

gine that it will cure itself in time. It must be met in this country, as it has been met in England and other countries, with restrictive and prohibitive measures of the most comprehensive and stringent character. Bad as our condition is, Professor Jenks is quite correct in saying it is not so bad as that of England was before the enactment of its Corrupt Practices Act in 1883. Our bribery methods are in some respects different from what the English were, and are less open and less general, but they are all as easily reached by law as theirs were found to be.

In all American efforts to meet the evil by legislation the mistake has been made of trying to accomplish the end in a brief and more or less general statute. The authors of the various bills, while drawing their ideas mainly from the English act, have been afraid to imitate its great length and minuteness lest their measures be condemned as "too complex" and "too cumbersome" for the simple needs of free American election methods. When ballot reform was first discussed, the opponents of it raised the same cry against the bills which its advocates prepared, and sought to have substituted for them measures of their own invention which were said to be simple and direct. Experience has shown, however, that in practice the simple and direct laws have all been failures, while those condemned as complicated have succeeded so perfectly as to furnish the accepted model of all subsequent ones. This lesson ought to be of use to us in preparing our corrupt practices laws. It is true that the English act is long, but it is also true that it was so completely successful from the moment of its application to an election that it abolished corruption and bribery at a single blow. The minuteness of the law covered every form of corruption so surely that its practice without detection was found to be impossible. Any law which fails to do this is too short, no matter what its length. The English act, as one of its ablest commentators, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, says, "is pervaded by two principles: the first is to strike hard and home at corrupt practices; the second is to prohibit, by positive legislation, any expenditure in the conduct of an election which is not absolutely necessary." Both these principles were embodied in the act with such thoroughness that bribery disappeared instantly from English elections, never to return.

We can accomplish the same purification in this country, whenever public opinion reaches the point at which it is demanded. We must, as Professor Jenks points out, limit the expenditures in every instance, grading the maximum sum according to the office, and must require the sworn return of every penny received or expended, either by the candidate, or his agent, or his campaign committee. On every point the law must be drawn with such minuteness and clearness that evasion or violation will be impossible without detection and punishment. Then, too "assessments" upon candidates must be forbidden, and voluntary contributions from them must be limited, and the uses made of money strictly accounted for; every loophole of escape from the publication of every penny expended must be closed and barred. That is the strength which makes the length of the English statute, and we must have the sense as well as the courage to imitate it.

One new evil has sprung up here recently which Professor Jenks does not mention, and that is the hiring of registered voters to remain away from the polls. By

this method the briber is able to get positive proof that the bribed voter has kept his bargain. This practice would be broken up by the requirement of strict accountability for every penny expended. Like all the other evils, it exists only because of a kind of dullness of the public conscience, which, while it may not exactly condone bribery in elections, is not equal to the exertion of declaring that it will no longer be tolerated. Professor Jenks's words on this question of public responsibility are strong and to the point, and we commend them to the serious consideration of our readers. Public opinion is king in the United States, and it must bear the responsibility of all the sins which its own supineness or indifference permits corrupt politicians to commit.

What the Columbian Exhibition will do for America.

THE fact which most strongly impressed all visitors to the international exhibition at Paris in 1889 was its artistic character. Far beyond any of its predecessors in any land as a triumph of industry and a triumph of science, it was still more remarkable as a triumph of beauty. To perceive this fact, one did not need to enter the vast and stately palace filled with pictures and statues which showed the current work of all civilized countries, and, as in a splendid historical panorama, France's own work for a century past. Nor did one need to examine the buildings, or to study the sculptured decorations with which buildings and grounds were lavishly adorned. The most impressive, the most beautiful thing at the Paris Exposition was the conception of the exhibition as a whole: the choice and arrangement and planting of the site, the placing of the buildings, their design considered as factors in a great coherent yet diversified scheme, and the way in which all individual factors worked together toward a magnificently harmonious general effect. It was the general effect of this exhibition — the fine combining of its architectural, sculptural, and natural features — which gave it unique importance as an artistic spectacle.

All Americans who saw it must have said: "Only in Paris could such a result be achieved. Only the most artistic nation in the world could have achieved it; and even this nation could not if its artistic powers had been unorganized, uncontrolled. France possesses a far larger number of great artists than any other land. These artists have been trained in the same schools, are inspired by the same practical and esthetic ideals, and are used to working together, and to working under official control; and this exhibition is an official, Government enterprise. Under such conditions such success was possible; under other conditions it would be impossible. Under American conditions how could we hope to see it even remotely approached? How can we hope soon to see in America anything very different from what we saw at Philadelphia in 1876: a big industrial show, a triumph of commercialism and applied science, an exaltation of material wealth, where beauty existed only in certain collections almost altogether drawn from foreign sources, and where the desire for beauty, when it could be elsewhere divined, had been stunted by crude ignorance, limited by economy or deformed by the love of mere display, and stultified by the lack of any common ideal and the absence of any general scheme of arrangement and design? We

are not nearly so artistic a people as the French," we said to ourselves in Paris. "Such artistic power as we do possess is largely untrained, and such trained talents as we have are accustomed to work independently and along different paths. Whatever we may do will be done by unorganized public, not by organized official effort; and so we can never have an exhibition which, as a whole, will approach the beauty of this one, or be half so useful in teaching how artistic talents of various kinds may best be utilized."

We said this in Paris, and, a year or so later, when the Columbian Exhibition of 1893 was decided upon, we said it again, and perhaps more emphatically, in the belief that such an enterprise would be less well carried out in a Western city than it might have been in Washington, as a Government enterprise, or in New York, the center of the artistic life of our continent. As the city of Chicago would appear to the eyes of the world if, for artistic importance, it were compared with the city of Paris, nearly so, all Americans feared, might the artistic importance of the Chicago Exhibition contrast with that of the last Paris Exhibition. Artistic capabilities, we knew, had vastly developed in our country since 1876. But our people, we thought, still did not rightly feel the difference between skill and ineptitude, between beauty and ugliness, and still did not rightly value skill and beauty even when it recognized them. And still there was no likelihood that the many hands which would have to plan and build the exhibition would agree upon any scheme of arrangement and treatment broad and firm enough to secure that fundamental harmony between part and part without which dignity, beauty, and impressiveness of general aspect could not be secured, and without which even the possible excellence of individual features would fail of its right effect. The very progress we had made in art during the past fifteen years seemed to make a harmonious exhibition improbable, for it had been progress along many diverging paths, and had meant rather the accentuation of artistic individuality than a growing concord in taste. Chicago, we thought, might show us some buildings and some collections much more beautiful than any we had seen in Philadelphia, but it would not show us a beautiful exhibition. The commercial, utilitarian side of American endeavor might not be so crudely set forth as in 1876; but at best we could expect only a carnival of conflicting individual efforts, where art, pseudo-art, frank utilitarianism, and a childish or a vulgar love of display would meet and struggle together.

Such anticipations as these were universal two years ago. We need not explain how radically mistaken they have already been proved. Mr. Van Brunt has told our readers how the great exhibition of 1893 was organized and how its site was selected—or, more truly, how the place for its site was chosen and then the site itself was almost literally created. He has told how architects of proven ability from various parts of the country were entrusted with the chief buildings, and how these architects consulted with each other and with the landscape architects as regarded the placing and the designing of their works. And he has described some of the buildings in detail, and has hinted at the harmonious grandeur and beauty of their general effect. He has shown that we are to have a very beautiful

exhibition, and has shown that it will be beautiful because those who are making it are working together in a brotherly spirit, according to a wise and well-defined artistic scheme, and with a distinct and lofty general ideal in their minds. He has shown that an association of practical American business men, securing funds for the most part by their own efforts, and employing a band of artists hitherto accustomed to work in entire independence of one another, will create an exhibition similar in interest, as a homogeneous artistic spectacle, to the one created by the Government of the most artistic nation in the world, exerting unlimited powers, and employing a corps of artists accustomed from their earliest student days to tread in the same paths and to work hand in hand.

But there is even more than this to be said. We confidently assert, on the evidence of all the most experienced judges of art whom it has been possible for us to consult, that the Chicago Exhibition will far surpass even the Paris one of 1889 when considered in its entirety and for its artistic interest. A much more beautiful, scholarly, and monumental type of architecture has been adopted for its main buildings; accessory works of an ornamental kind will be more numerous, more imposing, and more original, while at least equally artistic in character; greater care is being taken that harmony of effect shall not be injured by the aspect of minor works of utility or decoration; and the neighborhood of the great lake, and the novel and skilful way in which wide expanses of water and varied plantations have been made the basis of the plan of the grounds themselves, will much more than compensate for the absence of a rushing river like the Seine and a dominating hill like the Trocadéro. The Eiffel Tower is a marvelous, an interesting, and hardly an ugly structure; but it is not an artistic structure. It did not conflict with its surroundings at Paris. But anything resembling it—anything remarkable chiefly for size or for mechanical ingenuity—would look painfully out of place on the Chicago grounds. This fact suffices to prove their higher degree of beauty; and the fact that no conspicuous structure appealing in any way to mere curiosity, or to the love of the new or the marvelous, has been contemplated by the authorities at Chicago, proves how seriously and wisely artistic a spirit is controlling the great enterprise.

Those who fail to see the exhibition of 1893 will fail to see the most beautiful spectacle which has been offered to the eyes of our generation. But those who have time to see only its general aspect, without studying any of its collections—wonderfully interesting though these will be—will have seen the very best of it.

When we remember what a great impulse was given to the popular love of art by the collections shown in the exhibition of 1876, what may we not expect as a result of the stately, beautiful, and truly poetic panorama of art that will be unrolled before the eyes of the nation in 1893? It will show for the first time, to scores of thousands of Americans who have never traveled abroad and can scarcely hope to do so, what is the meaning of the word beauty, what is the significance of the word art. It will convince them, as nothing else but long and intelligent foreign travel could, that beauty is an enjoyable thing, that art is a thing worth striving for and paying for. Indeed, no amount of for-

eign travel could teach this lesson so clearly as it will be taught to the average American by the plain fact that all this stately splendor was thought worth getting and worth paying for by hard-headed American business men, and for a merely temporary purpose. One constantly hears expressions of regret that buildings and sculptures so costly and beautiful should be destined to last for a few months only. But, in truth, their transitory character will vastly augment their missionary power. Even the most ignorant may dimly understand that it is worth while to take pains and spend money upon a result which is to be for all time; but at Chicago they will be told that this is worth while even for a result of almost ephemeral duration.

But it is not merely the untraveled American, wholly ignorant and neglectful of art, whom the exhibition will profit and instruct. Cultivated Americans think well of their fellow-countrymen in many directions. But as a nation we have as yet too little faith in our artistic capabilities,—too little respect for the American artist, too little belief that the nascent love of the public for art is genuine, vital, and strong. The Columbian Exhibition will prove to the most doubting and critical spirit that American art exists, that it is capable of great things, and that it can do great things in a way distinctively its own. Had Chicago equaled Paris, it would be greatly to our credit; but it has surpassed Paris. Had it produced a beautiful exhibition in imitation of the Paris Exhibition, it would again be much; but it has conceived an entirely different ideal, and carried it out on entirely novel lines. We shall have an exhibition more dignified, beautiful, and truly artistic than any the world has seen; and it will be entirely our own, in general idea and in every detail of its execution. It will convince all cultivated Americans, we repeat, of the vitality and vigor and independence of American art; and, we believe, its effect upon the vast public which will view it will convince them of the genuineness of the nascent American love of art.

Of course the learning of these great lessons will quickly react for good upon the American artist, opening to him wider fields, creating for him a more sympathetic public, exalting him to nobler ambitions, inspiring him to more strenuous efforts, deepening and strengthening his self-respect and his respect for art as a valued factor in the life of the nation. So wisely have the architectural types for the chief buildings been chosen that, we believe, they will do much to determine the lines of our architectural work in the future; and, at all events, no artist who visits Chicago can fail to learn the great lesson that in harmony and fraternity of effort lies our best hope of a noble artistic development.

We shall not speak of the great effect this exhibition will have in increasing the respect of foreigners for the people of the United States. This seems to us a very minor point in comparison with the effect it will have upon ourselves. Its national will be of far more vital importance than its international effect. What we chiefly wish to lay stress upon is its claim upon Americans as a very beautiful spectacle, and, still more forcibly, its claim upon Americans as a very instructive

spectacle. It will delight their eyes as nothing else has ever done. It will teach them the nature and value of art as nothing else could do. And it will affirm and increase their faith in those democratic institutions which once more, in a new field, have proved themselves capable of a magnificent, an unrivaled achievement.

Liberty, Law, and Order.

GOOD citizens are often grievously perplexed by the contemplation of those situations in life where opposing opinions or interests are brought into sharp conflict, and where the thoughtful man finds a certain amount of justice on both sides, and therefore hesitates as to the side to which he will give his sympathies. We speak now of those cases where the good citizen is an onlooker merely, not where he is necessarily a participator in the struggle on one side or the other, for then he is quicker to make up his mind. If the conflict is between the Indian and the grizzly, there is apt to be a finer balancing of motives and rights than if the grizzly happen to be in pursuit of the citizen himself.

The only way we know of whereby these doubts and anxieties can be quickly resolved into definite views is by a firm grip upon a few definite principles. These are the days of special sympathy with the poor and with the so-called — and sometimes narrowly so-called — “working-classes,” — the days of new or renewed theories and experiments as to the relation of labor and capital. This is the present phase of the eighteenth-century revolution. Never was so much said or written and thought on these subjects. Meantime, while some are thinking, others are acting; theories are being put into practice, and in the process heads are being broken, and dynamite is destroying property and life.

Shall we not, then, says the doubting citizen, sympathize with “organized labor,” and with reasoned discontent, even if these lead in extreme cases to self-inflicted misery and brutal bloodshed? Oh, yes; sympathy is right, if this does not bring infirmity of purpose, and that softness of attitude which encourages violence and crime. Yes, sympathize wherever sympathy may be justly due; but cling to the solid rock of individual liberty, of obedience to law, and the preservation of the peace! And do so for the very reason that in this world it will take so long to straighten things out in a way satisfactory to all. The readjustment of interests, the experimenting with new economical and governmental devices, will be such a slow process; there will always be so many apparent causes of discontent, that, unless by general consent these matters are arranged by peaceful methods, perpetual war, secret and bloody plots, infamous assassinations, will make life on this planet, to say the least, even much more unpleasing than it now is. Violence and crime, committed in no matter what honest name, are anarchy; and anarchy, in a free country, must be stamped out like the plague,—with the discrimination and the remorselessness of justice.