

an ideal light; over a picture that, in the hands of a bungling realist, would have been coarse and repellent he has thrown the idealizing grace that makes it one of the most charming sketches in the world. Here is nature, as nature only ought to be in literature, elevated but never departed from. For me it is a good deal truer than a police report, and it adds something to life that I would not part with.

This is not the place for a discussion of Mr. Cable's genius. I only took up my pen to say that those who are so fortunate as to have an opportunity to hear this author interpret his own fascinating creations have a great pleasure ready for them.

Charles Dudley Warner.

Barnay as "Mark Antony."

HERR BARNAY'S vocation was unmistakably pre-ordained when he was endowed by Nature with his musical, resonant, flexible voice, his graceful and impressive presence, his noble head with its Roman cast of feature and commanding poise. Add to these physical gifts, the quick, electric fire, the happy blending of Oriental fervor with western versatility and vivacity characteristic of his Hungarian temperament, and we have the natural actor, who, no less than the poet, is born, not made. Possessing these splendid inherent qualifications, Herr Barnay has strengthened and developed them by the careful training, the earnest and laborious study of a conscientious artist. He is master of all the devices of the stage, using a freedom and variety of dramatic resource that occasionally (though only occasionally) verge upon the melodramatic. His art belongs to the romantic, realistic school, as opposed to the classic and antique. I use, advisedly, the apparently contradictory terms "romantic" and "realistic," for the great romantic revival initiated in literature by Rousseau and his followers, and developed by Goethe, Byron, Scott, and all the poets of the eighteenth century, was but the protest of truth, nature, and realism, against cant in morals and the artificial in art. By the singular effect of a violent reaction, romanticism to-day in its turn has come to signify the very antithesis of truth and reality. But this interpretation is only a passing accident resulting from the extreme point to which the movement was carried, and does not alter the fact that the best art may be at the same time very romantic and very real. Herr Barnay is seen to most advantage in characters that call into play these two qualities; while he lacks the serene repose, the majesty, the restrained power of the finest classic art, he is peculiarly fitted for the rendering of brilliant, fiery, and impetuous rôles. As *Mark Antony*, his masterly interpretation of the spirit of the part was not a little enhanced by his appropriate type of face and figure, which made the illusion complete. Never before was more adequate expression given to the triumvir's personal attributes,—his grace, elegance, and magnetism, his moral weakness and intellectual strength, his genuine but superficial sympathy, his unscrupulous ambition, his insinuating, nay, irresistible oratory. Herr Barnay is wonderfully fine and subtle in the scene immediately following the assassination; the studied self-control of his manner, the deeply calculated effect

of his conciliatory words to the conspirators, and the apparent sincerity with which he clasps the hand of each in turn, are worthy of all praise. But beyond praise is his sudden, overwhelming outburst of passionate grief, when the murderers have departed and he flings himself upon Cæsar's corpse.

"O pardon me, thou piece of bleeding earth,
That I am meek and gentle with these butchers."

This is one of those "great moments" of spontaneity and power that are the touchstone of quality, and that set the stamp upon the actor of genius as distinguished from the actor of talent.

Barnay's delivery of the funeral oration leaves nothing to be desired. Thé Roman mob (evidently drilled according to the rules of the Meiningen company, to which Barnay at one time belonged) bring his speech into admirable relief, swayed and controlled, as they seem to be, by his commanding voice and cunning rhetoric. Leaning forward on his arms over the pulpit he addresses them at first in a colloquial tone, only gradually working up to the eloquent, declamatory style of the orator, and visibly studying the effect of every inflection upon these coarse, expressive faces. He is extremely forcible and original in the concluding passage of the speech:

"But were I Brutus,
And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony
Would ruffle up your spirits, and put a tongue
In every wound of Cæsar, that should move
The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny."

Here he leaves the hearse, beside which he has been standing, and winds in and out among the mob, hissing forth these lines with half suppressed horror and indignation, directly inciting, as it were, each individual to the terrible act of "mutiny!"

Within the limits of his temperament, which, as we have said, is marked by energy, enthusiasm, and impetuosity, Barnay is an actor of the first rank. His repertory is extensive and varied; but if it were only for his *Mark Antony*, he would deserve to be classed with the very few actors who seem not so much to interpret as to reveal Shakspeare.

Emma Lazarus.

On Indian Education and Self-support.

THE antagonism felt toward the Indian seems to result, not so much from conflicts incident to our possessing the land, as from his sociologic status which differs so widely from our own. It is a comparatively recent suggestion that a social condition similar to that of the Indian preceded our present advancement, and that an intelligent study of archaic forms of society may reveal the sources of some of the laws and customs which are still potent in our midst. This suggestion, however, has not yet affected the bulk of our people, and the indiscriminate name of "savage" is still sufficient, practically, to cut the Indian off from human interest and sympathy.

Indian society is generally supposed to be without law or order—a sort of random life; but careful investigation is showing that most, if not all, of the tribes are organized into gentes, the gens being based

upon relationship; these gentes combine to form *fratres*, the fratres join to form the tribe, and tribes unite to form confederacies. The gens is, so to speak, the social unit. It possesses a distinctive name, significant of its religious or social ancestry; it has a system of names which are given to its members; it has its hereditary chief, elective chiefs, and soldiers; its location in the tribal circle is fixed; and it has its functions and duties in the religious and secular tribal ceremonies. It is, therefore, a little community possessed of distinct powers, but lacking the means of perpetuation because of the law which forbids a member of a gens to marry within his gens. Thus the tie of marriage and collateral relationship binds the gentes together. Each Indian, therefore, is born into his gens where he is thenceforth fixed, for he may not set up his tent and establish his home except with his gens, where his immediate interests and responsibilities center. The influence of the gens holds even when the Indians have broken up the tribal circle and scattered out on individual farms; and many generations will pass before all traces of this ancient social form will cease to exist.

War among the Indians is generally a private enterprise. When a man desires to avenge a wrong, or wishes to wander forth in quest of booty, or, if in the recklessness of sorrow, he desires to risk his life to assuage his grief, he steps out into the tribal circle or open space, and announces his intention to go on the war-path. Then, when he has fulfilled certain ceremonies, he departs, and is followed by those of his kindred or friends who care to join in the venture. Each one goes voluntarily,—no one is urged or forced to be of the party. War, therefore, rarely involves any considerable part of the tribe, and there is no record of a war ever being the unanimous wish of the tribe. Warfare, partaking of this private and irresponsible character, is more disastrous than when organized and national, since it renders life and possessions exposed to individual caprice. This custom, so detrimental to the advancement of a people, is, in part, counteracted by the authority vested in the chief.

It is the duty of the chief to prevent quarrels, to settle those that take place, to preserve harmony in the tribe, and to make peace with other tribes. His office is semi-religious, and he cannot go on the war-path, or lead his people in battle, unless under the stress of defensive warfare. Our failure to understand the private character of war-parties and the peaceful duties of the chiefs has led to mistakes. Negotiations have been entered into between the Government and Indian soldiers, and not with the chiefs of the tribe, who were quiet at home. The tribe, not being officially represented, either in the war or in the settlement, regarded the whole transaction as a private arrangement, which could not concern it as a whole. "Paper chiefs," as the Indians often call those Indian soldiers whom our army has sometimes caught and negotiated with, possess much less influence in the tribe than we are wont to fancy. Indians are never counted as chiefs unless they are initiated into the office by the regular tribal form.

Indian society has, therefore, its peculiar organization, and is both real and effective. The same is true of the religion of the Indian. It, too, binds him fast with minute observances, intricate ceremonials, long

rituals, on the exact performance of which the welfare of his daily life and his future depends. The Indian's religious duties begin in his childhood and last throughout all his days. Fixity, not freedom, is the characteristic of the primitive forms of his society.

Incapacity and aversion to labor are supposed to be characteristic of the Indian, and are spoken of in connection with his being a hunter, and, in the popular notion, to be a hunter is to live for sport and the pleasures of the chase. When the food supply is derived alone from the precarious chase, the occupation of the hunter becomes one of grave responsibility and labor. Among many of the tribes, the hunting was under the control of leaders, who were appointed to the office with certain religious ceremonies, and any person undertaking private hunting-ventures without the knowledge and sanction of these leaders would incur serious punishment. These rules were rigidly observed in the buffalo country.

Thus the life of an Indian man after reaching maturity was filled with activities and dangers, and it was impossible to avoid such a life in a land devoid of animals capable of being domesticated. Sex determined the occupation of the individual. The men composed the combatant force; they were the protectors and hunters. The women formed the non-combatant part of the community, and were the agricultural and industrial portion of the people. Many of the peculiarities of the Indian race and custom are traceable to the absence of domestic animals. Our more fortunate race, being bred on a continent where lived the sheep and the ox, laid upon these animals the burden of food supply, and the mind, thus freed from its most pressing need, asserted its creative power and devised better modes of living, and gradually society developed into coördinated forms and industries. It is a suggestive speculation to consider what would have been our present condition had our immediate ancestors been forced to accept the poverty of this country in respect to animals, cereals, and fruits. When we look at the Indian mode of life, it is important to remember his environment on this continent and its potent limitations.

It is worth noticing that the Indians have not invented a lock and key, as it opens a singular vista concerning their estimate of possessions. When about to leave their villages, they place their goods in cache to prevent loss from their enemies. Thieving among them is rare; the chiefs enforce the return of articles stolen. It would almost drop the race from the list of mankind to assert that Indians never stole; but it may truly be stated that stealing is not a characteristic trait. The contrary prejudice on our part is queerly indicated in the following quotation from an official communication: "They (the Indians spoken of) are honest, or at least as honest as it is usual for Indians to be. I have never known them to steal, and their word can usually be relied upon."

Treachery toward a friend is almost unknown among Indians. Toward an enemy it is as it is with us: "All is fair in war." To the outside observer vengeance often seems indiscriminately practiced by the Indians; but according to their laws of the responsibility of kinship, the acts find explanation. Among the Indians, kindred rise and fall together; any or all can be held responsible for the act of any one of kin

whether all are cognizant of the act or not. According to our law, innocent and ignorant persons may thus be made to suffer; but according to Indian law, kinship must bear the burden. It is not many centuries since a similar code held us in its clutch.

When fairly dealt with, the Indians are, as a rule, friendly, honest, and true. Truthfulness is an Indian trait, the ideal man is "straight." "I have talked to you without branches," said a venerable chief. The Indian idea of truth is simple, literal, hugging close to the fact, and this idea is consonant with his elaborate social and religious ceremonies. "It is," or "It is not," covers all the ground to the Indian, and he finds it difficult to comprehend the contingencies which hedge about our life and thought.

A careful study of the Indian reveals him to be a man bearing the marks of a common human nature. His peculiar environment has developed him in lines which do not coincide with our lines of development. If his ancient environment were to continue unaltered, there would be little hope of any speedy or great modification of his ancient social and religious forms; but his environment has already changed, and he is to-day stranded upon unknown and untried circumstances. For this change we are directly responsible, as well as for the difficulties involved and their solution. We have corralled the Indian and tried by various expedients to postpone facing the problem of his future, until at last further delay is impossible. His future is indissolubly linked to our own, and the welfare of both races demands careful consideration of the question before us and the difficulties involved in it.

According to the last report of the Indian Commissioner, there are in the territory of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, 262,366 Indians. Of this number 64,393 belong to the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory and the Six Nations of New York State, leaving 197,973 Indians whose treaties and relations place them in direct line with our responsibility. The amount of land held in reservations is 224,259 square miles, covering an area of 143,525,960 acres. Deducting the amount belonging to the civilized tribes before mentioned, which is 19,672,147 acres, of which only 9,500,352 are classed as tillable, there remains 123,853,813 acres, contained in about 124 reservations, not including the Pueblo villages. These reservations are under the management of fifty-six agencies, and are scattered over eleven States and nine territories. There are, besides, 15,434 Indians living at large without Governmental supervision or special land provision, and this number does not include the remnants of tribes living in the Eastern States.

The wide extent of country over which these tracts of land are spread, the variety of products, and the character of the soil, should prevent too sweeping generalizations when one is considering how the Indians are to become self-supporting on these lands.

Heretofore, the question of Indian land tenure has overshadowed all other considerations pertaining to his welfare. Important as is this question, the statistics contained in the commissioner's report show it to be less simple than has been supposed. Of the 123,853,813 acres contained in the 124 reservations and set apart for the support of the 197,973 Indians, only

8,096,463 acres are reported as tillable, which would give not quite five acres to each Indian. This calculation, however, is based upon an even distribution of the tillable land, according to the location of the population, but the report shows that the tillable land is very unevenly distributed. Another obstacle, perhaps, is the Indian's view of land tenure. He does not see how land, which is as necessary to the welfare of animated nature as air and water, can be withdrawn from the common weal and appropriated to the use of an individual.

The question, therefore, of the Indian becoming self-supporting is something more than giving the Indians titles, and telling them "to go to work on their lands," even if every Indian were adapted to farming.

Agriculture, where the land is suitable, will undoubtedly be the employment of a large number of Indians; but it is clearly impossible for all, since there does not remain enough tillable land to yield support from the soil alone. The inexperienced labor of the Indian adds to the difficulty, and this arises from his isolation and consequent lack of training by means of observation and contact with farmers. It may not be inopportune to allude here to the fact that heretofore tilling the land has been considered by the Indians as woman's work, and the Indian man possesses the aversion, common in our own race, of one sex entering upon the conventional occupation of the opposite sex. Nor is civilization as viewed by the Indian woman without its drawbacks. Their status is one of independence in many ways, particularly as to property. Once when our laws respecting married women were being explained to them, an Indian matron exclaimed, "I'm glad I'm not a white woman!"

A considerable portion of the land classed as tillable requires irrigation, and to make such land profitable, capital and intelligent labor are needed to construct ditches, canals, flumes, etc., and to keep them in repair. A considerable portion of the land reserved is suitable for herding, and there are many persons in our midst who advocate this occupation for the Indians as especially suitable, and quote the advance of our race in the remote past, through herding. The environment of our race was very different from the conditions of this continent, where the absence of animals capable of domestication has left the Indian without an heredity which would tend to make him successful in the care of animals. Herding is to-day, not a pastoral occupation, but a business requiring capital, executive ability, and a knowledge of the market. None of these requirements are at present possible to the Indian, particularly with his barrier of language and ignorance of commercial methods.

Looking at the Indian tribes from a close personal knowledge and study of their life and customs, it seems plainly indicated that variety of occupation and modes of winning self-support is to be the rule with them, as it is with us. Nor can one expect that every Indian will become an industrious, enterprising landholder. There will be such among the tribes, but there will also be the shiftless, indolent class that exists in every community. Our method of treating the race has been to level down, and to attempt to make all alike. The results have been unfortunate. It is the salvation of a people to permit those who can to advance and distance the less vigorous.

The industrial schools at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, Hampton, Virginia, and Forest Grove, Oregon, are movements toward recognizing the value of the individual Indian. At these schools he is taught trades, the worth of labor, and personal responsibility, and, thus is prepared to cope with the world and earn his own living. The Indian has always been a kind of artisan, and his hand is skilled by long heredity to steady lines and strokes, more fine than heavy. The trend of his past turns him toward the shop where the work of the eye and hand is coördinated. To the truth of this statement, it is only needful to call to mind the silver work of Northern and Southern Indians, the bows and arrows and other weapons, the wrought bone implements, the pipes, both historic and prehistoric; nor should woman's handicraft be forgotten,—her weaving, quill embroidery, the articles made of skin, bark, and wood; her pottery-making and free-hand ornamentation. Our museums bear ample testimony to the industrial ability of our native races. The Indian, therefore, is not lazy; but he does not labor as we labor; he has not learned the value of persistent work, which begets provision and care for the future, and his environment in the past has been of such a character as to furnish no suggestion as to the need of such care-taking, but rather the contrary. The one thing imperatively needed for the Indian is industrial education. Educate him thus, and he becomes a friendly neighbor and co-worker; keep him in ignorance and isolation, and he becomes dangerous to his own future and to those about him.

The Commission's report states that the number of Indian children who are of school age (exclusive of the five civilized tribes) is 34,662; and this is an underestimate, as several tribes are not reported. The number of reservation schools is given as 73 boarding, 105 day, and 2 night schools. These schools are maintained at a cost to the Government of \$278,733, exclusive of rations and of part of the clothing. Various religious societies contribute \$58,725, and the State of New York \$17,644. The industrial schools at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, Forest Grove, Oregon, and the Indian department at Hampton, Virginia, receive from the Government \$91,394, and religious societies give to these institutions \$49,882. It is not improper to state that, but for generous outside support, the effectiveness of these schools would be seriously curtailed. Those now in operation can accommodate only 10,202 children, leaving a school population of 24,460 without any possible means of education or instruction in the ways of civilized life.

Where is the block in the way of educating these children? It is in Congress, which should appropriate the money. It is but just to say that there are men in Congress who appreciate the need of education for the Indian, who desire to have the money appropriated; but they are surrounded by such a dead-weight of indifference and ignorance that they can make little headway. This year the appropriations are inadequate, considering the needs and just demands. Treaty obligations, the appeal of the Indians through their agents, the urgent request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the plain setting forth of the Secretary of the Interior, failed to move the Congressmen from their short-sighted policy and false notions of economy. It is cause for congratulation that the

present Secretary of the Interior is seriously and practically in earnest to secure education for the Indian. In his report he offsets war expenses against a plan for educating annually 10,000 Indian children, and adds:

"It is believed that with an annual expenditure of between five and six million dollars, during the next fifteen years, for educational purposes of the character indicated, the danger of Indian outbreaks may be avoided, and the great mass of Indian youth at least made self-supporting."

That such prudent counsel should fall short of practice for the lack of money gives rise to the query whether there remains any other available resource by which industrial education can be provided for the Indian in the near future. Turning to the report, we find that a considerable part of the 115,957,350 acres classed as untillable is adapted to herding. Men with capital and various corporations are coveting these plains, and even now negotiations are pending for the purchase of millions of these acres. Other portions of the untillable land lie in regions of known mineral wealth. Valuable mines have already been discovered, and prospecting parties are secretly pushing their investigations. The day is not far distant when these lands will also fall into the hands of those who can develop their hidden wealth.

The great reservations are sure to be broken up, and it is best that they should be, best for the Indians, best for civilization and for our own race. Isolation is ruin to the Indians, and brings injury to us as well. There is no safety for any people except in education, law, and freedom.

A considerable portion of the land held for the Indians is not secured by treaty, but by executive order; and when land of this tenure is withdrawn, little if any compensation will be given to the Indians. A detailed examination of the treaty lands shows that it is not prudent to delay longer the conserving of the land capital of the Indians. The income which can be secured from the sale of surplus lands will be none too large to meet the needs of industrial schools fitted to prepare the Indian youth to earn their living by intelligent labor, by which alone they can secure their future welfare and advancement. The well known "Civilization Fund" was derived from the sale of Indian lands. To that fund was mainly due the establishment of the industrial schools at Carlisle, Forest Grove, and Hampton, which herald the day of right-doing toward the native inhabitants of our land.

A. C. Fletcher.

On the Galloping Horse in Art.

THE article entitled "The Horse in Motion," which appeared in the *THE CENTURY MAGAZINE*, for July, 1882, describes how, at the instance and the expense of the public-spirited Governor Stanford of California, Dr. J. D. B. Stillman, a physician, and Mr. Eadward Muybridge, a photographer, investigated the sequence of attitudes taken by animals in quick motion, and their causes, and how in the five-thousandth part of a second an attitude was photographed at each foot of the stride of a galloping horse.

The truths discovered by these gentlemen are a most