

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### The First Presidential Election Under Ballot Reform.

THE presidential election of this year will be the first one in the history of the country to be decided by a secret ballot. Three quarters of all the States will cast their vote in that election in accordance with some form of the Australian system, and these three quarters include the most powerful States in all sections except the South. They include all the New England and Middle States, and all the Western and Northwestern States except Iowa, Kansas, Nevada, and Idaho. Four Southern States will have the system in operation this year,—Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, and West Virginia,—and Kentucky and Texas have adopted constitutions directing their legislatures to enact laws embodying its principles. Seven Southern States have, for some inexplicable reason, failed to realize the value of a reform which is of even greater importance to the South than it is to any other part of the Union.

The fact that all the so-called "doubtful" States, whose vote is decisive in the election, are to cast their ballots in absolute secrecy, free from all espionage and intimidation, is one of momentous importance. The first and inevitable effect will be to lessen enormously the part which money will play in the contest. Every State in which money has heretofore been used most freely has adopted the new system. If votes be bought in those States hereafter, the purchasers cannot follow the men whom they have bought to the polls to see if they keep their bad bargain. The result will be the same in those States as it has been everywhere else under similar conditions; namely, very few votes will be bought.

This is a novel phase of a presidential canvass and election which both political parties will do well to take into consideration in selecting their campaign managers for this year. If money is no longer to be the controlling factor in the election, will it be either expedient or wise to put a professional corruptionist in charge of the campaign of either party? On the contrary, will it not be the highest political wisdom to put men of character in charge of all the committees, national, State, district, and other? Surely the time has come when such a change is most earnestly to be desired. Everybody admitted at the close of the last presidential campaign that money had been used upon both sides with a profusion never before seen in this country. There was no concealment of the fact. Both campaign committees admitted that they had used large sums, but that each had been compelled to do so by the lavish outlays of the other. Indeed, for several years past the absolute necessity for getting skilled corruptionists to take charge of campaign work has been argued with great plausibility on the ground that for one party not to do it would be simply to let the other party's corruptionist win the battle without a struggle. "We must fight the devil with fire" has been the excuse on both sides, and the fire has been supplied with a recklessness and an abundance which aroused the conscience of the whole country, and did more than anything else to create the popular sentiment in favor of ballot re-

form which has led to the enactment of the twenty-nine laws of to-day.

These laws are certain to operate here in the same beneficent way in which they operated in England. They did not stop all extravagant use of money in elections, but they did put a stop to bribery. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, when in this country at the time our ballot-reform agitation was beginning, said of the operation of the Australian system in England: "In my opinion there is at the present moment exceedingly little electoral bribery and corruption in the United Kingdom. The elections are singularly pure, and are daily, if it were possible, improving in that respect. Corruption, indeed, is almost an impossibility, owing to the fact that the briber is absolutely dependent upon the bribe-taker's observance of the motto 'Honor among thieves,' for the briber has no means of ascertaining how the latter votes." Yet before the English law went into effect bribery was more open than, and its general practice had reached proportions far in excess of, anything ever seen here.

In England they did not stop with legislation making bribery unprofitable because of the impossibility of seeing the goods delivered, but they went a step further, and forbade extravagant expenditures of all kinds in elections by limiting the amount of money each candidate should be allowed to spend, and requiring him to publish a sworn account of all his expenditures. They made this the corollary of their ballot-reform legislation, and we must do the same thing here before we can stop the undue use of money in elections. The English Corrupt Practices Act, to which we have had occasion to refer many times, was passed by Parliament in 1883. It forbade the undue use of money and influence in every conceivable way, and fixed a maximum limit for all expenditures, requiring the sworn publication after election of every penny spent. When it was under discussion it was constantly predicted that it must fail of its purpose because the evils complained of were not such as could be reached by legislation, and the opinion was almost universal that the maximum limits of expenditure were far too low. Yet it was a complete success at its first trial, and practically abolished corruption in English politics at a single blow. When the grand total of expenditures in the election had been footed up, it was discovered that it was only a little more than one half of the grand total allowed by the law, so that, instead of being too low, the maximum limits were at least a third higher than they needed to be. This demonstration has been repeated in every subsequent election. When one candidate does not bribe, his opponent has no incentive to outbid him; and the result is that elections are not only decided on the merits of the candidates as they appear to the uninfluenced judgment of the electors, but they are so cheap that the poor man has equal chance with the rich as a candidate.

Does anybody doubt that if we had a law in this country fixing maximum limits for the expenditures in behalf of all candidates from aldermanic to presidential, and requiring sworn publication of all expenditures

after election, that the profuse use of money in elections would not be stopped at once upon the law's going into effect? Sworn publicity by itself would be almost a complete cure. If both campaign committees in 1888 had made their expenditures with the knowledge that at the end of their work they would be required to make public, under oath, a full statement of all the money they had received and spent, would not the outlay have been much less than it was?

We have, by passing ballot-reform laws, made the use of money for bribery difficult if not impossible, and have, therefore, cut off one of the avenues for large expenditures; but we must not stop there. So long as extravagant expenditures are permitted, they will be made. Our experience is like that of all other nations. There has never been a government under which the rich have not bought votes and the poor have not sold them, provided the law permitted such bargains to be made in secret. The American people are as jealous in the care of the moral health of their political system as other nations have been, and now that they have taken the first step toward abolishing corruption from their elections, they will be certain to take the second at an early day. In the mean time the political managers will do well to make a note of the fact that money is certain to play a less important, and reason and argument a more important, part in the campaign of 1892 than in those of its immediate predecessors, and select their campaign directors with this end in view. They can rest assured, furthermore, that the people are not in a mood to view with complacency the selection of a professional corruptionist to conduct the campaign of either party,—much less the nomination by any party of a notoriously corrupt politician as a candidate for the presidency,—though in these latter days such men have dared to attempt to juggle even the presidency into their pockets.

The New Electoral College.

UNDER the new Apportionment Act the Electoral College in the next presidential election will consist of 444 members, and 223 votes will be necessary to elect. This is an increase of 43 over the Electoral College of 1888, of which 23 come from enlarged representation in 17 old States, and 20 from the admission into the Union of six new States. We give in the following table the old and new apportionment for each State, the old States being divided between the two parties as they voted in the last presidential election:

Republican.		Democratic.	
New ap.	Old ap.	New ap.	Old ap.
California.....	9	8	8
Colorado.....	4	3	3
Illinois.....	24	22	22
Indiana.....	15	15	15
Iowa.....	13	13	13
Kansas.....	10	9	9
Maine.....	6	6	6
Massachusetts.....	15	14	13
Michigan.....	14	14	14
Minnesota.....	9	7	7
Nebraska.....	8	5	5
Nevada.....	3	3	3
New Hampshire.....	4	4	4
New York.....	36	36	36
Ohio.....	23	23	23
Oregon.....	4	3	3
Pennsylvania.....	32	30	30
Rhode Island.....	4	4	4
Vermont.....	4	4	4
Wisconsin.....	12	11	11
Totals.....	249	233	233
Increase.....	16		
Alabama.....	11	10	10
Arkansas.....	8	7	7
Connecticut.....	6	6	6
Delaware.....	3	3	3
Florida.....	4	4	4
Georgia.....	13	12	12
Kentucky.....	13	13	13
Louisiana.....	8	8	8
Maryland.....	8	8	8
Mississippi.....	9	9	9
Missouri.....	17	16	16
New Jersey.....	10	9	9
North Carolina.....	11	11	11
South Carolina.....	9	9	9
Tennessee.....	12	12	12
Texas.....	15	13	13
Virginia.....	12	12	12
West Virginia.....	6	6	6
Totals.....	175	168	168
Increase.....	7		

NEW STATES.

Idaho.....	3
Montana.....	3
North Dakota.....	3
South Dakota.....	4
Washington.....	4
Wyoming.....	3
Total.....	20

If we divide the States, old and new, according as they have voted in the most recent elections since 1888, some of which occurred in 1890 and others in 1891, we shall arrive at the following result:

Republican.	Democratic.
California.....	9
Colorado.....	4
Idaho.....	3
Illinois.....	24
Kansas.....	10
Maine.....	6
Michigan.....	10
Minnesota.....	9
Montana.....	3
Nebraska.....	8
Nevada.....	3
New Hampshire.....	4
North Dakota.....	3
Ohio.....	23
Oregon.....	4
Pennsylvania.....	32
Rhode Island.....	4
South Dakota.....	4
Vermont.....	4
Washington.....	4
Wisconsin.....	12
Wyoming.....	3
Total.....	186
Alabama.....	11
Arkansas.....	8
Connecticut.....	3
Delaware.....	6
Florida.....	4
Georgia.....	13
Indiana.....	15
Iowa.....	13
Kentucky.....	13
Louisiana.....	8
Maryland.....	8
Massachusetts.....	15
Michigan.....	4
Mississippi.....	9
Missouri.....	17
New Jersey.....	10
New York.....	36
North Carolina.....	11
South Carolina.....	9
Tennessee.....	12
Texas.....	15
Virginia.....	12
West Virginia.....	6
Total.....	258

In this compilation Massachusetts, Iowa, and New York are placed in the Democratic column because each of those States has been carried by the Democrats in two successive elections since 1888. Indiana is placed there because the Democrats carried it by nearly 20,000 majority in 1890. Michigan is placed in both columns because twelve of her fourteen electors are to be chosen this year by congressional districts, and two by the State at large. It is conceded that at least four of them will be elected by the Democrats, and we have put that number in the Democratic column.

While making this division on the basis of elections held since 1888, we do not for a moment wish to appear as assuming that the result of this year's presidential contest is foreshadowed by it. There are several States usually and rightly classified as "doubtful" which in this division are placed in the Democratic column. There are also at least two others which have hitherto been regarded as safely Republican in presidential elections. The "doubtful" States are Connecticut, Indiana, and New York, and the States hitherto classed as Republican are Iowa and Massachusetts. All the twenty-two States in the Republican column have hitherto been regarded as surely Republican, with the exception of Montana, and possibly New Hampshire and Rhode Island. As the Republican column stands, its total of 186 votes, 37 less than enough to elect, may be taken as representing fairly the number of absolutely "sure" Republican votes. If now we take from the Democratic column the 57 votes of the three "doubtful" States, and the 28 votes of Massachusetts and Iowa, we reduce the Democratic total to 173, or 50 short of a majority in the college, which may be taken as representing fairly the number of absolutely "sure" Democratic votes.

There are several interesting combinations which can be made with these "sure" totals as bases. First, as to the Republican side. Here are four :

Sure Republican votes .....	186
New York .....	36
Connecticut .....	6
Total .....	228

Sure Republican votes .....	186
Massachusetts .....	15
Iowa .....	13
Indiana .....	15
Total .....	229

Sure Republican votes .....	186
New York .....	36
Iowa .....	13
Total .....	235

Sure Republican votes .....	186
New York .....	36
Massachusetts or Indiana .....	15
Total .....	237

All these combinations are on a basis of ten Republican votes from Michigan. If there were to be eleven, this combination, giving precisely a majority of the college, could be made :

Sure Republican votes .....	187
New York .....	36
Total .....	223

Turning next to the Democratic column, we can arrange the following :

Sure Democratic votes .....	173
New York .....	36
Indiana or Massachusetts .....	15
Total .....	224

Sure Democratic votes .....	173
New York .....	36
Iowa .....	13
Connecticut .....	6
Total .....	228

These are arranged on the basis of four Democratic votes from Michigan. If the number from that State be raised to five, the following can be made :

Sure Democratic votes .....	174
Massachusetts .....	15
Indiana .....	15
Iowa .....	13
Connecticut .....	6
Total .....	223

The first point which will strike every observer of these various combinations is the overwhelming importance of the thirty-six votes of the State of New York. It is as true now as it has been for many years that the party which carries that State has by far the better chance of winning the election. The admission of the six new States with their twenty electoral votes, all supposed to be safely Republican, has diminished somewhat the importance of New York to the Republicans ; that is to say, they have more chances for winning without New York than they have had hitherto, and more chances than the Democrats have for winning without it : but, as our combinations show, they will have to carry all the States of Iowa, Massachusetts, and Indiana in order to accomplish that feat. As for the Democrats, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that New York is a *sine qua non* for them. With that and Indiana or Massachusetts they can win, or they can win with it together with Iowa and Connecticut ; but it is very difficult to make a combination by which they can win without it, unless we were to count Montana among the "doubtful" States and give them a chance at that, or, as our final combination shows, give them one more vote in Michigan than is usually allotted to them.

The importance of Michigan with its divided vote is second only to that of New York with its largest total in the list. This is made apparent by our final combination in each set, for it is there shown that the change of one vote from one side to the other in Michigan may enable either party to elect a President.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### The Yankee and Rebel Yells.

ALL organized bodies of men, whether civilized or savage, while engaged in desperate deeds, and every army from the days of Pharaoh to the present moment, have probably had their peculiar yell or cheer, a vocal outburst natural to the people represented. The potent or determining influence which yells, vigorous and enthusiastic, or weak and heartless, may have had from time to time in turning the tide of battle, whether in securing victories or in causing defeats, is an unwritten element or force in war which the historian has greatly if not totally neglected.

It is certainly safe to say, other things being equal, that the body of men or the army exhibiting the greatest amount of enthusiasm, even though its numbers may be decidedly inferior, will possess a marked advantage over its antagonist. Hence to awaken spirit, determination, and dash in his troops at the moment of a charge, is the

earnest desire of every commanding officer. To secure this end, when no secrecy is required, a bold, defiant "yell" is of the greatest value, not only in its effect upon the command in action, but also in the depressing influence which may be produced upon the enemy.

It would be interesting indeed to know the old Roman and Grecian yells, their tone, spirit, and vocal range ; but this the historian has left to our imagination. The same may also be said, so far as I am aware, of the English, French, German, and Russian yells or cheers, for we read and hear but little or nothing of their existence or of their influence in battle.

During and since our late war the "Rebel" and "Yankee" yells have been frequently referred to, but their true character and essential differences, with reasons for the differences, have not, so far as I know, been clearly presented.

I was recently asked to say something upon this subject before the society of "The Virginians" on the