

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Lawyers' Morals.

It is apparently the popular opinion that lawyers' morals are of a different type from those of ordinary human beings. There is evidently great difficulty in fixing the standards of legal morality and defining its rules. So much debate of this topic itself excites misgivings. Is a lawyer bound by the common laws of conduct recognized as binding by reputable men in other callings? Some of the disputants would seem to maintain that he is not, which is startling; and some to insist that he is, which insistence would itself seem to imply an abnormal condition of things.

Nevertheless, the discussion must be fruitful of good. Now and then we get a clear and uncompromising utterance like that of Mr. Theodore Bacon, read at a late meeting of the Social Science Association and printed in its journal. Mr. Bacon recognizes the fact that the typical lawyer is not the type of honesty. "If," he says, "unswerving integrity, if ingenuous simplicity are recognized by the community in the ranks of the legal profession, they are regarded—let us not blind ourselves to this fact—as an incongruous interpolation in the normal type, . . . and the friendly critic will most probably fall into the very phrase of the ancient epitaph, 'An honest man, although a lawyer.' The dominant feeling would still be fairly expressed by Dr. Johnson's pungent saying, who answered an inquiry as to a person who had just left the room: 'I do not wish to be calumnious, but it is my belief that the man is an attorney.'" When an intelligent lawyer admits that such is the "dominant feeling" with respect to his profession, the perennial debate upon lawyers' ethics is explained and justified.

Mr. Bacon's treatment of this theme is trenchant and uncompromising. His view is summed up in this saying: "I can find no different—or rather, I will say no lower—ethical basis of action for the advocate than for any other member of society." This is a wholesome maxim. It blows away a whole firmament of fog. It brings the subject within reach of common minds. If lawyers are amenable to the same ethical rules that govern other men, then it is not presumptuous for laymen to judge their conduct.

Doubtless there is some confusion in the popular mind as to a lawyer's rights and obligations. The common question, whether a lawyer can rightly defend a criminal known to be guilty,—answered so generally in the negative,—is often discussed under a fundamental misconception. "The fallacy involved in the prevalent objection," as Mr. Bacon says, "is in the notion that the interest of morality demands always the punishment of bad men. The error is a grave one. The interest of morality and of social order demands, above all things, that a bad man shall *not* be punished unless he has violated some law; and even that a known violator of law shall not be punished except by the forms of law. . . . And every lawyer who interposes against an eager prosecutor or a pas-

sionate jury the shield of a strictly legal defense, declaring, 'You shall not hang or imprison this man, be he guilty or not guilty, until by the established course of procedure, by competent legal evidence, you have proved that he has offended against a definite provision of law, and that the precise provision which you have charged him with violating,' is defending not so much the trembling wretch at the bar as society itself, and the innocent man who may to-morrow be driven by clamor to crucifixion." This view of the lawyer's duty in criminal cases is one that the layman does not always get hold of, but it is entirely just.

The question of the lawyer's relation to iniquitous civil actions is treated by this essayist with less perspicacity. He thinks that the cases are few in which honorable lawyers *know* their clients to be in the wrong. If this be so, then there must be many dishonorable lawyers; for, undeniably, there is a vast number of civil cases in which one side is *palpably* in the wrong. Mr. Bacon says that the honorable lawyer who *knows* beforehand that the case which he is asked to undertake is iniquitous, promptly declines it. And he accounts for the relation of reputable lawyers to bad cases by saying: "It is seldom that the incessant and fervent assurances of the client, the proofs and arguments which, all on one side, he arrays before his counsel, have failed to keep him convinced, from beginning to end, that he must be in the right." With strictly honorable lawyers this is undoubtedly the rule; but it is at this point that the temptation to lower the professional standards is strongest. This is, therefore, precisely one of the points at which the lawyer's morals need toning up. The advocate whose conscience has fallen into a too easily satisfied condition will be a little less thorough in this preliminary examination than he ought to be.

Not only has a lawyer no right to undertake a clearly unjust cause, he has no right to continue in a cause which he undertook, believing in its justice, if, in the course of the trial, he becomes convinced that it is unrighteous. His manifest duty to retire from the conduct of a bad cause, concerning the character of which his client has wantonly deceived him, is clearly maintained by this essayist.

Out of all this discussion it is easy to draw two or three plain maxims, obvious enough to men in other callings, but far from being commonplaces of legal ethics, as all who frequent the courts must know.

1. A lawyer ought to be a gentleman. His function as an attorney gives him no dispensation to disregard the ordinary rules of good manners, and the ordinary principles of decency and honor. He has no right to slander his neighbor, even if his neighbor be the defendant in a cause in which he appears for the plaintiff. He has no right to bully or browbeat a witness in cross-examination, or artfully to entrap that witness into giving false testimony. Whatever the privilege of the court may be, the lawyer who is guilty of such practices in court is no gentleman out of court.

2. A lawyer ought not to lie. He may defend a criminal whom he knows to be guilty, but he may not say to the jury that he believes this criminal to be innocent. He may not in any way intentionally convey to the jury the impression that he believes the man to be innocent. He may not, in his plea, pervert or distort the evidence so as to weaken the force or conceal the meaning of it. He is a sworn officer of the court, and his oath should bind him to the strictest veracity. It would be quixotic to expect him to assist his adversary, but his obligation to speak the truth outranks every obligation that he owes to his client. It is notorious that some lawyers who would think it scandalous to tell a falsehood out of court, in any business transaction, lie shamelessly in court in behalf of their clients, and seem to think it part of their professional duty. That bar of justice before which, by their professional obligations, they are bound to the most stringent truthfulness, is the very place where they seem to consider themselves absolved from the common law of veracity. So long as the legal mind is infected with this deadly heresy, we need not wonder that our courts of justice often become the instruments of unrighteousness.

3. A lawyer ought not to sell his services for the promotion of injustice and knavery. Swindlers of all types are aided by lawyers in their depredations upon society. The mock broker who operates in Wall street, and strips green country speculators of their hard-earned gains by the most nefarious roguery, always has an able lawyer as his accomplice. The gentleman by whose agency a nest of these rascals was lately broken up says: "The great difficulty in stopping swindles of this class is that the rascals make enough money to be able to employ the best of legal advice, and are, moreover, careful to do nothing which will render them liable to arrest." This is the testimony of a lawyer, Mr. Ralph Oakley, of New York. "The best of legal advice" can be had, then, in New York city for such purposes. It would be more difficult to believe this if its truth were not so often illustrated in the stupendous frauds and piracies of great corporations, all of which are carefully engineered by eminent lawyers. Our modern "buccaneers"—our brave railroad wreckers—are in constant consultation with distinguished lawyers. They undeniably have "the best of legal advice" in planning and executing their bold iniquities.

In the discussion which followed the reading of Mr. Bacon's paper at Saratoga, the suggestion was made that a better legal education would tend to correct disreputable practices at the bar, whereupon a clergyman put this troublesome question: "I desire to ask, for information, whether it is not the case that in many instances the most highly educated attorneys prove the most facile and unscrupulous instruments, as the advocates of large corporations and monopolists?" The question was not answered. Evidently it was not for the want of facts on which to base an intelligent answer.

So long as lawyers can engage in operations of this nature without losing caste in their profession, it will be needful to continue the discussion of professional ethics. And it would seem that the legal profession ought to lose no time in purging itself of those who are guilty of such practices. In the words of the late Lewis L. Delafield, Esq., of the New York bar, spoken in the discussion to which we have referred:

"There are many lawyers—and they are not exclusively confined to our large cities—who should be disbarred without delay for dishonest and corrupt practices; and until some serious and successful attempt is made in this direction, the legal profession must expect, and will deserve, to decline in popular esteem."

In all callings there are disreputable men; the presence of such men in the legal profession brings no necessary discredit upon that profession if it be evident that the professional standards of conduct are high and that lawyers in general are disposed to adhere to them, and to enforce them. This discussion simply raises the question whether the lawyer's ethics is not often confused by unnecessary casuistry, and whether the bar in general is not greatly at fault in neglecting to enforce its own rules against disreputable members. On these points it will be observed that the severest judgments of this article are pronounced by good lawyers. It may be added that the standard here raised is not an impossible ideal; many lawyers in active practice carefully conform to it.

The Bible in the Sunday-school.

THE calling of the Sunday-school teacher is becoming more and more difficult. It was never a sinecure to those who rightly conceived of its duties and responsibilities; but the progress of years, and the movements of thought, render its problems increasingly serious. Indeed, it begins to be evident that the business of teaching, in all departments, is one requiring great skill and wisdom; that it is not well done by those who make it the mere incident of a career devoted to other pursuits; that it requires the most careful study of the human mind, and the most patient adjustment of means to ends. Pedagogy is taking the rank that belongs to it as one of the nobler sciences.

While the work of teaching in general is receiving so much attention, the work of Sunday-school teaching has not been neglected. Sunday-school institutes and Sunday-school assemblies in all parts of the country are discussing methods and criticising theories with diligence and enthusiasm.

The burning question for the Sunday-school teacher is not, however, so much a question of method as of subject-matter. To learn how to teach is easier than to determine what to teach. Doubtless there are thousands of teachers to whom this difficulty has never presented itself; but to the most intelligent and thoughtful among them it is a serious question.

The Unitarian Sunday-school Society has proposed an answer to this question which is likely to awaken discussion. A little book entitled "The Citizen and the Neighbor" has been prepared by a clergyman of that denomination as a manual of instruction in Sunday-schools. This book treats of "men's rights and duties as they live together in the state and in society," and these rights and duties are classified under four heads, as political, economical, social, and international. Each chapter consists of a series of simple elementary statements, followed by well-framed questions, serving not only to draw forth the doctrines taught in the text, but to prompt independent thought. An admirable little manual it is; and in the hands of a judicious teacher it could be made extremely useful. The pastor who should organize the young people of his con-

gregation into a class for the study of this manual on a week-day evening might render them a great service. But most Sunday-school teachers will, we suppose, refuse to entertain the idea of introducing this book into their Sunday classes. The Sunday-school is the Bible-school. That is the name by which it is now frequently called; that is the character which, in the thoughts and sentiments of the great majority of Sunday-school teachers, belongs to it; and it will be a long time before any other book than the Bible is generally adopted as a manual of instruction in the Sunday-school. This conservatism is not irrational. Religion, rather than ethics or sociology, is the concern of the Sunday-school; and the Bible is the book of religion. Even the Dutch critics insist on this; the new theology, as well as the old, holds fast to the Bible as the book of religion.

It is exactly at this point, however, that the difficulty of the honest and intelligent Sunday-school teacher begins. That the Bible is the book of religion he firmly believes; but it is not so in the sense in which it was once believed to be; and the question respecting the character of the Bible—the view that he is to take of it in his teaching; the manner in which he is to use it; the extent to which he is to recognize the clear results of the higher criticism—is a question of great perplexity for every serious teacher. The fact that the Bible occupies a somewhat different place in the thoughts of well-instructed Christians from that which it held twenty-five or fifty years ago is a fact that cannot be denied. Such a book as that of Professor Briggs makes this entirely plain. In the most conservative theological circles it is conceded that the higher criticism has some just claims upon our attention, and that it has reached certain substantial results. It may be true that many of the conclusions of critics like Wellhausen and Robertson Smith are rash and unwarranted; but after their work has been thoroughly sifted and their questionable theories have been thrown out, there remains a residuum of solid truth, in the presence of which the old ideas of the structure, the growth, and the character of the Sacred Scriptures must be considerably modified. A thoroughly cautious and moderate statement was that made not long ago by Professor Harris, of the Andover Theological Seminary, in which he said:

“The doctrine of Sacred Scripture is at present in a state of flux. . . . Certain general statements may be made concerning the inspiration and authority of the Bible, and other statements may be rejected. . . . We hold no theory of the Bible which would be demolished if an erroneous statement is found concerning some matter of detail, or if we find that the writers shared the imperfect knowledge of their times concerning matters which only modern research clearly understands. No man has a right to impose a theory of the Bible which depends for its integrity on the scrupulous accuracy of every statement. We cannot consent that the Holy Book shall be put in such peril.”

Now, the simple fact is, that the theory of the Bible which Professor Harris says that no man has a right to impose, is the theory which has been imposed, until quite recently, by almost all Protestant teachers, upon those under their instruction. It is the theory which underlies almost all our Sunday-school teaching. Professor Harris asserts that the Bible is put in

peril by the promulgation of such a theory. Every man knows that overstatements are dangerous; that many a precious thing has been rejected because of the reaction produced by an exaggeration of its value. We may well believe that the Bible is the most precious of books, and that its value will be enhanced, and not diminished, by the thorough criticism which is now applied to it; but it is necessary to learn to speak of it with discrimination, to make no claims for the book that it does not make for itself, and to find out, if we can, wherein resides the authority with which it addresses us.

The learning of this lesson is hardly begun as yet by the average Sunday-school teacher. The traditional theory of the absolute historical and scientific infallibility of the Bible is the only one that he has ever permitted himself to entertain. His maxim is, that the extremest views on this subject are the safest; that the admission of a historical error in the book would be fatal to its authority. The notions that he is sedulously imparting to his pupils are sure to be exploded as soon as they become acquainted with the results of modern scholarship. He is helping thus to train a generation of skeptics.

Among the young men of this time there is a vast amount of superficial skepticism. Those who come in contact with it, and are able to estimate its causes, soon discover that it is largely the result of a reaction against extravagant theories of inspiration. These young men have discovered many facts about the Bible that cannot be reconciled with the theory of the Bible that was imposed on them in the Sunday-school, and they have rejected it altogether. It is high time that the Sunday-school should cease to be an active propagator of skepticism.

There are Sunday-school teachers, and their number is growing, who are aware of their responsibility to present the Bible to their pupils in such a way that it shall win and hold their confidence. That its true character may appear as the bright record of a revelation made in the historical progress of a people providentially led from barbarism up to civilization,—that the steadily brightening path of the divine purpose may be followed across the centuries to its culmination in Him whose Life was the Light of men. This is the great problem which many a conscientious teacher is trying to solve. To such teachers it may be useful to make a few practical suggestions.

1. Endeavor to obtain some rational and consistent theory of the Sacred Scriptures. Professor Fisher's essay on “The Christian Religion” is one of the most judicious statements now accessible, and it ought to be carefully read by every Sunday-school teacher.

2. Avoid all language which involves the absolute inerrancy of the Bible.

3. Distinctly recognize the fact that some portions of the book are of far greater value than others.

4. Make the pupils understand that much of the Old Testament legislation was accommodated to the understanding and the moral condition of the people to whom it was given, and is wholly superseded by the law of Christ.

5. Show them that the Scriptures are the record of a development of doctrine and of morals; that the successive stages of such a development must indicate incompleteness of view and moral imperfection;

that this development culminates in Jesus Christ, who, as Christians believe, is the Word of God, and in the light of whose doctrine and life the whole Bible must be studied.

Bribery in Politics.

THE practice of bribing voters has reached a development in this country that calls for thoughtful attention on the part of patriotic men. It has always, no doubt, been carried on to a certain extent, but never on so large a scale as in recent years, and there is reason to fear that it is on the increase. The bribery we speak of is that by means of money, to which the poorest and most ignorant portions of the people are most liable. But, in addition to this, there is the method of bribery by the promise of office, which has been so widely commented on, but which, it is to be hoped, will soon be largely removed by a better system of appointment. Bribery by money, however, cannot be thus removed, although it may be checked; and unless some other remedy can be found the corruption of our politics by that means will go on. The immense number of ignorant voters in the country, the vast interests involved in our national elections, and the large sums now at the disposal of party managers, render it well-nigh certain that until effectual means are taken to counteract it, the evil will continue to grow.

Nor is the bribery of voters the only form of the evil with which we have to contend; some of our legislators and other public men are quite as ready to sell their votes as the most ignorant of the masses are. This purchasing of legislators is notorious; and though it is not always effected by the payment of money, but in some less open way, it is none the less a form of bribery. We are all familiar with the mode of purchasing legislators by means of corporation shares and bonds, distributed by interested parties "where they will do the most good." Even some of the judges are not above suspicion, so that justice is liable to be polluted at its very source; though in most cases the purity of the courts is in refreshing contrast to the corruption prevailing elsewhere.

Such is the evil with which we have to contend, and it is not easy to find a remedy. With corrupt leaders, and corrupt followers, too, the problem of purifying politics is by no means a simple one. The difficulty is increased by the venality of some of the newspapers, by whose influence the people are misled as to the real character of candidates and the conduct of public affairs.

The punishment of both the giver and the taker of bribes would of course remove the evil, if the criminals could be detected and the punishment applied. But experience proves that bribery is one of the most difficult of all crimes to prove; while at the same time the powerful interests involved in most cases of political bribery render it extremely difficult to secure the punishment of the criminals, even when their guilt is undoubted. If candidates that had been elected by purchased votes could always be deprived of their seats in consequence, an effective check would be given to the bribing of voters; but this remedy is rarely available in this country, owing to the partisan character of our legislative bodies. It is notorious that contested election cases are apt to be decided in the interest of the

dominant party, with little regard to the justice of the case; and so long as this shameful practice continues no effectual check to bribery can be looked for in this quarter. The reform of the civil service will remove the temptation of the offices, but will not affect the other forms of bribery. It is true that when all officers are secure in their positions they will not be disposed, as many are now, to swell the corruption fund of their party; but there will be no lack of funds for all that. There are so many corporations and other interested parties seeking government favor, and so many rich men seeking office with little regard to the way they get it, that there will never be any lack of means for the purchase of voters and legislators.

It is evident that the only effectual remedy is the improvement of public sentiment and the enlightenment of the public mind as to the evils that bribery produces.

The improvement of public sentiment on this subject must necessarily be a work of time, and it cannot begin too soon. We may say, indeed, that it has already begun with the discussions of this year's canvass; but much more must be done in order to produce the desired effect on the public mind. It is especially incumbent on those who profess to lead and counsel the people on political subjects, whether in official station, in the press, or elsewhere, to lead the public aright in this matter. By exposing cases of bribery that may come to their knowledge, by showing what evils result from it, by denouncing it *especially in their own party*, by setting an example of perfect honesty in their own public life, and, above all, by scorning to use public station to advance their own private and pecuniary interests, they may do much to check the abuse even now, and perhaps remove it almost entirely at some future day.

The trouble is that men who would not themselves descend to bribery are criminally complaisant with regard to the use of foul means, when these are to advance their own interests and those of their own party. They are severe on the subject of buying votes only when the purchases are made in the interest of the other side. Their standard of political morality is high, as applied to candidates whom they are trying to defeat!

False Issues.

IN every political campaign large numbers of voters are moved in their political action by a consideration of side issues, questions not yet fully before the country, and some of which never will be. At times these side issues are legitimate enough, and sometimes serious changes in party politics are due to them; they may be, indeed, the means of originating new and influential parties, and of changing entirely the political history of a nation.

But, in addition to these side issues, there are very apt to be introduced into the canvass questions which are not only aside from the main points at issue, but which may be called absolutely false issues,—issues which are selfish, interested, personal,—which have to do with matters that do not concern voters purely as citizens,—which may even lead to action opposed to the general good of the country. At a time when leading parties imitate each other, instead of opposing each other, in their official declarations of principles, such side issues and false issues especially abound,

and seriously, sometimes disastrously, complicate the situation.

In the present Presidential campaign these side issues and false issues are numerous. Individual independence of political action was, perhaps, never so common in our politics as now, for the reason that party principles, at least as expressed in national "platforms," seem to be well-nigh verging into identity, and for the further reason that the present has come to be (from circumstances only too well known to our readers) a campaign having largely to do with the record, character, and fitness of the principal candidates. The leading side issue in the present campaign is the temperance question; a side issue, we say, not a false issue. It is not a false issue, because, whatever else may be said of the temperance movement in politics, it is not a selfish, interested, and personal movement, but a movement carried on, as its promoters profoundly believe, for the general good of the community, and not for the good, or supposed good, of a class.

As examples of false and illegitimate issues which have been raised during the present campaign, we will mention three. The first is that of religion, in its sectarian sense. The workings of this issue in American national politics are, in the main, subtle and secret; for there are not many nowadays who have the courage to acknowledge that they are moved by such considerations in their political decisions; and, moreover, secrecy is absolutely necessary when there may be danger of reaction were the religious question openly and definitely raised.

A second false issue has to do with the foreign birth or affiliations of portions of our population. In the suggestive article by Mr. Chamberlin in the September *CENTURY* on "The Foreign Elements in our Population," the author says: "I believe that no one accuses any large or influential portion of the foreign element of a set purpose to spread ideas subversive of our political institutions." It is true that the foreign element in our population would probably be the very last to advocate, for instance, a return to monarchical institutions. But that there are dangers in these foreign elements to the peace of the country, both at home and abroad, cannot be denied. Says Mr. Chamberlin:

"No greater danger can threaten than that the population will split into two or more castes, with caste hatreds and conflicts." The old class feeling as between native and foreign-born Americans has already been followed by class feeling between certain of the various foreign elements themselves, and in addition to this there are those among us who have set up as the measure of the fitness of an American to occupy office in his own land his devotion to the affairs of some other country! We yield to none in sympathy for the oppressed of all nations (including our own), be they Catholics, Jews, Protestants, or followers of Confucius; and we believe, with all our hearts, in the dignity of the American name and citizenship; but we resent attempts of demagogues in every party to mix foreign politics with those of the United States.

A third false issue is that which concerns the soldier element in our politics, and has to do with money, and not with principles. We can understand the appeal to soldiers, North or South, to "vote as they fought," and we can comprehend why it may be cordially responded to,—although the appeal is often a misleading and dangerous one, and is fortunately not so often heard now as it once was. We can understand, also, the sentiment that leads one who has been engaged in a conflict of arms to vote with whichever party he believes best represents the principles for which he endangered his life. But, supposing it to be true that the nation has already done its duty by the surviving soldiers, and by the widows and orphans of the lost, the pension issue in a political campaign seems to us an insult to American manhood, a false and sordid "issue," which every self-respecting soldier should disown and condemn.

False issues like those we have alluded to introduce into our politics distracting elements which have no place there. They prevent the unbiased discussion and decision of broader questions. They are a hindrance and a nuisance, and every self-respecting voter should see to it that he does not become entangled in their snares. When it comes to national elections, the true citizen should ask himself only this one question: What is best for the whole community—for the entire country?—not What is best for my pocket, for my class, for my section of the country?

OPEN LETTERS.

A Rallying Point for a New Political Party.

THE peculiar features of the political campaign recall strikingly the prediction made in *THE CENTURY* on the passage of the Civil Service Reform Bill, nearly a year and a half ago, that the adoption of that measure would inevitably cause the disintegration of the old political parties, which have existed for years solely on the possession or expectation of patronage. As the commercial world on the passage of the Resumption Act began to adjust itself to the only true basis of financial security, so our political world on the adoption of the Civil Service Bill began to adjust itself to the true basis of efficient

administration. In little more than a year from the establishment of the reform we see the spoils system, which has been the one controlling feature of the last four Presidential struggles, practically eliminated from the national political contest.

Not a single principle remains which either party unitedly advocates or opposes; and in the absence of any living issue of principle the contest turns on the personal fitness or unfitness of candidates, and, as is inevitably the case in personal discussion, gravitates at once to the lowest level, and becomes merely an exchange of epithets, a bandying to and fro of charges of intellectual incapacity, moral obliquity, and even filth. It is not the "young alumni" nor old alumni

alone who are standing aloof from both political parties, but a vast body of men of all classes who seek in political action and association not mere personal advantage, but the promotion of the general welfare and the establishment of principles which they believe conducive thereto; and they stand thus aloof not because they are indifferent to political results, not from repugnance to active political work, not from fear of the victory or defeat of any particular political principle, but from abject fear of perpetuating power in the hands of one organization or conferring it upon another, when both are equally and totally devoid of any political principle whatever. What choice of evils, even, have we in the present contest? what encouragement for a serious effort to redeem the country from the disgrace of a campaign in which all the indecencies of our later politics have culminated?

The only "third party" movement of note has been captured by a "politician" who repudiates civil service reform, upholds the present odious tariff, and deliberately advocates the taxing of the nation to furnish gratuities to a class.

We have nothing to hope for in this campaign save that the revolt from the old standards may throw the election into the House of Representatives; but during the two years which will elapse before another general election for representatives in Congress, we may hope to organize a party to whose platform the independent voter may subscribe without doing violence either to his intelligence or his integrity. For such an organization there can be no better starting-point than that suggested by Mr. Spahr in his letter in *THE CENTURY* for August: "Reform of the Civil Service and of the Tariff."

Of the first little need be said; the work is well begun, and must simply be kept going. The reform of our revenue system is now, and is likely to be for many years, the most important issue in national politics. An organization which will champion this movement on lines broad enough to include all its sincere advocates, may hope not only to inaugurate the reform, but to permanently establish it; for such a party may with certainty count on being the dominant power in the nation for the next quarter of a century. But the work must begin with a reform in the terminology of the tariff discussion. Writers and speakers who wish to be read and understood of men must cease to use the word "protection" as synonymous with "high tariff," or as the antithesis of "free trade." The protection of its own interests is what every nation is, or should be, aiming at; and the problem of our current political economy is to find out what particular adjustment of our revenue system will best promote the general welfare. Great Britain, after a long experience of high tariff, concluded that her interests were in general best "protected" by the low tariff, which economists call "free trade," joined with a rigid excise, for the primary and almost exclusive purpose of yielding revenue to the state. It has seemed, or at least it has been made to appear, to a majority of our own people, that our interests as a nation are best protected by a high tariff, which the greed of monopolists and the zeal of their representatives have transformed into a prohibitory tariff—a system as idiotic as it is iniquitous. The organization which undertakes the reform of our revenue system should welcome all

voters who are sincerely anxious for a rational adjustment, and willing to subordinate their individual opinions to the slight modifications of a general agreement, which must be under constant revision and steadily tending toward lower duties and greater freedom from commercial restrictions. The most odious feature of the existing tariff is, of course, the enforced tribute to monopolies which results from prohibitory duties; and the next worst feature is the excessive taxation which produces an enormous annual surplus to be prodigally and profligately expended by the votes of log-rolling representatives. We want a system which will give us protection without monopoly and revenue without surplus.

The point at which our interest will be best protected lies somewhere between a prohibitory tariff and absolute free trade. No revenue system can ever reach the point of final adjustment; it must at best be in the condition which physicists call "unstable equilibrium," but should vary as little as possible from a line of maximum efficiency established by the great consensus of the people acting through instructed representatives. In no direction will the beneficent effect of civil service reform be more marked than in the impetus it will give to a rational discussion of tariff and revenue questions, by creating a permanent class of intelligent, expert treasury officials who will rescue our industries from the empirical violence of volunteer tariff-tinkers. When such men, armed with the experience of long official service, shall find a welcome on the floor of the House,—either as members, through the "open constituencies" reform, or as counselors without votes, by virtue of the offices they hold,—we may look for an end to the heresies and abominations of our recent economic legislation.

E. B.

JOHNSVILLE, MICHIGAN.

The "Christian League's" Practicability.

THE September CENTURY contains a criticism upon Dr. Gladden's "Christian League of Connecticut." As a frequent listener to Dr. Gladden's preaching and a firm believer in his doctrines regarding the League, I should like to say a few words in reply.

The attack which is made consists mainly in an exposition of the evils which would result from the consolidation of *discordant* elements. On this point no line of defense need be drawn up, since Dr. Gladden does not hold the position which is assailed. He would be the last man to urge any such consolidation. Because he holds that there ought to be unity among the churches, it does not follow that he believes in forcing such unity upon them. He believes, as the readers of *THE CENTURY* well know, that there ought to be temperance; but he believes that the laws of temperance must first be written in the hearts of the people. He realizes most thoroughly that though the truths of natural science may be put in practice as soon as they are discovered, the truths of social science can only be put in practice when they are accepted by the public consciousness. In the matter of a Christian League, he would not urge the forcing together of enemies, since that would increase their enmity. He would urge the bringing together of friends, since that would increase their friendship.

The next point made against the League is, that the destruction of denominationalism would hamper the freedom of the pastor. It is said that "he could not speak his honest convictions for fear of offending or differing with a portion of his hearers." The obvious reply to this is the fact that our most independent thinkers are constantly hampered by denominationalism. They are told by their narrow-minded colleagues that they belong to the organization, that the organization supports them, and that they are bound to support it. The result of this is that they lose their independence, and in becoming part of an ecclesiastical machine, they lose their individual and personal power.

Another objection which is urged is, that the existence of one union church, instead of two or three denominational churches, would afford to every one an excuse to shirk his duties of attendance and contribution. If this would be so in a union church, it would be so in all large churches. Do the facts support the theory?

Those who uphold denominationalism always claim that it "tends to spread pure religion by calling attention to the doctrines discussed, and thereby leading to a careful investigation of the teachings of the Bible." There may have been a time when this was true, but it is true no longer. The eccentricity of each denomination, instead of being a rallying point for propagandism, is the rallying point for discord and schism. Those who leave the Calvinistic churches leave them because of their inflexible creed; those who leave the Methodist Church leave it because of its inflexible discipline; those who leave the Episcopal Church leave them because of their inflexible ritual.

Under a Christian League a larger liberty would be permitted. Every church is a tree of life, and the iron-clad box which protected it in its youth must be removed when natural growth is cramped thereby.

In considering the practicability of the Christian League, the most important question is, "To what extent does the Christian public accept its doctrines?" A safe answer would be, "More and more fully every year." We occasionally find bitter denominationalism in the country, but we find very little of it in our cities. I do not know of a single thoughtful man in any city who does not deprecate the fact that the churches do not cooperate. It will not be cynical to say that these denominational churches are conducted like business corporations, competing for "the gilt-edge trade" instead of cooperating for the service of the public. In New York city you have a notable instance of this, when you compare the number of churches on Madison Avenue with the number on Avenue A.

The church as an educational institution is becoming *relatively* less important. The public schools and the press have almost monopolized this function, and both are thoroughly non-sectarian. There are, it is true, denominational colleges and denominational papers; but the best denominational colleges do not teach denominationalism, and the denominational papers which are conducted as organs, and require their contributors to keep in tune, are almost without influence. A minister once told me that the imprint of a denominational publishing house doomed a book with the entire reading public. If this is true, and our educational institutions are all non-sectarian, it is impossible that sectarianism shall long survive.

Our religious thought also is becoming singularly non-sectarian. With the development of other educational institutions there has been a growing conviction that the work of the church is practical rather than doctrinal. Even where the new theology is combated, its spirit dominates. The thoughtful public recognizes that Christianity is neither a ritual nor a creed, but a life lived in the spirit of Christ. The church of the middle ages said: "Receive ye my forms, and ye shall find the way of salvation." The churches of the Reformation said: "Receive ye my doctrines, and ye shall find the truth." The religious thought of today says: "Receive ye the spirit of Christ into your hearts, and ye shall find, not the way only, nor the truth only, but 'the way, the truth, and the life.'" The spirit of the new theology is the spirit of the Christian League. It will not permit the details of creed and ritual to bar the way to Christian unity, for in Christ all contradictions are reconciled.

A Methodist Layman.

COLUMBUS, O., August, 1884.

"We of the South."

A CORRESPONDENT in the October number of THE CENTURY expresses his "profound regret and disappointment" that in the story of "Dr. Sevier" I should have said to the Northern soldiers marching down Broadway in 1861 that their cause was just, and that even we of the South can now say it.

I wish to thank the writer for the manly courtesy with which he takes his exception. A Southerner and a Southern soldier myself, I have yet rarely been dealt with in this generous manner by Southern writers dissenting from my utterances, and I hail this as, to me, the initial voice of a new and better form of debate in that South to which I belong, not only by birth, but by rearing and affection.

The passage which has given pain to Mr. McKay, should be read in connection with what goes before and follows if its spirit is to be properly understood. I do not there, and I cannot here, yield to any one in pride in our struggle and in all the noble men and women who bore its burdens; and it is while expressing such feelings as these that, turning to those who, once our foes, are now more than ever before our brethren, I gave to them in turn, not a repetition of those words of affection, too tender for any but our own heroes, but the one word of concession which, on the plane we of the South occupy today, we can speak without abating by the weight of a hair our perfect manhood. Englishmen do not change their opinions so readily as Americans; and yet our Anglo-Saxon brethren across the Atlantic soon conceded the justice of the infant American nation's cause in its War of Independence waged against themselves. Why, then, should I withhold my acknowledgment when I grasp in cordial reconciliation the hand of a brother the justice of whose cause has become my own complete conviction?

The right to do this Mr. McKay accords me, on the single condition that I will consent to be counted out of "the South, the best of it." He does not even assert that I stand alone in this attitude. He merely

insists that "the South, the best of it" has arrived at no such position. I think I can answer the objection in a word. He and those who think with him are still dwelling on the old question — I will not say quibble to so courteous a critic — the old question of Constitutional rights; while "*we* of the South" — I must insist upon the pronoun — have come down to the more radical question of moral right and wrong. Allowing, for argument's sake, that a State, not having in so many words given away its right to secede, still held that right beyond all dispute and at its own discretion (a doctrine never universally believed by the South), still we had no good reason for exercising that prerogative. I need not remind the gentleman that it was exercised contrary to the belief and advice of hundreds of thousands of Southern men. That doubtful doctrine was not our cause; if the gentleman is a young man I pray him to leave the preaching of that delusion to the venerable ex-President of the Confederate States. It was only the ground upon which some of our Southern political advisers cast up the defenses behind which our actual cause lay fortified. Our real cause — the *motive* — was no intricate question. A president was elected lawfully by a party that believed simply what virtually the whole intelligence of the South now admits, viz., that African slavery — the existence of which was originally the fault of the whole nation — was an error in its every aspect, and was cursing the whole land. And we chose the risks of war rather than in any manner to jeopardize an institution which we have since learned to execrate.

It is but a few weeks since a personal acquaintance, also an ex-Confederate soldier, asking me to explain the utterance that has given annoyance to Mr. McKay, presently conceded that the success of the principles for which we fought faithfully and gallantly — so far as the fight was for them — would have been ruinous, and that the best founded and profoundest cause of rejoicing in the Southern heart to-day is that, even at such cost, we were saved from the ruin of secession. Now, we may take our choice: Was it a war for slavery? We all know now that slavery was wrong. Was it a war for the right of secession? How can a principle that is ruinous be right? Nay, sir; we thank no man for buffets; we make no pretense of humility; but before an issue where both sides could be brave and conscientious and yet each be wrong in many words and acts; but where, as to the ultimate question, both could not be right; with the verdict of the whole enlightened world against us, it is surely not too much to maintain that in the fullest stature of human dignity we can stand up and say to our brethren, — no longer our adversaries, — "Time has taught us you were right."

"And yet" — I conclude with the same words of tender remembrance that follow the challenged passage in my story —

"And yet — and yet, we cannot forget —"

And we would not!"

George W. Cable.

The School of Dishonesty.

In looking for the primary cause of crime in its multitude of forms, the question arises, — At what period of life did the evil-doer first lose his sense of honesty and integrity? If we knew the facts, how often the

answer would be, — At the time that the offender was first placed in contact with the world; when, from one cause or another, he was first forced from the care of his parents and compelled to contend alone for his existence; when he first entered upon his apprenticeship to the merchant, the manufacturer, the professional man, the farmer. Perhaps his choice of occupation has been in a measure directed by the conspicuous advertisement of some one in some of the above-named branches of business. He is not long in discovering that the advertisement which led him to ask that employment was a misrepresentation, calculated to deceive the public and induce a patronage which a plain statement of facts would not effect. That boy or young man who has been taught to abhor a lie and a theft, — and taught that to deceive another to that other's injury, or to induce him to pay more or receive less for an article than its value, is as bad as to lie or to steal, is amazed to find that the man he thought exemplary is no better than, if as good as, the man who steals a loaf of bread because of his hunger, and is called a thief. His respect for his employer is gone; he no longer regards him as a great or an honest man, and he learns that it is not honesty and integrity of character that gives to that man his good name and position, but his great wealth, acquired though it be through fraud and deceit.

The next discovery the young man makes is, that he is expected to follow the example of his employer in deceiving his customers as to the quality or value of his goods or wares, in order to obtain their money. Long and hard is the struggle he undergoes. On one hand are certain dismissal from his situation, the disgrace of such dismissal, the suffering it must entail upon those dependent upon him, and the probability that he could not secure another place without a recommendation from this employer, which, under the circumstances, he could not obtain, and would not ask or accept. On the other hand is the loss of self-respect, honor, manhood. He hesitates, and then looks around among business men to learn if other men do the same kind of work. He goes over the various branches of trade with which he has come in contact, and finds to his dismay that a large proportion of men practice the same deceptions, that each day, and many times a day, they wrong their unsuspecting customers. His faith is almost shaken in the correctness of the teachings of his parents; he wonders if they were not in error, if there has not been some great mistake in his education; else why are all these men called honest men, and permitted to practice with impunity that which he has been taught was wrong and dishonest? Still he hesitates; but there comes to his mind those dear ones at home, a widowed mother, perhaps, with little brothers and sisters, already pushed to the verge of starvation. Or, if he be a man with a wife and family, can he return to those whom he loves better than his life and tell them he has no bread for them, when by doing as other men do he may provide for them luxuriously? All other arguments may fail, but he cannot endure the suffering of his family. He lays down his honor, and becomes his employer's slave. He learns to deceive and lie, and, shall it not be said, virtually to steal in behalf of his employer. If he becomes expert and successful in the art, he is praised and pro-

nounced "brilliant" and "sharp." Little by little he loses all regard for truth and even honesty, and hesitates at no deception that will promote his master's interest or his own, so long as it does not come within the statute as a crime.

Once the barrier is broken that guards the path of truth and rectitude, the successive steps are easily taken. He has seen how his employer and others thrive and grow rich upon the gains thus acquired; and how they are honored and lauded as honest and able business men. He has seen how even those who have been sent to the various seats of government to enact laws and provide penalties for a violation thereof, have grown rich without any visible reason therefor, yet who return to the people who sent them without a question as to how they have acquired their riches while in its service; but, as is often the case, with respect and honor proportionate to their added wealth. All this and more has this young man seen, and he knows how false are the deserts upon which is bestowed this esteem. What wonder, then, that when pressed with cares beyond the power of his meager salary to provide, he begins, in his desperation, to practice upon his employer the lessons which he has been taught to perform upon that employer's customers? There is no praise for him now, as he has changed employers and is now working for himself. Now he is called a thief, and is hurried away to jail for robbing his employer. That employer appears and expresses his sorrow that so promising a youth should be guilty of so great a crime; but there is no pity nor forgiveness in that man's heart. He must make an example of this lad that others may be deterred from daring to practice upon the rich and powerful merchant the lessons he has taught them to practice upon his customers.

There is hardly an article of manufactured merchandise made or imported in the United States that has not its adulterations or imitations; and there are but few articles of raw material that are not in some manner adulterated. What is needed is a law that shall compel all men to do an honest business; a law that shall apply alike to the rich and the poor; a law that shall punish the man who sells with a false balance, the same as the man who steals a loaf of bread; a law that shall punish the man who makes and sells a counterfeit article of merchandise, the same as the man who makes and circulates a counterfeit coin.

T. W. Tyrer.

Fiction and Social Science.*

It seems as if Dr. Holmes's assertion that every man has in him the material for one novel, and Mr. Cable's advice, in his lecture on the art of fiction, that every one should try his hand at story-writing as his particular contribution to the data of social science,

* "Mingo, and Other Sketches in Black and White." By Joel Chandler Harris (*Uncle Remus*). Boston: James R. Osgood & Co.

"In the Tennessee Mountains." By Charles Egbert Craddock. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

"The Crime of Henry Vane." By J. S., of Dale. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

"Ben Hur: A Tale of the Christ." By Lew Wallace. New York: Harper & Brothers.

were being taken seriously. Probably everybody who is "in society" at all has, at least, one novelist among his personal acquaintances; and about every other educated person, male or female, has made an essay in the fashionable art. The man who has not written a novel is getting to be the exception. Prominent physicians, like Drs. Mitchell and Hammond, are "bitten by the dipsas," and forced to tell their experiences; and ancient mariners roam the earth in search of wedding guests with hospitable button-holes. This is very shocking to admirers of the inarticulate and the eternal silences; but it is, on the whole, a harmless and cheerful form of mental activity. Of course but a small part of the product is literature; an infinitesimal part of it survives the decade. But it fills up the great social picture, it rounds out the world, when every one tells how life has gone with him, how the universe looks from his corner of it. We confess to a preference for the articulate and the conscious. Speech is human; consciousness is a high form of knowledge and observation. Let every one, then, who has seen anything worth telling, raise his voice and tell it. The world may listen or not, as it wills. One thing is plain: we are learning to know our America better. What has become of the old plaint that the uniformity of social conditions, etc., deprived the novelist here of the necessary contrasts, etc., etc.? The volumes of fiction on the lists of American publishers to-day certainly cover enough variety of life and character to satisfy the most exacting.

The South, to begin with, is having its turn. Cable's episodes of New Orleans life and Harris's "Uncle Remus" stories were both delightfully fresh revelations of new fields for the literary artist. Turning away, for the present, from folk-lore and character sketching, Mr. Harris has now brought together in a volume "Mingo, and Other Sketches in Black and White," a few narratives of a more formal kind than he had yet attempted—stories, in fact, rather than sketches, despite his modest title. The most important, or at least much the longest of these, "At Teague Poteet's: a Sketch of the Hog Mountain Range," is a novelette familiar to the readers of *THE CENTURY*, and dealing with life among the Moonshiners.

There is a striking plot, full of dramatic situations, and having for its background the scenery of the mountains and the habits and dialects of a peculiar race of people. The inhabitants of the Blue Ridge and great Cumberland ranges are a very different class from the poor whites of the lowlands. They are equally poor, rough, and ignorant; but they guard a wild independence, owned few or no negroes, and look with jealousy upon the planters in the valley as "restercrats." During the war they were mostly Union men. They are described as slow in manner and speech, shiftless in appearance, hospitable, but suspicious toward strangers, unprogressive, toughly enduring the poor, hard conditions of their lives, and oppressed with the melancholy silences of the vast, shaggy mountain solitudes among which they dwell. The women are lank, sallow, dirty. They rub snuff, smoke pipes,—even the young girls,—and are great at the frying-pan; full of a complaining patience and a sullen fidelity. These traits are relieved by a dry humor, a fondness for gossip, and an occasional dance-party, when the fiddle and the jug of

crooked whisky, with its corn-cob stopper, produce something faintly resembling gayety. This story is told with great force, originality, and truth.

"Mingo: a Sketch of Middle Georgia," less elaborate than "At Teague Potee't's," is even stronger in execution, and has a real depth of tragic pathos. The lovers in the last-named story are just the least little bit conventional. But in "Mingo" Mr. Harris is on his native heath, and we recognize the "Uncle Remus" touch in his tender, reverent picture of the gray-haired negro who refuses his freedom and devotes himself to the fallen fortunes of "de fambly"; to his little mistress, "Pud Hon" (Pudding Honey), and to her grandma, "Miss F'raishy." The latter—Mrs. Feratia Bivins—is an admirably drawn character and plain of speech. This is the way she talks to "ole miss" who had "Ferginny ways," and had disowned her daughter for marrying Mrs. Bivins's son, but now, stricken with remorse, comes to see her grandchild when its parents are both dead.

"Ef you er come to bother airtter Pud, thes* make the trial of it. Thes so much as lay the weight ev your little finger on 'er, an' I'll grab you by the goozle an' 'tar your haslet out."

"In the Tennessee Mountains," by Charles Egbert Craddock, is another delightful contribution to the literature of the new South. It is a collection of eight stories, of which "Drifting down Lost Creek" is perhaps the most ambitious, though "A-Playin' of Old Sledge at the Settlement" and "The 'Harnt' that walks Chilhowee" strike a Northern reader most freshly. The region and the people are the same as those described in "At Teague Potee't's." It is true that Mr. Harris's mountain is in Georgia and Mr. Craddock's in Tennessee; but the mountainous belt that runs from Pennsylvania through southern Tennessee and the northern parts of the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama is one in the characteristics of its scenery and its population. There is a wonderful similarity between the stories of these two writers, not merely in the lives, manners, and language described, but in their literary spirit and style. It would not be saying too much to affirm that if "At Teague Potee't's" had been published in Mr. Craddock's book, or if any of Mr. Craddock's tales had been published in Mr. Harris's volume, it would have required a sharp eye to note any difference in the authorship. They might easily have been the work of one man. This says much, of course, for the fidelity of their sketches. Two independent reports by observers so far apart, but concurring so closely in details, give a scientific value to their work, considered as a study of society. Mr. Harris's writing shows a rather more assured touch than Mr. Craddock's. The latter devotes himself to the landscape to a degree which, though not excessive in any single story, becomes somewhat repetitious when they are brought together in a volume. But his descriptions of mountain scenery are so sympathetic and imaginative that it would be ungracious to wish them shorter. In the portraiture of character and the construction of plot we should hesitate to give the preference to either of these accomplished story-tellers. Both of them deserve a hearty welcome from a public of sated novel-readers.

* Just.

We have been getting a good deal of dialect lately—too much of it, some will think, who have difficulty with the polyglot dialogues of "Doctor Sevier." The dialect of the Georgia and Tennessee "mountings" seems to be identical. The acute philological observer may note some minor differences. A ghost, *e. g.*, is a "harnt" in Tennessee and a "ha'nt" in Georgia; but this may be merely a distinction in the spelling. In both sections the minister is called the "rider." "Air" in Tennessee, is "er" in Georgia—*anglice*, "are." Tennessean "hev" becomes Georgian "uv." In Georgia they say "'stedder" for "instead of"; but in Tennessee, "'stiddier." As for such locutions as "we-uns" and "you-uns," "howdy," "low" for "think," and to "hone a'ter" for to "long for," they are too widely distributed in the South to be at all local.

In "The Crime of Henry Vane," we get back to civilization—to New York—and to the international point of view occupied by Henry James. It is by the author of "Guerdale." You remember the wonderful undergraduates of "Guerdale"? They were unlike all the undergraduates whom we have been privileged to meet, and our opportunities in that particular have been large. Instead of being the fresh and wholesome, but somewhat raw, boys of *our* experience, they were knowing, *blasé* young gentlemen who had seen a great deal more life than their parents and instructors, and had been rendered cynical thereby. They consented to reside for a time at Cambridge, Mass., and occasionally attended some of the exercises of Harvard College. They had a proper contempt for the pedantic old professors who conducted that institution; but though they refused to patronize their examinations, they contrived somehow, in intervals of gambling and cigarette-puffing, to get well up on most modern literatures and quoted profusely from Heine, Musset, etc., besides giving the faculty points on Lucretius and other classics. Well, Henry Vane is one of those same undergraduates, grown a few years older; only he has been educated in France instead of Massachusetts. At the time the story opens he is loafing about Europe, in possession of an income of four thousand a year—a mere bagatelle, of course, with which a fellow "can neither yacht nor race." He has been rejected by an English girl, and feels that he has no *raison d'être*. However, and all of a sudden, the hero's sister dies; then his father loses his money and dies, and his mother goes mad, and has to be supported in a very expensive French lunatic asylum—her only chance of recovery. Under these circumstances Vane "takes a brace." He goes to America in the steerage, gets a six-hundred-dollar clerkship in a New York banking-house, sternly lives in down-town lodgings at two dollars a week, and devotes his evenings to mediæval history and Italian poetry. At the end of the year the banker—as bankers will, you know, in the "Bab Ballads," if not in Wall street—calls him into his counting-room, presents him with a check for four hundred dollars additional to his salary, and raises the latter to three thousand a year—a really paltry stipend for a man of Vane's financial genius and acquaintance with the Italian poets. After a while he begins to go into society, and meets a Miss Thomas who has dead-black hair and eyes of gentian blue. American ways and American young women are very strange to Vane; and if we

did not know that "J. S., of Dale," knew all about Harvard, etc., we should think that they were equally strange to him—so cleverly does he contrive to shuffle off his long familiarity with this poor, dear America, and give the fresh impressions and the little shocks which American social queernesses make upon his hero—educated in France.

With the appearance of Miss Thomas upon the scene, the story begins in earnest. With her Vane conducts a complicated flirtation, in the course of which they read together "the familiar pages of Ariosto, Tasso, and Dante." It is fair to say that the author describes this very cleverly, and contrives to make his heroine appear a most piquant and desirable young woman. At the end Vane falls in love, and his accomplished adversary, after playing him skillfully through nearly two hundred pages, finally jilts him in the neatest fashion. Whereupon, in a fit of disgust, he shoots himself, leaving a million and a half of dollars. This last, however, quite by the way: the hero of a fashionable novel makes his money with his left hand, incidentally, as it were; his real, serious business is flirtation and love-making. The reader is not called upon to waste much sympathy on Mr. Henry Vane. Very young people in Italy and other southern countries, and more rarely among the lower classes in America, do sometimes kill themselves for love. Older men are often driven to suicide by the grim miseries of real life, by disease, dishonor, grinding poverty, domestic troubles, and overwork. But Vane, we fear, is only one of those "worldlings" of whom Carlyle writes with fierce contempt, that "vomit up their sick existences."

The author of this book has undeniable gifts as a story-teller. He writes a crisp, nervous style, and says a number of good things, approaching the epigrammatic, such as, *e. g.*, "A Frenchman drinks to go to the devil; he rarely goes to the devil because he drinks," and "no one is a pessimist who has to work for his living." One of the best things in the book is the capital description of the summer hotel and its frequenters at "Cinerea Lake," which is not less good because watering-place life has already been described in dozens of hotel-piazza-and-flirtation novels. If "J. S., of Dale," will drop his affectation of cynicism, his affectation of culture, and his little cosmopolitan airs, and give us something genuine, his talent will find worthier employment.

We own to a superstitious respect for a solid, old-fashioned historical romance like General Lew Wallace's "Ben Hur: a Tale of the Christ," there is so much "information" in it. It must have taken so much labor to write it that one is willing to bestow a great deal in reading it; and when one has come to the last of its five hundred and fifty-two pages he feels that he has not been merely trifling with society nonsense, but has stored his mind by the way with useful knowledge. To be sure, the people are not very real to us; even Ivanhoe is not as credible as he was in our boyhood. But then who expects them to be real? The pleasure is more like that derived from an epic poem. We can read "Hypatia" once in three years without much fatigue.

Still the historical romance is rather of an anachronism nowadays. Even Ebers's learned novels are pronounced wax-work, and a lively lady of our acquaintance, who instantly reads every book of Howells,

James, Black, Hardy, etc., as soon as it comes out, cannot be brought, during the intervals between the productions of these fertile narrators, even to dip into "those horrid old B. C. novels." "Ben Hur" is not precisely a B. C. nor yet altogether an A. D. novel. It might better be described as a C. novel. Its hero is a Jew of illustrious birth who has the Old Testament idea of the Messiah, and is waiting his coming to serve him with treasure and armies. The story tells how this Jewish conception is changed into the Christian one by the actual coming of the Christ. It is a good novel of its kind, and a successful one. The author possesses the historic imagination, the great value of which is to assist the reader in getting a definite concrete idea of the life which the regular historians give only in its general aspects. The period chosen is one rich in contrasts between races, religions, and states of society. On one side is the gorgeous, material, sensual civilization of Rome crushing down the eastern provinces with the brute weight of its despotism—its legions and its tax-collectors; on the other, "the living death of Jerusalem among her stony hills," inheriting a spiritual faith which withstands the Roman power, but is so exclusive and ritualistic that it must have a new birth in order to become a means of regeneration to the Gentiles. The splendor and the inhumanity of this old classic world, waiting for its Redeemer, are forcibly brought out in "Ben Hur." There is a spirited description of a chariot race, and an imaginative picture of the wonderful paradise of the Ephesian Diana, the bright consummate flower of Greek and Syrian paganism. And in sharp contrast with these are the vivid portrayals of the slow tortures of the Roman galley slaves and the horrors of leprosy in the caves about Jerusalem. A sage from India, a princess from Egypt, the chief of the wandering tribes of Bedouins, emphasize the mingling of peoples that took place under the Empire; and a Saxon athlete, who is hired to kill the hero, hints at the great impending destiny that hung over the northern borders of the Roman world, whose descent was yet to be postponed for four centuries.

There are some who like their history straight and their fiction straight. Those who prefer them mixed will find a notable addition to their pleasures in "Ben Hur."

H. A. B.

Mr. Watts's Pictures in New York.

MR. G. F. WATTS, R. A., has just decided to yield to the pressure which has been brought to bear upon him by his friends and admirers in America, and has promised to send a collection of his most important pictures to New York, to the charge of the Metropolitan Museum of Fine Arts. It is not to be denied that a great many friends and admirers in England will feel, and have felt, a good deal of alarm, and almost of indignation, at this piece of news. When Mr. Watts summoned me to his house, a day or two ago, to announce the fact to me and to ask me to write this "open letter," I confess that I, as the most humble of his friends and admirers, was alarmed and indignant. In a certain sense, there is no English art-product of our day which can so little be permitted to suffer the wear and tear of travel as Mr. Watts's pictures. They are painted in such a manner, and

with such a medium, that they cannot be reproduced with anything like an adequate result. If we were deprived of the actual work of Sir Frederick Leighton or of Mr. Millais, these masters would still live for us in engravings and photographs. But no process reproduces Mr. Watts's pictures successfully. The engravings of one or two of them, published in *THE CENTURY* for August, 1883, are the best that have been made, and these are very unsatisfactory. Therefore, if the ship that takes this argosy over to New York should founder in mid-ocean, Mr. Watts, as one of the chief glories of our national art, ceases to exist. There actually was once a Royal Academician whose entire works went bodily to the bottom of the sea, and now toss with shells and dead men's bones in the surge of the Bay of Biscay. Mr. Watts's pictures, moreover, are, in a large measure, not the property of private persons, but hoarded by him for a public purpose, and many of them destined at last to be a gift to the nation. No wonder, therefore, that friendship is alarmed and reluctant.

Mr. Watts, however, has consented. He first proposed to send a set of large photographs, painted up in monochrome under his personal direction, so as to give to America the scheme and sentiment of each picture, and everything, indeed, but just the color. To this and other proposals short of entire concession the Metropolitan Museum returned a steady refusal; and now Mr. Watts is gathering together a typical collection of the best pictures of his life-time to send to New York this winter. In the article in *THE CENTURY* to which I have just referred, Mr. Prothero gave an enthusiastic account of the pictures as they were seen at the Grosvenor Gallery. Most of what he so warmly described will shortly be seen in America—the portraits of men of genius, the "Paolo and Francesca," the "Psyche," the "Orpheus and Eurydice," and above all, the solemn and beautiful "Love and Death." There will, moreover, be certain important recent works not yet seen by the English public—in particular, an exquisite "Love and Life," which is only just finished, the ambrosial god leading the timid feminine incarnation of life up a narrow and rugged mountain pathway—a picture than which the artist has finished none more full of delicate imagination and tender beauty.

My vocation, however, here is not to stand upon Mount Gerizim, but upon Mount Ebal. I must not indulge in the privilege of praising. Mr. Watts desires rather, through me, to warn America of certain qualities which run throughout his work, which are part and parcel of its being, and which may cause disappointment to those who have only read the panegyric of his admirers. We understand in this country that American amateurs take but scanty interest in the development of our art as English art. They are interested, no doubt, in certain English artists, but not in English art. French art, on the contrary, we are told, is almost more interesting to them than French artists. They like the courageous training of the Parisian schools; the undaunted execution, the splendid brush-power, of the young Parisian painters. The youths that paint a piece of a street, with a barouche in it as large as life, or a pilot-boat of the natural size breaking on a reef that seems to roar with the surf,—these, no doubt, present us with a sort of art

which is fascinating, marvelous, and peremptory in its demand on the attention. Any one who has been a little behind the scenes knows how these "realists" will pirouette upon their stools before an empty canvas half a year, praying for one little idea, even somebody else's old idea, to descend upon them and give their skillful hands something to exercise that skill upon. We suppose, here in England, that when America contemns our sentimental English art, and looks to Paris, it is this skill that she admires, and that the want of thought that underlies the skill escapes her. Mr. Watts, at least, believes that the one goes with the other; that all this excessive cleverness in execution, in imitation of surfaces and textures, all this wonderful *chic* and *brío* and tricks that are *pschull*, are signs of artistic decline. Without judging Paris or any living school of art, he is anxious to have it understood, for fear of disappointment, that this cleverness of imitative execution, the fruit that deceives the bird, the curtain that deceives the slave, has never been a matter of solicitude with himself; that in such work as he has carried through, the idea has been preëminent; and that in short he has always approached art from the point of view of a poet, rather than of a mere painter.

I do not think that it would in the least amuse Mr. Watts to be told that any one had fancied his garlands to be composed of real roses, or his nymphs to be hung about with real jewels. This has not been his aim. But if any observer should sincerely say that the "Love and Life" possessed a Virgilian perfume and tenderness, that the "Paolo and Francesca" translated the real sentiment of Dante, or that the Greek landscapes breathed the spirit of Sophocles, that, I think, might be conceived to please him. That Americans should be prepared to find a meaning in the pictures which are about to cross the sea, not that they should be looking forward to dazzling executive effects and juggling with the brush, that seems to be Mr. Watts's desire. That he has never neglected the executive part, and that he might make his boast of his skill if he chose, that is not for me, as his mouth-piece, to insist in this place.

Edmund Gosse.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

A Word from the Organ-loft.

IN our ordinary congregations, from one-fourth to one-third of the time spent in public worship is given to musical exercises of some kind. The management and direction of divine service is entirely in the hands of the minister. He either reads the prayers prescribed by the Liturgy, or offers prayer *ex tempore*. The selection of the Scripture read is in most cases his own, while the subject and matter of his sermon are left entirely to him. For these duties careful preparation has been made during his years in divinity schools, and he feels his competency to direct. But is he competent to direct the Service of Praise? In most cases he is not; and realizing his insufficiency in this respect, his want of knowledge of musical matters, he naturally turns to those who are, or ought to be, proficient, and delegates to them the direction of this part of the service.

Why should he delegate the management and direc-

tion of his Praise Service more than prayer or sermon? "A minister," says Mr. Taylor, "is one who actually or habitually serves at the altar. The *clergyman* who delegates his functions is not a *minister*."

In so important a matter as that of the proper conducting of this one-fourth of our service, as thorough and complete preparation, it would seem, should be afforded students in our seminaries as for the other duties of the sacred calling; but inquiry made of thirteen of our leading theological seminaries develops the remarkable fact that in *not one* of them does music form any part of the studies of its course. Is it to be wondered at, in view of this startling fact, that things even more repugnant to good taste and to the proper conduct of the Service of Praise do not take place than have been recorded in these columns? I venture the assertion that careful inquiry into all the ludicrous cases narrated in Dr. Robinson's letters would develop the fact that not one occurred in a church where the minister was a good musician, and was in weekly consultation with his choir director.

The want of proper musical knowledge upon the part of the minister, the possession of which would

enable him understandingly to direct, together with the want of consultation with the chorister, which should be in time to arrange for the Sunday's services, — here is where the fault with the "music in our churches" is to be largely, if not mainly, sought and found.

The remedy, I believe, is of easy application; let our theological seminaries provide competent instructors in music; let there be among the students free and full consultation and criticism in musical matters; let this study be not an "annex" to the course of study, but let it take the place it deserves to occupy among the preparations for the ministry; let the opportunity be given the students for instruction in this important part of the conduct of public worship — whether there be musical talent or not among them; — let this be done, and then, with as careful preparation in *musical* matters as in their other studies, it will doubtless be found after a while that the minister will have no more trouble with the conduct of this part of public worship than with the other parts, for all of which he is equally responsible, and should be alike qualified.

Diapason.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

In Arcadia.

BECAUSE I choose to keep my seat,
Nor join the giddy dancers' whirl,
I pray you do not laugh, my girl,
Nor ask me why I find it sweet
In my old age to watch your glee —
I, too, have been in Arcady.

And though full well I know I seem
Quite out of place in scenes like this,
You can't imagine how much bliss
It gives me just to sit and dream,
As your fair form goes flitting by,
How I, too, dwelt in Arcady.

For, sweetheart, in your merry eyes
A vanished summer buds and blows,
And with the same bright cheeks of rose
I see your mother's image rise,
And o'er a long and weary track
My buried boyhood wanders back.

And as with tear-dimmed eyes I cast
On your sweet form my swimming glance,
I think your mother used to dance
Just as you do, in that dead past,
Long years ago, — yes, fifty-three, —
When I, too, dwelt in Arcady.

And in the music's laughing notes
I seem to hear old voices ring
That have been hushed, ah! many a spring,
And round about me faintly floats
The echo of a melody
I used to hear in Arcady.

And yonder youth — nay, do not blush,
The boy's his father o'er again;
And hark ye, Miss, I was not plain
When at his age — what! must I hush?
He's coming this way? Yes, I see —
You two yet dwell in Arcady.

R. T. W. Duke, Jr.

Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

YOU can encourage the timid, restrain the bold,
punish the wicked, but for the weak there is no help.
THE most reliable people we have are those whose
brains are located in their heads.

THERE is nothing like necessity to quicken a man, —
I once knew a man who was the laziest fellow on
earth, until he lost a leg by accident, after that no able-
bodied man could get around the village as quick as
he could on one leg and a crutch.

DON'T go back, my friend, after many years, to
your old home expecting to be made happy; for, if you
ever happened to commit an indiscretion in your boy-
hood days, people will remember nothing but that, and
most of them will remind you of it.

WHAT the world wants the most is novelty and dis-
patch. Civilization has so quickened all things, that,
before another hundred years rolls around, we shall
require a quicker kind of lightning than we have now
to do our telegraph business with.

THERE are those so pure that they are continually
repenting of sins they haven't the pluck to commit.

LEARNING seems to be rapidly driving all the com-
mon sense out of the world.

Uncle Esek.

Love Passes By. (FROM THE SPANISH.)

THE pure invisible atoms of air
Palpitate, break into warmth and glory;
The Heavens descend in rays of light.
Earth trembles with silent, unspeakable bliss,
A pang of delight, too dear!
Strange shocks and tumults of harmony
Swell on the winds, and fall and die!
In broken music I seem to hear
Confused, half-told, an exquisite story,
A murmur of kisses and rustling wings.
My eyelids close. What can it be
This marvelous presence so far, so near,
This unseen vision, I dare not see?
Love passes by!

Mary Ainge De Vere.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

One Way to Prevent Divorce.

THE more the statistics of divorce in the United States are studied and understood, the more alarming seems the situation. Although a good deal has been said and written on the subject in this magazine and elsewhere, it has not yet had the sifting and discussion that must take place before our law-makers are brought to give the proper attention to it. That some of the evils which exist may be reached by intelligent legislation concerning marriage and divorce, with a view to uniformity and the avoidance of fraud, there can be no doubt. Indeed, the time may come when legislation will not only look toward the unifying of our own laws on this subject, but likewise toward an international correspondence of legislation. For perplexity, distress, and outrage are owing not only to differences in legal enactments as between States of the Union, but also as between our own and other countries; and as the world advances in civilization and genuine Christianity, and as the natural barriers are more and more broken down, there is no reason why this all-important matter should not be arranged with a view to the general good of the people of all nations.

But while statisticians, moralists, and statesmen are at work, ordinary human beings may also be doing their share toward bringing about a different state of affairs. The institution of marriage suffers on the one hand from the cynic, on the other from the sentimentalist. The cynical method leads to ill-assorted and unhappy marriages, from which men and women fly to divorce for deliverance; the sentimentalist method often leads more dangerously, because more deceitfully, to the same disastrous consummation. (We are speaking of sentimentalism, and not of true sentiment.) Both the cynic and the sentimentalist will enter into the bonds of matrimony with perhaps less consideration of the true nature of the relation and the fitness of the person than that given by a careful man to the selection of his cook. A man who thinks deeply of his dishes will make many inquiries and tests. The sentimentalist will have none of these.

Is it not, in fact, the lack of a high ideal that renders many marriages in our day merely so many social disasters? Religion and morality may do much—but religion and morality in their broadest and profoundest sense. The men of law may make things seem somewhat better, but they will never be truly better unless the ideal of marriage is raised in the popular mind.

In scouting sentimentalism, it is only to pay higher respect to sentiment. What is wanted in the art of marriage, *i. e.*; in what old-fashioned people called "the selection of a partner," is the same that Joseph Jefferson once said was wanted in the art of acting,—namely, a warm heart and a cool head! But what is mainly needed is the old-fashioned thing that the poets of all ages have understood better than any others. In this domain the poetic is the practical. Poets them-

selves have by no means always successfully practiced what they preached; but the poetry was right, if the poet was not. In the field of the imagination, unfaithfulness, an impure heart, cut 'sorry figures; there the only thing right and beautiful is unselfish and everlasting devotion. That is the standard set up by the rarest minds in their most inspired words.

It is said that nowadays the poets are comparatively unread; that science and history have taken their place, even with the young. Is it fantastic to hint that this may have something to do with the impaired popular standard with regard to that most sacred, most deeply poetic, of all human relations?

Evidently the best way to prevent divorce is to maintain a purer and higher ideal of marriage.

Was the Chinese Traveler Right?

THERE is a story of a Chinese traveler who when asked what had struck him as most remarkable in the United States, replied, "the lack of honor." It would be well if the natural resentment of Americans at such an imputation could be fortified by facts and statistics. The repudiation of public debts by communities large and small; the recent unprecedented number of breaches of trust on the part of managers of banks and other corporations; the countless defalcations by trusted employees of private business firms; the growth and recklessness of speculation; the number of suits on the part of the general government to recover funds from delinquent public servants; the sordid character of much of our politics; the rings of financial adventurers discovered to be in secret collusion with legislative or executive officers,—all these would seem to sustain the view of the traveling Chinaman as to American honor.

But the situation assumes even a more serious aspect when we consider that notwithstanding the newspaper outcry at each new breach of trust, there is rarely an adequate punishment inflicted upon anything save the most flagrantly criminal action; and that the financial disasters which overtake certain institutions sometimes reveal the fact that their officers have merely been unfortunate in such speculative misappropriation of funds as is not uncommon in similar concerns.

When one contemplates the good influences active in church and state; the organized political and other reforms, our charities, and educational movements and enterprises; the vital moral and religious spirit at work as a leaven in the community,—one is re-assured as to the future; but there stand the other facts which cannot and should not be overlooked. The writer of the "Open Letter" on "The School of Dishonesty," in the last number of THE CENTURY, puts his finger upon one great source of our evils. To some his remarks will seem sweeping and sensational, but they will be corroborated by the experience of many; and the recent analyses by Dr. Elwyn Waller, chemist of the N. Y. Health Department, to

some extent confirm Mr. Tyrer's surprising statement with regard to adulterations.

There is little doubt that the thing which most needs to be preached to this generation of Americans, by ministers of the gospel, by both clerical and lay instructors of the youth, by all who have public influence or private authority, is—a sense of honor! It must be shown and insisted upon that every position in life where one person is employed by another to do a certain work, imposes an obligation to fulfill the duties of the place with an honorable and disinterested regard for the interests of the employer. It must be shown that this view of employment applies to the cook, the errand-boy, the cashier, the legislator, the Governor, the President. This is a trite, and apparently simple, and perhaps somewhat stupid view of the opportunities of a "smart" and ambitious young American of our day; but unless this commonplace view of responsibility is laid hold of by increasing numbers in the future of our country, we will not say that our society will go to pieces, but we will say that our calamities will increase, and that we will get into troubles, and not soon out of them, compared with which the dangers and distresses of the past will seem almost insignificant.

Economic Mistakes of the Poor.

ONE of the chief hindrances to the prosperity of the poor and to the improvement of their condition is their ignorance of economic matters and the mistakes they often make in them. We do not refer so much to economic laws and theories as to the practical conduct of life in its economic aspects, a matter in which theoretical knowledge is of subordinate importance. It is not to be expected that men so imperfectly educated as are the laboring masses, and with so little leisure and spare energy as they have, should be able to give much study to the laws of wealth; but there is no reason why they should not manage their own business affairs with more prudence than some of them now show. Want of skill and prudence in making purchases, and mistakes in regard to wages, are common among them, and have a tendency to prolong and intensify their poverty.

Every man in a civilized community is obliged to trade, to exchange his goods and services for those of others; since every man can produce but a small part of what he needs. It is important, therefore, for everybody to make such exchanges wisely, so as to purchase what he wants at the smallest cost, and sell his own services to the best advantage. Exceptional skill in this direction is the special qualification of the successful business man, and those who are lacking in such skill are sure to be less prosperous than their neighbors. Moreover, such skill and prudence are specially important for the poor; for though a rich man may continue prosperous notwithstanding blunders and losses, a man born to poverty can seldom rise to a better condition without care and wisdom in the management of his affairs.

Now, the mistakes of the poor in practical economy are frequent and of various kinds; and, first, in making their purchases. Their means are so small that they can ill afford to spend even a portion of them imprudently; and yet they very often do so. They are

apt, for instance, to purchase goods in very small quantities, when they could buy in larger amounts at a reduced rate. Some things, of course, must necessarily be purchased in small quantities, because they will not keep well; but many of the things that a man requires for his table or for other purposes can just as well be bought in larger amounts, and if so bought they can usually be got at a considerable reduction in price. Again, the poor are too much in the habit of buying goods on trust, when exertion and forethought would enable them to buy for cash, and make a further saving in that way. Moreover, their want of knowledge of commercial affairs and inattention to the course of prices prevent them from taking advantage of the state of the market, as they might sometimes do, so as to buy what they need at the lowest price. It may be said that the mass of the poor have not the means to buy in large quantities, or to buy always for cash and to take advantage of the fluctuations in price; and to a certain extent this is true. Yet it would be easy, in most cases, for them to get together a sufficient sum to make a beginning in these matters, and, once begun, the practice could more easily be continued. Many of them, indeed, are already alive to the advantages that may thus be gained, and are shrewd and economical in all their purchases; but many others are either ignorant or heedless of such things, and thus miss the opportunity of making many a small saving.

Besides these mistakes of a strictly economical character, there are others of a different kind into which the poor are apt to fall in the use of their means, though not the poor alone. One of them is the purchase of inferior goods, or shabby imitations, when a genuine article, even of a lower grade, would be more satisfactory, as well as cheaper. Then, large sums in the aggregate are spent for articles of ornament that are not ornamental, and for vulgar amusements and other things of little or no real value. We might allude, also, to the vast sums that are wasted on liquors and other things that are positively injurious; but all these habits and practices are rather to be condemned from a moral and æsthetic point of view than from the purely economical, bad as their economical effects undoubtedly are. Besides, it is not the poor alone who are guilty or imprudent in these matters, but other classes as well; and, so far as they concern the poor, we have spoken of them in these pages before.

Such are some of the economical mistakes of the poor in the employment of their means; but those of them that work for hire, who are the great majority, make mistakes of another kind on the subject of wages. Every friend of humanity must wish that the earnings of the poor might be increased; but the means they often employ to effect such an increase seem little likely to attain their object. We are not now concerned with the general policy of strikes and trades-unions, nor with the question of their justification from a moral point of view. But we would call attention to the lack of economic knowledge and the mistakes in economic policy which their leaders so abundantly display. One would think that if men were going to seek an increase of wages, they would take care to do it when the condition of the market was favorable to the success of their attempt. Yet nothing is more common than for the managers of a trades-union to order a strike when trade is dull, the

price of goods falling, and the market, perhaps, filled with unemployed labor. Under such circumstances the attempt to raise wages is necessarily a failure; while, if proper care were used to take advantage of the market, an increase of pay might often be obtained without any struggle at all.

But there is a further mistake into which laborers are apt to fall on this subject of wages: they often entertain extravagant ideas as to the extent to which wages can be raised. One would think from the talk in which some of them indulge, and from the reckless manner in which they order strikes, that they thought almost any rate could be obtained if sufficient pressure were brought to bear. Yet a little attention to the conditions of business, to commercial history, and to the state of the market at a given time, would show that any great and sudden increase of wages was out of the question. Such increase as is possible will result in part from the general moral and intellectual improvement of the laborer himself, and of his special skill as a workman, and in part from taking advantage of the various markets and of the times and seasons, so as to get the highest rate obtainable in each particular case.

Besides the mistakes above mentioned, to which the mass of the poor are liable, there are others, to which those of their number are exposed who attempt to do business on their own account. Men born in narrow circumstances have seldom much chance in early life to learn the management of business; and they need, therefore, to be specially careful in undertaking it. Yet they are very apt to enter upon it without sufficient attention to its conditions, and without the amount of capital which the business requires. Every year a multitude of small capitalists are thus wrecked; and in the majority of cases their failure is due to mistakes and imprudences which a little more care and forethought might have prevented. Doubtless one cause of such failures is the passion for great and sudden gains; a passion that afflicts multitudes in our time, and has caused the ruin of many rich men no less than of many poor. But whatever may be the cause of failure in any particular case, the result is much to be regretted, since an increase in the number of small capitalists is greatly to be desired.

Without touching here upon the subject of coöperative industry, or the means which the rich may devise for improving the condition of the poor, we have merely tried to state briefly some of the more serious economic mistakes into which poor men and those of small means are liable to fall, and which are a hindrance, and sometimes a great one, to the improvement of their lot. If, now, we are asked what remedy can be applied, we fear there is none except the slow working of time and education. For the purchase of goods by the poor, it has been proposed that coöperative stores should be established, so as to save for the purchasers the profit they now pay to the retail dealer. That such stores, when well conducted, are highly beneficial, there can be no doubt; but for some reason or other most enterprises of this sort in America have proved unsuccessful. On the subject of wages our native American laborers have not, as a rule, been so widely mistaken as foreign laborers and those of foreign birth; and experience will in time, no doubt, lead to more correct views and wiser methods. The

general education of the poor, bringing with it more thoughtfulness and foresight, must also in the course of time lead to greater knowledge of economic subjects and better methods of management. But something also may be done by direct advice and exhortation.

A Ready-made Foreign Market for American Goods.

THE recent political canvass was prolific of wide differences of opinion; but we believe there is one point upon which most men of all parties are now substantially agreed, viz., the desirability of securing additional foreign markets for American goods. Many think this can best be obtained by a reduction of duties which now operate against the freedom of commerce; while others advocate the establishment by public subsidy of ocean lines, or the conversion into business agencies of our entire consular service. A commission of investigation has been appointed to visit the countries of Central and South America with a view to the extension of our trade in those quarters, and legislation of some sort may be expected to grow out of this mission. That, in a large number of cases, our manufactories are abundantly able to put out more goods than they can dispose of is disclosed by the failures from overproduction, the reduction of wages, and the ruinous competition for the home market, which are matters of daily record in the newspapers. A considerable addition to the present area of sale for American goods would in all probability not only relieve the present stringency in trade, but would put many of our manufactories upon a favorable basis for years to come.

Whatever of trade we may hereafter acquire in new markets will be based upon a demonstrated demand for our products — a demand which can only be created in the laborious course of business. In other words, the market will have to be "worked up" in strict competition with the products of other countries. Agencies must be established, samples must be shown, advertised, and tested, and patents and trade-marks secured. These labors performed, there is no lack of assurance that those who shall thus extend our material civilization will be fully protected in obtaining the legitimate profits of their labor. The agent, the owner, and the inventor will each find new rewards and a new stimulus.

There is, however, one American business which, by the neglect of Congress, has been refused the security of its legitimate profits in foreign countries. Moreover, the demand for its products is already so well established and so extensive that the industry has for years given employment to a large body of smugglers, chiefly in England, who, by underselling the market with stolen goods, have grown rich by the labors of our producers, lessening the rewards not only of these, but of those capitalists in our own country by whom the products have been set before the world. The market is there, virtually ready-made, and waiting only for Congress to say the word to enable us to occupy it. No tariff has to be repealed, no commercial agency of consuls has to be established. Nothing remains but to secure the patent which is granted with alacrity to other forms of expressing American ideas; and this Congress could accomplish in twenty minutes. The revenue which would have accrued to America had this been done fifty years ago is incalculable, but

it is secondary to the national stimulus which has been lost by this flagrant and onerous omission. The product we have in mind is American literature.

On another page we print an "Open Letter" from Mr. George Parsons Lathrop, secretary of the American Copyright League, setting forth the efforts that are now being made by that body to obtain from Congress a recognition of property in literary products equal to that which we accord to even the poorest brand of Havana cigars. We have already called attention in

these columns to the distinguished advocates, in politics and literature, of the principle embodied in the Dorsheimer Copyright Bill, which is now high up on the calendar of the House of Representatives. The bill is not open to a single partisan consideration; it has no proper relation to the tariff, and the only strife it ought to give rise to is an eager emulation on the part of representatives to see who can do the most to procure the early passage of an always just and now doubly expedient measure.

OPEN LETTERS.

The World's Exposition at New Orleans.

ITS SCOPE AND EXPECTED RESULTS.

THE World's Exposition at New Orleans is the response to a demand that arose from most of the Southern States simultaneously—a response that had previously found partial expression in the local expositions of Atlanta and Louisville. The South herself was astonished at those exhibitions of success which had attended the labor necessitated by her defeat in the Civil War. She had been too absorbed in the struggle for existence to notice the change her energy was creating; and it was only when she had won for herself the right to a moment's rest that she looked around and saw the gratifying result of her toil.

The project of the new World's Exposition was born of a spirit of friendly rivalry with those other sections that had already proclaimed to the world their industrial development; and it was intended simply to show one phase of the country's resources. But as it was planned on an extensive scale, leading men of "the new South" saw the opportunity they had been seeking, and easily prevailed upon those having the enterprise in hand to make it neither local nor sectional, but national. The steps to this end were natural and easy. Cotton might no longer be King, but its cultivation from the seed to the bale, and its manufacture from the bale to the fabric, embraced so significant a part of the nation's industry, was so inextricably woven up with the wealth of the world, that it required no change of plan—merely an extension of idea—to make an exposition of cotton an exposition of the world's industry. As soon as this decision was reached, the entire country came to the aid of the undertaking, and, with a spontaneity and enthusiasm which are gratefully appreciated by the Southern people, extended such pecuniary assistance and moral support as were necessary for the successful completion of so gigantic an enterprise. Such are the causes that gave birth to the Exposition and extended its original scope; but the results that may be expected to flow from it cannot be so briefly stated.

What the Southern people have accomplished since the war has not been due to emulation springing from observation of what the world beyond their borders was accomplishing. The largest proportion of her people have been and still are profoundly ignorant of the higher phases of intellectual and mechanical power

as applied to the every-day wants of life. It is true that they read in their papers and in books that there is a continual re-adaptation of the sciences to meet the changed conditions of society, that each element of nature is being utilized in some new way to satisfy some new need. But those things are to them as things in dreams. Poverty has held them to their work; and living as they do far from the centers of activity, they have not been able by even hurried glimpses of great cities to form a conception of how their surroundings could be improved. What they have done has been by untiring energy with inferior appliances. It would be unfair to say that this is true of all sections of the South. There are certain portions of it where results are reached by the same means as those used in the North; but in the majority of instances Southern energy has been handicapped by inferior methods and appliances. Add improved methods to her natural advantages and intense desire to develop herself, and there must come a prosperity unexcelled in history. And since the larger mass of her people cannot go out into the world and see things with their own eyes, the world in essence is to be brought to them. National and international expositions have heretofore been held in the great centers of population, in places needing them least. The results have, notwithstanding, been beneficial, as interchange of thoughts and sympathies must always be; but it will be difficult to foretell how largely the Southern people will be instructed by the great Object Lesson to be placed before them at New Orleans.

If these remarks hold good of even the white population, who by means of the press have kept themselves to a certain extent *au courant* with the progress and processes of society, what can be said of the colored population, that vast agglomeration of ignorance as yet scarcely touched by the leaven of civilization?

If the Exposition has no other effect than that of guiding in the right direction the uncertain aspirations of this element of Southern life, the million of dollars appropriated by the National Government will be returned to it a thousand-fold. For, besides the advantages which the blacks will receive in common with the whites, a new factor has been introduced into their development, a factor so important that the World's Exposition is likely to mark an era in their history almost as significant as their emancipation from slavery. It is difficult to find at present a white Southerner who would return if he could to the ante-bellum system;

still the feeling toward the colored man up to within the past two or three years has been the passive sentiment of "live and let live." The civil equality of the negro was forced upon the white man against his will; but to his credit be it said that in order to show his acquiescence in the theory of government for *all* the people, he has come forward and asked the colored people, as being a large component of the society of which he is himself a part, to assist him in showing to the world what the South has grown to be. The management of the Exposition have created a department devoted exclusively to an exhibition of the advancement made by the colored people within the past twenty years, and have put at the head of it a colored man who commands the confidence of the entire country. A large space has been reserved for the colored people's exhibition in the Government Building. In consequence of this, the negroes in every Southern State are alive with eager activity; and although their exhibition will probably be crude, it will be one of the most significant features of the occasion.

These are the two distinctive benefits to the South that will flow from the Exposition. There are others common to all expositions not necessary to be enumerated here; but one or two of national importance cannot be passed over. New Orleans was selected as the site for the Exposition not only because this is the natural outlet for a large proportion of Southern trade, but because the city is the natural gateway for the vast commerce that must at some time spring up between the United States and the Central and South American countries. To foster and develop that trade, the management of the Exposition have bent every energy. Although aware that New Orleans and the South would be the principal gainers, they saw that the entire country would be enriched, particularly the manufacturing and agricultural industries of the North and West. Nothing was left undone to secure the coöperation of these southern races. Commissioners were sent to interest the governments and the peoples; desirable locations were reserved in the buildings and grounds; premiums were offered to suit the demands of the exhibitors. As a result, the most intense enthusiasm has arisen among countries that had never before evinced the least inclination to participate in foreign exhibitions. Each has vied with the other in attempts to place herself in the most favorable attitude before the world; and each will keenly watch what the various commercial, industrial, and agricultural centers of the world can offer in the way of interchange. European countries have finally appreciated this fact. At first there was a positive refusal on their part to participate in the Exposition. New Orleans was a great way off, and they had been surfeited with expositions. But when they saw the unprecedented zeal of the South American countries, the feeling changed. The newspapers began to call upon the merchants and manufacturers to exert themselves, unless they wished to see their trade directed away from its former channels. And now from across the Atlantic comes information that self-interest has done what self-pride could not do, and that the European will compete with the North American in a struggle for commercial supremacy in the far South.

The Woman's Department of the Exposition is also to be national in its scope, and will yield an abundance

of good fruit to the entire country. The women of the South particularly will reap a harvest from the experience of their more fortunate sisters of the North.

To say that the Exposition will have a softening effect upon the lingering animosities of the war is to imply that such animosities still exist—an implication that the Southerner is loath to admit. There is nothing so potent as prosperity to wipe out resentment. The more prosperous the South has grown, the less disposition has she felt to dwell upon what she was wont to consider her injuries; and to-day, standing on the eve of her great festival, to which she has invited the nations of the earth, she would resent the imputation that she harbors malice against any. Doubtless, however, the Exposition will bring about a still better knowledge and higher respect among the various sections of our common country.

NEW ORLEANS.

Richard Nixon.

Recent Electrical Progress.

THE Electrical Exhibition held at Philadelphia in September and October was to many people a disappointment. Many of the international exhibitions held in the last ten years have been marked by the appearance of important inventions, as the telephone at the Centennial and the phonograph at the great exhibition at Paris. This has led to a general expectation that all important exhibitions will be signalized by the first display of some startling and wonderful discovery or invention. This is particularly true in electricity, the public mind being quite prepared to accept anything, however strange, in this field of research. It must be observed as a curious change in public opinion that while twenty years ago all inventions were received with distrust and unbelief, there is now an eagerness to welcome everything that would be to the elder inventors, like Morse or Howe, something quite bewildering. All this seemed to give to the visitors to the Philadelphia exhibition a certain sense of disappointment, while to the student this feeling was the most striking feature of the occasion.

At the same time, the exhibition was in the best sense a success and very far from disappointing, because it showed a remarkable commercial and industrial progress of the electric light. With the general introduction of dynamos for lighting appeared new mechanical problems. There must be high speed, steadiness of motion combined with ease of management. The dynamos for isolated lighting, as in a hotel, factory, or single building of any kind or on ship-board, must also be compact in design and light in weight. The steam-engines shown at the exhibition were, for this reason, quite as interesting as the lamps. No specially novel motor was exhibited, yet the effect of the demand for high speed was evident in all the types of engines in the exhibition. Even in the matter of belts for connecting engines with dynamos progress was claimed, some belting being shown specially designed to secure steadiness of motion. In brief, the improvement in engines and connections is clearly the result of the peculiar demands of the dynamo, and a new class of motors has appeared, giving high speed and uniform motion, with the utmost compactness of design. One gas-engine directly connected with a dynamo was shown as an interesting illustration of the conver-

sion of heat with little light into motion, and reconversion of motion into light with little heat. Many experiments were made to show the transmission of power by electricity, including the driving of machine tools, printing-press, sewing machines, and a short line of railroad.

The necessity of getting rid of poles and wires in city streets has led inventive talent into this field of work, and a number of new underground systems were represented by models. Among these was at least one that is in actual operation, carrying both telegraph and telephone wires for some distance through the streets of Philadelphia. This system employs a wrought-iron tube carrying a cable formed of insulated copper wires braided together and laid loosely in the pipe, the pipe being kept full of oil slowly moving through the pipe under pressure. A more recent system consists of a brick conduit to be laid in the street, with man-holes at intervals. Within the brick tube are arranged on each side brackets carrying troughs in which the cables or bundles of insulated wires are laid. A track is laid in the center of the conduit between the brackets, and on this track runs a car, having a standard supporting arms that extend over the brackets on each side. This car is drawn through the conduit from one man-hole to another and serves to deposit the wires in the troughs. It is intended that the various wires, or cables, shall lie in the troughs, and to assist the insulation it is designed to have the conduit air-tight, and to fill it at all times with dry air under pressure. To accomplish this, an air-compressor is to be placed at some point of the line, and a tank containing some hygroscopic chemical to dry the air will be placed in connection with the conduit and kept full of compressed air. Safety-valves will also be placed at intervals to relieve the conduit from undue pressure. The aim of this invention is to keep the conduit free from moisture by an excess of dry air, every leak being rendered harmless by an outflow of air that would prevent the entrance of moist air. The system has not yet been tried on a commercial scale. Another more simple system employs a square tube of wood designed to be buried underground. Within the tube are cross-pieces for the support of insulated telegraph and telephone wires. When all the wires are in position an insulating material is poured into the tube, completely covering all the wires from one to six inches, and soon hardening into a kind of artificial stone. The material seemed to be hard and durable, though no tests were offered of its insulating value. Telegraph cables for streets were also shown, one system, at least, being already in use. Sections of the system used with incandescent lights in this city were also shown, consisting of copper rods bedded in insulating material in iron pipes. Other street systems were also shown in models, but seemed to offer no special features of novelty, except in one instance where a sheet of glass perforated with holes is used as a support for the wires in the conduit.

In the application of electricity to railroad work there seems to be some progress in increased efficiency in signaling. Perhaps the most novel is the use of a small dynamo on the engine, constantly kept in motion while the locomotive is running. The engine is insulated from the tender, and the wires from the dynamo are connected one with the engine

and the other with the tender, so that the current flows down the wheels of the locomotive, along the rails to the wheels of the tender, and through these wheels to the other wire. If now the joint between any pair of rails and the next pair is separated by some insulating material, the circuit will be broken for the instant when the wheels of the engine are on one pair of rails and the wheels of the tender on the other. This breakage of the circuit through wheels and rails may be used to ring a bell or sound the whistle. It is easy to see that a wire connected with the rail on one side of the insulated joint might be carried any distance and connected with a switch or the lock of a draw-bridge, and then carried back to the rail on the other side of the joint. In the normal position of the switch or the bridge this wire would be a closed circuit bridging the broken joint, and the engine passing the joint would not be affected. If now the switch or draw be opened, the circuit will be broken, and the current as the engine passed the joint would be interrupted and the signal made to sound. In this manner the movement of any switch, bridge, etc., could be made to signal automatically to an approaching engine while still at a considerable distance. By a reversal of the plan, the engine could be used to transmit in advance a warning of its approach. This is, however, already accomplished by other methods. The novelty appears to be in the automatic signaling to the engine by the movement of a distant switch or draw, or from any cause whatever, a washout, breakage of culvert, fire on bridge, or other accident.

The most important application of electricity to railroad work was a combined pneumatic and electric switch and signaling system. The design of this system is to control all the switches and signals at a junction by means of compressed air. The system consists essentially of a compressor and air-reservoir to supply air under considerable pressure to the pipes that extend from the signal-station to each switch and signal-post. At each switch and signal-post is placed a cylinder having a piston and piston-rod, and so arranged that the movement of the piston will control the switch or the signal. In the signal-station is an annunciator connected with distant points on each line of rails. On the approach of a train a bell is rung and the position of the train is shown by the annunciator. All the signals of the system are in their normal condition of danger, and to prepare the lines for the passage of the train hand-levers are turned and air under pressure is admitted to the cylinders controlling the proper switches and signals. This, at the same time, locks all other signals and displays on a board in the hut the exact position of every switch in the system. A full-size model of the switch and signals was shown in operation, and seemed on examination to work with certainty and precision.

Charles Barnard.

The Present State of the Copyright Movement.

THE American Copyright League was formed in May, 1883, with the object of obtaining a reform in our copyright law which should secure to foreign authors the right of property in their works in this country.

Early in the last session of Congress, Representa-

tive William Dorsheimer, of New York, introduced a bill intended to attain that object. The League knew nothing beforehand of his proposed action, but its Executive Committee at once decided to ask Mr. Dorsheimer to modify his bill, so as to grant the foreign author copyright for forty-two years, instead of twenty-five, with a limitation in case of death, as at first proposed. This change having been adopted, the League went on to give the bill all the support it could. The measure was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary,—one of the most thoughtful, conservative, and impartial committees within the Speaker's range of appointment,—and was reported favorably by that body, without a single adverse vote. It was placed on the calendar, with only ten bills (and those unimportant) in advance of it.

On Monday, February 18th, Mr. Dorsheimer moved to make the bill a "special order" for February 27th; that is, to take it from the calendar and discuss it until a decision of the House could be had upon it. This motion required a two-thirds vote. There were 155 given for and 98 against it; so it was not carried. But the vote in favor fell short of two-thirds only by fourteen. This shows that a large majority of representatives wanted to give the bill a hearing. Besides, several supporters of the bill were absent, and a few others voted "No" simply because they wanted to show their disapproval of the rules of the House, which make it impossible to consider any bills—except those on tariff and appropriations—unless a day be fixed for their discussion.

Mr. Dorsheimer, for the Judiciary Committee, made a report in which he showed that the United States is the only civilized nation which withholds property rights from alien authors. The report said:

"The policy by which States refused rights of property to foreigners has long since been reversed. . . . It is manifest that the ancient discriminations grew out of ignorance and prejudice. . . . It is believed that if the bill is passed, American authors will receive great and valuable advantages. They will then be able to obtain copyrights in England and in the English colonies, so that when they successfully address all the English-speaking people, they will receive the compensation to which their genius and industry may entitle them. . . . The Committee earnestly commend this measure to the House, in the full belief that its passage will work a high and enduring benefit to the people of the United States, and contribute to the civilization and enlightenment of the world."

It must not be forgotten that Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, and many others urged in the strongest terms a measure of this kind. The subject has been under discussion at intervals for fifty years. When I went to Washington last winter to see what were the prospects for Mr. Dorsheimer's bill, I found the sentiment of members friendly toward it, with a few exceptions. I had been told that the "wild West" would develop a bitter opposition; but, on the contrary, most of the Western members whom I met were extremely liberal in their view, and showed a fine enthusiasm for what they considered an act of simple justice. They also manifested a hearty appreciation of American authorship, and a desire to give it fair play by relieving it from the unjust and ruinous competition with uncompensated foreign literature, which a contemptible habit

of theft forces upon us. Some of the highly cultivated Eastern members, on whom authors relied as intelligent adherents, proved to be weak-kneed, because they tangled up the question with inapt, illogical tariff and manufacturing considerations. On the other hand, all but fourteen of the Southern members voted for consideration, and many, including the whole of a large delegation from one of the Southern States, pledged themselves without question to support the bill. Let me add that, in common with other gentlemen of the League who consulted members as to their views, I was careful to talk also with representatives who were thought to oppose international copyright; for it was our desire to have a fair and open discussion on both sides.

Why, then, did the bill not receive a hearing? First let us review the forces that urged it. The League grew to the number of nearly seven hundred men and women—authors, editors, college presidents and professors, clergymen, lawyers, journalists, physicians—engaged in the making of books. Among these were nearly all the most distinguished literary artists of the country: *their* weight was thrown for the bill. The "Christian Union" published letters from a number of clergymen: *their* weight was thrown for the bill. The great newspapers in all parts of the country—omitting the Chicago "Tribune" and "Times"—spoke up on behalf of justice: *their* weight, likewise, was thrown for the bill. The "Publishers' Weekly," representing the whole trade of book-manufacture and book-selling, printed the statements of fifty-two leading firms, scattered throughout the Union, saying that they wanted copyright granted to foreign authors: again, *their* weight was thrown for the bill. Since then the Music Teachers' National Association, meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, in July, has come to the support of the Dorsheimer bill; and the music publishers are also reported as giving it a hearty approval.

Now let us count the opposition. Out of all the publishers addressed by the "Publishers' Weekly," only fifteen insisted that, if a foreign book is to have copyright here, it must be manufactured in this country. *Of those fifteen, seven were situated in Philadelphia.* The organized hostility came from that source; and it was based on the theory that American industry would be hurt unless every foreign author were compelled to have his book set up, stereotyped, printed, and bound in this country.

That organized hostility on the part of a small Philadelphia minority of publishers proceeded to work upon the fears of typographers and paper-makers by telling them that they would lose their occupation if copyright were given to aliens, because all foreign books would then be manufactured abroad—this despite the fact that we long ago repealed, after short trial, the law compelling foreign patentees to manufacture their machines in this country. The first answer to this is, that any book made abroad is subject to a duty of twenty per cent. when imported. Next, it must be kept in mind that our composers would still have a great deal to do in bringing out new editions of foreign works published before the enactment of an international copyright law. Thirdly, the production of books by American authors would be greatly stimulated, thus adding to the market of composers and paper-makers. Fourthly, the enterprise

of our publishers, some of whom are now on good terms with English authors, would enable them to secure books from those authors for manufacture here. "Cheap books for the people" are loudly insisted upon; but in the same breath the *Philadelphians* insist on a total re-manufacture, which frequently would double the cost, many books being now simply printed here from imported duplicate plates. No author will object to the policy of moderately cheap books, so long as he is not defrauded by it. Cheap clothing, iron, coal, food, houses, are all desirable; but no one maintains that they should be made cheap by means of theft, or the refusal to pay the producer. Only a few years ago Americans constantly bought current books — books for amusement on the cars — at \$1.50, without a hint of grumbling. Do they not still freely pay a dollar to go into the theater? In the case of foreign "stars," citizens have been known to give three dollars uncomplainingly, in return for a two-and-a-half hours' entertainment. As yet no Congressman or Philadelphia theorist has declared that the foreign actor should be forced by law to play to our audiences at ten cents a head. The case of lectures and concerts is the same. Hence, I conclude that the American people are really not so poverty-stricken that they cannot afford to pay, individually, a moderate price for a book, which yet shall compensate the author. Besides, before the epoch of pamphlet reprints, the people had a large net-work of libraries and book-clubs, by which for a small subscription — a few cents per book — they could obtain a year's reading, and reading of a good kind. The League tried to counteract the fallacies of the *Philadelphians* and the paper-makers, by printing and circulating several short documents. But a "scare" was created by the men who said that, unless the inhabitants of this republic can buy most foreign books for, say, from ten to forty cents, and unless foreign books are wholly remade here, the country will be ruined as to its paper and printing interests, and plunged into ignorance.

As if this appalling argument were not enough, they contended that an author, anyhow, has no right to put a price upon the work in which he has invested his time, labor, money, brains, manual labor,—all his capital, in short,—and that he ought to be grateful if we give him anything for his production after it is published. Ideas, they say, are common property, and no one may demand a price for an idea. True enough. But how about the *form* in which those ideas are presented? Is not that the author's own work, wrought out with toil, sweat, and often with privations? Is not the labor bestowed upon that form as worthy of proper wage as the manual skill devoted to the making of a jumping-jack? Yet no one has denied that jumping-jacks must be paid for. Besides, the law already recognizes this *form* in which an author presents his idea, and calls it property, if only the author be an American. The argument that authors have no property in the form given to their ideas falls, therefore, to the ground; and no excuse remains for denying such property to foreigners, unless we hold as valid the excuse of deliberate dishonesty.

"The Constitution of the United States (Art. I., Sec. VIII., 8) empowers Congress 'to promote the

progress of science and useful arts, by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings,' etc. But, by its failure to render the rights of all authors secure, Congress has practically defeated hitherto the intent of the Constitution in this respect." I quote this from a sheet which was printed and sent to every member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States last winter. Ought not the statement to be heeded by bringing up the Dorsheimer Bill for debate at the next session of Congress? Is it not decent — nay, essential — that the representatives of the people should openly confer upon the question of common honesty involved in defending recognized property; a question that vitally affects the well-being of thousands of laborers in a useful profession? It has been supposed that American citizens, even if their occupation be only that of paving streets or writing books, are entitled to have from Congress a fair consideration of their rights, if not redress for their wrongs. I venture to ask all friends of the copyright movement, whether of the literary profession or not, to press upon the members of Congress for their respective districts, immediately, the propriety and importance of at least giving the Dorsheimer Bill a prompt and fair hearing.

G. P. Lathrop,
Secretary American Copyright League.

80 WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK.

Coöperative Agriculture.

DR. GLADDEN'S article in the October CENTURY is worthy the serious study of both capitalists and laborers. I have been connected with the largest labor organization in this country, and have studied the labor question. While indorsing wholly Dr. Gladden's paper, I wish to add one caution in respect to laborers. It is unfortunately the case that too many workingmen spend enough of their hard earnings foolishly in ten years to pay for comfortable homes. This is spent for needless beverages, gambling, and other so-called pleasures. While I greatly sympathize with all workingmen, I cannot but believe that intemperance is mother to half their woes.

Within a stone's throw, at this writing, live a score of mechanics. Some of them have comfortable homes — some do not. The cause of this difference is the personal habits of these men. The temperate, judicious men are thrifty, contented, and happy. The intemperate are poor, miserable, and ready to "strike" at any opportunity.

It is no less true, however, that manufacturers are grasping, and do not love their employees as themselves.

In Kentucky, as well as in many other States, agriculture is carried on coöperatively. The owners furnish land, teams, machinery, seed, and food. The laborer furnishes his labor and skill. The crops are sold and the profits divided. There is general harmony and satisfaction. No one has ever heard of an agricultural "strike."

J. W. Caldwell.

CORINTH, KENTUCKY.

The Number of Men Engaged at Bull Run.

IN the series of papers on the Civil War begun in this magazine last month it is not intended to deal with statistics except in a compact form; but so defective are the official returns of the forces engaged in the battle of Bull Run that we have requested Generals Fry and Jordan (who, it will be remembered, were the adjutants-general of the Union and Confederate armies respectively) to prepare the following careful estimates based on the existing official returns.—ED. C. M.

[UNION.]

EDITOR OF THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

SIR: I have your letter asking me to give you a statement of the forces of General McDowell's army engaged in the battle of Bull Run, July 21, 1861.

Many of the men of that army were volunteers, called into service for three months by the President's proclamation of April 15, 1861. After they arrived in Washington, and were equipped, they were sent across the Potomac to General McDowell, and were hurriedly thrown into brigades and divisions, and then pushed into an active campaign, in order that they might do something before they were discharged. Even if the officers had understood army returns and the necessity for rendering them, they had not time to attend to such matters. It was not practicable at the time to ascertain the strength of the army with accuracy; and it is impossible now to make a return which can be pronounced absolutely correct.

The army of General McDowell in the campaign consisted of five divisions: Tyler's first division contained four brigades—Keyes's, Schenck's, Sherman's, and Richardson's; Hunter's second division contained two brigades—Andrew Porter's and Burnside's; Heintzelman's third division contained three brigades—Franklin's, Willcox's, and Howard's; Runyon's fourth division was not organized into brigades; Miles's fifth division contained two brigades—Blenker's and Davies's.

Miles's division, with Richardson's brigade of Tyler's division attached, was in reserve at and in front of Centreville. Some of it was lightly engaged on our side of Bull Run in repelling a feeble advance of the enemy.

Runyon's division was left to guard our communications with the Potomac, its advance being seven miles in rear of Centreville.

The abstract which appears on page 309, vol. ii., "Official Records of the Rebellion," and which you seem to regard as a return of McDowell's army at the battle of Bull Run, is not such, and was not prepared by me, but, as I understand, has been compiled since the war. It purports to give the strength of the "Department of North-eastern Virginia," July 16th and 17th, not of McDowell's army, July 21st.

In fact, it is not a return of General McDowell's army at the battle of Bull Run; and if used for calculating such a return, several facts should be borne in mind. First, it does not show the losses resulting from the discharge of the Fourth Pennsylvania Infantry and Varian's New York battery, which marched

to the rear on the morning of the 21st, nor the heavy losses incident to the march of the army from the Potomac; second, it embraces two regiments—the Twenty-first and Twenty-fifth New York Infantry—which were not with the army in the field; and third, it contains the strength of Company E, Second United States Cavalry, as a special item, whereas that company is embraced in the strength of the second (Hunter's) division, to which it, with the rest of the cavalry, belonged.

In his report of the battle (p. 324, vol. ii., "Official Records of the Rebellion") General McDowell says he crossed Bull Run "with about eighteen thousand men." I collected information to that effect for him at the time. His statement is substantially correct. The following is an exhibit in detail:

COMMANDS.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
General staff.....	19	
First Division, two brigades only.....	284	5,068*
Second Division, two brigades.....	252	5,717†
Third Division, three brigades.....	341	6,891‡
Total—seven brigades.....	896	17,676

The artillerymen who crossed Bull Run are embraced in the figures of the foregoing table. The guns were as follows:

Ricketts's Battery.....	6	ten-pounder rifle guns.
Griffin's Battery.....	{ 4	ten-pounder "
	{ 2	twelve-pounder howitzers.
Arnold's Battery.....	{ 2	thirteen-pounder rifle guns.
	{ 2	six-pounder smooth-bore guns.
Rhode Island Battery.....	6	thirteen-pounder rifle guns.
Seventy-first New York Regiment's Battery.....	2	Dahlgren howitzers.
Total pieces.....	24	

That is to say, General McDowell crossed Bull Run with 896 officers, 17,676 rank and file, and 24 pieces of artillery.

The artillery, in addition to that which crossed Bull Run, was as follows:

Hunt's Battery.....	4	twelve-pounder rifle guns.
Carlisle's ".....	{ 2	thirteen-pounder "
	{ 2	six-pounder smooth-bore guns.
Tidball's ".....	{ 2	six-pounder "
	{ 2	twelve-pounder howitzers.
Greene's ".....	4	ten-pounder rifle guns.
Ayres's ".....	{ 2	ten-pounder rifle guns.
	{ 2	six-pounder smooth-bore guns.
	{ 2	twelve-pounder howitzers.
Edwards's ".....	{ 2	twenty-pounder rifle guns.
	{ 1	thirty-pounder rifle gun.

Very respectfully,

James B. Fry,

Retired A. A. G. with rank of Colonel,
Brevet-Major General U. S. A.

NEW YORK, Oct. 1, 1884.

* This division contained four brigades. Only Keyes's and Sherman's brigades crossed Bull Run.

† A battalion of marines, a battalion of regular infantry, and seven companies of regular cavalry were embraced in this division. There were but two brigades.

‡ This division was composed of three brigades.

[CONFEDERATE.]

EDITOR OF THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

SIR: I take pleasure in handing you an accurate statement of the forces on the Confederate side engaged in the battle of the 21st of July, 1861, known by some as the Battle of Bull Run and by others as that of Manassas. So far as the troops of Beauregard's immediate Army of the Potomac are concerned, my present statement is condensed from two that I prepared with the sub-returns of all the commands before me as the adjutant-general of that army, Sep-

tember 25th, 1861, and I can assure you of its exactness. Copies of the original papers prepared at that date will be found on page 568, Series 1, Vol. II., "Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies." In respect to the Army of the Shenandoah (Johnston's), I have been obliged to present an estimate, my authority for which is a statement written by me in the official report of the battle, and based, as I distinctly recollect, upon official documents and returns in my hands at the time, of the accuracy of which I was and am satisfied.

Respectfully, *Thomas Jordan.*

COMMANDS.	Number of Regiments.	General and Staff Officers.	INFANTRY.		CAVALRY.		ARTILLERY.		Rank and File actively engaged in battle, July 21, 1861.
			Officers.	Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates.	Officers.	Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates.	Officers.	Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates.	
General Beauregard and Staff.....	..	15	10
Bonham's Brigade.....	5	4	211	4,070	1,527
Ewell's ".....	..	4	133	2,307
Jones's, D. R. ".....	3	4	128	1,980
Longstreet's ".....	4	4	160	2,364
Cocke's ".....	6	3	208	3,065	3,276
Early's ".....	4	3	261	2,350	1,650
NOT BRIGADED.									
Seventh Louisiana Infantry.....	1	..	44	773	827
Eighth ".....	1	..	43	803	508
Hampton's Legion.....	1	..	27	627	627
Radford's Cavalry (30th Va.).....	1	34	642	600
Harrison's Virginia Cavalry Battalion (3 Co's).....	13	196	150
UNREGIMENTED.									
Ten Companies of Cavalry.....	38	545	250
Washington Artillery (11 guns).....	19	201	60
Kemper's (Va.) Battery (4 guns).....	4	76	80
Latham's " " (4 ").....	4	86	90
Roger's " " (4 ").....	3	55	58
Shields's " " (4 ").....	3	82
Camp Pickens—Heavy Artillery.....	18	275
.....	26	37	1,215	18,354	85	1,383	51	775	9,713
Holmes's Brigade (6 guns).....	2	1,265
ARMY OF THE SHENANDOAH.									
Jackson's Brigade of Infantry.....	5	} 8,334
Bee's and Bartow's Brigade of Infantry.....	5	1-5	
Kirby Smith's or Elzey's Brigade.....	
Fisher's N. C. Regiment of Infantry.....	1	
Hill's (A. P.) Va. Regiment.....	1	550	
Stuart's Regiment Cavalry (12 Co's).....	1	300	
Five Batteries Field Artillery (20 guns).....	} 6
Gen. J. E. Johnston and Staff.....	..	6	
.....	..	6	550	..	300	8,340

ARMY OF THE POTOMAC.

AGGREGATES AVAILABLE ON THE FIELD.		FORCES ACTIVELY ENGAGED.	
Generals and Staff.....	37	Infantry, Rank and File.....	8,415
Infantry, Rank and File.....	19,569	Cavalry, " ".....	1,000
Cavalry, " ".....	1,468	Artillery, " ".....	288
Artillery, " ".....	826	Generals and Staff.....	10
.....	21,900	9,713
Field Guns.....	27	Field Guns.....	17

RECAPITULATION.

	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Artillery.	Staff.	Total.
Army of the Potomac—Rank and File Engaged.....	8,415	1,000	288	10	9,713
" " Shenandoah, " " (estimated).....	7,684	300	350	6	8,340
Total Rank and File, both Confederate armies engaged..	16,099	1,300	638	16	18,053

NEW YORK, October 4, 1884.

Thomas Jordan,

Formerly Adjt.-General Confederate Army of the Potomac.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Degradation of Politics.

THE campaign which has recently closed has been exceptional in many ways—chiefly because of the damage which it has wrought upon public morals. The nation cannot for so many months resolve itself into a continental school for scandal without suffering untold injuries, and generations will pass before the harvests will all be gathered from the seeds of corruption sown in this campaign.

Not only have innocent minds been polluted by the vile stories kept in circulation, and honest consciences perverted by the specious reasonings about the laws of honor and honesty, the amount of trickery and falsehood employed in the conduct of this canvass by newspapers and public speakers seems to us altogether unprecedented. The memory that recalls with vividness nine or ten presidential elections will not report any such wide-spread deceit and duplicity as that which has overspread the nation during the last few months. Truth is not, indeed, the main quest of the average political campaigner. To him politics is war, and victory is the chief end. He will tell any truth that will injure his antagonists or favor his own cause; he will conceal any truth that helps his foes or hurts his allies. But this species of political warfare has this year been worse than usual.

The campaign has been notable not only for its perversion of the truth, but for its comparative disuse of sober and earnest discussion. The chief dependence has not been upon argument, but upon parades and what are called "demonstrations." It is true that processions and spectacular devices have long been resorted to in this country; in the great campaigns of 1840 and 1844 they were employed to a considerable extent, but they were not the main reliance. The parade took place in the early part of the day, and in the afternoon and evening the multitudes gathered to listen to great speeches, to hear careful and masterly discussions of the leading questions of state. There was misrepresentation and abuse then—no lack of it; but there was, at any rate, an apparent recognition of the fact that the voters were intelligent beings, and an evident assumption that it was more important to convince their minds than to stun their ears or dazzle their eyes. So it was in war time, and in the days just before the war: the appeal to the intelligence of voters was far more emphatic than it is to-day.

The great political meetings this year have been mainly matters of torches and bands and banners, and red light and Roman candles; the discussion has been pushed off toward the midnight hours, when everybody was tired out, and nearly everybody had gone to bed; and the daily papers, faithfully reporting the monster assemblages, have given us three columns describing the sights that were to be seen, when they have given us one column telling us of the things that were said. It is to this that campaigning in these lat-

ter days has degenerated, and the sign is not good. Such a method is essentially boyish, if not barbaric. It expresses an estimate of the popular intelligence which is not, let us hope, a just estimate. The forces on which the parties seem chiefly to depend are physical forces; noise, parade, spectacles, "demonstrations," strike the physical senses, and do not appeal to the reason. Doubtless there are reasoning beings in these caparisoned companies; but one would say beforehand that the man who consents to bedeck himself with tinsel and trumpery, and goes marching night after night to show his cheap regalia, is not likely to be a very profound student of political questions. If the time which has been spent during the last three months in devising gaudy uniforms, and beating drums, and carrying kerosene torches, had been partly devoted to some serious inquiry into the questions at issue between the two parties,—or perhaps to the preliminary inquiry whether there are any questions at issue between the two parties,—the country would have been in far better condition to-day.

To know that elections are carried chiefly by such methods is humiliating to every man who takes the trouble to think about the welfare of the Republic. It is a sign of that "era of small parties" of which De Tocqueville so wisely speaks, when the greater issues of wise and righteous administration are lost sight of in the scramble for place and power. The government of this country is a great trust; it can be administered only by serious and intelligent men—by men who have had a different kind of training from that which is gained in firing sky-rockets and leading torch-light processions.

We do not wish to be understood as condemning all parades alike. There were genuine and, we believe, sincere and useful "demonstrations" of this kind during the past campaign; but these were not the processions gotten up by the ordinary political managers, but the spontaneous expression of deep and strong conviction by business men and other citizens who rarely take part in such affairs, and who did not think it necessary to deck themselves for the occasion in unusual and ridiculous attire.

Evidences are not wanting of a revolt in the minds of the sober people against the mendacity and the buffoonery of current politics. Many are saying that it is time to put aside the arts of the assassin and the pettifogger and the mountebank, and to make appeal to the intelligence and judgment of the people. The presidential campaign, as at present organized and conducted, inflicts upon the material interests of the nation no small damage, and upon its morals an injury from which it does not recover in four years. It is an urgent question whether it is possible to rescue our presidential politics from brutal and sensational practices, and make the quadrennial contest—if it must come so often—an occasion of thorough and earnest discussion of political principles; a time when the whole people shall receive, in candid and

fair debate, some sound political education; a spectacle in which the reason and conscience of the people shall be as evidently exalted and honored as they now are thrust down and contemned. It is gratifying to note that a reaction has taken place, even among political managers, against the spectacular character of the late canvass, and that they are beginning to appreciate the value of solid argument and sensible discussion.

The Newspaper and the Organ.

THE recent quadrennial political upheaval must have suggested to many close observers that, in the near future, the newspaper, which has grown to be a daily necessity to half the American people, must be divorced from the low work of partisan politics. The confusion of the duties of the partisan organ with those of the newspaper is a survival, not of the fittest, but of the least fit. An organ cannot consistently with its duties as an organ be at the same time a reliable newspaper, such as men want who wish to keep abreast of the times and informed on current events. There are extremely few prominent newspapers in this country which, during the recent campaign, published the political news fairly. In nearly every newspaper office — whether orders to that effect were given or the matter rested upon a mere tacit understanding does not matter — news unfavorable to the candidate espoused by the paper was either delayed, or suppressed altogether when it could safely be done, or “doctored” when its suppression was deemed inexpedient. This is not mere idle assertion. It is a fact to which any honest newspaper worker must reluctantly bear witness, and of which the observation of any intelligent and unbiased man, though unfamiliar with journalistic usages and traditions, must satisfy him. Skillful correspondents were sent out by the “great dailies” to write up the preliminary struggles in “the October States,” and to “ascertain the drift of public sentiment” in certain localities. The mission, as a rule, was a farce. The men were not sent to represent facts as they found them, but to select, if not to manufacture, facts; in other words, to conceal and deceive “for the good of the cause.” And while, with the innocent, the efforts of one set of falsifiers counterbalanced those of the other set, with wise men very little effect was produced either way.

The task of supporting a party right or wrong, blind to its mistakes, lenient to its faults, oblivious of its abuse of power, or its dishonest and disingenuous efforts to obtain power, is the congenial work of the organ; but it is beneath the dignity of the newspaper. It is the office of the newspaper primarily to collect and publish the news, including, of course, political news, with reasonable accuracy and perfect fairness. To this may be added the editorial, critical, and literary contributions which form such valuable and interesting features of the best modern newspapers. But the value of a journal built upon this model is almost entirely destroyed when, in addition to its legitimate work, it undertakes that of the organ. The more of an organ it becomes,—the more complete the satisfaction it gives to the politicians who rely upon it for support,—the more unstable, unreliable, and distasteful does it become to fair-minded and discriminating readers. As matters go, the best a man

desirous of reasonably accurate information on political matters can do is to select two newspapers of opposite political predilections and about an equal degree of subserviency to partisan exigencies, read both, and judge for himself. This course is necessary not only in matters of opinion, but in matters of fact, where there should be no room for misrepresentation. The method is a clumsy one, and requires more time than the average citizen cares to devote to political reading.

If, besides the newspapers, there must be partisan organs, these ought to be distinct and separate in their field of operations — as distinct as the newspaper and the monthly magazine now are. Absolute independence of partisan trammels in its news pages, whatever may be the bias of its editorial columns, should be the rule of every newspaper worthy of the name. The organ need not be more untruthful than the partisan newspapers are now. It is to be hoped that it would not. But at least the onerous task of lying, misrepresenting and traducing characters and motives could be put upon the politicians who manage the other departments of political work not dissimilar to this. The frequent appearance during heated contests of ephemeral campaign dailies, run directly by the campaign committees, shows that the politicians will be ready to take up this work as soon as the newspapers will be ready to lay it down. The division of labor here pleaded for would render it no longer necessary for great journals, when the quadrennial madness is upon them, to publish barefaced falsehoods in their news pages, and to permit a distinct lowering of the tone of their editorial views for partisan ends. There is much in the history and present attitude of both of the leading political parties which honest adherents cannot justify, and they will not always submit to seeing newspapers, so called, complacently praising good and bad alike.

The work of the organs and the newspapers thus separated, the former would naturally be published at Washington, Albany, Harrisburg, Trenton, and other centers of political interest, while the newspapers would remain in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and the other great centers of population. The intelligent reader and voter might like both an organ and a newspaper to consult, just as he might at table like both soup and fish; but as he does not want his soup and fish in the same dish, he will prefer his organ and his newspaper to be entirely distinct and different enterprises. Each is well enough in its way, but their ways are not the same, and cannot be made so.

There is another view of the subject leading to the same conclusion. A newspaper which pretends to be a true newspaper is morally bound to give the news; and failing to give the news, by the withholding or the falsification of known facts, it is in the position of a grocer who puts sand in his sugar and thereby cheats and injures his customers. There is no reason why all newspapers should not do as did one, at least, which happened to come under our observation during the last campaign. Its editorial comments were vigorous and decided. There was no doubt among its readers as to the position of its editors on every subject under discussion. But the news columns, so far as we could tell, omitted no current information whatever—no matter what effect the publication of the news

might be supposed to have one way or the other. The meetings of each and every party and political group were reported, apparently, with equal fullness and fairness. We do not mean to say that this newspaper was conducted on the ideal plan, or that it was the only one that tried to act fairly by its readers during the campaign; but its conduct suggests what might be done in this direction, and what we believe will one day be done by every "daily" which calls itself a newspaper and not a mere organ.

A Grave Responsibility.

MULTITUDES of good men deplore the result of the recent general election, but those who approve take somewhat the same view of the situation as was here expressed, in January, 1883, with regard to the State elections of the previous autumn. "That the great political reaction of 1882 had no mere partisan significance," we then said, "no one has been more quick to see than the gentleman who has been elected to the Governorship of New York by a vote unprecedented, we believe, in American politics. On the very night of the election, Mr. Cleveland is reported to have said that the revolution meant not so much the turning of public sentiment to the Democratic party as it did dissatisfaction with the Republican party. 'The change,' he added, 'means reform and good government.'"

We went on to say that "if Mr. Cleveland and his party throughout the country live up to this programme of 'reform and good government,' they will have a long hold of power; for the revolution just accomplished . . . had this programme for its main object. . . . The people demand 'reform and good government,' and if they cannot get these from one side, they will get them from another; and if they cannot get them from either of the two great parties which now divide the suffrages of the nation, they will dismiss them both without remorse, as in past epochs, and will create another party to do the work. But whether or no we have a new party, now is the time for new men. Power will not be willingly left in the hands of thrifty renegades to the cause of 'reform and good government.' In other words, the acceptable leaders

of the next ten years will not be men whose conversion to 'civil-service reform' has been by earthquake."

The fact that the "Democratic victory" of 1884 was not *merely* a Democratic victory is too well understood to require discussion here. What happened in the election was exactly what politicians should have known was likely to happen, and what many outside of politics believed would happen. This belief was here definitely expressed as follows in March, 1884, long before either party had nominated a candidate: "We venture, thus early, two predictions: one is, that the independent voter will be found on the side of the candidate whose past life gives the best guarantee that he is in sympathy with the convictions and aims of the independent voter; and the other is, that the candidate supported by the independent voter will be the next President of the United States."

Now the "independent voter," in supporting, whether wisely or unwisely, the candidate of his choice, has contributed to the placing of the executive power in the hands of a party which has hitherto been regarded by Republicans as unlikely to do its duty by the negro. If the responsibility of the "independent voter" is great, how much greater that of the party which directly assumes the reins of government! Will or will not the better and safer counsels of that party prevail in matters of finance, and in all those questions of reform on which good citizens of every political complexion are heartily united? Above all, what will be the attitude of the Democrats of the South with regard to the political rights of the freedmen? But responsibility means also opportunity, and every well-wisher of his country will sincerely hope that not only the new Administration, but its allies of the South, will realize the greatness of the opportunity now offered to them. There are, indeed, many indications that this opportunity will not be neglected, and that the old lines of color, and of geography also, are soon (though none too soon) to fade from sight in American politics.

The paper by Mr. Cable in the present number of THE CENTURY comes with peculiar timeliness at this moment; and Mr. Cable has an especial right to be heard by Southern men in regard to the freedmen, for he is not only a Southerner by birth, but one who took part against the North in the great conflict of arms.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Trouble with the Stage.

CRITICS have been bewailing the degradation of the stage for many a long year, and have exhibited great ingenuity in attempting to find a satisfactory explanation of it. Most of them, however, have contrived to overlook the prime source of the evils of which they complain, probably because they have generally dealt with the question as if some complicated social problem were involved, instead of applying to it the principles of common sense and the lessons taught by every-day experience. Theatrical art, like every other art, business, or profession, is exposed, of course, to

many diverse influences, and has its periods of improvement and deterioration, which are not often difficult of explanation, and have been discussed from time immemorial with great frequency, some erudition, and much superfluous rhetoric. All these varying and temporary conditions are entirely outside the modest limits of the present article, which only proposes to deal with the present in a strictly practical way, by pointing out the legitimate deduction from certain notorious facts.

This deduction is simply that the chief cause of the miserable humiliation of the contemporaneous stage must be sought in the ridiculous incompetency of the

vast majority of the men who control the theaters—the managerial autocrats who select plays and companies, and whose wills are omnipotent to decide the casting of a tragedy or the pay of a scrub-woman. In every other walk of life—in theory at least—men cannot dodge their own responsibilities. Is the merchant who cheats his patrons absolved because there are fools enough to make swindling profitable? Do the critics spare the dauber because his smudges find purchasers? Is the author who prostitutes his art to vile and vulgar uses for the sake of gain admitted to the temple of Fame on the score of his pecuniary success? What is the general estimate of the bellowing pulpit charlatan who trades on public ignorance to win notoriety and a fat purse; of legislators who abuse their powers; of editors who betray their trusts? Is there any art, profession, or business in which public credulity, ignorance, or folly is accepted as a valid excuse for non-performance of duty? Why, then, in the name of ordinary intelligence, should an exception be made in favor of the men whose opportunities for good or evil are so vast, whose legal restrictions are so few, and whose prizes are so rich?

Let a man of inquiring mind broach this topic in a conclave of managers, and he will be stunned as by a chorus of parrots. We responsible! We accountable for the depravity of public taste! Angels and ministers of grace, defend us! What new and monstrous form of imbecility is this? Do you not know that we must conduct our theaters, as a tradesman conducts his shop, on plain business principles; that we must furnish the wares which people will pay for or go into bankruptcy? Has it not been proved over and over again that Shakspeare spells ruin, and that all legitimate drama, whether tragedy or comedy, empties theaters and treasuries more surely than the plague? What power have we to compel the populace to forswear theatrical sack and sugar, and seek more wholesome diet? If they demand blood and thunder, we get out our red paint and sheet-iron, and hire a chemist to furnish us with real lightning; if melodrama is the favorite dissipation, we give them all the horrors, mechanical and moral, which can be compressed into five acts; and if comedy is the rage, we can do no less than furnish it, even if we have to reënforce our "artists" with dogs and babies.

On this subject the dullest man of a dull class will wax eloquent, urging the old and stupid plea with so candid an air that it is impossible to doubt his absolute belief in it. And yet no more false or vicious theory was ever advanced. As a matter of fact, the public, primarily, is as little able to prescribe the policy of the stage as it is to ordain what medicines it shall swallow, what customs it will adopt, or what bonnets it will wear. In none of these cases does it exercise forethought or authority. Undoubtedly it has the capacity of choice between the different articles submitted to its consideration, but the quality of the articles themselves depends upon the fertility of the original inventors. The angler who is most cunning in his selection of flies catches the most fish—that is all. This is an axiom which will scarcely be disputed, and to it may be added another, that, as a general rule, persons who have money to spend will go where they can get the best bargains.

Although amid the vast amount of theatrical production during the last decade the mass of rubbish and corruption is overwhelmingly in excess of the material to which any kind of literary or dramatic value can be ascribed, there exists sufficient ground for the assertion that a good play well acted is certain of liberal support. If space permitted, it would be easy enough to specify a dozen plays by way of example; but it is needless to make a catalogue, as the rarity of even tolerable plays keeps their memory green in the minds of all true lovers of the theater. The term "good plays" is not intended to be unreasonably exclusive, but is meant to include all pieces which have a valid excuse for their presentation, such as honesty of purpose, the illustration of some particular phase of social life, artistic construction, analysis of character, or originality of invention, to say nothing of the loftier literary or dramatic qualities which can be exacted only from genius itself, the rarest of human gifts. The classification, unfortunately, may be made broad and liberal without incurring any danger of bewilderment on account of the multitude of precious works to be enumerated. For the present argument the financial success of half a dozen meritorious theatrical representations is all that is necessary, and the most confirmed pessimist will admit readily that this condition has been fulfilled. The objection that good plays have failed occasionally, or even frequently, is nothing to the point unless it can be shown that they were properly performed. The vile treatment of the noblest masterpieces by the modern manager is too notorious to be worthy of an instant's discussion. Ah, ha! cries the manager, with fine scorn, how about the success of the pieces which you, in your infinite wisdom, call "rubbish and corruption"? Why does your innocent public, which has no vote in the board of theatrical trustees, and is obliged to be content with what the arbiters of theatrical fashion prescribe for it—why does it turn its back on intelligent effort, and make my fortune and the speculator's when I treat it to babies and dogs? Do I supply better actors for my puppy drama than I do for my tragedy? Do I expend more money for scenery or show better taste in it? Are the supernumeraries more intelligent? Is the language more decent? Is the moral more valuable, or is there any moral or lesson or information in it whatever?

No. A thousand times no. But herein lies the whole gist of the matter. The puppy-dog drama is cheap and mean and ignorant. The whole scope of it lies well within the limits of the ordinary managerial and histrionic understanding. It calls for no artistic quality of the higher sort. The qualifications for it are a little personal eccentricity, a certain degree of mechanical proficiency, a good deal of bustle, a large share of impudence, and a strong spice of vulgarity. These characteristics are as common as dirt, and the possessors of them are as plentiful as sand upon the sea-shore. Thus it comes to pass that worthless plays—the word must be employed for lack of another—are given more satisfactorily than plays which demand a higher form of executive ability, and the public gives them the preference because it would rather laugh unrestrainedly at natural idiocy than undergo the boredom of a dull travesty of serious emotions. In other words, when it goes to see what is commonly called

a farcical comedy, it has a definite idea of the nature of the entertainment to be provided. If it cannot laugh with the players, it can at least laugh at them, and laughter, on any provocation, is preferable to the torture of seeing a score of incapables struggling with a task immeasurably beyond their reach.

It would be the height of unreason to expect managers to implant new tastes and instincts in mankind, but they can assuredly modify, foster, or improve those which already exist, and are under a moral obligation to labor to this end. If they deny their power or responsibility in this direction, they necessarily abandon the solitary plea which distinguishes them from a circus man or an alderman. If the stage is incapable of exercising any salutary influence as an educator; if it cannot contribute to the cultivation of the literary sense, or the admiration of what is noble or pure; if it cannot quicken imagination, give fire to ambition, or heighten appreciation of what is beautiful in form or color; if it has no historical, moral, or intellectual value, let it be thrust ignominiously out of all companionship with the arts, and branded as a worthless and pernicious impostor. But the evil lies not in the institution, but in the men who degrade it. The true sphere of the stage is indicated by the genius of the men who have written for it and about it, of the men who have acted upon it, and the men who have patronized it. Its capacity for good is undeveloped, because the men who control it, and most of the players who live by it, are equally unable to comprehend or supply the requirements demanded by the art which they profess. In literature, sculpture, painting, the pulpit, or the law, special training, special qualifications, are thought to be necessary to success. How is it with the ordinary manager or actor of the present day? Let us think for a moment what the equipment of a good actor, that is to say, a man fit for a responsible position in a good stock company, ought to be. To play in comedy, he ought to know how to comport himself like a member of civilized society; his enunciation and pronunciation of his mother tongue ought to be refined and correct; he ought to know how to walk, how to bow, how to enter a room and leave it, how to be polite without servility or affectation, how to convey an impression of ease without swagger or self-assertion. These things are elemental, the very A B C of the society primer, and yet how few of our young "comedians," as they are called, evince the slightest acquaintance with them. How many of them are able to stand even the simple test of a dress-coat? When a severer draft is made upon their accomplishments, when, for instance, they are asked to utter a word or two of French or any other foreign language, or to mention some name famous in ancient or mediæval history, the result demonstrates only too plainly the narrow limits of their learning. What chance is there for an art whose illustration is intrusted to dolts such as these?

Or, suppose that our actor has to bear his part in a tragedy. Is it hypocritical to wish that he should have some slight acquaintance with the laws of meter and rhythm in the delivery of blank verse, or exhibit occasionally some perception of the significance of gesture? Would it not be well, if the impersonators of noble Greeks and Romans knew something about the garb and manners of those ancient races; if they

could, for instance, avoid the embarrassment entailed by a search for the trousers pockets which do not exist, and many other similar blunders arising from total and helpless ignorance? But, says the reader, these are the baldest and stalest platitudes! Possibly they are. But whose fault is that? The facts are notorious and cannot be ignored. Exaggeration in dealing with this subject is almost impossible. The actors of to-day, as a class, are ridiculously unfit for the positions which they occupy. A lawyer who knows nothing of law, an artist whose mind is a blank with regard to color or perspective, a clergyman who has read no theology, or a compositor who has never handled type, is an inconceivable anomaly; and yet actors, who in their ideal perfection are required to portray the manners, emotions, and physical and mental peculiarities of men and women of all climes and customs and ages, are, for the most part, persons without any special natural qualification for their calling, without learning, without studiousness, and without taste.

There are, of course, honorable exceptions, or the stage, as a regular institution, would have vanished long ago. There are men and women who dignify the profession by their scholarly acquirements and spotless personal character. Some of the older players—not always those whose names are printed in the largest letters—are profoundly versed not only in theatrical knowledge, but in literature and art generally. There are younger actors, too, of natural ability and refinement, who have adopted the stage, not because it offers the possibility of a livelihood to drones and profligates to whom all other kinds of employment are refused, but for the sake of the art itself, and with the honorable determination to win fame by patient and persevering merit. These are the men who will in the future labor for the regeneration of the stage, and who now prevent it from sinking into a deeper slough of degradation and disrepute; but they are as yet an insignificant minority. If any one wishes to convince himself of the intellectual rank of the bulk of the body of actors,—ninety per cent.,—let him visit the places where they congregate, listen to their conversation, and observe their manners, and he will no longer wonder why dramatic art languishes. In a company constructed of material such as this, a man endowed with the ordinary amount of culture and intelligence which would enable him to occupy a respectable position in one of the learned professions—and not much is wanted for that—shines with astonishing brilliancy in contrast with the surrounding dullness. So soon as he meets with a character which happens to agree with his own personal peculiarities, and which he can therefore play satisfactorily without acting at all, his goal is attained. From that moment he becomes a star of greater or less magnitude, and, having surrounded himself with actors of incredible badness as an effective background for his own two-penny talent, he thenceforward revolves around a fixed orbit, year after year, endlessly repeating the one wretched performance, changing the name now and then to beguile the innocent. Even with stars of the first class the case is not much different. Some of them, indeed, present masterpieces—but in what a fashion! It is customary to compare these luminaries of the stage to whales among minnows. Sharks would be a more striking and apter simile. Their voracity is

one of the greatest barriers to the progress of the stage. They loudly lament the decay of the legitimate drama, the while they are doing their best to burke it. They demand for their services sums so exorbitant that the manager can only make a profit by reducing all other expenses almost to the point of zero. He has no money for competent actors, or decent scenery, or anything else. The star has taken it all to console himself for the depravity of the public taste which rejects a monologue when it wants a play. Other stars, whose love for art is more practical, provide themselves with a competent company and adequate scenery, rightly arguing that, even if their immediate profits are smaller, their repute with the public will stand higher and their fame be more lasting. Diamonds, be they ever so bright, are never dimmed by proper setting.

The ills wrought by the star and combination system are too evident to need discussion or enumeration. The responsibility for them rests mainly upon the managers, who, with their wonted obtuseness and lack of sagacity, have combined almost unanimously to support a policy which will surely work their own discomfiture. They have sown the wind, and some of them are beginning to feel the approach of the whirlwind already. Without their coöperation, the star system, which threatens to abolish the manager altogether, could never have been organized, for the wandering stars would not have had any theaters to play in. It is perhaps not too much to say that the managers are practically responsible for the existence of the stars themselves, for nothing but incapable management could enable a few men of third- or fourth-rate capacity to swell and fatten at the expense of the rest of the profession. Of all the men and women whose names head the list of traveling theatrical organizations to-day, there are not twelve, perhaps not more than six, whose ability is in the slightest degree remarkable, or whose removal would be of any consequence. Why does the public support them? Because it can get nothing better, and must have relaxation. How did incompetent actors advance to the dignities and profits of stardom? Through mean, ignorant, and spiritless management, which permitted the rank and file of the profession to sink to its present debased level.

There have been great managers in the past—Charles Kean, Macready, Phelps, and many others less familiar; and there are some able managers in this country, but only two or three of them are in actual service. Most of them have been forced into retirement by the folly of their associates, or have quietly stepped aside, content to wait for the time when the present rotten system will collapse and legitimate methods come again into vogue. It will not be long before some of the hot-headed youngsters who are now rushing to the front find the end of their tether. They are no more entitled to the name of manager than the men whom they manœuvre to that of actor. What would any one imagine to be the necessary attributes of the ideal manager? He ought certainly to be a man of brains and good taste; he ought to know something of the history of the stage from its inception; he ought to be well read in dramatic literature, ancient and modern; he ought, at least, to know where to look for authorities on questions of architecture, decoration, or costume; his literary sense ought to be cultivated sufficiently to enable him to discern the true quality of

the dialogue in plays submitted to him; while his judgment ought to be almost infallible in distinguishing between what is actually dramatic and what is only imitation. He ought to be, moreover, a man of good address, with a character strong enough to insure him the respect of his company and subordinates, and with sufficient executive ability to keep the general direction of everything in his own hands without assuming the overwhelming burden of minor detail. How many of our present theatrical managers fulfill all or any of these conditions? How many of them would be welcome in a drawing-room? How many of them can boast of any cultivation in any direction whatever? It would be easy enough to specify managers whose names are synonyms for brutal ignorance, coarseness, and immorality, but nothing is to be gained by it, as the names are well known, especially to "the profession which they adorn." As for the men who make dates and lay out routes, contracting to deliver a certain company at a particular spot on a certain day which is decided months beforehand, they are not managers at all, but parasites, of whom, perhaps, we may some day be joyfully ridden. They contribute, as parasites always do, to the general decay of the object preyed upon, but are altogether too insignificant for present consideration. Some of them venture to hire companies of their own now and then, in which case they become speculators—a name which in itself suggests a theatrical pest. The really capable managers can be counted on the fingers, and, being in so small a minority, have no power to effect reformation; and so the theater and all its interests are temporarily at the mercy of men perfectly incapable of any real sympathy with it.

It seems, then, clear enough that the only way to reform the stage is to reform the managers, and the only question is how to do it. There are indications that the solution of the problem has already been begun. The appearance of Mr. Irving in this country is likely to prove of incalculable benefit. He has exploded for all time the nonsensical notion that the public cannot appreciate the best work. His company, for all-round excellence and versatility, is probably the best ever seen here, and its existence demonstrates beyond cavil the possibility of keeping a good company together and making money at the same time. What Mr. Irving has done, American managers can do—not the pert and empty agents of to-day, of course, but their successors. And, what is more, the public, having learned what good acting and good management are, will be content with nothing less, and will soon be taking the question of stage reform into its own hands. To meet the higher standard of taste established by Mr. Irving and managers of his stamp, it will be necessary to form stock companies as of old, and many of the stars of to-day will return to their proper places. As soon as good stock companies are established at the principal theaters, the occupation of the wandering star is gone. He will make much less money, doubtless, but he will be paid quite as much as he deserves; and men of far greater capacity, but less favored by fortune hitherto, will be paid according to their deserts. As for the good plays which are in so much request, they will make their appearance when there is a demand for them. The only thing to do with a good

play nowadays is to lock it up. The impending reformation will not be wrought in a day, nor a year, but there is no lack of signs of a coming change for the better. The managers who read them aright will reap great advantage; the managers who neglect them will admit, when the day of grace is past, that public taste can be improved a great deal more quickly than they believed to be possible.

J. Ranken Towse.

Natural Gas Wells.

NATURAL gas wells have been common in the oil country for years. Their use and value have not been understood by the public until within a short time past. The people are now surprised to learn what a valuable fuel they have so long neglected, and with that reckless energy characteristic of the country are sinking wells in every direction. The district of natural gas covers a much greater area than that of oil. In general, it may be said to include a section of country extending from western New York, through Pennsylvania into West Virginia and Ohio and lying nearly parallel to the Alleghany mountains. The width of this section varies considerably. The boundary lines are very irregular, and are being rapidly extended by the finding of new wells. While the outlines inclose a large territory, gas is found in only a small portion of it, and then in spots and narrow belts or lines. When a company concludes to drill for gas, the first and most important thing is locating the well. As was the case with oil, there are a number of theories concerning the formation of natural gas, and the deposit of the sand-rock in which it is obtained. In this the "practical man," having more faith in luck than science, does not agree with the geologist. The only satisfactory explanation of the formation of the gas is that it is produced by the decomposition of vegetable matter deposited in the carboniferous age. Geologists say the gas district seems to be a vast caldron filled with deeply buried carbonaceous matter, subjected to great heat, and therefore constantly generating gas, which has been condensing for ages in the strata where it is found. They believe the strata to be general formations in this section, and doubt whether a well was ever put down without finding some gas, or at least where it might not have been found had the well been drilled to a proper depth. The experience of the "practical man" strengthens his belief in the belt theory. The degree of uncertainty accompanying its development has a strong fascination to his venturesome spirit; and the term "gas life" has now all the attractions of the "oil belt" of former days.

The general course of the oil districts is north-east, on what is known as the forty-fifth degree line. Profiting by this knowledge, the gas prospector ran lines from old "wild-cat" wells, where gas had been found, out of the oil country, and discovered that they marked the same general direction.

In locating a well, a survey is usually made, and the well is placed as near to the line as possible. Two such lines nearly parallel, running from Washington county, Pa., through the city of Pittsburgh, up the Alleghany valley, on either side as far as Kittanning, and on to the upper oil regions, are tolerably well defined. At several points a number of good wells are

found upon them, and a larger number of dry holes upon either side and between them. The drill has demonstrated the fact that the oil- and gas-bearing rock is deposited at intervals only, even on well-defined belts. The same is true of these lines, as good wells and dry holes are found upon them within a short distance of each other. So that locating a gas well is still very much a matter of chance.

The process and tools used in drilling for gas are the same as used in boring for oil. The gas-bearing strata are soft, pebbly sandstones, which dip toward the south. At Kittanning the wells are eight hundred feet deep; at Pittsburgh, forty-four miles south, they are sixteen hundred feet deep. In good territory, when the rock is perforated, the gas rushes out with great force. Instances are reported where this force was sufficient to throw the drilling tools out of the well. The latest case of the kind was the Westinghouse well, at the East End, Pittsburgh. This well was plugged for three days, shortly after gas was struck. When the plug was drilled out, the tremendous force of the gas threw the ponderous tools, weighing over three thousand pounds, out of the hole and fully three hundred feet into the air. This pressure varies. With the well shut off, it has been known to reach four hundred and fifty pounds to the square inch. The quality of the gas is not the same in the different wells. In some it is light and dry, in others it is wet and heavy. Most wells throw out a quantity of salt water, which contains a heavy precipitate that sometimes clogs the hole. To prevent this, the wells are entirely closed a few minutes each day, until a strong pressure is procured, when it is suddenly opened. The rush of the liberated gas through a short escape-pipe carries the precipitated matter with it, and the wells by this means are kept open. Near to the well the gas goes through a strong iron tank. The object of this is to catch the water-drip from the well, and prevent its passing into the distributing pipes, where it would freeze in the winter time. The objections to the use of natural gas in dwellings are the high pressure on the pipes, and consequent danger of leaks and explosions, and the fluctuations of the pressure. (It is well established that the pressure in the well is weaker in the morning and stronger in the afternoon. A general fluctuation is also noticed, simultaneous with the changes of the moon.) These objections are overcome by the use of automatic valves, which reduce the pressure and regulate the flow of gas. From these valves the gas is distributed through the town in the same manner as the illuminating gas, excepting that a high-pressure line is run to mills and factories. The pressure for dwellings is about one pound, for boilers and furnaces from thirty to forty pounds.

At Kittanning, Pa., natural gas is used almost exclusively for heating purposes—in stoves, heaters, open grates, under steam-boilers, in the foundries, and in the puddling furnaces at the iron works. It is also used for lighting the streets. The method giving the best results consumes about twelve parts of air to one of gas. This is done by means of an air-globe placed at the end of the burner, which is usually a piece of iron pipe, closed at the further end and perforated with rows of small holes. The globe has inlets for the air, and by the action of the gas through it the air is drawn into the burner and mixes with the gas

at the point of ignition. If the air is not used, the flame makes a great deal of smoke and soot. By consuming the air, perfect combustion is obtained, and a clean fire of intense heat is the result. In the private house it is the ideal fuel. Nothing could be so convenient: fires always ready; the turn of a stop-cock, the stroke of a match, and a fire is lighted; no coal to carry; no ashes; no shivering over a cold stove on a frosty morning. What a haven of rest and peace for the lazy husband! Housewives say their daily labors are reduced fully one-third by the use of natural gas. It makes a splendid fire for roasting and baking, and is equal to the good hickory coals for broiling meats. In open grates there is a variety of burners used, to suit the fancy of the owner. Some have the andirons and clay gas logs, in imitation of a wood fire; others fill the grate with broken sandstone, which is best for holding the heat. A beautiful fire is made by covering a number of the perforated pipes with a layer of asbestos. When the fire is lighted, the asbestos, becoming heated, glows and sparkles, and the room is filled with a cheerful mellow light. Under steam-boilers the natural gas is used in a number of ways. Some have the air-globes and long perforated pipes; others heat the gas before it reaches the fire by passing it through pipes in the boiler-flues. Ordinarily no change in the construction of the furnace is required, excepting to close it and shut off the draught. As a light, the natural gas does not equal that made from coal. The flame is not so bright and clear and is constantly flickering. In small rooms it is used in the common Argand burner with fair success. In large halls and factories, where a strong light is required, the Siemens incandescent gas-lamp has proved very satisfactory.

The greatest value of natural gas is for manufacturing purposes. In burning bricks and lime, or in melting glass, iron, and steel, it has no equal. Its freedom from smoke, sulphur, and other impurities makes it a perfect fuel. Most of the iron works in the city of Pittsburgh are using it, and are able to make a cleaner and better grade of iron than they could with coal. The steel works introduce it directly into the Siemens open-hearth furnace, and produce a superior quality of high carbon steel. Iron ore has been melted with it. It is believed by many that iron and possibly steel can be made from the raw material by the use of it. For making glass, in the words of a prominent manufacturer, "it is just the thing." At the Pittsburgh plate-glass works, it has proved especially valuable for tempering the large plates. By the use of gas this company saves one thousand dollars a day, and can make plate-glass superior to that of Europe. Since the striking of large wells near Pittsburgh, manufacturers have introduced it into their works as fast as it could be conveyed to the city. Considering its abundance, convenience, and economy, it will certainly revolutionize the manufacturing interests of this section, and possibly of the country.

That the reader may have an idea of how important a factor natural gas may be in the industries of the future, the following statement is given, based upon the information of gentlemen familiar with the facts. The heating capacity of natural gas is variously estimated at from 250 to 400 cubic feet to a bushel of coal. Assuming that three hundred feet, burned with the air and in a confined furnace, is the

average, we may approximate its value. Within a radius of twenty miles, with Pittsburgh as a center, there are twenty-five wells, with an average output of 3,000,000 cubic feet each per day; 75,000,000 in all, or 22,500,000,000 per year. This would equal 250,000 bushels, or 9260 tons, of coal per day, or 2,778,000 per year. The cost of drilling a gas well is \$3000, or \$75,000 for the twenty-five. To convey this gas to the city, allowing a six-inch pipe to every two wells, and placing the mean distance traveled at fifteen miles, would cost \$917,000. The average cost of coal per ton, delivered at the fires, is two dollars. The 9260 tons of coal, the equivalent of this amount of gas per day, would cost \$18,520, or \$5,556,000 per year. Deducting the cost of the gas, we have a saving in gas over coal of \$4,557,240 for the first year. The life of gas wells is said to be eleven years. If this supply of gas could be maintained by the addition of new wells for ten years, which is not improbable, it would give a saving of over \$50,000,000—figures which are not more surprising to the reader than they are attractive to the Pittsburgh manufacturer. This is not all. It is estimated that there are 500 gas wells in the oil country and vicinity, which produce at least 200,000 cubic feet each per day, or 100,000,000 in all. This gas could be transported to one of the large cities in pipe lines, as petroleum is at present. It could easily be collected from the wells, and forced through the main pipes at a high pressure by using air-compressors stationed along the line. The idea is practical, the investment inviting, and the matter is receiving the attention of capitalists.

The products of natural gas are numerous. The most important thus far are lamp or carbon black and carbon points for the electric light. There are ten carbon-black works in operation, making 3000 pounds of black per day. At a remote point, in Armstrong county, Pa., a Boston firm has large works, locally known as "the mystery," on account of the secrecy with which it is conducted. Here they make the black, and it is supposed coloring material also, from the gas. At Stuartson furnace, in the same county, is another "works" where the carbon points are made. Both these works are guarded, and a stranger is not permitted to be about them. A number of persons are experimenting with the gas, with as many different objects in view. It is impossible to learn what has been accomplished, as they are quick to see the advantage of keeping secret any discovery they may have made.

What the future of this wonderful fuel is would be difficult to foretell. Natural gas springs are known to exist in many parts of the United States. This would seem to indicate a wide distribution of it. In August last a large well was struck at Crestline, Ohio, which may open a vast territory. Where gas may or may not be found can only be determined by the drill. How far it may influence the manufacturing interests of the years to come depends upon its supply. The success which is attending the use of it in this section has attracted the attention of manufacturers in others. Wells will be put down in all parts of the country. Upon their success or failure depends whether or not natural gas shall be the fuel of the future.

J. D. Daugherty.

Political Work for Young Men.

"A POLITICIAN," says Burke, "is a philosopher in action." The best politician is the most practical idealist. When we remember that a large part—perhaps the greatest part—of the idealism of a country resides in its young men, we understand why at the present time our young men are looked to more and more as a regenerating force in politics. What a stupendous and far-reaching power would come into existence were the political idealism of the nation to be concentrated and converted into effective political exertion! The energy of this kind that lies latent for want of an outlet, or wastes itself ineffectually in mistaken channels, far outweighs the slender amount that has its perfect working as a practical force. From our experience can we not point out some correct course of political activity by which this mass of power may be energized? There is seen everywhere an involuntary reaching out for some such guidance, together with an overestimation of the real value of this unenergized power, and an evident misconception of the methods by which it is to make itself felt. Says an earnest writer, for instance, in one of THE CENTURY'S "Open Letters" for August:

"When the political machine shall be turned from its present uses and abuses into a power for the extermination of serious evils, . . . our 'critical indifference' will give place to a whole-hearted enthusiasm." "If they will give us a party which is based upon principles, we who hold the principles will work for it enthusiastically."

These expressions, with others, lead one to wonder whether zeal is not prematurely mistaken for its effects, and to ask of the writer—and in general of the earnest young men of the country who are daily declaring their high political principles—what is, in their opinion, the nature and mode of expression of this quality of political enthusiasm. What is their conception of this "work," so freely offered and promised as valuable support to the party managers? What is political work?

The expression of a mere sentiment of reform and honesty, without well-directed practical effort, constitutes no power in politics, and calls for no recognition on the part of political managers. There is a gap of considerable width between a laudable interest in political affairs and the accomplishment of a definite result in practical politics. Political power lies distinctly beyond political zeal—further than many young men imagine. How, then, shall they transmute zeal into work and power?

As affording some clue to those who are endeavoring to come to a practical solution of this question for themselves, let the writer offer a few humble suggestions from the experience of one of that class—young men—most nearly concerned in this matter. Amid present political conditions, the recognition of some such principles as the following is, the writer is persuaded, inevitable, if earnest young men would see their enthusiasm directed into effective work, and their work crowned by power and success.

(1) First, then, let the young men recognize and accept the positive distinction between actual political work and a merely thoughtful interest in national

issues and general political reforms. Remember Aristotle's supremely practical distinction between *ἔξις* and *ἐνέργεια*, between a capability and an activity, a yearning and a fulfilling. National politics form an unpractical field for the exercise of a young man's energies. No young man of moderate capacity can expect to assume any important part in the discussion and dissemination of their far-reaching principles, or to undertake any valuable or even promising work in behalf of them, strong and eager as may be his political feelings. National campaigns and large political controversies are conducted through the newspapers and on the stump. The writers and the orators are the effective workers. It is a broad and general work, comprehensive in its spirit and in its results; and men of experience and popularity are those on whom it falls. When we turn to the sphere of local politics, there appears a marked difference. The genius of municipal politics is the genius of the ward-club. Here it is that genuine political work is seen—that work in which every man of political standing must have served apprenticeship—that work by which in the beginning a man climbs out of obscurity and weakness, and seizes position and influence and control. In the work of that sphere belong canvassings, solicitations, button-holings, persuasion of friends—every species of activity that is likely to secure to oneself a majority of the voting body. Influence, good-fellowship, wide acquaintance, boldness, persuasiveness, unflagging zeal; a list of some of the necessary qualities is the best exposition of the nature of the task that calls for them. The sphere thus laid out is to be for us our real political work. It comprises, in truth, the greater portion of all political activity; but it is the only portion open to the young men of to-day, who are about to make a beginning of laboring for their principles. Let them, therefore, cast aside that conception of politics which imagines that the political machine is moved mainly by the power of thought, and that they accordingly hold a part of that power in themselves by virtue of their high intellectuality. Let them realize the intense commonplaceness and practicalness of the fundamental agencies of politics. A patriotic interest in national political issues, however unselfish and noble-minded may be the passion, is not political work, and never will be. Let the young man take for a text the words of a political leader of ability who was once asked what he thought of the young man and the scholar in politics. "The scholar," he said, "studies a German authority on the Constitution, and some books on comparative politics, and goes out into the world with a notion that he is a representative figure of the scholar in politics, and wonders that the people do not recognize him and send him at once to Congress. The scholar should cultivate the simple ways by which he may influence his own neighborhood. The first thing for a scholar is to learn his duties to his own neighbors before he can enter into the political life of the people. . . . To be good for anything in the public service, a young man needs to have some sense and experience as well as money and education. He should go to caucuses as a kindergarten, to conventions as a primary school, into the service of his town as a grammar-school, to the legislature as a gymnasium, and to the world as his university. Too often the young man is a student of

politics, not a politician." Observe again Burke's definition: "A politician is a philosopher *in action*." "You may note," said Emerson, in almost his latest public address, "that each aspirant who rises above the crowd at first makes his obedient apprenticeship in party tactics."

Never forget, then, that in practical politics it is to be found for beginners their real political work.

(2) Let this be a second general principle:

Direct your work under the conviction that the control of nominating bodies is an important condition in the success of your principles. It is the only condition which relieves you from the necessity of a severely restricted choice, and allows an adequate exercise of judgment in the selection of trustworthy candidates. All political effort should aim primarily at securing control in nominating bodies. The expediency of this principle is based on very simple reasoning. After the nominations are made, there are two, at the most three, candidates to choose from. What if neither is suitable? Is any positive good then attainable? Are we not reduced to a choice between evils? Of what avail is it to abide passively until the nominees are offered us, and then impotently signify that we accept neither of them? How much better to seek the fountain-head of nominations, the convention, and behind it the ward-clubs and caucuses, and therein to obtain power, and exercise free choice among an unlimited range of candidates! Success in the nominating body is far more than half the battle. Preliminary control of the convention, as it is the most difficult, is also the most important task. Note how the political managers of the great cities are content to possess simply the mastership of the political machinery. Note how they are found, not in public municipal offices, but in chairmanships and executive committees of political organizations. Can we not seize this lesson—that political power originates in the local political associations—that the lever of popular government rests on the hidden fulcrum of party organizations, and is wielded by the controllers of those agencies? Let the young men recognize that the best part of their political efforts are to be spent in lifting the control of ward and district politics from the hands of the unprincipled minority to the hands of the honest-minded majority. Let those who are entering politics remember that it is better to be the wire-pullers than the puppets, and that otherwise the only capacity which they can fill is that of helpless spectators.

(3) In your local political work, next (and here let me not be misconstrued into advocating anything but the deepest devotion to principles) learn not to rely too much on the power of abstractions as your rallying standard. Do not be too confident that the nobility of your cause will constitute a sufficient stock-in-trade. In the average citizen you will find that you can arouse little enthusiasm on behalf of abstract principles—whether of scientific truth, of government, or of lofty morality. Either in his political cynicism he smiles at their realization, or in his contempt for what is higher than himself he despises them. Success of principles must be sought through the success of individuals. Political work must aim to raise trustworthy men to power, and on them it is to rely for the practical fulfillment of the desired end.

For abstractions men will not vote; for individuals

they will. It is a principle of human nature that our emotions are stirred in proportion to the concreteness of the object of emotion that is presented to us. If you are to enlist men's support in politics, present the matter to them concretely. Make it a matter of friendship to yourself or to the candidate—of success of the party; use any honest argument that may promise to be effectual; but your political zeal runs exceeding risk of dying out speedily if you appeal to them solely on the ground of political duty, of reform, of unselfishness,—for you may as a rule expect ridicule, suspicion, and worst of all, failure. It is a hard fact, but it is too true to be disregarded. "The young man," was the dictum of a local political manager, "who is not going into politics to make something out of it, is either a fool or a tool." So say they all; and you will do well if you are prepared for it. Cynicism and selfishness nowadays among those who hold the suffrage shut up the avenues of political activity and reform. When unselfishness and zeal for political purity cannot thaw out these barriers, ply them with whatever honest argumentative and emotional weapons may be most apt to secure favor for your suit.

If I might add one more suggestion, as a prime and comprehensive principle of all practical politics, reformed or unreformed, it would be this: Organize, organize, organize! Combined knavery can be opposed only by combined honesty. "When bad men combine," says Burke, "the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, in a contemptible struggle." Do not think that desultory magazine articles and pulpit exhortations, or spasmodic seasons of political house-cleaning, can compass the desired end. There can be no effective substitute for such organized and persevering work as will undermine the enemy's stronghold—party organization—and possess it for ourselves. Such a work will be thorough and progressive. Such a work succeeds because it permeates the organic structure of our political system. Its process is subtle and slow, but sure. "Give me a fulcrum," was Archimedes's phrase, "and I can move the world." Give a political manager one hundred active young men, and with the results of their work he can control and govern a city. *In the city of the writer that task is accomplished with fewer.* Let the earnest young men of each locality work together, become each one a representative unit of influence, gather together the units, concentrate their power, and they will constitute a momentous governing force having the virtues without the vices of a political boss,—the power without the license, the use without the abuse, all the power for good divorced from all its debasement for evil.

John H. Wigmore.

A Great Historical Enterprise.

MR. HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT, the well-known historian of the Spanish-American States, was originally a book-seller and publisher. Being permanently established in San Francisco in 1856, he naturally began to collect books, pamphlets, and other printed matter containing information relating to the early Spanish occupation of the country. His interest being quickened by the results of his investigations, he pros-

ecuted his search as far back as documentary history and tradition would carry him, in the domain which he had at first only cursorily explored. Every collector knows how rapidly one's stores accumulate when once the habit of collecting has taken hold upon him. Mr. Bancroft's business and his library grew apace, and finding his first store-room too strait for him, he built anew, this time his goods and accumulations being housed in a large structure, five stories high, in San Francisco.

Meantime, as profits flowed in from the book-trade, the mania for collecting took a firmer grasp upon the publisher. Finding that much valuable information concerning the early history of the Pacific States was slowly dropping out of existence, as men died and oral traditions vanished with them, Mr. Bancroft began the arduous work of collecting written narratives taken down by scribes from the lips of surviving Spanish and American pioneers on the coast. The area of his research was extended until his books, tracts, and documents represented all attainable knowledge relating to the western half of the North American continent. Then, consumed by an unquenchable thirst for more information, he went to Europe and ransacked public archives, libraries, and other depositories, in quest of coveted lore. At the sale of the Mexican collection (intended by the unfortunate Maximilian as the foundation of an imperial library), which was held in Leipsic, three thousand volumes, many of them being unique, were secured. The Ramirez sale in London, and that of the Squier manuscripts in New York, also yielded the indefatigable collector valuable additions to his library. And in this manner a remarkable collection of material slowly accumulated.

Next, having gathered this rich harvest of historical knowledge, Mr. Bancroft began to arrange, catalogue, and classify the abundant but heterogeneous mass. During six years he had secured ten thousand volumes, among which were the standard chronicles of the earlier historians, Peter Martyr, Oviedo, Las Casas, and Purchas, as well as the histories of Ferrera, Haman, Robertson, and others of their class. To these were added original manuscripts, some of which are of priceless value, and printed documents such as the "Documentos Inéditos," "Izabalceta," and the like. When we consider that the dictations of pioneer settlers, copies and originals from colonial, mission, county, and state archives were added to this vast mass, the extent of the labors of the indexer may be estimated. The field thus covered embraces an area equal to about one-twelfth of the earth's surface; and if the collector's activity had stopped here, he would have accomplished an undertaking for which civilization would have owed him a debt of gratitude.

But the collector resolved to become a writer of history. He would separate the wheat from the chaff in his collection, and would give the results to the world. Accordingly, the library was removed to a fire-proof structure built in the middle of a large lot in the outskirts of San Francisco. Here it was arranged, and, assisted by a staff of competent men, Mr. Bancroft began his arduous undertaking. Ten years were required to index the library, the work being conducted precisely as in indexing a book. The several topics desired to be reached were indicated, references made, and information drawn forth in the shape of rough

material. This was revised and divided into chapters, and other chapters were written from them; and the work was then put into Mr. Bancroft's hands in a state advanced as far as possible. Mr. Bancroft rewrote, revised, and, in many cases, went back to the original sources and took out for himself the original rough material.

Under the plastic hand of Mr. Bancroft has thus arisen a valuable structure of historical literature. The design of this industrious author comprises the issuing of thirty-three octavo volumes. The first five, "The Native Races," have been before the reading public for several years. History proper, so to speak, begins with the sixth volume of the series, which is devoted to Central America. As the first points touched by Europeans when they landed on the North American continent were on the Isthmus of Darien and northward, the propriety of beginning the history with that of the Central American States is apparent. Mexico occupies Volumes IX. and X., as the discovery and conquest of that country followed the events described in the previous volume. Then the work is resumed in the second volume on Central America, which brings the reader down to A. D. 1800. The thread of Mexican history is taken up again in Volume XI., and the recital is brought down to 1800 also, and in the succeeding volumes is carried forward, as "History of the North Mexican States," to the same year. Having thus concluded the history of the lower Spanish-American States, Mr. Bancroft goes northward and gives us a history of California in five volumes, the first of which — Volume XVIII. of the entire series — is just now published. This fascinating volume begins with the earliest mention of California by fabulists, chroniclers, and historians, and, drawing liberally from the rich accumulations of which mention has previously been made, ends with 1800, when the rule of the Spanish Viceroy, Don Diego de Borica, closed. Future volumes will contain the history of Nevada, Utah, the North-west coast, Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho and Montana, British Columbia and Alaska. These are to be followed by two more volumes on California, entitled "California Pastoral" and "California Inter Pocula," the first embracing a history of the country under Roman Catholic mission rule, and the second that during the gold-seeking epoch. Two volumes of essays and miscellanies — the scattered and otherwise unmarshaled stragglers of this vast literary column — bring up the rear of this, one of the most enormous undertakings in historical writing ever projected by one man.

It will be seen from this cursory review of Mr. Bancroft's work that his task has been to furnish and classify vast stores of historical material, rather than to erect a monument of literary beauty. There is no attempt here to popularize history, as Knight and Macaulay have popularized English history. It is true that graphic and vivid chapters appear throughout every volume of this long procession; and the skill with which material points are made salient, and immaterial facts are subordinated, is worthy of high praise. But the author, embarrassed with his riches, must needs hurry on to the completion of his apparently interminable labors.

We catch glimpses of princes, potentates, and powers famous in history; of knights-errant, avaricious con-

querors, and bloody-minded zealots; of simple-minded and pastoral tribes, warring savages, and willing converts to self-denying missionaries; of far-voyaging and ignorant adventurers, fearless explorers, and covetous gold-seekers; and of an uncounted host of builders who laid on the shores of the Pacific the foundations of many States. The narrative marches on to its close. But much cannot be said in praise of the literary quality of the work. When there has been so satisfying a display of zeal, industry, and enthusiasm, the critical reader would prefer to believe that the turgidity and the affectation of high style which occasionally mar these pages are the contributions of unlearned assistants. The student of history, however, must overlook the ambitious attempts at fine writing, and confine his quest without diversion to the contents of this store-house of available and well-arranged material. From these stately tomes must be drawn hereafter the only trustworthy history of that part of the North American continent which lies between the Arctic Ocean, the equator, the Pacific, and the Rocky Mountains.

Noah Brooks.

Old Questions and New.

NATURALLY, there is a good deal of interest manifested in Mr. Cable's statement in the concluding chapters of "Dr. Sevier" that the cause of the North was just. There is also a good deal of interest felt in his reply to the gentleman who challenged his statement. It was inevitable that the statement should meet with a challenge in some quarter, but perhaps the most remarkable fact in connection with the whole matter is that it should have been challenged in only one quarter. So far as my observation extends, no Southern newspaper has taken Mr. Cable to task, and yet it would be safe to say that there are not ten editors of Southern newspapers who have not read "Dr. Sevier" from beginning to end. To a thoughtful person, this fact is very significant—as significant, indeed, as Mr. Cable's concession.

Five years ago such a statement made by a Southern man would have aroused quite a little tempest of indignation; but a great change has been going on in the South, and one of the results of this change is the tacit admission of those who are supposed to be the chosen defenders of the South that Mr. Cable, as a Southern man, has a right to hold opinions of his own, even though they may run counter to the opinions of other Southern men.

I am free to confess that Mr. Cable's declaration that the cause of the Union was just shocked me a little. It slipped in ahead of expectation; it seemed to be, at first glance, somewhat flippant. But a little reflection showed me that it is only a bold and fresh interpretation of the attitude and expressions of thousands and thousands of Southern people. For instance, it is safe to say that there are not five hundred thinking men in the South to-day who believe in secession either as a principle or as an expedient. There are not ten who would vote to secede to-morrow, even though such a movement was entirely practicable. In other words, there are not ten thinking men in the South who feel to-day (no matter what their feelings may have been in the hot days of war, and the hotter

days of reconstruction) that secession would give them any rights or advantages as valuable as those they now have as citizens of States that are a part and parcel of the American Union. I am not giving my opinion merely, for that is worth little or nothing; I am giving the result of observation, association, experience, and discussion.

Mr. Cable, aroused from a dream of the Civil War, discovers that that conflict was a very curious affair indeed. Reflecting over it, he is moved to say that the cause of the Union was just. Others, waking to the realities of events, and recognizing facts as they stand, are moved to admit that the South, taken as a whole, is in a better condition to-day than it was in 1861. Nobody wants slavery, nobody wants secession, and everybody feels that we have as many rights and as much freedom as the people of the North. Such a situation must have a deeper meaning than we have been in the habit of attaching to it. What is that meaning?

The substance of all this has been stated and re-stated hundreds and hundreds of times in the leading papers of the South, by the leading men of the South in Congress and other public places, and by thinking men of all classes. The facts have been variously used by the politician, the place-hunter, and others who have only a partial and fleeting interest in facts of any kind; and it now remains for the statesmen of both sides to reconcile their notions to this most mysterious result of the integrity and elasticity of our republican institutions, namely, that by some queer twist of fate or fortune the vanquished share the fruits of victory, and are as devoted to the Union as it stands to-day as those who fought to preserve it intact.

All this sounds paradoxical, and so it is. The result I have attempted to describe is a part of the stupendous paradox of the war. Over the remains of this paradox History is even now holding her grand inquest, but the witnesses summoned are by no means agreed. One from the North says it was a war to maintain the American Union; another from the North says it was a war against slavery. One from the South says it was a war in defense of the reserved rights of the States; another from the South says it was a war in defense of the institution of slavery. Well, History will settle this matter to her own satisfaction, and we may be sure that few will dispute the justice of the verdict.

Who shall say how many compromises of opinion and prejudice are necessary to give us a clear view of the truth? Assuredly compromises are necessary, and thus it happens that all the concession need not come from the South. There is not a Northern man whose opinion is worth having who will not frankly admit that the South made a gallant fight for what it conceived to be right—a fight that thoroughly illustrated American valor. Moreover, there is not a thinking man at the North who will not admit that American slavery seems to have been a provision of Providence for the advancement of a large part of the negro race. This is a phase of the slavery question worthy the attention of reflecting minds. The negroes came to this country barbarians. They were savages; but they were not savages when freedom found them out. On the contrary, it may be said that, in the history of the world, there has never before been an instance where a race of people only two hundred and fifty years re-

moved from a condition of abject barbarism was so closely related to civilization as were the negroes of the South when they were made free. If this is true, —and the statement of the fact is all the proof that is necessary,— then the North and the whole world will be compelled to admit that there was some good in American slavery; will be compelled to admit, in fact, that American slavery was a part of the divine economy which has in view the advancement of the human race.

The truth is, there is a new North as well as a new South, showing that the tempest of war that blew in on honest people was calculated to clear the atmosphere. It strengthened and settled matters, and created that moral ozone so necessary to the health of a nation. In view of these things, it is hardly necessary to discuss the question whether Mr. Cable is entitled to express his opinion that the cause of the Union was a just cause.

A Southern Democrat.

Our Church Club.

IN the so-called "good old times" the dwellers in country villages were not divided into as many cliques as to-day. People were more on a level then, at least as to externals, and they met each other in a freer and more informal way. It was not necessary then, as it is now, to invent ways and means for bringing together those who attended the same church and sat side by side in the Sunday-school. This was owing partly to the fact that life was not so crowded nor so exacting then as now, and partly to the equally evident fact that the churches in the olden times were more the center of all things than they are to-day. In and of themselves they gave to their people a common ground on which to stand—a ground on which high and low, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, met and were as one, to a degree that seems hardly possible to this eager, exigent present of ours, with its multiplicity of interests and its ever-increasing demands.

It was to meet this need—the need of a broad plane upon which those of widely differing tastes, habits, pursuits, and capacities could meet each other and be happy—that, a few years ago, the women of a certain church in a large New England village, with the advice and coöperation of its pastor, formed a society called "The Fortnightly." While it is neither a school nor a prayer-meeting, and is not in the slightest degree sectarian, yet it is as strictly a church organization as is the Sunday-school itself. It could add greatly to its numbers and its resources by throwing open its doors and welcoming all comers with outstretched hands. It would often be glad to do so; just as a family, no matter how united and how sufficient unto itself it may be, sometimes finds that the presence of a guest adds savor to the Thanksgiving dinner, or zest to the Christmas feast. Yet, on the whole, most households find it is wiser and pleasanter to limit the table on those occasions to the family circle. So "The Fortnightly" is purely a family affair; and to make it anything else would seriously interfere with its workings and its practical results.

It has, as a matter of course, the officers common to all societies—a president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, who are elected annually. It has, also,

three standing committees, appointed yearly by the president and ratified by the society: one on Christian or benevolent work, which is popularly called the Christian committee, though it does not claim to be any more "pious" than other folk; a social committee; and a committee on studies. The four officers above named, with the chairmen of these committees, constitute the board of directors, of which the pastor is also a member *ex officio*. He has, however, never availed himself of his right to be present at any meeting of the board or the society, unless on special invitation.

The managers mean to have no more red tape than is absolutely necessary; yet it is found that a little is indispensable, if only to tie it together. Therefore Article Fourth of the Constitution provides that "Any lady of the church or society, above the age of sixteen, whose name shall be presented in writing by not less than three members, may become a member by a majority vote at any regular meeting, on condition of subscribing to this constitution, and paying to the treasurer the annual fee." This fee, as may be supposed, is a small one, so small as to be no burden. But it was thought best, for many reasons, that it should be exacted.

"The Fortnightly" is so fortunate as to have at its command the pleasant church parlors, and there it meets on every alternate Saturday afternoon, except when otherwise ordered by the board of directors.

Perhaps the question oftenest asked of the members is this: "What is the object of your society?" A question that is briefly answered by the motto recently adopted, "First to Receive; then to Give." Its first and most direct object is personal and individual growth; not in any selfish or narrow sense, but because no one can give what he does not in some way possess. He must himself have, before he can share with others; he must be, before he can do. This motto, emblazoned on a banner supported by an appropriate standard, and decorated with the colors of the society, holds a conspicuous place by the president's table at all meetings, and, with the pretty though inexpensive badge worn by the members, has done much to foster the *esprit de corps* so important to the well-being of every such organization.

"What does your society do?" is another question.

It does a great many things. Through its social committee it stretches out its hands to the stranger within its gates. It brings together, and binds in harmonious, pleasant relations, those who otherwise would seldom meet. It keeps its finger, as it were, on the pulse of the social life of the church.

Through its committee on Christian work, it cares for a mission Sunday-school, and in connection with other societies does its full share of the charitable work of the town, beginning always with the work that is nearest to its hand.

Yet, after all, it is perhaps true that the strongest interests of the society center in its regular fortnightly meetings, and that from them go forth its widest and most beneficent influences. Fully to understand this, it must be remembered that the steadily lengthening roll of membership now numbers 170, embracing women of all ages, from girls of sixteen to white-haired matrons, and that, rain or shine, there is an average attendance of half the members. There is

great diversity in the homes from which they come. Some are rich; some are poor. Some have had every advantage that money can buy, social position, and abundant leisure; some have struggled all their lives with straitened circumstances, if not with absolute penury. Some are familiar with London, and Paris, and Rome; some have never been out of sight of their native mountains. It has of "sweet girl graduates" not a few; and it has also many a girl who not only supports herself but helps to support others. It has many whose province it is to minister, and many who are ministered unto.

But with all these differences the club is bound together by the common tie of womanhood. Its members have learned, as perhaps they could have learned in no other way, that these other things are mere externals, mere husks, the outer rind that may be removed without touching the life beneath. It has been proved to them beyond a peradventure that the life is more than meat and the body than raiment.

When "The Fortnightly" was first organized, comparatively little importance was attached to the meetings, *per se*. The journal was read; there was usually some business, more or less, to be attended to; and then the classes in history, literature, and art went each to its own room, and worked each in its own way. For two years this plan was carried out, and with good results. But as the society grew and widened, it became more and more evident that there were steadily increasing numbers who did not wish to join the classes, and yet who did need and long for something that it was the duty of the society to give them in the way of mental quickening and stimulus. An effort was accordingly made, while keeping up the classes, to make the regular meetings more interesting by essays, readings, talks, and recitations, with such good (or bad) results that, little by little, the classes dwindled, and the numbers in the large room increased day by day.

Some time ago, after much deliberation, it was thought best to drop the classes entirely, and try the effect of making two hours of the alternate Saturdays as rich, as full, as varied, as the resources of the united society could make them. This plan has worked to a charm. A programme for each meeting is made out, and the work allotted, as long in advance as is convenient—the particular study of this season and the last having been the lives and works of representative women, covering a wide range of life and thought.

One day, for instance, this was the programme:

France in the Time of Jeanne d'Arc.
Peasant Life in France in the Time of Jeanne d'Arc.
Jeanne d'Arc.
Different Conceptions of Poets and Artists.
Translations from Schiller's "Maid of Orleans."

On easels in the room were a number of pictures relating to the subject for the day, from old wood and steel engravings down to the inspired dreamer of Bastien Lepage.

With Queen Elizabeth as the theme, this was the programme:

Pen-portrait of Elizabeth.
Elizabeth as a Queen.

Elizabeth as a Woman.
Manners and Customs of the Day.
Literature.
Mary, Queen of Scots.
Readings—"Marie Stuart" (Schiller).

On another occasion Mrs. John Adams was chosen:

Life and Times.
Puritan Homes.
Selections from Whittier.
Abigail Adams.
Selections from Letters of Mrs. Adams.
Colonial Belles.

Another group of women was:

Vittoria Colonna. Readings—"Michael Angelo."
Madame de Staël.
Margaret Fuller.

Every possible effort is made to give variety, color, and individuality to the exercises. History alternates with poetry or romance, and mirth with earnestness. On the Saturday after Christmas the subject chosen was Mary, the Mother of Christ. The parlors were made beautiful with drapery, garlands of cedar and hemlock, and appropriate mottoes, among which "Ave Maria" and "Blessed art Thou among Women" were conspicuous. Thirty different Virgins, Madonnas, and Holy Families were on the walls. The papers were on "The Inn at Bethlehem" and the "Legendary Life of Mary," and Mrs. Browning's "Virgin Mary to the Child Jesus" was read.

It will be seen at once that in an organization of this kind nothing very profound or abstruse, and no exhaustive treatment of any theme, can be so much as attempted. Heaviness would be suicidal. To stimulate, to awaken, to lead on, is all that we have undertaken. To this end every diversity of power and capacity may be used. I venture to say that no one can have anything to do with the management of such a society for one year without being surprised at the resources and the talent that will be developed. It has not proved necessary to apologize for the papers, to receive them with large grains of allowance, or to say they were "pretty fair, considering all things." They have been good, and sometimes exceptionally so. At one time, partly for the sake of variety and partly as a sort of test, twenty young girls were each asked to bring to the next meeting some notable instance of womanly heroism, fortitude, or self-sacrifice, the papers not to be more than five minutes long. The result was a pleasant surprise. No stereotyped, hackneyed stories were reproduced. The matter was fresh and relevant, and no two girls hit upon the same incident or character.

The society occasionally keeps memorial days and birthdays, and it has a letter-box, which is not used as much as it ought to be, for "Questions" and "Suggestions." Sometimes it allows its members to vote for their favorite poems, and out of the list thus formed a choice is made for readings and recitations. The last gathering of the season is always made a social event with attractive features.

The suggestive motto of the society, "First to Receive; then to Give," strikes the key-note of its very life. Whoever has received is expected to give; and who has *not* received? But the willingness, the cheer-

ful alacrity, with which all demands are responded to, the absence of all petty jealousies and narrow-minded criticism, the ready assent to all measures for the general good, have been very marked. The tithes of "mint and anise and cummin" have been paid without demur; neither have the gold, the myrrh, nor the frankincense been held back.

In short, "The Fortnightly" maintains that the woman loses her life who devotes it all to material uses—who crowds it so full either of work or of pleasure as to leave room for nothing else.

Like a previous letter, this is written in answer to many inquiries; and this must be the writer's only apology for details and prolixity.

Julia C. R. Dorr.

Another Plan for Women's Clubs.

THE open letter, "More Words with Country-women," presenting a new manner of providing intellectual and literary feasts for those women who may wish to and *can* partake of the same, is most praiseworthy. Still there is an impediment to young mothers which cannot be overruled, viz., babies. I am one of that class, and sadly miss the mental food which was furnished me at school. 'Tis true the precious babes are the first care, but they are also a mother's barrier to the acquisition of any but maternal knowledge!

Mrs. Dorr's "Friends in Council" have meetings fortnightly, and organize a committee, board of directors, etc. Then they have a plan of study, also preparation of essays. Now, I want to ask how all this can be accomplished when home requires your presence, time, and care. How can you attend these meetings? I write this in the cause of women of my own standing and social status, who, it is true, have to do their own work, but at the same time crave the intellectual food—not as a necessity, but as part of the manna on which they have been raised.

While we have not time to devote to these councils, we have intervals of leisure at home, which we spend in reading ancient and modern history when we chance to light on them, but frequently intersperse with romances, novelettes, descriptive notes, and, last but not least, THE CENTURY. Now I am going to suggest to many of my friends who are situated as I am a scheme for organizing a literary club of an indefinite number. It will not be productive of any ebullitions of wit, nor will it lead to much learning; but it will be a source of entertainment which we poor mortals sadly lack.

This scheme consists in establishing a library, to be in the most convenient and commodious house of a circle of friends, its mistress to be the librarian. All the members of the club to furnish what works they possess, whether historical, ecclesiastical, poetical, political, novels, or any addition they wish at times to make. No criticisms or formal meetings, which to me savor of the *bas bleu*, but perfect liberty to each member to call and select a book—one at a time—when so disposed, and return in a reasonable number of days. Have the library insured in case of accident, and outside of this there will be no expense. This clique of friends can then exchange notes and ideas during any social call, if so inclined, and no need of

borrowing or lending books, no need of laboring on literary compositions when other things more important demand our attention. I do not place my views in opposition to *any*, but as a woman who loves to study and develop the mental faculties,—which have only lain dormant since leaving school,—and with the restraint of two "darling responsibilities."

DENVER, COLORADO.

M. L. N.

Co-operative Studies—The Natural Sciences.

WHILE reading Mrs. Dorr's very suggestive and helpful letter in the September CENTURY, on the formation of societies for mutual study and discussion, it occurred to us that this is just the time to put in a plea for the coöperative study of the natural sciences.

Not that we undervalue the importance of history, or consider that Greece and Rome belong in any sense to a dead past, but there is such a very "living present" all around us here and now.

Although winter is not the best time to begin the study of a natural science, since the material necessary for thorough work cannot always be readily obtained, still private and public cabinets offer something, and much may be done to create the taste for experimental work—work which could be pleasantly and profitably carried through the summer months, which are now so largely wasted.

The natural sciences seem to be particularly well adapted to society work, so numerous and varied are the phases any one of them presents—sufficient to satisfy the demands of any society, however heterogeneous its elements. Take botany, for example; what opportunities for investigation and discussion would arise from the consideration of

1. The Beginnings of Plant Life.
2. How Plants Grow.
3. Their Pedigrees.
4. Family Traits and How Modified.
5. Varieties and How Produced.
6. Carnivorous Plants.
7. Parasitic Plants.
8. Floriculture as an Art.
9. Floriculture as an Occupation for Women.
10. Flowers in Art.
11. Flowers in Poetry and Song.
12. Flowers in the Bible.

What a preparation such a winter's work would be for the coming of the New Year, the real New Year, which comes to us with the budding spring! What pleasant "field-days" might follow, and what choice collections could be prepared for the following winter's work, or as a nucleus for a village museum.

Entomology, or mineralogy, or indeed any other one of the various branches of natural science, presents an equally broad and rich field for mutual labor and discussion. Will not some society make the experiment and report?

Church Music.

A VOICE FROM THE CHOIR-LOFT.

In the first place, it cannot be doubted that a great reformation has been going on during the past twenty years, not only in the character of the music performed in our churches, but as well in the character of the per-

sons employed in the musical service of the sanctuary; this much must surely be patent to any one competent to observe the change. One institution of former times has seen its palmy days, and will soon be a thing of the past. I allude to the "quartet choir," alone and unaided. No educated church musician will to-day be satisfied with such a choir; and with the "quartet" will die many a disturbing element.

Thus the reform in church music has been begun, and indeed made good progress, and the question would seem to be, what can be done to aid in the good work, and to carry the same on toward completion?

Money will be a potent factor in this, as in all good works, so I will first take up the question of salaries; and, in behalf of my brother organists and choir-masters, I claim that the salaries generally offered are totally inadequate to pay for the services expected and demanded. I know I shall be met here, and at once, with the statement that "the pay is fully as good as the services rendered"; and my retort will be that "the services are fully as good as the pay." And both statements will, in the great majority of cases, be very near to the truth. I am perfectly willing to admit that the pay and the services are generally about on an equality. But the trouble is, there is but little manifestation, on the part of the churches, of a readiness to pay better prices for better work. On the contrary, there seems to be a tendency in many places toward a wholly unnecessary and petty economy in regard to the music of the church. We too often hear the phrase, "Oh, it is good enough for us!" or, "It will do!" I think I am safe in saying that the average salary now paid to organists is not so large as was paid five or ten years ago. For one instance, I know of a city claiming to have over one hundred thousand inhabitants, and also claiming a great amount of musical culture, where, as I am informed by good authority, the highest salary paid to any organist is the munificent sum of four hundred dollars. One church in said city, and one of the largest and most prosperous, paying its minister a salary of five thousand dollars, had an organist who served them well and faithfully for many years. Him they discharged a year ago, because—why, because another organist could be secured for fifty dollars less per year. And this is but a sample of the encouragements which are to-day held out by the churches to ambitious young people to fit themselves for church musicians. Another statement, which I am sure all my brother professional organists will say I am correct in making, is this: that there are at present in this country fewer organ students than there have been in times past; I mean, of course, in proportion to the number of places to be filled; and this I fully believe to be a consequence of the meager salaries paid. I would therefore warn all church music committees that the time is rapidly approaching when they will have to put up with more and more inefficient services on the organ-bench, or pay larger salaries than they at present dream of paying. But let it be known that the churches are ready and willing to pay proper salaries for competent services, and in a few years there will be an abundant supply of educated church musicians. I imagine myself asked the question, What would be a proper salary? I will answer that question boldly, and say that an efficient organist and choir-master should receive a sum cer-

tainly not less than one-third of the total salary paid to the minister of the same church. Methinks I hear loud exclamations of dissent, even of indignation. But let us reason together. I said an "efficient" organist and choir-master; and I certainly would not advise the payment of such a salary to any one of the many incompetents who at present fill positions where they have no more right than I would have at the helm of a Mississippi River steam-boat. I am writing of an ideal time in the future, when any church, willing to pay a liberal salary, can secure good service. And am I extravagant in my ideal? I think not. I have based my estimate of what should be the salary of the organist and choir-master upon the salary of the minister, for the reason that the clergy are very apt to consider themselves not overpaid as a class, and I am quite disposed to agree with them. Now the organist and choir-master, to be at all competent, must surely be a man of at least one-third the intelligence of the minister; his musical education must have cost at least one-third as much as the theological education of the minister; and he must be able and willing to devote at least one-third as much time to his department of the church work as does the average clergyman to his parish work. I know this last statement will be received by some with surprise, and by others with incredulity. Many a time have I had said to me the equivalent of this: "I would be very glad if I could earn as much money as you can by a few minutes' work on Sunday and at rehearsal." Well! so would I be glad, very glad indeed, if I could honestly earn my salary by so little work as many good people imagine. But every organist and choir-master knows that his work cannot be done, with any satisfaction to himself or to those whom he serves, without his devoting to it every week a number of hours sufficient to constitute at least two good days' work. And I really think that, in most cases, the meagerness of the salary offered is due to ignorance of the amount of time and labor required to satisfactorily fulfill the duties of the position. While on this subject of salaries, let me say that I have a still higher ideal of what may be in the future. There are very many churches in America abundantly able, and which ought to be willing, to pay to their organist and choir-master "a living salary"—a salary sufficient for all his needs—so that he would not be forced to gain a livelihood by other means, but would be able to devote his entire time and work to the service of the church. And there would be plenty to occupy his attention. He should be present at all services or meetings, on week-days as well as on Sundays; should work in the Sunday-school as well as in the church, meeting the children of the school every week for practice; the young people of the church should be given an evening in every week for practical and free instruction in the rudiments of vocal music; advanced classes should also be formed for choral practice; congregational rehearsals should be held as frequently as possible; special instruction should be given to such young voices as gave extraordinary promise of being available in the choir; all this being understood to be included in the pay given to the choir-master, so that there would be no feeling that a charity was being accepted.

In regard to the so-called "trials" of organists and singers, I fully agree with the Rev. Dr. Rob-

inson that they are simply a farce. They are fair neither to the musicians nor to the church, and should be done away with, as has, in at least a great measure, the old plan of "preaching on trial." They are fully as unsatisfactory, and, in some respects, for corresponding reasons. And at the same time with the "trial," I would do away with the equally faulty system of yearly engagements. Let the engagements be made terminable at the pleasure of either party to the contract, such reasonable and proper notice being given to the other party to the same as may have been agreed upon. I have worked under both systems, and believe the one proposed will be found much more satisfactory; that under it engagements will be much more likely to prove agreeable and permanent, and far better results be attained. Under the yearly engagement plan both music committees and musicians get into the way of beginning to be unsettled in mind at least three months before the expiration of the year, and to begin to look about to see if they cannot in some slight degree better themselves, even though the present situation of affairs be quite satisfactory, and things are just settling down into good working order.

Another great source of trouble is the want of any interest taken by the members of the church in the members of the choir. I do not mean in the music itself, or in the choir as a whole, but in the individuals composing the same. A friendly word to some one belonging to that body, a little bit of praise for the singing of some particular anthem or hymn, goes much further than is imagined. Much moral good may often be accomplished by letting the members of the choir feel that they are regarded as a part of the congregation, and not as a separate, possibly even a somewhat antagonistic, body. But, surely, if the church is disposed to regard the relation of the musicians to itself as a mere matter of business, no fault can be found if they, the musicians, regard it in the same light.

Edward Witherspoon.

WATERBURY, CONN., June, 1884.

The Recent Legal-Tender Decision.

ON page 540 of THE CENTURY for August last, in a note accompanying Mr. Rice's "Work for a Constitutional Convention," it is stated that in the case of *Juilliard v. Greenman*, 110 U. S., 421, "The Court holds that when Congress is not expressly prohibited from passing a certain law, it is left to its sole judgment whether or not it be a constitutional law." If this is really the meaning of the decision, all checks upon the legislation of Congress would seem to be removed. The only duty of the Supreme Court in deciding upon the constitutionality of a law would be to inquire, "Is Congress expressly forbidden to pass this law?" If not, the law must be declared constitutional. Under such an interpretation, Congress would have power to interfere in all matters, however local, now left to the State legislatures—except the few expressly denied to it. All constitutional objection to the giving of money for the protection of the lands of the Mississippi delta would fall to the ground—for such gifts are nowhere "expressly prohibited." The clauses of

the Civil Rights Bill lately declared void could be reënacted and stand as law, since a Civil Rights Bill is not "expressly prohibited" by the Constitution. And so, for hundreds of more objectionable laws, Congress would simply say to the Supreme Court, "Hands off."

But I think the decision has been misinterpreted. The question before the Court was whether Congress could give United States notes the legal-tender quality. The Court held that it could, not at all because it was not expressly prohibited from so doing,—that must be true of every power conceded to Congress,—but because Congress was *expressly granted* a power (to borrow money), to carry out which this was a suitable means. The difference between this interpretation and the other is of course very great. In the one case, every law which is not expressly forbidden is constitutional. In the other, every law, to be constitutional, must be, first, not forbidden, and must be, second, a means of executing some power given by the Constitution to Congress. As these powers are comparatively few, this second qualification cuts off hundreds of laws, good, bad, and indifferent, which without it Congress could enact with impunity.

It is impossible to give quotations in the space allotted to an "open letter." It is owing to careless and incomplete quotations from the fifty pages of the decision that the general misapprehension concerning its effect has arisen. I believe that a careful reading of its whole text will convince any one that the Court has only reapplied—in a very loose manner, perhaps—the words of Marshall, spoken sixty years ago:

"Let the *end* be legitimate—let it be within the scope of the Constitution—and all the *means* which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, *which are not prohibited*, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional." (4 Wheaton, 316, 421.)

The *end*—to borrow money—was legitimate; the Court declares that the means—to give the legal-tender quality—are appropriate, are adapted to the end, and are not prohibited. The last is the least important qualification, for it is simply a matter of course.

Harry H. Neill.

REJOINDER BY MR. RICE.

MR. NEILL contends, in the first place, that if my interpretation of the decision in the recent legal-tender case be correct, "all checks upon the legislation of Congress would seem to be removed." I think that in this he is mistaken. Putting the responsibility for violating the Constitution upon Congress does not remove a single constitutional check upon legislation. On the contrary, it tends to increase the influence of those checks, as I have endeavored to show in my article. France, England, and Germany are governed under constitutional limitations, and yet no one in those countries ever dreamt of confiding the safeguards of the people to the courts; and it seems to me that a truly responsible government cannot exist in our republic until in this respect we follow the example set by the great nations of Europe.

Mr. Neill, however, goes beyond the *argumentum ab inconvenienti* just referred to, and attempts to estab-

lish positively the incorrectness of my interpretation. To this second point I would reply, first by calling attention to that portion of Judge Gray's opinion which bases the constitutionality of the Legal Tender act on the fact, among others, that the power to make the notes of the government a legal tender in payment of private debts is one of the powers "belonging to sovereignty in other civilized nations," and is not expressly withheld from Congress by the Constitution. This language is certainly quite different from the "words of Marshall" quoted by my critic, and more than warrants the interpretation criticised.

Secondly, I base myself on the decision itself, as contradistinguished from the reasons for rendering it, which, after all, is the main thing. Now, it is incontestable that the decision declares that under the power "to borrow money" Congress may pass a law making mere paper a legal tender for private debts. I ask whether, under a construction of the constitution so broad and liberal as is involved in this decision, we can conceive of a public measure which will not come within one or the other of the powers expressly granted to Congress? If this question is answered in the negative, and I am convinced that it must be, it follows as a corollary that Congress is the sole and responsible judge of the constitutionality of all acts not expressly prohibited.

Isaac L. Rice.

"Anachronism."

EDITOR OF THE CENTURY:

SIR: I have seen, without the shame and confusion which the fact might have been expected to bring me, a newspaper paragraph convicting me of "anachronism" in the first installment of my current story in your pages. As I may hereafter repeat this cause of offense to accurate minds, perhaps it will be well for me to state the principle upon which I reconcile it to a conscience not void of the usual anxiety. It appears to me that I discharge my whole duty to reality in giving, as well as I can, the complexion of the period of which I write, and I would as lief as not allow one of my persons to speak of Daisy Millerism, even a whole year before Daisy Miller appeared in print, if it gave a characteristic tint in the portraiture. In like manner I would make bold to use a type-writer in 1875, when it had only come into the market in 1874; and if an electric light threw a more impressive glare upon certain aspects of life than the ordinary gas-burner, I should have no hesitation in anticipating the inventions of Mr. Edison several months.

An artist illustrating my story would put the people in the fashions of 1884, though they actually dressed in those of 1875, and I think he would be right; for it is the effect of contemporaneousness that is to be given, and the general truth is sometimes better than the specific fact.

W. D. Howells.

The Death of Tecumseh.

HAVING observed in one number of your admirable monthly, not very long ago, a query and a reply in reference to the killing of Tecumseh, I have ever since intended to add a remark of my own. The purport of the reply, to the best of my recollection, was that it had generally been supposed that Colonel Richard M. Johnson, Vice-President during Mr. Van Buren's presidential term, had slain Tecumseh, in a personal encounter, during the battle of the Thames; but that some degree of doubt still rested on the fact. This reply recalled to my mind the circumstance that about the year 1842 I happened to be present where Colonel Johnson was giving a graphic account of the whole battle, and in particular of his hand-to-hand conflict with a powerful Indian, whom he finally killed. The colonel then remarked that for some time a doubt had existed whether the Indian killed was really the formidable chief or not; but he added, in terms entirely unqualified, that recently developed circumstances had removed all uncertainty as to this fact. He gave no information showing what circumstances had determined his question, but simply spoke with positiveness on the subject.

Colonel Johnson took occasion, in the course of his interesting narrative, to express a generous admiration of the bravery of General William Henry Harrison, his commander at that time, with whom, in a measure, he may be said to have divided the honors of the victory; and either of the two, in the stirring events of the time, could say, "*Quorum magna pars fui.*"

CARROLL, MD.

Benjamin B. Griswold.

The Apathy of Women.

THE summary in "The Appeal for the Harvard Annex" of bequests made by women to colleges from which woman is excluded is of deep import and interest. Woman's generosity, woman's unselfishness, are unquestioned; but woman's apathy to the best interests of her sex, to the limited advantages and opportunities for woman's advancement, is amazing.

The difficulty in awakening an interest in, or securing funds for, any institution devoted to the education of girls may not be generally understood, but it is universally experienced, whether the institution be secular or sectarian. The apathy of women in this direction is astonishing, for, without waiting to be taught to reason, a woman's instinct should teach her how much is involved. It is not for an exclusive, limited work; it is not for woman the appeal is made; it is for a work that in its influences is infinite. It is for the world's work, in its largest, broadest, deepest, most literal, most practical sense. It is wise to recognize the powers and responsibilities that are hers, and to the very utmost develop in her such recognition that they may be wielded for the good of the country, the safety and well-being of the people.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI.

C. P. W.

eral McDowell to command on the Pacific coast, on the ground that after the war for the Union should have ended there would be in California a more powerful rebellion than that then existing among the Southern States.

Fitz John Porter.

NEW YORK, December 8, 1884.

General Robert Patterson and the Battle of Bull Run.

APPENDED to General Beauregard's paper in the November CENTURY, on "The Battle of Bull Run," is the following foot-note:

"It was Patterson upon whom the Government at Washington depended to neutralize Johnston as an element in McDowell's contest with Beauregard. But, whether from the faultiness of Scott's instructions or of Patterson's understanding of them, or from his failure or inability to execute them,—all of which is matter of controversy,—Patterson neither held Johnston nor reinforced McDowell.—ED."

General Patterson's duty was to assist in carrying out the plans of the general-in-chief when they were made known to him. There is no official record that General Scott gave any order to General Patterson to reinforce General McDowell.

Some nineteen years ago General Patterson, having sought justice in vain through every official channel, published his "Narrative of the Campaign in the Valley of the Shenandoah in 1861," in which he thus summarizes his defense:

"(1) That I have already courted an investigation of any charge that could be brought against me; (2) that my whole course was entirely approved by the officers attached to my command, whom I was instructed to consult; (3) that I complied with every order issued to me; (4) that I kept Johnston from joining Beauregard, not only on the day I was directed to do so, but for five days afterward; (5) that I was never informed that the battle had not been fought, at the time indicated, though within reach of a telegraph, but on the contrary, the only dispatch received convinced me that the battle had been fought; (6) that for the delay in fighting it I was in no wise responsible; (7) that the general-in-chief, when I told him I was not strong enough, in my opinion, to attack Johnston, could have ordered me to do so, if he differed

from me, as I told him all the circumstances, and asked, 'Shall I attack?' (8) that I informed him that Johnston had gone to General Beauregard, and he himself, in his comments on my testimony (see page 241, vol. II., 'Conduct of the War'), admits that he knew it before delivering battle on the 21st of July."

After a long and useful life, wherein he never hesitated to obey his country's call, General Patterson has passed away. His son now speaks for him.

Robert E. Patterson.

UNITED SERVICE CLUB, PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 10, 1884.

[While we gladly give place to the above communication, it is proper to say that the object of the foot-note was to make clear to the reader the importance of certain events in the campaign of Bull Run, and not to assign responsibility for those events; and it was to guard against such an inference that we expressly stated this responsibility to be matter of controversy.—ED.]

Uniform of the Highlanders at Bull Run.

IN a foot-note to the "Recollections of a Private" in the November CENTURY, it is said that the Seventy-ninth New York wore the Highland dress at the battle of Bull Run. If by that is meant the "kilts," it is an error. It is true that all the officers and many of the men did wear that uniform when we left the city in June, 1861, and on dress-parade occasions in Washington. But when we went into Virginia, it was laid aside, together with the plaid trowsers worn by all the men on ordinary occasions, and we donned the ordinary blue. Captain ——— was the only one who insisted on wearing the kilts on the march to Bull Run, claiming that as the Highlanders wore that dress in India, it would be quite as comfortable in Virginia; but while chasing a pig, the day before we reached Centreville, the kilts were the cause of his drawing upon himself the ridicule of the whole regiment. When we started for the battle-field on that Sunday morning he, also, appeared in ordinary blue uniform.

William Todd,

Company B, Seventy-ninth New York (Highlanders).

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Some Practicable Retorms.

THE experience of the recent Presidential campaign illuminates the path of political reform with respect to two or three matters of great importance, concerning which there should be no difference of opinion.

The first is the separation, in a few of the States, of the State and Congressional elections from the Presidential election. Twenty years ago the State elections were held separately in many of the States; but the number of these separate elections has been gradually reduced, until the only Northern States now holding

elections before November are Vermont, Maine, and Ohio. Pennsylvania was once the "Keystone State" of the political arch, but its citizens grew weary of that distinction, and transferred their State contest to November. Indiana was a "pivotal" State four years ago, but the experience of that campaign sufficed for Indiana, and the October election was abolished. In West Virginia the same change was made at the last election. The remaining States may well follow the good example. The fewer these preliminary elections become, the greater will be the injury suffered by the States that retain them. The people of these States

can do themselves and the whole country a great service by simply changing the date of their State elections. These remarks will apply to all the States, North and South, that still maintain the separate contest; but they are especially applicable to Ohio, which, from its central position, its large population, and the evenly matched strength of the two political parties, has now become the battle-ground of the politicians. The Valley of Jezreel in the early ages was no more the arena of the fighting nations than are the broad and fertile fields of the great central State, the scene of the fiercest political struggles of the nation. This is the fact already, and it is destined to be more and more true with every succeeding year. No sooner are the issues between the two parties joined than the eyes of the leaders are concentrated upon Ohio, and the campaign opens with activity and even fierceness.

Indeed, the strife begins before the national conventions assemble; for, in the choice of delegates to these conventions, the action of the "pivotal" State assumes a factitious importance, and is discussed with disproportionate zeal. Practically, therefore, Ohio devotes fully six months of every Presidential year to the excitements of political campaigning. The effect of this protracted diversion of the energies of the people from their regular pursuits is injurious in the extreme. Business is paralyzed; workmen are listless or irregular; the schools are invaded by the frenzy; the churches are hindered in their work. The additional cost of the October election to the people of Ohio must be very large. The merchants and professional men of both parties complain bitterly of the tribute exacted of them for campaign purposes; and one who observes the amount of money expended in every city and town for bands and torches and fireworks and uniforms, and all the various campaign devices, can easily believe that these levies must be severe.

But these are the smallest of the evils entailed upon the October States by the October elections. The needless protraction of the excitement must affect injuriously the health of multitudes. The young men who spend so many weeks in almost nightly parades, exposing themselves to all kinds of weather, depriving themselves of needful rest, and keeping their nerves in constant tension, must suffer serious and, in many cases, permanent physical injury. The bitterness engendered by these fierce and long-continued contests even disturbs the pleasant relations of neighbors, and mars the peace of society. Above all, the occurrence of these early elections affords to the partisans and the corruptionists of both parties their opportunity. All the political rascality of the country stands ready to contribute its services and its resources to carry the principal October State. Arrangements are made for colonizing voters from the neighboring States; money in large amounts is poured into the State for the corruption of the franchise. If Ohio is a "pivotal" State, it will be the opinion of the average political machinist that the pivot must be well lubricated. Thus, upon the October States, and especially upon Ohio, are concentrated the worst political influences of the whole country. And although the injurious effect is chiefly felt in Ohio, the whole country suffers to a considerable extent from the disturbance of business interests and the uncertainty and anxiety occasioned by the early elections.

If the States in which the local elections are now separate from the Presidential election would amend their constitutions so that hereafter all the elections should occur in November, a great and valuable reform would be secured. There would still be close and heated contests, and the ills of which mention has been made would be cured but in part; but it is perfectly evident that a very large part of them would be abated by this simple remedy. We are not aware of any reasons for continuing the present order in these States that could have any force when compared with the obvious reasons which have been suggested for the change. It is gratifying to hear that the people of Ohio are fully awake to the importance of this reform, and that a movement to secure it is receiving the support of the best men of both parties. It is to be hoped that Ohio will spare itself and the nation the curse of another October election in the Presidential year.

In most of the large cities, and notably in the city of New York, it would be well to separate the municipal elections from both the State and the national elections, in order to prevent the trading which is always practiced in the interest of local candidates. There is no good reason why party lines should not be ignored in municipal contests. It makes not the slightest difference whether the mayor of New York is a Democrat or a Republican, if he is only a man of sound character, clever judgment, and firm will. The complete divorce of municipal affairs from party politics, and the hearty coöperation of all good citizens to secure clean and economical government, are greatly to be desired.

Another perfectly feasible reform is the postponement of the nominating conventions of the political parties. The time now occurring between the nominations and the election is much longer than is necessary for a fair canvass of the questions at issue and a thorough investigation of the merits of candidates. If the conventions were not held before the first of August, the campaign would be quite long enough for all practical purposes. If the elections occur once in four years, and if the campaign be protracted through five or six months of the year, the time devoted to these contests is certainly excessive. A strain so frequent and so long-continued upon the industrial and the moral interests of the nation is intolerable. If we cannot have the Presidential term extended, the next best thing to do is to shorten the campaign. And this will be done if the business men of the country resolutely demand it at the hands of the politicians.

Still another most salutary reform would be the holding of the nominating conventions in halls barely large enough to contain the delegates and the representatives of the press. The conventions could then be, what none of them has been of late, deliberative bodies, and could exercise some judgment in the choice of candidates. The presence in the convention of a mob of heelers and strikers, from all parts of the country, to shout for their favorite candidates and to overpower the assembly by sheer brute force, is a most discreditable spectacle, and it has proved to be a mischievous appendage to our political machinery. The gentlemen of the national committees can put an end to this if they will; and it is to be hoped that a clear expression of public opinion will make plain to them the path of duty.

Three Comments on the Stage.

By a mere accident, three interesting comments on the modern stage have been made by contributors to THE CENTURY within a very brief period. In January Dr. Gladden and Mr. Towse made some severe criticisms; in this number of THE CENTURY one of Mr. Howells's characters speaks his mind on the subject. The general tone of these three utterances is neither complimentary nor reassuring. Dr. Gladden merely suggests an offset to the lower influences of the stage, while Mr. Howells's man expresses a passing, but very positive opinion. Mr. Towse alone goes into the question of direct remedies, and his remarks are worthy of serious consideration, for he is, especially, a "friend of the stage," and by profession a student and critic of it.

We have often thought that if the habitual denouncers of the stage and its associations really knew their subject, they could prepare a much more telling bill of indictment against it than any we have yet seen from such sources. In proportion as they do know their subject, are their criticisms effective and useful. But the usual perfunctory "attack upon the theater" is apt to be a vague, rather ignorant and indiscriminating essay, which offends persons of knowledge and common sense, and naturally infuriates the actors of every grade and standing.

The fact is that the modern stage is probably a little worse and certainly much better than its customary condemners have any idea of. The mistake they make is to suppose that the whole thing is corrupt, objectionable, and removable. Acting may be called the oldest art, as it is the most popular—and, at its best, one of the most useful and commendable. It came a great while ago, and will doubtless stay as long as this globe is habitable. It is, moreover, a very trying profession,—we are inclined to think the most trying. Some of the worst people in the world are on the stage, or in some way or other connected with it,—some of the most ignorant, vicious, and pernicious,—and also, we verily believe, some of the best.

We heartily wish that literature were better, *all the way through*, than it is. There are many very good books and periodicals in the world; but there are a great many abominable ones, and their number increases year by year; they are sold cheap, circulate widely, and do no end of harm. We heartily wish that the stage were better than it is, *all the way through*; but we know of no medicine that is sure to work its perfect cure. Every one in any way associated with it, whether behind or in front of the foot-lights, should do his part toward "improving its condition," for its condition, as reflected in the three comments we have printed, is evidently in great need of improvement. The present tendency of some of our best writers of fiction to write plays for actual presentation is a hopeful sign of the times. As for ourselves, if sticking pins in here and there, and speaking an encouraging word now and then, in the future as in the past, will do any good, the stage is welcome to our services!

In suggesting, as above, a comparison between literature and the stage, we do not mean to imply that the theater and general literature are in every way comparable. The theater should rather be compared with the literature of amusement—say with fiction. Even as thus compared we fear that it would be at a disad-

vantage. While there may be more that is degrading in current fiction, there is perhaps less that is elevating in the stage of to-day. In other words, take together the bad and the good of current fiction,—while the bad may sink lower than anything one is likely to see on the stage, the average of fictional literature would probably be found to be better and more elevating than the average of theatrical entertainment. One cause of the vulgarizing tendency of much of the amusement offered in our theaters may be found in the double nature of dramatic representation. The stage is compounded of two arts—that of the author and that of the actor. Even when the author does worthy and refined work, ten chances to one his characters will be debased by actors without culture of mind, soul, or manners.

Authors, actors, and managers are alike under obligation to the public to give better entertainment than is now the rule; as Mr. Towse has shown, they cannot throw their own personal responsibility upon the public shoulders, for there is no "art, profession, or business in which public credulity, ignorance, or folly is accepted as a valid excuse for non-performance of duty." But neither can the public rest blameless if it accepts without protest an inferior article.

After all, the surest way to "elevate the stage" is to elevate the audience. The stage, like the press and like literature generally, will be apt to take its tone from the community to which its appeal is made. If the community will demand a better class of theatrical representation it will get it.

Overmuch Wisdom.

A STORY is told of a conservative clergyman who was present at a woman-suffrage convention when a terrible thunder-storm arose, and who made haste to interpret the storm as an expression of the wrath of God against the "infamous work" in which the reformers were engaged. Thereupon the aged negress known as Sojourner Truth is said to have retorted: "You ain't acquainted with God." The parson was silenced, of course; what reply could be made to such a challenge? "Answer a fool according to his folly," says the wise man. The reply of Sojourner was a good specimen of this style of controversy. Does the wise man mean that none but a fool can effectually answer a fool? Certainly we do encounter, now and then, examples of unreason so gross that it seems useless to attempt any rational response. The clerical expounder of the thunder-storm furnishes a specimen of this stupidity. None but a densely ignorant person would have ventured thus to declare the final cause of a natural phenomenon of this nature. A "Master in Israel" who knows no more than to assign moral reasons for particular meteorological changes has not yet learned the alphabet of Christ's religion. Such reasons there may be; but the power to discover and reveal them does not belong to man, and he who undertakes to exercise such power makes an enormous assumption. Knowledge of this kind could only be derived from an immediate prophetic revelation. Respecting the general course of nature, we may be able to affirm confidently that it is under divine guidance, and that the outcome of all its forces is good. Strauss himself asserts that "order and law, reason and goodness" are the soul of the universe; and Matthew Arnold declares

the statement that all things work together for moral ends to be a verifiable statement. But although as much as this may be said concerning the divine Providence, considered in its larger relations and in its ultimate results, it is impossible to explain any single natural phenomenon or any particular event of history. The great results which we confidently predict are produced by the interworking of a vast number of causes; the process is one that no man can understand; the relation of any given fact to the grand result no man can explain; nothing short of omniscience can discern the moral meanings of particular events, as they are combined in the divine purpose, and he who undertakes, as the clergyman in question did, to declare the intent of Providence in any particular occurrence assumes omniscience.

The readiness to expound Providence is a sure mark of mental obtuseness. Those who know the least are the readiest to undertake it. The barbarian always judges that an unexpected calamity or a violent or unusual death is a proof of the displeasure of the gods. That was the opinion of Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite, enforced at great length in the Book of Job. "Who ever perished being innocent, or when were the righteous cut off?" Against this judgment the good Sheik sturdily remonstrates, and the argument of the book vindicates his protest.

When the boiler of a ferry-boat exploded on a Sunday in New York harbor, those were not wanting who expounded the accident as a divine testimony against Sabbath-breaking. The fact that a score or more of innocent children suffered in the catastrophe caused these expounders no trouble; the God whom they worship would seem to be a being who deals out his penalties without much discrimination. When a theater was burned in Brooklyn, these interpreters made haste to announce that it was a sign of God's displeasure against theater-going. But when casualties of the same description have occurred in churches, they have not been so swift with their explanations. A good woman in the West was killed by lightning while praying with her children during a thunder-storm. If she had been playing some innocent game with them, certain good people who disapprove of diversion would have regarded her death as a testimony against that particular game. Occurring as it did, they would be slow to assert that it was a testimony

against prayer. The simple truth is, that providential evils, like providential benefits, are visited on the just and on the unjust, and they are wise who refuse to expound them. It is singular that any man who reads the daily newspapers should venture on such an exposition.

"Let us Have Peace!"

AS THIS magazine has not hesitated to bring to the notice of the country whatever social and political evils were supposed to exist in any part of it, and as it has especially given attention to the condition of the freedmen in the Southern States, we will not now be regarded as writing in a partisan spirit when we deprecate and denounce the narrow, sectional, and embittered tone of comment which still lingers in certain quarters of the North. That this tone is less frequent than it was a few years ago is a token of the mellowing of feeling which takes place as the Civil War, with its animosities, moves farther and farther back into history; it is a sign, also, of the improved condition and spirit of the South, and of the new era of common interests and mutual sympathy and respect.

It is something worthy of remark that at the present moment, whenever the old note of sectional hatred is struck, it has a jarring and unwelcome sound in the North itself. The true lover of the whole country—undivided and indivisible—is shocked and pained when this note is sounded,—a note that was not sounded by Lincoln or by Grant even in the thick of the fight. It is further noticeable that it is to "the fury of the non-combatant" that we generally owe this note of discord; while the men who did the fighting did it "with malice toward none, with charity for all." Our men of war have proved indeed the true friends of peace, and not its enemies. "Both read the same Bible," said Lincoln, "and pray to the same God, . . . let us judge not that we be not judged." It was Grant who stipulated that not one sword should be handed to the conquerors at Appomattox.

While the questions of slavery and secession are forever settled, there are still to be approached grave and delicate problems growing out of changed social and political relations. These require the most conscientious, cool, wise, and brave consideration. This is the time not for the demagogue, not for the reckless agitator, but for the philanthropist and statesman. In our day the politician who wears the "bloody shirt" will be buried with it.

NOTE.—In justice to the author, we should mention that an accidental omission in the January installment of "The Knight of the Black Forest" was not discovered until the present installment had gone to press. We mention this to explain the abruptness of the beginning of chapter IX. In the omitted portion are elaborated the points of difference between Lois and Prentiss. Prentiss's *gaucheries* of manner and lack of æsthetic appreciation are made more evident, as well as his genuine kindness of heart; while the essential rudeness of the more polished Von Lindenfels is shown by his compliments to Lois during a walk taken by the party in the neighboring woods.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

THERE are people who will argue with you half an hour to prove that two and two make four.

ALL majorities are of the nature of a mob; when mankind gets into a tight place it always looks to the minority for relief.

RHUBARB and sugar is just as good physic as rhubarb and salt, and it is a heap more pleasant to take.

THE top round of the ladder is an imaginary one; no man ever reached it yet.

I NEVER judge a man by the length of his creed, but by the breadth of it.

Uncle Esek.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The "Century" War Series.

THE reception which has been accorded to the first papers of the series on the Civil War has more than confirmed our belief in the timeliness and expediency of non-political discussion of the leading events in the great conflict. We had anticipated a cordial interest in a subject of such immediate historic importance upon which there is little or no systematic popular education; but we were hardly prepared for the almost unbroken response of welcome which has greeted the enterprise, whether in the generous notice of the press, or in the large number of encouraging and helpful letters that have come to us from all sections of the country, or, last and most practical of all, in the extraordinary increase of the circulation of the magazine. For all this support, and especially for the courtesies and valuable suggestions received from officers of the War Department, and of the volunteer and regular armies, and others, it is a pleasure as well as a duty to make grateful acknowledgment here.

If the welcome has been somewhat greater than we expected, so also the series is increasing every week in resources of entertainment and instruction. Its announcement has brought to us unpublished original documents of marked significance, and contributions of both text and illustrations which will noticeably reinforce our plans. As we proceed, there is a larger fund of pictorial material to be drawn upon, especially in the history of the Army of the Potomac. Moreover, as those who had the direction of military affairs awake to the fact that the enterprise has arrested the attention of the public, and that it is conducted without bias, they are increasingly willing to contribute to it.

It must be confessed there are thousands of intelligent people who would be ashamed to be ignorant of the outlines of the Napoleonic wars to whom probably the greatest conflict of ideas and arms of the nineteenth century appears like "men as trees walking." There is something perfunctory and sentimental about the belief in the heroism of past ages; we need to become familiar with the valor of our own times to realize of what mankind is capable. To many a reader of the younger generation who has begun these papers, the war was a sort of miracle concerning which he knew little; as his knowledge of it increases it will be, like nature herself, more and more of a miracle; and when he has reached the Grand Review of 1865 he will then be all the better prepared by inclination and temper for an examination of the real causes of the struggle, concerning which the last word has by no means yet been spoken.

We are aware that the present series is not all history, but even in its errors, its bias, its temper, and its personalities, it is the material of history — what the French call *mémoires pour servir*. It is not too much to claim that when completed it will probably constitute a more authoritative and final statement of the events of the war as seen through the eyes of commanders and participants than has before been made

on a single plan. Collected, it will be an intimate and authentic record such as has never before been made of the war for the Union, or indeed of any military conflict.

To literary and historical clubs these papers offer a convenient adjunct and nucleus for a systematic study of the general subject. Various veteran associations are wisely engaged in making record of the personal experiences of their members, and to these a generation hence the historian will resort for the substance of his final judgments. Meanwhile, the civilian and the student have little or no benefit from these rich materials. In every town or city to which THE CENTURY goes a most interesting study of the war could be carried on by the aid of the reminiscences of officers and soldiers, and of the diaries and letters penned in camp and bivouac, to say nothing of the books and documents accessible in every library. Doubtless investigations conducted in a historical spirit would be the occasion of shedding important light on the character of the conflict, or (as recently in the case of a literary club of Cincinnati) the occasion of clearing up misapprehensions concerning its origin.

To the thousands of new readers who have been brought to the magazine by their interest in the war, as well as to those older constituents to whom the war papers are not an attraction,—if such there be,—we recommend special attention to the other contents of the magazine—to the fiction, the travel, the domestic papers, the public discussion, the art, the humor—for the most part drawn from American life. We are well aware that its permanent increase of prosperity will depend, not upon any special series or feature, but upon the general character of the magazine.

An Undesired Guest.

THE recent horrible continental outbreak of Asiatic cholera has stimulated medical investigators generally to make fresh attempts in the direction of penetrating the mysteries of its pathology. Dr. John Chapman, of England, the inventor of and strong believer in an ice-bag, advances in the "Westminster Review" a new theory, viz.: that cholera is essentially a nervous disease which is non-contagious, and owes its genesis to causes which reduce the vigor of the sympathetic nervous system. In riding his hobby, which he does in all sincerity, and in a graceful literary manner, the author puts out of the question to a great degree all the well-established climatic, topographical, and other facts that have been found to play so important an etiological part. The element of local filth seems to have no weight with him, and he regards Koch's microbe theory as of no moment whatever. This is indeed a bold way of accounting for the disease. Dr. Chapman's article is clever and suggestive, but he makes the same mistake that he would if he were to consider typhus and other zymotic diseases as essentially neurotic affections, because the nervous symptoms are dominant. In these diseases, as well as cholera, the great derangement of the cerebro-spinal and sympa-

thetic systems is undoubtedly due to the specific influence of some poison, which we agree with him is but imperfectly known; that it does exist, however, can hardly be gainsaid.

Dr. Chapman points out a fact which is and has been known for a long time, viz.: the serious influence of fright, exhaustion, and other depressing circumstances in their relation to the spread of epidemics. There can be no dispute about the fact that in time of epidemics the ravages of disease are greatly helped by panic and its belongings, and we are furnished with numerous historical instances. The sweating sickness of 1485 and 1506 was largely due to the superstition and ignorance of the soldiers of the army of Henry VII. Before the epidemic of 1506 the fears of the common people were aroused, and a state of superstitious horror was excited by the falling of a large golden eagle from the tower of St. Paul's, which crushed in its way to the ground a black eagle which ornamented a lower building. This with other enfeebling causes so demoralized the inhabitants of London that they fell ready victims to the pestilence.

The psychological interest attached to panic is worthy of close study. "Expectant attention," especially when of a depressive nature, is always likely to lower the energy of all nervous functions. We find isolated evidence of this every day, but there can be no doubt that it has been an important factor in the recent cholera epidemic, especially in Italy, where instances of fanaticism and wild superstitious fear were found among all classes.

The first outbreak of cholera in Moscow was attended by a display of popular insanity which was simply incredible, the mob breaking open the hospitals and killing or wounding the medical officers. From the history of other epidemics, it would appear that the mental disturbance may even amount to hallucinations which are shared by many persons of a community. The prostrating effects of fear are well illustrated in those medical cases where collapse follows the unfavorable dictum of the attending physician, and individuals with a reasonable hope of recovery sink and die. This is precisely what happens in time of epidemic disease. It therefore behooves the public, whenever a visitation of cholera is threatened, to keep cool, to allay the fears of the excitable and to prevent panic. The comparatively slight extent of the disease in America in 1849 was largely due to this self-possession; and one of the English medical writers then expressed himself as follows:

"The manner in which the epidemic that visited us in 1849 was met and submitted to is a decisive proof of this" (self-possession), "and shows that the mental capacity and docility of the masses of mankind are very materially exalted in the scale of moral beings. Our Transatlantic brethren, the Americans of the United States, surpassed us, we must own, in this respect. No superstitious propensities were evinced on either side of the ocean; no fatal delusions, instigating the populace to public outbreaks of a terrifying nature; no disabling panics, no shameless libertinism; nay, no profane outcry, or brutish infidelity. But everything was conducted with the most perfect self-possession—soberly, humanely, and discreetly. The best means, suggested by the best reason and knowledge, as far as they went, were listened to, adopted, and resolutely put into practice."

All this augurs well for the ordeal through which

we in America may be obliged to pass next summer. Our present efforts, however, should be directed to the removal of existing nuisances, which may tend to favor the spread of the disease, should it come to us. New York, despite its admirable situation, washed as it is upon either side by rivers with rapid tideway, is badly drained, the space between the piers containing deposits of foul mud, organic matter, and sewerage sediment.* This is due to the fact that the sewer outlets end abruptly at the ends of streets. In no other great city in the world would such a state of things be permitted to exist. Another grave and alarming danger is that which must arise from the scarcity of water. For over two years the occupants of many houses below Thirty-fourth street have not had water above the first floor, and even the most carefully constructed hygienic plumbing must become a disease-breeding nuisance. Upon either side of the city are fat-boilers and "gut-scrappers," while thousands of tons of decaying manure upon the river front fill the air with noxious gases. These and many other evils must be abolished, and such overcrowding as the papers tell us existed not long ago in one house, where there were fifteen cases of typhus fever, should be prevented.

Bearing in mind the fact that cholera is in large measure a disease which begins with gastric derangement, the importance is apparent of a rigid system of food inspection, something much more rational than that now followed.

But New York is not alone in the necessity for prompt and continuous precautions. Every seaboard town should be alive to its particular needs, which in many cases are great indeed. Above all things, let there be pure air and plenty of good water and wholesome food. With these requisites, and with the vigilance of intelligent, systematic officials, cholera, if it should arrive at all, may be kept within bounds, and the danger of a general pestilence may be averted.

Freedom of Discussion.

THOUGHTFUL and unpartisan observers of the Southern situation have long been watching with interest the signs which show that the South is emerging from provincialism into a genuine spirit of nationality and of intellectual freedom. The great test of this advance is the growing liberty of opinion, as manifested in the press and on the platform, and in other quarters as well. Without this liberty of opinion there can be, of course, no genuine solution of any social or political question whatever—in the South or anywhere else.

No essay on the subject of the freedmen published for many years has attracted wider attention than Mr. Cable's "The Freedman's Case in Equity," in the January CENTURY. The reception of this essay in the Southern States (though not unaccompanied by some amusing reminders of the good old-fashioned bowie-knife and fire-eating days) would seem to be a new proof that the Southern people admit of the honest and free discussion of burning questions in a manner which has not always been characteristic of that section. Not only does the South admit the distasteful opinions of

*See Colonel Waring on "The Sanitary Condition of New York," in this magazine for May and June, 1881.

thinkers from other sections, but, what is still more noticeable, it is increasingly tolerant of differences of opinion among its own writers. When one considers the intolerance recently manifested in the North and West in the matter of political independence, and the spirit of "boycotting" shown toward certain Northern leaders and periodicals, and when one sees this new attitude of Southern newspapers and leaders, one has food for reflection. Evidently a great many

changes have taken place in this country during the past twenty years.

A number of more or less dissenting essays and "Open Letters" have come to us from the South since the publication of Mr. Cable's last article, but we have thought best to confine the reply, at present, to a single representative essay of some length, which is now in preparation, and which will appear in an early number of *THE CENTURY*.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Claims of Chicago.

IN the September number of *THE CENTURY*, 1883, is an article entitled "Will New York be the Final World Metropolis?" in which the author aims to prove the affirmative of this inquiry. Now, while every one is willing to acknowledge that, so far as this country is concerned, New York from the stand-point of to-day is far in advance of any competitor, it is not so very clear that she will ultimately have the predicted world-wide preëminence. But, dismissing all question of competition from other countries, let us consider whether there may not be in our own land, and far removed from salt water, some aspirant to a higher position in population, trade, and finance.

The great majority of mankind "have no way of judging of the future but by the past." In deference to this characteristic trait of the many, let us consider for a while what the world's history thus far teaches us in the way of urban development. The great cities of Europe, notwithstanding the wonderful change which has taken place in the methods by which business has been conducted, maintain very nearly the same relative rank as they did sixty years ago, and the establishment of seaports does not seem materially to affect the cities of the interior. London and Paris, Vienna and Berlin, still hold their own, and a good deal more; and if Venice has long since been "crushed" and gone to seed, it is mainly because it had no territory of its own, and the conditions regulating trade in its day of prosperity, some four or five hundred years ago, have passed away.

It is from the land, and not from the sea, that the larger cities of to-day must derive their main support and continued prosperity. The sea in itself produces but little in comparison, and serves in matters of business chiefly as a highway of communication. It is the land that tells, provided the soil is good and the climate fair. As a gentleman from San Francisco said to the writer, who had made some flattering remarks as to its rapid progress and promising future, "After all, it stands to reason that a city like Chicago, which has land all around it, has a much better show than a city which has land only on one side."

Let us see what time has brought about in some of the older nations.

In China, united under one government, homogeneous in its population, and where a certain facility of communication and a peaceful history have allowed free scope in its business developments, we find by far the most populous and important city situated at

or near the center of its most fertile and productive territory,—a city excelling in numbers the aggregate of Canton, Shanghai, and Peking combined, and whose pulsations of trade are felt to the utmost limits of the empire.

Huc, the Jesuit missionary, who spent ten years in China proper, learned its language, and traveled extensively over every part of it, after expressing his surprise at the intense business activity which first met his eyes at the seaports, goes on to say: "And yet, when one has not penetrated to the center of the empire, when one has not seen the great towns of Han-yang, Wochang-fou, and Han-kow, facing one another, it is impossible to form an adequate idea of the amount of its internal trade." The population of this great triple city, situated on the Yang-tse-kiang river at the junction of one of its principal branches, was, before the Taeping rebellion, estimated at eight millions, and Huc was astonished "to see vessels of such size and in such numbers in the very middle of China."

If the same development has not taken place in Hindostan (with its two hundred and fifty millions), it may be attributed to the following causes: First, that there are no navigable rivers connecting with the interior, and until very lately no means of easy communication; secondly, that before the British occupation the country was divided up into diverse and hostile nationalities, creeds, and governments; and, lastly, because the English since they have held sway have as a matter of business and governmental policy endeavored to draw its commerce toward the sea-coast, where it could be more easily supervised and controlled. The other parts of Asia, either in consequence of rigorous climate or sterile and arid soils, are hardly worth considering in this regard.

It may be fairly questioned whether England as a nation, and London as its metropolis, did not at the outset owe their progress to the fact that as a whole the kingdom had the best soil in Europe. London, the world's present center of trade, is a long way in advance of New York, and is situated nearer the greatest aggregations of civilized communities; and it is all useless to consider New York a dangerous competitor so long as she can deal with her foreign customers only through the agency of foreign shipping, notwithstanding this country furnishes the great bulk of the commerce of the Atlantic Ocean. England is different from an extensive and self-sustaining country in its commercial aspect, inasmuch as she is obliged from her limited area and insular position to obtain a

large portion of her supplies of food and raw materials from abroad; and her commerce has kept pace with this growing necessity, a source of power and wealth in time of peace, and of solicitude and weakness on the interruption of amicable relations with other powers. In a limited territory like that of England a strictly central position for its chief city is not of so much importance.

France has the next best soil in Europe, and Paris is the result — a city which holds its own wonderfully well, in spite of its want of a free communication with salt water. It is substantially an interior city, though not so centrally located as Berlin and Vienna, whose rapid progress of late years is a matter of surprise to all those who have not closely considered its causes.

St. Petersburg, at the head of the Gulf of Finland, owes its origin to an imperial mandate, and not to the requirements of trade. It has a considerable territory on all sides of it, but cannot compete in the traffic induced by Moscow's central position. The great trade, where it has free scope, of most of the extensive countries of the world is the internal trade. The exports of a country are mainly of its *surplus products*, while the great internal trade deals in the *aggregate productions*. There is no comparison in this country between the two, the latter being probably ten times the former in quantity and value; and it is to the development of this internal trade that we must look for the development of our larger cities. Wherever there is a very large population in any country, and especially in a civilized country, a large business is a necessary result; and, with free communications from all quarters, that business or trade naturally converges toward the geographical and population center of the territory, if settled uniformly, or approximately so, in point of numbers.

It is generally admitted that the Mississippi Valley is capable of sustaining, and will in the future sustain, an immense population. And yet most persons' opinions in this regard are of a rather crude and indefinite sort, accepting the broad facts without caring to ask why it is so, unless for plain reasons which are patent to every one. The primary reason is that it has the best land in endless quantities. It has also a fair climate, and generally an abundant supply of coal, hardly excelled in this last respect in any portion of this or any other country, the coal area in Illinois alone being four or five times as great as that of Great Britain, and the coal selling at retail in many parts of the State at the low price of one dollar and a half per ton. The earlier settlements in the country naturally clung to the Atlantic coast, and it is only since the commencement of the present century that population began to flow freely into the Western States; while the prestige acquired by the maritime cities has given them an impetus which is still felt, though the cause for their establishment and growth has lost somewhat of its relative power. Now, however, the day of rapid increase has passed away. The Southern States may have a new dawn of prosperity; but at the present time, and for very many years to come, the West and Northwest promise the most rapid increase in numbers and wealth. Let us endeavor to form some estimate of the capabilities of this vast interior region for the sustenance of a dense and enormous population. The valley of the upper Mississippi and its confluent is com-

posed almost entirely of arable and fertile land, and there seems to be no good reason why it should not support as dense a population as any country in the world. England to-day has about 500 inhabitants to the square mile; Belgium has about the same number; and the three most densely populated provinces of China have an average of over 700. The great wheat-field of the continent may be considered as extending from the eastern boundary of Ohio to the western boundary of Nebraska, and from the southern boundary of Kentucky to the Peace River in the British Possessions. Estimating this territory as 1500 miles from east to west, and 2000 miles from north to south, we have an area of 3,000,000 square miles of arable and fertile land. There is no parallel to this on the face of the earth. If we suppose one million out of the three millions of square miles settled to about one-third of the density specified in the above cases, or about 200 to the square mile, we have, as a result, 200,000,000 people, who would consume probably per capita fully twice the amount consumed in other civilized countries, which would, in a business point of view, represent the consumption of 400,000,000 Europeans. 'Tis hardly worth while to expatiate on the immense amount of traffic which such a population will develop, as it must be self-evident. Of course these surmises apply to a distant future. Assuming, then, that a vast volume of business is a necessary consequence in the case, it follows that with such a net-work of railroads and their facilities for the transportation of passengers or freight, in a country yet in a formative process, a greater concentration of its trade will occur than has heretofore resulted in any other nation. As an evidence of this so far, St. Louis and Chicago are almost alone in the division of this great north-western trade, there being in all that immense region only one other city (Milwaukee) that has over 100,000 inhabitants. The next largest city to Chicago in Illinois has less than 40,000. Any reliable information of the size of the cities of China is difficult to obtain, but it is probable there are twenty cities there with a population of over a million each, though we hear of but few besides Canton, Shanghai, and Peking. If this empire had had in times past as perfect facilities of communication as we have here, we should have found much fewer although much larger cities as the result, and even Han-kow would have doubled its former enormous population. As the population increases, we shall consume more of our products of the soil and manufacture more of textile fabrics and other articles that we need, and the occupation of the ports as factors in surplus products both in exports and imports will be relatively diminished; and the main mission of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf of Mexico ports may be as purveyors to the wants and distributors of the products of this great, populous, and central region of the continent, excepting so much as may possibly in the future find its ingress and egress by the way of the lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

Now, as a necessary consequence of the dense settlement of a territory like this, having every requisite for the development of all the agricultural, manufacturing, mining, and commercial industries on the grandest scale, with most perfect transport facilities, must be the establishment and growth of some great central

leading mart, most easily accessible from all parts, where the great exchanges of this region can be the most speedily and advantageously effected. Where will this point be?

The census of 1880, showing that Chicago had 150,000 inhabitants in excess of its strongest competitor (St. Louis), gives it the lead at present of all the cities of the interior, and a lead which, from the outlook of to-day, it seems likely to maintain. Situated at the head of Lake Michigan, the terminus of navigation of these inland waters, and on the watershed of this part of the continent, a canal of less than one hundred miles connects the waters of the lakes with the Illinois River, forming a continuous line of navigation of 5000 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, running through the heart of the country, and of which Chicago is the central point. In addition to this, the old adage that "all roads lead to Rome" may find a new application. If we cast a glance at a good railroad map of the United States, where all the routes are plainly laid down, the eye is instinctively directed to Chicago as the point toward which by far the larger number converge. Five great trunk lines lead to the Atlantic; five more trunk lines will soon be completed to the Pacific; five more to Mexico and its Gulf, with an indefinite number toward the north and north-west, all of which have virtually their termini at this point; and these, with their multifarious branches, necessitate the arrival and departure of a thousand trains a day. Lakes Michigan and Superior extend 500 miles to the north, forming an effectual barrier for a large portion of the year to any direct transit, either of freight or passengers, between the North-west and the East; and all this business of necessity is *forced* for that portion of the year round the head of the lake and through Chicago. This gives it rather an exceptional position, the like of which is to be found in no city of the United States, as all other points can be "flanked" (so to speak) without loss of time or additional expense. With such advantages as these it would seem unnecessary to dwell upon the inevitable result—a large and rapidly growing trade, and a very large population. Few persons at the East have any adequate idea of the activity of the lake trade, and are hardly prepared to learn that the entries and clearances of this port in 1881, for the period of eight months, and as recorded in this Custom House, were 26,029, or 29 more than New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco combined for the whole year. This is exclusively, or nearly so, the trade of the lakes, the vessels employed in the trade being from 100 to 2000 tons burden. The enlarging and deepening of the St. Lawrence Canal will materially increase this amount, and vessels of 1500 to 2000 tons can run with their cargoes direct from foreign to the lake ports, without breaking bulk, for six months in the year. A few years since the writer received a letter from an English firm suggesting the establishment of a line of first-class steamers to run directly from Liverpool to Chicago. The proposition was of course premature, but we may rest well assured that sooner or later it will be accomplished.

The Canadians apparently are not pushing these works with much energy, under the impression that the through passage of these ships might deprive them of the advantages of reshipment which they now en-

joy. The idea some of the English merchants have, that an outlet to Europe may be found through Hudson's Bay, is probably chimerical, for it is not likely that more than two months of navigation could be depended upon. Middleton, a navigator who traversed these waters in the early part of the eighteenth century, speaks fully of the dangers he encountered, and states that the period of reasonably safe navigation extends only from the 15th of July to the 15th of September, and that he lost a vessel in the strait nipped by the ice in the middle of that short summer. Not a very encouraging outlook certainly!

So, too, as regards manufacturing as developed in this city, but few persons know that it holds the third rank in the United States, and that more than one-half the population is engaged in such pursuits, one hundred and twenty-seven new factories having been established in 1882 alone—only one, started within six months with eighty looms, being in the line of cotton fabrics.

The writer has no predilection for large cities, and looks upon railroads with less favor than some, inasmuch as they tend to concentrate business, and to foster monopolies and combinations alike prejudicial to good morals and a healthful condition of trade. But such seems to be the tendency in our day; and if there be any one place in the whole country where it will be more manifest than in any other, it is this same city of Chicago. The redundant population of the North-west will one day make it the best market in the world, and the productions and commodities of Europe and the Eastern States, of Asia on the west, and of the tropics on the south, as well as of the boundless wheat, grain, and grazing fields which stretch away to the distant west and north, will some day meet here as on common ground for sale and purchase. These predictions may seem extravagant to residents in the older States, but in the West there are many intelligent men who have a firm and abiding faith that these things will come to pass. During the last forty years the city has grown from a small settlement of 6000 people to a magnificent city of over 600,000, having increased a hundred-fold, and it would not be a whit more surprising if in fifty years more it should increase to five times its present magnitude. The Chinese call their great trading city of Han-kow "The Mouth of the Commercial Marts," and it may be that it will find its counterpart some day in the Garden City of the West. No one is now endowed with the spirit of prophecy, so that no one can say positively that these things will be so; but of one thing we may be reasonably well assured, and that is, that the great emporium of these United States will finally be developed at some point in the interior of the country which is the most accessible from every part, and which will be determined in the days of our children or grandchildren "by the inexorable logic of facts."

George M. Higginson.

Courbet, the Artist.

DR. COAN'S article on Courbet [about a year ago] doubtless seemed to all its readers what it seemed to me—an interesting account of an interesting man. But to those who care about Courbet chiefly as an *artist*, it

will not have been, I think, entirely satisfactory. I may be pardoned, therefore, if I try to explain in a very few words what seems to me his real artistic worth.

To begin with, no strikingly individual artist should be judged wholly by the intrinsic value of his pictures. He should also be judged by the place he holds in the history of art — by the peculiar qualities his works reveal when compared with those of his predecessors and contemporaries, and still more by the influence they have had on subsequent performance. Notably is this the case with Courbet. He was not only a very strong and individual painter, but an *innovator* in the full force of the term. He was the prime mover in what has proved almost a revolution in art, and his example has largely molded the practice of our later day. He and Millet were the first champions of what we call — rather vaguely and incorrectly — “realism” in art. They were offshoots, of course, of the “romantic” movement of the early part of our century — that movement which proclaimed individuality to be the most important factor in art, and showed that a man might see with his own eyes and paint with his own brush, instead of seeing and painting in accordance with traditional, academic formulas. There had been a fierce battle at the outset of this romantic movement, — a battle which had been gained by the romanticists before Courbet’s day, but which renewed itself about his work and Millet’s. They saw fit to push the new doctrine further than the romanticists had carried it — were the first to insist upon absolute freedom in the choice of material, to say that peasants were as well worth painting as kings, humble contemporary life as history or mythology, and ugliness, upon occasion, as the goddess of beauty herself. Dr. Coan’s words give us but a faint idea of the fury with which Courbet especially was attacked. He held a different position from Millet, and not alone in the more aggressive character of his work. Millet could be simply denied for many years all admittance to the Salon. But Courbet had won the right to such admittance when, in his earlier, less revolutionary time, he had gained a second medal. His work was, therefore, thrust constantly before unwilling eyes, and was assailed with corresponding violence. And the scorn which was confined to Millet’s pictures was shared by Courbet’s person. Never before or since has an artist been so berated, abused, and traduced simply for his pictures’ sake. Political were mixed with artistic arguments and prejudices. It was in the year 1850 that Courbet’s so-called brutal peasants first made their appearance on the Salon wall — just when the republic was disintegrating and before the *coup d’etat* had restored security at the price of liberty. The pictures as such were involved in the wrath and fear excited by their subjects. The prevailing terror of socialism and revolution caused critics and public alike to see in these rustic figures, and in the uncompromising portraits of the “Burial Scene at Ornans,” an attempt to exalt a dangerous class and to discredit the priesthood with the people; and the wildest political fury was turned upon them and their creator. Being what he was, Courbet retaliated with the weapons of the enemy, giving back scorn for scorn and rage for rage. But this fact, however it may affect our opinion of him as a man, does not in the least detract from the merit of his

course as an artist. It would have given a deserved relief to some of the less noble traits of Courbet’s character had Dr. Coan dwelt more strongly on the steady, plucky, indomitable way in which he followed his artistic conscience. If he and Millet had succumbed to their assailants, the world of art to-day would have been immeasurably poorer and less vital — or else some later comers would have had to fight the battle in their stead. And where should we have found another such pair of giants to do the work?

But even when Courbet’s art is judged intrinsically, not historically, it seems to most critics, I think, much more worthy of admiration than it does to Dr. Coan. Of course it must not be confounded with his spoken theories. Who does not know how often the things an artist most sincerely holds in theory are belied by the testimony of his work? Driven to bay as Courbet was, moreover, and possessed as he was of a rough, excitable, domineering disposition, we should not go far wrong, perhaps, if we guessed that his words were more radical and uncompromising than were his inner feelings. But be this as it may, we must not conclude that because he reprobated all “idealism” in his speech there is none of it to be found upon his canvas. Idealism in the choice and arrangement and meaning of his subject-matter is, indeed, non-existent. But the true painter’s touch is apt to idealize *pictorially* whatever subject it selects. Dr. Coan admits as much when he says that the head in one of Courbet’s portraits of himself is “too ideal for Courbet’s at any time, unless possibly for the year or two during his college life, when he studied Goethe, and even painted a scene from the ‘Walpurgisnacht.’” And could one look, for example, at the “Violoncello-Player,” recently exhibited in New York and reproduced in this magazine, and call its creator a quite prosaic artist? Or at the Boston Museum picture? Or at the majority of his superb and splendid waves and skies and landscapes? Who but he has ever shown with such strong and, I must submit, poetic sympathy the majesty of the tumbling surf and the overarching heaven, and the beauty of the deep-green, wet, and rocky woodland glades that were Courbet’s peculiar province? Grant that there is no intellectual or spiritual poetry in Courbet’s art, we must yet acknowledge that it shows, in spite of any verbal theories he may have seen fit to profess, an immense amount of poetic seeing and poetic rendering.

Nor do I think our author is quite right in saying that Courbet was “in one sense not a painter at all, at least outside of his landscapes. . . . In all his other work he was a story-teller. He did not paint for the sake of painting. . . . He was a born story-teller and satirist, and he painted to tell stories and to satirize.” On the contrary, I think all his brethren in art will bear me out in saying that whatever else he was or was not, — perhaps not a great *artist*, for that is another and a wider matter, — he was most certainly a “born painter.” His doctrine was that a man should paint only what he saw — not what he imagined, or what he thought he should have seen. After this principle he worked; and it is, I think, a *painter’s* principle, if not the whole principle which guides the greatest artists. And his eyes were peculiarly wide-open and clear-sighted and sensitive. He saw an in-

finity of things with pleasure and sympathy, and he painted them all with equal sympathy and pleasure,—ugly things and beautiful things, rare things and common things, landscapes and sea views and figures and animals and fruit and flowers, and sometimes stories and satires too; but even in this last case not often for the sake of the story itself so much as for the sake of the *picture* which that story made before his eyes. He was extremely sensitive to all physical things; and this is what marks the painter born. He was not very sensitive to spiritual things; and this, if you will, is his failing as an artist. If there is one fact proved alike by his life and his work, it is that he *did* paint for the sake of painting. Whether he chose his subjects well or ill is quite another matter—as is also anything he may have *said* about his “mission.”

With regard to his technical merits, Dr. Coan says: “As pure art, his works have little value outside of their color; but they have a sturdy material verity.” With this judgment, too, I think most artists will disagree. He was often deficient in drawing—as have been, at times, so many great painters before and after, including Titian. And for composition he had commonly no care—though here, I think, he sometimes showed a great if unconventional ability. But his handling had a freedom, a fire, an individuality, and an immensity of vigor we seldom find in modern work. A perfect painter he never was—but a great painter, none the less. It is a curious parallel to set him beside Blake, who was not a painter at all, but a draughtsman of very variable skill. Even the more abstract comparison which would mean that he ever failed as entirely in realizing his conceptions as Blake often failed in realizing his, comes nowhere near the mark. And to say that he was a less able practitioner than Martin leads us very far indeed astray. Surely it is not Courbet’s color alone, nor the rather rude vigor and verity which Dr. Coan accords him, that have raised him to so high a rank in recent years; nor yet the extrinsic fact that he was a sturdy pioneer who opened up for us a new and fruitful field in art. No; Courbet’s works are admired and studied to-day, purchased at immense prices by his government, and hung with honor in the Louvre, because he was a true if not a great artist, and a great if not a faultless painter.

M. G. van Rensselaer.

Progress in Forestry.

To your inquiry in regard to the progress in forestry recently made in this country an encouraging answer may be given. This subject, old and familiar in Europe, is comparatively new in America. But the last ten years have witnessed an advance unequalled in any other country in the same space of time. The movement, though as yet a mere beginning in this country, starts with such an impetus as to insure its expansion over broad areas. The uninhabited plains of the West, described in the old geographies as “the Great American Desert,” are fast filling up with an enterprising and prosperous population. Tree-planting is becoming almost universal on the great prairies of Minnesota, Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska, where

it once was believed no tree would grow. Many causes have contributed to this remarkable result, prominent among them being the timber-culture act passed by Congress ten years ago, amended in 1874 and again in 1878. Already 93,246 entries have been made, the area covered by them being 13,677,146 acres. Nearly one-fifth of this vast area was “entered” in 1882, which shows the growing influence of the princely premiums offered by Congress and by many of the Western States to encourage tree-planting. The timber act may need further amendment to prevent frauds, but recent inquiries of those who have had the largest experience and observation in Minnesota, Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas convince me that its benefits have been so manifest as strongly to commend it to the people in those States. Many settlers have planted much more than the required ten acres in their one hundred and sixty acres, or “quarter section.” Said a Nebraskan: “We have thousands of trees, thirty to forty feet in height and eight or nine inches in diameter, grown from seedlings or cuttings planted less than ten years ago. The fuel problem is settled for many farmers. The trees and land are already worth three times their cost.”

The cottonwood is a prime favorite, on account of the facility of its propagation and rapid growth. The cottonwood, ash, elm, box elder, soft maple, and white willow are well adapted to the soil and climate of the first four of the States above named. These trees planted young and with care are almost certain to grow. A Western forester of large experience said to me: “For economic planting I would not accept as a gift three-year-old trees, when I could buy yearlings. Beginning with such seedlings and with adaptation of kinds to local conditions, timber can be grown at moderate expense and with certainty of success. The old notion that trees could not be grown on the great oceanic prairies has been thoroughly exploded.”

The dreaded grasshoppers deserve some credit for the new interest in arboriculture. In recent journeys in the prairie States, I have found the opinion common that timber-belts form the best protection from grasshoppers and other insects injurious to vegetation. The great grasshopper visitations of 1873 and 1876 emphasized the question how to prevent their recurrence; and the most satisfactory answer to the Western mind was, “The planting and culture of forests.” George P. Marsh says, “It is only since the felling of the forests of Asia Minor and Cyrene that the locust has become so fearfully destructive in those countries.” Michelet says, “The insect has well avenged the bird. In the Isle of Bourbon, for instance, a price was set on the head of the martin. It disappeared, and the grasshopper took possession of the island.” The United States Entomological Commission, appointed by Congress in 1877 to report on the best means of preventing the ravages of this pest, say “that it has its homes or breeding-places in the arid plains east of the Rocky Mountains, and that the progress of civilization and colonization, converting those heretofore barren plains into areas of fertility, will gradually lessen the evil.”

The practical appreciation of forestry shown by some of the leading railway companies of the West, especially the Northern Pacific, has made a strong impression as to the economic value of tree-planting. With a wise foresight, this company has organized a “Tree-

planting Department" and made liberal provision — \$80,000 — for its work. Over one million trees have already been planted, and next spring as many more will be set out. In this way the cuts will be protected from snow-drifts, and long lines of "live fences" besecured. It was my privilege to travel on this railway with the experienced forester who is the superintendent of this department. He has the utmost confidence in the success of this work. He lately bought in Bismarck 100,000 trees for \$125, or at the rate of \$1.25 per thousand, which is not an uncommon price for *large* orders in the great nurseries of the West. One of these nurseries, located on the Missouri River, sells an average of seven million trees a year.

The Northern Pacific Company also offer liberal premiums to land-holders for the best groves, wind-breaks, or shelter-belts that may be planted along their lines, and circulate gratuitously among the farmers a pamphlet giving needful information for the procuring and planting of trees; and besides all this, they give free transportation of all trees, tree-seeds, and cuttings that may be planted in any of the prairie regions along their lines. The influence of this wise policy can be best appreciated by observation and personal conversation with the settlers.

Ex-Governor Furnas, of Nebraska, who has both personally and officially shown great interest in forestry, says that over 600,000,000 trees have been planted in that State during the last twelve years, and that they thrive in western Nebraska even beyond the 100th meridian, where it has been so confidently asserted that trees will not grow. Where the rainfall is less than twenty inches in a year, however, tree culture is difficult, and with some species impossible. The amount of rainfall in each locality should be taken into account in the selection of trees to be planted there.

Forestry associations, state and national, have awakened new interest in silviculture. The State Forestry Association of Minnesota was organized in 1876, under the lead of Leonard Bacon Hodges, the pioneer in the forestry movement in that State and the secretary of the association till his death in April last. This association prepared an excellent manual on tree-planting, and distributed over ten thousand copies among the settlers and land-owners of the State. Many farmers were thus led to become their own nurserymen. Similar associations have recently been organized in other Western States, and with like promise of usefulness.

The American Congress of Forestry is strongly pushing on the same work. Its annual sessions at Montreal, St. Paul, Washington, and Saratoga were attended by the most experienced foresters of the country. The United States Commissioner of Agriculture, for two years its president, is encouraging this movement by his strong personal and official influence, having given an elaborate address at each of its annual meetings. The proceedings of the meeting in Montreal were published by order of the Legislative Assembly of Canada and widely circulated. The Hon. J. G. Joly, of Quebec, a practical forester, who has under his control over 100,000 acres, and has had large experience in re-foresting denuded lands in the Province of Quebec, says that these discussions led to important legislative enactments for the increase and pro-

tection of forests, and among them, one authorizing "the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint an Arbor-day for the planting of forest trees."

In the Western States, the Arbor-days appointed by the respective governors, usually with the sanction of the legislature, have greatly promoted economic tree-planting. In Minnesota, for example, the number of acres planted on Arbor-day in 1878 was 811; in 1882 the number was 1184; and the whole number of acres planted increased from 18,029 in 1878 to 38,458 in 1882. Similar work has been done in Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Dakota, and to some extent in Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio.

According to official reports, the acreage of cultivated woodland in Kansas is 107,000; while in Nebraska it has reached 244,356 acres, besides over 12,000,000 fruit trees and nearly 3,000,000 grapevines. The large bounties offered for tree-planting secure the collection of such statistics. The abundance and excellence of the fruit, and especially the grapes, in Nebraska was a surprise to me. Ex-Governors Furnas and Morton, the pioneer tree-planters there, are now recognized as the benefactors of Nebraska by their advocacy of arboriculture, alike forest, fruit, and ornamental. It is due to their influence that Nebraska is the banner State in tree-planting. Around "Arbor Lodge," the mansion of Ex-Governor Morton, near Nebraska City, are fine groves of black-walnut and other forest trees, most productive orchards, grape and other fruits, where twenty-seven years ago was a treeless prairie, on which he was told "trees would not grow." I am soon to plant in Connecticut a bushel of nuts grown this year on the trees which sprang from the nuts planted by the hand of Mr. Morton. He was the originator of Arbor-day twelve years ago, when, through his influence, the second Wednesday of April was officially appointed for tree-planting; and so influential was his advocacy of this plan, both by pen and tongue, that over 12,000,000 trees were planted on that one day. The Nebraskans justly view their extensive tree-planting as a great achievement, and by enlarging this work from year to year they are determined to maintain this preëminence. Each governor since 1872 has formally recognized Arbor-day, and now it is observed in schools. Such a day has been set apart in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Colorado, and West Virginia, and with the happiest results in improving and adorning the grounds around the homes as well as the schools. The National Educational Association at its late meeting in Wisconsin, with an attendance of over five thousand, recommended the appointment of such a day in every State. The Wisconsin Teachers' Association, held the same week, passed a similar resolution and appointed an efficient committee to carry out the plan. The Indiana Association initiated a similar movement last spring.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the Forestry Congress in St. Paul, which included representatives from Canada: "In view of the wide-spread results of the observance of Arbor-day in many States, this Congress recommends the appointment of such a day in all our States and in the provinces and Dominion of Canada."

At its late meeting in Washington, this Association appointed a committee to present the subject to the

governors of those States where no such appointment has been made. The cordial response received from every governor whom I have since met warrants the hope that instead of eight there will be twenty-eight States observing Arbor-day next spring.

B. G. Northrop.

About People.*

IN the little volume in which Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells brings a great deal of fresh and honest thinking to various social topics, there are two essays that I find peculiarly interesting. I do not remember seeing elsewhere the "Transitional Woman" dealt with as a fact so intimately and frankly; and the phenomenon of "Caste in American Society" is viewed from a point not hitherto seized. The word caste always suggests to the readily heated imagination of the sympathizer with toil and poverty their oppression by a superior class through invidious social distinctions, if nothing worse. This is the recognized form of caste, and it is perhaps the most odious, but it is not, certainly, the most ridiculous. There is another phase of the same iniquity, which Mrs. Wells's practical relation to questions of social reform has enabled her to study with singular advantages. In every age and in every country the manners, customs, and prejudices of the more enlightened have descended to the less enlightened, like cast-off clothes; and they sit on their possessors at second hand with the edifying grace of old coats and rumpled gowns. In this way it happens that at a moment when cultivated people who think seriously of the matter think with shame and misgiving of the social distinctions which are not based on character and achievement, the lines have never been more sharply drawn between the different sorts and grades of labor. As Mrs. Wells has learned:

"The lower we descend in what is called social life, the more perceptible become its demarcations. . . . A marriage between a laundry maid and a washer-woman's son is contrary to all the rules of propriety, and ends in family feuds. The regular visitant at hotel cupboards who receives pie is further removed from the tattered mendicant at back doors than a member of the diplomatic corps from a native of Washington. . . . Among the working-women is a feeling of exclusiveness most noticeable, while with working-men it is no more prominent than with professional men. 'It is this spirit of caste,' says a working-woman of fifty years, 'which keeps us all down. If we could nag one another it would be some gain; but we avoid one another instead. There is no union among us; never was, except for a little while through the French International Association, which has died out. We never can raise ourselves from the bondage of ill-paid labor till we combine, and most of us would rather starve to death than associate with those beneath us.' Another one complains that 'the skilled workwomen pride themselves too much upon their skill to be willing to pull up the unskilled; just as in the professions a good lawyer or physician will not take a poor partner. It is social ambition, caste, that rules us; it begins with

us, and goes up and up to kings and emperors. A woman with many servants despises her with one; and she with one despises the woman who does her own work; and she who does her own work looks down upon her who goes out to work; and the one who goes out to do special house-work scorns the scrub-woman, who is the end of womankind.' . . . In a conversation with several of them, it was asked: 'What is the real grievance of the working-women?' And the general answer was that it was due to the spirit of caste, which prevented combination and coöperation, the two agents that could lighten the burdens of ill-paid labor; yet they had sufficient intelligence to see that social union among themselves must first be effected. The stern self-restraint, the power of self-sacrifice, the delicacy of taste, refinement of feeling, appreciation of knowledge, and acts of touching-kindness to one another that are found among hundreds of them, do not negative the statement that the social line, based on kinds of labor, is closely drawn among them.

"Here is a classification given by one who understands, works, and aids others in various ways: 'Employments of working-people are either subjective or objective; one cannot consort with another. Under the first are included (1) the stenographer, (2) the newspaper hack, (3) the type-writer, (4) those engaged in life-insurance business and in any sort of nursing; the second division embraces (1) mercantile women, (2) saleswomen, (3) tradeswomen, and (4) servants, who are Pariahs, so to speak, in the eyes of all other working-women.'"

These are curious and novel aspects of our democratic civilization; but I suspect that further observation would develop more facts of the same kind. I remember hearing a gentleman who had some official relation to the construction of a large public building, where the workmen were lunched on the premises, say that three different tables were necessary to preserve the different sorts of artisans and laborers from contact at their meals. It is all very droll when it gets down to this, and exclusiveness among carpenters and bricklayers is no more impressive than it is among lawyers and doctors, or their ladies. Perhaps it is even less so, being in the nature, as I said, of a cast-off garment with these humbler swells. The fact shows, however, that we are still indefinitely remote, in every grade of life, from the democratic ideal, which is also the Christian ideal. Very likely the comparative method of observation would discover far greater liberality and generosity in the higher society—even in the thin air of the heights where Fashion sits—than in the world of hunger and hard work, in which we have hitherto taken it for granted that fraternity and equality reigned. We ought,—I am talking as if I were myself a social magnate, whereas I have my pocket full of wholesome snubs of assorted sizes,—in the interest of these poor fellows and silly women who think they elevate themselves by trampling upon those of a lowlier trade, to get rid of what exclusiveness is left us, and let our light down among them. Then, in another generation, we should have a bricklayer eating at the same table with a hod-carrier, and feeling no sort of contamination. But in the mean time let us not smile at the tinsel of his tawdry distinctions; ours are not more genuine or valuable.

* About People. By Kate Gannett Wells. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co.

This whole essay of Mrs. Wells's is full of fresh suggestion, and it is pervaded by the same just and humane spirit which characterizes the book. What she chiefly does is to accumulate the facts for you, and then tacitly invite you to do your own thinking about them. Other essays in the volume are more didactic, the one on "Personal Influence" being perhaps the most direct appeal to the sense of brotherly and sisterly responsibility which they all in some measure involve. The paper on the "Transitional Woman," which I began by mentioning, is a study of the characteristics of contemporary life, which portrays the tumult in the feminine mind with the accuracy of feminine touch. One says "mind," in the Hebrew fashion—discovered by Mr. Matthew Arnold—of throwing language out at an object; but it is not exactly "mind" always. Much of this undirected or misdirected yearning and striving on the part of modern womankind is the reverse of mind, as Mrs. Wells distinctly recognizes, with no intent to be satirical of her sex. Money and labor-saving inventions have deprived that respectable sex of the old-fashioned necessity of domestic work; and the fact is that it does not yet know what to do with its leisure. The old-fashioned American wife and mother is extinct, and something better has not been born. In the mean time, we have something very pretty, very brilliant, very cultivated, very ambitious, very amusing; packages of electrical nerves, hysterical inspirations, infinite good intentions, enlightened views, high aims, noble missions, and perpetual unrest and distraction. They are probably quite good enough for the men; but they are not really any better, not more refined or good at heart; and we poor fellows who were brought up with the expectation of having an example set us, do not quite know what to do. The woman must make haste to cease being transitional, if the world is to go forward. Mrs. Wells gives us some vague hope that the woman will do so by and by, and that then the world will have something much better in her way than it has yet had. I think she might make a beginning in the right direction by making a study of Mrs. Wells's study of her. I am sure that if there were a similar study of the Transitional Man submitted to men, we should not be slow in profiting by it. The difficulty with us now is that if we acknowledge the women to be good enough for us, candor compels us to confess that we are also quite good enough for the women; and this is bad for our native modesty, and tends to spiritual pride.

Mrs. Wells's essay recognizes the absurd aspects of the case with sufficiently humorous perception, but it is a more serious affair with her than my report of it might suggest. She has a conscience about it, as she has about every subject she touches, and what she says should have the greater interest because of her position as an anti-suffragist advocate of the cause of woman. She does not flatter her sex, nor sentimentalize it, as women are so apt to do, and she has for this reason almost a unique claim upon the attention of ours when she writes of men's wives, sisters, and daughters. For once, here is a woman's-rights woman who refuses to believe that there is an antagonism in men to their amelioration, and who directly and indirectly advises women to begin their elevation themselves.

D.

The Blue and the Gray.

THE last chapter of "Dr. Sevier" and the recent "Open Letters" from the pen of George W. Cable, and "Old Questions and New," by "A Southern Democrat," in the *JANUARY CENTURY*, voice a sentiment toward the North—the war and its issues—which I firmly believe exists to-day among the progressive and thinking classes of the South, and the testimony of these gentlemen comes most gratifyingly to every true Northern heart.

True, there are those at the South as bitter to-day as twenty years ago. It is likewise true there are in the North a few so blinded by prejudice that they cannot or will not believe in a new South. Feeling that a better knowledge of this sentiment now existing in the South is in every way desirable, I cannot refrain from adding a little testimony within my own knowledge.

In September, 1883, Crocker's Iowa Brigade, comprising the Eleventh, Thirteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Iowa, held a reunion in this city, at which was present General D. C. Govan, now of Marianna, Ark., a brave division commander of the Western Confederate forces. He brought with him a flag captured by his command from the Sixteenth Iowa at Atlanta, July 22, 1864, which at his own instance he presented to Colonel A. H. Saunders, in the following words:

"Veterans of Crocker's Iowa brigade: I am unable to find words to express the feelings of pleasure and satisfaction that I feel in standing before you veterans to-night. I feel it a compliment, not only to myself but to every ex-Confederate soldier who served in the late war, that I am permitted to participate in this reunion. They will feel grateful for this honor, and will respond and return it whenever opportunity is offered. I have testified heretofore to the valor of your Iowa soldiers in their heroic resistance at Atlanta; and if I had said nothing, the long list of the killed and wounded of my command would bear mute but irresistible testimony of your courage and valor on that occasion. In behalf of our ex-soldiers I beg leave to return to you the flag won from you on that memorable occasion. I trust you will bear it as honorably as you did on that former occasion; and I assure you, that should it ever again be assailed, the men who opposed you that day will stand by you in the future and vie with you in its defense. I hope that flag may float as long as the everlasting hills endure over a free, prosperous, happy, and united people,—as long as the waters flow to the great ocean."

The general spoke in an earnest manner, with a voice full of emotion, and no one present for a moment doubted his sincerity or the truth of his statements. Surely such spirit must soon remove bitterness—such testimony soon convince skeptics.

C. N. Jenkins.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, January, 1885.

The Bombardment of Alexandria.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY:

SIR: As Stone Pasha made use of his private griefs to introduce in the June *CENTURY* a condemnation of British action in Egypt, it seemed not out of place in noticing his letter to show that the trials to which his family were subjected were seen and accepted by him

in advance. He alone is responsible for the publication of his motives, and he ought neither to regard nor characterize their discussion as a personal attack, a thing which, it is hardly necessary to explain, was never meant.

Since people *did* come from Cairo on the day preceding the bombardment and found shelter on board the ships in the roadstead, I may be pardoned for adhering to my original statement as to the accessibility of the refuge.

Regarding the sending away of all British subjects prior to hostilities, the original expression was Stone Pasha's; only the inference was mine. That inference was the abstract proposition that "other governments are less solicitous than the British for the welfare of their citizens," which, as an abstract proposition, Commander Batcheller, in the October CENTURY, seems inclined to admit and no one can deny.

Commander Batcheller questions my terming the affair of June 11 a massacre. This subject is treated rather fully in a pithy and interesting brochure* by our consular agent in Alexandria from June 15 to August 26, 1882, a man whose personal and official acquaintance with Egyptian affairs makes him an authority. He is, moreover, free from the grave charge of a leaning toward the British.

I venture to quote a few pertinent lines from this little work, to the eleventh chapter of which, entitled "The Massacre," I take the liberty of referring Commander Batcheller and such of your readers as may think the occurrence in question a mere riot.

Page 130: "It has been charged that the bombardment of the 11th of July was a crime. This was not the feeling of the foreign population in Egypt. The crime was committed in the refusal to land troops on the 11th day of June, and the bombardment one month after was a tardy recognition of this fact."

Page 131: "Arabi had succeeded admirably in proving that he was the power in the country; he had ordered a massacre to prove this, and now he was appealed to to keep order," etc., etc. Yours truly,

C. F. GOODRICH,
Lieut.-Commander U. S. N.

Making Light of It.

IN the lulls between campaigns, the honest newspaper editor everywhere devotes himself to crusading

* The Three Prophets — Chinese Gordon, El Mahdi, Arabi Pasha. By Colonel Chaillé Long, ex-Chief-of-Staff to Gordon in Africa, ex-United States Consular Agent in Alexandria, etc., etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

zealously against current social evils, such as, in particular, the alarming increase of divorce and defalcation. At the same time, the editor does much to offset his own labors by ill-placed levity. He writes a thoughtful leader upon the sinfulness of speculating with other people's money, laying the blame rightly on the public which applauds success without regard to the means by which it is attained, rather than upon the few who are detected in wrong-doing and come to grief. But in the next column is a flippant paragraph of the sort the American public is supposed to crave, perhaps upon the attractions of Canada as a winter resort, or the swell society to be found there in exile. Garnished with quotation-marks and other typographical tricks that catch the eye, the paragraph attracts far more readers than the editorial, and goes to strengthen the unavowed popular notion that defalcation is a huge practical joke on the creditors — an impression enforced by facetious headings as well as by funny paragraphs whenever a new exposure is made.

Again, the editor diligently calls upon all good people to uphold the sanctity of the marriage-tie and the sacredness of that divine institution, the family, which is, he says, the basis of society, and to protect and defend the same from all undermining influences. But he allots many a column to grotesque caricatures, or to that utter abomination, the mother-in-law joke, which after years of active service is not permitted the honorable discharge it has earned, while every elopement or divorce is rendered as interesting and spicy as possible by the reporter's art. How can he expect the public to look upon marriage as a solemn thing, or defalcation as a serious crime, or either as anything but a joke, when he freely throws into the opposing scale that unknown quantity — the influence of the funny paragraph? The editor's theory that he must make fun of everything to render his efforts readable is, to be sure, borne out by the popular demand for that species of fun. But there is also a popular demand for the police publications and a good many other things which no reputable editor would touch. To forego all jocoseness in treating of these social evils would be the death of a great number of poor jokes, and would involve a fresh tax on the eternal vigilance of the editor; but it would cut off one way in which loose notions of serious things gain currency, and there would still remain enough bright, pure fun in the prints to save us from becoming an austere and taciturn people.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

John Stone Pardee.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

WISDOM doesn't take away our folly; it only helps to hide it.

ONE'S own horn is a most delicate instrument to blow.

ORIGINALITY in writing has had its day. Nobody but a quack will strain for it. The best any one can do is to make the trail a little plainer for others to follow.

POPULAR opinions have their day, just like fashions. Every generation has a new set.

ECCENTRICITY, at best, is but a fungus, just as apt to grow out of the soil of a philosopher as of a fool.

THE cheapest thing in life is common sense, but a few people seem to have a corner in it, and are holding for a rise.

WHEN a man preaches morality from the house-tops, he is above his business.

Uncle Esek.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Practical Politics.

IT strikes us that even the humorous anecdotes in Mr. Theodore Roosevelt's paper in this number of THE CENTURY have a value beyond their mere capacity to drive dull care away. The entire paper will, we think, be found an incentive to active and wholesome participation in political affairs on the part of the honorably aspiring youth of America; and these lighter passages tend toward righteousness, for they show that the path of duty, though thorny, has its roses. It is evident, moreover, that a sense of humor may be as valuable for a reforming legislator as it proved to be in the case of our great, harassed, perplexed, and fate-overwhelmed President.

Will not the young man who intends going into politics, after reading this record of the experiences of the youthful legislative reformer, turn back to the January number of THE CENTURY, and read again Mr. Wigmore's "Open Letter" on "Political Work for Young Men"? With these two essays before him, he will possess a practical guide to American politics, which will doubtless prove a useful supplement to such moral and mental equipment as Heaven may have blessed him with.

These two papers, and others of similar import that have appeared in THE CENTURY, certainly seem to reveal a field of manly action of the very highest interest, as well, of course, as of the greatest usefulness and importance. The study of practical politics might indeed well take the name given to the study of the classics: it is preëminently a study of "the humanities." The politician studies and deals with human nature in many of its most curious and entertaining aspects. It is the fashion to call every branch of investigation nowadays a "science": if practical politics be called a "science," it is, according to Mr. Roosevelt at any rate, not a dull one.

Mr. Roosevelt's reminiscences and comments, however, are not only addressed to the intending legislator, but no less to the general well-intentioned public. The testimony of this "practical reformer" to the power of public opinion, and the necessity for its assistance in the procurement of all just and desirable legislation, is most emphatic and monitory. "Just as soon," he says, "as politicians realize that the people are in earnest in wanting a thing done, they make haste to do it." The check to legislative vice and recklessness furnished by a watchful constituency and by individual interest and exertion is everywhere theoretically acknowledged, but Mr. Roosevelt makes the fact freshly clear and impressive, and his illustrations of an old truth bring the matter home with redoubled force to the conscience of the citizen.

One reason why legislators and other officers are not looked after as sharply as they should be is that many think that unless the candidate for whom they voted is the one elected, they personally have no responsibility for the "member" or the "officer," and

they therefore take no interest in him or in his doings. This is, of course, a wrong idea of political office, and is, in fact, an outgrowth of an exaggerated and somewhat old-fashioned partisanship. With the progress upward and downward of the principles of the merit system, the theory is extending of the responsibility not only of public servants, but also of the public that is served.

"Not the American Way."

PROBABLY no unphysical argument addressed to genuine dynamiters would be likely to have any powerful effect. But words may not be entirely misapplied when addressed to certain American politicians who seem at times to hesitate in their attitude toward dynamiters themselves, the aiders and abettors of dynamiters, or the sentimental sympathizers with such outlaws. The reason for hesitation is generally obvious. It is a question of political votes — of personal or of party success.

Well, there is one thing to be said to such doubting and hesitating politicians: Gentlemen, you are making a mistake. To use an expression made popular, we believe, by General Hawley some years ago in regard to a very different question, dynamiting is "*not the American way!*" The methods of the assassin, of the sneaking and cowardly murderer, are not, and never will be, popular in this country. It is true that two of our Presidents have met their death at the hands of the illegal taker of life, but there was no popular support to either mad and murderous act. Lynch-law, on our borders especially, has had too much vogue, but this is decreasing; and there is a long distance between lynching a villain who it is feared may escape justice, and the dastardly and reckless use of explosives, where invaluable works of art, and innocent men, women, and children, together with the supposed "oppressor," are confounded in a common destruction.

Let the question once be brought to an issue in our American communities, and the politician who hesitates to denounce dynamite, and all that goes with it,—all cowardly and conscienceless attempts to settle either public or private questions by means of private and secret violence,—such a man is lost. He will find too late that his deference to an unreasoning, brutal, and restricted sentiment has brought him into contact with the great, sound, uncowardly, law-abiding sentiment of the people of these United States.

The Difference between a Painting and a Pound of Sugar.

THE advocates of the present Chinese-Wall American art-tariff make what they believe is a strong point in favor of the existing law when they call attention to the fact that works of art for public museums are admitted free of duty. They say that the educational effects of foreign art are secured by this specific exemption; that, so far as the public uses of art are concerned, the tariff is liberal. These gentlemen seem

always to be forgetting that works of art, in their essence and potentialities, differ very widely from hams, sugar, pig-iron, and silk or woolen underclothing. A pound of sugar consumed by a single individual, and by him alone, is not likely to prove of the slightest use, physical, mental, or moral, to any other human being; whereas an etching of Rembrandt or a pastel of Millet consumed, or rather studied and admired, by a single intelligent art-student or artist, and by him alone, is most likely to prove of decided use to others than himself, and ultimately to the public at large. We suggest that if the Old World's art, of any age or country, is considered to be of such value to the nation that whoever imports the same and places it upon public exhibition is to be considered a benefactor of the people, and subject to no duty or tax whatever in the prosecution of his laudable undertaking,—then such works of art, in all places, private or public, are valuable and precious objects, whose importation should be encouraged, and not discouraged, by an enlightened government. If this argument is sound, then the present tariff of thirty per cent., which is avowedly a prohibitive measure, is a blot upon the statute-book of the United States.

But the gentlemen who approve of taxing private buyers thirty per cent. while public institutions are exempt from the payment of import duties should know that public collections are constantly being enriched from private galleries; and that the thirty per cent. taken by the Government must decrease private importations, which our public institutions often ultimately get the full benefit of, at least thirty per cent.; that, in fact, the tariff limits the importation to a much greater extent than this, without being of the slightest benefit pecuniarily to our own artists. Indeed, as a protective measure the scheme has been a laughable failure. If it is to have any effect on its "protective" side at all, that effect seems likely to be curiously distant from the one intended by its ingenious authors. Foreign painters are beginning to come over to America, where the charm of novelty and the courtesy of hospitality serve, in some cases at least, in place of genuine distinction; they set up their temporary studios in the great cities, and our rich "patrons" of art hasten to secure the supposed prestige of European wares, gloriously free from the pains and penalties of the great American art-tariff. We do not, ourselves, object to this kind of art competition; the more of it the better. But we do not believe that the framers of the present law had it in mind, and we respectfully urge upon their attention the necessity of an additional clause taxing the imported painter, no less than his imported products.

We have said that private collectors should be encouraged, rather than hindered, in their efforts to bring to our shores the master-pieces of foreign art, partly because if even a few among us see these works it may still result in public benefit, and also because these private collections often find their way, in whole or in part, into the public galleries. But there are, moreover, private collections to which the public have constant access, either by means of "loan exhibitions" or such freedom of admission as is frequently granted. The galleries, for instance, in which Mr. Walters, of Baltimore, has stored the marvelous results of a lifetime of conscientious study and rigid and generous selec-

tion, are accessible, at proper times and under proper restrictions, to all lovers of art throughout the country.

We have so often explained in these pages the principles which appear to us to favor a liberal policy with regard to art importations that we have, at present, only a few words to add. The movement has recently had the approval of President Arthur, in his customary message to Congress; and the replies to a circular sent out by the Art Committee of the Union League Club, of New York, show that our artists are nearly unanimously opposed to the present tariff, and in favor of free art. (Number of artists heard from February 13, 1885, 1242. In favor of free art, 1150; ten per cent. duty, 25; thirty per cent. duty, 8; specific duty, 42; partly free, 17.) Nevertheless we fear that the movement against the present duty will come to little or nothing until there is an organized effort made to enlighten the public and Congress itself. The authors of America, as is well known, have made a permanent organization, a Copyright League, which will be continued, if necessary, from generation to generation, till some Congress is found at once honest and intelligent enough to enact justice in their behalf and in behalf of their foreign brethren in authorship. American artists, in the cause of free art, which they have so rightly and generously espoused, will probably find it necessary to proceed in some such systematic fashion as this.

The Attempt to Save Niagara.

A NATURAL phenomenon of the proportions of Niagara constitutes a public trust. The people cannot escape responsibility for its care and preservation, even if they would. The experiment of private ownership and management of the lands about the Falls has been fully tried, under circumstances more favorable than can ever exist in the future, and has failed completely. The existing state of things is one which no intelligent person can defend. The demoralization is natural and inevitable; competition between the owners of rival "points of view" naturally develops a tendency to the employment of tawdry, sensational attractions. The increasing ugliness everywhere; the destruction of all vernal beauty and freshness; the crowding of unsightly structures for manufactures of various kinds around the very brink of the Falls; the incessant hounding of travelers, and the enormous exactions of which they are the victims,—all these evils are inseparable from the system of private ownership of the land, and nothing could be more idle or fruitless than to find fault with individuals because the results of the system are disagreeable and mischievous.

The only practicable remedy is ownership by the State, and suitable permanent guardianship over these lands, with such provision for the safety, convenience, and comfort of myriads of visitors as can be supplied only by a competent directory clothed with the authority of the State, and acting in the interest of the general community. This is the object of the measures recommended by the Commissioners appointed by Governor (now President) Cleveland in the spring of 1883. These Commissioners have selected about one hundred and eighteen acres of land contiguous to the Falls, comprising Goat Island and all the other islands in the river, with a narrow strip of land on the "Amer-

ican shore," running from the upper suspension bridge to Port Day, and including Prospect Park. The various separate portions constituting this tract have been appraised, and the Supreme Court has confirmed the appraisement, which fixes the value of the lands in question at \$1,433,429.50. The Commissioners recommend the appropriation of this sum by the Legislature for the purchase of these lands, and the establishment of a State Reservation, as the only means of

preserving the scenery of Niagara. The highest interests of the people of our State will be promoted by the passage of the bill in which this plan is embodied. There is no ground for opposition except what is sordid, and hostile to public spirit. No man in public life will hereafter be able to feel pride or satisfaction in the remembrance that he resisted the endeavor of the people of the State of New York to rescue the scenery of Niagara from destruction.

OPEN LETTERS.

The "Solid South:":

ITS CAUSES AND PROBABLE DISAPPEARANCE.

WHAT is the "Solid South"? How came the South to be solid? In what way can its solidity be broken?

The "Solid South," as a current political expression, came into vogue during the Hayes-Tilden canvass of 1876. The Democratic "tidal wave" in the elections of 1874 had shown a powerful, if not irresistible, drift toward Democracy in all the then lately reconstructed States, as well as in their sisters on the old borderline which had also maintained slavery, but which had not gone into the rebellion. The alliterative term commended itself to the Republican stump speakers and newspaper organs as a happy catch-word, and the idea which underlay it was impressive enough to arrest the attention of the whole country. That sixteen commonwealths, stretching from Cape May down the Atlantic and around the Gulf to the Rio Grande, and thence back up the Mississippi to its junction with the Ohio and the Missouri, should all be controlled by the same political party, as has now happened in three successive Presidential elections (not counting the disputes over the electoral votes of South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana in 1876), is truly a fact of the first magnitude.

Dividing the male population of the voting age according to the census of 1880 in this section between the two races, it will be found that in two States the possible black voters exceed the white, in South Carolina as 7 to 5 and in Mississippi as 6 to 5; in Louisiana the two races are almost exactly equal in numbers; in Georgia, Florida, and Alabama the blacks stand to the whites as 5 to 6, in Virginia as 2 to 3, and in North Carolina as 5 to 9. The proportion then drops rapidly, being 1 to 3 in Arkansas and Tennessee, 1 to 4 in Maryland and Texas, 1 to 5 in Delaware and Kentucky, 1 to 15 in Missouri, and only 1 to 21 in West Virginia. The "black belt" thus takes in all the coast States from the Potomac to the Mississippi, and Louisiana beyond; while outside those eight States the percentage of negroes sinks till it reaches a point scarcely higher than is found in some parts of the North.

This is the "Solid South." How came it to be solid? One element, which should be the most obvious, is so often overlooked that its very statement will surprise most people. This is the operation of what may be called the law of political heredity—the influence of tradition and inheritance. No fact is more clearly demonstrated by our political history than the tendency toward a transmission of party fealty in a community of pronounced conviction from one gener-

ation to another. The more homogeneous the community, the more binding is this law of political heredity. Vermont has received but a small infusion of outside blood during the last thirty years, and the population of the State to-day approaches more nearly to being the offspring of the inhabitants of a generation ago, unaffected by external influences, than that of any other commonwealth in the Union. The student of political statistics will find that the vote for Fremont in the Green Mountain State in 1856 (39,561) was almost exactly identical with that for Blaine in 1884 (39,514); and the relative division of parties has remained practically unchanged during the whole intervening period.

The slave States were all strongly Democratic before the war. It was therefore not only natural, but almost inevitable, that by the law of political heredity they should have continued strongly Democratic after the war, provided there had been no change in the character of the voting class other than that produced by the trifling immigration into the section. That Mississippi, for example, should go overwhelmingly Democratic in 1884 would be a thing to be as much expected as that Vermont should go overwhelmingly Republican, provided that the suffrage in the Southern State, as in the Northern, were now confined to the same class of voters as wielded it thirty years ago.

It was expected by the Republican leaders who carried through the reconstruction measures that the enfranchisement of the negro would change all this. They took it for granted that the blacks would become always and everywhere the firm supporters of the party under whose administration they had received both freedom and suffrage. They supposed that the white men would divide, as white men had always divided, even in the most strongly Democratic States of the South, before the war. They expected that a large percentage of the surviving "Old Line Whigs," and of the descendants of those who had carried half the Southern States for Harrison in 1840, would embrace a party which found so many of its Northern supporters among men of similar political descent. The census showed that in two of the States the black males outnumbered the white, and in a third equaled them, while in several of the others they were so numerous that their vote, combined with that of a vigorous white Republican element, would constitute a majority. It seemed an easy matter, seventeen or eighteen years ago, with a pencil and a piece of paper to figure out sure Republican victories in nearly every Southern State. Indeed, a census computation and a firm belief in the power of Federal "patronage" were

almost sufficient to make the South—in Republican imagination—"solid" for that party.

But a stupendous blunder had crept into all these little sums in addition. Looking back calmly upon it now, it seems almost incomprehensible that men familiar with the history of the world could have entertained such delusions. Just think of it. Here was a race of men who, through no fault of their own, had been sunk by slavery and ignorance to a condition but little above that of the brutes, like which they had been bought and sold at auction. They, and their ancestors before them for generations, had been mere chattels, whom it was a grave crime to teach even to read. They were absolutely devoid of the first qualification for participation in the government of a country which had always denied them the right to govern even their own persons. They were viewed, not merely with distrust, but even with violent hostility, by their late masters, who still felt wronged at being dispossessed by the Federal power of what they had been educated to consider as really property as stocks and bonds. They were scarcely better fitted to wield the suffrage than the beasts of the field. And yet they were intrusted with the power, under the law of majorities, to absolutely rule more than one American commonwealth!

The results which followed, at the hands first of the blacks and later of the whites, were horrible; horrible, and yet, the historian will say, in both cases inevitable. The ignorant negroes became, of course, the easy prey of the worst white leaders. The sentiment of the white race being so hostile to the very idea of negro suffrage, but few respectable natives of that race, comparatively speaking, attached themselves to the Republican party. The carpet-baggers, who so largely assumed its command, despite some honorable exceptions, were for the most part unprincipled men, with little honest regard for the interests of either race, but with a strong desire to line their own pockets. The saturnalia of corruption, the carnival of misrule which followed, constitute the most frightful satire upon popular government ever known. The climax was reached in the black Legislature and "the robber Governor," in South Carolina. It became evident that there must be either a revolution by the white minority, or ruin for whites and blacks alike. A revolution was resolved upon by the whites, and it was carried through. The negroes were intimidated from going to the polls, so far as possible, and when violence did not suffice to keep them away, their ballots were tampered with and neutralized after they had been cast. By force or by fraud the race which possessed in more than one State an actual numerical majority was reduced into an apparent minority. The negro vote was practically suppressed, and the majority ceased to rule.

This result was inevitable. Reconstruction had sought to "put the bottom rail on top," to reverse the highest and lowest strata of society, to place ignorance and poverty in authority over intelligence and property. Such an attempt had never before succeeded in the world's history; it could not have succeeded permanently in the South without destroying civilization. It was from the first only a question how soon and in what way it should be defeated.

Let another truth be told: the same result would have been reached under similar conditions in any

Northern State. People commonly overlook the fact that, although the negroes had lived in the South so long, their admission to the suffrage was like the sudden incorporation into the body politic of a vast foreign element. Suppose that there had been unexpectedly distributed over the State of Massachusetts, on a certain day sixteen years ago, a new body of voters, of an alien race, so immense that it outnumbered the previous wielders of the ballot in the proportion of seven to five, so ignorant that it possessed no conception of its trust, and so inexperienced that it readily followed any demagogue who bid for its support by cultivating the distrust which it naturally felt of the former ruling element. Suppose that the Constitution and laws of the State had never required either an educational or property qualification for the suffrage, so that there was no legal way of preventing this horde of illiterates from casting ballots which they could not read. Suppose that the men who had made the Bay State rich and prosperous discovered all at once that the control of the Legislature, the administration of justice, the fixing of the tax-rate, the appropriation of the public money, the whole government of the commonwealth, had fallen into the hands of this vast aggregation of ignorance. Suppose that there had emerged from this mob and had been attracted from a distant section of the country the worst set of leaders that ever brought disgrace upon representative government. Suppose that corruption and misrule had run riot until the well-being, and even the very existence, of society was threatened. In other words, suppose that Massachusetts had been put in South Carolina's place. Does any intelligent and candid man, born and bred in Massachusetts, doubt that the former residents—the property-holders and taxpayers—would speedily have forgotten old differences, struck hands in defence of their threatened interests, and, minority though they were, have contrived some way to put the majority under their feet?

In short, the South became "solid" because it had to be—that is to say, so far as States with a large negro population were concerned. The negroes proved to be Republicans, as was expected by those who had made them voters. Their treatment by the whites operated to strengthen this tendency. A natural fear of an attempt at their reënslavement, cunningly cultivated by their unprincipled leaders, still further confirmed their opposition to the party which included their old masters. Broadly speaking, the blacks as a class were Republicans. This forced the whites as a class to be Democrats, in order that they might present a "united front." A feeling of sympathy led to a similar union of the whites, more or less complete, in States where the black element was not dangerously large. The hereditary drift in favor of Democracy added the only other element necessary to make the South solid.

How can this solidity be broken? Obviously, only by removing the cause which produced it. That cause was the massing of the negroes in one party. The recollection of negro misrule in South Carolina has hitherto checked an evidently strong tendency among the whites of that State to divide their votes, and has made the race almost unanimous in support of the regular Democratic ticket, although a large element has often at heart opposed it. What was a real danger in a commonwealth where the whites were

largely outnumbered by the blacks has been exaggerated out of all reason in States where the negro vote by itself could never threaten white dominance, and the bugbear has hitherto proved terrible enough to maintain Democratic supremacy everywhere.

The way in which this supremacy is to be finally overthrown has already been foreshadowed. Through the last decade, when the Democrats have controlled every Southern State, certain Congressional districts have either remained Republican or have been contested by the two parties on equal terms. Investigation will show the very striking and significant fact that, with two or three exceptions (like the heavily black sections along the coast of the two Carolinas, where the few whites have made no struggle for power), these Republican or doubtful districts have been districts which contained scarcely any blacks. That is to say, Republican representatives have been elected by white Southerners, without any help from black Republicans. Kentucky has always been considered a typical Southern Democratic State; yet in the mountain region which includes its south-eastern counties lies a district which has more often sent a Republican than a Democrat to the national Capitol since the war. In this district the white preponderance is so pronounced that the negroes constitute but a fourteenth of the whole population, which shows that the whites have divided almost equally between the two parties. The tendency, on the other hand, of a large negro element to unite the whites in the party opposed to the blacks may be seen in the same State of Kentucky. Nearer the heart of the commonwealth is a Congressional district where the negroes number nearly half as many souls as the whites, so that anything like such an even division of the whites as exists in the mountains would give the Republicans an overwhelming majority of the voters. But, in point of fact, this district is always strongly Democratic, the presence of the negroes having driven the whites together, and the proportion of the Republican vote to the total poll does not much exceed the proportion of the negro inhabitants to the whole population. Moreover, if the analysis be carried a stage farther, the surprising discovery is made that the only two counties in the mountain district which contain many blacks (in each case a little over a third of the whole population) are both Democratic, although it would take but a bare fourth of the whites to constitute with the blacks a majority of their voters. So strong is the influence of race feeling, even in a section where, for the most part, that issue is not raised.

The mountain country of eastern Tennessee also contains but a small negro element, and here, too, are Congressional districts which the Republicans either carry without difficulty or render always doubtful. The hill country of northern Georgia has a similar population, and here the white opponents of the Bourbon Democracy have repeatedly proved strong enough to elect Independents to Congress with but little help from black voters. The State of West Virginia is a still more conspicuous illustration of the tendency to division among the whites where the race issue is not brought home to them. The blacks here constitute less than five per cent. of the entire population, which is but a trifle larger than the proportion of blacks in New Jersey. The whites divide with apparently little

more regard to the blacks in the Southern than in the Northern State, and Cleveland carried each by a plurality which did not vary far from four thousand.

The reason why this normal and natural division of the whites between the parties exists in West Virginia and in the specified regions of the other States is evidently because in these parts of the South there is no fear of negro rule. It would be ridiculous to prate to the 132,777 male whites in West Virginia about the danger of their race being "dominated" by the 6384 blacks unless they vote the Democratic ticket, and they vote it or not, according as they believe or not in the Democratic party. Even in a State like Georgia, where the negroes stand to the whites in the ratio of five to six, the whites, in counties where they easily control the local administration by reason of the small black population, have not always been held to the support of the Democratic party by the strongest appeals of their white brethren in the black districts.

Obviously, all that is necessary to widen this division among the whites, which is already apparent in a few quarters, is to relieve them everywhere from the fear of negro rule in case they divide. It is useless to ridicule this fear. The fact must be recognized that it exists, and that it is the most potent factor in Southern politics. So long as the whites in South Carolina see the blacks ready to march to the polls in a solid column, and to vote almost as one man against the party which includes nine-tenths of the wealth and intelligence in the community, so long will the whites disregard all ordinary causes for division, and unite for what seems to them—and really is—the protection of the State. The massing of ignorance and poverty under one banner will marshal knowledge and property under another; and there never has been but one issue to such a contest, as there never can be. Each union is abnormal, but the one forces the other. Disintegration of the higher stratum cannot be expected until the lower has begun to split apart. A division of the negro vote is therefore the prerequisite to anything like a general division of the white vote.

Two motives have hitherto conspired to make the negroes Republicans—the two strongest motives which could influence an ignorant and impressible race—gratitude and fear. Gratitude, not only in the shape of thankfulness to the party which had freed and enfranchised them, but as "that lively sense of favors to come" which the traditional promise of "forty acres and a mule" had aroused. Fear, lest the race which had formerly held them in bondage still plotted for their reduction to servitude, and lest the elevation of the Democracy to power in the nation might mean their reënslavement.

Time dulls the edge of gratitude. Young colored men are now coming on the stage of action who were born in freedom, and who recognize no indebtedness to any party for their liberty. The "favors to come" from Republican rule have largely proved illusive. A Republican administration at Washington has practically left the negro in the South to shift for himself. On the other hand, the Democratic State governments have pleasantly disappointed him. The appropriations for schools have, almost without exception, been steadily increased above the amounts provided by Republican legislatures, and his children now have better teachers and longer terms than ten years ago.

A distinct advance in kindness of relations on the part of the white man is already so perceptible as to have favorably affected the negro's sentiment toward him.

The fear of harm from a Federal administration controlled by Democrats has survived. Natural enough in its origin, it has been sedulously cultivated by the leaders of their party as the easiest device for keeping the blacks solid for the Republicans. The support of that party by the negroes has never represented any intelligent acceptance of its principles; it has been only, so far as it was not an expression of gratitude, an attempt to secure a periodical renewal of an insurance policy against apprehended evil. The election of a Democratic President will emancipate the blacks from this nightmare of apprehension. The absurdity of their dread lest they might be put back into slavery by the Democrats will be demonstrated by the one convincing test of experience. A few months will suffice to prove its folly, even to the most timorous.

Freed from this overmastering fear, relieved from the sway of leaders who were for the most part Republicans "for revenue only," the negroes will, for the first time, be governed in casting their ballots by the same motives, good and bad, which sway voters elsewhere. Instead of blindly following some alien Federal office-holder against the whites among whom they live, they will, more or less quickly, come to accept the lead of their white neighbors. The negro already often seeks and follows the advice of his old master as to his material interests. Only the deep-seated fear of his master's party has kept him from heeding the white man's suggestions as to his political course. Convince him that the white man means him no harm in his relations as a citizen, and he will soon be ready to accept his leadership in public affairs, as he already often does in private.

Once divide the negro vote, and the "Solid South" is broken. The whites have only been held together by the union of the blacks. The elements of division among the whites already exist, as is clearly seen in West Virginia and parts of several other Southern States. Even now leaders of rival parties, or leaders of rival factions in the same party, divide the votes of whites in the mountain districts, where negroes are scarce; they will do the same thing in the cotton, rice, and sugar sections, where the negroes most abound, as soon as the latter escape from their bondage to a superstition, and are ready to divide their votes also.

Thus at last, for the first time, we shall see parties at the South separated by something else than the race line. This is by no means the same thing as saying that the South is at once going to become Republican. On the contrary, in most of the cotton States at least there may be, probably will be, at first a temporary depression of the Republican party below even its present weak condition. The Republican Federal office-holders, who have looked after its machinery, will disappear, and the machinery, with nobody paid to keep it in running order, will rust and decay. The blacks, convinced that they can vote the Democratic ticket as safely as the Republican, will be much more likely to do so, as their employers will make it seem for their interest to do so, precisely as Northern employers of white laborers do with their workmen. It will not be strange if next year, and perhaps the year after, the elections in some

Southern States are carried by the Democrats almost without opposition. But such a development will call for no tears from any friend of honest politics and good government. Indeed, the more rapid and complete the disintegration of the old Republican party of the South, with its rank and file composed almost exclusively of ignorant blacks, the sooner will come about the division of the Democratic whites in that section. When such a division occurs, the "Solid South" is broken, never to be reunited.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Edward P. Clark.

"The School of Dishonesty."

In the "Open Letter" department of *THE CENTURY* for November there is a contribution entitled, "The School of Dishonesty," which, while containing much that is true, is yet fallacious in that its charges will not admit of a general application, and must necessarily fail to account for the great prevalence of "crime in its multitude of forms."

No; "the primary cause of crime" does not come from mercantile life, which is no more a school of dishonesty than any other branch of labor. In answer to the question as to when the evil-doer first loses his sense of honesty and integrity, Mr. Tyrer says: "If we knew the facts, how often the answer would be: At the time that the offender was first placed in contact with the world, when from one cause or another he was first forced from the care of his parents, and compelled to contend alone for his existence; when he first entered upon his apprenticeship to the merchant, the manufacturer, the professional man, the farmer." In the visible facts of the case this is true, but the evil lies far deeper, and the crimes of dishonesty are but the outward manifestations of a diseased condition of society behind them. It is much like saying the eruptions in measles are the cause of the disease, when they are but the result of forces much deeper.

If the family and social life of the country to-day was what it should be, these outward schools of dishonesty would not exist. Where do the innocent and honest youths, upon whom Mr. Tyrer predicates his argument, come from? Are they the sons of "merchants, manufacturers, professional men, farmers," apprenticeship to whom means moral ruin? Do thistles produce figs?

It seems to me that the American youth of both sexes are trained to a false standard of life, to the accumulation of wealth — the boys to get it, the girls to marry it. This is the teaching of parents in all walks of life, from the cottage of the poor man to the mansion of the already rich. It is the worship of the almighty dollar, the golden calf, which is at the basis of so much crime. The youth goes out into the world "on the make," and the results soon follow. Until the American people live for something besides money, and have some other aim in life, "crime in its multitude of forms" will ever be with us, and laws to "compel men to do an honest business" will not need to be suggested. Statute laws cannot remedy the evil, for there are none to enforce them. The only remedy is the inculcating of a higher standard of life, according to the principles of Christianity; but here the work of the layman ends, and that of the preacher begins.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

P. H. Felker.