

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

George Bancroft on the Legal-Tender Decision.

TWO notable and clear-sounding bugle-calls in the battle for honest money have caught the public ear within a few weeks; namely, Mr. George Bancroft's "Plea for the Constitution of the United States of America Wounded in the House of its Guardians" (No. 53, "Harper's Handy Series"), and Secretary Manning's letter of March 2d, in reply to the Bland resolution passed by the House of Representatives on the 3d of February. Very great importance attaches to Mr. Manning's deliverance, by reason of his public position and of his political affiliations and authority. This is not the first time that New York has thrown down the gauntlet to the Democratic party. The act was deliberately and effectively performed by Seymour and Tilden in 1868. In a different way, but with equal boldness, Mr. Manning has challenged all the forces of soft money and short-weight money to deadly combat, for he exposes the vice of legal-tender paper with the same freedom, though not to the same length, as that of eighty-cent silver dollars.

It is to Mr. Bancroft's monograph that the reader's attention is invited in this article. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Juilliard vs. Greenman*, March 3, 1884, decided that the Constitution gives to Congress the power to make Government notes legal tender for private debts contracted both before and after the emission of such notes, and to do this in time of peace as well as in time of war. In making this decision the Court reversed its former decision in the case of *Hepburn vs. Griswold*, and by inference reversed the decision in the *Legal-Tender Cases*, which had apparently restricted the issue of legal-tender notes to times of war. It should be remarked that the decision in the *Legal-Tender Cases* reversed the decision in the *Hepburn* case, but not so completely as is done in the *Juilliard* case. In short, the Court has been contradicting itself on this class of questions for seventeen years, and has now made the worst possible decision that the subject matter admits of; for surely nothing can be worse than the declaration that Congress has the power to issue, to-day or to-morrow, a billion of greenbacks, appropriate them to any purpose or persons it likes, make them legal tender for private debts, and accomplish in this way a transfer of all the capital in the country from one class to another class without merit on the part of the one or demerit on the part of the other. Thus, although private property may not be taken for public use without just compensation (Article V., Amendments), yet it may be taken for private use whenever Congress pleases.

Against this monstrous doctrine Mr. Bancroft brings the resources of history, political economy, and law. Historically he shows that when the framers of the Constitution came to that branch of the instrument which treats of the public finances, they solemnly, and by a vote of nine States against two, cast out of it the power to "emit bills of credit." What were bills of credit? So effectually were they then and there slain

that when the war broke out, and when disputes arose over the national bank bill and the proposed tax on State bank issues, hardly anybody in public life knew what sort of thing was referred to in that clause of the Constitution which prohibits the States from issuing bills of credit. Mr. Bancroft shows by a careful upturning of the colonial records that bills of credit were nothing else than Government legal-tender notes; in some cases legal tender only for private debts contracted after the passage of the acts, and in others for those contracted both before and after. In twelve of the thirteen colonies experiments of this kind had been repeatedly made. In several instances they had been vetoed by the King. In all cases they had produced incalculable mischief, and had bred a feeling of loathing and disgust so nearly universal that when it was proposed to confer upon Congress the power to issue bills of credit, the proposition was voted down by nearly five to one.

The Supreme Court could not avoid noticing this significant fact. Anybody who will take the trouble to read Mr. Bancroft's chapters I., II., and III., and compare them with that portion of the opinion of the Court which relates to this branch of the discussion, will perhaps infer that if Mr. Justice Gray had set about proving that a horse-chestnut is a chestnut horse, he could have accomplished the latter feat quite as conclusively.

Mr. Bancroft's argument is divided into three main parts, and the first has been already summarized. The second relates to the assumption by the Court that "the power of impressing upon bills or notes of the Government for money borrowed the quality of being a legal tender for the payment of private debts was a power universally understood to belong to sovereignty in Europe and America, at the time of the framing and adoption of the Constitution of the United States." So sweeping a statement, one would think, ought to be accompanied by the citation of at least one case of the exercise of such power, or of the asserted right to exercise it, contemporaneous, or nearly so, with the adoption of our Constitution. No such case is mentioned. Mr. Bancroft challenges the statement in its length and breadth, affirming that neither in Great Britain nor in any country of Europe was any such power either exercised or claimed as one of the attributes of sovereignty. And Mr. Bancroft is right. The old and often abused power of the sovereign to change the measure of value by altering the weight or fineness of the coin, which is merely another form of legal-tender chicanery, had fallen into disrepute and disuse, and the new fashion of replenishing the treasury by first cheating his subjects and then licensing them to cheat each other had not yet come in vogue. It was not until July, 1811, that England passed a *stay law*; she never passed a legal-tender law, in the sense that our Supreme Court says that all European countries were in the habit of doing, or claiming the right to do.

The bank restriction of 1797, which was first an

order in Council, afterwards confirmed by Parliament, did not make Bank of England notes legal tender. It merely exempted a debtor tendering notes in payment of his debt from liability to arrest and distraint by summary process, leaving the creditor to pursue his claim by ordinary process of law. (See Tooke, v. 522; also Sumner on the Bank Restriction, in his "American Currency.") Accordingly Lord King, who had been a strenuous opponent of the restriction act on principle, notified his tenants in 1811 that he should require payment of his rents in gold or in Bank of England notes of equal value. The notes were then at sixteen per cent. discount. Thereupon Lord Stanhope introduced a bill in Parliament, which passed both houses, making it illegal to pay or receive gold at more than its nominal value. Lord King was thus checkmated. A bill abolishing the courts of justice would have had the same effect.

When the bank charter was renewed in 1833, the notes were (for the first time, we believe) made legal tender between individuals, but under conditions which required and provided for their prompt redemption in gold. The history of the time shows that the legal-tender provision was adopted merely to prevent the needless transportation of coin from one place to another, and not for the purpose of asserting or exercising a "power universally understood to belong to sovereignty."

Mr. Bancroft's third point is a noble defense of the limitations of the Constitution. The Court has assumed that the Government of the United States has powers over and above those granted by the Constitution. Since the power to make its own notes legal tender is not one of the granted powers, it must be derived from some source outside of that instrument. This source is indicated by the Court as being the sovereignty which it possesses in common with other governments. But every jurist of eminence, from the foundation of the government down to the present Supreme Court, and including the latter, "composed identically, man for man, of the very same nine men who constitute it now," have, at one time or another, held that "the Government of the United States is one of delegated, limited, and enumerated powers; therefore every valid act of Congress must find in the Constitution some warrant for its passage." Where is the power to make its notes legal tender "enumerated"? When did the thirteen colonies "delegate" to it any such power?

Mr. Bancroft's words are those of sorrow rather than of anger. The gravity of the subject and the respect due to the institutions of one's country forbid the use of sarcasm in this discussion. Else how readily would such a paragraph as the following, from the second of the three decisions, lend itself to such treatment (the italics are our own):

"It is hardly correct to speak of a standard of value. The Constitution does not speak of it. It contemplates a standard for that which has gravity or extension; but *value is an ideal thing*. The coinage acts fix its unit as a dollar, but the gold or silver thing we call a dollar is *in no sense a standard of a dollar. It is a representative of it.*"—Legal-Tender Cases, 12 Wallace, 553.

The possible consequences of the legal-tender decision are alarming. Granted the power to make Government notes legal tender in the discretion of Con-

gress, and granted that Congress agrees with the Court in holding that value is an ideal thing, and that the gold or silver thing we call a dollar is only a representative of a dollar, what may not happen? Just now silver is the popular delusion, but will it always remain such? It certainly will not if the public can ever be brought into personal contact with it so as to experience the inconveniences of weight and bulk which have caused it to be expelled from modern commerce. No, the cheapness and convenience of paper will outbid everything that silver offers to a generation well up in the philosophy of legal tender. As we write these lines (March 9), our eyes fall upon an interview in the daily papers with Mr. T. V. Powderly, Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, a person for whom we have considerable respect, although we never chanced to meet him. Mr. Powderly, pooh-poohing the suggestion of the reporter that the Knights might some time become a political party, speaks of himself as a Greenbacker. The thought occurs to us that if Mr. Powderly and his friends ever should change their minds so far as to go into politics, and if they ever should control the law-making power, they would find in the decision which Mr. Bancroft has so eloquently pleaded against the means and lawful warrant for more widespread and effectual spoliation than all the confiscations of the French Revolution.

James Russell Lowell's Bible Argument.

It is not too much to say that the scene in the room of the Senate Committee on Patents on the morning of Friday, January 29, 1886, was one of the most interesting and significant events of our generation. We refer to the hearing there given by committees of both Houses of Congress to James Russell Lowell, President of the American Copyright League, who presented in person his argument in favor of International Copyright. The journals of the country have already printed Lowell's words, but no report, verbatim or otherwise, could re-create the atmosphere of this remarkable scene. The legislative power, that very power hitherto appealed to in vain through generations of authors and Congressmen, was here confronted in behalf of the intellectual world, in behalf of public morality, and in the name of common honesty and common sense, by one of the chief living exponents of literature,—who is also one of the chief citizens of the Republic. Nothing could exceed the tact, good-nature, ready wit, and hurtling sarcasm with which Lowell took the field. A gentleman well known in the Washington lobby, and opposed to the measure, had been permitted to precede Mr. Lowell. This, as it were, gave for his lance, at the most fortunate moment, an embodied foe; though we doubt whether the subject of his genial and exquisite scorn will ever realize that, like one of the heroes of Dante's "Inferno," he was then and there transfixed for all time. The keenest thrusts were accompanied by a twinkle of the eye, a pleasant falling inflection of the voice, or a smile, that was like the glistening of a Damascus blade, with an edge as sharp as its glitter. It was not only in direct assault that Lowell proved his ability, but throughout the long session by answering quickly and ably the questions coming to him from every side, by turning off queries

too vague for answer with, for instance, some quotation from Charles Lamb, and himself asking questions that went to the marrow of the subject. When, in answer to a question, the President of the League answered, "I do not know of any way in which nations distinguish themselves except by their brains; that is, permanently to make an impression upon all mankind," those present could not help thinking how the truth of this statement was illustrated by the author of the "Biglow Papers" and the "Commemoration Ode," whose name to-day is known among the cultured throughout the world quite as familiarly as that of any battle ever fought under the American flag.

But the great value and force of Lowell's argument lay in the fact that he lifted up the whole discussion from the level of interests and expediencies into the clear air of duties and moralities. While he said with all distinctness and with iteration that, so far as human foresight could determine, the granting of foreign copyright would benefit American literature, would not make books dear, and would be for the good of the whole country, with still greater emphasis he upheld the leading issue. Said Lowell: "I myself take the moral view of the question. I believe that this is a simple question of morality and justice; that many of the arguments which Mr. — used are arguments which might be used for picking a man's pocket. One could live a great deal cheaper, undoubtedly, if he could supply himself from other people without any labor or cost. But at the same time — well, it was not called honest when I was young, and that is all I can say. I cannot help thinking that a book which was, I believe, more read when I was young than it is now, is quite right when it says that 'Righteousness exalteth a nation.' I believe this is a question of righteousness. I do not wish to urge that too far, because that is considered too ideal, I believe. But that is my view of it, and if I were asked what book is better than a cheap book, I should answer that there is one book better than a cheap book, and that is a book honestly come by."

The moral question is, and always has been, the leading issue in this controversy, so long left unsettled through the clamoring of narrow and selfish interests — interests too often able to command the degrading subserviency of brains fitted to nobler uses. It is the moral question that has most interested the thoughtful and honorable portion of the community — which, let us not doubt, is, in fact, the great body of the reading public of these United States.

The American Opera Company.

AFTER one of the early rehearsals of "The Taming of the Shrew," by the American Opera Company, a member of the orchestra said, "That's splendid music; it's too good for opera." The remark shows what opera is often supposed to be — an exhibition of a few stars against an insignificant background. The interest of the performance is monopolized by three or four artists; the orchestra is only an accessory; the chorus only bridge over intervals, and help things along. For this kind of opera the elaborate instrumental music of "The Taming of the Shrew" would perhaps have been too good. But our contemptuous

fiddler found out presently that opera was not to be given by the American company on the easy old plan. The representations under Theodore Thomas's direction were distinguished for the careful manner in which all the agencies of musical and dramatic expression were fitted together in an organized work of art. Parts which are commonly neglected as subordinate were raised to their proper rank as factors in the general result. Principals, chorus, and orchestra, poetry, action, and decoration, blended harmoniously in the complex structure. Some of the individual artists were excellent; but when we recall the performances, it is not so much of *Orpheus*, *Elsa*, and *Lohengrin* that we think, as of the perfect and finely balanced combination which gave to the interpretations as a whole their beautiful expressiveness.

This close knitting together of all the parts — something much more than we usually mean when we speak of the *ensemble* — was the characteristic note of the representations which Thomas began at the New York Academy of Music last January. He plays opera as he would play a symphony. To him it is a symphony of voices and instruments. The incomparable orchestra, the fresh young chorus, always correct, sure, and in tune, the whole assembly of stars and satellites, respond to his command, and respond together, exactly as the well-trained band answers him, as if by one impulse, in Beethoven's "Eroica." Thus it is not only in the singing of soprano or tenor that we feel the glow of passion, but the whole mass is burning with magnetic fervor. There is an eloquent description of the proper manner of directing an orchestral performance in the preface to one of Liszt's "Symphonic Poems," and we often thought of it as we watched Thomas last winter. Assigning to each voice, each instrument, each group of voices and instruments, the prominence and the special style of delivery which befitted each at the moment, the conductor brought out those elusive refinements of expression which convey the changing emotion, those subtle variations of color, rhythm, emphasis, and contrast which give nerve and accent to the music, and those nice distinctions between the graces which adorn a score and the broadly marked phrases which carry its essential meaning. This symphonic method of playing an opera cannot be taught by written directions on the musical page; it depends upon the conductor's insight, sympathy, and poetical temperament, together with an exceptional power of control over his subordinates. Many intelligent conductors who have the requisite delicacy of feeling never acquire the art of communicating their intentions to the performers, and so they fail.

There was a remarkable example of Thomas's control of the whole stage in the Invocation of the first act of "Lohengrin." With slight gestures he restrained one part, enlivened and accented another, disentangled the theme from the crowded score, heaped effect upon effect until the swelling orchestra quivered with sensibility; then, lifting his hand towards the scene, he loosed little by little the growing tide of voices, and at last hurled all the impatient forces together in an outburst which thrilled the house. Of course this remarkable crescendo is indicated in the score; but just think how many years we had to wait before a conductor brought out its full splendor. The "Lohen-

grin" effect, however, which was mainly dynamical, was far surpassed in Gluck's "Orpheus," where Thomas's capacity as an interpreter of great music was signally illustrated. The very simplicity of the music, as noble and severe in its outlines as the sculptures of Phidias, makes it peculiarly difficult of execution. Mistakes cannot be covered up; phrases cannot be slurred; in Gluck's open scores every technical imperfection shows like a great blot. The poetical spirit of the work, moreover, is in total contrast with the violent impulses which dominate the modern lyrical stage and have formed the style of nearly all our operatic performers. Here we have deep natural feeling in place of fiery passion, an almost religious solemnity in place of sensuous excitement, and a rigidly plain and direct mode of expression both on the stage and in the orchestra. Yet the exquisite performance at the Academy of Music was as true in sentiment and as perfect in execution as if the American Opera Company had been studying Gluck all their lives. The public, who had seen nothing like this before in New York, were both fascinated and astonished — most of all by the lovely third act, where the sense of repose, of dreamy tranquillity, of beauty almost too serene and delicate for human enjoyment, broods over the Elysian Fields, and even the grief of Orpheus seems to burn with a purer light in the presence of the Happy Shades. The scene is filled with exquisite passages, all of a somewhat ethereal character; and it does not end with a dramatic situation, but fades away like a vision. How tender and gentle, yet how profoundly emotional it all was! It was not a performance to bring a prima donna before the curtain, but it left people in tears.

There we saw great conducting! There we had also an earnest of the high artistic purpose with which the new enterprise seems to have taken up its work. An American Opera Company which begins its career with such an achievement takes rank at once as a very important institution.

A Readjustment of the Industrial Order.

IN the present crisis of the labor agitation, one of the encouraging signs is the earnestness with which the clergy as a class are taking hold of the matter. Not long ago one of the professional labor reformers made the assertion that there were but one or two clergymen in the country who had given any serious attention to the labor question. The remark was very far from being true at the time when it was made: apart from the professors of political economy, the ministers of the gospel have given the subject more intelligent study than any other class of professional men. But during the last year their interest in the matter has been greatly quickened; it is the uppermost theme in their assemblies; and the duty of the Christian church to enforce the obligations which wealth and power involve, and to preach to all classes the gospel of goodwill, is clearly discerned. Whatever reason there may have been for the charge that the church was on the side of capital in this conflict, it is evident that the pastors of the churches are now generally and heartily endeavoring to remove that reproach, and to assert with all fidelity the rights of the weak and the duties of the strong. The fact that the moral power of the

Christian church is now exerted in behalf of justice and humanity encourages the hope that a peaceful solution of the difficulty may be reached in due season.

The state of the public mind with respect to this question is indicated by a remarkable series of letters published during the past three or four months in "The Age of Steel," a journal of St. Louis devoted to the interests of the iron manufacturers. This journal had sent out a large number of circulars to men of all callings in all parts of the country, asking these five questions.

"1. Are strikes and lockouts a necessary feature of the wage system?"

"2. Is arbitration the necessary coupling between capital and labor?"

"3. May we not hope to discover some more satisfactory and equitable basis for the division of the profits arising from industrial enterprises?"

"4. Does the remedy lie in the direction of industrial partnerships — a mutual participation of all concerned in the profits arising from production?"

"5. Is productive coöperation possible in the United States?"

These questions were addressed to manufacturers, merchants, ministers, teachers of political economy, the heads of the labor bureaus of the several States, the chiefs of the various labor unions, intelligent workingmen whose names were known, and many others who were supposed to be interested in the subject. The great majority of the answers are full, frank, and intelligent, and it would be a good service if they could be compiled in tract form and widely distributed among workingmen and employers. The general impression among the workingmen that employers as a class are altogether conscienceless and careless of the interests of those whom they employ, would be modified by the reading of these letters.

It is true that the letters contain some stupid and heartless utterances; but most of these employers of labor show a true apprehension of the seriousness of the situation, and a disposition to consider the interests of their men. Some of them frankly concede that the condition and prospects of the laboring classes are not all that could be desired, and that civilization owes to them a fairer chance and a larger hope. As for the experts who take part in this symposium, — the economists and the statisticians, — they generally agree in the opinion that there is a labor question of great urgency. Not one of them appears to think the prevailing discontent unreasonable; the opinion that something ought to be done and can be done to improve the condition of the working people is freely expressed. To the question whether some more satisfactory and equitable division of the product of labor may not be found, Professor Henry Carter Adams replies that "such a discovery is essential to the further development of our Christian civilization"; and Professor J. B. Clark answers: "The competition which is the basis of the orthodox political economy is already a thing of the past in the sphere of wage-adjustments. It has been vitiated by combinations on both sides. True competition gave a rude approximation to justice in assigning the rewards of industry. The wreck of a competitive system, with the true competition left out, approaches more and more to the ignoble condition from which civilization has emerged.

. . . The wage-system, from which the redeeming element has departed, ought to give place, in many industries, to a system based partly on the coöperative principle."

Nearly all of these writers urge the arbitration of labor disputes. The workmen and the employers are about equally unanimous in the opinion that reason is better than force in the adjustment of these difficulties. As to the feasibility of pure coöperation there is much doubt, but the method of profit-sharing is strongly advocated by most of them. Out of forty-two replies five pronounce this system impracticable, seven have no opinion about it, and twenty-seven are clear in their affirmation of the wisdom of the method. This expression reveals a remarkable advance of public opinion. During the last few months the thoughts of men have ripened fast. Those who have long been urging the principle of participation, and who have been accustomed to hear an almost unbroken chorus of skeptical and contemptuous dissent, will read these letters with considerable satisfaction. The St. Louis organ of the Knights of Labor, in referring to this series of letters, is not far from the mark when it says: "Taken altogether, it is a very cheering output of public sentiment in favor of considering the workman's rights. Many of those who speak out so boldly in favor of arbitration and industrial partnership now, would a few years ago have scoffed at the idea."

Some of the employers in this list show by their works their faith in the participatory method. A few of the

iron-masters mention the fact that wages are regulated by the price of iron. A great firm of merchant millers in Minneapolis testify that they have practiced profit-sharing for several years with excellent results. Mr. J. G. Batterson, President of the New England Granite Company, forwards a sketch of the plan on which the quarries of his company at Westerly are now worked, by which the workmen have a stipulated share in the net profits of the business, in addition to their regular wages. The letter of Mr. Batterson, in which he explains this method to his men, is full of a humane and benignant wisdom. "I sympathize," he says, "with the laudable ambition of the skilled workman to emancipate himself from the thralldom of a service in which he has no other interest than the daily wages and who aspires to that identity of interest in results which begets self-respect, and a worthy pride in the success of his own company or corporation." It is a mistake, he insists, for labor to suppose that by any kind of combinations it can coerce capital into its service, and equally a mistake for capital to assume that it can force labor into its service and monopolize the profits; satisfaction and contentment will only come "when there is a just recognition of the values contributed by each, and an equitable division of the same."

Such utterances are full of promise. If the spirit that breathes through them should find constant and consistent expression in the words and the conduct of all our employers, the labor question would soon have a complete and final solution.

OPEN LETTERS.

The True South vs. The Silent South.

BURKE said that no man could draw an indictment broad enough to cover a whole nation, but Mr. G. W. Cable has accomplished it in very brief space, in "The Silent South." One charge in substance is that the Southern courts and juries, not in a few scattered and occasional cases, but habitually and generally, prostitute their offices and perjure themselves to convict the blacks of crime; that they affix a punishment, on the average, five times as great upon a negro as upon a white man for the same offense in the same courts; that whereas the penalty for burglary is greater than for larceny, the courts indict and convict a negro of burglary who has only committed larceny, or, indeed, no offense at all; and that these enormities are perpetrated in obedience to a public sentiment in favor of oppressing the negro.

That far more blacks than whites, in proportion to numbers, in the Southern States are convicted of crime, is unhappily only too true. This must of necessity result from one of two causes: either the blacks are the criminal class, or justice is prostituted, and judges, witnesses, jurors, and people indulge easily and without scruple in perjury. Mr. Cable rejects the former solution and accepts the latter, and this in face

of the fact that no man anywhere in the United States can be tried for felony without being furnished with a copy of the indictment and confronted with his accusers, and having the aid of counsel and the right to summon witnesses.

I propose to test the truth and accuracy of Mr. Cable's statements by official documents, which happily are at hand, and to show that he has made the gross-est misstatements, to the prejudice of the Southern whites, in many important particulars.

He opens his indictment by charging that for larceny alone "such sentences are imposed as twelve, fourteen, fifteen, twenty, and in one case forty years of penal service, whose brutal tasks and whippings kill in an average of five years."

No such penalties as these are allowed by law in any Southern State, unless for a second offense. I have examined the criminal codes of most of them, and find that in Georgia, to which Mr. Cable particularly refers, the general crime of larceny is divided into: 1. Theft or larceny from the person. 2. Simple theft or larceny. 3. Theft or larceny from the house. 4. Theft or larceny after a trust or confidence has been delegated or reposed.

The penalties are: Horse-stealing—confinement in the penitentiary not less than four nor more than

twenty years. Cattle-stealing—not less than two nor more than four years. Hog-stealing—not less than two nor more than four years. Larceny from the person—not less than two nor more than five years. Larceny from the house—not less than one nor more than ten years.

Want of space prevents similar quotations from other codes in the South, but in none of them are such penalties allowed as Mr. Cable indicates, and it is not credible that any judge would venture to put upon the records of his court a sentence against a prisoner for a longer term than the law affixed.

Proceeding with the counts of the indictment in the order made, we come to this:

“Larceny is the peculiar crime of the poorest classes everywhere. In *all** penitentiaries out of the South, the convicts for this offense *always** exceed, and generally double, the number of convicts for burglary. Larceny has long been called the peculiar crime of the negro criminal. What then shall we say to the facts, deduced from official records, that in the Georgia penitentiary and convict camps there were, in 1882, twice as many colored convicts for burglary as larceny, and that they were, moreover, serving sentences averaging nearly twice the average of the white convicts in the same places for the same crime.”

Not only in the South, but everywhere else, burglary is regarded as a more serious offense than larceny, and the penalty affixed to it is greater. But Mr. Cable says that the courts, the officers of the law, and the juries take advantage of this difference of penalty to send a negro to the penitentiary who has been guilty of larceny or some other inferior crime. Fortunately, the records are accessible to refute this statement, and the examples of the two great States of New York and Ohio are sufficient for the purpose.

Official reports give the following facts on this point: That in the two Northern States of New York and Ohio there were eight hundred and ninety convicts for burglary and only seven hundred and seventy for larceny; and in the four Southern States of South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Georgia there were seven hundred and forty-seven for burglary and seven hundred and eighty for larceny. In the Northern States quoted the convicts for burglary outnumber those for larceny, and in the Southern States just the reverse is the case, and thus this count in the indictment is successfully refuted.

The next count states, “We are far from overlooking the depravity of the negro. But those who rest on this cheap explanation are bound to tell us which shows the greater maliciousness: for one man to be guilty of hog-stealing, or for twelve jurors to send him to the coal-mines for twenty years for doing it?” I have already shown that such a sentence as this could not be rendered in any Southern State; unless possibly in a rare and occasional case, where the convict, after being once tried and sentenced, continued to repeat the offense, each time incurring an increased penalty. And the world—even its philanthropists—will not be inclined to think that a persistent and irreclaimable criminal like this is entitled to expect anything but the maximum punishment.

Next comes this from Mr. Cable’s prolific reservoir:

“In Georgia, outside of her prisons, there are eight whites to every seven blacks. Inside, there are eight whites to every eighty blacks. The depravity of the negro may explain away much, but we cannot know how much

* Italicised only here.

while there also remain in force the seductions of our atrocious convict-lease system, and our attitude of domination over the blacks, so subtly dangerous to our own integrity.”

By this he means to say that courts and juries in Georgia send colored men to the penitentiary merely to afford a few citizens the opportunity of getting convict labor.

But if it can be demonstrated that in the Northern States as well as in the Southern crime is much more common and flagrant among the colored race than the white, and that in this respect the sections stand on a common platform, then Mr. Cable will be compelled to fall back upon the proposition that the black man and woman are more prone to crime than the white. Once more the official records are needed, and referring to them, and taking some of leading States, both North and South, what is developed?

In the Alabama penitentiary there are about seven and a half colored convicts to one white. In Georgia the ratio is nine colored to one white. But in the District of Columbia, according to the census of 1880, there are 115,446 whites and 62,596 blacks, or nearly two whites to one black. And yet from January, 1881 (I quote from data given in the “Agricultural Review” for May, 1884, the accuracy of which I have verified by personal examination), to November, 1882, there were two hundred and fifty-three convictions for felony in the District of Columbia—sixty-four whites and one hundred and eighty-nine colored.

In the State of New York there are 5,016,022 whites and 95,104 colored people,—a proportion of about seventy-seven to one. But in the three State prisons of Sing Sing, Auburn, and Clinton there are 2395 whites and 178 blacks—about thirteen and a half whites to one black. Or, to state it as Mr. Cable does, in New York, outside of her State prisons, there are seventy-seven white persons to one black; inside, there are only thirteen and a half to one.

In Ohio there are 3,117,920 whites and 79,900 blacks—a ratio of thirty-nine to one. In the penitentiary there are six hundred and three white convicts and ninety-four colored—a ratio of six and a half to one. And in all the State prisons there were 1081 white convicts and 190 colored—a ratio of five and two-thirds to one. Again stating it as Mr. Cable does, in Ohio, outside of prisons, there are thirty-nine whites to one black; inside, six whites to one black.

In the city where our national Government is located, where Congress is effusive in its care of the colored people, where Howard University bestows its benign influence, and in the great States of New York and Ohio, substantially the same state of things exists, as to the conviction of the colored race, as prevails in the Southern States. This being the case, there can be but one explanation: North as well as South the colored race furnishes largely more criminals than the white, and Southern courts, juries, witnesses, and people must stand acquitted in the minds of all fair men of the charges Mr. Cable brings against them.

It is in Georgia that Mr. Cable fancies he finds most to condemn. One of his main causes of complaint is that the courts inflict on colored convicts for larceny sentences five times as great as on white convicts at the same places. But the official report of the Georgia penitentiary and convict-camps for the period from

October 20, 1882, to October 20, 1884, is conclusive on the subject. I took one of the penitentiaries, where there were five hundred and thirty-five convicts, and went carefully through the sentences for larceny, putting the whites in one column and the blacks in another, and then ascertained the average of each. I found the average sentence of the white convicts for larceny was actually greater than of the blacks! That for the whites was six years and one month, and for the blacks five years and six months.

The most cruel of all the charges which Mr. Cable has published against the people of the South is when he characterizes its penal service as one "whose brutal tasks and whippings kill in an average of five years." This is predicated specially of Georgia, but the official reports are once more available to contradict and disprove, in the most conclusive manner possible, this dreadful aspersion. Dr. Westmoreland, the physician having general charge of all the penitentiaries, reports that from the 1st of January, 1884, to October 20th of the same year there were sixteen hundred and thirty-nine convicts in all the penitentiaries, and during that period there were only thirty-eight deaths—twenty-eight from acute or ordinary diseases, five from chronic or malignant diseases, and five from accidents or violence. This is really a low rate of mortality, and will compare favorably with that existing in any city in the United States, among the colored people. It is only twenty-two to the thousand, while the mortuary reports for the cities named below show in every case a greater percentage:

Richmond	37	to the 1000
Norfolk	34	" "
Lynchburg	30	" "
Washington	32	" "

Mr. Cable speaks of the mines at which some of the convicts are employed, in Georgia, as particularly fatal to life, and denounces the treatment that the colored convicts receive there. But let Dr. Westmoreland and Mr. Helms, the Marshal of Georgia, tell the facts about these mines. I quote from the report relative to the Dade coal-mines. There were three hundred and seventy-five convicts working at these mines, and from January 1, 1884, to October 20, 1884, there were only two deaths— one from cancer and one from accident. The physician says:

"The above table of sanitary statistics shows most excellent results, particularly as to the mortuary list, as not one death has occurred from ordinary camp or acute diseases— nothing, certainly, that could be attributed to the management of the camps or their surroundings. One was killed from slate falling on him, and the other died from cancer. These favorable results, in my opinion, are due to three causes: First, to the humane and intelligent management of the officers directly in control of the camps,—I mean the physician and superintendent of the camps; secondly, to the well-arranged and roomy prisons and hospitals; and thirdly, not the least, and perhaps above all, to the existence of a vegetable garden convenient to the camps, of one hundred acres, in the highest state of cultivation, thus furnishing the year round that variety of fresh vegetables so essential to the health of men in confinement."

And Mr. Helms, the Marshal of Georgia, in reply to a question asked him by myself as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the old penitentiary system and the convict-lease system, answers:

"Your second question is, Is the treatment of the convicts as humane under the present system as under the former penitentiary system? I have no hesitation in

answering that it is more humane. They have a great deal more outdoor exercise, they are as well fed, they are as comfortably clad, they are as humanely treated, and worked as moderately, as they ever were within the walls of the penitentiary, under the former system; and being out in the open air a great deal more, their health is generally better, and they are more cheerful and contented than the convicts under the former system were."

The two races are nearly equal in numbers in the Southern States; the blacks have the right of suffrage and all the other political rights that belong to the whites. Upon the conduct of the negro depends in a large degree the destiny of the white man; and no one who is not given over to a blind hatred of the Southern white race can believe that they desire anything but the success and prosperous advancement of those who are to be their neighbors and coadjutors in the matters that interest both.

Mr. Cable imputes much "domination" over the blacks to the Southern whites. If he means this term as synonymous with oppression or wrong, I deny it emphatically. But the Southern whites are Anglo-Saxons, and in one sense that race dominates all others with which it comes in contact— red, black, or white. By virtue of superior energy and force of character they remand other people to a secondary and subordinate position. In this sense, and this only, does "domination" exist in the Southern States.

I ask fair and candid men everywhere to judge the Southern whites by official facts, which certainly afford the best tests by which to measure their conduct to their colored fellow-citizens.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

John W. Johnston.

EX-SENATOR JOHNSTON seems to me to be a very careless reader. In "The Silent South" I presented certain official facts which on their face appear to justify the complaints of the colored people that they do not get justice in court in the Southern States. And then I wrote, "Shall we from these facts draw hasty conclusions? We draw none. If any one can explain them away, in the name of humanity let us rejoice to see him do so. We are far from charging any one with deliberately prostituting justice." Does that sound like an indictment?

The utmost I can be said to have charged I can condense here into an axiom: that nowhere on earth can one people hold another people in political or civil subjection, and forcibly monopolize the administration of the laws, without putting judges and juries into constant imminent peril of distorting justice. If an axiom is an indictment, what does the gentleman propose to do?

That he reads without due care is still plainer when he reports me as charging Georgia courts with "affixing an average punishment five times as great upon a negro as upon a white man," etc. I did and do say that for burglary the average sentence of the colored Georgia convict (1880-82) was twice as great as the white convict's; a statement the gentleman makes no attempt to refute. "This, too,"—I quote from "The Silent South,"—"notwithstanding a very large number of short sentences to colored men, and a difference between their longest and shortest terms twice as great as in the case of the whites."

Neither does the gentleman attempt to refute this. Now the difference between the average sentences of

white and colored convicts for *larceny* is almost nothing; but the preposterous difference between *lowest and highest sentences* of colored convicts for larceny was thirty-nine years, while in the case of white convicts for the same crime it was but eight years; and thirty-nine lacks but one-fortieth of being five times eight; which is what I say in "The Silent South": "For larceny the difference is five times as great." One has only to add this short, simple sentence on to Mr. Johnston's first fine-print quotation of me, to see how unnecessary it was for him to have misconstrued its meaning; for that is its place in the original text.

I shall assume that all Mr. Johnston's citations of law are correct; but when he cites the letter of law merely to follow it with the assumption that because the laws are so and so therefore judges and juries could not and do not pass excessive sentences upon colored men, I can only point him to the official reports of the prisons, and without venturing to impeach any one pray him to explain them away. He offers but one explanation, and takes no pains to make it good. It is merely his assumption that the heavy sentences of black men are in cases "where the convict, after being once tried and sentenced, continued to repeat the offense, each time incurring an increased penalty." But what are the facts? Even this would not explain the gross difference between white and black men's sentences, for surely the reconviotions are not all and always black. But what are the facts? In the Georgia penitentiaries, October, 1882, there were 1243 convicts; 736 of the 1074 adults were under sentences of seven years and upward, yet only four per cent,* 50, were reconvioted criminals. One child of thirteen years was under a twenty years' sentence for burglary, and one youth of seventeen was serving twenty-six years for the same crime committed in the night. It is a confession of fatal weakness for the gentleman to appeal only to laws that prescribe what must be, and pass by the official reports that tell what actually is. If the laws say one thing and the prison reports say another, why are not the *prisons* called upon to explain? But in all this controversy the prison lessees are treated as tenderly as though they were honorable men engaged in a decent calling; and my critics spend their diligence to show that the cruelties officially recorded in these prison reports are fortified by statutes. Truth is, slavery and slave-holding fostered, and has bequeathed to the population of the Southern States, both black and white, a crudity and cruelty of criminal laws foreign to the humane spirit of the times. For stealing a horse a man can, under these laws, be sent for 20 years to a penitentiary, where in October, 1882, among the 218 convicts on sentence of 20, 30, 35, and 40 years, and for life, *not one had survived over 19 years of sentence*, and only four had lived out 17 years. There were then there 1126 convicts under time sentences, of whom 162 were under sentences of 15 to 40 years — that is, about every seventh man; yet in the whole two years preceding that date, out of 390 prisoners discharged only *two* had served 15 years of prison life, and none had been in longer. In Virginia, the *least* penalty for a larceny of fifty-one dollars' worth of property is three years in one of these penitentiaries.

* See Biennial Report of the principal keeper of Georgia Penitentiary, October, 1882, p. 7.

Law or no law, the facts are terrible. In October, 1882, there were in the Georgia penitentiaries (among many others under higher sentences) 79 convicts under sentences of from only one to only three years for committing and for attempts to commit all the gravest and foulest crimes on the calendar. One ought to suppose, therefore, that for first offenses in the various forms of pilfering called larceny three years would be deemed an excessive sentence; and yet, of the 216 convicts for larceny, only 37 were under sentence of less than three years, while 62 were serving terms of from 10 to 40 years. If men found guilty of murder — let the palliations be what they may — can expiate their fault in two years, how much or often must a poor wretch steal to deserve a sentence which no physical strength can live out?

It has not been my choice to lay special stress upon criminal affairs in Georgia. In South Carolina the law is, in one direction, at least, more cruel than in Georgia. In my essay on the Convict Lease System a passage that to the hasty eye seems to apply to the Georgia prisons is meant, as a more careful reading will show, to apply to the system at large. The statement is that "Six men were under sentence for simple assault and battery — mere fisticuffing — one of two years, two of five years, one of six years, one of seven, and one of eight." This record really belongs to the South Carolina penitentiary for the year. I make these statements because I am an American citizen, and these things are happening in America, and are done by Americans in the jury-box and on the judge's bench. It is nothing to me that they happen in this quarter or in that, so long as they have happened and are happening in our common country. In other States of the Union the laws are less cruel and the prisons far more so. Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas affix a maximum sentence of five years where Georgia imposes twenty; but their penitentiaries —!

The inference which the gentleman draws from the first paragraph of mine quoted by him in fine print is a false inference. As to his figures and mine, let us see: In the Maryland penitentiary, in 1883, the larceny convicts exceeded 260; the burglars were only 59. In the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania there were received, in 1884, 167 larceny convicts and only 49 burglars. In the Western, in 1883, the larceny convicts were 104, the burglars 35. In the Colorado State penitentiary, December, 1882, the larceny convicts numbered 118, the burglars 32. Of course, when a State has a number of correctional institutions, we must combine the statistics of all to find the true proportion between the numbers convicted of different crimes. In New York State, it is not enough to engross the tables of Sing Sing, Auburn, and Clinton; for the State has besides several other penal and reformatory institutions, — in New York city, for instance, in Elmira, and, I believe, in Rochester; and these are just the sort to which culprits guilty of larceny would be sent to avoid throwing them into contact with the burglars of the State penitentiaries. The same is true of Ohio; but the same is not true of Georgia, though certain Georgians are making a noble effort to bring it about. In the Michigan State prison, September 30, 1883, the year's admissions showed 71 larceny convicts against 35 burglars; in the same State's reformatory at Ionia, the previous year, the larceny convicts were

295 as against 44 burglars; while the engrossed criminal statistics of the province of Ontario for 1882 show the commitments for larceny 1401, and for burglary 63. I have not said that the disproportion of these two crimes in Georgia prisons extended to South Carolina and other neighboring States. For the gentleman to engross with the prison records of Georgia the prison records of other States with which Georgia courts and laws, judges, and jurors have nothing to do, merely to get a more favorable showing, is worse than no explanation. And even if this were justifiable, he does not by this device reach anywhere near a normal proportion; so, after all, he only drags the prison systems of these other States into the mire without pulling Georgia's out.

As to the gentleman's misinterpretation of the second paragraph quoted from me in small type: I do not charge judges and jurors with consciously or maliciously sending colored men to penitentiaries who should not go there; but I cannot take up the official report of any prison where caste-rule and the convict-lease system dominate without finding it full of facts and figures whose accusations no Christian community ought to leave unanswered for a day. Look, for instance, at the number of colored men and boys sent to these penitentiaries for slight offenses; for when not even extreme youth is saved from such cruel sentences as eight, ten, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five years for crimes against property, and older men get even thirty, thirty-five, and forty, it seems to me such figures assert that those who are found in the same places for technically the same crimes, on sentences of but one, two, and three years, *must* have been comparatively trivial offenders. And when, on the other hand, I see in these prisons white offenders against property serving *heavy* sentences,—though not nearly so heavy as the black man's heavier sentences,—it seems to me such figures imply that white men steal and break and rob in those communities, and when the misdemeanor is great are brought to even a cruel justice, if such a thing can be called justice, but that when the offense is light the offender must be dark, or the penitentiary gets him not. Cruel implication! enough to arouse the indignation of any community! But whence comes it? From me? Nay, from the official returns of the prisons themselves! In October, 1882, the Georgia penitentiaries held under sentences of only one, two, or three years, for various forms of larceny, 62 colored men and boys and only *one white man*. No wonder the black man's *average* sentence for larceny did not exceed the white man's!

Or look at another fact. I am challenged on every side upon the truth of the assertion that in 1880 a man was in the Georgia penitentiary on a 20-years' sentence for "hog-stealing." Yet *no critic ventures to consult the official records*. One, who said he could easily consult them but who would not, produces instead the following:

DEAR SIR: I was principal keeper of the Georgia Penitentiary in 1880, and there was not at that time nor has there ever been a man in the Georgia Penitentiary under a sentence of 20 years for hog-stealing.

Truly yours,

JOHN. W. HELMS.

Yes, John W. Helms; from whose *official records* I took the statement, and whose unsupported assertion

is worth we shall presently show how much. The record is in his biennial report of October, 1880, page 45, as follows: "Holmes Barry, colored, age 39, crime hog-stealing, Jefferson county, term 20, received May, 1879." From Mr. Helms's next biennial report, October, 1882, this convict mysteriously and utterly disappears, not being reported as either present, dead, pardoned, released, or escaped. Then in the same official's report of October, 1884, he as mysteriously reappears as having died in custody more than fifteen months *after* his disappearance from the previous record. And here the poor wretch's record has been changed from "hog-stealing" to "simple larceny"—from tweedle-dum to tweedle-dee; or, to recall the very ancient joke—"If he'd only a-said *ducks*."

But is this case an exception or an example? By this officer's official rolls of 1880-82 there were two white convicts under the cruel sentence of ten years for "simple larceny." It is some gratification to know that no white man was serving a longer sentence for this crime. But the fact remains that under the same charge and at the same time 18 colored men were under sentence for 10 years each, 3 others for 12 years, 6 others for 15 years, and 4 others for 20 years; while one black man, William Williams of McDuffie County, who was put in on a cumulative sentence for simple larceny at the age of 40, will, if he lives and serves out his term, emerge from the prison 80 years old. But this will not happen. These rolls show 406 convicts in the penitentiary under sentence of 10 years and upward; that is, one-third of all the convicts. The official figures show that these "long-term" men were coming in just $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as fast as they were being pardoned and escaping; yet the report shows that of 380 convicts discharged on expiration of sentence, the proportion of these "long-term" convicts to the whole number had dropped from one in every three to but one in every ninety-five. Death had made the difference. Not one was left to go out alive whose sentence exceeded 10 years.

The explanation has been attempted that these brutal sentences were given before 1868, and so antedate the convict-lease system in Georgia. But in fact, of the more than 400 long-term convicts surviving in the Georgia penitentiary in October, 1882, under 10 to 30 years' sentences,—many for simple larceny only,—*all but one* had been received since 1868; he the previous year.

One word in this connection it is pleasant to say: that in the Georgia Legislature there are gentlemen even now denouncing this whole convict-lease system as a disgrace to civilization and humanity, and nobly struggling to destroy it.* And like efforts are being made in every other State where the system exists. Would to heaven the same righteous and active war were waged by them against that spirit of race-subjugation which is the root of the whole trouble and the shame of our land.

Are Ex-Senator Johnston's efforts bent in the same direction? Far from it. His endeavor is to show that the "depravity of the negro" is enough to account for

* In the Georgia Legislature, June 9, 1885, Dr. Felton said: "If the fiends of hell had undertaken to devise a [penal] system, devilish, barbarous, and malignant, they could not have succeeded more fully than Georgia has succeeded in her system."

everything. But error has its uses, and the gentleman, instead of proving his case, actually brings forward an incontrovertible, arithmetical proof, based on official figures, that the "depravity of the negro" accounts for barely half. For see: In the District of Columbia, January, '81, to November, '82, the convictions were 64 whites and 189 colored. But the white population of the District is to the colored, as Mr. Johnston says, about two to one, or more exactly nine to five, and the *proportion* of convictions in equal numbers of white and black is therefore 1 white to $5\frac{3}{10}$ blacks. In New York State Mr. Johnston finds 77 whites to 1 black, and in its penitentiaries $13\frac{1}{2}$ whites to 1 black. This shows a proportion of convictions, in equal numbers of white and black, of 1 white to $5\frac{7}{10}$ blacks. In Ohio the population shows 39 whites to 1 black; its penitentiaries $6\frac{1}{2}$ whites to 1 black. The resultant proportion of convictions in equal numbers of whites and blacks is 1 white to 6 blacks.

Now, has the gentleman proved that in these regions "substantially the same state of things exists as to conviction of the colored race as in the Southern States"? He proves just the contrary. In Georgia the population shows 8 whites to 7 blacks; in the penitentiaries, says Mr. Johnston, 1 white to 9 blacks, or more exactly 8 whites to 74 blacks; and the consequent proportion of convictions in equal numbers of whites and blacks is 1 white to $10\frac{1}{2}$ blacks, *nearly twice what it is in the places with which he compares it*. Is it urged that the colored population North is a higher style of people on an average than the same South? Then let us turn to some region where the colored man has lately come from the South with all his squalor, poverty, ignorance, thriftlessness, and vices. Let us look at Kansas, the goal of the late exodus; what do we find? Population, 952,155 whites to 43,107 colored, or 22 whites to 1 colored. In the penitentiary, June 30, 1882, 504 whites, 113 colored, or $4\frac{7}{10}$ whites to 1 colored. Proportion of convictions in equal numbers of whites and blacks, 1 white to *less than 5 colored*.

And yet in these regions, where the proportion of penitentiary convicts among the colored race is but half what it is in some Southern States, it is freely admitted that the proportion would be still less were there not still a great deal of unreasoning prejudice against the black man on account of his color; while it is conspicuously in States where the freedman's consignments to the penitentiary are twice as frequent as his lower average moral condition will account for that with the same mouth men justify race-subjugation and deny the warping moral effect of race-prejudice. Such is one of the foul fruits of slave-holding which it becomes the duty of every American—and especially of every Southern-born citizen—to help with all his might to destroy.

But one of the unpleasant consequences of acknowledging this duty is the necessity of replying elaborately to men who answer facts with crude misinterpretations, and deny the precious title of "Southerner" to whoever doubts the sacred dogma that the oligarchy can do no wrong.

Here, for instance, is Mr. Johnston's assertion that my characterization of the convict-lease system as one "whose brutal tasks and whippings kill in an average of five years" is predicated specially of Georgia. Not

so. It is predicated of the aggregate results of the entire system throughout the South. In my essay on the convict-lease system I have spoken with specific accuracy of the mortality in the Georgia penitentiaries. I there showed that the official summary tables of Mr. Helms, the State Marshal, whom Mr. Johnston quotes with such confidence, are not worth the paper they are printed on. The mortality in the Georgia prisons and prison-camps is not as bad as in some other leased prisons and camps. In the Texas wood-cutting camps, only a few years ago, half the average population died in two years. One of the habits of the system that screens much brutality is the lowering of the death-rate by pardoning convicts whose health it has destroyed. In the two years ending October 20, 1882, there were 109 convicts pardoned in the Georgia penitentiaries, among whom more than half the number on time sentences had not served out half their terms, and many not a third or a fourth of them. Such a record is a record not so much of mercy as of criminal imbecility.

It is only as evidence against him and his kind that such documents are admissible evidence until these sworn signers of them have removed their implications by proving them false.

I repeat that as evidence in favor of his schemes or theories Mr. Helms's reports are worthless. He reports 538 convicts received within two years; his rolls show 634. He reports 324 discharged; the list of their names makes them 422. He makes three separate statements that the number of convicts on hand is 1243; the addition is incorrect: the columns foot up 1193, and in the classification by crimes not a single number in the list agrees with the actual count of the rolls; while as to the total it is, by the rolls (which are not added up), neither 1243 nor 1193, but 1266. Everything goes to indicate that Mr. Helms has not known for years how many living human beings he has in captivity, or ought to have. How is any one to know from such a source how many convicts have died that never went to hospital at all? The reports of the Alabama prisons are in a similar condition. When convicts are in the care of men that make out such official reports as these, we need better evidence than their assurance that the rate of mortality is low, and the more so when we know the frightful death-rates confessed by other convict-lease prisons, where, moreover, the rate is higher among the "outside" than among the "inside" men.

Mr. Johnston's comparison of prison death-rates with city death-rates, which include infant mortality and the like, is too absurd for serious notice. Prison populations must be compared with prison populations. The usual annual mortality of a well-conducted penitentiary is about 10 to 1000—one per cent. Mr. Helms, for 1880-82, claims this low figure without any foundation in fact. In reality his average prison population was 1266, and his surgeon's report for one year, August 1, 1881-82, was 22, or nearly 2 per cent.—nearly twice what it should have been. From October, '78, to October, '80, the rate was nearly $2\frac{7}{10}$ per cent., which Mr. Helms says is one-half what it had been in earlier years. In the year 1884 the rate was over $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.

Yet this annual mortality, still nearly thrice what it should be when it had been reduced to half what it was,

is one of the least offensive features of the convict management of Georgia, and one of the lowest death-rates known to this execrable system in any of the States where it is found. The death-rate in the Mississippi convict camps, 1881-82, was 8 per cent. a year. In Louisiana in 1881 it was 14 per cent. Such are the official figures of a prison system which exists nowhere among civilized people except where two centuries of slave-holding have blunted our sense of the rights of man. To quote once more my own words so carefully left unquoted by Mr. Johnson, "If any one can explain them away, in the name of humanity let us rejoice to see him do so." And let the ex-Senator make room for him, for he has only made the case look worse than it did before.

Only the necessity of maintaining the truth of my pages, brought into question by Mr. Johnston and others, has induced me to lay the present statement before the readers of *THE CENTURY*. I maintain, and have asserted from the first, that much of the injustice and cruelty practiced upon the colored race springs not from malicious intent, but from mistaken ideas at war with the fundamental principles of human right and American government; and the gentleman himself illustrates this by lifting up, after all, the standard of class-rule, race-rule, and status-rule, as against the right to *earn* domination without regard to race, class, or status, by intelligence, morality, and a justice that is no respecter of persons.

G. W. Cable.

The South Kensington School for Cookery.

DESIRING a month's experience at the famous cooking school of South Kensington, I had written the secretary from Germany, asking the conditions of entrance, offering testimonials as to my social standing, and expressing a wish to meet all expenses of correspondence. I was told in reply that I could enter on any Monday upon paying the proper fee, that references as to character were not required, and that I owed the school tuppence-halfpenny for postage. The letter was accompanied by "The Directory of the National Training School for Cookery," which I eagerly studied. I derived from it the information that the school was under the patronage of a long list of names "hedged about" with accompanying titles; that the "training for teachers of cookery" required a course of study extending through five months, the expense being £21 (\$105), exclusive of books, board, etc.; that there were a "high-class cookery kitchen" and a "plain cookery practice kitchen," in each of which a learner might take a two weeks' course, and receive at the close a "certificate" which should state her standing and attainments.

The school occupies one of the buildings erected for the exhibition of 1872, a dismal place situated in the rear of another structure. When first organized, the instruction consisted of lectures on food and the processes involved in its preparation, accompanied by demonstration lessons, at which the pupils simply took notes. Under the intelligent supervision of Sir Henry Cole, practical work was soon introduced, and the whole scope of the enterprise was extended. By the death of this large-minded and benevolent patron, the school lost one of its best and most active friends.

As now carried on, "The National Training School for Cookery" includes five departments — the scullery, the children's room, the demonstration kitchen, the plain cookery practice kitchen, and the high-class cookery practice kitchen. The working force actively engaged comprises the "Lady Superintendent," four teachers, two professional cooks, and several scullery-maids. The superintendent has the immediate charge, financial and executive, of the entire enterprise. She is undoubtedly a woman of ability, and has her work well in hand. The school is altogether a private enterprise, sustained by voluntary subscriptions and pupils' fees. Like all such educational attempts, it is cramped for means, and has not as yet been able to meet its current expenses, and is consequently burdened with a small debt.

The scullery is the primary room in the course, and the pupils practicing therein brighten the coppers and clean the utensils used by the demonstrator in her lessons. They are taught thoroughly and practically, and it is an interesting sight to watch their work. The coppers are made to shine like molten brass, and come from their hands spotless within and without. Scrupulous cleanliness is enforced, and no more valuable lesson can be taught an incipient cook. All the polishing is done with the bare hand, using soap, sand, and a little acid, lemon-juice being preferred.

Next the scullery is the children's kitchen, and a pretty thing it is to see the little maidens cooking there, each with a whimsical look of grave responsibility shadowing her small face and intently absorbed in her particular work. The morning I visited this room a class of twelve young girls — all, I should judge, under fourteen years of age — were busy under the instruction of a professional cook. They came from one of the numerous charity schools of London, and were sent at the expense of the "Worshipful Company of Cooks," one of the old guilds, a wealthy and influential organization. The children were all in uniform — a blue-flannel dress, large white apron, and a quaint little cap, such as London under-housemaids wear, perched on their heads. This weekly lesson in cooking must be of great value to them. The cook who had them in charge is an expert, and has long been employed in the school. She had one maid to assist her, and the two kept the twelve pupils busy each at a separate task. Every child was numbered, and there hung by the cook's table a programme of the day's work indicating what each pupil was to do.

In the demonstration kitchen lessons are given in plain cooking from ten to twelve in the morning, and in the nicer operations of the culinary art from two to four in the afternoon. This kitchen is well furnished with ranges, gas stoves, and all needed utensils. The cook stands behind a long counter, in front of which are arranged benches rising one above the other, so that all can see perfectly. The class is always large; the cook in charge is quick, skillful, accurate, and fully competent for her work. Men as well as women study in this room, — two, who were preparing to be professional cooks, attending regularly the four weeks that I was in the school.

The practice kitchens are on the other side of the building, separated from the demonstration room by the secretary's office. The class which I entered numbered eight. One of the staff teachers, a graduate

of the school, superintended the instruction in this room, assisted by one and sometimes by two of the normal pupils. The lessons learned here in regard to saving and utilizing every scrap of everything are well worth the fee given for the course. The best and most practical work of the school is done in this kitchen. The same theory is taught in the plain cookery demonstration lessons; but here practice is joined to theory, and the value of both is increased by the union.

Opening out of this room is an apartment in which dinner is served every day at one o'clock to any customers who may desire it. Here, too, in the afternoon are displayed in tempting array, and offered for sale, the results of the day's work in the various departments. Many purchasers come daily at four o'clock in the afternoon to select cakes, jellies, pastry, entrées, or whatever may be for sale.

I learned from the secretary that the students, except in the demonstration classes, were mostly servants learning to be cooks, or young women from the lower middle class who expected to practice in their own homes. The normal pupils seemed intelligent and earnest, and it is required that they have sufficient education to be able at least to speak and write correctly. Ladies of position do sometimes attend the demonstrations and take notes, but it is the exception rather than the rule. The poor, who most need such instruction, have not yet been benefited by the school to any appreciable extent, since the expense involved is too great for their means.

The plain cooking taught is essentially English, and has both its excellences and its defects. The English seem to love meat puddings, pork pies, and heavy, rich stews, all of which are to my mind neither wholesome nor palatable. To make a beefsteak into a pudding with a suet crust and then boil the mixture is quite as grave an error as the Yankee "fry." The crust for pork pie is made by boiling lard and flour and water together, and then this heathenish compound is formed into proper shape, filled with scraps of pork, and baked. If the crust is not intended to be eaten, it is certainly not an economical way of cooking pork; if designed for food, what stomach could digest it? Let no one imagine that more pork is consumed in America than on the other side of the Atlantic. That the South Kensington school teaches such a variety of ways in which it can be prepared is an indication of the rank it holds as an article of diet.

Boiled puddings also prevail over any other kind. Many are excellent, and can be recommended for the same reason that Dickens recommended crumpets,—they are both "cheap and filling." The number of delicate puddings, attractive both to the eye and the palate, is very small. On the other hand, the English buns, scones, galettes or tea-cakes, and a great variety of plain cakes for the most part raised with yeast, are far more digestible and satisfactory than the rich cakes we so delight in. When the English child wants a "piece," or the English "grown-up" takes a lunch, either calls for a "bun," which is simply a delicate sort of bread with sugar and currants or raisins added. A bun and a cup of tea are much indulged in by the

English woman, and both are invariably good. Another improvement on American cooking is the superiority of the fruit tart over our pie. It is made in a deep dish, which is filled with the fruit and covered with a light, tender crust. The soggy under-crust is thus wholly avoided; the filling composes the larger part of the tart, and the pastry is not in the least greasy or hard to digest.

In the high-class kitchen the French methods prevail, as they do in all places wherein elaborate and elegant cooking is successfully attempted. One reason for their superiority is the minute attention to details they exact. Every step must be perfect, and, as a consequence, the result is also perfect. In this kitchen, not only the richer boiled puddings, including of course the English plum pudding, are prepared, but delicate soufflés, delicious creams, and jellies of all sorts are made and offered for sale at the close of the day's work.

While the dishes prepared are almost invariably good, the instruction is certainly open to criticism. In the first place, the teaching force is too small, and pupils are obliged to waste considerable time waiting for attention. There is, moreover, no systematic way of giving recipes. One must pick up the items piecemeal and patch them together as best she can. The school publishes a book, "Lessons in Cookery," but it is full of inaccuracies and has been since revised. A student purchasing this manual does not know, of course, which recipes are correct and which are not, and is sure to come to grief if she undertakes to follow them without supervision. The following instance will illustrate this point. One of the pupil-teachers, working near me, was making an Irish stew exactly according to the instructions in her book. The superintendent, happening to pass the table, asked what she was doing. She answered respectfully that she was making an Irish stew, whereupon the teacher said severely, "I wish you would do it right," and then proceeded to give directions which were totally at variance with those in the book. The girl meekly did as she was bid, but after the superintendent had gone she said in a grieved tone, "I wish they would correct the book or not allow us to use it." The preface to the English edition says that "the loose expressions, such as 'a pinch,' 'a little,' found in all cookery books, are therefore avoided, and precise quantities are given." This principle is constantly violated in the school. Scarcely a lesson passed during which I was not told that certain ingredients could not be exactly stated, that I must use my judgment as to amounts, and that certainty could only come with practice.

The school aims to give simply manual practice. There are no courses of scientific lectures, no instruction as to combinations of food, dietaries, comparative values, or anything of the sort. I was told that such instruction had been attempted, but the attainments of the scholars were not as a rule sufficient to make it profitable. It is undoubtedly an excellent place to be trained for a cook, but cannot be recommended to those who wish to study the philosophy underlying processes as well as the processes themselves.

Mary B. Welch.

tracted his line between Dunker Church and Sharpsburg. His cannon were in position, his troops in line. I knew, as did everybody else, that Franklin's corps was comparatively fresh; that McClellan had twenty-nine thousand men who either had as yet not fired a musket or had been only slightly engaged. Why did he not attack? No one could tell.

Riding up to the right, I found that hostilities had ceased; that the ambulance corps of both armies were gathering up the wounded in the field near the Dunker Church. Going out over the ground where the tides had ebbed and flowed, I found it thickly strewn with dead. I recall a Union soldier lying near the Dunker Church with his face turned toward heaven, his pocket Bible open upon his breast. I lifted the volume and read the words: "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me. Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." Upon the fly-leaf were the words: "We hope and pray that you may be permitted by a kind Providence, after the war is over, to return."

Near by stood a wounded battery-horse and a shattered caisson belonging to one of Hood's batteries. The animal had eaten every blade of grass within reach. No human being ever looked more imploringly for help than

that dumb animal, wounded beyond the possibility of moving, yet resolutely standing, as if knowing that lying down would be the end.

The assumed armistice came to an end, the pickets stood in hostile attitude once more, but the day wore away and no orders were issued for a renewal of the attack. Another morning, and Lee was beyond the Potomac. I galloped along the lines where his army had stood, and saw the wreck and ruin of battle. I recall the body of a Confederate sharp-shooter, lying in the forks of a tree by the roadside, between the Dunker Church and Sharpsburg. Shells had exploded in the streets of Sharpsburg. The horses of a Confederate battery had gone down in a heap in the public square.

Porter's corps was passing through the town. McClellan and his staff came galloping up the hill. Porter's men swung their hats and gave a cheer; but few hurrahs came from the other corps — none from Hooker's. A change had come over the army. The complacent look which I had seen upon McClellan's countenance on the 17th, as if all were going well, had disappeared. There was a troubled look instead — a manifest awakening to the fact that his great opportunity had gone by. Lee had slipped through his fingers.

Charles Carleton Coffin.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

A Word of Sympathy and Caution.

THE wage-workers believe that the social Fates are against them, and they are now proposing to take their destiny into their own hands. Fields and forests and mines bring forth untold stores of wealth; miles on miles of shafting drive the machinery by which this raw material is adapted to human uses; there is enough of every sort of commodity to give everybody abundance; and yet, in the midst of this overflowing bounty, one million willing workers, very few of whom are strikers, stand idle in the market-place because no man has hired them, while their little children cry for bread. It is not strange that "the army of the discontented," as Mr. Powderly has named them, grows apace. It is not to be wondered at that a feeling is spreading among the labor-classes that something is radically wrong.

In a thoughtful little book entitled "Our Country," lately published, the Rev. Josiah Strong observes that the tragedy of our civilization consists in the fact that while knowledge has been multiplied and diffused, wealth has been multiplied and concentrated in few hands.

"The horizon of the workingman, during this century, has been marvelously expanded; there has been a prodigious multiplication of his wants. The peasant of a few generations ago knew little of any lot save his own. He saw an aristocracy above him which enjoyed peculiar privileges, but these were often justified in his eyes by superior intelligence and manners. The life of the rich

and great was far removed from him and vague. He was not discontented for lack of luxuries of which he knew nothing. But modern manufactures and commerce and shop windows have made all luxuries familiar to all eyes. The workingman of to-day in the United States has probably had a common-school education, has traveled somewhat, attended expositions, visited libraries, art galleries, and museums; through books he has become more or less acquainted with all countries, and all classes of society; he reads the papers, he is vastly more intelligent than his grandfather was, he lives in a larger world, and has many more wants. Indeed, his wants are as boundless as his means are limited. Education increases the capability of enjoyment, and this capability is increasing among the many more rapidly than the means of gratification; hence a growing popular discontent."

Such are the obvious causes of the great uprising of labor which was recently witnessed in this country. The more compact organization of the wage-workers, through the agency of the Knights of Labor, and the introduction of the boycott as a weapon of war, have suddenly changed the whole aspect of the labor problem; "the army of the discontented" has come into the field ready for an aggressive campaign.

Such a sudden accession of conscious power on the part of any class of persons that had long felt themselves oppressed would be witnessed with anxiety; it could hardly be expected that they would behave with entire justice and moderation. And while among the wage-workers there are hundreds of thousands whose instincts are sound, and whose counsels in such an emergency are sure to be temperate, there is also a great multitude of ignorant and undisciplined men

who are likely to use their new power recklessly and destructively. The danger is that these rash spirits will often rule in the workingman's assemblies. This danger is not indeed remote; the thing is continually taking place. The most destructive strike that has lately occurred in the coal regions was forced by the ignorant and brutal majority of the miners, against the strenuous counsel of their cooler and wiser leaders. After months of idleness, and the loss to the operators and the miners of millions of dollars, the men went back to work for ten cents less per ton than they were offered when the strike began; and when, after working for a few months at this reduced wage, they complained of its insufficiency, and submitted their complaint to arbitration, the referee, ex-Senator Thurman, granted them, to their great satisfaction, the precise compensation which they refused a year before. The wisdom of the leaders who could not lead, and the folly of the followers who would not follow, must by this time have become evident in all that section. Such rash and ill-considered movements often occur in the trades-unions. It is not an unheard-of thing that an employer who has kept his wheels running at a loss for months solely for the sake of furnishing his men with a livelihood will be rewarded by a strike as soon as business brightens up a little, and long before his shrunken capital is restored. By such a procedure good-will in the breasts of employers is cruelly put to death, and many a kind-hearted man who had studied the welfare of his employees has been turned into a cynic.

The labor-unions will do well to remember that this warfare that they are waging concerns not merely themselves and their employers, but the whole community. The comfort, the safety, the welfare of the entire population are seriously affected by those violent interruptions of the industrial order which they are able to bring about. Such a strike as that which recently occurred upon a great railway system in the South-west paralyzes the industry and the trade of the whole section, and entails inconvenience and loss, if not positive suffering, upon hundreds of thousands of households that are in no wise implicated in the quarrel. This great middle class is ready to endure not a little discomfort and annoyance in the interest of justice and humanity. If the workingmen have a real grievance, and if there is a fair chance of their getting their wrongs righted by their united resistance, the popular sympathy will sustain them, and millions who are not of their class will cheerfully bear their burdens with them. But this sympathy may easily be over-taxed. The outside millions who are so directly affected by every industrial insurrection will be apt to make sharp inquisition into the causes of these uprisings, and they will not patiently endure all this inconvenience in support of demands that are whimsical or unjust. It is a large assumption that the laborers of a single corporation make, when they lay an embargo upon the traffic of a whole State or of several States in order to enforce their claims. After a few experiences of this sort the popular judgment will array itself solidly against the organized bands of labor, as common nuisances and public enemies. The labor-unions ought not to have any such reputation; if they do not desire it, let them beware that they do not deserve it.

Two Kinds of Boycotting.

Most persons who mix much with other people have found a large number who regard the process commonly known as "boycotting" as a powerful but legitimate engine of organized labor. The social analogies which are cited in support of its legitimacy are familiar to every one. It is an open secret that many of our sects habitually boycott tradesmen who are not of their creed. The boycotting of one class of society by another or by all others is about as old as the organization of society into classes. However un-Christian or immoral these cases of boycotting may be or may become, it is practically impossible to frame a legal indictment against them, to specify any workable method by which organized society can get a hold upon them and put a stop to them. It is therefore argued, and often very plausibly argued, that boycotting, since it is a thing which society cannot reach, is a thing to which society must yield; that he who is intractably dull to the moral arguments against boycotting is under no further or legal obligations to refrain from using it to any extent.

That the analogies indicated may not carry a force to which they are not fairly entitled, it may be well to distinguish clearly between two very different kinds of boycotting, for which the names direct and indirect boycotting might be employed. The former, direct boycotting, consists in the exercise by the boycotter of his right of choice of the persons, firms, or corporations with which he shall deal. The reasons which induce him to choose one and reject others may be unfounded, or even distinctly immoral; but the exercise of the right of choice is an act with which society would find it hard to interfere without the implication of almost intolerable evils. Society has therefore let this variety of boycotting alone. The latter, for which the name of indirect boycotting is suggested, consists in the effort by the boycotter to prevent other people from exercising their right of choice of the persons, firms, or corporations with which they shall deal.

When a labor or other organization decides not to purchase a particular kind of stoves, it is exercising its right of choice between makers; and, whether the antecedent reasons be good or bad, society can hardly reach the overt act of direct boycotting. When a labor or other organization goes further, and threatens or attempts to boycott all who sell or buy the stoves in question, it denies to third parties the very right of choice on which it insists for itself. If society cannot reach and suppress this form, indirect boycotting, then the neutral third parties are denied the equal protection of the laws; and class government, in its most odious form, takes the place of the equal rights on which our system of society has been based.

As soon as the distinction is clearly apprehended, it must be evident that every precedent which has been offered in defense of the new system of boycotting, evolved during the past eighteen months, is altogether irrelevant. The precedents offered are all cases of direct boycotting, which society has tolerated, not because it approved them, but because it would have cost more to suppress them than the suppression would have been worth. The system which it is sought to establish on these precedents is a quite different one,

one which society cannot tolerate without surrendering its own reason for existence.

To establish the proposition that society and government must suppress the new form of boycotting, or abandon the functions of society as we have known them, it is only necessary to consider the essential nature of indirect boycotting. In the first place, its nature is to spread. Let the case be that a newspaper is boycotted. Under the old system, the results are limited; certain persons no longer buy the newspaper or advertise in it, and that is all. Under the new system, it becomes necessary to boycott all the news-stands which deal in the newspaper; then all the hotels which give privileges to recalcitrant news-stands; then all those who patronize such hotels, or who deal with their lodgers; and so on *ad infinitum*. Once grant the principle of the indirect boycott, and no limitation is possible except the number of the boycotters. Any social struggle, once begun, must be more or less general.

In the second place, there is no longer any neutrality possible for uninterested or peaceably disposed third classes. They must take part with the boycotted, by dealing with him, or with the boycotters, by refusing to deal with the boycotted. The boycotter thus becomes the intestine enemy of society and its peace. The closest analogy is the case of the first Napoleon in the international society of Europe during the early years of this century. His consistent policy was that of the indirect boycott. As he could not reach England, he held every people an enemy unless it took part with him against England. In the end, the organized international society of Europe was really compelled to boycott him. The analogy will be complete in our case when capital organizes and makes use of the indirect boycott as organized labor is doing. The lot of the uninterested individual citizen will then be an unenviable one.

In the third place, the organization which succeeds in maintaining this right of indirect boycotting must necessarily grow enormously by simple accretion. A small class can make even an indirect boycott cover but a small territory. It is naturally impelled to join a larger organization, through which it can reach a wider jurisdiction. This impulse is universal; and the sudden and startling increase of the Knights of Labor organization is the result. The larger it grows, the stronger is the impelling force to join it. The greater also is its power over the social organism; and it tends to become a power within the state greater than the state itself. If this were all, it might be worth while to consider the question whether it would not be better that the Knights of Labor should assume the responsibilities as well as the powers of government, and make other classes contented subjects, if they can no longer be equal American citizens.

But the case cannot stop here. The organization which now wields the great power of the indirect boycott is unknown to the law. There is nothing to give it a monopoly of the power, or to prevent new and ambitious men from forming other organizations in competition with it. Not a month of the year 1886 has passed without an attempt to form such a rival organization; and the time must come when the attempt shall be successful. The new organization, however "subsidiary" or friendly at first to the original organization, must come into collision with it at last. Even

a total surrender to the indirect boycott would not save society from the effects of it at the hands of rival labor organizations. The war is one in which neutrality is impossible, and even surrender is useless.

The indirect boycott, then, is a private wrong, in that it strikes at the right of private security, which the state is bound to maintain for the individual citizen. Its plainest aspect is when it is threatened or employed for the purpose of extorting money, under the guise of fines or otherwise. The act is a conspiracy which law would not tolerate in any person not a representative of a labor organization. Other individuals are not allowed to collect their debts or to enforce their contracts in that fashion. It is also a public wrong, for it strikes at the functions and existence of the state itself. The plainest aspects of this point are in two recent propositions. One is the proposed organization of the policemen of our cities into branches of the Knights of Labor. The guardians of the public peace would then owe allegiance not to the state, but to the *imperium in imperio*. The other is the proposed boycotting of the militia of a State, of individuals who do not leave the militia organizations, and of individuals who refuse to boycott members of the militia. This rises beyond conspiracy into the field of treason. But it is the logical result of an admission of the principle of indirect boycotting.

The inevitable tendency to social disintegration is already shown by the increasing disposition to make use of the boycott as a remedy for the real or imaginary grievances of all sorts of combinations and classes of individuals. The tendency is increased by the practical license which the organization of the Knights of Labor allows to its branches. If a branch of the order makes use of the boycott, in the shape of a causeless strike against an uninterested third party or otherwise, the boycott continues until it is removed by the branch which applied it, or until the boycotted party accepts the mediation of the managing committee of the whole order. The order is a federation whose principle is one of large local sovereignty. In these local boycotts, the branches are thus the "wicked partners," who take the responsibility of the act; the managing committee is the factor whose "moderation" recommends the system to those who do not perceive its real nature. Let us understand the thing clearly, its nature, and its results. The new system, in any of its forms of combination to injure the business or assail the rights of uninterested third parties, is one which the state must deal with or die; its refusal to exercise its essential function of the protection of the individual would be merely a relegation of that function to new combinations of the assailed individuals. By making the alternative one of social peace or social warfare, labor succeeds only in forcing into consideration a question before which even its claims to recognition and substantial justice must retire for the time.

The single question which is pressed upon the American people is whether they will permit a power to be exercised by one class of American citizens which must deprive other classes of their rights, or compel them to organize similarly in self-defense and overthrow social order in the inevitable conflict. The only admissible answer to the question would seem to be the decision of the state to adhere to its fundamental principle, to deal with individuals only, and to re-

sist combinations whose object is to usurp or to nullify the state's functions of punishing or protecting the individual citizen.

Who are the Guiltier?

THE scandalous revelations recently made with regard to the Board of Aldermen of the city of New York have simply been a bringing to the surface of facts long known to all familiar with the so-called "politics" of the chief city of the Union. The direct alliance of the criminal classes with parts of the city government has been effectively disclosed; but it is probably true that much in other departments of our local government, that has hitherto remained merely a well-founded suspicion, will continue to remain such, and that the full details of official misdoing are not likely soon to see the light of day.

The rascality of the New York aldermen has lately been the chief topic of local discussion,—this and the alleged shameless bribery of these officials by conscienceless speculators. And yet this side of the ques-

tion of municipal morals seems to us much less discouraging and alarming than the certain knowledge of the fact that there is an endless chain leading from the parlors and offices of many among the better classes of the community, down to the very criminals who have been "running the politics" of our crowded wards, and occupying offices of trust in the city government—a chain that binds them all together in a common guilt. We ask whether there should not be more pity, as there is certainly more excuse, for the rascallions who, nursed in poverty and infamy, end by energetic devotion to the double profession of burglary and politics, than for the respectable, often "pious" and "charitable" members of society, who reluctantly but surely consent to the bribing of aldermen and state legislators in the interests of corporations of which they are trustees or managers.

If all the men in the city and State of New York who call themselves moral would cease to-morrow to be parties in or connivers at any sort of municipal or legislative iniquity, the rascals would soon be driven into a corner and beaten to the ground.

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union.

A REPLY TO DR. CROSBY BY PROFESSOR HOPKINS.

NO fact could be more encouraging to the friends of a reasonable improvement in the conduct of worship in non-liturgical churches than the discussion on Christian Union now going on in the columns of THE CENTURY. It is but a very few years since such a discussion would have been inappropriate and almost unintelligible; for although as far back as 1867 the General Assembly thought it necessary to sound a note of alarm against "liturgical tendencies," yet it was only the feeble beginning of a movement in that direction. Those beginnings have by this time developed into a stream of sentiment which calls upon the foremost champions of the church's inertia to gird on their armor and descend into the battle. This is just as agreeable to the party of the movement as it was to the church of the second and third centuries to have Philostratus, Celsus, and the other defenders of the lost pagan cause break their contemptuous silence and throw themselves, pen in hand, across the track of the beneficent revolution. In all efforts looking to the improvement of society, whether in civil or religious matters, it is a sign of the beginning of the end when the obstructionists show serious alarm and begin to look about them in every quarter for help. The change already made is a sufficient foreshadowing of the coming event. In the Presbyterian Church certainly, and I believe also in the Congregational body, more progress has been effected within the last ten years in the direction of decorum and beauty of worship than during the previous half-century.

It is only three or four years since a certain preacher thought it necessary to consume his whole hour before the General Assembly in blowing a note of alarm

against the progress of "formalism" in the church; "formalism," in his dictionary, meaning such very dangerous proceedings as the responsive reading of the Scriptures in public worship, the oral repetition of the Lord's Prayer, or other similar usages of the earliest Christian Church. Now let Dr. Crosby go, on any Sunday, into any one of a considerably large number of Presbyterian churches extending from New York city to Buffalo, and he will observe a service which must grieve him to the soul. To say nothing of increased worship by means of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs (that is to say, a good deal more liturgical service in *rhyme*, to which no objection seems ever to be felt by the most violent anti-liturgical alarmist), he would find both the features mentioned above in common use, and, in some of those congregations, the regular reading of the Ten Commandments, with responses by the choir; and worse still, perhaps, he would find that darling feature in the service, the *long prayer*, broken up into several parts, with singing or reading between.

These changes in the time-honored ritual of the Presbyterian Church have come about gradually and silently, and because of a general conviction that some improvement was demanded by the changed conditions of society since the middle of the century; and they are not going to stop just here or now. A few years ago the General Assembly, in its incomprehensible wisdom, refused to permit the responsive reading of the Psalter in worship; to what effect? The practice prevails in ten congregations now to one then; or where it does not prevail in the church, it does in the Sunday-school; and the children are thus being trained up to love a service of prayer as well as of praise in which they can join their own voices. Reforms which the spirit of an age demands are not checked by fulmina-

tions from doctors of divinity. They move on with calm, irresistible strength; and those who do not choose to join in them are soon left in the rear.

Dr. Crosby rather uncharitably insinuates that those who are urging an improvement in the Presbyterian service are disloyal or treacherous friends to that church. I reply, they are its very best friends. They desire to increase the strength and beauty in her sanctuary. They wish to augment her power to retain her own children, instead of leaving them to wander off to other folds. They wish her to keep up with the march of all true ecclesiastical and religious improvement. Why should Dr. Crosby's congregation worship in a church the superfluous ornamentation of which perhaps doubled the cost of the building? Simply because an improved taste and science in public architecture demanded it. Why should they not then equally yield to the demand for something warmer and richer in worship than the "bare" routine which they have inherited from the time of the Westminster Assembly?

I agree entirely with the distinguished writers in the March CENTURY in their estimate of Dr. Shields's scheme for a union of all Protestant denominations on the basis of a common liturgical worship. I read that article with a degree of interest until I came to the writer's sovereign panacea for the distractions of Christendom; when my admiration suddenly changed into a feeling of rather comic surprise. "No union on doctrinal grounds possible." I fancied we were tolerably united on that basis already. "No union on the ground of a common church government." True enough; nor is that necessary to a vital church unity. What then? Why, that, retaining each our own doctrinal diversities, running from low Arminianism to Supralapsarian Calvinism, retaining all our differences in church order, from low independency to high prelacy, we should make one church by agreeing to use the same prayer-book! I felt much as Doctor Faustus felt at the disproportionate outcome of the swelling and elephantine poodle behind his stove: *Das also war des püdel's kern? Der casus macht mich lachen.*

Any scheme of union among Christians which implies that the Presbyterian Church is to modify in the slightest degree her polity or constitution, with a view of approaching the platform of Episcopacy, is in the highest degree absurd. The Presbyterian Church is unalterably Presbyterian. She has not the least desire to unite herself in any outward way with the Episcopal communion. Whenever, let me hospitably say, the latter is sufficiently tired of her isolation to take Dr. Franklin's advice, given her just a century ago, and "turn Presbyterian," there is room enough for her in the ample bosom of the *μεγαλήν Ἐκκλησίαν*.

No possibility exists of organic union in any other way. But in perfect consistency with this the Presbyterian Church may go on improving her cultus in the line of her own history and traditions. Calvin, Melancthon, Luther, John Knox, all approved of and practiced liturgical worship. The Westminster divines have left us ample directions for public prayer, which, with a few connectives, make up a liturgical form. Stephen Marshall, in reporting to the assembly this part of the directory, expressly recommended it on that ground. The fathers of the American Presbyter-

ian Church, and especially the eminent Dr. Greene were, many of them, favorable to forms of prayer; and antedating all this, going back to the very origins of the church, we find in the "Didache of the XII. Apostles" (which Dr. Schaff assigns to a period not later than A. D. 100) the union of the simplest Presbyterianism with liturgical worship. In the Didache there is no threefold ministry. The only ordinary church officers recognized are bishops (or presbyters) and deacons; and side by side with this simple Scriptural organization appears a full liturgical form for the celebration of the Eucharist, and the injunction that the Lord's Prayer should be thrice repeated each Lord's Day. This should be quite sufficient, so far as authority goes, for any friends of improvement in the worship of the Presbyterian Church.

AUBURN, N. Y.

Samuel M. Hopkins.

Shall Women go to College?

THE "previous question," fundamental to the whole subject of the education of women, so central that the least divergence there will emerge as a large difference of view as to the usefulness of giving women a liberal education at all, is the question — to state it baldly and flatly — *What is woman for?* Has she, that is to say, an independent significance in the universe, such as man is assumed to have; or has she only a subordinate and merely accessory relation to him? It is useless to expect any agreement on the more superficial question of women's education between persons who hold the two opposite views of this underlying question. These two opposite views are:

1. That woman is for herself and for the community; for man, no doubt, but only in the same sense that man is for her. This view implies that the natural relations between the sexes in civilized society are relations of equality. However much they may be relations of difference and division of labor, the difference does not depend on any natural distinction in grade of intelligence, nor the division of labor involve any distinction in grade of education. It implies, in short, that one sex has just as much individual significance in the universe as the other. This may be called the modern view. It is, however, even in modern times, only the view of the most enlightened nations; and in those nations a view chiefly confined to the best-educated communities; and in those communities not apt to be the view of persons wholly unaccustomed to the society of superior women. For this is emphatically one of those subjects on which the old adage is true, that "seeing is believing."

2. That woman is for man, as subordinate and accessory. This may be called the mediæval, Asiatic, or Miltonic view. It implies that the unit and center of this world is man. The air was created for him to breathe, the herb of the field to furnish him sustenance, the beast thereof to do his bidding; and among these conveniences a bountiful Providence added woman. There have been many varieties of this general view, from that which admits that woman has a soul, and regards her as man's vizier, or housekeeper, or adviser in chief, down to that which regards her as his mere slave and drudge. Practically, all these varieties of the Miltonic view have a tendency to reduce themselves to the last. Theoretically, however, they usu-

ally take the form of regarding her in the conveniently ambiguous light of a "helpmate"—actual wife-beating not being popular, at least in this country, among the native population.

Even on this theory of the subordinate "helpmate," it would seem worth while so to educate a woman that she should be a "mate," and capable of "helping," in the higher activities of thought as well as in the lower ones of frivolity or drudgery. But the more radical question is, why should the man be assumed to be the unit, and the woman his "helpmate," any more than the reverse arrangement? Those who quote the Old Testament to support this view should remember that the same authority has been quoted, as every one knows, to sustain human slavery in its more obvious form; yet we have taken the liberty of extirpating that from modern civilization. Is it not time to admit in plain terms, since we have already admitted it in so many institutions of society, that the one sex has equal significance in the world with the other? To suppose that one sex is the integer, and the other a mere cipher having no value except as appended to it, is simply one final relic of barbarism. The unit of civilized society is not the man, or the woman,—it is the family. It is no more the chief end of woman to glorify man and serve him forever, than it is man's chief end to sustain that relation to her. It is her privilege, doubtless, to be the mother of his children; but is it not equally his privilege to be the father of hers? The higher any community rises in the scale of civilization, the more do men and women become equal "mates," equally "helpers," in the family and community life.

To both sexes, then, and to both sexes alike, the important thing in youth is that the mind should be helped to attain to its best possibilities. It belongs not to man's rights nor to woman's rights, but to human rights. The birthright of each—whatever the obstacles to laying hold of it—is a complete intelligence. And certainly the burden of proof lies with any one who asserts that the course of liberal culture productive of educated men would fail to produce educated women. Vague reference to some mysterious "difference" between the male and the female mind is of no value in supporting such an assertion.

It needs to be shown in what precise region of the mental faculties any given branch of liberal study would fail to form and inform a woman's mind as it does a man's. It would be interesting to know, for example, just what corner of the intellect would be affected differently in the two sexes by, say, algebra, or English history, or the science of astronomy.

To insist on definite statements in this way from the opponent of a liberal education for women, would be to discover in many cases that the wish is father to the thought. He is compelled to admit, at last, that he has no desire to see women completely rational. If he does not quite say frankly, as an intelligent foreigner once said to the writer, "Sometimes it is not good that a woman should know too much; it makes trouble in the family!" yet he evidently is apprehensive of some indefinable danger from the tendency of modern ideas on this subject. His fancy seems to cling to the primitive ideal of the silly and adorable thing, whose confessed inferiority mingles an element of self-complacency in his devotion.

What the exact ideal of a woman is, in the minds of

those who express such fears, we do not see distinctly stated. It is doubtful if they would like to state it in plain English, even in the bosom of their families; perhaps there least of all. But this ideal may be inferred from the character of the education to which they seem to look for its production. This mild form of education, favored by those who fear the effect on the feminine mind of the too robust college course, calls for courses of study somewhat tenderer and prettier, and especially somewhat easier. They are apparently expected to produce a fair being equipped about as follows. Her disposition should be soft and pillowy. Her will, or any rudiment of it that may have begun to show itself, should have been gently caused to disappear. Of the intellectual powers, perception would probably have been cultivated to whatever limited extent it is absolutely required in good society, but not to a degree that would force on her attention any facts unsuited to her sphere. The judgment would have been delicately stimulated, but not to any revolting extent. The memory would be expected to be well developed, as being convenient in housekeeping, but coupled with a certain felicity of forgetting any little matters that would not conduce to domestic peace. In the region of the feelings, the regulation of this special feminine education would be truly difficult. For, while sensibility in general would be the strong point in the highly specialized femininity, there are obviously certain feelings which she should not be permitted to have, even though surgery in the cerebral lobes were required for their extirpation,—the desire of knowledge, for example, or the aspiration after intellectual enlargement, or the sense of justice, or the desire of power. But the sweet sensibilities should be hers; the hunger for approbation and applause; the capacity for gazing upon sublime objects, notably upon the males of her household, with wonder, love, and awe.

Happily this is not the only extant ideal of what a woman should be. There is another ideal; one that has perhaps existed from the beginning of civilized history; one that certainly now exists in an increasing number of minds. It is the ideal of a woman having all the mental endowment that the most fully equipped man has ever had; and having this "capability of godlike reason," not latent, but trained by the most thorough-going education to complete activity. It has made it the easier for the world to retain this ideal, that all along, in spite of prodigious hindrances, it has persisted in revealing itself as an accomplished fact.

For those, then, who are disposed to believe that not one sex merely, but the human mind in general, is intended to be intelligent, the question arises, Is a college education, in the case of women as of men, the best available means to that end?

Underlying this inquiry, also, there is a "previous question" which needs to be asked and answered before we can see just where we stand on this matter of the college training. It is the question, *What is a college for?* This question is seldom raised, because the discovery is not often made that we differ upon it. But if we will take the trouble to look closely, we shall find that precisely upon this point there is the greatest diversity of opinion.

Many seem to suppose that the purpose of a college is to fit a man—being as he is—for some special pursuit. Its true purpose, on the contrary, is to take

the crude material of a man and make of him far more than he is, or ever would have been without some such liberal culture. It aims to determine, not what the man shall get in this or that pursuit, but what he shall be, whatever his pursuit. It proposes not merely that the man shall get a living, but that he shall get a life. The notion that the purpose of a college is to fit a man to get the greatest amount of money or reputation in the least amount of time in some particular occupation, belongs with that whole Philistine view which regards existence as only a vulgar "struggle" after political preferment or other squalid prize, and which looks upon education therefore, as but a sort of Fagin's training for this "struggle of life"; whereas, in fact, if a liberal culture has any one end more marked than another, it is to lift a man above the desire or the necessity for any such feverish and selfish "struggle." It sets before him higher aims. It makes it seem shameful and contemptible to "struggle" for the office or the reputation which should seek the man, not be "struggled" for by him. It equips him with powers that make the getting of an honorable living, or of respectable position and influence in the community, too easy a matter to seem very exciting as the prize of a life-long "struggle." If the purpose of a college were to fit a man for some one of three or four special pursuits, there might be an argument against the admission of women to college, in the assumption that these pursuits are unsuited to women. But the colleges would never have been any such power in the world as they have been and are, had they been built on that narrow basis. Their purpose is to give a man, as a preliminary to any or all occupations, that complete intelligence, that breadth of power and inner resource, which no special training ever could furnish; which, in fact, both a narrow special training and the special pursuit afterward, in our system of extreme division of labor, must (to the apparent present gain of society, no doubt, but to the loss of the individual) oppose and curtail. All the more need that, to begin with, the man should be broadly educated, no matter what bread-occupation shall claim and confine him afterward. The college courses have grown out of the instinctive hunger for this complete intelligence. They consist, therefore, not of occupative, but of educative studies. These studies have been chosen — and still are retained, notwithstanding the complaints of persons who seem impervious to this point — not so much with reference to their being convenient to the man hereafter in one or another pursuit, as with reference to their being necessary to him now, while still capable of organic mental growth, in that nearly miraculous change from a raw youth to an educated man. If, for example, the *literæ humaniores* are still retained in college courses, it is from a settled conviction, based upon both theory and experiment, that these studies are best fitted to "educate the man."

There can be, then, but one rational answer to our second question. The purpose of a college is to produce, first of all, a completely intelligent mind. It is a preparation, not for this or that special profession, but for the great common profession of living the intellectual life, no matter by what particular occupation this is to be maintained.

What is there, now, in woman's nature or woman's natural pursuits that should debar her from the privi-

lege of such mental development? Is reasonableness a different thing in the two sexes? Is intelligence a word of two genders? When we have once come out of the Asiatic view of the natural insignificance of half the human race, it is a little hard to see why the son should be instructed and the daughter left ignorant; why the husband should be a philosopher and the wife a fool. If a one-sided and cruel custom as to this matter has come down to us with all the absurd sacredness of a long ancestry, it is time now to do away with it. A woman should claim from life a completely developed intelligence, and life should claim it from a woman, no less than in the case of a man. She needs it as a wife no less than he as a husband. They need it equally as parents. It belongs to them alike, as members of the community, as makers of public opinion, as readers, thinkers, and writers, as partners in the common business of living.

And if it be agreed that it is as undesirable for one sex to be left ignorant and feeble-witted as for the other, and that the college course is, to say the least, one good way to prevent this, the remaining question is, *Shall the two sexes get this college training together?*

It certainly would seem natural and reasonable — unless some very serious objection to it is discovered — that the two sexes, growing up together in the family, studying together in school, associated together all the rest of their lives in the work and play of society, should also receive their liberal culture together. It would seem an obviously unwholesome contrivance that should, for this single period of four years out of a lifetime, compel an artificial separation into two flocks: a scholastic monastery on the one hand, a scholastic nunnery on the other. As if history had not plainly enough declared the results of such unnatural contrivances! And the question forces itself on the mind, Is not this whole superstition of a separate sex education a relic of the dark ages? Is it not a part of the mediæval plan of shutting women up in towers; a modified form of the Mohammedan custom of forcing them to muffle up their heads, or peer out upon the world with one eye?

Our conservative friends who still hold to some modified form of this mediæval and Asiatic view of "woman's sphere," have been able to retard the progress toward a full education for women, at complete or co-education colleges, by several ingenious objections.* One such objection, quite plausible some years ago, before the experiment had been thoroughly tried, was the fear that the health of young women would suffer by attending a complete college. It is too late to make this pretext prosper now. Experience has shown that a college is a peculiarly healthy place for young women. The fear that the use of the brain would endanger the health belonged with the old notion that an ignorant person has a better chance for life than an educated one. It was a notion that easily arose in simple minds. The brutes were seen to be healthy; "argal," the nearer a man could keep to the level of the brutes the better.

* Let us do justice to the usefulness of a conservative opposition during any reform. It would have been a misfortune if co-education had suddenly become the fashion, so as to drift a multitude of frivolous young women, without earnest aims or solid preparation, into the colleges. It was well for college faculties to learn gradually, by a few isolated instances, the impossibility of harboring any such class of persons.

Those who have sustained the prodigious toils of the college course in comparative safety, will not be likely to take these perils of brain-activity too seriously. They will be disposed to agree with the doctrine of the physiologists, that the brain, like other organs, is meant to be used. Not only is its use not detrimental to health, but it is conducive to health. It should not be overworked, neither should the muscles; but it should not be left torpid any more than the lungs or the liver. Thought is as natural and wholesome an activity as breathing is. And if for the one sex, it is difficult to see why not for the other.

At all events, the stubborn fact remains that the young women in complete colleges, where the two sexes pursue together a course of liberal study, enjoy excellent health. They are good eaters, good walkers, free from morbid states of either mind or body, cheerful, animated, industrious. Why should they not be, with their "plain living and high thinking," their regular habits, their freedom from the alternate excitement and *ennui* of society life? The daily contact with high-minded teachers; the dignified plane of occupations; the natural, open-air relations with fellow-students; the busy intellectual interests of the place,—these are all guarantees of physical as well as spiritual health. It is certainly a life that contrasts favorably, in both these respects, with either the feverish emptiness of the fashionable world, the dull home-life of "quiet families," where ideas do not greatly penetrate, or the bovine existence of the illiterate country girl.

One element of culture, at least, can never be gained elsewhere so well, either by man or woman, as in a great college of both sexes; an "element" of culture that might better be called its very soul. It is the breaking-up of provincialism; the learning of the existence of the other point of view; the perception of the common human egotisms and limitations, and so the inference of one's own. And one final provincialism of the mind there is, which a unisexual college certainly never would have any power to eradicate; it would rather have an influence to strengthen its growth. It is the provincialisms of the exclusively sex point of view itself. It is the tendency, that is to say, characteristic of the crude and brute condition of both men and women, to see in the opposite sex only an opposite sex.

No one has any business with this subject who fails to appreciate its gravity. It is not a question to be treated flippantly or dogmatically. The whole matter is still in the stage of experiment, and it is one of those experiments that need careful handling. But we are already in a position to see that many supposed risks attending co-education were fanciful, not real. Its difficulties and dangers may almost be said to resolve themselves into a single one—a great one, but it may be and has been met. It is the danger that, through some easy shifting of responsibility, or some happy-go-lucky good-nature, the college will suffer itself to be a mere play-ground for idle and frivolous young men and women.

If it is to attempt to be a complete college—that is to say, a complete family—it must throw to the winds the sentimental idea that anybody, no matter what his or her morals, manners, pursuits, or purposes, must be permitted to dangle about the institution indefinitely. Its governing body must stand *in loco parentis*, at least

to the extent of excluding flirts and other fools, of whatever age or sex, both from the students and (let us dare to say) from the faculty. And be it always remembered that, in this matter of co-education at least, no college can hope to succeed with a cartilaginous backbone in its highest official position.

We have alluded to one embarrassment in discussing this question of co-education. It is, namely, the disposition in the opponents of the modern idea to escape the frank expression of their fundamental objection to it. Other reasons are put forward by them, such as anxieties concerning health, morals, etc.—anxieties wholly unsupported by the results of actual experiment—when the real point often is that they do not heartily approve of the thorough education of women anywhere, or by any plan. So that it would always be as well, before wasting breath in a discussion of ways and means, to get a categorical answer to the blunt inquiry, "Do you believe in women's knowing as much as men, anyway?"

But there is a second embarrassment. It lies in the fact that the most influential opposition to co-education, after all, is not open to any reasoning whatever on the subject. For it is an open secret, to those who are familiar with the really dominant forces in our great educational establishments, that the power behind the throne is not altogether an intellectual, but partly a social power. It consists, namely, in the instincts, the prejudices, the convictions—if we choose to dignify them by that term—of those estimable leaders of the best academic society, who are accustomed to a social supremacy based on quite other sorts of prestige, and who naturally shrink from the inauguration of a new régime. This conservative social power is armed with many gentle ferocities for both male and female reformers, and will be apt to yield but very slowly to the march of events and ideas.

What the condition of human affairs will be when they shall have, not as an exception in a privileged class, but as a rule in all classes, the advantage of two completely intelligent and rational sexes, instead of one, it is impossible accurately to know; but that the world will then enjoy a more symmetrical and steady progress, it seems safe to predict.

E. R. Sill.

The Labor Question.

WHAT is called the Labor Question is a question of fact. Is the laborer's condition better now than formerly? Are the real wages of labor larger at the present time than they have been in past times? Will the average annual earnings of the man who works for wages to-day purchase for him a larger amount of the necessaries of life than the average annual earnings of the man who worked for wages in any given past time would have purchased for him?

This question is vigorously discussed by economists and statisticians, especially in England; but it is so large a question, and points of comparison are so often unfairly taken, that the conclusions reached are sometimes misleading.

The condition of the English laborer, as history shows, has been greatly affected by political and social changes. At some periods he has been in far better case than at others. Within the memory of men now living the degradation of the workingmen of England

was appalling. The first quarter of the present century found them in the very depths of wretchedness. Not more than once before, during all the centuries of English history, had they ever sunk so low. When, therefore, Mr. Giffen, the statistician, and Mr. Mallock, the rhetorician, undertake to show that the English workman is far better off to-day than he was in the early part of the present century, they have an easy task. But the inference that he is now better off than ever before must not be too hastily drawn. He may have been much poorer fifty years ago than now, yet there may have been many periods in English history when he was richer than he is to-day; and the average welfare of the workman of past times may even have been greater than that of the workman of the present time.

On this whole question Mr. Thorold Rogers's "Six Centuries of Work and Wages" pours a flood of light. By the collection of a mass of bailiffs' accounts of estates, running through six centuries, and representing different parts of the country, he is able to show beyond a question, not only what wages were paid to laborers during the successive periods of history, but also what were the laborer's perquisites, and what were the prices of the necessaries of life at each period, and what were the relations of employer and employed. From this wide and careful induction the conclusion is reached that "the best condition of the English laborer was during the fifteenth century, and subsequently, but in a less degree, in the first half of the eighteenth; the worst in the first half of the seventeenth and in the first quarter of the nineteenth." This is not a cheerful conclusion. The wealth of England is vastly greater now than it was four hundred years ago; if the man who works for wages earns no better livelihood than was earned by the wage-laborer of the fifteenth century, his relative position in society must be far below what once it was. The fact that a large section of the English people is thus left behind in the march of progress—that the people who do the world's work, and to whose efforts the great increase of the world's prosperity is, in a large measure due, are not sharing as they ought to share in this increased prosperity—is a fact that should not be passed lightly over by any thoughtful man.

It is true that a great middle class has arisen, composed of small capitalists or of those who are economically affiliated with the capitalist classes, among whom the growing wealth of the world is freely distributed. The rise of the middle class has been strikingly exhibited by Mr. Mulhall, in figures drawn from the tables of the income tax and the probate court. Between 1840 and 1877 the number of families whose estates were valued at from £100 to £5000 increased about 130 per cent., while the population increased only about 28 per cent. The greatest increase has taken place in the class whose incomes range from £150 to £600. It is probable that this class consists largely of professional men, teachers, artists, employees of the government, salesmen and clerks in commercial houses, and so forth. Superintendents of labor, and especially skilled workmen, may also be included in it, but not many of the men who work for wages. The growth of this class relieves somewhat the pressure of competition among the

laborers, for this class is largely recruited from the ranks of labor; but it must be remembered that this middle class is very small when compared with the class whose incomes are less than £150. Out of thirty-six millions of people, at least thirty millions are below this level.

Mr. Mulhall concedes that one-quarter of the "poorer classes" may be no better off, possibly in worse condition, now than they were forty years ago. But, as he himself points out, these "poorer classes" include thirty millions of people, and the number thus admitted to be in the depths of penury is not less than seven and a half millions. He is not wrong in saying that "there is room in even half this number for enough misery not only to shock a philanthropist, but to be a source of serious social danger to the community." And when the fact is steadily kept in mind that the roseate view presented by him is the result of a comparison with one of the darkest periods in the history of English labor, it becomes evident that his optimism is by no means warranted. The more sober tone of Mr. Rogers has the justification of experience. The historian of English labor does not overlook the fact that in many particulars the lot of the laborer is far brighter now than it was in the fifteenth century; that many of the luxuries of past times are the habitual comforts of the present. But he lifts up a voice of warning to which economists and statesmen may well give heed:

"It may be that the progress of some has been more than counterbalanced by the distresses and sorrows of many, that the opulence and strength of modern times mocks the poverty and misery which are bound up with and surround them, and that there is an uneasy and increasing consciousness that the other side hates and threatens. It may well be the case, and there is every reason to fear it is the case, that there is collected in our great towns a population which equals in amount the whole of those who lived in England and Wales six centuries ago; but whose condition is more destitute, whose homes are more squalid, whose means are more uncertain than those of the poorest serfs of the middle ages, and the meanest drudges of the mediæval cities. The arm of the law is strong enough to keep them under, and society has no reason to fear their despair; but I refuse to accept the answer that a man is an admirer of the good old times because he insists that the vanities of civilization should be examined along with, and not apart from, its failures. It is not possible to give the solution of one problem, the growth of opulence, and to refuse all attention to the other problem, the growth of penury."

The growth of penury in the midst of plenty—the is the phenomenon. Whether the people who work for wages are, as a class, in better condition than formerly may be an open question. It seems clear that they are not so well off *relatively* as they were in past times; it is certain that a large section of this class are sinking into utter degradation. "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London" opened the eyes of the English people to this ghastly fact; and it is becoming evident enough in all the large cities of this country. But what are the causes of this increase of the pauper class in the midst of increasing wealth? Mr. Henry George says that individual ownership of land explains it; but that explanation is altogether inadequate. Mr. George fails to take sufficient account of the physical and moral deterioration produced by vice and propagated by heredity. Many of these paupers are such because they were born with enfeebled bodies and

minds, and have grown up in indolence and squalor. Much of that growing misery that he depicts is due to physiological and moral, rather than to economical causes. The pauper classes go on multiplying; and a careless and sentimental charity protects them from the destruction that their vices and their indolence invoke, and encourages them to increase and multiply and scourge the earth with their bestialized progeny. We are beginning to understand this matter a little better, and it is to be hoped that in the future our charity will be wiser and less productive of pauperism.

But the growth of penury is not wholly due to hereditary infirmities and vices, nor to unwise philanthropy. Economical causes exist, no doubt; and if Mr. George's explanation be not the true one, then the true one must be sought and found. Multitudes there are of worthy people who are willing to work, and who do not succeed in raising themselves out of actual want. In "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London" we are told that even in the most degraded portions of that city, "those who endeavor to earn their bread by honest work far outnumber the dishonest." But what does it mean for these people to earn an honest living?

"Women for the work of trousers-finishing (*i. e.*, sewing in linings, making button-holes, and stitching on the buttons) receive $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ a pair, and have to find their own thread. We ask a woman who is making tweed trousers how much she can earn in a day, and are told one shilling. But what does a day mean to this poor soul? *Seventeen hours!*—from five in the morning to ten at night; no pause for meals. She eats her crust and drinks a little tea as she works, making, in very truth with her needle and thread, not her living only, but her shroud. For making men's shirts these women are paid $10d.$ a dozen; lawn-tennis aprons, $3d.$ a dozen; and babies' hoods, from $1s. 6d.$ to $2s. 6d.$ a dozen. . . . With men it is, correspondingly speaking, no better. 'My master,' says one man, 'gets $\pounds 1$ for what he gives me $3s.$ for making.' And this it is easy to believe, when we know that for a pair of fishing boots which will be sold at three guineas, the poor workman receives $5s. 3d.$ if they are made to order, or $4s. 6d.$ if made for stock."

Such stories can be duplicated in New York and Boston. The stipend received by tens of thousands of honest workers is barely enough to keep body and soul together; and there are tens of thousands more who struggle for their meager stipend, and failing to get it, are driven finally to accept of alms, losing thus their self-respect and sinking into pauperism. Certainly, there must be some defect in the industrial and economical system under which such results are steadily increasing. What this defect is, there is here no room to inquire. It is only necessary to say that what is called the Labor Question is, in truth, a tremendous question; and that its solution demands the best thought of the wisest men.

Washington Gladden.

Found—"A Universal Tinker."

IN "Open Letters" of the December CENTURY appeared an anonymous article, entitled "Wanted—A Universal Tinker," which awakened some inquiry as to the author. On the face of it the article was an honest wail from the owner of a house with all "the modern conveniences," and *inconveniences* when its complicated machinery is in any part out of order. But its practical suggestions were so humorously flavored as to cast suspicion in many minds upon the author's sincerity. It will account for everything that is unusual in the article, to unmask the writer as the ingenious Mark Twain; and we incline to doubt if a private grief were ever more sincerely voiced than in his cry for "a universal tinker." The following circular, which is an exact copy, except for the omission of the telephone number and the names of the company's references, is proof that the cry has been heard by a tinker of the right sort, and that Mark Twain is the inventor of a new profession.—EDITOR :

OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSAL TINKER CO.,
920 WALNUT STREET, KANSAS CITY, ————1886.

DEAR SIR:—Have you ever made an estimate of the amount of money you spend for repairs in and about your house and grounds? If not, do so, and see what a handsome sum it foots up for just one year. Now, add to this, time lost in chasing plumbers, painters, gas-fitters, carpenters, etc., etc., around to secure their needed services, and then you will be in a fitting frame of mind to listen to the proposal we are about to make you. We propose to take this *annoyance* and *excessive expense* off your hands. We will put your house in proper repair, and we will, for a small sum monthly, cause your house to be inspected, and kept in a constant state of repair.

We will mend gas leaks.	Put in window panes.
Keep the waste and water pipes joint tight.	Mend roof leaks with slate, tin, or shingle.
Look after electric bells.	Make periodical search for sewer gas.
Inspect your plumbing.	Pack water-pipes and waste-pipes where the thoughtful plumber has left them to freeze.
Silence creaking doors.	Jack-plane the edges of doors that won't shut.
Correct obstinate sashes, so they slip up and down.	Fix window catches that now invite the festive burglar.
Put a shelf here and there.	Put on door-knobs; repair locks.

In fact, repair and put in shape all breakages and disorders that happen in and about your house, thus relieving you of all such annoyance and *great expense*.

Why can we do this work so much better and cheaper than others? Simply because we confine all these branches under one head.

We have	The Carpenters,	The Painters,
	The Plumbers,	The Locksmiths,
	The Gas-Fitters,	The Roofers.
	The Steam-Fitters,	

And last but not least, we have the veritable Tinker, himself, who can mend anything from a smoky chimney down to a hole in the cellar bottom.

Just think of it—trusty and expert men, in all branches, subject to telephone orders. Call us for all repairs, and for estimates on any new work you may want. Try the thing and see how it works. Yours resp'y,

THE UNIVERSAL TINKER CO.



TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Negation not a Remedy.

THE present number of THE CENTURY contains several discussions of the labor question, three of them by employers of labor: Mr. William Morris, the well-known poet, artist, and art-manufacturer; Mr. E. L. Day, a manufacturer in a Western State; and Mr. Theodore L. De Vinne, of the De Vinne Press. Mr. Morris was one of the earliest contributors to this magazine. His genius, the warmth and breadth of his sympathies, and the purity of his intentions few will question; but we are sorry to find Mr. Morris's hopes for a solution of the labor question so vague, and presented in language so easy to be misunderstood.

An old writer, Algernon Sidney, has given us a work on government. In spite of its implicit belief in the theory of the Social Contract, in one or other of its phases, the work is to be commended to Mr. Morris's serious attention, in that it shows on every page the reverence with which a man of Sidney's ability regarded the task of government, even when the society in which he lived had far fewer individual members, and far less intense individual wants, than at present. In one striking sentence Sidney declares his contempt for the understanding of those who believe that "the care and direction of a great people were so easy a work that every man, woman, or child, how young, weak, foolish, or wicked soever, may be worthy of it, and able to manage it." Anglo-Saxon society has heretofore taken as its guide the principle here upheld by Sidney; it has believed that the individual's ability would be fully occupied if the care of himself and his interests were left as far as possible to himself, and that the individual, though he be an autocrat or a government agent, is foredoomed to failure in any effort to exercise a general paternal care and restraint over the interests of others; individual liberty has thus had its roots rather more in distrust of human ability than in assertion of human privilege. On what new revelation of governmental capacities does Mr. Morris base his proposed "revolution"? How long is it since the state acquired the ability to do with success what the individual finds difficulty in doing even very imperfectly?

Mr. Morris evidently does not propose to banish production from his revolutionized society. Where are we to look for the managers of this production? The question is the pivot of the discussion. Mr. Morris's school never have answered it, and ought to answer it before expecting a respectful hearing. At present there is need of the most intense energy on the part of that arch-fiend, Competition, in order to evolve such managers; they must be given the largest salaries; and even then the lament is that the supply is by no means equal to the demand. How is "universal coöperation, *i. e.*, socialism," to obtain its managers of production without offering them incentives which shall at once raise them above the body of their fellows and reintroduce the antagonistic principle? And, on the other hand, as we are to deal with the modern civilized

state, accustomed to have its wants supplied regularly and promptly by men who are brought to the work by the rewards which it promises, are we really to deprive it suddenly of their services without preparing or suggesting a substitute? Is not this rather a serious proposition? Is it not fair to demand that the new society should first prove its claims to recognition on a smaller scale, where the consequences of failure would be minimized? The retail trade, under the guidance of the object of Mr. Morris's uncompromising hostility, Competition, supplies the people of every city daily with just the number of loaves of bread and quarts of milk needed therein. Some individuals, it must be admitted, get less than they desire or need. Let Mr. Morris persuade the government he wishes to reform to intrust to him, as head of a bureau, the task of supplying London. If he does not leave a far greater number of individuals empty than Competition ever did, he will have a fairer claim on public attention than ever before. If he cannot yet persuade society to intrust to him this comparatively trifling task, on what grounds does he claim the infinitely larger one of regulating and supplying the individual wants of a great people?

Until the school for which Mr. Morris speaks is willing to descend to some such practical test, to offer clear propositions, and to defend them in plain terms, their disquisitions tend to no conclusion. Mr. Morris may say that he is "driven toward revolution as the only hope"; but the plain fact is that he is only driving others. The words are pleasant and satisfactory to him; they are a soothing-syrup which enables him to enjoy all the advantages of competition with the rest of us, while repudiating all responsibility for it. But there are countless others to whose temperaments they are firebrands and sharp arrows. The dissatisfaction which is but a plaything to some is a bitter and a burning thing in the hearts of others; and the socialist leaders of our day might find better work for humanity than that of fanning it into a hopeless and destructive conflagration.

Civil Liberty and Equal Rights.

THE study of man as he is in human society shows him in an aspect very different from any in which he can be dealt with by theology, or economics, or natural history. He is no longer merely a moral agent, or an economic force, or a bimanous mammal. All the characteristics or rules which could be derived from the most careful study of man in these aspects might be summed up and yet entirely fail to give any definite idea of man as a member of society. Here he is hedged in by metes and bounds; he is conditioned on every side by limitations of which he can know nothing in his other aspects. He may not intrude upon the property of another, nor may he burn his own house; he may not lock up his enemy in his dungeon, nor may he drive his horses over a drawbridge at a rate faster than a walk; he may not send threatening

letters to another, nor may he offer money to another to induce him to vote righteously; he may not practice as a lawyer without the permission of society, nor may he buy poisons at retail except from those whom the agents of society have designated to sell them. There are restrictions on every side of him, and the bulk of his education as a citizen consists in learning the exact nature of these restrictions, and in learning to appreciate the overwhelming attendant advantages which more than make them good. When he has learned the nature and extent of the restrictions which society has imposed upon him, he knows also the residue of his freedom of action, which makes up his civil liberty.

Until the present, our branch of the human race, particularly in the United States, has been fortunate in the simplicity of the social forms to which it has been able to confine itself. There seems to have been a peculiar self-restraint in the blood of the people, which has led individuals to be chary of asserting the full measure of their civil liberty, so that society has found it necessary to proclaim and enforce only certain general restrictions. Public opinion, that most formidable factor in a fully developed democracy, has been felt by every individual as a restriction on his civil liberty, the more powerful, perhaps, in that it was enforced by no organized power, was formulated in no permanent terms, and yet reached to particulars more minute than any with which human law could ever concern itself. Simple as this social system has been, it has shown a wonderful power of absorption. English, Irish, Scottish, French, and German blood has been poured into the body politic, and has shortly ceased to be distinguishable from the original. It has seemed as if the mold which the fathers of the republic had provided would be able to fashion into Americanism the blood of all the nations that be upon the face of the earth, and that here civil restriction would always be light, and civil liberty correspondingly large and generous.

Now we find a thin stream of blood which persistently refuses to be assimilated, and is, moreover, irreconcilably hostile to the society which it has entered. We have to deal with professed anarchists, to whom a law has no value except as furnishing the opportunity to break it, to whom public opinion is only the supreme irritant, and to whom modern science has furnished destructive agents of indefinite power. Alien in blood, in sentiment, in purpose, in language, in everything that makes man man and distinguishes him from the beasts that perish, they have injected themselves into a country whose institutions abhor them and are abhorrent to them. Why are they here? Who invited them hither? What prevents their going elsewhere, to some still uninhabited quarter of the globe, and there constituting society to suit themselves? Do they stand on their "liberty" of going where it pleases them? Then let them learn and remember that they have voluntarily obtruded themselves upon a society where only civil liberty is recognized, and that bomb-throwers and dynamiters, who are in society but at war with it, shall have only the laws of war up to an unconditional surrender. If they despise the surface weakness of American society, they shall feel the weight of its arm as no enemy has ever felt it before. When they assert by overt

acts their liberty of attacking society, of killing policemen and resisting militia, the only argument in reply will be the rifle and the rope.

But there are other demagogues who may well anticipate and avoid the lesson. We have prided ourselves on the fact that our society was mainly composed of workingmen; and the great mass of our workingmen have an American horror of the coward who stabs in the back or throws dynamite. But there are professional agitators, who are ignorantly inciting workingmen to acts which differ only in degree from those of the anarchists; and some of their disciples, having no better instruction than the agitators are in the habit of furnishing, are inclined to apologize for or defend acts committed in the name of labor which they would condemn at once if a professed anarchist were the doer. They should learn the meaning of civil liberty, that it is the measure of natural freedom which society considers to be consistent with the equal freedom of others. Let it be shown, at any time, that the measure of civil liberty is so large that some are using it to abridge the equal liberty of others, and society must and will abridge civil liberty so far as is necessary to secure equal rights.

Can society, at least in our American form of it, accomplish such a task as this if it should become necessary? The anarchist thinks not; he evidently has but a meager notion of the war-power of democracy; for forcible resistance to society must be considered as war. Only monarchies and aristocracies make war and peace with facility. A democracy seldom prepares for war, always begins it with a succession of costly blunders, and usually succumbs only through absolute exhaustion. The manner in which republican France threw back Europe from her borders in 1793 and assumed the hopeless contest with Germany in 1870-71, the desperate nature of the struggle between the United States and the seceding States and between the two republics of Peru and Chili, are but examples of the intensity with which democracy rises to the height of an increasing danger. The poet's simile of "a wild-cat mad with wounds" is none too strong for a democracy when it is pushed into a dangerous position. Is there any reason to suppose that the American democracy has changed its nature in twenty-five years?

The courts are open for all; the laws may be altered peaceably. If laws are bad, if rich oppressors exist, powerful labor organizations are just the element needed to reform the one and to prosecute the other. But let the work be done decently and in order, without infringing the recognized and equal civil liberty of others. Above all, let the organizations impress upon their members, as the very first lesson, that violent resistance to society can only be of evil omen for these organizations, for society itself, and for civil liberty.

Charity Organization.

In a systematizing age it is inevitable that so large a branch of human activity as is comprehended under the term charity should share in that tendency. Seventeen years ago this propensity took the form in London of an association of practical and devout philanthropists, who expressed their aim by calling themselves "The Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity." That the movement was

opportune is shown by the character of those who have come to its support, and by the rapid expansion of the organization. In whatsoever city it has planted itself it would be difficult to find a person conspicuous for actual service among the miserable, or for intelligent acquaintance with the problems of philanthropy, of any religious faith or any nationality, who has not been one of the promoters of its enterprises. Since its inception in London, in 1869, the society has grown into more than sixty provincial auxiliaries, and has enrolled among its correspondents a hundred other local associations within the United Kingdom. In America, during the past eight years, more than fifty organizations tracing their initiative impulse directly to the London society have arisen in our chief cities, from Portland to Kansas City and New Orleans.

No large or genuine reformation in society ever took root which had not a long series of antecedent experiments, out of the failure or success of which the true line of movement gradually came to view. Thus it has been with Charity Organization; otherwise it could never have commanded the general support of eminent philanthropists in the widely divergent communities where it has gone.

Aware that immeasurable harm to those whose hardships leave them defenseless against it was constantly flowing in the channels of so-called charity, the promoters of the new movement warned the rich and the religious, the educated and the generous, that they were responsible for the consequences of their crude, sentimental prodigality, and that they were doing mischief instead of good by it. They told this heedless, self-complaisant public that its cheap methods denoted alienation from and not pity for the poor, whom it could not treat so injuriously if it had the heart to acquaint itself with their true wants. It is no answer to say that poverty cannot be eradicated because Christ has forewarned us that "the poor ye have always with you," since he did not say that poverty must of necessity be a whining, dissolute mendicancy.

Among the long train of evils which lavish alms and heterogeneous administrations of them have caused, experience has shown these to be the most obstinately recurrent: The accumulation of many donations in a common treasury, whether that of a board of guardians or of a voluntary society, seduces by its magnitude the imagination of those to whom five cents is a large provision for a dinner; the applicants for a share in these funds are tempted to fit their narratives to the temper and conditions which govern their distribution; a sense of right to provisions made expressly for their ilk grows up in them, without a corresponding sense of gratitude, because those who furnish the money have no intercourse with or interest in the individuals who receive it; the success of one application is almost immediately followed by scores of others from the same locality; trades spring up based upon traffic in the things which such mechanisms gratuitously supply; idleness and intemperance are fostered among the weak, and encouraged in proportion to the extent to which society releases them from the necessity of taking care of themselves; illegitimacy, the abandonment of children and wives, and the neglect of aged parents increase as the hard-pressed find provisions made to take the place of the duties of natural affection; the lot of honest toil is handicapped by competition with

those who cast their responsibilities and cares upon the charity purse; wages are lowered as the almshouse fills up, and the infection of mendicancy grows more virulent with depressed conditions; through enticement to easy lying, rascality gets the prize and uprightness is neglected; the children of those whom the strangers' money has corrupted grow up in squalor, familiar with the shifts, the tricks, and the obscene character of pauperism. What charity is there in schemes that bear such fruit?

Two processes have been successfully employed in Charity Organization for preventing these mischiefs. First comes that of registering those who apply for gratuities. The names are obtained from public officials, from corresponding societies, from churches, and from private citizens. In the New York society the registers now record about 75,000 families, or 300,000 names. The object of these lists is as much to sift out and certify to the good character of the meritorious as it is to detect rounders, impostors, and dissolute households. For the most part the lists are in fact a registry of laziness, craft, and vice, but this result is an illustration of the kind of life which is nourished by the old methods of almsgiving. Registration does not cause but only exposes it. The information thus accumulated is accessible only, as to individual cases, to those who have occasion to use it for charitable purposes. It also affords an initial point for investigation into the real circumstances of the mendicant, and the means of arriving at an understanding of the course which should be pursued to reclaim those who are not incorrigible. The value of such a system in rendering futile the frauds of the base, in accrediting the worthy poor to the charitable, in protecting the generous from misapplied services, and in furnishing almsgivers with the means of concerted or complementary relief, needs only to be suggested.

The second process of Charity Organization aims to secure the intercourse and coöperation of all the agencies and individuals engaged in ministering to public distress. This aim is naturally slow of achievement, because adhesion to the new movement implies defects in old customs, and wounds the *amour propre* of their followers. But in the wide constituency of charity there has always been enough sweet graciousness to rally hundreds of thoughtful men and women to "try all things and to hold fast that which is good." There has always been enough coöperation to show how excellent a thing it is. Among the economies gained by it are these: The associates protect each other from impositions, and thus liberate from misuse large sums for the aid of genuine misfortune; they make the varied knowledge of each the common property of all, in respect both to acquaintance with the poor and to methods of dealing with them; they save each other from duplicating and reduplicating the same investigations and experiments; they supplement each other's work, so that the aggregate of aid from several varied sources becomes adequate to the complete relief of a case of destitution; they gain in the intellectual and moral emulations of mutual intercourse and in the sense of power arising out of liberation from disheartening deceptions, and the consciousness of more precise direction of their energies.

Though Charity Organization is largely a matter of administration, yet nowhere is the impotency of

machinery and of money more keenly felt. Its service calls not for less, but for a different and a more arduous sort of effort. In its judgment relief is not relief, but a snare, until it puts an end to the condition of dependence. Each instance of necessity must be studied by itself; the means of recuperation which may inhere in it are to be sought out even at the cost of months of patient watching and inquiry; it is firmly and wisely to be restrained from following hurtful impulses and using injurious helps. This thing cannot be done until the prudent, the wise, the brave, and the chastened become the household friends of those who

falter and stumble in the rough paths of life, for the face of man answereth to face, and not to purse. Hence Charity Organization emphasizes the worth of personal intercourse between those who would give and those who need; it summons the benevolent to conference that the blundering hand may learn skill, and the truest word may be the guide of them all; it sends out corps of household visitors, and is intent on gaining for every miserable home at least one friend, with whom dissembling is useless, and from whom it can draw the inspiration of hope, the strength of truth, and the guidance of discretion.

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union.

LETTERS FROM CONGREGATIONAL DIVINES.

From President Seelye of Amherst.

CHRISTIAN union in the New Testament has its originating impulse and continued inspiration in the Christian's union with God. It belongs thus to the deepest reality of the Christian life. This is expressed in the utterance of the Redeemer, when he prays "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. . . . I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John xvii. 21, 22.)

This oneness with God and this oneness with one another spring from the same fountain. The blood of Christ is the living source in both. So Paul expressly states in the first and second chapters of his epistle to the Ephesians. It is the blood of Christ through which "we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. i. 7), and it is the blood of Christ "which hath broken down the middle wall of partition between" Jew and Gentile, "for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." (Eph. ii. 14, 15.) "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." (Eph. ii. 11, 12, 13.)

Christianity is thus fellowship, in its innermost meaning,—fellowship with God, and therefore fellowship with man. The love which unites Christians with one another is no more the result than it is the reality of the love which unites them to God. "We love him because he first loved us." (1 John iv. 19.) "And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." (1 John iv. 21.)

This is very different from a pantheistic union, which merges and absorbs the individual in the universal. In the truly Christian fellowship, the Christian,

so far from losing, only thus gains his true individuality. He who comes to know himself as distinctly loved of God, comes to a distinct apprehension of himself, and by the power of loving thus awakened gains his highest power of personal life. He only finds his life by losing it. (Matt. xvi. 25.)

By loving his fellow man also, he does not diminish, but rather enlarges and intensifies the reality of his individual life. This is quite unlike the relations existing in the natural world. There the individual exists only as the representative of the species. He has no worth nor end save as the species shall be mirrored and reproduced in him, and when this has been accomplished he disappears and ceases to be. But in human life inspired by love, the loving will lifts the individual into his only true individuality. Self-sacrifice does not destroy, it creates the true self. Love emancipates the self from its bondage, gives it true liberty, and is its only life. What is personally its own, the truly Christian life retains for itself in all purity and excellence, because it has first given all its own to others. This seeming paradox is in reality the profoundest truth of the Christian life.

This fellowship of Christian hearts is the church. As the word used to denote it in the New Testament literally means, the church is primarily an assembly, the assembly of believers, called together not to constitute the fellowship, not to create the love which unites Christian souls, but to express, and thus to perfect and maintain, the living communion—the communion of saints—in which is the reality of the Christian life. As such the church is manifold. There are various assemblies, many churches,—according to the various localities in which they are gathered together. In the New Testament more frequent reference is made to these individual assemblies than to the general fellowship in which they are all participant. But the same word denotes both. We find in close connection, as in 1 Cor. x. 32, and xi. 16, references to "the church of God" and "the churches of God." Christ is "the Head of the church" (Eph. v. 23); it is "the church of the living God" (1 Tim. iii. 15), and there are also "churches of Christ" (Rom. xvi. 16), and "churches of the saints" (1 Cor. xiv. 33).

The unity and the plurality are both distinctly marked, and neither can be to the prejudice of the other. Indeed, as in the personal Christian life the individual does not lose but rather gains his complete individuality by the love which unites him to God and to his fellow men, so the individual church, by the consciousness of its relationship to the church universal, increases also in the consciousness of its own identity and rights and powers. The freedom belonging to the individual church of managing its own affairs—the freedom of self-determination—is not impaired by that fellowship which belongs to “all the churches of the saints.” Neither is this fellowship which constitutes “the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts xxii. 28), and “which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23), any more inconsistent with the freedom of the various churches, than is that fellowship in which individual hearts are united in love to one another and to God inconsistent with their own individual freedom. Freedom belongs to fellowship and fellowship to freedom. Liberty and love grow out of the same root in the reality of their meaning, as in the origin of the words which express them. The individual church is free by virtue of the fellowship of the church universal, and the church universal is a fellowship in so far as it fulfills and upholds the freedom of all the churches which participate in it. The fellowship of all believers is one. They are all members of the one living body of Christ, which is the church,—one body with many members. That union may be the closest which permits the greatest diversities.

The freedom of the churches and the unity of the church are similar, if not identical, with the freedom and the unity belonging to the state. The state is a unit. In strictness of meaning it is the organic unity of mankind. All men are united in the state as members of an organism wherein each member is the means and the end of all the rest. Each man has his manhood only by virtue of this union. He is a man only as he is a means for the well-being of all men, and at the same time an end of their well-being. Considered apart from this union, as alone and separate from other men, he ceases to be a man, as the old proverb puts it: *Unus homo, nullus homo*. This organic unity of mankind which is the state, makes it proper to affirm that there is, in the broadest meaning of the term, but one state. And yet there are many states, with also great diversities in their constitutions and laws. We have monarchies, republics, democracies, all exercising the functions of government, and all claiming a right, which is also universally acknowledged, to the prerogatives of states. This diversity, however, does not militate against their unity. It is equally true that there is but one state, and that there are many states. The universal and the particular complement each other and are not contradictory. The organic unity which is the state requires for its actualization that there be particular states, as geographical or other conditions determine. These particular states are states in so far as they typify the one state, just as individual men are men only as the universal qualities of manhood are mirrored or expressed in them. The particular states together do not constitute the one universal state, any more than individual men in the aggregate make up the one universal manhood.

The state is one and universal, as manhood is one and universal, and at the same time there are particular states as there are individual men. The unity of the state, therefore, does not require—indeed in the actual condition of men would not permit—that all particular states should lose their individuality of government or institutions, and be merged in what might be deemed the visible embodiment of the one universal state. The universal state has no visible embodiment. It finds its expression, in certain degrees, among the different states, but is itself beyond all expression, and higher than any forms can reach. Yet it is not thereby without reality or power. In our modern world nothing has shown itself more real or potent. What we call international law, or the law of nations,—unknown except in the vaguest, faintest way in ancient times,—is recognized in our day as a sovereignty in human affairs, equally majestic and mighty. It has no visible throne; it does not utter itself through the voice of a monarch, or the votes of a legislature or the people; it has no courts to expound, nor any fleets or armies to enforce its dictates; but it guides kings, and legislatures, and peoples, and courts, and fleets, and armies in our times, with an authority whose manifestation of power is steadily increasing. There is nothing so characteristic of modern politics as the sway which international law is continually gaining among the existing nations. There is no other point in which the politics of the present day are so clearly distinct from those of the ancient world. But international law is nothing other than the voice of the one universal state. It is the state in the highest exhibition of it yet given in history. It is one and indivisible, and is uniting through itself more and more manifestly all particular states. But it leaves these states in their separate forms, each to manage its own affairs in freedom, each to maintain for itself a monarchical or republican or democratic government, as its own requirements shall determine. The organic unity is not impaired in the least—it is rather maintained—by this diversity. The organic relationship among men, the principle of human brotherhood itself, which requires in one case a monarchy, may require in another a republic, or a democracy, as it requires in every case the exercise of freedom.

The relation of church and state is not now our theme, but this obvious unity of the state amid all diversities of states fitly illustrates the true unity of the church. The church is one and indivisible. There is but one holy and catholic and apostolic church. But this church has no more definite form or visible embodiment than has the one universal state. It would be as absurd, and an absurdity of precisely the same sort, to affirm of any given form of church organization—Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational—that it and it only is the one church, as to declare that any given state—monarchical, republican, democratic—is the one and only state. The catholic church, like the universal state, is more or less clearly mirrored or fully expressed in particular organizations; but self-direction is as much the law of the church as it is of the state, liberty everywhere being the normal evolution of law, the freedom of the one, in its strictest meaning, being involved in the fellowship of all. Of course by freedom and liberty here I have in mind something quite other than license.

License is lawlessness, while the only perfect conception of liberty is perfect obedience to perfect law. That individual churches should cease to have their separate organizations, or be denied the liberty, under the general law of Christian fellowship, to manage their own affairs, is no more practicable or desirable than that individual states should cease to have their self-direction. Questions of difference, questions of comity or agreement, between the individual churches will be best settled by the enlarging sense of what is required by the communion of saints and the fellowship of the one body of Christ, just as such questions between different states are best adjusted by the larger knowledge of the organic relationship of all states, and the increasing disposition to conform to all the demands of the universal state. The autonomy of the individual church or state is preserved in liberty and kept from license through the autocracy of the universal.

In the common version of the New Testament, our Lord says, in John x. 16: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." In the original, however, the "one fold" is "one flock," and is thus rendered in the new version: "And they shall become one flock, one shepherd." The difference is quite apparent between the oneness belonging to the flock, and the oneness secured by a fold.

Julius H. Seelye.

From Professor Fisher of Yale.

It is not the design of this paper to set forth the advantages of any particular ecclesiastical system. The question is how catholic Christianity can be made to prevail over sectarianism. Sectarianism is the taking of a part for the whole,—the spirit that breeds division, separates Christians into hostile camps, hinders fraternal unity in feeling and coöperation in Christian work. Christian union, the inward sense of oneness, may show itself in the cordial intercommunion of different churches, and in their harmonious exertions for the common cause. It may, also, conceivably give rise to an organic unity.

As regards the Church of Rome, the Vatican dogma of the Pope's infallibility has raised a new and high wall of separation. Protestants at present can only abjure the old intolerance which denied that the Roman communion is a branch of the Christian church, recognize and appreciate whatever is good in the Latin church both now and in the past, and unite, as far as practicable, with Roman Catholics in Christian efforts to do good. For anything beyond this we must wait for changes, to occur we know not when or how. In this brief paper it is expedient to confine the attention to the Protestant evangelical bodies.

The groundwork of unity among Christians is religion, the most powerful of all principles of union among men. There is a common relation to Christ, whereby each obedient child of the Father, according to the saying of Jesus himself, is to Him a "brother, and sister, and mother." The bond of unity among His followers is the Holy Spirit, dwelling in all, and to be recognized by the fruits of Christian character and work. Peter was called to account at Jerusalem

for recognizing Cornelius and other uncircumcised persons as brethren. He defended himself by appealing to the fact that "God gave them the like gift"—the gift of the Spirit—"as he did unto" the Jewish Christians. So the Jerusalem apostles and believers joined hands with Paul when they saw that he had been as successful in converting the heathen as Peter had been in converting the Jews. "The same" [Spirit], Paul explains, "is mighty in me toward the Gentiles"; they "perceived the grace that was given unto me." This is the test always. Who can look on the Wesleyan Methodist body, and the great work done by it for God and man, without being constrained to say just what the Judaic Christians were obliged to acknowledge of Paul and Barnabas? Who can look on the Moravian missions, or on the missions of the Congregationalists in all quarters of the globe, and judge otherwise than the Jerusalem conservatives judged of Paul and Barnabas? The Judaizers clamored for other criterions; not so "James, Cephas, and John." External, historical, ritualistic touchstones are fast giving way before the palpable, immediate, irresistible appeal made by the actual fact of casting out devils in the name of Christ.

What are the chief obstacles to Christian union? First, of course, there is the immense bias in favor of some one sect and against others, which we inherit from the past and from ages of conflict. But this prejudice, like the traditional antipathy of nations, slowly melts away. Next, there is the blind bondage to names. People will not only cling to what they have had, but they will have it under just the same name. Many a Congregationalist has a dread of episcopacy, of "prelatical rule"; but no small part—I do not say the *whole*, but *no small part*—of the actual, practical work of a bishop is really done among Congregationalists by an irresponsible episcopacy of theological professors, secretaries of societies, "leading pastors," etc. Moreover, it is a kind of work that *must* be done by somebody. Thirdly, there is the specific hindrance to union arising from dogmatic intolerance. The single truth on which Christ (in his words to Peter) founded the church is not deemed enough as a term of communion. Dogmatic inferences are spun out, and supposed logical implications are piled up so high as to constitute numberless walls of exclusion. If there is to be union, diversities of opinion on a great variety of topics must be genially allowed. Theological narrowness and logical fanaticism will have to be overcome; and this change is gradually taking place.

There are barriers of *rite* as well as of *dogma*. Men have been resolved to insist on uniformity of observances as well as of doctrinal tenets. Why not permit here, too, a wider range of diversity? Why not make room for an orderly variety even under the same organization? Why should not the church be as comprehensive in its ritual as in its creed? Is it absurd to imagine a time when liturgical and non-liturgical churches may be combined under one ecclesiastical régime? When, even in the same sanctuary, there may be in one part of the day a liturgical service, and in another part of the day a non-liturgical? Are not these long-continued varieties of preference as to the mode of worship likely to continue? Are they not founded in diversities of character and taste that will always exist? At least, ought there not to be, and is

it not plain that there will be, some solution of the problem which shall not involve either the extirpation of one of the parties, or chronic ecclesiastical warfare and division between them? It is true that there are disagreements which only alterations of opinion can remove. A difference regarding a single rite parts one great evangelical body from others. The Baptist deduces from his premises, that immersion alone is baptism, and that baptism is the prerequisite of communion, the inference that only the immersed have a right at the Lord's table. If the Church of Rome professes to be founded on Peter, the Baptist Church may be said, without disrespect, to be founded on a syllogism. As long as both premises are conscientiously cherished, there must be this degree of isolation. The difference about the baptism of infants is another point which stands in the way of full communion, not to speak of organic union, with religious bodies which regard this practice as indispensable.

From rite we pass to polity. Here it would be a decided gain if all sects would acknowledge—what has become clear to scholars—that no existing form of polity corresponds closely to the polity of the apostolic age. The congregationalism which establishes many distinct organizations in the same town was not the system then in vogue; no more was diocesan episcopacy, either then or immediately after, whatever may be thought about the date and origin of episcopal government in its primitive form. The same may be said of the other ecclesiastical systems. Much more important—nay, of vital importance to Christian union—it is to discern that, while general principles at the basis of church organization are in the gospel teaching, there are no prescriptions, beyond these, applicable to all time. It is the great service of Richard Hooker to have demonstrated this truth. In other words, the *divine-right* theory of church polity, which has been a grand hindrance to Christian unity, must be exorcised. The Presbyterians in England were the first to assert the indispensableness of a particular form of organization. The Episcopalians followed: among them the moderate school of Hooker was ultimately overborne by the mystical school of Laud. Congregationalists have sometimes set up the same lofty claim for their system. Not content with contending that a particular polity is necessary to the *well-being* of a church, it has been often maintained to be indispensable to its *being*. It has been assumed that we must find out and take as a model the precise state of things on the last day of the last apostle's life. The controversies between Episcopalians and other evangelical bodies could be simplified, and perhaps brought nearer to an adjustment, if the distinction between the idea of a *governmental* and the idea of a *sacerdotal* episcopacy were kept in mind. This is not the place to approve or to condemn either of these theories. Enough to say that to a multitude of Christians a *governmental* episcopacy, with limited and defined powers, contains in it nothing formidable, while they recoil from the *sacerdotal* or *mystical* theory as involving the notion of a priesthood, a sacerdotal class, a close corporation,—a notion which, in their view, would rob the church at large—the Christian laity—of their reserved rights, and assimilate the gospel dispensation to the Old Testament economy. In justice to the Protestant Episcopal Church, it should be

added, however, that within its pale both theories exist side by side, their respective adherents being satisfied with episcopacy as a fact, in the absence of agreement as to its theoretical basis.

If organic unity is ever to occur, it is not likely to be through the surrender to any one church of all that is distinctive and is prized in other communions. Each sect is ready enough to swallow up all the rest. The Presbyterian will embrace you if you will only take his Westminster Confession and his synods; the Episcopalian, if you will take his prayer-book and his bishops; the Baptist only asks you to be immersed and to stop baptizing children; the Congregationalist simply demands that you will lodge all authority in the local congregation of believers, the professed Christians, or a fraction of them, in a town or village. There is little prospect of unity until the sundered communities mutually recognize their common Christianity and their equal standing as branches of the church of Christ. Plainly we can hope for no immediate visible union beyond a cordial coöperation and non-interference in Christian activity. It is a gain, however, to perceive that the present divisions of Christendom are a crying evil, and to put far from us the offensive idea that emulous sects help forward by their rivalries the cause of the gospel; that is, that Satan can be harnessed and made to do good work for Christianity.

If organic unity is ever to occur, what form will it take? It is unsafe to predict, but one may venture to think that as it was natural for the early church to follow the lines of political division, so if unity should be restored a like arrangement would emerge. Then as nations are united by various bonds, and we aspire after a "federation of mankind," so the churches of the nations might have their forms of union.

There is a powerful incentive in the direction of Christian union in the opening of the heathen world to missions. In the presence of the nations which are to be conquered to the religion of the cross the divisions of Christendom, and of Protestants in particular, present a disheartening spectacle, and are felt as a disgrace. Christ prayed for the unity of his disciples, that the world might know that the Father had sent him. The sight of discordant sects is not adapted to impress the heathen mind with this truth.

In different ways Christians of the various religious bodies, of their own motion, are uniting in distinctively religious and Christian work. Voluntary associations of this character attract to them numerous members from denominations distinct from one another. Books of devotion, like the "Imitation of Christ," find a welcome among the disciples of different creeds. If Christian people do not say the same prayers, they sing the same hymns. The centrifugal age of Protestantism is closed. The centripetal reaction has begun. Polemics may sound the old war-cries, but "the stars in their courses fight against Sisera."

George P. Fisher.

The Character of the New English House of Commons.

BY AN OLD MEMBER.

ENGLISHMEN accustomed to compare the working of their own assemblies with those of the United States often wonder whether there is the same kind of difference between one Congress and another which they observe between one Parliament and another.

Probably there is a greater difference in the English case than in the American, because the intervals between the election of one House of Commons and its successor are usually longer than the two years which separate one congressional election from the next. Yet in England we should expect to find a difference even with a two-years' period; for each House has got its own marked characteristics; is wiser or more heedless, bolder or more timid, with more rich men in it or more poor, than that which has gone before or that which follows. Edmund Burke remarked long ago that "besides the characters of the individuals that compose our body this House of Commons has a collective character of its own." We in England are now engaged in studying the character of our new master. Though we have known him scarce three months, we perceive great merits, coupled with some grave defects; and those of your readers who have occasion to watch the ways of Congresses may be interested to hear what we discover.

The present House of Commons was elected on a greatly enlarged suffrage, and after a redistribution of seats which finally extinguished the small boroughs and gave the large cities and populous mining and manufacturing county districts a representation fairly if not quite exactly proportioned to their population. These changes destroyed the chance of many men who had previously relied on their local interest or family connection and brought a new set of persons to the front. For the first time in half a century the number of members who did not sit in the previous Parliament, a number usually about a third, has exceeded half of the whole House.

The landed aristocracy, who before 1832 commanded four-fifths of the seats, and even down to 1868 had the majority, are now reduced to a shadow of their ancient strength. They are especially weak on the Liberal side. Hitherto between a half and a third of the Liberal members have belonged to what is called the Whig section of the party, whose moderate desire for progress is natural to a class of land-owners. This section is now less than a fourth of its own side. On the Tory side many scions of the great families were defeated at the polls in December last by obscure men belonging to the popular party, and in consequence the House presents an aspect quite unlike that of former Houses. The tall, handsome, well-dressed young men of society, with that air of superiority which is polish in the more genial, and turns to insolence in the less well natured, the young men whose real interest is in sport or fashionable entertainments and who look on politics as an amusement sometimes a bore, have now become a small minority of the whole; and a new element has appeared, in the labor representatives, of whom there are now about a dozen. Three or four are working-men from London and other great towns, some more are miners from Durham and Northumberland. Two or three, the most conspicuous of whom is Joseph Arch, the famous leader of the agricultural strikers, represent the newly enfranchised rural laborers of the counties. In all previous parliaments black coats (except during the heats of summer) and tall silk hats have been *de rigueur*. Now, however, you may count nearly a score of members in low-crowned felt hats, soft or hard, and gray or brown coats such as a farmer or a foreman in a

workshop might wear. In previous Houses there were scarce any doctors or university professors or journalists. The number of all three classes, but especially of the last, has increased in this one, rendering it more like a French or German or Hungarian Chamber than have been the Houses of past days.

As regards ability, the average level of this Parliament is high. Sir Erskine May, who, after sitting as clerk at the table of the House for five and thirty years, has just announced his retirement, said in 1874 that the House of that year was the stupidest he could remember. That of 1880 he thought better; this he thinks better still. No new genius has appeared, but the number of men of marked capacity is decidedly larger than before, and the gain is most notable on the Tory side, where the need for it was previously greatest. The speeches are not only better in substance and expression; they are also shorter. A tedious orator does not obtain the toleration which the last House extended to him. Cries of "Divide" or "Agreed" warn him to abridge his observations, for the present House is an active and impatient body, bent on work, and thinking so well of itself as to put a high value on its time. It has come up from the country, interested in politics, and particularly in social and industrial questions. It consists largely of young men in whom the hopeful eagerness of youth has not yet been dulled by these disappointments which make up three-fourths of the experience of an old parliamentary hand. The present members are less absorbed in social pleasures than their predecessors, and few of them have their own axes to grind. There is, of course, in every House of Commons, as in other legislatures, a certain number of persons to be found who enter it for the sake of serving their own interests as merchants, or contractors, or financiers, or promoters of joint-stock companies, persons who intrigue among their fellow-members, who try to bring secret influence to bear on the ministry of the day, who seek to gain authority in the eyes of the general public and of foreign governments by a trumpeting of their political importance. This noxious class is comparatively small when one considers what are the facilities for jobbing which the enormous powers of the House of Commons and its committees offer; and in the present Parliament it is apparently even smaller than in the last two that preceded. So far the change in the *personnel* from land-owners and plutocrats to persons belonging to the professional and working classes seems to have done no mischief. The majority in the present House is thinking less of its own concerns than of public legislation, and is eager for such legislation even to the verge of impatience and recklessness. Ideas and projects which till lately were deemed visionary are discussed seriously, and with difficulty prevented from taking effect in statutes. The majority is, in fact, what is called radical; nor is radicalism confined to the Liberal side of the House. There is a good deal of the same disposition to trust *a priori* reasonings, to bow to any popular cry, to follow an apparently philanthropic impulse, on the Tory side. That cautious, solid, unsentimental conservatism which used to characterize English politics is at a discount nowadays, and finds its exponents quite as much in the Whig section of the Liberal party as among the Tories. Old members are astonished, sometimes even shocked, at the

light-hearted energy with which this new House goes on its way, caring neither for the time-honored maxims of the Constitution nor for the rules of party discipline. The present ministry, although radical when compared to previous ministries, is not bold enough for the bulk of its supporters, and is often in danger of being defeated when it tries to restrain them. That it does maintain some sort of control is chiefly due to the immense personal influence of the Prime Minister.

The self-confidence of the new House appears in the behavior of individuals no less than of the body. The members are not shy or timid like those of former parliaments. Twenty years ago it was deemed the duty of a new member to sit silent for a session or two, and learn the temper of the House by listening to his elders, before he ventured to address it himself. But in the first weeks of this Parliament most of the speaking was done by the new-comers. They jostled the old members aside, and expressed themselves with ease and fluency on the gravest topics.

In fact the new House is courageous in every respect but one,—it is horribly afraid of its constituents. Whether because the memory of election speeches and promises is still so fresh in its mind, or because the members, relying less upon personal or family influence than in former days, feel themselves more purely delegates, there can be no doubt but that the present representatives of the people are extremely sensitive to the slightest breath of popular sentiment. Many a man will tell you that he voted for such and such a resolution or bill, not because he held it right, but because a section of his constituency desired it, or because the language he had used on the platform constrained him. It sounds absurd to say that persons who ought to know their own business best are mistaken in paying such abject deference to the wishes of their constituents; yet some who have had the amplest means of studying the English masses believe that the masses like an independent member better than a submissive member, that they value backbone in their representative, and deem him the more honest if he does not try to humor all their fancies. This is perfectly true. But the pres-

ent race of members is in a fair way to spoil the people by too much deference; and when one considers that on many subjects the opinion of a trained and able man, who has listened to debates by other able men, must be sounder than the notions of a mass of uninstructed voters, it is a misfortune that the country should lose some of the very benefits which a representative debating council was meant to secure, and that Parliament should be in danger of sitting merely to register conclusions formed by an irresponsible multitude outside.

M. P.

In Relation to the Labor Question.

IN answer to letters received and for the information of all interested, we give below a list of articles bearing upon the Labor Question which have appeared from time to time in this magazine, down to July, 1886.

The Foreign Elements in Our Population, <i>Joseph Edgar Chamberlin</i>	September, 1884
Danger Ahead, <i>Lyman Abbott</i>	November, 1885
The Strength and Weakness of Socialism, <i>Washington Gladden</i>	March, 1886
Strikes, Lockouts and Arbitration, <i>George May</i> <i>Powell</i>	April, 1886
A Letter from <i>William Morris</i>	July, 1886
The Labor Problem — By a Western Manufacturer, <i>Edward L. Day</i>	July, 1886
Coöperation — By a New York Master Printer, <i>Theodore L. De Vinne</i>	July, 1886

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Our "Commune," <i>J. G. Holland</i>	August, 1878
The Capitalist and the Laborer, <i>J. G. H.</i>	October, 1878
Popular Despotism, <i>J. G. H.</i>	January, 1879
An Aspect of the Question, <i>J. G. H.</i>	June, 1879
The Uses and Abuses of Trades-Unions	February, 1884
Economic Mistakes of the Poor	December, 1884
"Not The American Way"	April, 1885
Mercantilism Transfigured	December, 1885
A Readjustment of the Industrial Order	May, 1886
A Word of Sympathy and Caution	June, 1886
Two Kinds of Boycotting	June, 1886
Negation not a Remedy	July, 1886
Civil Liberty and Equal Rights	July, 1886

OPEN LETTERS.

Trades-Unions, <i>J. H. Loomis</i>	February, 1884
Danger Ahead, <i>H. C. Fulton</i>	February, 1886
The Labor Question, <i>Washington Gladden</i>	June, 1886

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

ALL political parties are made up of foxes and geese — about five thousand geese to one fox.

THE great beauty of charity is privacy; there is a sweet force even in an anonymous penny.

I AM an uncompromising Radical up to date, but when I reach the other world I can be a Conservative, if it is the best thing to do.

MEN of great genius should not forget that their failings, or vices, are more apt to be noticed, and even admired, than their virtues.

ALL Conservatives have once been Radicals, and their virtue consists in having found out that half a loaf is better than no bread.

My friend, if you must keep a pet, let it be one of the serene kind (a rattlesnake or snapping turtle, for instance); this will exercise your caution and strengthen your genius.

I KNOW of nothing that will test a man's true inwardness better than to feel like the Devil, and be obliged to act like a saint.

MY dear boy, if you must part your hair in the middle, get it even, if you have to split a hair to do it.

INDEPENDENCE is a name for what no man possesses; nothing, in the animate or inanimate world, is more dependent than man.

IT isn't so much what a man has that makes him happy, as it is what he doesn't want.

THERE are many comfortable people in the world, but to call any man perfectly happy is an insult.

THERE is nothing so valuable, and yet so cheap, as civility; you can almost buy land with it.

THE great mass of mankind can only gaze and wonder; if they undertake to think, they grow listless, and soon tire out.

Uncle Esek.

asked General Sumner what he thought, and he replied that the troops had undergone such great fatigue and privation, and met with such a disaster, that it would not be prudent to make another attack so soon. General Hooker, who was lying full length upon a bed in one corner of the room, upon being appealed to by General Burnside, sat up and said in the most frank and decided manner that no attack ought to be made in the morning. Then a general consultation took place, in which all who were present joined, the result of which was a verbal order, transmitted through me, countermanding the order for the second attack.

Of those present at the first interview, on the Fred-

ericksburg side, Generals Getty, Willcox, Butterfield, and probably several others not now remembered, still survive. The only survivors of the Phillips house interview are General Franklin and myself. To show the importance that General Franklin attached to the second interview, let me quote a paragraph from a letter from him to me, dated Hartford, Conn., December 17, 1866, in which he says :

" . . . I distinctly recollect your talk to Burnside, to which you refer, and had he been so talked to before he crossed the river, many lives would have been saved, as well as much credit to himself and reputation to the gallant Army of the Potomac."

Rush C. Hawkins.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Falsehood of Extremes.

IN the fight now going on between capital and labor, the worst elements on both sides are pretty nearly agreed in their fundamental principles. The conscienceless capitalist and the demagogue laborer seem to be far apart in their aims, but in their ruling ideas they are quite in harmony. Each believes in the employment of force to achieve his purposes; they differ only in the way in which the force is employed. The one organizes workingmen into companies, and arms them with brickbats to raise the price of labor; the other gets possession of legislatures and courts, and thus calls into action the power of the State, with its police and its militia, to validate and invalidate contracts, to make and unmake properties.

In their philosophy, as well as in their methods, the extremists on both sides are substantially at one. The maxim that the end justifies the means is continually appealed to as the warrant for their worst offenses. When we denounce the monopolies by which competition is crippled and killed, we are pointed to the beneficent results of these monopolies. Is not coal cheap to-day in the New York market? Is not the price of oil lower than ever before? How much does it cost to bring a barrel of flour from the Mississippi River to the Atlantic coast? Such are the triumphant queries of the apologists of monopoly. Has it not cheapened commodities and greatly multiplied the facilities of transportation? Does not the end justify the means?

The answer to these questions is by no means so obvious as the questioners suppose. Even from an economical point of view it is not certain that these triumphs of cheap commodities and cheap freight are not disasters. Oil at twenty cents a gallon may be a boon, but if it is the result of a process by which enterprise has been paralyzed in one great branch of industry, and by which thousands of men who might otherwise have been organizers of labor and captains of industry, gaining in such pursuits not only livelihood but mental development and independence of character, have been deprived of employment, or else made parts of a great machine in which their individuality is suppressed and their activity greatly circumscribed,—it is a serious question whether the loss to the country does not exceed the gain. Suppose that

the cheapening of oil, through this monopoly, has resulted in the weakening of the habit of self-help, and in the reduction of the productive energies of a large number of the people. Some of us would be willing to pay a little more for oil and a little less for poor-rates. We would rather have good neighbors than cheap commodities. It is possible that the end may justify the means; but what is the end? Are we sure that we have got to the end of the monopoly when we have purchased the material product at a reduced price?

A portion of the people may be benefited by cheap freights between terminal points on the great trunk lines of railroad; but the effect of the discriminations in favor of these points upon all the intermediate communities must also be considered. The fact that a barrel of flour is carried from Chicago to New York for fifty cents does not conclude the argument in favor of railroad monopolies and combinations. Nor does any story that can be told of the great reduction in the cost of transportation really meet the case, until we hear also the tale of those thousands of luckless investors who have been plundered of their little all to make this reduction possible.

It is not, then, so clear as it might be that monopoly is the beneficent force that its apologists represent it to be. So long as it keeps within the law, however, it must be allowed to use the power that it is able to accumulate. But when it begins to defeat the law by bribery and corruption, it is time to make a stand. Cheap freights and cheap commodities are a poor recompense for perverted justice and debauched legislation. The New York aldermen and their bribers may point to the increased facilities and the reduced prices of travel on Broadway; but the people of this city could better have afforded to travel that thoroughfare on foot for twenty years than suffer the injury to their municipal life of which these men were the authors. The end of those insidious practices by which great corporations, aided by astute lawyers and abetted by corrupt officials, evade and pervert and paralyze the laws of the land, does not appear in the cheap freights and the low railway fares that they sometimes offer us; it begins to be visible in the contempt for law which is constantly showing itself, and in the sullen resentments that fill the minds of the less fortunate classes. Greedy capital, seeking to justify its lawless methods by pointing to the good which it has accom-

plished, may well reflect that the end is not yet, and consider carefully what the end may be.

This counsel is equally good for the other side. The notion that the end justifies the means is at the bottom of the worst practices of the labor organizations. The coercion to which they often resort is utterly iniquitous; but they defend it on the ground of a benefit to be conferred on the whole working class. To compel employees content with their work and their wages, and on good terms with their employer, to quit work and suffer in idleness, is a gross violation of personal rights; to drive men out of the labor in which they are gaining an honest livelihood because they do not choose to join the trades-union is a most flagrant usurpation; but such invasions of the rights of individuals are justified by pleading the good to be gained in the increase of wages.

Nothing could be more utterly hostile to the fundamental principles of a democracy than these interferences with personal liberty. If any right is inalienable, except for crime, it is the right of the workman to sell his labor in a free market. At a great price the workmen of America have obtained their freedom; the denial of it to any man is a crime, no matter by whom committed. We boast of our liberties; is any one of them all more precious than the right of every man to choose his occupation, and to make his own contract for the disposal of his labor, without let or hindrance from any man or men? Yet this is the right that the workmen themselves are trampling under their feet. They admit the immediate injustice, yet point to an end to be gained that justifies the iniquitous means. It is wrong, they confess, to deprive men of their liberty, but they do this present evil that future good may come to the men oppressed, in the form of enhanced wages. The coercion of a peaceable citizen by unauthorized private bands of men is clearly wrong; but the citizen is coerced for his own good and for the public benefit.

This is the plea of every despot; he deprives the people of their liberties because he thinks that they do not know how to use them. And it is time for the American workmen to consider whether they desire to establish a despotism for beneficent ends. Does a beneficent end justify despotism? And are we quite sure, after all, that the end is beneficent? Larger wages and shorter hours of work will result, we are told, from this benign tyranny. But will this be the final and sole result of these lawless methods and these deeds of violence? Shall we not witness, along with this result, a grievous breaking down of the self-respect and the self-reliance of multitudes of our workmen, who have ceased to think and act for themselves, and who have become the tools of an impossible ochlocracy? Shall we not, even more surely, find that lawlessness has become chronic; that the habit of coercing men by one sort of mob rule or another has become dangerously prevalent; that the foundations of our liberties have been undermined? It is no more the end when violent combinations of workmen have raised the rate of wages, than it is the end when heartless monopolies have lowered the price of commodities. The end is yet to come, and it is the same in both cases — a deterioration in the manly virtues of individuals, and a weakening of the just restraints of the law that protects our liberties. How

high should be the wages and how cheap the commodities for which we are ready to barter these birth-rights?

The workmen of this country will do well to give this subject serious consideration. Their right to combine for the promotion of their own interests cannot be denied; the attempts of some to deprive them of this right are tyrannical; but the correlative of the right to form such combinations is the right of every man to refuse to enter into them. That right they must recognize and defend. Whatever they can do by peaceable and rational methods to improve their circumstances they ought to do; but let them not suppose that they can grasp by violence any real advantages. The right of every man to work for whom he will, and for what wages he chooses to accept, is the corner-stone of our free institutions; it is a monstrous blunder for workmen to deny this right to any honest man. Some of them do not seem to see how deeply their welfare and happiness are concerned in the preservation of this sacred right. Let them think well upon these words of one of themselves, who stood when he spoke them at the head of the nation:

"Nowhere in the world is presented a government of so much liberty and equality. To the humblest and poorest amongst us are held out the highest privileges and positions. The present moment finds me at the White House, yet there is as good a chance for your children as there was for my father's. Again I admonish you not to be turned from your stern purpose of defending our beloved country and its free institutions by any arguments urged by ambitious and designing men."^{*}

To save these institutions for our children, to keep these paths of privilege and preferment open to all, there must be no despotisms here, not even for beneficent ends. Workingmen want no other weapons than liberty and light. By peaceful and orderly measures they will the more speedily and surely gain the ends they seek; by any other measures they will undermine and shatter the civil structure which is the shelter and the defense of all that they hold dear.

Democracy in England.

It was, no doubt, a source of some umbrage to our forefathers that their English cousins should care to know so much less about American geography, history, and politics than Americans were wont to know about those of England. There was in the comparison a certain derogation from what Americans felt to be a just estimate of the work which their country had done in the solution of the problems which vex the progress of men from good to better. Our own domestic difficulties of the past two years have not taken our attention from English politics, and the study has given rise to sympathy where once there was resentment. We see Englishmen struggling desperately, almost hopelessly, with problems which were solved in the United States decades since; we see that our comparatively successful solutions came from a previous study of English experience; and we think, at last, that our English cousins would have done better and more wisely if they had made a judicial study of American experience before their own problems came hurrying upon them with a pressure not to be denied. The

* Lincoln's speech to the 148th Ohio Regiment.

most acute of English thinkers are coming over to the same belief, and are beginning, though late, the thorough examination of the *terra incognita* of American politics.

Even these investigators, however, are in too many cases beginning their work on wrong lines. The success of the American Democracy has not been due simply to its adoption of a Federal system, of Home Rule, if you will, though this has been one of its most excellent instruments. Just as soon as it can see a reasonable certainty of growth and permanence in a community of frontier farmers, it is quick to grant them a Parliament of their own, a Legislature, as we call it, with powers wider than have yet been seriously proposed for St. Stephen's. All this is Home Rule in the fullest sense of the term. But our country had this same Home Rule under the Articles of Confederation; and it brought then neither prosperity nor peace. Nor can the secret be found in the Senate of the United States, austere grand as that body may appear when the wide Atlantic rolls between it and the observer. It is the surviving fragment of the Home Rule of the Confederation; and the nation which puts its trust only in the Senate, as we have it, is simply adopting a form of Home Rule which this country has already tried and found wanting. Nor is the secret in the Federal judiciary. The nine wise men, who, sitting as a Supreme Court, determine the legitimacy or the illegitimacy of legislation in this country, would find their occupation hopelessly gone if they were transferred bodily to England. That occupation consists in comparing the rights claimed under an act of legislation with the standard set up by a written Constitution; and such a constitution does not exist in England. Thus, also, it was this written Constitution which converted the intolerable Home Rule of the Confederation, now represented by the Senate, into the excellent system which has covered central North America with autonomous commonwealths. Turn as he will, the English observer will find that the American success lies in some phase of the written Constitution, and that other instruments are only indices of this.

There seems to be a great deal of misapprehension among Englishmen as to the nature of the work which the Constitution has done for the United States. There need be no such misapprehension; like all great political inventions, the essence of this is simplicity itself. In 1787 the American Democracy, acting, as it has always preferred to act, on State lines, delegated to certain representatives the task of formulating that which should be a permanent expression of its will. The work of the representatives having been done, it was approved and ratified. From that time to this the American Democracy has had no further occasion to meet by delegates. It need not speak, for it is always speaking through the Constitution; it is continually saying to Congress, to every Government agent, to the State Legislatures and Governments, "This may be done; that must not be done." Englishmen consider the Crown as a most useful means of avoiding quadrennial Presidential elections; the American Constitution is, much more accurately, a device for avoiding most of the haste and hurry of Parliamentary constitution-making. The American Democracy speaks once for all through the Constitution; the English Democracy

must be always at it through Parliament. The American judges arraign legislation and individual action by the rules of the Constitution; English judges arraign individual action by Parliamentary legislation. It is most misleading to compare Parliament with Congress; it would be more exact to say that the Constitution is the American Parliament, and that Congress takes the place of the English Ministry.

No democracy can be forever declaring its will. It has other business to attend to, and it must lose a percentage of its efficiency in daily business if it is again and again called upon to consider minutely and register its final decision on great matters of public welfare. One cannot wonder that the Athenian Democracy lasted but a little more than a century, when he finds that every citizen was continually busied in serving as a magistrate, or priest, or juror, or legislator; that he could not oversee the lading of a ship without being interrupted by a call to decide whether there should be peace or war with Sparta, or whether some novel religious teaching was in accord with public policy. Nor can we hope for a long existence for an English Democracy, if it is to be called upon to drop all other business and deliberate and decide upon a fundamental change in the constitution of government whenever an ambitious or desperate Minister chooses to "appeal to the country." It is but a question of time when the weary people shall seek and find in Cæsarism of some sort the respite which the American Democracy has found in its written Constitution. Better, far better would it be to call upon the people to decide, once for all, upon the broad and clear lines within which they wish their government to act, so that the government may be as much as possible administrative, and as little as possible creative. Creative geniuses are a bane to a democracy.

A still higher advantage of a written constitution is that it is a self-imposed check upon the democracy. A repeated necessity of dealing with fundamental questions is not only exhausting to a democracy; it is dangerous for much the same reasons. Here sober second thought is not a luxury; it is an absolute necessity. Time and again the American democracy has put the seal of its condemnation, at the second or third opportunity for consideration, upon propositions on which it would have wrecked itself at the first but for the impediments found in the Constitution. The Constitution is the minority's barricade; under the English system the minority is at the mercy of the majority, and a House of Commons may upset at one blow the rules of governmental action which have been the only guides tested by experience. An omnipotent Parliament, with a strong aristocratic or royal influence within it, is a conceivable, though hardly an advisable system. An omnipotent Parliament of a single house, elected by almost universal suffrage, the Crown and the Lords having gone by the board, could be suggested to an American only to be repudiated as essentially and incurably revolutionary.

The apprehension of Americans, however, is that it is too late for the English democracy to impose upon itself the permanent curb of a constitution. The time was in 1832, when the wheel began to turn toward democracy. Then, if ever, was the time to limit the coming power, to accustom it to act with self-restraint and rely for details upon its governmental

agents, and yet to put those agents under bonds to see and respect the expressed will of the people, without harassing them by continual appeals for new revolutions. Then the steps which followed, in 1867 and 1884-5, would have been only a safe and orderly advance upon well-marked lines, instead of an admission of a wider and still wider circle to a share in irresponsible power. For fifty years the energy of English

Liberals has gone to widening the suffrage, without taking any hostages for order, deliberation, and the security of the minority. It is unhappy for the best hopes of human progress if the outcome of a half century's struggle for democracy in England is to be simply the establishment of that for which the most democratic American has no liking—the tyranny of a majority.

OPEN LETTERS.

A Dutch Success in Coöperation.

THERE is no undue boast in the title of the book, "La Question Ouvrière, Essai de Solution Pratique," in which the story of this coöperative distillery is told by its creator and managing director, Mr. J. C. Van Marken, Jr. What I have to say of the enterprise has been learned from his lips as well as his book; and the testimony of both was confirmed by my own eyes when I made a pilgrimage to Delft, not long ago.

The factory began work in 1870. It is owned by a joint-stock corporation, so that Mr. Van Marken has had to make his coöperative schemes not only alluring to his workmen but profitable to his fellow-shareholders. In 1874 the first dividend was paid on the capital stock of \$84,000. It was less than six per cent. In 1877 the dividend was thirteen per cent.; in 1879, twenty-four per cent.; in 1880, thirty-six per cent. upon a doubled capital of \$168,000. During 1880 the profits set apart for the laborers amounted to six and a half per cent., so that the total net earnings of 1880 were forty-two and a half per cent. on the capital invested. I give these figures to show that the business has been carried on upon a business basis, for profit and not for philanthropy.

This factory lets its employees buy, in small installments, a minority interest in its stock. It supports them in sickness. It supplies them, or rather (and more wisely) it aids them to supply themselves, with good doctors and pure drugs at cost. It began to teach them about "first aid to the injured" a year or more before such teaching was offered in New York. It sells them fire insurance at cost; and the cost is 12½ cents per \$100 per annum, payable in quarterly installments. It has given their children a gymnasium. It has built some model tenements for them. Lately it was laying out a small park for them.

The company has established a system of premiums, which is intended to "interest labor in increasing the yield from the raw materials used." The average yield of alcohol and yeast from a given quantity of grain prior to 1874 was fixed in that year as a minimum. It was determined to divide among the workmen each week, in proportion to their wages, about one-third of the value of any increase. If the yield in any week fell below the fixed minimum, this deficiency was to be deducted from the surplus of subsequent weeks. The results of this system are thus stated: "The percentage of yield from the raw materials is not surpassed, so far as I know, in any other similar establishment." The consequent premiums increased wages about ten per cent. in 1875 and about thirty per cent. in 1880.

VOL. XXXII.—84.

There is a system of rewards, which is intended to "interest labor in the reduction of the general cost of production by limiting the number of laborers." In 1878 the number of men needed to work a certain amount of grain was fixed. A reward was offered for each extra thousand kilos of grain worked per week by this number of laborers. This reward is a small percentage of the gain. The result has been that forty-three workmen now do twice the work formerly done by thirty-nine, and earn forty-five per cent. more wages.

There is a "participation in profits, interesting labor in the net result of its toil." From the profits of each year a five per cent. dividend is paid. The surplus is divided about as follows: ten per cent. of it goes to the reserve fund, fifty per cent. to the stockholders, ten per cent. to the executive committee, twenty per cent. to the managing director, and ten per cent. to the executive committee and the managing director in trust for the operatives. These trust funds are devoted to the purchase of annuities. An amount equal to seven per cent. of each laborer's wages buys him a fixed annuity, payable to him from his sixtieth year. An employee whose labors in a factory begin when he is twenty and continue till he is sixty will thereafter receive an annuity about equal to the average of his wages during that time. If the percentage of profits fails to pay the sum due in any year, there is no forfeiture of rights already gained, for a separate annuity is bought each year. The only result is to diminish the aggregate by the amount which would otherwise have been bought that year. Workmen who are employed less than two years, or who are discharged for misconduct, lose their annuity rights. Those discharged for any other reason retain only a part of their annuity rights. This annuity system was introduced in 1880. The profits of that year permitted the purchase of annuities for all the workmen then in the company's employ, not only for that twelvemonth, but for each year of their employment before the system was introduced. This is at once the most novel and the most valuable of all Mr. Van Marken's plans.

Plans for general accident insurance are in preparation. Since the barbarous doctrine that an employer is not liable for a hurt to an employee caused by the fault of a fellow-employee has ceased to be law in England, companies have been formed there to insure employers against such liabilities. Mr. Van Marken's plan seems somewhat better.

When the ten per cent. of net profits above the fixed dividend on capital becomes more than sufficient to

pay for the annuities already mentioned, the surplus is to be devoted to the purchase of life insurance.

There is a council called "The Nucleus." It is composed of the managing director, the heads of departments, the foremen, and three laborers. The last are elected annually by their fellows. This body meets once a week to discuss matters of general interest pertaining to the whole enterprise. Its functions are purely advisory.

In every department of the factory there is a box with numbered compartments. Each employee has a corresponding number. Money can be dropped into any compartment at any time. The boxes are secured by two locks. The foreman has one of the keys, the managing director the other. Every Wednesday morning (wages are paid Tuesday afternoon) the boxes are opened and the sums found in them are credited to the several depositors. Interest is paid at five per cent. per annum, and a bonus of five per cent. is credited for each florin deposited. Deposits may be withdrawn at any time. After any withdrawal, in whole or part, no bonus is given until the deposit exceeds the total credit at the time of withdrawal. The five per cent. bonus comes from the funds of the "Bank for the General Good." This attempt to encourage saving has been only moderately successful. In 1881, after a ten years' trial, the total deposits were less than two thousand dollars. Mr. Van Marken attributes this partly to the existence of his obligatory savings institution, and partly to the reluctance of his employees to let him know how much they can save,—a reluctance due to their fear that their wages may be reduced.

The premiums already mentioned are paid wholly in cash only to married workmen who have four children less than fifteen years of age. The other cash payments are as follows:

90	per cent.	to married men with 3 children below 15.
80	"	" " " " " 2 " " " "
70	"	" " " " " 1 child " "
60	"	" " " " " without children.
50	"	" " " " " unmarried men above 23.
25	"	" " " " " between 18 and 23.
10	"	" " " " " below 18.

The balances are credited to the owners and draw four per cent. interest. Neither principal nor interest can be withdrawn before the depositor is sixty years of age, unless (1) he ceases to be employed; (2) he is married, when he can draw upon his deposit to an amount equal to twenty-five days' pay; (3) his wife is confined, when he can draw an amount equal to two days' pay; (4) he satisfies the managing director of the advisability of permitting him to withdraw all or part of his deposit. This system of enforced saving began January 1, 1879. Up to June 1, 1881, one hundred and seven persons had had credits amounting to nearly \$4500, and had withdrawn about \$2700, half of it to buy stock in the corporation.

From the part of the premiums nominally payable in cash, according to the table already given, a deduction of ten per cent. is made. The funds thus realized are paid into the "Bank for the General Good," and are disbursed by the managing director as he deems best for the general good. These funds have so far sufficed to found and maintain the club-house, the library, and the gymnasium, and to pay the five per cent. bonus upon voluntary savings, etc.

There are reading and recreation rooms in a pretty

little building between the factory and the model homes. It is really a club-house, open from five to ten P. M. to the operatives, their wives, and their children above the age of sixteen. There are billiards and cards, chess and dominoes, stereoscopic views and engravings. Pictures and the diplomas awarded the factory for the excellence of its products adorn the walls, below the truth-telling motto, "The factory for each; all for the factory." The rooms are also open on Sundays from two to ten P. M.

A library of eight hundred volumes occupies part of the club-house. It is free to the workpeople and their families, and circulates on an average one hundred and sixty volumes per week. It was founded in 1871. For seven years the books were kept in Mr. Van Marken's house. Nobody applied for them. In 1878, when they were transferred to the club-house and put in charge of an operative, the whole force apparently began to read.

Literary and scientific lectures are given in the reading-room during the winter to audiences of twenty to thirty persons. Sunday-evening readings of prose and poetry draw about fifty people. The display of the magic-lantern, which is the newest treasure of the club-house, always fills the hall.

Festivals are held several times a year. The opening of an addition to the factory, the birthday of the director, a successful year,—such events are celebrated together by master and men.

Any workman who wishes to do so can have his child's name entered on the company's prize books. The child's teachers then make regular reports of the pupil's progress. Prizes of three or four cents are given each month to all the children who reach a certain grade. These sums are deposited to their credit in the savings-bank, and cannot be withdrawn till the end of the year. There are festivals for the children each summer and winter. At the winter celebration special prizes are distributed. The children are notable in the Delft schools for punctuality, for regularity of attendance, and for zeal in study.

I have sketched as briefly as might be the story of a great success. The success is born of the brain of an enthusiast, but his enthusiasm pays dividends, and his book shows less able men how they can make co-operation successful. Any one who cares to do so can find the story told with a myriad details in Mr. Van Marken's book.

Alfred Bishop Mason.

Bird-Destroyers.

IN a communication relating to the destruction of birds for millinery purposes, Mr. Ernest E. T. Seton calls attention to the work of the American Ornithologists' Union, and the Audubon Society recently founded by "The Forest and Stream" of New York city. The members of the Audubon Society are pledged to do all in their power to suppress the killing of birds for any purpose except for food, and all persons are invited to join and extend the work. These societies, Mr. Seton adds, are distributing among legislators and leaders of opinion throughout the country magazines and pamphlets relating to this subject, and already the results of the movement are so encouraging that the progress toward extermination is strongly checked.

Not in the sky,
 Where wastes of grandeur lie,
 May genius find wherewith to slake its
 thirst;
 The rainbow is not first
 On Beauty's list,
 Nor is the enchantment of heaven's highest
 mist
 The master maker's aim!
 The lowliest hearth-stone flame
 Is worthier of worship than the sun!
 The patter of bare brown feet that dance and
 run
 With childish grace on roughest cabin floor,
 And the poor mother's happy smile, are more
 Than starry hosts
 And lofty ghosts
 And awful phantoms born of overwrought
 And soulless travail on the heights of thought!

Come down, O Lark, to earth,
 And give a new song birth —
 The song of life that grants its sweets to all,
 In hut and lofty hall;
 Forsake the sky,
 And sky-born melody;
 Fill thy meadow and thy grove
 With a strain of human love —
 With a wide, strong pulse of music for the
 waiting ears of men,
 Who, to be born again,
 And live the life of freedom that I live,

More than their lives would give;
 Yea,
 Would slay,
 And heap vast hecatombs, and flood
 The world with blood,
 And jar
 Heaven with the thunder,
 And the wonder,
 And the awful weltering whirlwind of the storm
 of war!

Oh, ere it is too late,
 Take heed, and contemplate
 What tempests sleep
 That yet will wake and leap
 Across thy starry fields and blot them out,
 And drown thy voice in their uproarious shout!
 Thou art too high;
 No longing ear or eye
 May follow thee, nor is thy sweetest note
 Echoed by mortal throat;
 But ever it goes forth with none to hear
 And none to catch its cheer!
 Come sit beside me now,
 Here on my orange-bough;
 Forsake the legendary lights,
 Forget the old hereditary heights,
 And we will pipe one lusty score together
 Wing by wing,
 In this land of spring,
 While all the world comes out to feel the weather
 Throb with the fire of Freedom as we sing!

Maurice Thompson.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Legislative Inefficiency.

WITH much that our correspondent, whose interesting contribution we publish among our "Open Letters," says about the inefficiency of the lower House of Congress we heartily agree, but it seems to us that in drawing his indictment he overlooks several important points. He assumes that the failure of the House to pass a larger number of the measures which had been passed by the Senate was a proof of inefficiency, and he argues at some length to show that a measure which has been approved by the Senate must be desirable. This is unfortunately not the case. He cites one hundred and twenty-eight of the Senate bills as having been claims of private persons against the Government. How often such claims may be undeserving we have had striking evidence at the recent session of Congress, in the series of admirable vetoes which the President has written upon them. It is true that the last House failed to pass the Bankruptcy Bill and the Presidential Succession Bill, both obviously desirable and important; but the latter is now a

law, having been passed early in the recent session of the present House.

We do not deny the inefficiency of the House; nobody can do that successfully; but it seems to us a mistake to assume that the usefulness of a legislative body can be gauged by the number of bills which it passes. The great evil of the times is not too little legislation, but too much. It requires eternal vigilance on the part of the disinterested portion of the press, not so much to get desirable laws enacted as to prevent the enactment of positively vicious measures. It is a fact that the whole country breathes a sigh of relief when Congress adjourns, because there is then no further danger of pernicious legislation. The same thing is true of our State legislatures. We cannot agree with our correspondent that the Senate is a more efficient body than the House. Take, for example, the record of the recent session. Aside from the passage of the Presidential Succession Bill, the Electoral Count Bill, and the Blair Educational Bill (a measure concerning which wise men differ in opinion), the most conspicuous act of the Senate has

been the passage of the Blair Pension Bill, calling for an annual expenditure ranging anywhere from fifty million to two hundred million dollars. This pension scheme was not only a demagogic device, but it called for such enormous drafts upon the Treasury that its becoming a law would have been a step toward national bankruptcy. The House killed this after the Senate had passed it.

With what our correspondent says about time wasted in debate we are also inclined to disagree. Much time is undoubtedly wasted in useless talk, but it is a mistake to say that nothing can be gained by debating a measure which has little or no chance of becoming a law. Especially is it a mistake if the measure be a tariff bill. We shall never secure the much-needed revision of our present tariff laws until the subject has become more thoroughly understood than it is at present, and there is no better way of diffusing knowledge upon it than by debate. What we need in Congress is not less talk, but better talk.

And this brings us to the root of the whole difficulty. We shall not have abler debating and more efficient legislation until we get a better class of men for Congressmen. Nobody who has followed the course of all our legislative bodies for the past few years can fail to conclude that there has been a steady descent in the scale of ability and character of the men who are elected to make our laws. It used to be considered a high honor to be sent even to a State legislature. Does anybody consider it so now? Few men who are fit for the service make any effort to get into it, while the most unfit men work hardest, and usually succeed in getting the position. The remedy is with the people, and in our opinion clearly lies in the line of a thorough and universal application of the merit system to all the minor offices of the nation, the state, and the municipality.

Marriage, Divorce, and the Mormon Problem.

MANY Americans believed in 1865 that the last of problems had been worked out by the United States, and that the country had now no more to do than to enjoy its well-earned leisure, with none to molest or to make it afraid. The futility of the expectation has only become more evident with the years. No year has come without its problem. Some of them have been great and others small; but each in turn has pressed imperatively for a solution. The general success of the country in meeting them has been due in no small degree to prevision. The problem has not been allowed to roll up to its full potentiality of volume before the wisest solution that foresight could compass has been applied, and then modified in execution as circumstances seemed to demand. To this general rule of action there has been one striking exception. One problem, What shall be done with the Mormons? is still unsolved; the general lines of all the attempted solutions have proved total failures; the problem is rising swiftly to a volume which threatens to be beyond remedy; and experience brings no hope of an agreement as to the solution. Surely, the urgent necessity of dealing with other difficulties need not lead us to ignore this one until it passes the others and asserts its claim to the lead among all the topics of the time.

It has been a common belief that Young and the

other Mormon leaders who founded their State of Deseret in 1846-48 were coarse and ignorant men; and yet there are some circumstances which are not easily reconcilable with this view of them. This is particularly the case with their management of the *quasi* international relations between the Mormon community and the United States. It may be that they merely blundered into the advantageous position which we have found to our cost that they occupy. If so, it is odd that they have never happened to blunder out of it. It is a possibility, on the other hand, that they have acted under some guidance which was well read in our constitutional law, and possessed also a clear and far sight into the future. It may be that this is the reason why their action has so constantly hit the weakest joint in our national harness. If we look back over forty years' connection with them, and notice their successes in meeting every blow which has been aimed at them, it may aid us in finding the counteracting circumstance, the remedy which shall solve the problem and at last bring the natural forces of advancing civilization to bear upon them.

In 1845-46, when the first migration from Nauvoo to Utah was planned and executed, the country around the Great Salt Lake was still Mexican soil. It required no great foresight, however, to see that the culminating difficulties with Mexico might result in war; that the harbor of San Francisco would be an irresistible temptation to a conqueror; and that the annexation of San Francisco involved the annexation of the country around the Great Salt Lake. Still, all this was *in nubibus*; it might be or it might not be. If it should not be, the Mormon leaders would have gained their primary object. Their colony would be on the soil of a foreign, and that a very weak, government; it would be on the very outskirts of a country which could hardly maintain order in its capital city; and it would nevertheless be close to the border of the United States, and at the gateway of immigration. Supposing that the other alternative should be, as it was, proffered to them, that the United States should annex Utah, were the Mormons shut up to their first programme? Were they to meet annexation by a further migration into Sonora, or some other northern Mexican State? What were the advantages which kept them where they were, whose force the nation feels more severely with every year?

The American State, or commonwealth, has absolute power over the subjects of marriage and divorce. Any American State might at any time permit plural marriage within its jurisdiction, if it should so will. This fact might have kept the Mormons where they were, in the State of Illinois, with the purpose of gaining control of it and making it a polygamous State, but for the fact that the State had also the correlative power, when the danger should become visible, to crush the minority by imprisoning its leaders for violation of its marriage laws, while tolerating the lawless expression of the majority's public opinion. A territory where the Saints could be in the majority from the start, was the only safe place to begin a polygamous State.

But would the American Congress ever allow such a polygamous territory to become a polygamous State? Unholy as the affirmative proposition might seem, there was every chance in its favor, if patience could secure

her perfect work. Given a sufficiently large number of persons in a community, the proposition that the American people should keep them forever under absolute power was unthinkable. The Mormon community only *permitted* polygamy. The great mass of its members must always be monogamists. Let them have patience; let them submit to the imprisonment or disfranchisement of such of their few polygamists as should be convicted; let them only remain a majority, and the time must come when Congress, in some weak, hopeless, or over-sanguine hour, should admit the State of Utah. The gift of Statehood is irrevocable; once a State, Utah could not be deprived of her absolute power over marriage and divorce by any subsequent Congress, or by any instrument with the exception of an amendment to the Constitution, giving Congress the power to regulate marriage and divorce by general laws for the entire Union, and Federal Courts the power to punish for violation of them.

If this is the only remedy for a hasty or thoughtless admission of Utah to the Union, why not apply it now? Is it better to go on for years as we have done, holding this wolf by the ears, knowing that the chances are that it will some day escape? If that is to be our line of action, truly it was an astute and provident policy which kept the Mormons in Utah in 1848, for they had everything to gain and nothing to lose by a territorial location. Their population has risen from 11,380 in 1850 to 47,130 in 1860, 86,786 in 1870, and 143,963 in 1880. They are now more in number than the law requires as a constituency for a Representative in Congress; and their retention as a territory is every year becoming a greater strain upon our institutions. What are we to do when the population of Utah is a million or more? Are we still to keep them under the absolute government of Congress? Or do we imagine that our patience will be the greater, and that the Mormons will then be in the minority, or converted to monogamy? So far from that being probable, our delay is only preparing for us new difficulties of the same kind. The neighboring territories, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, are becoming infected with the Utah disease; and the time will come when we shall have on our hands the problem of holding in four polygamous territories, instead of one, from becoming States.

There are objections to be considered, of course. The leading objection would be that the proposed grant of power to Congress would be distinctly outside of any proper limits to a really federal system; that a national marriage and divorce law would be a long step on the road to a French, or unified, republican system. The validity of the objection cannot well be denied. The fact is with the objector. Circumstances, mainly the rise of Mormonism, have forced upon us one evil. The country must decide whether this single step toward unification is too large a price to pay for a final solution of the Mormon problem. The ratification of the amendment would for the first time stamp Mormon polygamy as forever hopeless. A State government under the proposed amendment would relieve Congress of any further necessity for governing Utah; it would remit the punishment of polygamy, including disfranchisement and exclusion from office, to the automatic action of the United States courts; and, by changing political

into purely legal prosecution, its natural effect would be to break up the influences which now make the Saints a consciously peculiar people, to urge the ambitious younger men out of its jurisdiction, and to strike at the ecclesiastical, which in many respects is more important than the mere polygamous, element of the question.

Again, it may be objected that such an amendment would merely substitute the loose Western divorce laws for the higher standard of the older States. Is there a Western State whose divorce laws are looser than those of Connecticut, the "land of steady habits"; or whose marriage laws and practice are looser than those of New York, the Empire State? As a matter of fact, it would be a blessing for most of the States, old or new, East or West, if national legislation on these subjects could take the place of their present systems. The Senator or Representative who would pay little attention to loose marriage and divorce laws in his own State, would hesitate before giving the legislation of the nation a character calculated to invite the contempt of sister nations. For the same reason the transfer of power would lighten, by concentrating, the labor of those devoted men who have so long been striving to reform State divorce laws. If they were released from the necessity of attacking thirty-eight different legislative bodies, and were referred to Congress alone, their efforts would have far greater promise of effect.

The evil itself has become so far national as to make national legislation applicable and appropriate. If the remedy through constitutional amendment is to be tried, the work cannot be begun too soon. The passage and ratification of an amendment to the American Constitution is about the most difficult legislative feat imaginable. To accomplish it before the Mormon problem shall have become hopelessly great, the work should be begun at once. If the first draft of the amendment should be offered in Congress in 1886, its passage and ratification would occupy probably ten years of hard work, and by that time the population of Utah will number about half a million. To leave the beginning of the work until that time would simply mean the admission of Utah as a State, out of sheer desperation, before the amendment could be ratified.

The Forgotten Millions.

MISCHIEF sometimes lurks in the tamest platitudes. Sayings that passed current until they were worn smooth have been found to be pinchbeck. The maxim which declares that it is better to feed a hundred mendicant impostors than to permit one worthy and needy person to suffer,—or, varying the form of the adage, that a hundred criminals might better be set free than that one innocent person be punished,—is by most persons accepted as a moral axiom, but it needs to be carefully analyzed.

Doubtless it is the dictate of humanity that no helpless child of want should be left to starve, as it is the dictate of justice that no innocent victim of circumstances should be made to endure an undeserved penalty. So far as it is possible in the wise administration of our charities and in the vigorous execution of our laws to prevent such wrongs, they ought to be prevented. But

these maxims are often quoted to justify indiscriminate almsgiving and a lax enforcement of criminal laws. It is when we are making choice of methods that they are generally appealed to; and thus they are made to mean that a method which lets loose upon society a hundred tramps or a hundred criminals, in order to avoid the risk of inflicting suffering upon one innocent person, is better than a method which punishes with the hundred miscreants one innocent person.

Now, it is to be remembered that all our legal and charitable machinery is imperfect. Our best discriminations are never infallible. No matter how cautious our methods may be, we shall sometimes punish innocent men. It is only a rude approximation to perfect justice that we can hope for. The question by which our administration must be tested is simply this: What methods will accomplish the most good and the least harm? Some harm we shall surely do, and much good we shall surely leave undone, if we adopt the wisest methods which it is possible for us to devise; but we must choose those measures which, on the whole and in the long run, will secure the greatest good of the greatest number.

When we find that the administration of a systematic method of poor-relief has resulted in a failure to reach and relieve some worthy person, our sympathy for the sufferer is aroused, and we are inclined to denounce and abandon the system. It has put an end to mendicancy; it has lifted many families out of pauperism into self-support; it has furnished employment and livelihood to a multitude; but it has left undone one thing that it ought to have done. This one failure, in the eyes of some sentimentalists, vitiates all its good work. It were better to feed a hundred beggars than to let one worthy person go hungry.

The suffering of the one worthy person deserves our compassion; but what of the hundred beggars? Is there nothing to deplore in the injury done them by the misapplied charity that encourages them to pursue their life of shame? Are there no tears for the moral degradation into which they are sinking? Suffering, too, is surely waiting for them if they go on in that path. Most of them will become criminals, and through their depredations upon society an indefinite amount of injury will be inflicted upon innocent persons. Is no account to be made of this? If we must choose between a method which, in order to avert suffering from a single individual, lets a hundred beggars loose in society to destroy themselves and prey upon the honest citizens, and a method which turns the hundred beggars into the paths of honest industry, but in doing so fails to relieve one worthy sufferer, there ought to be no great hesitation in making the choice. Yet there are thousands of soft-hearted and short-sighted philanthropists who are able to see no farther than the case of the individual sufferer, and who are ready to say that the system which has failed to bring him relief must be defeated, even though it has prevented a hundred times as much suffering as it has caused.

The case is quite as clear with respect to the criminals. It seems a light matter to some philanthropists to set a hundred miscreants free. They do not stop to think of the vast mischief that will be wrought by them; of the homes they will invade, of the lives they will destroy, of the sense of insecurity and terror that will pervade the communities infested by them. A

great evil it is that one innocent man should be punished; but those who declare that it is a less evil to set a hundred scoundrels free, do not always comprehend what is meant by the saying. The future victims of these hundred scoundrels are entitled to a little compassion. These are the people that near-sighted philanthropy always forgets.

Moreover, the consistent following of this maxim by courts and juries results in assuring all intending criminals that they will have one hundred chances of escape to one chance of conviction, and thus practically cancels the fear of punishment and helps to multiply the criminal class.

It may be said, however, that the unjust punishment of an innocent person is a judicial wrong for which government is responsible, and therefore to be regarded with especial horror. But is not the liberation of the hundred ruffians also a judicial wrong for which government is responsible? Are not our courts and juries accountable for the evil that results from their failure to punish the guilty, as well as for their unjust condemnation of the innocent? Is not the injustice thus done to the great multitude of honest people to be taken into account in the administration of our laws?

It is easy to detect the influence of maxims of this nature in many of the current failures of our jurisprudence. The Supreme Court of one of our States lately pronounced a registration law unconstitutional, on the ground that it interfered somewhat with the right of the sovereign voter. Several opportunities were given by the law for the citizen to register his name; but the judges reasoned that some voter might possibly be absent from the State on the designated days, and might therefore lose his vote, which would be an intolerable hardship and wrong to him. Doubtless this deprivation of a few voters would be an injury to them. But if experience showed that for want of some such protection of the suffrage honest voters by whole precincts lost their votes, being overrun by organized gangs of repeaters and "colonists," then it would seem that the convenience, and even the "right," of these few absentees should give way in behalf of the measure by which such enormous wrongs might be averted. Effective legislation for the protection of the community is apt to interfere somewhat with the convenience of many honest people. Society imposes some measure of limitation and privation on all its members. It is possible that under any practicable system of registration ten or perhaps a hundred voters in a large city would lose their votes. Such a consequence is certainly to be regretted. But suppose that for want of a thorough system of registration ten thousand honest voters lose their votes by fraud. Such a result is very common. Are not the rights of the ten thousand worth considering?

It is fair to say that the decision to which we have referred follows the common rule of our jurisprudence; in its jealousy of the rights of the individual. The question here raised is simply this: Whether this tendency of our jurisprudence be not extreme; and whether the rights of the individual are not often upheld to the great injury of society. Professor Sumner pleads for the Forgotten Man. It is time that somebody should put in a plea for the Forgotten Millions.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Inefficiency of the Lower House of Congress.

THE Forty-eighth Congress was the last one that sat to the end of its term, and its record, therefore, contains the best extant evidence of the efficiency or inefficiency of our modern American Congresses. That record indicates that the Senate is comparatively attentive to its duties; but the record of the House of Representatives, as exemplified in that of the Forty-eighth Congress, is far less favorable to an optimistic view of Congressional diligence. It is my purpose to set forth the character of that specimen record, to state the evidence it contains of the inefficiency of the lower branch of Congress, and to indicate the cause of that unnecessary evil and point out a remedy therefor.

The House of Representatives of the Forty-eighth Congress received from the Senate four hundred and eighty-eight bills which had been passed by the higher body. A majority of these never were voted upon in the House, and but few of that majority were even taken up for consideration there. Two hundred and sixty of the bills received from the Senate died with the Forty-eighth Congress, merely because the House did not consider them at all, or did not consider them long enough to reach any conclusion thereon. The fact that the House passed two hundred and twenty-two and rejected only six of the bills passed by the Senate of that Congress, raises a strong presumption that nearly all of the two hundred and sixty would have been passed by the House if voted upon in that body. Debate in the Senate is substantially free, and no bill can pass that chamber without running the gauntlet of the speeches that all or any of the seventy-six senators may see fit to make against it. For this reason, the fact that the Senate passed these bills raises a strong presumption that all of them ought to have been enacted into law, and demonstrates that it was the duty of the House to give them adequate consideration.

One hundred and twenty-eight of the neglected bills were propositions intended to do justice to a similar number of private persons. The amounts involved in the claims thus allowed by the Senate were very small in proportion to the resources of the debtor nation; but they were very important sums to the people to whom they were due. It is painful to contemplate a great nation neglecting to pay just debts to poor citizens; and it is impossible to estimate the privation of living and the sense of outrage which are thus inflicted upon the innocent and the deserving. The nation itself would not willingly perpetrate such heartless wrongs. The responsibility therefor must generally be localized in the House of Representatives. Seventy-three of the neglected bills were of a public nature, but local in their immediate operation. They were probably all measures of justice to the localities to which they related; and many of them would doubtless have resulted in still wider public benefits. Nineteen of the neglected bills related to the Indians—

those almost helpless wards of the nation, upon whom the Representatives seem willing, by neglect, to perpetrate another century of dishonor.

Forty of the neglected bills were public in their nature and general in their operation. Many of these were very important to the national welfare. Among them was the bill providing for the presidential succession. The omission to enact it would have left the presidency vacant if Mr. Cleveland had died before the assembling of the Forty-ninth Congress in December, 1885, and would then have probably led to a hateful party struggle over the filling of that vacancy. Among them, also, was the Bankruptcy Bill, which was carefully matured by the Senate, and passed that body by more than a two-thirds majority. That bill was very important to public justice and business prosperity; and the lack of such a law is still inflicting extensive injuries upon those interests. Another of these bills was that which reserved from sale and settlement about 60,000 square miles of the public lands around the sources of the great rivers in the Rocky Mountains, to the end that the forests growing on the lands reserved might not be destroyed and the rainfall thereby diminished and misdistributed, and the rivers be thus made to flood the adjacent country in the spring and run low in the summer season of each year. The great importance of the bill was explained and enforced by Senator Edmunds, and there was no vote against its passage in the Senate, but the measure was wholly neglected in the House. These three measures may serve as specimens of the forty. The evils and losses which must follow from the omission of the House to consider such important public measures as these are too numerous to be more than indicated here.

The Forty-eighth Congress was in session during forty-two weeks. The House had as much time as the Senate had; and its power to curtail debate, by means of the previous question, gave it a means of finishing business not possessed by the higher branch. Its omission adequately to consider the two hundred and sixty neglected bills was, therefore, not due to lack of time. It was due to waste of time; and the following are some of the particulars of that waste:

More than three weeks were occupied by the members of the House in delivering speeches on the Morrison tariff bill. That time was all wasted, because that bill was rejected by the House, and because there never was any prospect that, if adopted by the House, it would pass the Senate, and because there never was any probability that, if successful in both Houses of Congress, it would be approved by the President, or be enacted over his veto. It is evident that the time spent on that bill was not spent with any expectation of enacting any law. It was spent in delivering party speeches, to be printed and circulated at government expense, for party purposes.

More than five days were spent in delivering speeches on the Fitz John Porter bill. That time was also wasted, because the character of the bill was well understood without debate, and its passage through the House

was certain whether it was debated or not, and because nobody expected the debate to have any effect upon the action of the House. The motives that caused these speeches were doubtless somewhat variant; but they perhaps consisted mainly of desires to make personal displays of military autobiography, and of hopes to effect party purposes by reviving the recollections of the civil war. Much time was used during each of many days in delivering redundant speeches on questions which required and received decision, but did not require repetitions of well-understood arguments. The Chalmers-Manning contested election case was an instance of this kind. In that case the debate occupied more than four days, though the facts were simple enough to be abundantly debated in an hour.

The three topics last mentioned wasted more than a tenth of the entire time of the sessions of the House of the Forty-eighth Congress.

More than another tenth was wasted in redundant speeches on other bills; in calls of the House rendered necessary by the absence of a quorum, or by the refusal of a quorum to vote; in useless debates on the order of business; and in personal quarrels of the members relevant to matters quite disconnected with legislation. The entire time wasted by the House was quite enough to have enabled it adequately to consider every one of the two hundred and sixty bills which were passed by the Senate and neglected by the lower branch of Congress. These facts demonstrate the inefficiency of the particular House to which they refer; and the record made, at the time of this writing, by the present House, affords no prospect of any improvement upon its last predecessor. The inefficiency of the lower branch of Congress has become chronic.

The causes of these evils do not necessarily reside in the constitution of the House of Representatives. They reside mainly in its membership, and will continue to produce the observed result till the character of that membership is changed. The three hundred and twenty-five men who constituted the lower House of the Forty-eighth Congress, and the three hundred and twenty-five men who constitute the lower House of the Forty-ninth Congress, are capable of a fourfold analysis and classification. Many members have affinities with more than one of the four classes; but these affinities are so unequal in power that it is probably practicable to assign each man to the particular class to which he really belongs. That, however, is not the present undertaking. The present undertaking is to delineate each of the four classes, leaving the reader to assign his own representative in Congress to one or to another of those classes in the light of that delineation.

First. The intelligent statesmen. These are they who study public questions on their merits, and who conduct that study with intellectual ability and honest diligence. They seldom or never make a speech without a legitimate legislative purpose, or extend a speech beyond its legitimate boundaries. In the committee-rooms these men are laborious and thorough. In the sessions of the House they are attentive and decorous. Speaking often, they speak not to display their talents, but to convince their colleagues. Skillful in management, they use their power to forward the public business, and not to promote their private ends.

Second. The voluble demagogues. These men are not students of public affairs. They advocate whatever opinions they suppose to be popular among those to whom they look for reëlection, but seldom with any adequate knowledge of the topics to which those opinions relate. If such a man represents a "silver State," he will waste valuable time in making a superficial speech against any suspension of silver coinage; and if he represents a district where holders of Government bonds are numerous and powerful, he will waste valuable time in making an equally superficial speech in favor of such suspension. If such a man represents Texas or Arkansas, he will dilate for an hour against a protective tariff, speaking wholly from the basis of the interest of the consumer; and if he represents Pennsylvania or New York, he will dilate for an hour in favor of such a tariff, speaking wholly from the basis of the interest of the producer of protected merchandise. Neither of these men who speak about silver will indicate the possession of any fundamental knowledge of the complex factors of the problem discussed; and neither of these men who speak about the tariff will show that he has penetrated below the surface of the subject.

Third. The silent intriguers. These men seldom speak in the House, because they have not intellectual force enough to catch and hold the attention of their colleagues. They generally pretend to be influential in the committees, but they are seldom able to point to any notable measure which they caused to be enacted. In truth, they have little real connection with the public business, except to vote with their party on party questions, and on other questions to vote in such a manner as to fulfill their engagements with their special supporters. Their real labors in Washington are in the executive departments. These they haunt as the special agents of particular constituents. To-day such a member is seen seeking a pension for one supporter, and a patent for another; and to-morrow he industriously struggles to secure a pardon or a post-office for a third. He is the errand-boy of his district, the obsequious servant of its party politicians.

Fourth. The wealthy dullards. These are men who have sapped their strength to accumulate their money, and weakened their minds by indulgence in the luxuries they were thus enabled to purchase. Late in life they were called upon by party managers to be candidates for Congress, with a special view to the securing of large contributions to campaign funds. In youth and middle life they gave no particular attention to public affairs, and really learned little or nothing useful about them. Entering Congress in advanced years, their minds are too sluggish and too untrained adequately to study such complex questions as those upon which they are called to vote. Therefore they simply vote with their party, or vote for measures said to be beneficial to the business interests with which they are most nearly related; and they let the residue of legislation go forward or stand still, as it may.

The remedy for the evils I have endeavored to portray would obviously consist in electing only men of the first class to Congress; and that is an enterprise which is within the power of the people. There is probably no Congressional district which does not contain several members of the locally prevailing

political party who are honest enough and intellectual enough to be Congressmen of that class; and if there is a district which is lacking in such material, it may lawfully select such a man from any other part of the State of which it constitutes a portion. But such men are seldom nominated by party conventions, where those conventions are controlled by delegates who are sent there to promote selfish ends. To secure the nomination and election of such men to Congress, it is generally necessary for patriotic citizens to attend and control the caucuses or primaries which select the delegates to the nominating conventions. Such citizens are always numerous enough to be entitled to control such conventions; and nothing but their systematic and united action is necessary to such control.

Albert H. Walker.

The Rev. Dr. Munger on "Evolution and the Faith."

WITH the interest which fine writing always excites, enhanced by my personal friendship for the author, I have read Dr. Munger's "Evolution and the Faith" in the May number of *THE CENTURY*.

It has intensified my conviction that we shall not be able to make very satisfactory progress in the discussion of this subject until thinkers and writers shall somehow contrive to agree upon definitions. So long as we continue either to make one word carry two meanings, or to employ two words to signify the same thing, we shall be in confusion. I can see how an intelligent man would both agree and disagree with Dr. Munger's article, taken in its totality. Its one defect is that he uses two words indiscriminately. In one place he does this so distinctly as to be marked; it is where he closes a sentence with these words: "One law or method, namely, that of development or evolution"; and that way of thinking and writing diminishes the value of his brilliant article. He is not solitary in this, but instances might be drawn from many writers showing this same confusion of thought.

Why is it not possible to separate "development" and "evolution" so as to have no confusion in the use of the words? Professor Huxley ("Critiques and Addresses") says that the fundamental proposition of evolution is "that the whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was based." To him the leading evolutionists, such as Tyndall and Haeckel, give agreement. Why should we not all agree? Then we should confine "evolution" to the hypothesis which means that matter has the promise and potency of all things; that matter is first, and that all things proceed out of matter without any intervention *ab extra*; that the forces are in the molecules; that they act and interact on themselves, and that they have always done so, and will always do so, as long as they continue to be the basis of matter. If we could all agree to this, the advantage would be that it would leave us free to give "development" another meaning, a meaning which might include a process by which matter passed from a homogeneous into a heterogeneous condition, under the supervision of the intellect which devised the law in the beginning and continues to operate that law

until now. Would not this be a real gain to our philosophical and scientific literature?

I call attention to the following passage in Dr. Munger's article, as showing the embarrassments under which writers labor so long as "development" and "evolution" are considered interchangeable terms: "I grant that these fears would be well grounded if certain theories of evolution were to be accepted as settled—such as the theory that matter has within itself the potentiality of all terrestrial life, and goes on in its development alone, and by its own energy; a theory that may stand for the various mechanical and atomic doctrines that deify force and dispense with cause." But that is "evolution"; that is the definition of evolution given by the most conspicuous scientific men on that side of the question; and we are surprised to hear the doctor say: "This theory is now an outcast in the world of thought." Does the *Encyclopædia Britannica* agree with this? Do the writings of the scientific gentlemen named above agree with this?

Take another passage: "When evolution is regarded, not as a self-working engine,—an inexorable and unsupervised system, a mysterious section of creation assumed to be the whole,—but rather as a process whose laws are the methods of God's action, and whose force is the steady play of God's will throughout matter, there need be no fear lest man and religion be swallowed up in matter and brute life." Yes; but that is *not* "evolution." Evolution is "an inexorable and unsupervised system, a mysterious section of creation assumed to be the whole"; but "development" may be a "process whose laws are the methods of God's action," etc.

Why should we not settle upon that distinction, and not bracket the words, or tie them together? Does it not lead to great confusion of thought? Is it not confounding genus and species? If not that, is it not confounding two species? For instance, if process were genus, might not evolution and development be species included in that genus? Evolution could stand for the process that has no creator nor supervisor, and development for the process which is carried forward by one who is both creator and supervisor. Also, "evolution" could continue to stand for that hypothesis for which it now stands, namely, the product of mind by matter; and "development" could stand for what Dr. Munger sometimes calls evolution, namely, the product of matter from mind in a process which had a person who is both the creator and the supervisor.

Dr. Munger would have found great advantage if he had given his paper the title of "Development and the Faith"; for evolution, according to its own accredited apostles,—and we have no right to steal their thunder,—is a process in which there are no pauses, no laps, and no breaks. According to "evolution," in the beginning was matter; according to "development," in the beginning was mind. According to evolution, there must be abiogenesis: the organic must spring from the inorganic; the living must spring from the non-living. I am not now saying whether this hypothesis be true or false; if it be true, we shall certainly discover spontaneous generation, and until spontaneous generation be discovered, whether true or false, it is not scientific to take this hypothesis as settled scientific doctrine. I do not now say that the other theory

that of development, is true or false; that remains to be shown; but its reception among thinkers certainly seems to be growing, and Dr. Munger has amply and ably shown that some forms of it may be held without at all endangering the faith. But it must be borne in mind that what he has shown as not endangering the faith is *not* "evolution," if evolutionists are to be allowed to define the name which they give to their own hypothesis, and it would seem that they are certainly entitled to this privilege.

With all the pleasantness of personal regard, I must say that my friend in his article reminded me of Milton's description of the lion coming from the earth, which Mr. Huxley ridiculed in his New York lecture:

"Now half appear'd
The tawny lion, pawing to get free
His hinder parts."

Towards the end Dr. Munger says: "I have attempted merely to show that the Christian faith is not endangered by evolution, and to separate it from a narrow school of thought with which it is usually associated," etc. Plainly he cannot pull out: evolution belongs to the school of thought with which it is usually associated. If we baptize our child into the name of our neighbor's child, it will not make the babies one, nay, it will not even make them twins; they are separate things. Dr. Munger may call a certain school of thought "narrow," but evolution belongs to the school of thought with which it is usually associated. And then immediately after, in laying down categorically the lines upon which future study should be pursued, the first line is: "The respects in which evolution as a necessary process in the natural and brute worlds does not wholly apply to man." Now just so far as any process in the natural world does not apply to man, so far forth it is *not* "evolution," and we ought not to call it "evolution," because it produces confusion of thought by making confusion of terms.

Throughout his whole article, wherever Dr. Munger has held to "the faith," he has been compelled to reject "evolution." If he had simply stated what evolutionists hold to be evolution in the first paragraph of his article, and then stated the development theory as held by other scientific men, he would have increased the value of his brilliant article. My simple contention is that when there are two theories before us, the *terminus a quo* of one being matter, and the *terminus ad quem* of the other being matter, we shall not talk of two trains, both running, but running in opposite directions, as if they were one and the same train.

Charles F. Deems.

REPLY BY THE REV. DR. MUNGER.

I AM grateful to my friend Dr. Deems for the very courteous terms in which he comments upon what he regards as an unwise confusion of the terms "evolution" and "development." The points he raises did not escape me while writing the article, and I considered the reasons he so well states, but reached a different conclusion. I trust Dr. Deems will not consider the brevity of my reply as indicating that I think the point unimportant or not ably defended.

My main reason for using the word "evolution"

where Dr. Deems would say "development" is that I do not consider it wise to yield the word to the school that first brought it into general use and put its own definition upon it. It is not a trademark; it is not private property; and I must so far disagree with my friend as to think that it has not been so exclusively used by one school, and in so exclusive a sense, that it cannot properly be used by other schools. It is too valuable a word to be so surrendered. It has already passed into literature and common speech as a general phrase, and it is now too late to limit it to a certain hypothesis, even if it were desirable. It seems to me wiser to use it in its general sense, and not as an exact term, and to contend under it for the definitions we hold to be true. I grant the inconvenience of using terms that are not precise, but the contention between the two schools is not one that will be much helped or hindered by mere words. It is not the first time that opposing schools have fought under the same banner. The Church of Rome has as good a claim to the word "Catholic" as the Huxley school has to the word "evolution"; but the Protestant refuses to yield it to the Romanist, because the word itself has inestimable value and power. On exactly the same ground I deemed it wiser to use the word "evolution" and put into it what seemed to me its proper meaning, just as the Protestant insists on using the word "catholic" despite opposition and occasional misapprehension. In other words, I believe we can win a place in common speech for *theistic evolution*, and that the phrase is worth contending for.

T. T. Munger.

A Plan for Harmony between Labor and the Employing Interests.

A COMMON suggestion in what has been written on the labor question is, that arbitration can accomplish a settlement of the existing difficulties and those of a kindred kind that may occur in the future. But the theorists seem to lose sight of the fact that only one side of the arbitration would be a responsible side, viz., the side representing the industrial establishment against which the demands of the laborers are advanced. In a recent railroad strike a large amount of property was destroyed by violence, and when a proposition was made by the workmen to submit their grievances to arbitration, the other party put the question as to who would pay for these losses. On the refusal of the labor organization to assume this burden, the peace negotiations were stopped.

The only safeguard for both the workman and his employer is a written contract with sufficient surety. Let every man who employs workmen in large numbers divide his men into twelve classes, which are to be employed respectively from one to twelve months each. He will then make with the individuals of each class a written contract, binding himself to employ them for the period of time represented by the class to which they are assigned. Any causes which will void the contract, such as negligence or the indulgence of bad habits on the part of the workman, and the failure to pay the wages agreed upon, or other default, on the part of the employer, are to be specifically enumerated in the instrument. Unless ten days' notice is given by either party, the contract is to be renewed for the

same period, and upon the same terms, immediately upon its expiration. The laborer has his side of the bargain protected by the pecuniary responsibility of his employer, and he must in turn give his employer a claim upon him by leaving in his hands up to the time of the expiration of his contract wages for a half-month; that is to say, a man belonging to the second class (which will insure his employment for the space of two months) begins to receive his wages on the first pay-day that occurs after he shall have been employed fifteen days. If wages are paid by the month, he will not get his first pay for one month and a half. When his contract expires, of course he is settled with to date. Worthy employees will gradually be promoted from the shorter classes to the longer ones. Fluctuations in the seasons of production can be met by the employer giving the required ten days' notice to any of the shorter classes, that upon the expiration of their contracts their services would not be longer required for the present. This condition of things would naturally result in elevating the best men into the highest classes, where their employment would be sure and steady; while the floating element,—men without family ties,—which is really responsible for much of the trouble and discontent so often engendered by the discussion of imaginary wrongs, would be kept in classes where they could be dispensed with as soon as it was found that they were not trustworthy. This plan would be an absolute protection to both sides. Should the men establish a strike, the employer has in his possession a forfeitable sum of their money, which, under the written contract, he has a right to appropriate. If, on the other hand, the employer is disposed to grind his men beyond reasonable endurance, those who consider the wrongs unbearable can give notice and quit.

Legislation on this subject will be without avail until there is a more harmonious feeling between the parties representing respectively capital and labor. A plan like that outlined above would make the capitalist absolutely secure in his ability to employ sufficient labor for any term within a year, at a known scale of prices; and the laboring man possesses in his contract an instrument which will protect him against the petty malice or unreasonable exactions of any sub-heads of departments, who would otherwise unjustly cause his discharge or call for undue work at his hands.

S. H. Church.

"Danger Ahead."

SOME passages in an article in THE CENTURY for November last, written by Dr. Lyman Abbott, under the title of "Danger Ahead," are adversely criticised by H. C. Fulton in an open letter in the February number.

The government is the political person of the people. It is animated by the spirit or genius of the people, and in all its operations will display that spirit or genius with a freedom and a naturalness corresponding to the freedom and naturalness with which a man displays his own spirit or genius in his own career.

Dr. Abbott has not misconceived the province of government in the instance before us.

The public railroads and the telegraphs of this country were built and are operated by corporations

created by government especially for that purpose. Those corporations are persons in law, but they are public persons, and not private persons; they are artificial persons, and not natural persons; artificial or conventional subjects, and not natural subjects of the state. Public railroads and telegraphs are therefore public and not private institutions, their business is public and not private business, and they and their business are therefore properly subject to government regulation.

Government, being competent to create a subject for the especial purpose of enabling it to render a necessary public service, is, and must be, competent to compel that subject to conform to the law of its creation, and execute the design of its being.

Failing that, there is no sort of reasonable question that the government is competent to dispense with all other agents, and render the required service itself. Nor is there the least room for doubt that our government is entirely competent to undertake the general railroad and telegraph service of this country at any time and under any circumstances, upon the sole pretense of promoting the general welfare.

Our government has always been considered competent to render us the postal service, *i. e.*, to carry our letters for us. To say that our government is not also competent to render us the railroad service, *i. e.*, to carry us ourselves, and our baggage, and other *bona mobilia* for us, is mere cant and nonsense.

John C. Perkins.

"Petra."

MR. R. LESLIE MORRIS writes us from Highgate, England, that the list of European and American visitors given in the foot-note to "A Photographer's Visit to Petra," in THE CENTURY for last November, might be increased by the names of fifteen persons who visited Petra in April, 1862. These were Mr. Buckle, the author of "The History of Civilization," who had with him two English lads; Mr. Byron of New York, his son and two daughters; Mr. Bosworth, Mr. Harding, Mr. Gray, Mr. Stewart Glennie, Mr. R. Seaman, Mr. Ehni, Sir Capel Molyneux, and himself.

The author of the article writes as follows: "In my effort to supply a list of those who had visited Petra during the past twenty years, I neglected to mention several who are entitled to be placed upon the roll, as follows: Edward S. Philbrick, Boston; Charles G. Loring, Boston; Hon. E. Joy Morris, Philadelphia; George H. Mifflin, Boston; James Milliken, Bellefonte, Pennsylvania; Frank M. Good, Winchfield, England, and W. Berghem, Jerusalem, Palestine. Mr. Good was 'photographer to Dean Stanley,' and told me he made less than six views, and was then only too glad to make his escape. Firth of London sells Mr. Good's views, but Firth was never in Petra. Mr. Berghem made some photographs, but they are long since 'out of print.' On the summit of Mount Serbal (Sinai Peninsula) I found a bottle containing the names of Mr. Milliken and his companions, George D. Wells and William G. Tiffany. Doubtless there are a few others who have been to Petra, but Sheikh Salim fails to keep an accurate record!"

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Authorized Life of Abraham Lincoln.

TO this day the life of Abraham Lincoln has never been told. Many biographies of the President, of varying value and interest, have been written; one of the best, considering the promptness with which it was prepared, being by Dr. J. G. Holland, our former editor-in-chief. Dr. Holland's work is to be classed among those prepared by accomplished authors who enjoyed no personal acquaintance with the subject, nor any unusual means of access to authorities; several interesting books have also appeared bearing the names of men personally acquainted with Mr. Lincoln, and giving details of more or less value and authenticity, particularly as to his early career. But only his private secretaries, John George Nicolay and John Hay, have had the opportunity and the authority to tell the complete story of Lincoln's life, and particularly of that part of it which pertains to the Presidency. When Lincoln died, these two returned to the White House, where they were still living, though already appointed to Paris; they gathered together the President's papers, and handed them to Robert Lincoln and David Davis, who sacredly guarded them till the return of the secretaries from Europe. They were then redelivered to the latter, for the purposes of this history, and have never been in any other hands. They have served as an important part—by no means the whole—of the data preserved by the biographers for the purpose of presenting to the world the record of their illustrious chief, in all its truth and fullness. This history includes not merely the personal career of Lincoln, but a graphic account of the events which led to the civil war, and a history of that war from the point of view of the White House,—the point of view, in fact, of the commander-in-chief of the armies and navies of the United States.

Friends and admirers of President Lincoln have sometimes perhaps wondered at the liberty we have allowed certain contributors in their criticisms of the martyred President. But it has been our belief that the freer the discussion of the motives and actions of Abraham Lincoln, the brighter would emerge the character and genius of that extraordinary man. And beside, we have been planning for the presentation to the world in these pages of this, the only authoritative life of Lincoln,—the first installment of which will be given in the November number of *THE CENTURY*.

The appearance of this life in the pages of *THE CENTURY* is at a time most fortunate. The war series (not yet concluded in these pages) has brought an audience to the reading of the true life of Lincoln unprecedented in numbers, as it is also one peculiarly interested in the subject. This applies not merely to the soldier-and-sailor audience, but to the "general reader" of *THE CENTURY* whose interest in the war has been quickened by the absorbing narratives given during the last two years by leaders and other participants in the great conflict. In writing editorially of the war series in March, 1885, we then said that our readers of a

younger generation, would, after following these narratives, 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." This "inclination and temper" of the public mind is still more evident to-day, and the life of Lincoln will be largely devoted to a study of the causes of that war, which, when considered in itself, or in its results, must be regarded as one of the most momentous events wherewith human history has ever had to deal.

There are other considerations which make the appearance of the authentic life of Lincoln most timely. The war is well over. The South long since gave up its championship of slavery. That doctrine is dead. The doctrine of disunion is also dead. There is no longer any one section of the country that can claim an exclusive devotion to the sentiment of nationality. The doctrine of disunion, we say, is dead—but, naturally enough, not yet quite in the sense that the doctrine of slavery is dead. The once Secession States have long since accepted the situation; the leaders, with few and marked exceptions, have accepted it as loyally as the rank and file of rebellion. There is no danger to the Republic from that quarter, so far as the dead doctrine of disunion is concerned. But it is particularly desirable at this time, with a new generation rising up and coming to the front in the South, that the sentiment of nationality should be fostered and strengthened as it can alone be by a study of the political causes of the armed conflict which happily ended in the salvation of the leading nation of the world. From Lincoln the Southern citizens of the Republic are prepared to learn again that lesson of nationality which Washington alone has illustrated with equal luster and devotion.

From Lincoln, we say,—for he, a Southerner by birth and ancestry, not only quelled the Southern insurrection, but was destined by his precepts and career and by the sympathetic nature of his personality, to be a perpetual guide and influence in behalf of national unity,—an example, a precedent, an enlightenment to all sections; and not the least to that section which it was his life-work to oppose and thwart in its most cherished social and political theories and schemes. We do not hesitate to say that the political gospel of Abraham Lincoln is the one which the new South is more in the mood to study and to accept than that of any other American statesman. It is one of the most moving and significant facts in history that the pathetic affection lavished by Lincoln upon his disaffected fellow-countrymen, to be met during his life with little else than scorn and insult, was finally, after his untimely death, returned to him with remorse and unending regret. Before the murdered body of Lincoln was cold, the word leaped from many a Southern tongue, "The South has lost its best friend!"—how good a friend was thus lost the new life of Lincoln will, for the first time, authoritatively relate! Such is the sure effect of consistent devotion

to the unchanging principles of freedom and "the deep heart of man."

But it is not only the principle of nationality which needs fortifying at this moment, in view of the "manifest destiny" of the united Republic in the future of civilization, but also those underlying principles of human brotherhood, of individual liberty, and civil rights which the career of Lincoln conspicuously illustrates, and which have of late been confused in many minds among us; but principally in the minds of certain wild-beast refugees from the Old World whose compliment to the free institutions of America is their attempt to destroy them.

Starting as did we ourselves upon the reading of the life of Lincoln by Nicolay and Hay with a deep interest in the subject and a special enthusiasm for the personality of the man, we found the record a revelation of even a finer, more winning, more ideal, and more masterly character than we had hitherto imagined. Indeed, as we read the manuscript of this work—a work remarkable for its thoroughness, its historical accuracy, its literary force, its revelation of secret events, and its illustration of events hitherto only partially understood; and supremely great, moreover, in the dignity of its subject; as we have read this great work it has seemed to us that the fame of Lincoln, mighty as it already is, could be compared to a gigantic statue set up in the open square, but still partly veiled from the public eye; a statue which, notwithstanding that its form and features are only vaguely visible, yet awes by the grandeur of its proportions, and the strong lines which show beneath the folds that hang over it. The reading of this minute and illuminating history was for us, as we believe it will be for the world, the unveiling of the statue of Lincoln!

Is American Society Ready?

PRESIDENT STILES, of Yale College, in his Election Sermon of May 8, 1783, before the General Assembly of Connecticut, portrayed the future glories of the United States in terms almost prophetic. The arts, the arms, the commerce, the literature of the new nation in the coming decades are dwelt upon by the venerable doctor with an enthusiasm which would be considered nowadays rather more appropriate in a freshman's first forensic effort. One of the richest of his themes is the inevitable growth of population, and he dilates upon it as if the complete census report of 1880 had been unrolled before his enraptured vision. "Our degree of population is such as to give us reason to expect that this will become a great people. It is probable that within a century from our independence the sun will shine on fifty millions of inhabitants in the United States. This will be a great, a very great nation, nearly equal to half Europe . . . so that before the millennium the English settlements in America may become more numerous millions than that greatest dominion on earth, the Chinese Empire."

Not once, throughout his long vaticination, does it seem to have occurred to Dr. Stiles that his descendants might find some drawbacks to this happy enumeration of fifty millions, or that the Americans of 1886, looking at the successive census reports with their steady decennial leaps of one-third, might be provoked only to murmur plaintively, "How long?"

To him, fifty millions meant power, wealth, resources, ten millions of fighting-men, universal respect abroad, with only that vague sense of "responsibility" which should prevent the possessor of a giant's strength from using it like a giant. To us it means the exaggeration of contrasts of wealth, the exasperation of those who would have considered themselves examples of comfort fifty years ago, a proletariat not grown out of proportion, but armed for evil with weapons which can do more mischief in an hour than can be repaired in a year; and, to the gloomy among us, the prospects for the future are only of a time when the country shall be "like a Stilton cheese, run away with by its own mites." Time has brought us respect abroad; but with it, and a part of it, has come a growing danger from within,—the increasing size of the residuum which prefers lawlessness to law.

It must be a cardinal object with all governments, our own included, to prevent the evolution of mobs. Government must be not only good, but reasonably satisfactory; the appearance of organized lawlessness, like the appearance of pustules on the human body, is an indication that there is something out of order in the organism, for there are not many men who actually prefer lawlessness to law. It is the part of wisdom to endeavor to trace back the symptoms of lawlessness to their source, and remedy the one by removing the other. But during the investigation, it is the imperative duty of human government to see to it that lawlessness of every sort is eliminated from the discussion. It is a pressing question for statesmen and law-makers, though the hope of attention to it from our "statesmen" is not particularly bright, why so large a portion of our workingmen have come to prefer the boycott and other lawless remedies to the regular operations of law; but the lawlessness must not be permitted to continue pending the decision. The state which would settle such a question with equity to all concerned must be prepared to enforce a Roman Peace upon all concerned. Long before we can consider and determine the disease which has produced the great labor organizations and its proper remedy, long before the prisons shall be so filled with violators of our penal codes as to produce embarrassment to justice, the effort to end the struggle by violence, to release violators of law, and to establish the supremacy of illegal organizations over the law, must be met and dealt with. It is impossible that collision should interminably follow collision, and invariably with Pickwickian results. Any other result means war upon society; and, though society must conquer in the long run, it is neither wise nor just for society to allow itself to be so taken by surprise as to give space for irreparable mischief to innocent parties. How far may we consider American society to be on a war footing?

The traditional American policy of avoiding the employment of regular troops in the suppression of disorders has been proved a wise one. It has spared us the financial and other evils which attend the maintenance of a large regular army. It has surrounded the little regular force with so much of the odor of sanctity, that when it has become necessary to use it in the last resort, a sergeant and a dozen men have been sufficient to make their way through the stoutest mob. It has kept alive the popular sense of the cumu-

lative power by which American society deals with disorder; first the sheriff with his *posse*; then the governor with the militia of the State; and finally, and in the last resort, the President with the regular troops of the United States; so that a sufficiently serious resistance can only result in arraying against it the entire physical force of the nation. Every indication to be drawn from past experience warns us to rely on the militia of the States as the main instrument for the preservation of order, keeping the little regular force as the final trump card, to be played only when the state of the game imperatively requires it.

The State militia, then, is the key to the situation. How the States have dealt with their trust it is hardly necessary to say. The story is the same in all the States. In each there are a few "crack" regiments, usually in the cities, and a number of others which figure largely on paper, but would need several months of active campaigning in order to take rank as a really effective military force. Some of the companies hardly ever see one another until they touch elbows for the first time while listening to the reading of the Riot Act. Such a force must of necessity be but a broken reed when the State comes to lean upon it; and the persistent refusal of the States to better it is only symptomatic of that general policy which subordinates everything else to the securing of time for the legislatures to engage in the more congenial business of deals, to the neglect of the protection of the State and its interests. There is small hope for the State militia, when left to the tender mercies of a State legislature.

There is no need that it should be left to any such fate. The Constitution, in the eighth section of Article I., gives complete authority to Congress to meet the emergency in question. It empowers Congress, by general law, (1) to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; (2) to provide for their use in executing the laws of the Union, and in suppressing insurrections, and (3) to provide for governing the militia, when so called out, reserving to the States the appointment of the officers, and the execution of the discipline prescribed by Congress. There stands the power, waiting for Congress to put life into it, if that estimable body could spare time for the work at any of its sessions. One-fifth of the appropriations in the River and Harbor Bill, one-fiftieth of the heart-burnings, jealousies, and log-rolling which mark the annual progress of that measure, would put American society into a position from which it could consider judicially and decide justly the conflicting claims which now so seriously threaten the public tranquillity. To decide under the pressure of riot and disorder is of necessity to decide unjustly. For security against such a calamity it is only necessary for Congress to exercise its plenary power under the Constitution. Will the new Congress do it?

Marriage and Divorce again.

THE last issue of THE CENTURY contained a suggestion that a solution of the Mormon problem might be found in the ratification of an Amendment to the Constitution, giving to Congress the power to legislate for the whole people on the subjects of marriage and divorce. It was possible in that article only to indicate the reasons for the step proposed, in its bearings

upon the Mormon problem; but, when we leave that comparatively narrow phase of the question, far larger interests open up and press for consideration.

The objection which will first occur to most men is that Congress is not able to accomplish with any great success the work which is now admittedly within its constitutional jurisdiction, and that it would be folly to add a new burden to the load which is already too great for Congress to carry. Most of the force will be taken from the objection by laying stress upon the perfectly fair distinction between that which Congress *may* do and that which Congress *must* do. Congress may, undoubtedly, waste a whole session in pottering about the affairs of the District of Columbia, to the neglect of more important matters; but it is surely not wise to encourage it in the practice by laying down the rule that, if Congress will do so, its persistence must be a good excuse for its more injurious neglects. The time has evidently come when Congress must be brought to abandon many of the subjects on which it has been in the habit of legislating. The country and its interests have come to be so large that Congress cannot be permitted much longer to act as a parish vestry for the care of town pumps and other minor things. Willingly or unwillingly, Congress must become a really national legislature. Perhaps the imposition of a new burden of this sort might aid in forcing the development of that which must come in the long run.

A quite parallel objection would arise as to the effect of the proposed change upon the Federal courts. They are already clogged with unfinished work; is the whole mass of the marriage and divorce business of the Union to be added to the amount? The answer would be much the same as that just given. The congested state of the Federal judiciary has arisen very largely from the assumption by Federal courts, or the imposition upon them by Congress, of functions which would be better performed by the State courts. The process was probably inevitable at a time when some of the State courts could not, perhaps, be fully trusted on certain cardinal questions. Hardly any lawyer will insist that this reason is still of weight. For example, since the Civil Rights clause has been invalidated, and Southern State judges have been thrown back upon their professional honor and the Common Law, the lines of Southern decisions are taking directions which are startling; and it begins to look as if the rights of the freedmen were rather safer under the ægis of the Common Law than even under a Ku Klux Act. Let us change the policy and set the State courts at work where we can. Until this be done, any new duties which will increase the congestion of the Federal courts and force a change will be only a blessing slightly disguised. It will hasten the day when the Federal judiciary shall no longer be a mysterious agency, several years behind time, whose innermost *arcana* are only to be penetrated by the richest of men or the strongest of corporations.

Social objections are, after all, the strongest. Laws may be made by wholesale, but, unless they are evolved by popular needs, or unless the popular life and feeling meet them sympathetically, they must fail, and perhaps ought to fail. Is it possible, then, to frame a marriage and divorce law for the United States which shall satisfy the general feeling of the American people? A law which should represent very

exactly a mathematical average of the public sentiment of the country might fail to represent more than a minute percentage of absolute sentiment. An average does not necessarily represent anything. To all this it will be fair to answer that there are really two kinds of sentiment in our people — the local and the national. The effects of the distinction may be seen by supposing that the regulation of divorce were remitted to the towns. Removed from general inspection, exposed to the full power of a few influential and interested individuals, the towns would certainly make our divorce laws even a greater stench than they now are. Even State control, though it has avoided some of the evils of town control, has not avoided all of them. Local sentiment might tolerate loose divorce laws by a town, or even by a State; but a proposition for a loose *national* divorce system would call into action a national sentiment on the subject which has never yet been fairly voiced. It is not meant that the general sentiment would drown the local, but that the voters and their representatives, if called upon to approve a loose divorce Act of Congress, would look at it from quite a new point of view, and would have a hesitancy about exposing the nation to the condemnation of Christendom which they would never feel if only their town or State were in question. As this mode of public sentiment is an utterly unknown quantity, it must be a matter for individual judgment how far it would operate to restore the balance, so that a divorce law, too stringent to satisfy the local sentiment of the town of A or of the State of B, might be perfectly in accordance with the *national* character of both. To us it seems to be the factor needed; but at all events it is one which has not received adequate consideration, while little more than a statement of it is needed to show its importance in any attempt to forecast the results.

The objection just mentioned, if it should be pressed, as it certainly would be, would at once bring out to view one of the worst evils of our present system. The objection implies that a divorce law which would suit New York would not suit Louisiana or Oregon,

or even New Jersey or Connecticut. The objection would have more weight if interstate migration were of as small proportions now as a century ago. In 1880, nearly ten millions of our population were living in States other than those of their birth. Suppose one-half of these were women, and the magnitude of the evil becomes apparent. No class is so much exposed to the purely legal evils of our divorce system as women; no class is so ignorant of them. The little that a woman knows of the marriage and divorce laws of her own State is the result of a long series of petty social observations. Leaving the State of her first residence, she loses all the little knowledge she had, and goes into her new location as ignorant as a child. When the ablest lawyer can hardly make anything intelligible out of the marriage laws of the State of New York, wherein shall the average woman dare to rely on her own knowledge? So far from its being true that the social repulsions of the States are an argument for State marriage and divorce laws, the mobility of our modern population exposes a very large class to constant and extreme danger from them. While the States make these laws, a woman must take her social life in her hands whenever she steps an inch out of the beaten path of ceremony; and even when she thinks she has kept the beaten path she is apt to find that she has merely been committing social suicide. The social repulsions of our men may demand State laws on these subjects; but are the interests of our women to count for nothing?

It is true that the transfer to Congress of legislative power on marriage and divorce is, in more senses than one, a leap into the unknown. But, when it offers so promising, so clear a road to the solution of the Mormon problem, when it offers assurance of security to a great and helpless class of our ever-moving population, when the indications from analogy are that the unknown will be advantageous to the social and political interests of the people and injurious to none, the subject is evidently one for the most thoughtful consideration, lest opportunity, once let slip, should pass from us forever.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Outlook of the Fisheries.

THE future of our fisheries is a subject which is now attracting a large share of public attention. An industry that in 1880 employed 131,426 men, an invested capital of \$37,955,349, supported a population of more than half a million, and the annual product of which, at the prices paid to the fishermen, was \$43,046,053, is certainly entitled to consideration as an important factor in our national growth and prosperity. Especially is this so when it is considered that the harvest thus reaped is taken from the sea — from fields that no man has sown — and the gathering of which trains a large body of hardy and enterprising men, who constitute a self-supporting militia of the sea, a force of inestimable value to any nation that aspires to naval or commercial greatness.

The question of the hour is, what ought to be done

to foster and protect our fisheries, in order that they may be carried on with that reasonable assurance of success which alone will guarantee their continuance? Will success be best assured by some so-called reciprocal arrangement with the British provinces, similar to the Washington treaty recently expired? or will greater prosperity be attained under the treaty of 1818, which is now in force? The answer to this question has been most emphatically given by the entire fishing population of New England. The expiration of the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty was hailed with unfeigned satisfaction, and during the past winter they unanimously declared in memorials to Congress that the inshore British fishery was absolutely valueless to them. It was stated "that there was nothing in its use as a fishery that our fishermen desired the Government to procure for them at the price of any equivalent, whether in opening our

market to Canadian fish, or in money; that when the treaty of Washington had, at the cost of \$5,500,000 and other considerations, opened those waters as a fishery to us, the shore people prevented our taking bait by mobs and violence to our vessels and seines; that Great Britain, unwilling to restrain them, paid damages for the Fortune Bay outrages; that we did not use the cod fishery in the limit; that the mackerel was insignificant, and that the use of these waters as a fishing adjunct to our undoubted rights of common fishery in the ocean had no practical value for fishing under our flag and was not asked for by our fishermen."

A brief review of the New England fisheries will enable us to weigh the value of this declaration, in the light of well ascertained facts, and to arrive at an understanding of whether the reciprocity treaties which have been made, ostensibly in behalf of the fishermen, have been of value to them or otherwise. By so doing we shall be better able to judge of the future of our fisheries and of what is best calculated to insure their prosperity and continuance as an American industry.

First, what are the advantages to be gained by American fishermen from enjoying the so-called privilege of fishing within the three-mile limit, on certain parts of the provincial coast, from which, by the treaty of 1818, they are debarred? It may be stated at the start, in positive terms, that the cod and halibut fisheries are prosecuted by American fishermen entirely in the open sea, outside of British jurisdiction. According to the United States Fish Commission, the area of the off-shore banks thus unrestrictedly frequented by the American vessels, and exclusive of the Greenland and Iceland halibut grounds, is 73,123 square geographical miles. This includes the range of elevated ocean plateaus that extend from Cape Cod to the Flemish Cap, off Newfoundland, and which constitute the great fishing banks in the western Atlantic.

The mackerel fishery, then, is the only one which, even under the privileges of the Washington treaty, was prosecuted to any extent at all by American fishermen in inshore British waters. The value of the privilege of fishing for mackerel within the three-mile limit on the Canadian coast may be judged from the following:

According to a report on the fishing grounds of North America, prepared by the United States Fish Commission, the total area of the mackerel fishing grounds off the eastern coast of the United States is 56,000 square geographical miles. Here, in our own waters, the most extensive and valuable mackerel fishery of the world is carried on. In addition to this, our fishermen have the right to fish in the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence outside of the three-mile limit; and thus is opened to them an additional area of 15,200 square miles, making a total of more than 70,000 square miles over which they have an unquestioned right to prosecute their operations. Now, if we estimate the area of inshore waters frequented by our fishermen in pursuit of mackerel, we will be able to get an idea of their relative importance, always supposing that the fishery can be prosecuted as well inshore as it can off, which is not the fact, as will be shown hereafter. The north shore of Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton are the localities in the inshore British waters which are now chiefly visited by American vessels in pursuit of

mackerel. The total area of the inshore waters in these regions commonly resorted to by American fishermen does not much exceed 775 square miles (if we follow the coast line), or about one per cent. of the area of the mackerel fishing grounds to which they have an unquestioned right. Or, if we include the south shore of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, the east side of Cape Breton, and what is known as the "West Shore"—from Point Escumencac to Point Miscou—in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, we shall have a total area of 2,064 square miles. But a simple statement of the area of these inshore waters over which alone England has any control can convey little idea of their value. The mackerel fishery is now exclusively prosecuted with the great purse seine instead of by hook and line, which were formerly used. Therefore, the larger portion of this inshore area of water being too shallow and the bottom too rough to permit of the successful manipulation of the fishing apparatus, it is comparatively seldom that any fish are caught near the land. On the southern coast of Nova Scotia few fish are taken by American vessels, and these only during their migratory period. Thus it will be seen that the available area inside the limit is exceedingly small.

Then, too, the change in the methods of fishing has, in recent years, led to the almost practical abandonment of the mackerel fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Occasionally a considerable fleet enters the Gulf; but, since the results have generally been unsatisfactory, there have been seasons when only a very few vessels went there. It is true, perhaps, that the mackerel being a remarkably erratic species, its movements cannot be predicted from year to year with any absolute certainty.

The results obtained in the past ten years, since the universal employment of the purse seine, may serve, however, as a fair basis in judging of the future. It is an historical fact, now well established by the most accurate and careful investigation and inquiry, that the catch of mackerel in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, not to speak of the inshore waters under British control, has been of comparative insignificance during the last decade. And even under the most favorable conditions, when the catch there has been exceptionally large, as in 1885, the total product of the Gulf mackerel fishery did not amount to more than eight per cent. of the entire catch of the New England fleet. Of this, less than one-fourth was taken inside of the three-mile limit.

The influence of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was not immediately felt, and the fleet employed in the food fisheries of New England seems to have reached its maximum in 1862. At this date, according to the returns of the Bureau of Statistics, there were 133,601 tons employed in cod fishing, and 80,596 tons engaged in the mackerel fishery, a total of 214,197 tons. Since 1862 there has been more or less fluctuation in the tonnage employed in the fisheries; but, since the conclusion of the Washington treaty, the decline has been very marked, so much so that in 1883, according to the authority above mentioned, the tonnage employed in the cod and mackerel fishery was only 95,038 tons new measurement, which would be equivalent to about 140,000 tons old measurement, which shows an actual decrease, since 1862, in these branches of the fisheries, of 74,197 tons.

In 1879 an excellent opportunity was presented to me to note the practical operation of the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty. In the summer of that year I was at Pubnico, Nova Scotia, and was told by residents of that place that its fishing fleet, under the influence of the free markets of the United States, had grown from four small vessels to a fleet of about sixty fine schooners, during the previous six or seven years. In the latter part of the summer I entered upon the work of investigating the fisheries of New England for the tenth census. In many places on the coast it was found that the treaty had exerted a very baneful influence. Towns which had formerly sent to sea fleets of fishing vessels, varying from twenty-five to upward of one hundred sail, had then barely a remnant left, and in some cases not a single schooner. Some of these outfitting stations were veritable pictures of desolation—merely reminders of a lost industry. One in particular, called "Rigg's Cove," at Georgetown, Maine, impressed me the most forcibly. From here had sailed, a few years previously, fifty fine schooners. But what a change! At the time of our visit nothing remained to indicate its former business importance but neglected and tumble-down storehouses, and decaying wharves, against which lay a superannuated fish freighter, the tide flowing in and out of her open seams, and the broken cordage flapping monotonously against her bare spars, as if she had come here to die on the scene of her former usefulness.

It may not then be wondered at that, with such examples before them, American fishermen look with dread and distrust upon any proposition to renew similar relations with the British provinces. The evils they now have under the treaty of 1818, though they are many and onerous, are preferred instead.

Judging from the past, there can be no question that the result of another era of free fishing and "free fish" would be the practical annihilation of our ocean fisheries. And there can be little doubt that fair success can be obtained, and our fisheries restored to prosperity, if they are accorded a reasonable amount of protection, so that, at least, they may be placed on an even footing with foreign competitors, who are fostered by bounties, and have none of the onerous duties to pay which are exacted from our fishermen.

The future of our fisheries, then, depends almost wholly on the action of our Government. Let the rights of citizens of the United States in provincial waters be only clearly and authoritatively defined by the United States, and the fishermen will soon adapt themselves to the existing conditions. If they have commercial rights, as has been claimed by the highest authorities in the Senate, it is proper that they should know what those rights are, at the earliest practicable moment. They do not care to fish in British waters which are *only inside the three-mile limit*, and do not include off-shore fishing grounds, as has been erroneously supposed by many. This right would be valueless, as has been shown; and it is worthy of remark that not one of the Canadian cruisers has had cause for interfering with American vessels on this head during the present season.

The rights which are ours by the convention of 1818 have also to a large degree been rendered valueless in consequence of the interpretation given to the treaty

by Canada. Such, for illustration, is the right of shelter. Let me ask who has the best right to an opinion in regard to the need of shelter for a vessel? Is it her master, who, by long years of training and experience, is competent to judge of the dangers which he must encounter in leaving a harbor, or is it a landsman, devoid of all experience of the sea, who, nevertheless, may be appointed as a custom officer, and, under the present arrangement, may have the power to order a vessel to sea under the penalty of seizure! On a coast where gales suddenly arise, accompanied by hard driving snows, rain and fog, frequently lasting for many days, where comes the right to order a vessel to sea under penalty of seizure if she lay in harbor beyond a prescribed limit? It is, perhaps, not too much to hope that questions of this kind, which have long been held in abeyance, may be soon settled, in accordance with the humane and enlightened spirit of the age.

Let our fishermen be once assured of protection in the enjoyments of their rights under the treaty of 1818, and there can be no reasonable doubt that, with the improved methods and appliances which have been recently adopted, together with the bravery and hardihood which have been their distinguishing characteristics, the industry in which they are engaged will recover its former prosperity. It will take time, to be sure, to shake off the effects which are a result of two reciprocity treaties. But this can be done if the conditions are favorable.

And will it not be a wiser policy to promote by all justifiable means an industry which adds to the country's wealth, and at the same time trains a large body of efficient seamen, who must ever stand as a bulwark against its invasion by sea? If this is granted, then experience has proved that there is only one way to reach the desired result. While "free fish" will surely sound the death knell of the American fisheries, the assurance of American markets for American products will as certainly promote them.

J. W. Collins.

Is it Sectional or National?

SENATOR JOHNSTON was right when he said Mr. Cable impeached a whole nation. If he meant, by his article on the "Silent South," an impeachment of the justice of whites toward blacks, that impeachment covers the Union from Florida to Oregon and from Maine to California. The same facts that are true from Richmond to Galveston hold also from Boston to San Francisco.

I base my assertion on a statement by states of the number of prisoners in penitentiaries, jails, calaboses, workhouses, military prisons, and the hands of lessees. Tables were compiled by Fred H. Wines, for ten years secretary of the Illinois Board of Commissioners of Public Charities, and are the most accurate of the kind ever gotten up by the government of the United States.

Figures deduced from these tables show that in the South* the percentage of the negro population who were in prison convicted or accused of crime was 3.67 times as large as the percentage of the white

* Under the title South we include the fifteen old slave states (with West Virginia), and the District of Columbia. The term North is used as including all the remaining states.

population so imprisoned. At the North the percentage of the negro population who were prisoners was 4.82 times as large as the percentage of whites who were prisoners. Thus on the hypothesis that judges and juries unjustly discriminate against negroes, a calculation based on the foregoing figures shows that Southern jurymen are thirty-one per cent. kinder to the blacks than Northern men are.

Taking only the ten cotton states and Virginia, the results are still more favorable to the South, and making the comparison within those states between negroes and native whites (the best basis of comparison) slightly raises the percentage of superiority.

In some individual states, both North and South, the apparent discrimination is very great. It is extremely great in Georgia, but *even worse* in Michigan. It is greater east than west in both sections, but notably so in the South. This is probably for the reason that the drift of the criminal classes among the whites is westward, which is not the case among the blacks.

Northern negroes are richer. They are less illiterate. They are more scattered and more subject to civilizing white influence and less to that of each other. They would also, naturally, be less hated because of being few, weak, and helpless. These and other considerations would induce the reasoner to expect greater discrimination South than North. It would take a year's or rather many years' work to determine their mathematical value; but they may all be offset by two things. The institution of slavery implanted in the Southern negro temperance and subordination, a combination of qualities which the freedom of the Northern negro from any such school could never give him. Northern negroes are urban. Southern negroes are rural. There is more crime in cities than in the country. Hence we would look for the proportion of Northern negro prisoners to be greater. We have no statement of the division of prisoners into urban and rural, but an estimate reduces the thirty-one per cent. of greater Southern kindness to fifteen per cent. But, could all the elements of difference be mathematically eliminated, I doubt if the original percentage would be altered. The residuum of difference could probably be explained by the kind feelings of the Southerners toward their old slaves, and the fact that *their chivalry is rational*. They are favorably inclined toward *all* weak and helpless classes, *whether a weaker sex or race*. Thus I think it has been demonstrated, as near mathematically as such a thing can be done, that *race discrimination in the administration of justice is not sectional*.

In reality, it would be a miracle, under the circumstances, if absolutely no discrimination were exhibited. As much of it as exists should be blotted out by our vaunted "chivalry" and "philanthropy." Indeed, in the North the negro is not protected by loving memories, and justice can be secured to him only by repeated, persistent efforts of noble philanthropists. In the South, where the problem chiefly lies, there is certainly room for improvement in the mutual feelings of the races. The negroes are the wards of the nation, perhaps, but each individual owes him the treatment due a fellow-citizen and fellow-man. He owes this not only to the negroes of a distant part of the country, but also to those in his own state, city, or his own street. He owes it not so much to those being tried

before juries in a distant state as to the men who come up before the one on which he himself is impaneled.

A. E. Orr.

A REPLY.

EDITOR CENTURY:

Mr. Orr has, with great pains and accuracy and a most praiseworthy deference to truth, drawn his conclusions from the Census of 1880, vol. 1., pp. 3 and 929. Yet his generalizing is crude. He says my "impeachment of the justice of whites toward blacks" "covers the Union from Florida to Oregon and from Maine to California." "The same facts," he says, "that are true from Richmond to Galveston hold also from Boston to San Francisco." Appealing to figures, he finds that in all the Southern states the comparative criminality of blacks and whites—if prison populations are conclusive evidence—is less than four to one, and in the Northern less than five to one; the proportion being nearly a third *greater* in the whole North than in the whole South.

Now the first trouble here is that Mr. Orr is contesting a statement that nobody has made. In my reply to ex-Senator Johnston [THE CENTURY, May, 1886], my assertion as to an excessive disproportion of colored convicts is made only of "some Southern States," and specifically only of Georgia. Both there and in the earlier pages in which ex-Senator Johnston found this and kindred statements, they are to the effect that such things are actually occurring here and there and are *liable* to occur wherever the "attitude of domination over the blacks" meets the "seductions of the atrocious convict-lease system," which system, I wrote specifically, "does not belong to all our once slave States nor to all our once seceded States." Hence Mr. Orr is entirely wrong in resting his argument on aggregate statistics of the whole South.

But this is only the beginning of his error. He is wrong again in appealing to aggregate sums of *all prisoners*; for I spoke only of penitentiary convicts leased into private hands. So that the U. S. Census tables of all prisoners in jails, calaboses, etc., are not the proper data to argue from. The proper data are the penitentiaries' official reports. In South Carolina, by the U. S. Census, the comparative criminality of blacks and whites in equal numbers of each shows six and three-fourths to one; while the report of the state penitentiary for 1881 shows the proportion of blacks and whites committed to it over *ten to one*. Is this excess entirely due to an excessive criminality, or does not faithfulness to truth compel us to consider the additional fact that, while other confinements do not, the penitentiary does disfranchise?

I have not been so careless as to imply that even the convict-lease system works the same sort and degree of evil in all places alike. Varying conditions make varying evil results. This is plainly recognized in the seventh paragraph of my reply to ex-Senator Johnston and in other places in the general controversy. In Louisiana the disproportion of black convicts is not as large as in Georgia, and yet it has one of the most brutal lease systems in the whole South.

But do Mr. Orr's mistakes end here? By no means. He errs seriously if he would imply that I do not admit a greater depravity among blacks than among whites. The fact is palpable; the fault—we will not speak of that, for who would be innocent? In my

reply to ex-Senator Johnston I said that gentleman had accounted for barely half the excess of black convict population attributed by him to "the depravity of the negro." And now comes Mr. Orr, and from another set of statistics accounts for the same five to one that ex-Senator Johnston had accounted for and leaves the same additional, remaining five to one without explanation in the states where it exists.

And still again the gentleman is wide of the mark when he says, "The same facts that are true from Richmond to Galveston hold also from Boston to San Francisco." They do not hold uniformly North or South, and only Mr. Orr has said they do. They fluctuate. There are regions where there is something like a general disposition to treat the negro as a man, regardless of race; as in Massachusetts, for instance. There are other Northern regions where — to quote my reply to ex-Senator Johnston — "it is freely admitted that the proportion of colored penitentiary convicts would be less were there not still a great deal of unreasoning prejudice against the black man on account of his color"; for example, in Illinois or Indiana. Again, there are Southern states, Tennessee, for example, where the proportion of colored criminality seems to compare favorably, not with such states as Massachusetts, but with such as Illinois or Indiana; though even this momentary advantage is more than lost when we leave census figures of "all prisoners," and turn to the states' own official lists of their *penitentiary convicts*. And, lastly, there are such states as Georgia and South Carolina, where the figures are simply indistinguishable. Here is a small table of comparative figures :

EXCESS OF BLACK CRIMINALITY IN EQUAL NUMBERS OF BLACK AND WHITE.

State.	By U. S. Census of all prisoners.	By State official reports of Penitentiary convicts under lease system only.
Massachusetts.	2 ³ / ₄ to 1	Convicts not distinguished by color.
Indiana	61 ¹ / ₄ to 1	" " " "
Illinois	52 ² / ₅ to 1	52 ² / ₅ to 1 in Joliet Penitentiary.
Tennessee	5 to 1	7 to 1.
South Carolina	63 ³ / ₄ to 1	101 ¹ / ₂ to 1.
Georgia	74 ⁴ / ₅ to 1	13 to 1.

Mr. Orr's census figures are well enough, but his conclusions have an embryotic immaturity. He is not more to blame than a thousand others for overlooking entirely the figures of lynch law; it is the fashion to ignore them. And yet there they stand, in all their naked, shameless, unpardonable savagery. But, passing them by, there is still between certain states this additional unestimated difference: that while in one the great majority of all questions of offense against persons of property, small or great, are brought before the bar of law and authority, in another the great majority of such questions are submitted only to the law and authority of one's good right hand. South Carolina will doubtless maintain its civilization to be not greatly inferior to that of Massachusetts. On the other hand, with three-fifths of her population of

such sort that the other two-fifths deny them full citizenship on the ground of mental and moral unfitness, she will not claim to be greatly superior. But in Massachusetts the total of prisoners, even exclusive of reformatories, was in 1880 one in every four hundred and ninety-three of the state's population; while in South Carolina — almost destitute of reformatories — it was but one in every fifteen hundred and fifty. The total white prisoners in South Carolina, a state more than one-fifth of whose white population of ten years and upward could not write, were only one in every six thousand nine hundred and eighty-four. To assume that such a record indicates conclusively the amount of criminality in a population is too preposterous for serious notice.

Such facts as these make it quite superfluous for Mr. Orr or ex-Senator Johnston to find ingenious reasons to account for excess of Northern over Southern incarceration of colored men. The North, the East, the West, shall never find in me a champion of any error in them. If I do not enlarge upon the presence of race prejudices there, it is because I see their best people recognizing, lamenting, and steadily crowding out the wicked error. Moreover, I find but half a million dark sufferers from this error in all the North. There are twelve times that number in the South. Meanwhile I see in the South the seat of the contagion, and her intelligent but deluded people alternately denying and boasting its presence, and openly proposing to perpetuate it, against the peace of the nation and their own good name, happiness, and prosperity. I have never yet spoken first in this matter, save under the conviction that silence was treason to the South. It is treason.

But I must be done replying to such critics as ex-Senator Johnston and Mr. Orr. Why will not some one for once attempt a reply to what I have actually said or implied? There are my statements; The Convict Lease System, The Freedman's Case in Equity, The Silent South; not one assertion actually made in any one of them has been even seemingly refuted. The false doctrines which so many have claimed to be the true sentiment of and right system for the South have thus far found no advocate able to speak to the point. I shall make no more replies to those who cannot; but if any can — there lies the gage in the open arena.

Mr. Orr seems to me the fairest minded of any critic I have yet had. He seems really ready not only to acknowledge the truth, but to be in search of it. If he is he will presently find his way to an outlook whence he must see that the true duty of every Southerner is to make peaceable but inexorable war against the foul errors bred in the South, and only in less degree in the North, by slavery, and that only one among them is the corrupting and execrable penal system that distinguishes the majority of our Southern states from the rest of the enlightened world.

George W. Cable.

"A Healthy Change in the Tone of the Human Heart."

(SUGGESTIONS TO CITIES.)

THIS is the term used by a great writer to describe what indolent people would be apt to call a difference of taste, the difference between the "taste" that led to the building of the Parthenon and that evinced in

the building of the cathedrals, and, again, between the public taste of the period of cathedral-building and the time of the building of — what shall be said? — our soldiers' monuments? our patent iron bridges?

In the fifteenth century, Mr. Ruskin tells us, the most cultivated of men found delight in scenes of which the chief characteristics were trimness, orderliness, framedness, surface fineness,—sources of gratification that could be so only through a conspicuous manifestation of human painstaking. The water in which they took pleasure was water flowing in a channel paved at the bottom, walled at the sides, rimmed at the surface, and bordered by parallel floral fringes, specimen trees, or hedges. The rocks they enjoyed were any but crannied, craggy, mossy, and weather-stained rocks. They liked best to look on forest trees when they had been trimmed, shorn, and disposed in rows by the side of a road. They disliked all that we mean by depth, intricacy, mystery, in scenery. They liked clear outlines, fences, walls, defining circumstances, scenes fretted with bits of bright color, turf patched with flower-beds, nature dressed on the principles of our drawing-room and garden decorative art. They fairly hated the sight of the disorderly, unconfined sea, with its fluctuating lights and shadows and fugitive hues. The civilization of our times, Mr. Ruskin thinks, finds a greater pleasure in rivers than in canals; it enjoys the sea, it enjoys the distinctive qualities of mountains, crags, rocks; it is pleasantly affected by all that in natural scenery which is indefinite, blending, evasive. It is less agreeably moved by trees when standing out with marked singularity of form or color than when the distinctive qualities of one are partly merged with those of others, in groups and masses, as in natural woodlands. It takes pleasure in breadth, sedateness, serenity of landscape. If modern art has any advantage over that of the middle ages, it is through its awakening to the value of these aspects of nature and its less respect for the mere material wealth of man's manifest creation.

This doctrine is not Mr. Ruskin's alone. Scholars in general have substantially taken the same view from the time of Addison and Horace Walpole down. Mr. Ruskin has but presented it more fully and accurately than others. But if we accept it, what are we to think of the neglect that is apparent at many of our centers of civilization to preserve, develop, and make richly available their chief local resources of this form of wealth? Let me refer to a few examples.

At our national capital, while we are every year adding to its outfit new decorations in marble and bronze, formal plantations, specimen trees, and floral and bushy millinery, we leave the charmingly wooded glen of Rock Creek in private hands, subject any day to be laid waste. Once gone, the wealth of the nation could not buy for Washington half the value of landscape beauty that would thus have been lost.

Again, one of our Northern cities has always had lying at its feet a passage of scenery in which, with some protection and aid to nature, and a little provision of convenience, there might be more of grandeur, picturesqueness, and poetic charm than it is possible that this city shall ever otherwise be able to possess, though it should increase a hundred-fold in population and wealth, and command the talents of greater artists than any now living. No effort is made

to hold the opportunity. No thought is given to it. The real estate in which it lies, as yet mainly if not wholly unproductive, is from year to year bought and sold as private property with regard alone to its possible future value for some industrial purpose to which thousands of acres near by can easily be as well adapted. There is a river running through it, but its chief interest to "the human heart" does not lie in the water. The water is of no small value, yet it might be wholly drawn off to turn wheels and all that I have said remain true.

We have another fine city, a city of some repute for its poets, its architecture, sculpture, music, gardening, its galleries and its schools of art. Liberal, provident, thrifty, clean, it sits at the head of a harbor giving directly on the sea. The harbor has made the city. Various islands and headlands make the harbor. The islands and headlands are thus the life of the city. Following Mr. Ruskin, one would suppose that whatever of beauty lies in them would long since have engaged all the art-sense of its people. But, in fact, hitherto, a stranger wishing to look down the harbor toward the sea could find not a foot of ground along the shore prepared for the purpose. Once the islands were bodies of foliage. Seen one against another and grouping with woody headlands, they formed scenery of grace and amenity, cheerful, genial, hospitable. But long ago they were despoiled for petty private gains, and the harbor made artificially bald, raw, bleak, prosaic, inhospitable. Each island now stands by itself, as sharply defined in all its outlines as the most mediæval mind could desire. Several of them are the property of the city and are in use for excellent purposes. It would not lessen but enhance their value for these purposes to dress them again with the graces of naturally disposed foliage; and under a well-prepared system, patiently followed, it would cost little more every year to do this than is spent for an hour's exhibition of fireworks. The harbor is often more crowded than any other on the coast with pleasure-seeking yachts and yachtlets; all that has been stated is perfectly plain; but the opportunity remains not only unused, but, so far as publicly appears, unconsidered,—a matter of no account.

One of the most impressive (and by its impressiveness most recreative, and by its recreativeness most valuable) city grounds that I have known, I strayed into by accident, never having heard of it before. This was thirty years ago, and I have not heard of it since; but the impression it made was so strong that being asked for a note on this topic, it is instantly and vividly recalled. The entire value of this city property lay in its situation. Otherwise it was barbarous — barbarous in its squirming gravel-walks, its dilapidated essays of puerile decoration, its shabby gentility; its hogs and its hoodlums. But far below flowed a great river, and one looked beyond the river downward upon the unbroken surface of an unlimited forest; looked upon it as one looks from a height upon the sea.

No matter what is beyond, an expanse of water, as you say, can never fail to have a refreshing counter interest to the inner parts of a city; it supplies a tonic change at times even from the finest churches, libraries, picture galleries, conservatories, gardens, soldiers' monuments, parks, and landward outskirts. What is easier than to provide a grateful convenience

for such refreshment? Yet if one wants it at Troy, Albany, Newburgh, Springfield, Hartford, Middletown, New London, Trenton, Norfolk, Louisville, St. Louis, Memphis, Vicksburg, what is offered? What was lost for Brooklyn when the brow of its heights was wholly given up to paved streets and private occupation! What resources is Burlington wasting!

The wayfarer in Lynchburg may come to know by a chance glimpse at a street-corner that that city holds one of the greatest treasures of scenery at its command; but if he would see more of it, he must ask leave to climb a church-steeple, or, what is better, plod off by a dusty road to a point beyond the city's squalid outskirts, where the James river will give him undisturbed space for western contemplation. Many such illustrations of the general fact might be given.

But one who believes that Ruskin is describing tendencies of civilized movement rather than stages attained, as he looks over our land, is not left cheerless. Years ago a traveler arriving in Buffalo asked in vain where he could go to look out on the lake. "The lake?" he would be answered in the spirit of the middle ages; "nobody here wants to look at the lake; we hate the lake." And he might find that two large public squares had been laid out, furnished and planted, leaving a block between them and the edge of a bluff to be so built over as to shut off all view from the squares toward the lake and toward sunset. But lately land has been bought and prepared, and is much resorted to, expressly for the enjoyment of this view. This new public property also commands a river effect such as can be seen, I believe, nowhere else,—a certain quivering of the surface and a rare tone of color, the result of the crowding upward of the lake waters as they enter the deep portal of the Niagara. Is the regard paid to these elements of natural scenery by the city less an evidence of growing civilization than is given in the granite statues on its court-house or in its soldiers' monument? San Francisco holds a grand outlook upon the Pacific; New Haven has acquired a noble eminence overlooking the Sound. Be it remembered, also, that at Chicago and at Detroit, at Halifax and at Bridgeport, sites have been secured at which the public interest in great, simple, undecorated waters may be worthily cared for.

Between the two neighboring cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis the Mississippi flows majestically. Its banks are bold and nobly wooded, a virgin American forest. Mr. Horace Cleveland, a veteran artist, a kinsman of the President's, is urging upon the people of these two cities that they secure the opportunity thus offered for a public ground common to both with which no other city recreation-ground could be brought in comparison. If Mr. Ruskin be right, it speaks well for the health of these two wonderfully growing communities that the suggestion has been gravely received and is earnestly debated.

A small space, it should not be forgotten, may serve to present a choice refreshment to a city, provided the circumstances are favorable for an extended outlook upon natural elements of scenery. This is seen in Durham Terrace at Montreal, the inward as well as the riverward characteristic scenes of which Mr. Howells has described in "Their Wedding Journey." Another illustration of the fact may be found in a queer little

half-public place, half-domestic back-yard, from which the river may be overlooked if any one cares for it, at Hudson, New York. Yet another may be come upon at Providence, a public balcony, not more than a hundred feet square, thrown out from a hill-side street. A trifling affair, but a trifle that expresses much of public civilization.

For low-lying towns upon the sea or lake coasts, promenade piers will generally offer the best means to the purpose. A simple promenade pier built with tree-trunks from neighboring woods, nicely hewn, nicely adzed, nicely notched, nicely pinned, without a bolt or strap of iron, with no paint or applied "gingerbread," built by a village bee, would be a work worthy to be celebrated in a wood-cut poem of THE CENTURY.

Frederick Law Olmsted.

Ocean Signal Stations.

THERE is, perhaps, no question in science in which there has been so large an admixture of speculation and fact as in the attempts made to reduce to general rules the phenomena attendant upon storms, the reason being that meteorological observatories were too few in number, and too widely separated to procure the necessary data without drawing largely upon conjecture.

The introduction of the electric telegraph has contributed greatly to the solid advancement of the science of meteorology, which, more than any other, must depend upon extensive and carefully conducted observations. In this respect the United States stand preëminent, having at the present time nearly eight hundred observing stations. One of the results of the increase in the number of meteorological stations on the land, is the valuable system of storm warnings, or weather indications, now so widely studied.

From the ocean, however, until recently it has not been considered possible to obtain accurate knowledge of meteorological conditions, except such as might be compiled from the logs of incoming vessels.

In order to overcome this serious defect in the world's weather service, I have prepared the following practicable plan for the collation and distribution of meteorological data from the North Atlantic Ocean. The system as designed embodies the construction of a number of lightships of peculiar form, which are to be moored at intervals across the Atlantic Ocean, displaying weather and code signals, and the laying of a submarine telegraph cable connecting each of these floating stations with the telegraph systems of Europe and America. The hull of the station is cylindrical in shape, the bottom or lower end being flat, securing a maximum buoyancy. The top, or upper end, is convex, with a pitch of thirty degrees, presenting a minimum surface of resistance to either wind or sea.

The hull, when in position, will be submerged nearly to the level of the upper deck, maintaining at all times an equilibrium as nearly perfect as is possible. For regulating the depth of submersion, two large tanks having a capacity of many hundred tons of water ballast are placed in the lower hold.

From the upper deck, a skeleton-like tubular iron framework arises, at the top of which are placed the lantern and lighting apparatus, the latter consisting

of a Fresnel lens of the first order and an electric arc light, forming a beacon of the greatest range of illumination and brilliancy.

The tubular columns supporting the lantern serve as smoke, steam, and ventilating shafts, one being used as a stairway to the lookout and signal box, situated just below the lantern.

The interior of the station is subdivided into cabins, observing, electrical machinery, and other departments. For ventilating purposes, two of the tubular columns will contain powerful fan-wheels, the one supplying pure fresh air, while the other exhausts the foul air and gases accumulating below the decks. These fans are calculated to furnish seventy-five hundred cubic feet of air per minute—a quantity more than sufficient for all necessities.

For mooring purposes, a peculiar form of anchor, known as the mushroom, is to be used in connection with a light steel cable of small diameter, the great buoyancy of this form of station readily sustaining the immense weight of cable required to anchor in the great depths of the ocean, varying from one thousand to three thousand fathoms, the average depth on the telegraph plateau being two thousand four hundred fathoms.

To provide electrical communication between the stations and the two continents, a submarine telegraph cable is to be laid between Europe and America, and connected with each of the intermediate stations. In order to avoid strain or injury to the main cable, the local or direct connection will be made by means of a secondary cable, buoyed in the immediate vicinity of the station. The motion of these ships in heavy weather will be slow and easy, and with absolutely no strain upon either the hull or mooring cable. The fact of the stations being so nearly submerged and presenting but a minimum surface of resistance to the elements, places their ability to ride in safety through the severest Atlantic gale beyond all doubt. Comfortable quarters are provided for the meteorologists, electricians, and crew necessary to properly attend to the management of such stations.

The system is also intended to record the movements of shipping at sea, especially of the great fleet of passenger steamships, the observers reporting the location and condition of each ship as signaled. By reason of the almost constant knowledge of the progress of steamships, the anxieties of the world would be greatly allayed when, by disabled machinery or other mishaps, a steamship compelled to proceed under sail-power alone becomes long overdue.

The stations, being moored in known latitudes and longitudes, will become points of departure for mariners who through stress of weather have lost their reckoning and bearings.

F. A. Cloudman.

RONDOUT, N. Y.

Pronunciation of Alien Words.

I WOULD like to ask through your columns the proper treatment of such words, in the matter of pronunciation, and perhaps of spelling also, as have come into daily use among us from other languages, many of them being proper names, as of persons, geographical, etc. As an instance, I had occasion a few days

ago to mention the Simplon in connection with a small collection of Alpine flowers I had gathered last year on this famous pass, and pronounced it, according to its spelling, in English sounds. I was met with an interrogation from one of my audience, "The Samplon?"

Again, I used the word to express a person employed by another, and spelled it, as I pronounced it, employée. My spelling was corrected to employé.

How are we to escape between the Scylla of misspelling on the one hand, and the Charybdis of mispronunciation on the other? If we pronounce *Simplon*, *employé*, and other like words according to the rules of their respective languages, are we to set any limits? If so, what limits? If not, must we become familiar with the pronunciation of every language under the sun, words from nearly all of which we meet with in our daily papers? Must the continental traveler speak of *Paris*, and the pulpit of Calvin, as these are pronounced abroad? Or shall we adopt the rule of pronouncing from all languages according to the sounds of our own, and thus maintain a uniformity and consistency that is otherwise impossible to any but a polyglot?

The writer would like to see this question discussed for the benefit of your vast and intelligent *clientèle*.

Marcellus.

THE proper answer to the above questions is not very favorable to those who have not the gift of tongues. For the pronunciation of words which are altogether foreign to the English language, there can be but one rule: pronounce them as nearly as possible as they are pronounced by those to whom they are vernacular. This rule is dictated by both good taste and common sense. The only excuse for violating it is ignorance, of which, in the case of the majority of languages, most of us must, of course, plead guilty. Every well-educated man, however, is to-day supposed to have a knowledge of at least French, German, and Italian, sufficient to enable him to pronounce correctly the few words from those languages which he is likely to meet in general reading. For Chinese, Burmese, and the like, he must consult the authorities or trust to Providence. A blunder in Russian or Choctaw is in a high degree excusable. What is true of pronunciation is equally true of spelling.

But our correspondent's questions—to judge from his examples—cover also a large class of words to which the above rule does not apply; which, in fact, are not really foreign words, but anglicized pronunciations and forms of such words, established and recognized as integral parts of the English language. The language-makers are not fine scholars, and in their mouths French, German, or Italian words, if frequently used, or if especially difficult to pronounce, soon acquire an English sound; and when usage lifts this new sound above the rank of a blunder, we must all recognize it as the only legitimate one. When change of sound is accompanied by a change of spelling, this necessity is obvious to all; when it is not so accompanied, it is common—among certain would-be accurate people—to discard the English and affect a foreign pronunciation. Thus, for example, to say *München* for Munich would at once be condemned as affectation; but it is equally affected to use the German pronunciation of *Berlin* or the French pronun-

ciation of *Paris*, or to say *Calvan* for *Calvin*. This remark applies to a vast number of geographical names, names of persons, and other words which we need not specify in detail. On the other hand the exceptions are very numerous. The language-makers have not transformed every familiar foreign word into English, and hence, while we, for example, with right, use the English pronunciation of Galileo and Luther, we must use the German of *Hegel*, *Fichte*, and *Jacobi*, and the French of *rendez-vous* and *ennui*. Whether *Simplon* should be pronounced as English or French is probably a matter of taste, since the English pronunciation of it is hardly established; but *employee* is a good English word, preferred by the "Imperial" to *employé*, and admitted by "Webster" to be "perfectly conformable to analogy" though it is not given a place in his vocabulary.

To sum up: When there is an established anglicized pronunciation or form of a foreign word, it is always to be used; otherwise, and especially in modern European languages, where ignorance is no excuse, the foreign pronunciation is the only accurate one. But who then is to tell when such English forms exist? That is the duty of the pronouncing dictionaries.

Benjamin E. Smith.

The Singing-schools of Olden Time.

THE simple tunes, the fugues and anthems of the olden time awoke as keen a pleasure in the hearers and performers of that day as the music that has supplanted them awakes in the disciples of the advanced culture of the present. They were happy as far as they knew, and they knew enough to be happy therein.

The teachers of these schools were men whose attainments in music were above mediocrity. The mechanical part of their art they knew quite thoroughly; in its deeper scientific and philosophic principles they could probably hold no comparison with our modern professionals. They were prominent variously for taste, voice, or ability to teach, and their employment was on the itinerant method. The musically inclined in several contiguous towns arranged for schools on different evenings of the week during the winter, and, by virtue of the footings on the inevitable "subscription-paper," bargained with a teacher whose whole time was thus employed on the comprised circuit, to the mutual advantage of all. All the preliminaries having thus been arranged, the young people of the several towns for whose pleasure and benefit these affairs were mainly intended, reënforced by some of the veteran singers for back-bone and support, joyfully gathered for the vocal campaign. The order of proceedings with some of the older and more thorough of the teachers was to call the novitiates, one by one, to the front and require them to "raise and fall" the eight notes of the gamut. Those unable to climb and descend this test ladder were summarily set aside by the choral autocrat, and assigned to the spectators' seats thereafter.

The successful passers of the test were then put through the musical alphabet and rudimentary exercises, though I do not remember that the aid of a blackboard or chart — now considered almost indispensable — was ever called in. Proficiency in the practice of

the scales was attained according to the grade of apprehension in the individual pupils, and the lessons were continued sufficiently long to enable the brightest to wade glibly among the semibreves, crotchets, and quavers, and become leaning-posts and "ponies" for those of duller intellects. When *word* came to be substituted for *note* practice, the dullards came alongside of the experts, since rote could counterfeit knowledge undetected.

A recess interluded the two hours' session. Sometimes, when the teacher used a violin as an accompaniment of his instructions, the instrument was called into requisition to aid a dance or two during the interval. The chorister who was master of this accomplishment added another leaf to his laurels.

Toward the close of the season came the practice of the "set-pieces" and anthems which were to be the crown of the final concerts. Oh, the recollection of old "Denmark" and the "Judgment Anthem," as I followed their mazy wonders, is among the things secure from oblivion!

On the finished course of lessons supervened the grand finale — a concert in each of the several localities wherein the schools had been held, often aided by a selection of the prominent singers of the neighboring precincts. The spacious, old-fashioned church was the scene of this terminal demonstration. Its galleries, extending around three sides of the edifice, were lined by the performers; the chorister, instrumentalists, and most prominent vocalists occupying the center front. The parish clergyman and his visitant brethren filled the pulpit, and the pews and aisles were crammed with the expectant audience gathered from far and near. After prayer, the great volume of modulated and cadenced sound began to roll — at first along the simple measures in the tunes adapted to ordinary use. Gradually, as the singers warmed to their work, and the harmony became more perfect, more complicated themes astonished the listening multitude, whose admiring interest was halted and whirled through fugues whose labyrinthine intricacies, like the evolutions of trained battalions, were as wonderful as the skillful clew that brought all the prolonged and errant tones into triumphant unison at last. Occasionally, when rare voices were found in a community, they were paraded in a few solos or quartettes; and I remember occasions where "Deep is the sleep of the hero," from Handel's Oratorio of Saul, and "Eve's Lamentation," by a forgotten composer, were rendered with an effect to which the perfect silence and irrepressible tears of the great audience bore expressive testimony.

Many of the music-teachers were uniques in their line; often, as they became veterans in their profession, they assumed proportional autocracy, and surpassed the old-time district school-master in disciplinary *réligime*. An unlucky whisper or a thoughtless giggle during the exercises would, in some cases, provoke exhibitions of temper and results which the "young America" of these days would resent as intolerable. I have seen buxom maidens of eighteen years and more, drawn from their seats with no gentle gallantry and stationed in mid-floor, blushing, mortified, tearful, or defiant, as the case might be, and young men taken by the collar to the door and summarily ejected, for some trifling indiscretion during the performances. Nor were the educational acquirements of some of

them at all remarkable beyond the gamut. I recall the criticism of one such who called a sudden halt in the midst of a tune and exclaimed in wrath: "Mind your words! You lay too much stress on the pronoun *and*, and the adverb *of*." On another occasion he chid his choir thus: "You sung that no better than a lot of *Squammux* Indians would do."

Well, all this is now among the by-gones. Picked choirs and paid quartettes, or promiscuous congregational singing, have supplanted the volunteer full-gallery performers of olden time; and where modern refittings have not yet been applied, those empty galleries still remain to awaken sad remembrances of other days and the old-fashioned singing-school.

E. W. B. Canning.

A Grave Omission in our School Histories.

HAVING had occasion (as member of a city school board) to examine a number of text-books on American history "prepared for the use of schools and academies," I have been struck with one defect which all seem to possess in common. This is their glaring omission of any due notice of the vast immigrations, from foreign countries, which have taken place within the present century and which have so largely contributed to the "making of America."

I look at the census tables and learn that there are fourteen million people, in the United States, of foreign parentage. I observe that there are half a million Irish men and women in New York and that a majority of the voters in the State of Wisconsin are of German birth. I turn to my school history, which pretends to tell me the story of the American people, and I find no trace of the coming of these millions. There is no record of the mighty industrial impetus which their immigration must have produced; nor the slightest hint of the vast, though subtle, social and political influences which, almost necessarily, must have accompanied the instreaming of such a mass.

As well might a record of the thirteen original colonies brought down to 1886, in which all reference to the Great West and South-west was omitted, be called a "History of the United States" as one which ignores the colonists who have landed since the Revolution.

Possibly some explanation of this inexcusable hiatus may be found in the habit of school-book compilers of servilely imitating their predecessors of the '30's and '40's. "Peter Parleyism" has been the bane of the schools in this particular department. Apparently there is no America until the curtain is rung up to witness the landing of the Puritans, "those brave refugees" from a religious despotism they did so much to reestablish in their new home. And the school-boy is regaled with all the little joys and woes

of the Plymouth villagers while the rest of the country is settled "without note or comment." There is, for instance, no adequate mention of the earlier influx of Irish settlers whose hatred of English dominion exerted so powerful an influence in favor of the Revolutionary movement (if we are to credit the authorities cited in one of Mr. Lecky's recent volumes), and that has since grown to be so important an element in the history of the American people. The pupil has forced upon his memory all the Netherlandish names of the governors of colonial New York, while the vast German immigration that has built up entire States in our Western domain is scarcely noticed.

In this particular our text-book writers on American history have made a great mistake. They have closed their epoch of colonization and settlement a century too soon. They notice the arrival of a hundred refugees in the seventeenth century, and expatiate on the causes of their exile. But they ignore the "million a decade" who have landed on our shores during the present century. Yet this colonization of the nineteenth century is greater than that of all previous eras. It has exceeded numerically that great migration from the north which overturned the Roman Empire. True, it has not carried in its train the disastrous and destructive results of the barbarian inroads, but it may possess all the constructive and modifying force of that mighty popular upheaval. It has brought widely differing races into the community. They have adapted themselves to the society which they have found here, but has there been no responsive adaptation on the part of the native community? But, in any event, whoever fails to recognize in European immigration and Western settlement main threads, aside from purely political events like the slavery agitation, in the history of the American people during the present century, is unfitted to write a suitable text-book for the schools.

H. J. Desmond.

Death of David Crockett.

CAPTAIN REUBEN M. POTTER, U. S. A., writing to correct some statements in an account of the fall of the Alamo that appeared in an article on General Sam Houston, in *THE CENTURY* for August, 1884, states that Crockett was killed by a bullet-shot while at his post on the outworks of the fort, and was one of the first to fall. Captain Potter says that the story of Crockett being captured with a gun-barrel in one hand, and a huge knife in the other, and a semicircle of dead Mexicans about him is pure fiction. Bowie was ill at the time of the fight, and was found murdered in his bed; and a single bullet-hole in the forehead of Travis tells the whole tale of his death. Nothing else, he adds, can be known.

