

instruction, may now be taught how the men who were divided on a question of principle and State fealty, and who fought the war which must remain the pivotal period of our history, won by equal devotion and valor that respect for each other which is the strongest bond of a reunited people.

#### Tips and their Takers.

ONE of the chapter-headings of Professor Sumner's keen and cruel little book about Social Classes is this: "THAT A FREE MAN IS A SOVEREIGN; AND THAT A SOVEREIGN CANNOT TAKE TIPS." It is greatly to be wished that some benevolent person would cause this to be printed in plain letters, neatly framed, and conspicuously hung up in every hotel office and dining-room, in every sleeping-car, in every minister's study, in every legislative chamber, and in both of the houses of Congress. How much deterioration of character is produced by the custom of bestowing and receiving gratuities cannot be easily estimated; if the facts could be shown, it would appear to be a fruitful source of moral degradation, and the first step in many a career of shame. The habit of taking tips, of expecting small gifts and unearned concessions, of looking for little favors of one kind or another, engenders a despicable state of mind, and strips a man of all manliness. He is simply a mendicant; he differs from the beggar in the street only in the method of his appeal. The beggar is brother to the thief, and the taker of tips has entered on the broad road to beggary. No man can keep his self-respect who sets out on this career; and when self-respect is gone the foundations of character are undermined.

Professor Sumner's trenchant apothegm concentrates the truth respecting this matter into a burning ray that ought to penetrate the consciences of a generation of mendicants. "A member of a free democracy is, in a sense, a sovereign. He has no superior. . . . He wants to be subject to no man. He wants to be equal to his fellows, as all sovereigns are equal. So be it; but he cannot escape the deduction that he call no man to his aid. The other sovereigns will not respect his independence if he becomes dependent; and they cannot respect his equality if he sues for favors." There is the whole matter in a nutshell. The taker of tips abdicates his sovereignty. He proclaims himself no longer independent. He acknowledges that he is inferior to the man whose gratuities he expects and solicits.

It is a curious and significant fact that white native Americans of the working classes are not greatly addicted to the acceptance of gratuities. Something in the genius of American institutions has hitherto kept our poorer people from falling into this degradation. The American has been taught that he is a sovereign; and he feels the force of Professor Sumner's deduction from this principle. The takers of tips in this country are largely negroes and persons of foreign birth. The employments in which tips are regularly accepted, as those of servants in hotels and restaurants, porters and stewards on ships and steam-boats and sleeping-cars, are almost wholly monopolized by foreigners and negroes. The white native American has his faults and his vices, he is often an extremely disagreeable person, but he is not often found clamoring for backsheesh.

It is not strange that the native of a country in which distinctions of rank are firmly established should be addicted to such practices. He has been taught that he is inferior to many of those about him; there is no reason why he should not accept at their hands unearned favors. The social gradations to which he is accustomed justify the bestowing and the receiving of gratuities. But there is no room for any such relation in a democracy, and the introduction of these practices among us is therefore demoralizing. The taker of tips acknowledges himself to belong to an inferior class, and there is no foundation for any such distinction; the only difference between himself and the man from whom he takes the tip is that the other has a little more money. For a dime he degrades himself.

Undoubtedly many of those who bestow these gratuities are well pleased to do so for this very reason. The ceremony symbolizes the fact that they belong to a superior class. When a man takes a dime from our hands, it is a confession on his part that we are superior beings. He knows full well that we would not accept a dime at his hands. The proclamation and acknowledgment of this superiority pleases the vanity of some silly people. On the other hand, the abhorrence felt by many persons for this practice arises chiefly from the fact that they are unwilling to allow any man to make the abject confession concerning himself that is involved in the taking of tips. The exaction of this tribute here and there is sufficiently annoying, but it is a small matter after all; the dropping down into virtual mendicancy of a large class of their fellow-citizens is a great matter; in that social injury they desire to have no part.

So far as the colored people are concerned, their willingness to accept gratuities is a natural fruit of generations of slavery. The pity is that having got their liberty they should be so willing to wear the badge of servitude and inferiority. Those who have grown up among the colored people at the South say that many of them are disinclined to make definite agreements for personal services. They prefer to establish a sort of dependency upon those whom they serve, and to take their compensation in the form of occasional gifts. The evolution of economical society, according to Sir Henry Maine's often-quoted generalization, is from status to contract; many of the Southern negroes are disposed to stick to status and eschew contract. Some of the gentler virtues are developed under this regimen; but it is not good, on the whole, for those who depend, nor for those on whom they depend. It is better to accept the fact of independence with all that it implies. If the colored people will not take what always goes with liberty, they may not keep their liberty; or, if they do, it will not be worth much to them. Sorry sovereigns will they be, if they consent to be distinguished as the takers of tips.

There seems, just now, to be a strong disposition on the part of certain ambitious leaders of the negroes to claim a larger share than they have had in the political life of the nation. How much foundation there is for this claim it might be difficult to say; on the lips of some who urge the claim it sounds like a cry for a more liberal distribution of political backsheesh. But this much is clear: the welfare of the colored people will be most effectually promoted by inspiring them with a disposition to ask for no favors, and to take none

by which their self-respect will be lowered or their independence compromised. Those are their truest friends and their safest leaders who strenuously urge them to free themselves at once from all the implications and incidents of servitude; to refuse to enter occupations in which their livelihood is made to depend upon gratuities; to sell their labor by fair bargaining; to live on what they honestly earn, and expect nothing more. When this spirit prevails among the colored people their social and political rights will be perfectly secure.

We have assumed that the gratuities received by porters, stewards, waiters, and others, in public houses and public conveyances, are unearned extras, since these employees are, or ought to be, paid for rendering the services for which the tips are taken. But this assumption would not, in all cases, be well founded. That these employees ought to be well paid by their employers is true; but many of them are not. One of our leading palace-car companies, for example, though a rich corporation, is said to pay its porters only fifteen dollars a month. This is scarcely enough to keep them from starving; and the company expects that their compensation will be made up from the gifts of passengers. But the porters are not allowed to ask the passengers for gratuities; if gifts thus solicited are reported to the company, the amount is subtracted from the porters' wages. Thus this rich company has organized mendicancy into its system; it makes a portion of its employees subsist on money which they may not take as earnings, but must take as gratuity. It is a thoroughly demoralizing system, and the company ought to be ashamed of it. The men should be paid fair wages for their work, and the system of gratuities should be suppressed. The same remarks will apply to many other great corporations, and to nearly all the keepers of hotels and restaurants. The protection of the traveling public against these petty exactions is often urged, but that is of secondary consequence. The great reason for abating this evil is the need of preserving from degradation the men on whom these gratuities are bestowed.

We need not add that the considerations here suggested are applicable not only to sleeping-car porters and hotel waiters, but to many persons in higher stations. It is a melancholy fact that Senator Charles Sumner's rule against the receipt from interested persons of small favors (and large ones as well) is not universal among American "statesmen."

#### The Danger of Delaying Reforms.

ONE of the most singular facts in politics is the unwillingness of the rulers of nations to enact reforms until agitation among the people absolutely compels them to do so. The fact is noticeable throughout the history of the world, and is hardly less so to-day than in the centuries of the past. It is easier, no doubt, in our time for the people to secure reforms than it has been in ages past, because the people of most civilized countries have now some effective voice in public affairs. The methods of agitation, too, in most countries have become more mild than in former times, civil wars and popular tumults being much less frequent than they used to be, though other forms of violence

seem lately to have received a new development. But whatever may be the methods employed, a persistent agitation, frequently rising to violence, is still found necessary in most parts of the world to induce statesmen to enact reforms.

One of the most recent examples in point is furnished by the case of Ireland. The Irish had long been suffering from the operation of laws in some respects oppressive, and in other respects unadapted to their circumstances; yet they had sought in vain for redress. The subject had been thoroughly investigated by government commissions, and the remedies for the existing abuses pointed out. Some of the more liberal statesmen, including the greatest of them all, were ready to do Ireland justice; but the mass of English public men refused their concurrence. Then began an agitation of an alarming character, conducted by lawless methods, and resulting in infamous deeds; and when at last the whole United Kingdom was disturbed, and civil society in Ireland seemed in danger of dissolution, Parliament consented to remove some of the abuses from which the Irish people were suffering. The result has been that, though the heaviest grievances of Ireland have been redressed, the feelings of the Irish people are more widely estranged from the Imperial authority than ever before.

Another case in point is that of Russia. The people of that empire have long been seeking to obtain a share in the conduct of their national affairs; and their rulers know as well as the people themselves that the popular demand is right. Moreover, unless the Emperor and his advisers are more ignorant and unintelligent than we can suppose them to be, they must know, not only that the people are entitled to a voice in affairs, but that they are certain before long to have it, since the whole course of European politics tends irresistibly in that direction. Yet neither the demands of justice nor the logic of events has been able to secure a recognition of the people's rights from the Emperor, save only in the form of vague promises, which are never fulfilled. The result is that an agitation of the most dangerous kind has spread over the empire, undermining Russian society, destroying the life of one Emperor, threatening that of his successor, and setting an example of violent and lawless methods to political agitators everywhere. Still nothing is done toward establishing parliamentary government, which is the only thing that can put an end to the agitation; and there is reason to fear that a revolution at home, or a terrible defeat abroad, will be necessary to secure to the Russian people their rights.

These examples show in the clearest manner the danger and folly of delaying political reforms after their justice and expediency have become manifest, and they ought to serve as a warning to statesmen throughout the world. But it is not alone the danger of social disturbance that has to be considered; there are other evils that result from unreasonable delay in reforming abuses. One of the worst is that the abuses themselves become more deeply rooted and more difficult to overthrow. The persons who profit by the abuses are always vehement opponents of reform; and the longer the abuses are allowed to flourish and increase, the greater becomes the number and the stronger the influence of such persons, so that every day of delay renders the reform more difficult to effect. Moreover,