

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The American Militia.

THE importance of the militia in our political and social system has several times been noticed in THE CENTURY. The new development of the American militia system was described in "Topics of the Time" for June, 1884; and the necessity and propriety of early action by Congress were stated in our latest issue.* Since the former article was written, the development which it forecasts has gone on with so much rapidity that it deserves attention here in connection with the more recent article.

The American of the present day hears continually of the "National Guard," and he may come to believe that the body which bears that name is that to which the Constitution refers as "the militia of the United States." It may be well, then, to remind him that the National Guard is a purely voluntary outgrowth of the Constitutional militia, which was intended to be a universal and compulsory service. When the Constitution empowers Congress to provide for calling "the militia" into the service of the United States, it is well to remember that the term "militia" covered, and was meant to cover, all the fighting-men of the country; and the use of the term in this way shows that, even in 1787, the framers of the Constitution had anticipated the modern German system of universal compulsory military service. It must be admitted that the principle is logically essential to a democracy. Upon it hangs more than half of Jefferson's famous summary of the democratic programme—"every one who fights or pays shall vote." Without it, we could only conclude that only those who pay shall vote, unless we could fall back upon the somewhat vague doctrine of the diffusion of taxation to show that most people pay something and hence should vote. To get any definite basis for a democracy, it is essential that the popular consciousness should be kept awake to the physical basis of the ballot, the necessity of a return in some form, whether of money support or of a physical support to the government; and that any present exemption from active service should be clearly understood to be a privilege, not a right.

Every indication from our early history goes to show that, if the political geography of the young republic had been the same as that of Prussia in 1860, the result would have been the same; and that the United States would have had a *Landwehr* and *Landsturm* before Bismarck was born. Circumstances, however, were propitious to the American republic. It had no neighbors powerful enough to make the *Landwehr* a practical necessity; and the mass of its citizens were spared all personal contact with the pomp and circumstance of glorious war. For a time there was a survival of the original idea of universal compulsory service in the annual training-days of "the militia," of which Corwin's vivid sketch has left us so clear a description. In course of time even this survival be-

came obsolete, and "the militia of the United States" has now become as purely a census term as the population between twenty-five and thirty, or the population according to latitude.

Instead of the militia, as it was originally intended to be constituted, there has grown up in most of the States a purely voluntary service, the so-called National (or State) Guard, composed of citizens who volunteer to serve the State for a longer or shorter time. Under extraordinary circumstances the persistence of the original idea is shown by the Draft Act of 1863; but under ordinary circumstances the duties of the real "militia" are now performed by this part of their number who have voluntarily assumed the burden. It is thus a fact that the so-called National Guard is now in practice the militia of the United States; and, while the voluntary nature of the force may create certain embarrassments, it must be looked to for the present as the American militia. Of course the disappearance of the original militia organization has not deprived the United States of the right to call upon the State for its quota of "the militia"; while the State may satisfy the call by the services of its voluntary militia. It is evident that there is here the germ of a future voluntary army, closely similar to that which sprang so suddenly into existence in 1861.

In the development of this germ the good offices of the United States have been practically nothing. Some of the Eastern States have done good work of late years. The railroad riots of 1877 were a cogent lesson to Pennsylvania, and the lesson seems to have been taken to heart. Some of the neighboring States have also entered in earnest upon the work of fostering the efficiency of the National Guard, and have made it a force of far greater possibilities in action than was the case ten years ago. But it remains true, as it was ten years ago, that the mass of our States care very little for the proper development of their volunteer militia. Indeed, why should they care for it? Under the present system, the conditions for a sound National Guard only come into existence when population has become dense, and when there is a sufficiently large portion of the population inclined by fondness for military experience to endure voluntarily the obvious discomforts of the service. In States where these conditions do not yet exist, there may be need for an efficient National Guard, without the possibility of it. The need is not evident enough to induce the State to take the only road to a provision for it; and the State goes on in the old shiftless way, growing more prone at every emergency to look for protection to the Federal Government, instead of relying on its own resources. In most of our States the annual provision by Congress constitutes the bulk of the appropriation available for the support of the National Guard, and this provision is inexcusably meager, too small, at any rate, to be any basis for a claim by Congress of a right to enforce a strict regimen on the force which subsists on it.

Nothing can be more evident than that, in the

* "Is Society Ready?" Topics of the Time, THE CENTURY for October, 1886.

States where population is not yet dense, Congress alone can properly develop a real National Guard. It can do what hardly any power could induce the State Legislature to do; it can appropriate an amount large enough to insure a thorough summer encampment by giving a reasonable payment to the men. Experience has shown that the encampment training is an essential to any effective system. It is carried on in many of those States having a uniformed National Guard, but almost always under great embarrassments and for too brief a period for want of funds. In some States, the men have served without pay and even paid their own expenses while in camp, and in almost all the States the member of the Legislature who should vote for the appropriation which is really necessary for that purpose would have an unhappy quarter of an hour on meeting his constituents to explain. And yet the men should be paid for the time spent in the work; and any parsimonious policy in this matter is not even tolerable. The National Guard is as much in the service of the State as the Fire or Police departments are in the service of the city; its possible service is much more unpleasant; and it has fully as much claim to adequate compensation. Some of the States, but by no means all, are able to afford this. If we wish a thoroughly trained National Guard in every State, we must look for it to Act of Congress.

The appropriation of a sum large enough to arm and equip the National Guard thoroughly, and to pay the men for the time spent in the annual training or for any other service rendered to the United States, would be a foundation for a larger oversight of the National Guard by Congress. The administration of "the discipline prescribed by Congress," and the appointment of the officers, must remain with the States; but Congress would have a fair right to insist that its War Department should be satisfied, through its inspecting officers, that the discipline was properly carried out. The mere presence of United States officers has a bracing effect upon the officers of the National Guard, and it is nowhere more necessary. The story of the militia officer who kept his men under a fire of bricks and stones for ten minutes, while he turned over the pages of his hand-book in search of the proper order, may be altogether apocryphal. But the deep cut at Reading, Pennsylvania, through which a militia genius marched his men, exposing them helplessly to the fire of the mob above, is still to be seen of all men who travel by rail from Philadelphia to or through Reading; and it testifies that it is sometimes better to have no men than to have some officers.

The reform which has been the first to be carried through by the States which have begun to develop their National Guard has been a comparatively simple one, but one of wide effects, and not easy to accomplish. Under the voluntary constitution of the National Guard, the uniforms were about as various as the companies. Under the new system, the service uniform and equipments of all the regiments of a State's force are to be identical throughout. How difficult it was to extirpate the reds and blues and yellows, the varieties in style and caliber of weapons, perhaps some of the self-sacrificing men who have given their time and attention to the work can tell us; but the results have been all for good. A riotous mob can no longer distinguish one regiment or company from another by its

uniform, or pick out off-hand the particular company from which it believes that there is comparatively little danger. Uniformity gives the sense of discipline to the men and a business-like air which creates respect. Similarity of uniform is a large factor in securing safety to militia, when employed in distant parts of its own State. When the time comes, if it shall come, that militia of one State must be employed in another as in 1794, nothing but a *national* uniformity of equipment will make the step even a reasonable experiment. Evidently, in the course of development into which circumstances have forced us, national action and national development are the only legitimate lines to choose.

The immediate answer to all the line of argument here relied upon, would be that the step proposed would have a strongly centralizing tendency, throwing more power into the hands of the Federal Government. So it may seem on the surface; but in reality the tendency is directly the reverse. Affairs have drifted in such a direction that, while all the States need home protection, only a few are able to provide it for themselves. When the emergency comes, the helpless State naturally looks to the Federal Government for protection, and relies progressively less upon herself. The plain drift of such a policy is to a necessarily strong central government, with a powerful standing army, and the disappearance or absorption of the militia, as we now have it. The development of our National Guard system, an entirely unobjectionable system of volunteer State forces, is simply the encouragement of individual States to rely on themselves. It is thus a National Guard in the complete sense of the adjective under our complex system, an effort by the Federal power to enable the States to carry on the normal operations of the social system. The bill which seems to come nearest to the measure of the national duty, the Sewell Bill, increasing the militia appropriation, passed the Senate at the last session without opposition. It did not reach consideration in the House of Representatives, but still hangs there, ready for consideration and passage in December. The duty of the House in the premises seems plain; and it is to be hoped that one of its first steps will be to take up, consider, and pass the Sewell Bill, as the lowest limit of the national obligation to the National Guard.

The Congressional Balance-sheet.

ECONOMY, says the proverb, is wealth; and though it ill becomes a great people to follow a cheese-paring policy with its government, to scrutinize its cost too closely, and thus compel it to study petty retrenchments instead of great national interests, there is still a certain proportion of results of government to cost of government which even the greatest of peoples is bound to insist upon. If results are great, the people can well afford a considerable expenditure; if results are *nil*, the cheapest of governments is dear at the price; if results are *nil* and expenditure generous, the government is worse than useless. The forty-ninth Congress, whose second session begins next month, closed its first session, August 5, 1886, having begun it December 7, 1885. In order to direct public attention to the results of the coming second session, it may

be well to compare the cost with the results of the first session of the same body. It should be borne in mind, however, that the first session had as near as may be eight months of "work," while the second session will have but a scant three months.

In arranging the debit side of such a balance-sheet, the appropriations for the fiscal year, ending June 30th, may stand as the cost of the session. If, on the one hand, they err in giving appropriations not fully expended, the error will be more than balanced by deficiencies due to the continuance of the session beyond the end of the fiscal year. The statement of the cost of Congress, as given below, errs, if at all, in being too small. The appropriation bills make it as follows:

SENATE: Pay of Senators.....	\$ 380,000.00	
Mileage.....	33,000.00	
Pay of employees.....	344,113.10	
Contingent expenses, stationery, etc.....	109,970.00	
HOUSE: Pay of Representatives.....	1,695,000.00	
Mileage.....	110,624.00	
Pay of employees.....	390,849.10	
Contingent expenses, stationery, etc.....	114,462.00	
CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.....	1,200.00	
Police.....	36,700.00	
Public Printer.....	18,300.00	
Library.....	59,320.00	
Garden.....	16,700.00	
Cost of Session.....	\$3,310,238.20	

Such being, roughly stated, the cost of the session, let us turn to the credit side of the sheet, the practical results accomplished by this body which costs the country nearly three and a half million dollars a year. They are as follows:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED:		
In the House.....	10,228	
In the Senate.....	2,974	13,202
BILLS PASSED:		
From the House.....	746	
From the Senate.....	241	987
BILLS PASSED AND VETOED:		
Private pension bills.....	102	
Bills for public buildings.....	6	
Other bills.....	7	115
Bills passed over the veto.....		1
"REPORTS" MADE BY COMMITTEES:		
In the House.....	3,455	
In the Senate.....	1,610	5,065
Pages of "The Congressional Record" filled,		9,000

It would be unjust, as well as impossible, to state any grand total to this side of the Congressional balance-sheet. The reader must look upon the whole mass of "work," and estimate the grand total as seems to him good. It would be unjust, however, both to the reader and to the legislative body, to ignore certain comparative results, for which the first session of the forty-ninth Congress may fairly claim a preëminence over other sessions. Thus, it succeeded in filling about fifty per cent. more pages of that invaluable periodical, "The Congressional Record," than the corresponding sessions of either of the two preceding Congresses. It "introduced," in this one session, nearly twenty-five per cent. more bills and joint resolutions than the two preceding Congresses introduced in both sessions; and the two preceding Congresses were by no means prentice hands at the trade. Its busy and efficient committees made twenty-five per cent. more "reports" in this one session than the forty-eighth Congress made in both sessions, and

fifty per cent. more than the forty-seventh Congress made in both sessions. And it may be added that, for the number and variety of the vetoes placed upon its legislation, this session will rank as without a peer. Such considerations as these must surely reconcile the voter to a balance-sheet as to which he might otherwise complain of the intolerable deal of sack compared to the bread of actual legislation.

About six and a half per cent. of the bills introduced were passed and escaped the veto. It would, however, be quite misleading to leave the impression that even this small percentage constituted any important addition to the country's accumulated stock of legislation. Outside of the regular Appropriation Bills, the Presidential Succession Act, the tax on oleomargarine, the increase of the navy, the Congressional Library Act, a railroad forfeiture, and the Porter Act, the mass of "legislation," achieved by the first session of the forty-ninth Congress was as colorless as a jelly-fish, and of about equal importance. It consisted mainly of private legislation, interesting only to certain constituents of the more skillful members of Congress, and of such "public" legislation as Acts permitting the erection of bridges at specified points, and Acts for the erection of public buildings, interesting only to larger or smaller groups of other shrewd or fortunate Congressmen. So far as really national legislation, business worthy of the time and attention of the legislative branch of one of the most powerful governments of the world, is concerned, the results of the session are sadly inadequate.

The reader may perhaps desire an explanation of this failure of our national Legislative. Let him, then, go to Washington while the two Houses are in session. Let him sit in the gallery of the Senate, provided an "executive session" does not turn him out; let him scan the faces of the Senators, reflect upon their previous records, and consider how many of them came to occupy their present positions. Let him then go and sit for a time in the gallery of the House of Representatives, and watch that national bear-garden. Let him enjoy the usual scene — one purple-faced Representative sawing the air in the progress of what is technically called an "oration"; a dozen or more highly amused colleagues surrounding him; the rest of the members talking at the top of their voices, clapping their hands for pages, writing, reading, telling funny stories and laughing uproariously at them, making social calls from desk to desk, doing anything and everything except the business for which they are paid. Let him try to estimate the rapidity with which a plain business man, finding his clerks engaged in such a scene during business hours, would make a "clean sweep" of them. He will no longer ask an explanation of the Congressional balance-sheet. What better result could be expected from two Houses, each in its own way controlled by influences antagonistic to intelligent legislation? Congress is no longer a legislative body. Its degeneration is now admitted. It consists now of a plutocracy at one end, and a mobocracy at the other. The two chronic perils of a democracy have a firm grip on the Congress of the United States.

Here is no question of comparative guilt or responsibility. Each House is as bad in its way as the other. Nor is there any partisan question involved. The course of Congress has for years been down-hill. Able and sincere men are still to be found in both Houses,

yet each successive Congress is, on the whole, worse than its predecessors; not because Democrats or Republicans control it, but because it is two years further on the road. The rules of the Lower House have been developed with the apparent design of making a familiar acquaintance with them the great requisite for a party leader and of excluding all others from influence on legislation. Pitt or Gladstone would be an enforced cipher in our House of Representatives; and the mass of its members have grown out of the knowledge of or care for legislation. They have long since left all that work to committees; and the session just closed has developed a new feature—an unofficial “steering committee” selected by the majority to regulate the consideration of legislation; in other words, to save the incompetency of the House from exposure. So far as the real business of a legislative body is concerned, the Representatives might fully as well have met and organized in December, chosen their committees, and excused the rest of the members until the committees had done their work for them. By remaining in Washington, an incompetent House is reduced to the ignoble necessity of filling up the intervals with horse-play.

The Congress of the United States has become the most incapable legislative body of the constitutional world. So far as the Senate is concerned, its case is hopeless; the only remedy is outside of it, in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the senators. The case of the House is somewhat different; its failure may be redeemed by reform within itself. The arguments for the present abominable condition of its committee system rest only on the amount and variety of the business which is introduced and laid before it. But most of this business is petty and utterly unworthy of the Congress of the United States. The great mass of it could easily be remitted to the courts or other permanent agencies, or regulated by general and automatic laws. The really national business could then, as in the earlier days of the republic, be discussed and settled by the House itself. The resistance to such a reform would probably come from the very members who are most injured by the present state of affairs. They have grown accustomed to the husks of legislation. The privilege of “introducing” private legislation, with an occasional sop in the shape of the passage of one of their bills, has become so dear to them that they can hardly give it up. They do not see that they are thus increasing the volume of “introduced” business to such an extent as to tighten the chains of the committee system around the House. It will require some intelligent self-denial and a determined suppression of a good many “leaders,” to bring the House back to its constitutional position as the popular branch of a really national legislative body; and the second session of the forty-ninth Congress could not spend its three months of existence to better purpose than in beginning the work.

The Uses and Dangers of “One Idea.”

MOST men of mature age have been tempted, at some time in their lives, to become “men of one idea” in order to gain that increase of power which devotion to one idea brings. Paul’s summary, “This one thing I do,” is believed in devoutly by many who have no similar reverence for any other of Paul’s summaries. The

prison reformers, from John Howard down, the Abolitionists, the framers and supporters of the Anti-Corn-Law League, the men, who, in England and the United States, have striven to take the civil service from the politicians and preserve it to the people, are familiar examples of the increase of power which man gains by giving himself up to one idea. It is no more than the conversion of all his force into one groove; and if the groove be well chosen, the result can only be to give the man more than his share of influence on the world’s progress.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the largest part of this increase of power is due to man’s retention of control over his dominant idea, to the fact that he utilizes it and does not surrender to it. The man who surrenders control of his thought or judgment to a predominant idea, whether his own or that of another, sees but a part of the case, and the judgment which he bases on it is either inapplicable to the whole or positively injurious. It cannot be preached too strongly, in these times of ours, that it is the characteristic of a well-balanced intellect to look for all the modifying circumstances of a case, as well as the one great circumstance which seems on the surface to control it, and to form a final judgment on the whole; just as universal charity, not the limited affection for one’s immediate dependents, is the characteristic of a well-balanced heart. To deal otherwise with facts is to warp the judgment, and to lose influence over one’s fellows. It need not go much farther to become positively noxious. Let the pursuit of wealth gain predominance as the one idea of a mind or soul, and only fortunate circumstances may be the reason why the result is not theft, swindling, or murder. Whatever be the increase of power which comes from a regulated devotion to one idea, it is easy to show how often fanaticism, lunacy, and crime have their common roots in the *surrender* to one idea, and that there is no quicker road to complete perversion of judgment. Dynamite properly used is power; but it would be folly to carry it in one’s pocket for daily use, and crime to use it for purposes of vengeance.

It is a familiar fact that masses of men often think, judge, and act on the presentation of one idea, and that a surface one. And yet there never has been a time when the fact was more dangerous, when it was more necessary to recall to men’s attention the fact that any wise and useful judgment and action is the resultant of a clear understanding of many correlative, perhaps apparently conflicting forces and circumstances. The citizen sees a policeman clubbing a man evidently in needy circumstances, hears that the offense arose in an effort to resist a reduction of wages by a street-car company, and jumps to the conclusion that it is his duty to side with oppressed labor against capital. He does not see the labor which has been oppressed simply because it has not been organized, which has been dubbed “scab” merely because it is individual labor; he does not see that in this case the real oppression has been that of labor by labor, not by capital. In modern times, when the life of each man is marked by an increasing absorption in a narrow line of work, and a consequently increasing unreadiness to appreciate off-hand the circumstances which are not on the surface, no better service can be done than the consistent preaching of a cautious reservation of individual judg-

ment, a self-diffidence of individual comprehension, until care has been taken to know all the facts of the case under consideration. A well-balanced and powerful public opinion is the sheet-anchor of a democracy. The mischief is done by those who preach only the power of public opinion, and neglect the weightier matters of caution, care, and clear understanding in the make-up of an effective public opinion.

The recent struggle for a national labor organization is a case in point. It is not wonderful that such a scheme should have a strong attraction for minds honestly devoted to the elevation of labor. The annals of legislation among the progressive nations are not pleasant but humiliating reading where they have touched upon the relations of the laboring classes to the rest of the community. The English laws, many of them copied in our own country, forbidding any organization of workmen in self-defense, forbidding any combination for the purpose of striking, attempting as far as possible to regulate wages in the interest of the employer and to reduce the workman to the level of a slave, if not of a brute, are not such laws as our descendants will point to as proofs of their ancestors' humanity or wisdom. They are gone, and it is shameful to think that it is so short a time since they went. But it is singular, also, that so many refuse to see that they are gone, refuse to see in the sudden and easy growth of a great national labor organization the clearest evidence of the complete freedom with which labor in our times may gratify its widest legitimate aspiration. Will any one specify a single point in which American law desires or attempts to limit the liberty of workmen to organize, to act together, to make an injury to one the concern of all? No such point can be specified, for no such point exists. If our law errs, it has been in creating corporations without being sufficiently careful to limit their powers of dealing autocratically with their employees or with the public; and what more powerful agent for the work of pointing out and remedying such errors could be imagined than the national organization to which the laws have given free existence and action? Public opinion has therefore inclined toward the national labor organization, and that largely from a conscientious consciousness of the past oppression to which labor has been subjected. But neither the members of the organization nor public opinion must forget that sympathy with the organization's legitimate aspirations cannot carry sympathy with its illegitimate aspirations, and particularly with any which strike at the state which has acquired for labor its present liberty. It seems difficult for some to understand that public opinion may fairly sympathize with a labor organization in its efforts to repeal unjust laws and to put employer and employee on an equal footing before the law, while refusing sympathy to the organization's assumption of power to punish its enemies through agencies outside of and unknown to the laws. Why should such a modifying circumstance be admitted to consideration? A few sentences from Professor Macy's lately published volume, "Our Government," though meant for other purposes, are applicable here:

"A government may exist and do nothing for the education of youth; it may entirely neglect to provide public highways; it may do nothing for the poor and other unfortunate classes. All these things may be left to other agencies. But there is one duty which the government cannot leave to other agencies. It must administer justice; it must punish the wrong-doer. If the government leaves to another agency the protection of life and property and the punishment of wrong-doers, then that other agency becomes the government."

Here is wholesome truth in a nut-shell, and it constitutes the modifying circumstance which, if neglected by any organization, must bring it into conflict with human government and result in the destruction of one or other of them. Would it not be well to regard it in time, and thus preserve the organization for its nobler ends?

If labor has been oppressed in the progressive nations, what shall we say of *all* the weaker classes in other nations? Fools prate of an "indictment of democracy in France"; if democracy all over the world wished to indict the systems of government which it is supplanting, what more horrible indictment could be framed than an ordinary cargo of immigrants from selected regions of the old régime would furnish? We get no such cargoes from the English democracy; and if the American democracy should send out one such cargo from its born and bred members, the world would ring with the description of it. Beaten down by an hereditary system of repression, of artfully contrived taxation, of military service extorted to gratify the ambition of hereditary officers, they come to us with but one idea, that of a "free country." To them, freedom means anarchy. They have never been taught that there are modifying forces to be considered, that the limits of one man's liberty are the rights of other men. That seems to them too much like the submission to the will of an official class from which they have fled. And yet this is the very first lesson which they must learn from their American surroundings; and, as new ideas come through the medium of language, it might almost be admissible to make knowledge of the English language a prerequisite to immigration.

We can no longer shut our eyes to the fact that the American democracy is destined to burdens of which none of its members dreamed five years ago. It must solve new problems for the race, and it must do it, as it has supported other burdens of the kind, soberly, manfully, understandingly. It must, then, study anew the art and practice of considering all the circumstances of a case propounded before giving a deliberate judgment. That frame of mind which is shown in going off at half-cock in a hasty verdict of approval or disapproval on a half view of surface circumstances never was so dangerous as now. There is a new responsibility on our newspapers, on our other periodicals, on our public men, on our clergymen and other teachers, and it behooves them to meet it and to carry on the consciousness of it to the generations which are pressing on for the future. Hence alone can we have that sober and trained public opinion without which democracy is a foredoomed failure.

OPEN LETTERS.

A Siberian Tragedy.

IN the New York "Evening Post" of August 25th appeared the following telegram from London:

"LONDON, August 25.—Alexander Krapotkin, brother of Prince Krapotkin, the translator of Herbert Spencer's works into the Russian language, has committed suicide with a revolver at Tomsk."

As I was perhaps the last West-European or American to see Prince Alexander Krapotkin before his death, circumstances seem to lay upon me the duty of explaining the significance of the brief announcement above quoted, and of giving such facts as are in my possession with regard to a life which ended so tragically, and which seems to me to have been so needlessly and cruelly wrecked.

I made the acquaintance of Alexander Krapotkin in February of the present year at the Siberian city of Tomsk, where I spent two weeks on my way home from the Trans-Baikal. He had then been living in exile as a political offender nearly ten years. Although banished to Siberia upon the charge of disloyalty, Krapotkin was not a nihilist, nor a revolutionist, nor even an extreme radical. His views with regard to social and political questions would have been regarded in America, or even in Western Europe, as very moderate, and he had never taken any part in Russian revolutionary agitation. He was, however, a man of impetuous temperament, high standard of honor, and great frankness and directness in speech, and these characteristics were perhaps enough to attract to him the suspicious attention of the Russian police.

"I am not a nihilist, nor a revolutionist," he once said to me, indignantly, "and I never have been; I was exiled simply because I dared to think and to say what I thought about things which happened around me, and because I was the brother of a man whom the Russian Government hated."

Prince Krapotkin was arrested the first time in 1858, while a student in the St. Petersburg University, for having in his possession a copy in English of Emerson's "Self-Reliance" and refusing to say where he obtained it. The book had been lent to him by one of the faculty, Professor Tikhonravof, and Krapotkin might perhaps have justified himself and escaped unpleasant consequences by simply stating the fact, but this would not have been in accordance with his high standard of personal honor. He did not think it a crime to read Emerson, but he did regard it as cowardly and dishonorable to shelter himself from the consequences of any action behind the person of an instructor. He preferred to go to prison. When Professor Tikhonravof heard of Krapotkin's arrest, he went at once to the rector of the University and admitted that he was the owner of the incendiary volume, and the young student was thereupon released.

After his graduation from the University, Krapotkin went abroad, studied science, particularly astronomy, and upon his return to Russia made a number

of important translations of French and English scientific works into his native language. Finally, he entered the government service, and for a time previous to his exile held an important place in the Russian Telegraph Department. This place, however, he was forced to resign in consequence of a collision with the Minister of the Interior. The latter ordered Krapotkin one day to send to him all the telegrams of a certain private individual that were on file in his office. Krapotkin refused to obey this order upon the ground that such action would be personally dishonorable and degrading. Another less scrupulous officer of the department, however, forwarded the required telegrams, and Krapotkin resigned. After this time he lived constantly under the secret supervision of the police. His brother had already become prominent as a revolutionist and socialist; he himself was under suspicion, his record from the point of view of the government was not a good one, he probably injured himself still further by frank but injudicious comments upon public affairs, and in 1876 or 1877 he was arrested and exiled to Eastern Siberia upon the vague but fatal charge of disloyalty. There were no proofs against him upon which a conviction could be obtained in a formal trial, and he was therefore exiled by what is known in Russia as the "administrative process," that is, by a simple executive order, without even the pretense of indictment, presentment, or hearing.

His place of exile was a small town called Minusinsk, situated on the Yenisei River in Eastern Siberia, two or three hundred miles from the frontier of outer Mongolia. Here, with his young wife, who had voluntarily accompanied him into exile, he lived quietly four or five years, devoting himself chiefly to reading and scientific study. There were in Minusinsk at that time no other political exiles, but Krapotkin found there, nevertheless, one congenial companion in the person of a Russian naturalist named Martiánof, with whom he wandered about the country making botanical and geological collections and discussing scientific questions. To Martiánof's enthusiasm and energy and Krapotkin's sympathy and encouragement Minusinsk is wholly indebted for its really excellent public museum, an institution which is not only the pride of all intelligent Siberians, but is likely, through an illustrated catalogue now in course of publication, to become known to naturalists and archæologists in Europe and the United States.

During the long series of tragic events which culminated in the assassination of Alexander II., Siberia filled up rapidly with political exiles, and the little town of Minusinsk had to take its quota. With the arrival of these new-comers began a stricter system of police supervision. As long as Krapotkin was the only political exile in the place he was allowed a good deal of freedom, and was not harassed by humiliating police regulations; but when the number of "politicals" increased to twenty, the difficulty of watching them all became greater, and the authorities thought it neces-

sary, as a means of preventing escapes, to require every exile to report himself at stated intervals to the chief of police and sign his name in a book kept for the purpose. To this regulation Krapotkin refused to submit. "I have lived here," he said to the *Ispravnik*, "nearly five years and have not yet made the first attempt to escape. If you think that there is any danger of my running away now, you may send a soldier or a police officer to my house every day to watch me; but after being unjustly exiled to Siberia I don't propose to assist the government in its supervision of me. I will not report at the police office." The *Ispravnik* conferred with the Governor of the province, who lived in Krasnoyarsk, and by the latter's direction told Krapotkin that if he refused to obey the obnoxious regulation he would be banished to some place lying farther to the northward and eastward, where the climate would be more severe and the life less bearable. Krapotkin, however, adhered to his determination and appealed to General Shelashnikof, who was at that time the Acting Governor-General of Eastern Siberia and who had been on terms of personal friendship with Krapotkin before the latter's banishment. General Shelashnikof replied in a cool, formal note, insisting upon obedience to the regulation and warning Krapotkin that further contumacy would have for him disastrous consequences. While this appeal was pending, General Anutchin was appointed Governor-General of Eastern Siberia, and, as a last resort, Krapotkin wrote to his aged mother in St. Petersburg to see Anutchin previous to the latter's departure for his new post and present to him a petition in her son's behalf. When the aged and heart-broken mother appeared with her petition in General Anutchin's reception-room she was treated with insulting brutality. Without reading the petition Anutchin threw it violently on the floor, asked her how she dared come to him with such a petition from a traitor to his country, and declared that if her son "had his deserts he would be cleaning the streets in some Siberian city under guard, instead of walking about at liberty." For this brutal insult to his mother Krapotkin told me that he was afraid he should kill Anutchin if he ever happened to see him.

By this time all of the other political exiles in Minusinsk had submitted to the new regulation and were reporting at the police office, and Krapotkin was notified by the *Ispravnik* that if within a stated time he did not follow their example he would be banished to Turukhansk, a wretched settlement of twelve or fifteen houses, situated in the province of Yeniseisk, near the coast of the Arctic Ocean. Krapotkin, however, still adhered to his resolution, and after a terribly trying interview with his wife, to whom he was devotedly attached, he succeeded in extorting from her a promise to return to European Russia with their young child, and let him go to Turukhansk alone. What this promise cost them both in misery I could imagine from the tears which suffused their eyes when they talked to me about it. At the last moment, however, while Mrs. Krapotkin was making preparations to return to European Russia, she happened to see in the "*Siberian Gazette*" a letter from some correspondent—a political exile, I think—in Turukhansk, describing the loneliness, dreariness, and unhealthfulness of the settlement, the Arctic

severity of the climate, the absence of all medical aid for the sick, and the many miseries of life in such a place. This completely broke down the wife's fortitude. She went to her husband, convulsed with sobs, and told him that she would send her child to European Russia, or leave it with friends in Minusinsk, but go with him to Turukhansk she must and should—to let him go there alone was beyond her strength. "After this," said Prince Krapotkin, "there was nothing for me to do but put a pistol to my head or yield, and I yielded. I went to the police office, and continued to report there as long as I remained in Minusinsk."

I have related this incident in Prince Krapotkin's Siberian life partly because it seems to have first suggested suicide to him as a means of escape from an intolerable position, and partly because it is in many ways an index to his character. He was extremely sensitive, proud, and high-spirited, and often made a fight upon some point which a cooler, more philosophic man would have taken as one of the natural incidents of his situation.

About two years ago Prince Krapotkin was transferred from Minusinsk to Tomsk, a change which brought him a few hundred miles nearer to European Russia, but which in other respects was not perhaps a desirable one. When I saw him in February he was living simply but comfortably in a rather spacious log-house, ten minutes' drive from the European hotel, and was devoting himself to literary pursuits. He had a good working library of two or three hundred volumes, among which I noticed the astronomical works of Professors Newcomb and Holden, Stallo's "*Concepts of Science*," of which he expressed a very high opinion, several volumes of Smithsonian Reports, and forty or fifty other American books. His favorite study was astronomy, and in this branch of science he would probably have distinguished himself under more favorable circumstances. After his exile, however, he was not only deprived of instruments, but had great difficulty in obtaining books; his private correspondence was under control, and he was more or less constantly disquieted and harassed by police supervision and searches of his house; so that his completed scientific work was limited to a few articles upon astronomical subjects, written for French and German periodicals. He was a fine linguist, and wrote almost equally well in French, German, or Russian. English he read easily but could not speak.

On the last day before my departure from Tomsk he came to my room, bringing a letter which I had promised to carry for him to one of his intimate friends in Western Europe. With the keen sense of honor which was one of his distinguishing characteristics, he brought the letter to me open, so that I might assure myself by reading it that it contained nothing which would compromise me in case the Russian police should find it in my possession. I told him that I did not care to read it, that I would run the risk of carrying anything that he would run the risk of writing—his danger in any case would be greater than mine. He thereupon seated himself at my writing-table to address the envelope. We happened at the moment to be talking of his brother, Pierre Krapotkin, and his pen, taking its suggestion from his thoughts, wrote automatically upon the envelope his brother's name instead of the name

of the person for whom the letter was intended. He discovered the error almost instantly, and tearing up the envelope and throwing the fragments upon the floor, he addressed another. Late that evening, after I had gone to bed, there came a knock at my door. I opened it cautiously, and was confronted by Prince Krapotkin. He was embarrassed and confused, and apologized for calling at that late hour, but said that he could not sleep without finding and destroying every fragment of the envelope upon which he had inadvertently written the name of his brother. "This may seem to you," he said, "like absurd timidity, but it is necessary. If the police should discover, as they probably will, that I visited you to-day, they would not only examine the servants as to everything which took place here, but would collect and fit together every scrap of waste paper found in your room. They would then find out that I had addressed an envelope to my brother, and would jump at the conclusion that I had written him a letter, and had given it to you for delivery. How this would affect you I don't know, but it would be fatal to me. The least I could expect would be the addition of a year to my term of exile, or banishment to some more remote part of Siberia. I am strictly forbidden to communicate with my brother, and have not heard directly from him or been able to write to him in years." I was familiar enough with the conditions of exile life in Siberia to see the force of these statements, and we began at once a search for the fragments of the envelope. Every scrap of paper on the floor was carefully examined, but the pieces which bore the dangerous name, "Pierre A. Krapotkin," could not be found. At last my traveling companion, Mr. Frost, remembered picking up some torn scraps of paper and throwing them into the slop-basin. We then dabbled in the basin for twenty minutes until we found and burned every scrap of that envelope upon which there was the stroke of a pen, and only then could Prince Krapotkin go home and sleep. "Two years hence," he said to me as he bade me good-night, "you may publish this as an illustration of the atmosphere of suspicion and apprehension in which political exiles live. In two years I hope to be beyond the reach of the Russian police." Poor Krapotkin! Less than two years have elapsed, and his hope is already realized, but not in the way we then anticipated.

When I kissed him good-bye on the following day he was full of anticipations of freedom and a new career outside the limits of Russia. His term of exile would have expired in September of the present year, and it was his intention to go at once to Paris. His only fear was that at the last moment an addition of two or three more years would be arbitrarily made to his term of exile. That, he admitted, would be a terrible blow to him, because he had nearly exhausted the little money which remained from the wreck of his small private fortune, and he could not support his family upon the pittance of three dollars a month which is the allowance made by the government to political exiles in Western Siberia.

The evil which he dreaded probably came upon him. I have no information as to the circumstances which brought about his suicide, but there would seem to be little doubt that late in August he was informed that he would not be permitted to return in September to European Russia, and that, in a fit of despair, he

took his own life. It would be easy for such a man, in the bitterness of his disappointment, to reason himself into the belief that his wife and children would be better off without him than with him, and when once this morbid belief had taken possession of him, there would be little to restrain him from suicide. In Prince Alexander Krapotkin's death Russia loses an honest man, a cultivated scholar, a true patriot, and a gallant gentleman.

George Kennan.

Time-Reckoning for the Twentieth Century.

IS THERE not a necessity for reform in our system of time-reckoning? Scientific authorities and railway managers are pretty generally agreed that there is, but they are not sure that the public is prepared for what at first sight may appear too radical changes on use and wont. I am inclined to think that the public is more intelligent and more ready for useful changes than doubters suppose. There is certainly room for reform. According to the system of local time, there are in the world as many different days as there are meridians round the circumference of the globe.

"These days overlap each other, but they are as perfectly distinct as they are infinite in number. There are no simultaneous days on the earth's surface, except those on the same meridian, and as the different days are always in the various stages of advancement, difficulties must necessarily result in assigning the precise period when an event takes place. The telegraph may give the exact local time of an occurrence, but it will be in disagreement with the local time on every other meridian around the earth. An event occurring on any one day may on the instant be announced in a locality where the time is that of the previous day, and in another locality where the time is that of the following day. About the period when the month or year passes into another month or year, an occurrence may actually take place, according to our present system of local reckoning, in two different months or in two different years. Indeed, there can be no certainty whatever with regard to time, unless the precise geographical position be specified as an essential fact in connection with the event described. Under these circumstances it must be conceded that our present system of notation is most defective. Certainly it is unscientific, and possesses every element of confusion. It produces a degree of ambiguity which, as railways and telegraphs become greatly multiplied, will lead to complications in social and commercial affairs, to errors in chronology, and to litigation, and will act as a clog to the business of life, and prove an increasing hindrance to human intercourse."

Thus argues Mr. Sandford Fleming, who has done so much to press this subject on the attention of the world, in a memoir read by him before the Royal Society of Canada, in May last, and prepared for publication in the Smithsonian Institution Reports. To show how unscientific is the system of reckoning time by our position on the earth's surface, we have only to reflect that every meridian converges at the pole. If we ever get there, we can take our choice between the days of Berlin, Paris, London, New York, Winnipeg, San Francisco, Peking, Calcutta, and as many others as we like, and live at the same moment of time in the different hours, days, months, or years of different places. What a blissful place for the Irishman who pathetically complained that he wasn't a bird, and therefore could not be in two places at once!

The present system has human inertia on its side, and nothing else. It leads to loss of time and loss of

life. It subjects travelers and men in business in particular to innumerable annoyances and perplexities. It is altogether unsuited to an age of railways, telegraphs, and submarine cables. What is needed to secure a perfect system? Simply this, that as we have in the revolution of the earth on its axis a standard of time accepted by all men, all should agree on a zero or prime meridian from which the revolutions are to be counted, and accept a common subdivision and a common notation by which parts of the revolution shall be known by all. Canada and the United States have already taken important steps in this direction. By the scheme of hour meridians, the days in North America, which formerly were as numerous as the number of places that observed their own local time, have been reduced to five. We have thus recognized the absurdity of each town, State, or Province choosing its own zero, and maintaining a separate reckoning. This reform was accepted by the people with a unanimity and promptitude that ought to show that the nineteenth-century public may be trusted. A more important step was taken when the President of the United States, influenced largely, I believe, by President Barnard of Columbia College, invited delegates from all nations to a scientific conference at Washington to consider the subject of time-reckoning.

At this International Conference, which met in the autumn of 1884, and at which twenty-five nationalities were represented, Greenwich was accepted as the most expedient zero, and a proposal for a universal day, to begin for all the world at the moment of mean midnight of the initial meridian, and the hours of which should be counted continuously from zero to twenty-four, was adopted.* The advantage of having the day unbroken will be appreciated by travelers who have puzzled over railway guides and been particularly baffled by the A. M's and P. M's. They will be glad to know that a special committee of the American Society of Civil Engineers has announced (January, 1886) that one hundred and seventy-one managers and officers of railways in the United States and Canada have declared their readiness to abandon the division of the day into half-days, known as ante and post meridian, and to accept the numeration of the hours in one series from midnight to midnight. The Canada Pacific Railway has actually adopted the twenty-four-hour system on its main line and branches between Lake Superior and the Pacific. Mr. Fleming now suggests the beginning of the twentieth century as the best starting-point for the general adoption of the cosmic day of twenty-fours counted continuously.† The only question to be asked is, Why not sooner, if it must be soon or late?

It has been objected that this universal or cosmic day may be accepted for scientific purposes, but that it would never do to change the hours to which we have been accustomed in ordinary life for ordinary uses; that, for instance, it would be impossible for us to associate noon with seven o'clock instead of twelve. But such persons forget that no thing, no fact of nature, would be changed, and that it is not a law of Heaven that noon should be known as twelve o'clock. Sunrise and sunset, dawn

and noon, "early candle-lighting," as our fathers denominated the gloaming, and bed-time, would come as usual. Only the numbers of the hours with which we have associated those facts would be changed, and in an incredibly short time we would become accustomed to the change. In some countries the day is divided into four parts. To the people in whose minds noon is associated with six o'clock, it must sound very oddly when twelve o'clock is used as the equivalent for noon. In ancient times each nation had its own chronology, just as it had its own language, laws, and religion. When the Roman Empire became practically coextensive with the world a general system of chronology was required. Hence the introduction of the Julian Calendar, which, with the rectification made under the direction of Pope Gregory, has regulated the Christian centuries. But, like everything else, the Gregorian Calendar itself is now seen to be antiquated. It is unsuited to modern facts and conditions. The world is much larger than when Rome spoke "*urbi et orbi*," and, thanks to steam and electricity, it is at the same time much smaller. New discoveries and inventions are annihilating space, and everything that interferes with the full recognition of the unity and solidarity of the race must be shaken and disappear. "If," says Mr. Fleming, in the memoir from which I have already quoted, "the reforms of 46 B. C. and 1582 A. D. owed their origin to the dominant necessity of removing confusion in connection with the notations which existed in the then conditions of the human race, in no less degree is a complete reform demanded by the new conditions which are presented in this age. The conclusions of the Washington Conference make provision for the needed change, and they will in all probability be held by future generations to mark an epoch in the annals of the world not less important than the reforms of Julius Cæsar and of Pope Gregory."

G. M. Grant.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, CANADA.

Genius and Matrimony.

THE literary taste of our day inclines strongly in the direction of personal memoirs, private letters, and biographical and autobiographical sketches. It is not surprising, therefore, that amongst the most widely read books which have issued from the Anglo-American press of late years, we should find those edited by James Anthony Froude, unfolding to a curious public the home life of Thomas Carlyle, and the "Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife," by their son, Mr. Julian Hawthorne. The lives of these two men of genius, Carlyle and Hawthorne, disclose such a startling difference of experience on the part of their wives that they may seem to preach very different gospels to romantic and ambitious young women. But do they? Mrs. Carlyle, after years of married life, cries from the bitterness of a nagged-out spirit, "My ambition has been more than gratified in Carlyle, and yet I am miserable!" Mrs. Hawthorne, after eight years of daily companionship, and the endurance of trials and comparative poverty more severe than any her English sister had to contend with, writes to her mother: "I never knew such loftiness so simply borne. I have never known him to stoop from it in the most trivial household matter, any more than in a large or more

* The names of the delegates on the part of the United States were Admiral C. R. P. Rodgers, Professor Cleveland Abbe, Commander W. T. Sampson, Louis M. Rutherford, and William Frederick Allen.—EDITOR.

† This suggestion was first made by Prof. Simon Newcomb, in December, 1884.—EDITOR.

public one. . . . Such a person can never lose the prestige which commands and fascinates. I cannot possibly conceive of my happiness, but in a blissful kind of confusion live on."

I recommend the hundreds of women who, having pitied the victim of Carlyle's dyspepsia, and sympathized with her heart-aches under years of bickering and neglect, accepted the dictum, *no woman who looks for happiness in her home life should marry a genius*, to review their decision in the light of Nathaniel Hawthorne's love-letters to his sweetheart and wife; nay, more, let them dispassionately examine the foundations of the unbroken felicity and inward peace of this typical New England home, where "plain living and high thinking" were the habits of every-day life; where, on occasion, *the genius* made the fire for the morning bath or meal, instead of smoking his pipe while his wife scrubbed the kitchen floor; let them notice that both Carlyle's and Hawthorne's muse was shy and sensitive and solitary, and that it was impossible for either of them to associate his wife in his great work; but that, whereas the wife of the Scotchman felt aggrieved and wounded at her exclusion from his inner life, and restive under the menial services she must render her lord and master to protect his enforced seclusion from any outside noise or interruption, the wife of the American went about her domestic duties with a light heart and cheery voice, while her husband wrestled with his vivid thoughts shut up in his darkened room, or pacing the quiet and solitary path between the pines.

To those interested in the subject of genius and matrimony, the writer ventures to suggest an explanation for such conflicting evidence, borne with such pathos and ecstasy by these two charming and clever women,—an explanation which might also point many a moral in circles of our social life where so disturbing an element as genius never penetrates.

The Hawthorne and Carlyle households were organized on totally diverse principles; one was a marriage of heart and mind, entered into seriously, reverently, and in the fear of God; the other was merely an intellectual *marriage de convenance*, and both bore fruits after their kind.

There was between Hawthorne and his wife not only absolute sympathy, but a still rarer quality, to be found in any relation of life, *justice*; she says of him, "It is never a question of private will between us, but of absolute right. His conscience is too high and fine to permit him to be arbitrary. He is so simple, so transparent, so just, so tender, so magnanimous, that my highest instinct could only correspond with his will."

Theirs was a love-match, tested and tried by judgment and self-control both before and after marriage; she did not feel shut out from his interests and work merely because a wooden door separated them during the working hours of the day; she knew that the very inspiration which produced his imperishable contributions to American classics depended for its undisturbed flow on a serene and happy domestic environment which she alone could supply. Hawthorne could not write when he was unhappy or felt that other duties demanded his efforts, and we are told that for one year the embryo of some of his best works lay dormant in his mind, because the only place for his desk in their cramped quarters was the nursery! So he played with

the children while his wife did her share of their common duties, and in the evenings refreshed them both for the weary and dull routine of the morrow by reading Scott, Dickens, or some other favorite author, and bided his time with *faith* that he would be given the needful opportunity to write. Mrs. Hawthorne had as many stitches to take as Mrs. Carlyle, but when Hawthorne thought she had sewn enough for that twenty-four hours, he bid her put down her needle, *this side of fatigue*, and was always "immitigable" when he thought this point was barely reached. In a word, she was necessary to him, to his higher and nobler self, even more than to his economically ordered home; he makes her realize it year by year more perfectly as their life flows on through trials and worries such as come to genius and mediocrity alike, and, woman-like, she is happy.

In the case of the Carlyles, it was on one side a woman disappointed in love marrying from ambition,—which she admits was gratified beyond her utmost expectations; and on the other, the fit and prudent "settling in life" of a selfish Scotchman, who sought in his wife what he certainly found, an economical housekeeper who could pay her proportion into the family exchequer, and a brilliant and vivacious mind that should worthily receive and entertain the numerous visitors of a literary lion. If either member of this nervous and eccentric couple had sprinkled in their daily cup of bitterness a small part of the love which was the daily portion of Sophia Peabody and Nathaniel Hawthorne, the English and American world of readers would have been spared much of what Mr. Frederic Harrison justly calls "an autopsy of the personal and domestic life of a man that has written famous books."

Catherine Baldwin.

The Architectural League of New York.

IN my concluding chapter on Recent American Architecture ("American Country Houses, III.," in the July issue of *THE CENTURY*) I spoke of the Architectural League of New York as a "student-club." But I have since received from one of its members a letter of which the substance is as follows: At the first organization of the League several years ago, it would have been correct to call it a student-club; but such is not now the case. From various causes—chief among them the fact that its rules required too much of its members—it gradually fell into a state of disuse, and may almost be said to have died. Meanwhile many of its original members had outlived their student days and entered upon the practice of their profession, some of them in distant towns. In the autumn of 1885 the committee which had in charge the exhibition of architectural drawings held in connection with that of the Salmagundi Club, came to the conclusion that an annual exhibition of such a kind would be sufficient *raison d'être* for the existence of a permanent Architectural Society. At the same time they learned that the old League was showing signs of renewed vitality, and several among them hastened to unite themselves with it. As now reorganized, the League is practically a new society, embracing architects, sculptors, painters, decorators,—in fact, all who are in any way interested in architecture as an art. "I

write all this," adds my correspondent, "because I think your error" (which he is kind enough to call a "very natural" one) "may give a wrong impression — an impression, too, that we have been most careful to avoid. If we are known as a 'student-club,' it will be detrimental to us; for eventually we hope to get a large membership, and not alone from the ranks of the younger generation."

It is with great pleasure that I now make this correction; for the status of the League, as I now understand it, seems to me an even greater proof of the vitality of the profession and the earnestness and enthusiasm of its members than it seemed when I believed it to be a mere association of youthful students.

M. G. van Rensselaer.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

A Catch.

IF any grace
To me belong,
In song,
Know then your face
Has been to me
A key;
For pitched in this
Delicious tone,
I've known
I could not miss
What music slips
Your lips.

If faults be found
In any line
Of mine,
To mar the sound
Of notes that try
To vie
With yours, my Sweet,
Then, always true,
Do you
The words repeat,
And make sublime
My rhyme!

Frank Dempster Sherman.

A Question of Ethics.

FAIR Mary was my boyhood's flame,
When I was nine and she nineteen;
To all the swains who courting came,
Her ready answer was the same:
"I guess I'll wait for Johnny Green!"

Just what the maid was pleased to mean,
I will not now pretend to claim.
I only know she was my queen;
Nor did another step between
Till I myself nineteen became.

Now I relate the fact with shame;
I cannot think my conscience clean —
But Mary's love appearing tame
In ten years' playing at the game,
I craved her sister Josephine.

A fairer maid was never seen;
A host of lovers cried her fame.
But had I any right to blame
Her wish to wait for Tommy Green,
When that's my little brother's name?

Walter Clarke.

Dreams.

HERE is the cottage, ivy hung,
And here the garden gate,
That softly to my footsteps swung
To find you fruits and flowers among.
My pleasant memoried Kate.

You were a free, fresh girl in teens;
I, old in college airs,
Proposed, you know, by well-known means
To raise you from these humble scenes,
And smooth your unborn cares.

I come back sometimes now and muse
On what had been our fate,
Had you lacked courage to refuse;
Though, as it is, I cannot choose
But thank you at this date.

The place looks old, and people stare
To hear me say it's falling;
You're just as handsome, they declare;
I hope so,— though I should not dare
To risk my dreams by calling.

Yet sometimes as you pass, I trust,
You pause as I am doing,
To free those few bright thoughts from dust,
And wonder what had been with just
A trifle warmer wooing.

Edward F. Hayward.

Aphorisms from the Quarters.

DE cooles' spring hides de closest 'mongst de rocks.
LAS' 'ear's hot spell cools orf mighty fas'.
LIGHT nigger too much for de so'-back horse.
DE meller apple give fa'r warnin' 'fo' it fall.
DE noise o' de wheels don't medjer de load in de wagon.

WILD goose in de wheat-fiel' don't go to sleep.
'TWONT he'p de crop to plant a new-fangled sort o'
corn, wid fifteen eers to de stalk, on de po' broomstraw
fiel'; dat sort o' land got all it kin do raisin' one eer to
de hill.

DE dog dat try to scratch a mole out de groun' aint
got 'nough edication to hu't him.

BLIND horse know when de trough empty.
TAR'p'N on de log is jes' safe as de red fox in de
bushes.

J. A. Macon.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

To our Readers — In Confidence.

THE larger magazines of our day are evidently made up with a view of presenting such a variety of contents that every intelligent reader can, in each number, find something especially adapted to his or her taste. This is the reason a modern editor so easily comforts himself upon the advent of any one of those numerous advisory or objurgatory epistles which he is sure to receive in the course of a twelvemonth. Bless you, my dear sir, or madam, he says,—at least to himself,—the essay, or story, or poem you have put yourself to the trouble of reading was never meant for you at all! Turn over a few pages and you will find your own special part of the magazine; doubtless, in fact, you actually did so five minutes after dispatching that scathing criticism to the editor of your "favorite magazine." If you see nothing in Stockton, and want more of Cable and Harris and the rest, remember a letter has just been sent by your next-door neighbor, perhaps indeed by the member of your family who sits opposite to you at the breakfast-table, saying he or she really cannot read Cable, and does not know what Harris was made for, but will take all of Stockton that the new patent steam printing-and-folding Hoe press can supply!

Perhaps no series of articles ever published in a magazine has been followed by so large, so eager, and so persistent an audience as the War Series of THE CENTURY; and yet we are aware that there are some who have found certain of these valuable, and to very many readers intensely interesting, contributions too disconnected, or too technical, or even too warlike (!) for pleasurable reading.

But there are in every number of every magazine articles which are intended to interest, not one class of readers, but all classes. We wish, therefore, to take our friends into the editorial confidence and to say that both the readers of the War Series and those who have not been interested in them will find no difficulty in following with complete understanding the Life of Lincoln begun in the November CENTURY. Here is a connected, logical, historical story, which can be read chapter by chapter for the interest or charm of narrative contained in every separate sub-division of the work; and which can also be followed continuously from month to month for the serial interest of the narrative, which has from beginning to end the sequence and logical progress of a great drama.

In point of fact, even were this Life of Lincoln less lucidly and persuasively written than it is, there would be a sort of patriotic duty in its perusal. This is the book that Lincoln himself helped to make and would wish to be judged by. But it is more than this; for we believe that no other book yet written will be found to contain a clearer and more authentic statement, from the national point of view, of the political origin of the military struggle of 1861-1865. The American who neglects the present opportunity to make himself acquainted with this vital epoch in the history of his country will be less intelligent in his patriotism than the faithful reader of the authorized Life of the great

President. English and other distant readers of THE CENTURY, not a few of whom have found the War Series difficult to master, will be able to follow the Life without confusion, and with a surety of obtaining, as a consequence, a thorough understanding of the man and of his times, of the war itself and of the reasons for it.

But it is, of course, especially to the American reader that the Life of Lincoln has an interest. Both its letter-press and illustrations will be studied by him with something more than ordinary curiosity. Among other things, he will find that Abraham Lincoln, as President of the United States, was no accident of politics; that it was almost as a matter of course that he came to be the standard-bearer of the party of liberty in America. In *this* sense there was no accident and no miracle about Lincoln, as many have supposed. But there was indeed a miracle, and one which grows greater the more it is looked into: namely, the old miracle of individual genius! Why did the boy that fished little Abe out of Knob Creek remain the simple, worthy, but, save for this one act, unknown personage that he still is, while the boy that was fished out became a man fit for the companionship of King Solomon and of Shakspeare? Not a President merely, not a martyr merely,—accidents may create either,—and not merely a Liberator; but a man of such surpassing character and sagacity as to dominate by native right in one of the most terrific conflicts recorded in human annals!

The Eight-hour Working-day.

THE argument for a decrease of the daily hours of labor to eight has taken two forms. One of these asserts that there are now more workmen than are required for effective production, and that a decrease of the daily hours of labor in the case of the employed would bring about a demand for the services of those who are now unemployed, and so "make room" for the latter. This line of argument, though often used in our popular American reviews, may be dismissed as ridiculous. If there were anything in it, its object could be attained as easily by requiring each employed workman to work with one arm tied behind him. "Room" for unemployed workmen is not made by decreasing, but by legitimately increasing production. The introduction of a single new process, such as nickel-plating, is a greater "relief" to unemployed labor than all that trade-unions or statutes could offer. The other line of argument is far more respectable. It holds that the proposed reduction would not operate practically to decrease the amount of production, thus ignoring the problem of "making room" for the unemployed; but that the workman's cheerfulness, hopefulness, and increased efficiency would make good the decrease in working-time, leaving the saved time for rest, recreation, and mental improvement. Those who advance this argument offer in evidence, as they have a fair right to do, the historical results of previous reductions of working-hours; and the evidence is well worthy of consideration, provided

we bear in mind the essential distinction between the natural and unforced decrease and the attempt to decrease working-hours by statute.

Under early conditions, there may be said to have been two classes of labor, agricultural and artisan. Whether the agricultural laborer were working for an employer or on a corvee, his daily hours of labor were practically equivalent to his waking-hours; and he is probably little better off yet on the greater part of the earth's surface. It seems to be the artisan who has gained most largely. The strongest authority to the contrary is Professor Thorold Rogers. He gives little space in his "Work and Wages" to the subject of hours of labor; but he takes several opportunities to insist that the normal working-day in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was one of eight hours, so that "the artisan who is demanding at this time an eight-hours' day in the building trades is simply striving to recover what his ancestor worked by four or five centuries ago." And yet, in almost the only two items directly referring to the question, his own evidence states the normal working-days of the past as fourteen and a half hours for agricultural laborers and twelve for artisans. He believes that two and a half hours are to be deducted from these figures for meals; but even then the remainder would be much short of an eight-hour day.

It is most likely that the conditions of early artisan labor, at any rate, were such as to make any comparison or estimate very difficult. The guild system was patriarchal. The master fixed his own hours of labor; his apprentices, like the children of his family, worked according to his estimate of their strength; and his journeymen, or adult employees, though paid by the day or year, evidently worked by conventional piece-estimates; the sawing of a hundred boards, for example, being taken as a day's work. Under such a system, it would not be easy to say what was the normal day's work. The guild statutes, indeed, always ordain that no one "shall work longer than from the beginning of the day until curfew"; but this limit is so generous as to be practically useless. The Statute of Apprentices (5 Eliz., c. 4) provides that daily hours of labor for apprentices should be limited to twelve; and this would seem to point to fourteen or fifteen hours as the outside limit for the stronger journeymen, who answer to our modern workmen.

The industrial change from the domestic to the factory system, toward the end of the last century, consisted in the disappearance of the old guild-master and his family inmate the apprentice, the substitution of the modern individual master or employer, emancipated from guild or other control, and the confusion of the apprentice, the journeyman, and the female employee into one class, the operative or workman. The result was the modern factory. A long struggle followed to transfer the provisions of the Statute of Apprentices to the new order of things; but the masters succeeded in wiping out this last remnant of the old system in 1814. All the new class of workmen were now thrown on self-defense, but burdened by the tyrannical acts against combinations, which gave a criminal character to attempts by workmen to unite to begin or maintain strikes. These were abolished after 1824 in England, though it is but a few years since some of our American States have repealed what had long been a dead letter.

We have now had, for half a century at least, two classes, master and workmen, settling hours of labor by treaty, instead of three, master, apprentice, and journeyman, all bound by guild rules or their survivals; and any decrease has been mainly natural.

Under the new factory system, the masters at first had every advantage over their men; and the hours were for a time increased, sometimes to an inhuman degree. In the long run, the advantage was on the side of the workmen. Collected in great establishments, they felt a new confidence in the presence of their own numbers; and their larger numbers brought public attention more directly upon their complaints and grievances. The daily hours of labor have certainly been decreasing for fifty years in England and America, until they now shift around what may be considered the normal amount of about sixty hours per week.

The decrease has not been accompanied by any falling off in quantity or quality of production. On the contrary, the general rule has been that the working-day has decreased as the labor has become more efficient and has produced more largely. The silk factories of northern Italy are open from five A. M. until ten P. M., the operatives making ninety-four and one-half hours per week, or fifteen and three-fourths hours per day. The contrast between this and the fifty-two hours per week, or eight and two-thirds hours per day, of an operative in an English machine factory, is the extreme; but the superior efficiency of the English laborer makes the shorter hours in the comparison really the longer, measured in results. The same tendency shows itself even within a country. When we leave the localities of the more efficient labor in England, the hours of labor invariably increase. In international comparisons, the English consular reports are a most convenient authority. The following table, cited by Mr. J. S. Jeans, giving the normal hours of weekly labor in the factories of different countries, will show something of this relation of efficiency to contraction of hours of labor:

	Textile Factories.	Machine Factories.
Germany.....	72.....	60
France.....	72.....	60
Austria.....	66.....	66
Russia.....	72 to 84.....	72
Switzerland.....	66.....	66
Belgium.....	72.....	62
Italy.....	69 to 90.....	72
Holland.....	72.....	64
United States.....	60.....	60
Great Britain.....	56.....	52

If we consider the question only under the conditions which now affect labor, the general tendency to a decrease in hours of labor, together with the concentration of this tendency in countries of well-known efficiency, as shown in the table above, seems to confirm the historical argument for the eight-hour day. But it seems to show also (1) that, as things now are, this tendency has a limit somewhere between nine and ten hours a day; (2) that a decrease to this limit is not made so easily as to the limit of forty or fifty years ago, but meets a resistance more pronounced as the limit is approached; (3) that only a careful organization of labor, having an unusually intelligent consideration for the necessities of the employer, and that in a few very efficient trades and countries, such as the machine factories of

Great Britain, can carry the limit below nine hours; and (4) the statistics of special trades show that a reduction below nine hours regularly represents the imperative influence of winter weather on certain outdoor occupations, accompanied by the unpleasant result of reduction of wages, and in any event foreign to the special subject under consideration.

However strongly such conclusions may support the argument that decrease of hours of labor does not result of necessity in a decrease of production, it must be remembered that they lend no countenance to the notion that a *statutory* decrease of hours of labor can have any good effect: on the contrary, all the indications go to show that it would have a very bad effect in losing the decrease which efficiency has thus far gained, in banishing capital and business from the place where statutory decrease had been attempted, and in compelling the renewal of the decreasing process in another place and probably under more unfavorable conditions. If capital and labor, under healthy conditions, have carried efficiency of production to its highest present limit, and consequent decrease of hours of labor to its lowest present natural limit, the state of affairs has become exceptionally delicate of adjustment, and any interference can only throw it out of balance, decrease efficiency, and either decrease wages or increase hours of labor in order to make successful competition possible with more favorably situated labor and capital. The desired decrease must be natural rather than merely statutory.

Every indication points us to the belief that such a further reduction in hours of labor, even below the eight-hour limit, is not only possible, but exceedingly probable, if it is allowed to come naturally, not artificially; that the progress of art and science is constantly tending, where it is unchecked, to make less labor necessary for man's subsistence. Nothing could be so certain to check or destroy this tendency as an organized effort by labor to gain a forced, artificial, and unfair advantage over its employers. When hours of labor are far above the limit possible at the time, statutory interference can do comparatively little harm; the nearer they approach the natural limit, the more does statutory interference tend to drive them up again. Labor organizations can do very little by striving for a *legal* eight-hour day; they can do very much by striving to sweep away passion and prejudice, by upholding peace, order, and security, the conditions of efficient production, and by inculcating an intelligent consideration of facts by their members. Only in this way can they gain or approach an eight-hour working-day.

Appropriations and the Veto.

It would not be surprising if, when Congress meets again, the President's annual message should renew the request that Congress approve an amendment to the Constitution, giving to the President the power to veto particular items of appropriation bills while approving the rest of them. Every President of late years has urged this step upon the attention of Congress, and Congress has persistently ignored it, with the exception of a committee report in flat opposition to it. Yet the argument in its favor only gathers strength as the years pass.

The growth of the country in wealth and resources

brings with it an unavoidable change in the nature of its system. A large part of its government tends to take on the character of a machine, and of a machine with which it is dangerous to meddle. Experience, if it has been properly utilized, comes to show about the amount necessary for the annual support of great departments of the Government, and the arrangement of the items of the appropriation bills for them becomes largely a perfunctory office. The annual amount of the great appropriation bills can be guessed in advance within comparatively small limits. To give the State Department, for example, less than a certain amount would only cripple its efficiency for the year, and the normal amount is not difficult to get at. The result is that a percentage of the annual appropriations tends steadily to become a matter of routine.

Such a tendency, if judiciously guarded, would not be at all bad in its nature. It ought, on the contrary, to act in the direction of economy of effort by the appropriating body, by making it certain of part of its work in advance, and by enabling it to give more of its time and effort to the rest of its work. When it does not so act, the fault is regularly in the appropriating body, through its determination to make use of these routine appropriations for the purpose of grasping an illegitimate increase of power over the other departments of government. The knowledge that some of the appropriations have become fixed only moves the legislative body to make these fixed appropriations the vehicle to carry new appropriations by means never designed in the foundation of the political system. The new items are presented to the possessor of the veto power as a part of the routine appropriations, and he must approve all or veto all. The message sent by the Legislature to the Executive runs in reality thus: "We are aware that you have a constitutional voice in the adoption of new appropriations through your possession of the veto power. But we know, also, that some of these appropriations have become fixed through process of time, and that their delay would throw the Government into temporary confusion. We intend to make use of that knowledge to make you approve appropriations of which you really disapprove, and thus to balk a part of your constitutional functions. We send you the routine appropriations, with just as many new appropriations as we dare introduce without absolutely forcing a veto. You must approve or veto the whole mass. If we have calculated correctly, the percentage of new matter is not large enough for you to go to the country with a *primâ facie* case for a general veto. In any event, the people will be apt to hold you, rather than us, to be the responsible party for any confusion in the Government, so that you had better quietly sign the whole." If such a message were really sent *ipsis simis verbis*, what self-respecting Executive could do anything else than accept the challenge and impose the veto? And yet, how else can the action of the legislative body be interpreted?

The political organization of the States is so closely similar to that of the Federal Government, that the pressure of this evil has naturally been felt in the States as well. As constitutional change is easier in their case, the remedy has been applied by some of them in the form of a modification of the veto power, allowing the Governor to veto detached items of an

appropriation bill while approving the rest. The change was introduced by Georgia in 1865, and was followed by Texas in 1866, by West Virginia in 1872, by Pennsylvania in 1873, by Arkansas and New York in 1874, by Alabama, Florida, Missouri, Nebraska, and New Jersey in 1875, by Colorado in 1876, by California and Louisiana in 1879, and by Illinois in 1884. There are thus fifteen of our States which have adopted this provision. If we deduct from the remainder the four States which give their Governors no veto power, and class as doubtful the States in which the veto may be overridden by a mere majority vote of each House, we shall find that the list given comprises a remarkably large proportion of the States in which it would be effective. Another point which deserves notice is the fact that the list includes so large a proportion of the States which have great expenditures and business interests to care for, and are therefore more likely to feel the pressure of the evil and to seek for a remedy. Whatever other remedy may be suggested, that which has been approved and adopted by California, Georgia, Louisiana, Missouri, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania is fairly entitled to respectful consideration.

The amendment, as adopted by Georgia, was brief, providing that the Governor "may approve any appropriation and disapprove any other appropriation in the same bill; and the latter shall not be effectual unless passed by two-thirds of each House." The forms adopted by other States have shown a tendency to become more complicated, in order to avoid possible misunderstandings. That of New York, probably the most complete which has been devised thus far, is as follows:

"If any bill presented to the Governor contain several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items while approving of the other portion of the bill. In such case, he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects; and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect. If the Legislature be in session, he shall transmit to the House in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If on reconsideration one or more of such items be approved by two-thirds of the members elected to each House, the same shall be part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All the provisions of this section in relation to bills not approved by the Governor, shall apply in cases in which he shall withhold his approval from any item or items contained in a bill appropriating money."

The New York amendment could easily be adapted to fit the Federal Constitution; and it is evident that it would at once remove the power of Congress to force new appropriations upon the President through the medium of the routine appropriations. Another evil, almost peculiar to Congress, would still remain. Congress would still have the power to insert new legislation, what are known as "riders," in the routine appropriation bills, and thus attempt to evade the President's legitimate veto power. The bill might still be made to state that "none of the appropriations herein contained shall take effect unless" something is done which Congress wishes and the President is known to oppose. The use of the word "paragraph" instead of "item" might perhaps put an end to both mischiefs at one blow.

There is but one argument against the proposed amendment which there is any difficulty in meeting,

and the opposition will undoubtedly turn upon it. It will be argued that the change would so diminish the power of Congress, and so increase that of the President, as to make the latter absolute over the appropriations. The argument ignores many essential features of the case. In the first place, the proposed change is no more than a definite separation of the routine from the temporary appropriations, leaving each to be dealt with in its appropriate fashion. Congress may still make the routine appropriations what it will, and the President will have no power to increase them; it may introduce what new appropriations it will, and the President will have no more than his constitutional voice in the matter. The only effect of the change will be to preserve to the Executive his constitutional function, which circumstances tend strongly to diminish. The framers of the Government could not have foreseen that so large a part of the appropriations would come to be settled in practice, so as to need comparatively little discussion and to be merely a weapon in the hands of Congress for the coercion of the Executive. The proposed change will only restore the balance to what it was originally meant to be.

Again, the argument ignores the fact that the change has already been tried in practice, and that none of the States which have adopted it show any disposition to abandon it. Are we then to conclude that fifteen of our States, including some of the wealthiest, have given their Governors absolute power over the appropriations? Has the change made Governor Hill any more a despot in New York than was Governor Dix? The States are the very best of fields on which to try such experiments; but when this field has been used, are the results to be altogether ignored?

Finally, the argument ignores the fact that it is really the Legislature which has secured almost absolute power over the appropriations, through the natural growth of routine appropriations and the possibility of inserting temporary appropriations therein. This is the evil which the States have guarded against, and the Federal Government is only asked to profit by their experience. To assume that the evil is itself good, and that any proposed remedy is itself an evil, is hardly sound logic. It is true that Congress hardly ever attempts to use its power to the full limits, for fear of exposing the evil to plain view by forcing a veto of good and bad appropriations alike; but this means no more than that the firmness of the President is the measure of the modesty of Congress. Congress lays claim to an arbitrary power which was never meant for it; and the results can hardly be better stated than in the quaint words of Franklin in 1769:

"The arbitrary government of a single person is more eligible than the arbitrary government of a body of men. A single man may be afraid or ashamed of doing injustice; a body is never either one or the other, if it is strong enough. It cannot apprehend assassination; and, by dividing the shame among them, it is so little apiece that no one minds it."

It is much to be desired that, at this session of Congress, some organized effort shall be made to bring about a consideration of the proposed amendment, as a remedy for a growing evil, which has more than once thrown the government into at least temporary confusion, and which may yet threaten worse consequences, when it shall be too late to remedy them.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Union of the American Churches.

FROM A METHODIST EPISCOPAL POINT OF VIEW.

THE discussion in *THE CENTURY* of the feasibility of a more perfect union of the American churches has taken a wide range, and included a great variety of topics. It is not clear that the writers of the articles already printed are aiming at the same object. Doctor Shields* is asking, or at least hoping, for an organic unity of our churches, to be effected hereafter by common consent. He defines organic unity to be "such unity as inheres in their internal organization." Is there not here a confusion of ideas? The unity of the churches is an established, a divine fact, and that unity is necessarily organic. The church is already one by virtue of the life which pertains to all its members, as members of Christ. Paul's account of this unity is very clear. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? . . . Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular (severally members thereof)." If such opposites as Jews and Gentiles could in the Pauline period be one body, much more can the Christian opposites of the modern period enter, through the life-giving Spirit, into the composition of one body. Paul's idea is then of a divinely created unity of the church, which subsists in all ages, which remains the same, whether Christians recognize it or not. As the human race is one, being of one blood, notwithstanding the wars which nations wage with each other, so the church is one, notwithstanding the conflicts, spiritual and carnal, which Christians are waging with one another. As in the one case the conduct of men, so in the other the conduct of Christians, is out of harmony with divinely established relations. And that this unity, created by the Spirit, is organic, Paul additionally shows when he says to the Ephesians: "[That we] may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

There is small hope of profit from a discussion which begins with a confusion of terms; which sets out to create by human means a condition already established by divine means, and which asks men to do what it is not in the power of all men, however combined, to accomplish. The Christian Church is not a dead but a living body; and its unity consists, as already stated, in the life which it has derived from its head, through the ministrations of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Shields, looking for organic unity by human means, proposes to find it for the United States in the

combination of the American churches, Protestant and Catholic, under one government or confederacy. They would then be the united Christian churches of America. He proposes as a means to this end an agreement either in doctrine, or in polity, or in liturgy; the first two are, however, dismissed as being, for the present, unattainable. The respected representatives of the Protestant Episcopal Church concur in this suggestion of a visible organic unity, and offer, as the readiest means of attaining it, the acceptance by the American churches of Apostolic succession. We cannot doubt that this offer is made in all sincerity. But it involves several difficulties. First, it makes the unity of the church consist in an external organization. If this be so, the church has been without organic unity ever since the Greeks and Latins separated from each other; and has been much worse off since the Protestants broke away from the Latin Church. Again, only one of the three successional churches, Greek, Latin, and Anglican, can be the true church; for there is only one body of Christ, and if unity consists in an external organization, it rests in one only of the three. Which shall it be? † But a third and more important difficulty is found in the fact that the majority of the Protestant Christians of the United States attach no value to an Apostolic succession derived through bishops. They do not see how the bestowal of it can effect the unity of Christ's Church.

We might well pause here to ask the question, "Suppose all the churches of our country to be under one government, what would be the good of it?" Would we really be better off? Would we not have in place of our present elastic ecclesiastical mechanism one so cumbrous that much movement would be well-nigh impossible? Does not the gain which we derive under our system of the separate action of churches more than balance the supposable loss from the lack of administrative unity? The progress of Christianity in the United States during this century has been one of the most amazing facts in the history of the century; and is not this largely due to the independence of action enjoyed by each group or family of churches? Must all this abounding energy be tamed down under the pressure of a dull, dreary uniformity? For my part, I should dread the effect, conceiving the thing possible, of bringing the American churches under a single administrative unity. Where would Methodism have been, if, before proceeding upon its career of evangelism, it had had to wait for orders from some central power? That system which leaves most room for spontaneity of action is far the best, at least for Protestantism. For myself, I have a dread of over-much ecclesiasticism; the trouble we had to get clear of Rome ought to be a reminder to us Protestants that a concentrated ecclesiastical unity is sure to be a concentrated ecclesiastical tyranny.

I confess that I rubbed my eyes when I read Dr.

† Cyprian holds that salvation is possible in *one* external organization only, which alone is the church.

* In *THE CENTURY* for November, 1885.

Shields's proposal to unite American Catholics and Protestants in one ecclesiastical government, as though it were conceivable that Catholics would recognize any other authority than that which is seated at Rome. But I was still more astonished when I found him calling Protestantism one extreme, and Roman Catholicism another, and asking if we may not "look somewhere between these extremes for the path of wisdom and safety." Has he fully weighed the import of these words? Let us see what they really mean. There are, and for the purposes of this discussion it may be said that there can be, only three forms of Christianity. First, that which recognizes one mediator only between God and man; second, that which recognizes human mediators, as necessary to salvation; and third, that which denies the need of any mediator. The third of these forms, known in America as liberal Christianity, may be dismissed from present consideration; the questions of modern life pertain to the other two. Now I think that the essence of Protestantism consists in our deliverance from dependence upon human mediators and human mediation. In other words, Protestantism has taught us that every Christian is his own priest, and can go directly to God through Jesus Christ, for the blessings of forgiveness of sin and a new life. He does not depend for pardon on the judicial act of a human priest. This may seem to the secular mind a small distinction, but it has most important consequences in the civil, social, and political life of the world. The doctrine that all Christians, as priests, are equal before God has as its corollary the doctrine that all citizens are equal before the law. The church governed by the universal priesthood, all whose members are thus equal, precedes in modern history the state governed by the body of equalized citizens. The divine republic is the parent of the political republic. Under the sacerdotal system of a limited human priesthood, the believer remains morally a child; under Protestantism, he grows to manhood, being educated in a sense of his direct responsibility to God. Under the one system he is taught that he must give answer for his conduct to God and his conscience; under the other, that he must give answer for conduct to a human priest, who can bind or loose the soul at pleasure. All that the modern world has gained of progress has been achieved by the overthrow of sacerdotal Christianity. We but state a truism when we say that but for such overthrow there would have been no modern world. Modern civilization has been made possible solely by the denial of the right of the human priest to absolve man from sin. Politically, as well as spiritually, we are the children of the Reformation. Not only is this true of Protestant states, but Catholic states, in order to enter upon the path of progress, have begun by the overthrow of sacerdotal Christianity. Italy, as a state, breaks with the church in order to recover her autonomy; Mexico does the same; united Germany the same; France did the same in the revolution of the last century. The sacerdotal principle is, in these cases, denied as far as the state is concerned; for sacerdotal Christianity claims supremacy over the state as well as over the individual. All modern progress has, therefore, been conditioned upon the rejection of a human priesthood.

What Doctor Shields asks of us is to look somewhere "between the extremes of Protestantism and

Catholicism for the path of wisdom and safety." Safety in what? In religion? Surely not. In morals? Again surely not. In politics? Shall we forsake the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and again be subject to bondage? We maintain that in the matter of progress Protestantism has the right of way, and that to it alone we must look for the solution of the spiritual and political problems of the age. There is no middle ground between Protestantism and Rome, because there is no middle ground between the principle of one only divine mediator and the principle of a body of human mediators reconciling man to God.

It is startling to hear a Presbyterian speaking of Protestantism as an "extreme." I have always read that Protestantism is the recovery of New Testament Christianity; and if it is extreme, it is only so as the New Testament is extreme. Its formal principle is the rejection of the coordinate authority (with Scripture) of human tradition in matters of faith and practice, and a very precious principle it is. How is it possible to bring into the unity of one administration systems of such opposite ideas as are the Protestant and the Roman? It may be asked, Is, then, our outlook for the future an outlook upon a never-ending series of theological and ecclesiastical conflicts? My own opinion is that as the states have overthrown the sacerdotal principle in order to recover their autonomy, so will the individuals composing the states follow in the same line of direction. The states have taken the first step, the individual members of Catholic nations will follow. I cannot believe, therefore, that the drift of American Christianity, or, for that matter, of the churches of Europe, has been towards a middle position between the extremes of Romanism and Protestantism. As for the American churches, their drift has been more and more towards Evangelicalism, which we may call Protestant radicalism, inasmuch as it includes a most positive denial of the sacerdotal principle. Statistics prove beyond question that evangelical, as distinct from sacerdotal, Christianity is the faith of the vast majority of the American people.

We come next to the means proposed by Dr. Shields for the organic unity of the American churches, to wit, the adoption by them of the English Prayer-book. We can safely leave the Roman Catholic—for he is included in this scheme—to make his own answer. But we can fancy him saying: "My prayer-book has a central idea, the offering up of the body and blood of Christ for the sins of the people; but yours is a thing of shreds and patches, without any principle of unity whatever. It has borrowed so much from every quarter that its meaning is the perpetual puzzle of the Protestant ages." This would be irreverent, but I fear expresses substantially the Catholic estimate of the English Liturgy. As to the power of this book to become a bond of union among American Protestants, one fact completely overthrows all of Dr. Shields's hopes. The Methodists have inherited the English Liturgy; a revision of it was provided for them by Mr. Wesley when he organized them into a church in 1784. Most of this service-book has been retained, the chief exceptions being the forms for morning and evening prayer. The baptismal, the marriage, the communion, and the burial services, the forms of ordination, have been, with important excisions, in use among the Methodists for a century; but dur-

ing all this period they have been moving farther and farther away from the Church of England and its representative in this country. The Church of England has seen since 1833 a great revival of what are called Church principles; Methodism has been diverging more and more from Church principles. The prospect of a union of Methodists with Anglicans, on the ground of a common liturgy, is *nil*; meanwhile, aggregate Methodism has grown to be as large a body as the total of Anglicanism, yet with each succeeding year Methodists are more resolved to maintain their independent position. The truth is, the two bodies are, in their practical work, moving on different lines, and could not coalesce without injury to both.

Is there, however, no way out of the present merely formally fraternal relations of the Protestant churches with one another? Can we not come to a closer union? It seems to me that we should

I. Recognize the organic unity of the churches as a divinely established fact, and seek not to create that unity, which is impossible for us to do, but to find for it a better expression in our church life;

II. Enter into a closer coöperative union as a means (1) of thereby declaring our essential unity, (2) of cultivating spiritual fellowship, (3) of better maintaining Christian morals as against practical ungodliness, and Christian faith as against unbelief;

III. Recognize for decency's sake, if no more, one another's churchly standing, so that the efforts to obtain a more perfect union may not carry upon their face an aspect of insincerity.

The limits assigned to this article will not permit any elaboration of the second and third propositions.

George R. Crooks.

George Bancroft on the Legal-Tender Decisions.

UNDER the above head, "Topics of the Time" for May contains an article in criticism of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of March 3, 1884, in the case of *Juillard v. Greenman*. Of this decision it speaks as "the worst possible decision that the subject admits of"; of its "monstrous doctrine"; of it as evincing ability to prove "that a horse-chestnut is a chestnut horse"; and as one readily lending itself to sarcastic treatment.

Beside this, it summarizes, with approval, Mr. Bancroft's effort, in which one is to find justification of the above characterizations. Of this summary the first point is that Mr. Bancroft "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 the vote of nine States against two, cast out of it the power to 'emit bills of credit.'"

Passing directly to the consideration which might connect this historical fact with the subject in hand, the very pertinent question is stated: "What were bills of credit?" Then this answer is given: "Mr. Bancroft shows by a careful turning of the colonial records that bills of credit were nothing else than Government legal-tender notes."

This statement it then follows into two distinctions, with a carefulness which would have been highly commendable had the statement itself been correct. But

it is not correct. It is a misstatement, substantial and fundamental, to the matter under consideration — one which turns awry the main argument. It is here, where good standing was absolutely essential to Mr. Bancroft's success, that the ground fails him.

Bills of credit are something else than Government legal-tender notes. They are Government notes. There is the difference. They are Government notes, whether they are legal tender or not. A Government note which is not legal tender is a bill of credit. It is a bill of credit as fully — a bill of credit to all intents and purposes as known to the Constitution — as though it were legal tender. The ordinary treasury note, issued long before our late war, was a bill of credit as much as is the present legal-tender greenback. Every bill of our present National Banks which is now in circulation and serving the wants of our community is a bill of credit.

The pertinent question, which this summary states, has been put to the Supreme Court, and has been answered. The answers are now ancient: given in 1837 and 1830, one by Chief Justice Marshall himself, — answers apparently unknown to Mr. Bancroft and the writer who summarizes his pamphlet. The term "bills of credit," as then judicially defined, comprehended all Government notes issued to serve as currency. No difference was recognized between such paper which was, and such paper which was not, legal tender. It was, all alike, bills of credit. (*Craig v. Missouri*, 4 Peters, 410; *Briscoe v. The Bank*, 11 Id., 257.)

The court did not leave this point to be matter of implication. They expressly decided it. It was urged upon them that the paper then at bar was not a bill of credit, because it was not (as, in fact, it was not) legal tender; and the court declined to sustain the point thus taken. They decided the paper in question to be a bill of credit, when it was not impressed with the quality of legal tender. (*Craig v. Missouri*, before cited.)

Thirty years and more later, the court again considered this subject; and they then definitely declared that the bills issued (as now) by our National Banks were bills of credit. They were bills of credit of the United States, because the United States was responsible for their redemption: that is, ultimately. (It is well known that these bills are not legal tender.) (*Veazie Bank v. Fenno*, 8 Wall., 548.)

Such Government paper — that is, paper issued to serve as currency, resting on the pledged faith of the Government — had been issued by the United States, as occasion required, for more than fifty years.

And now the court declared, on the authority of this repeated practice of the Government and of uniform previous decisions, that the United States was authorized to emit bills of credit.

This decision was announced by the late Chief Justice Chase, who afterwards gave the opinion against the constitutionality of the legal-tender laws; and to the point here stated it was the opinion of a unanimous court. Mr. Bancroft and the writer in the *MAY CENTURY* both see what escaped the attention of the learned Chief Justice — to wit, that that decision carried with it the constitutionality of the legal-tender laws. They rest their case against those laws on the want of power in Congress to emit bills of credit; and Chief Justice Chase, as the mouthpiece of the court, affirmed that power.

Congress does possess and has long exercised the constitutional authority to emit bills of credit. And this authority includes the authority to make such bills legal tender. Congress, being authorized to emit them, may make them legal tender or not, at its discretion.

Beyond this brief consideration of this strongest point made by Mr. Bancroft, your magazine cannot afford me space.

Thomas H. Talbot.

THE three decisions or declarations referred to by Mr. Talbot in the order of their dates are :

1. That certificates of indebtedness issued by a State (Missouri), bearing interest and intended to circulate as money, are "bills of credit" within the prohibition of the Constitution, and therefore void.

2. That the notes of a bank, the capital of which is owned wholly by a State (Kentucky), and the officers of which bank are appointed by the Legislature, are not "bills of credit" within the meaning of the Constitution.

3. That the notes of a National Bank, no part of the capital of which is owned by the National Government, are "bills of credit" within the meaning of the Constitution.

It would be easy to show that the second of these opinions is inconsistent with the first, and the third with the second, but this is not now important, since all three agree upon the point that the legal-tender character is not essential to "bills of credit" within the meaning of the Constitution. Mr. Talbot is so far right in his contention. But Mr. Bancroft is not wrong. He does not affirm that legal tender is or was an essential feature of "bills of credit" anterior to the adoption of the Constitution. The mistake of quoting him to that purpose was our own. How far this error was fundamental to the purposes of the article in the May number of *THE CENTURY* might be made the subject of a separate discussion, but such discussion would neither invalidate Mr. Bancroft's argument nor advance the interests of legal or monetary science. In order to recast the article upon Mr. Bancroft's lines, it would be necessary to say that, the right to issue a Government paper currency being prohibited, still more is the right to make such currency legal tender between private individuals prohibited. The fact that treasury notes were issued by the Federal Government, which passed into circulation (and were probably intended to) prior to the year 1861, does not carry overwhelming presumptions in favor of their constitutionality, since the right to issue them was always challenged. As late as 1844, the Secretary of the Treasury, having put out a few treasury notes bearing only a nominal rate of interest, the Committee of Ways and Means of the House, in a very able report rebuking this operation, drew the line of demarkation between treasury notes and bills of credit, holding that the former, being in the nature of temporary loans, payable at a definite time with interest, were allowable, while the latter, being intended for a paper circulation payable on demand, were prohibited, the power to issue them having been not merely not granted to the Congress but expressly refused. (See Knox's "United States Notes," pp. 53-61.)

Mr. Knox (p. 20) summarizes the note issues of the Government as follows :

"No notes were issued from 1789 to 1812, a period of 23 years. Notes bearing interest were issued in the years 1812, 1813, 1814, and 1815, and at various dates from 1837 to 1847. They were again issued in 1857, and subsequently in the years 1860, 1861, and thereafter. The periods for the issue of these notes may be summarized as follows: first, the war of 1812; second, the financial crisis of 1837; third, the Mexican war; fourth, the financial crisis of 1857 or during the Buchanan administration; and fifth, the war of the rebellion. It will thus be seen that there have been four emergencies in which Congress has seen fit to authorize interest-bearing notes, and only one in which it has authorized bills of credit, or circulating notes payable on demand in lawful money."

The Writer of the Article.

Practical Help for Ireland.

[AT our request, Mrs. Ernest Hart of London has prepared the following description of an interesting experiment which has attracted much attention in England and, we are informed, is to be undertaken in America, viz., the systematic revival of cottage industries.—EDITOR C. M.]

IN the spring of 1883—a period of great distress in Ireland, and especially in the congested villages of Donegal—my husband and I visited that region in order to re-study the Irish question and the causes of Irish misery. Here we found, separated from the more prosperous parts of Ulster by vast bog-lands, thirty to forty miles in extent, crowded colonies of Celts, a primitive Catholic people, speaking but little English, the descendants of the "mire Irish," who were driven out of the "fat lands" of Ulster in the settlement of James I. These "idle Irish" have by a most laborious process reclaimed every inch of soil from the ungenerous bog-land, built their own cottages, and drained and trenched and flanked their farms entirely by spade labor; but during that and previous bad years they would have starved but for money sent from America, and for relief given in seed-potatoes by their old and constant friends the Quakers. Yet everywhere in these crowded and famine-stricken villages we heard but one demand, and that was for work. A brave, simple, independent, and penurious people are these Donegal peasantry, and work we determined to give them; but how? Could poor, far-away Donegal compete with the thousand mills of Bradford and Manchester? Reflection on the peculiar conditions and capabilities of a peasantry rooted in the soil, but willing to work at home industries, bade me hope; and in spite of wise political economists who told me I could not put back the clock, that I was attempting the impossible, I determined to try to revive, with the aid of the modern influences of art and science, the old cottage industries which once flourished among these people. A Donegal "farm" consists of from five to ten acres of bog-land that has to be reclaimed, and the "farmer" migrates in the summer to England or Scotland as a farm-laborer; if during the long winter months of enforced agricultural idleness he and his family could be employed at some industry that could be pursued at home, it would, I thought, be sufficient to lift the family out of destitution, and the recurrent spring famines would be forestalled. What could the people do? They could spin, weave, knit, embroider, sew, and make lace. Spinning was and is still done on the primitive large wheel, the wheel being turned with one hand, while the thread is manipulated with the other. The carding was careless and the thread

uneven; the weaving was slovenly done in narrow looms which have not even the flying shuttle, and the rough gray cloth made had no sale in the large towns. There were, however, many excellent knitters, as the knitting industry, owing to the cheapness of labor, had survived; but embroidery or "sprigging" had been killed outright by Swiss machine competition. To make a long story short, I set to work to remedy these defects and then to find a market for the goods. I sent yarn and wool and patterns, with careful and minute instructions, into the mountain villages; I established agencies in the most remote districts; I insisted on the exact fulfillment of orders, and gave technical information about dyeing, washing, weaving, etc., and now, after nearly three years' steady cultivation of these industries, homespun, made entirely by hand, are turned out of these village looms, which compete with the Scotch in texture, quality, and price, and which are bought by Poole and other fashionable tailors, as well as patronized and worn by Mr. Parnell. The peasants also produce hand-knitted hosiery and gloves, which have taken the highest awards; delicate hand-sewn under-linen for trousseaux and outfits, and needle-point laces fit for bridal dresses. The benefit to the people is not only in the money which now comes into these poverty-stricken villages, but also in the impetus thus given to Irish home industries and the encouragement to good work. These forgotten peasant folk have been brought into communication with the outside world; they have been lifted out of their despair, and have been taught that by intelligent industry they also can claim a position as workers in the world.

I have left it to the last to speak of the "Kells Art Embroideries," of which an exhibition will be opened in New York at the rooms of the Associated Artists in December. In the need which I felt to find employment for the skilled embroidery workers of Ireland, I chanced to hit on a happy idea, consisting in the use of polished flax threads of beautiful tints, worked in a broad and effective manner on flaxen materials in designs suggested by the Irish illuminated MSS. of the seventh and eighth centuries. This, primarily, is the "Kells Flax-on-Flax Art Embroidery"; but other fabrics and designs are now included under the designation, and much of the work

shown in New York will consist of silk embroideries in Celtic designs on cloth spun, woven, or dyed by the Donegal peasants. These embroideries won the gold medal at the International Inventions Exhibition of 1885; nearly all the members of the royal family have purchased specimens of them, and the Queen recently gave us an order for a pair of "Kells" embroidered curtains. In this industry not only peasant girls, but destitute ladies—the innocent victims of the present crisis—are employed. Altogether the Donegal Industrial Fund employs in Ireland nearly one hundred embroiderers, one hundred and twenty spinners and weavers, four hundred knitters, and numerous other workers. Springing but three years ago from the smallest beginnings, a few pounds of money and a few pounds of yarn, the Donegal Industrial Fund, for which my husband and a few private friends have subscribed the necessary capital,—still all too small,—has now a growing business, a handsome depot in London at Donegal House, 43 Wigmore street, and agencies in most of the large cities in England, in Melbourne, New York, etc. The basis of the undertaking is the sharing of profits with the workers.* We and those who act with us desire no recompense but to see the artistic success of the enterprise and the benefit of the Irish peasants. If larger funds were available other industries, such as basket-making, wood-carving, toy-making, etc., could be developed, the present success placed on a firmer footing, the methods of working improved, and the means of finding markets increased. Why should not the silent and lonely valleys of Black Donegal, through which numerous rivers run to waste, be made as merry with water-mills as the uplands of Bohemia, Saxony, and Bavaria? In these countries the steady and intelligent cultivation of small industries is beginning to make one factor in German competition with even the great industrial forces of Birmingham and Manchester. At the bottom of the political question in Ireland is the agricultural question, and at the bottom of the agricultural question is the economic question. To treat the symptoms only is not sound medicine.

Alice M. Hart.

* I may mention that our accounts are audited twice a year by Messrs. Price, Waterhouse.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

A GOOD memory is no evidence of superior intelligence.

THOSE who have a great deal to say, say it in a few words.

WE cannot spare any of the passions, for what are the virtues but the passions subdued?

ALL simple people are not great, but all great people are simple.

I BELIEVE in the immortality of the soul, not because I *can* prove it, but because I can't.

Uncle Esek.

A Rhyme of the Corn-field.

UP at early morn,
A-plowin' out corn
In the ten-acre lot.

I foller the row,
Whistlin' as I go.
Goodness, ain't it hot!

Sun two hours high—
Suds, but I'm dry!
Guess'll go'n' git a drink.

Been't the house most'n hour,
An' now't's goin' to shower.
Have to stop, I kinder think.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

A Tyranny that cannot Live in America.

FAMILY and other similar influences are, no doubt, a potent factor still in England and other countries of Europe in securing advancement, but they have been losing ground steadily for a century past. Merit is continually gaining force at the expense of other influences, and every year makes a stronger contrast to the state of affairs a hundred years ago. Then the private soldier had no hopes of rising; the officer grounded his hopes of promotion on the power of his family, on the length of his purse, on the superior immorality of the influences which he could bring to bear, on almost anything, in short, except his usefulness to the state. The English army was probably about the best of all; but what a picture does Junius draw of its system of promotion! "If it be generosity to accumulate in his own person and family a number of lucrative employments; to provide at the public expense for every creature that bears the name of Manners, and, neglecting the merit and services of the rest of the army, to heap promotions upon his favorites and dependents, the present commander-in-chief is the most generous man alive. . . . If the discipline of the army be in any degree preserved, what thanks are due to a man whose cares, notoriously confined to filling up vacancies, have degraded the office of commander-in-chief into a broker of commissions?" "In emergencies," wrote Lord Grenville, bitterly, "we have no general, but some old woman in a red ribbon." Wellington's dispatches show how powerful extraneous influences were in the English appointment system; who is to describe that of Prussia or Austria or Russia?

Into this placid system of favoritism there entered a whirlwind in the shape of the French Republican armies. Here favoritism was at a heavy discount; the rise of the sons of tavern-keepers, butchers, and tailors to be victorious generals, dukes, and princes, and even petty kings, paled before the career of the little Corsican lieutenant of artillery, who in ten years fought his way to the empire of a continent. Every French soldier, it was said, carried the baton of a marshal of France in his knapsack. His advancement was limited only by his opportunities or his abilities, and he fought as no other private soldier had yet fought. He was obedient, for he expected some day to command. He was ingenious, inventive, reckless of danger, indifferent to privation or physical suffering: what were such obstacles as these to a man who had before him a constant hope of securing their highest rewards? And in the ceaseless wreck of military reputations which for years kept the easy-going courts of Europe in almost continual mourning, it was the French soldier rather than the French general who did the work.

Since the French revolutionary epoch, its cardinal lesson has been ground into the armies of Europe not only, but into every department of administration and industry the world over. Civil-service reform is but

a small phase of a far larger process. It has been found by experience that all the work of a people is done better and more efficiently according as the individual is spurred on by the highest hopes of individual advancement as his personal reward. Every rise of a rail-splitter to the presidency stimulates a multitude of friendless boys to rely on their unaided efforts. Every rise of a workman to be a manufacturer and employer stimulates a multitude of workmen to higher endeavors and keener foresight. Every appointment to a judgeship on merit alone stimulates a multitude of lawyers to harder work and greater devotion to the public interests. The tendency has not been, as a certain class of minds is fond of representing it, an empty worship of Demos, a sop to the credulous vanity of the people; it is due to the people's instinctive perception of the fact that equality of opportunity brings a differentiation of natural abilities, and secures to the state the best results of the greatest natural powers.

All classes of society, with a single exception, have learned the lesson thoroughly, and applied it; organized labor alone refuses to admit its truth, and strives to resist its application. A fundamental object of the English trades-unions has always been to cut out high individual ability from having any influence on the question of wages; and the American trades-unions, as they develop, show the same tendencies as their English prototypes. Mr. Thornton and Sir William Erle's British Commission of 1867 have collected a mass of testimony, documentary and otherwise, which has never been contradicted or explained away. The unions struggle against piecework, unless the additional wages be divided among the workmen of the room or shop. They forbid a workman of one trade to do a stroke of work in another, no matter how pressing the necessity or how great the consequent loss. They encourage the ordinary workman's instinctive repulsion to improvements in machinery, or the use of more powerful natural agencies. "Not besting one's mates" has by several unions been made the subject of special enactment. "You are strictly cautioned," said a by-law of the Bradford Bricklayers' Laborers, "not to overstep good rules by doing double work, and causing others to do the same, in order to gain a smile from the master. Such foolhardy and deceitful actions leave a great portion of good members out of employment. Certain individuals have been guilty, who will be expelled if they do not refrain." The Manchester Bricklayers' Association had a rule providing that any man found running, or working beyond a regular speed, "shall be fined two shillings and sixpence for the first offense, five shillings for the second, ten shillings for the third, and if still persisting shall be dealt with as the committee think proper." At Liverpool a bricklayer's laborer might legally carry as many as twelve bricks at a time. Elsewhere ten was the greatest number allowed. But at Leeds, "any brother in the union professing to carry more than the common number, which is eight bricks, shall be fined one

shilling"; and any brother "knowing the same, without giving the earliest information thereof to the committee of management, shall be fined the same." During the building of the Manchester Law Courts, the bricklayers' laborers struck because they were desired to wheel bricks instead of carrying them on their shoulders.

All this has been within public knowledge for twenty years; the professed advocates of the unions have never denied its truth or announced any reformation, but have contented themselves with pointing out asserted parallel restrictions in the professions; and every American employer who has much to do with the unions knows that the American unions go as far on the same road as they see a possibility of success. It is within a few months that the workmen in a New York jewelry factory struck and compelled their employers to give up all phases of the piece-system. Every labor journal contains letters denouncing some arrangement to enable smart workmen to earn higher wages as a scheme of the bosses to grind the faces of the ordinary workmen; every invention is an item in this supposed conspiracy, and every workman who takes charge of a labor-saving machine is regarded as a party to it. The rules of the union are the product of a majority vote, and what chance has the smart, capable workman of influencing the majority vote? It is the "smart," pipe-laying demagogue who controls the majority vote; and his surest chance of doing it is to support rules which seem to the ordinary workman likely to obtain for him the same wages as the workman of exceptional abilities. If it cannot yet be said with truth that the cardinal object of the unions is to secure entire uniformity of wages to all workmen, good and bad alike, it is quite safe to say that no rules have so enthusiastic support from the unions as those which seem likely to bring about that result; and that no men have so little influence with the unions as those who seem likely to impede such a result.

In the long run, such a tendency is most injurious to those whom it professes to benefit. The unions have not yet come, except by indirection, to dispute the right of the employer to discharge whom he pleases when decrease of work compels a reduction of force. Suppose wages are reduced to a condition of entire equality, and the exasperating spectacle of extra or higher wages has disappeared; who shall be chosen for discharge when a reduction of force becomes necessary? Evidently the less efficient workmen, and the more efficient workmen are retained, and that at the average wage. The poor workman has reaped no enduring advantage; the good workman, reduced to a cart-horse round of hopeless labor, does not and cannot show the best that is in him; and the employer, hampered by unnatural restrictions, cannot do his work with advantage, or put himself into a position where the unions can use the striking power with any prospect of permanent success. The system injures everybody concerned, and yet it seems to be an inevitable accompaniment of the irresponsible majority vote of the unions.

But, though the poor workman reaps no permanent gain from the system, the good workman does incur a permanent loss. It is altogether against his interest to enter any such organization, conducted as it is on principles opposed to all the current of the world's

development for the past century. It is a return to the family politics and favoritism of the last century, the favor of the union taking the place of the favor of the government. Each is as fatal to real individual ability as the other. What, then, shall we say of the methods by which skilled workmen are forced into such organizations, of the cry of "scab," of the pelting and beating, the maimings, even the murders, by which examples are made to guide the decision of workmen as yet untested, of the persecution of wife and children, by which life is made a burden until the union is entered? A demand on a skilled workman for a percentage of his wages for the benefit of his less capable associates might at least be not intolerable: the additional burden might be an incitement to more than equivalent exertions, and a real increase of wages. But here he is forced into a system under which he must bear the burden without any hope of recouping it by extra exertions. Is this organized labor, or organized robbery?

No more important or excellent work can be done by labor organizations than that of teaching their indifferent members that they and their children have a personal advantage, not a personal injury, in the superior capacity of some of their comrades. And, if the lesson be not taught or not heeded, public opinion must speak promptly and emphatically in condemnation of the injury which its skilled labor is daily receiving at the hands of unworthy men. Labor is the life of the country; and he who dishonors it with this opprobrious name of "scab" is the lineal descendant of the slave-driver of ante-bellum times; their community of feeling is due to almost exactly similar reasons.

We believe that no periodical of the kind has paid more attention than has *THE CENTURY* to the labor question, or shown greater sympathy with all who work. But we shall never cease to protest against tyranny, whether exercised by combined capital or by combined labor. And we shall do all we can to hasten the day when these imported methods of keeping down laboring men to a dead level of energy and opportunity shall be utterly eliminated. The Statue of Liberty at the gate of the new world will be a shameful fraud if the first principles of individual freedom are to be defied by the very men who should most jealously guard the liberty which our Constitution guarantees to every American citizen. What the workingmen need to-day is not leaders who preach the gospel of the dead level, or flaunt before their eyes doubtful theories and panaceas of "reform," but rather leaders of the type of Lincoln, who study their needs, sympathize with their burdens, and illustrate in their own lives the upward path of free, honorable, and self-respectful labor. The dead Lincoln is a better leader than the live theorist or demagogue.

The Blot on the 'Scutcheon.

If one hour is ever more timely than another to sue for justice, there are strong reasons why the opening of the present session of Congress is an especially fortunate time for one more effort, in the long series of efforts which American writers have made, to obtain from Congress a just and adequate recognition of the property of an author in the product of his brain. Among these reasons are:

1. The subject was never so generally understood as

now. During the past year the work of the American Copyright League, for three years ably carried on under the secretaryship of Mr. G. P. Lathrop, has made, under the efficient direction of his successor, George Walton Green, Esq., marked and practical progress, both in the general forwarding of the reform and in the forcible presentation to the attention of Congress of a simple and workable measure. The press of the country—which, from the establishment of the League, has borne a most honorable part in the movement—has responded with vigorous aid to the latest calls upon it. The merits of the reform have been made clear to President Cleveland, and he has added his exhortation to those of his predecessors for speedy attention to the subject. The committee of the League, representing the large body of American authors, has advanced the reform by the spirit of friendliness which it has exhibited toward other interests, while at the same time it has very properly declined to consider it a part of its duty to urge their case; nor has anything been done to impair the confidence of the writing fraternity that its interests and honor are in safe and prudent hands. For the first time in the history of the movement a full hearing has been accorded to authors as such by a committee of Congress. In the conference which was held before the Senate Committee on Patents in January last, the League was fortunate in having for its chief spokesman an advocate who—to the credit of the guild of authorship, be it said—was in nothing more entirely their representative than in demanding the reform on the highest ground of morality. By those whose political code never rises above the stop-gap theory, Mr. Lowell would perhaps be called derisively an idealist. It is not the provision for the present emergency which enlists his interest, but the final establishment of the principle involved. He is not one of those (to quote his own words)

“Whose love of right is for themselves
And not for all the world”;

and as idealism always excites emulation (and sometimes blushes), his resolute speech before the committee put the question on a higher plane in the minds of his hearers, and, along with the reinforcements of other friends of the reform, has advanced the cause to the point where it can no longer be ignored by Congress. Another practical result of the conference is that it has committed to the principle of International Copyright the chief body from which opposition to the principle was to be expected; so that, if we except a theorist or two of inherited economic squint, all parties concerned have now virtually declared themselves before Congress in favor of the reform. It is therefore difficult to see how—without unpatriotic, almost criminal indifference on the part of Congress—the requisite legislation can be postponed beyond the present session.

2. Another reason for prompt action lies in the fact that during the past year the rest of the civilized world has put the seal of shame upon us anew by uniting, at the Berne Copyright Conference, in an international arrangement which is at once the most definite recognition and complete protection of literary property in existence. From this honorable compact the United States Government alone has excluded itself, the State Department not having felt at liberty to commit itself

to a convention the subject of which was at the time prominent before Congress in the form of the copyright bill of Mr. Dorsheimer.¹ During the past summer England, in addition to her action with the other powers, adopted a comprehensive, and in the present condition of English affairs, a most statesmanlike, measure of intercolonial copyright, superseding all her previous legislation and making uniform for the mother country and her dependencies the provisions relating to the ownership of copyright property. In both compacts the way is left open for us to obtain their advantages at any time. That the present shameful condition of affairs is not likely to exist for many years longer is evident from the daily increasing injury it entails upon the legitimate book trade. When would be a better time to terminate it than now? The committee of the Senate has with most praiseworthy interest and patience heard all sides of the copyright question and is probably ready to report. *Why should it not report both bills to the Senate* and let us have a full, free, and final consideration of a subject which, with the most honorable support from the cultivated classes, has never yet reached in the Senate the point of discussion on its merits? This is all that the friends of the League bill have asked, and this, it seems to us, is not an unreasonable demand. It is to be hoped that no senator will be found who will not be willing to devote time and attention to the practical consummation of so good a cause, and that the measure will not be left till the last of the session, to be swept aside by the appropriation bills.

3. A cogent argument for immediate attention to the subject lies in the recent growth of the communistic movement in America. The laws of property which give stability to life and hope to the worker have never been so formidably attacked as within the past year. The chief argument against International Copyright—an argument which appeals not so much to the reason as to the indifference of legislators—is that the absence of copyright makes books cheap. But is not the League right in urging that this is in itself a communistic principle: that we may refuse protection to foreign property if the uncompensated appropriation of it be, as is alleged, for the public good? Reduce communism to its least common denominator, and it is simply wanting something for nothing—a sentiment at war with self-respect, and thus an element of weakness in any individual or nation. It is unbelievable that this sentiment should affect to any great extent the Congress of the United States, the curator of our national honor. And what obligation has Congress to give the people cheap books more than cheap beer? Let us hope that, in the coming political conflict with communism, when Senators and members of Congress shall rise from their seats to denounce it, this blot on the escutcheon will have been removed, so that there will be no occasion to say to them: “Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone.”

How Prohibition Grows.

MOST Americans are as yet rather indifferent on the subject of the license or prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. Either they see little of immediate importance in it, or they are waiting to see whether Prohibition can be enforced, if it is enacted into law;

or they are still content to adopt without much question whatever position their customary political party may see fit to take on the question. There is, however, an increasing number of persons whose minds are distinctly made up, who are pronounced Prohibitionists; and the fact that their numbers are increasing ought to make it interesting to consider the influences through which this increase is taking place. For these influences are quite different from those which affect the ordinary political fortunes of the country. Political parties usually find speeches and contagious enthusiasm good, but printed documents better; oratory and the printing-press are their legitimate weapons of warfare. How many men have been converted by a Prohibition speech or a Prohibition document? Very many, no doubt; but no extended investigation will be necessary to show that such conversions have been more commonly due to some organized effort of the manufacturers or vendors of intoxicating liquors to protect their own interests. When a National Brewers' Convention or a State Liquor Dealers' Protective Association, or any kindred body, interferes successfully in an election, or raises a fund for the legal or political protection of its interests, or passes a series of resolutions which seem calculated to act as a menace to doubtful voters, the telegraphic dispatches are not only carrying the news through the country, but are everywhere operating on the feelings of men hitherto uninterested, and preparing them to vote at the first opportunity against the "Liquor Interest." The results come in every variety of form. In most cases they probably produce only a feeling of anger against the party which has been the agent of the organization; in a smaller number there appears a somewhat vague willingness to appear as the public opponent of "the saloon in politics"; a still smaller number will account for the steady increase in the absolute Prohibition vote. But the process is the same in all, and almost any man can verify the statement of it within the sphere of his personal acquaintance.

The situation is a startling echo of some of the features of the anti-slavery contest. In that struggle, also, the attacked party was a body of men, not formally organized, but bound to common action by great common interests. Its consequent discipline gave it the ability to secure great initial advantages; but it never gained one of these without having its success reflected in a rise of the tide which opposed it. Its true policy was to seek sedulously the shelter of retirement from public view, and to sacrifice almost any advantage, however tempting, which would bring it into public collision with an opposition whose moral aspect could not but be respected, however troublesome it might be in practice. Such a policy was its only possible salvation or reprieve; and yet it was just the policy which was impossible of adoption as soon as the number of slave-holders ceased to be small. The larger it became, the more impossible was it to prevent organized or common action by a number of slave-holders so considerable as to force the bulk of their fellows, with or against their will, into reinforcing them; and so the struggle went on widening to its inevitable conclusion. Who can avoid seeing the parallel in the present case of the liquor-dealers? The larger their numbers become, the more difficult is it to check ambitious or heedless individuals in their efforts to precipitate pub-

lic conflicts which can operate only to add to the pronounced opposition. Organization means action; and every public action is but a step on the road to destruction. It does not follow that the parallel must necessarily be carried to the same conclusion. If the question is presented often and strongly enough, it may be taken as certain that the mass of voters at present uninterested will side against the liquor-dealers; an American people committed, after full deliberation, to the support of drunkenness, is hardly conceivable. But everything will depend on whether the stream of opposition is to remain a narrow torrent of absolute Prohibition, or is to spread out into the broad reservoir of high license and moral opposition to "the saloon."

The settlement of this final question will depend very much on the power, for it is a power, which is now engaged in the defense of the manufacture and sale of intoxicants in the United States. It may, if it will, make this a Prohibition country. Its best friends, if the expression be permissible, could not, to be sure, induce it to pursue the only policy which would insure it a peaceable, though unostentatious, existence; but its most eager enemies could not ask a more happy dispatch for it than will certainly come from a violent resistance. Buying legislatures is bad; buying voters by wholesale is worse; but to undertake to check the Prohibition movement by shooting its apostles or setting fire to their houses is simply suicidal. One such case in Iowa last summer probably made more Prohibition voters than all the Prohibition speeches up to date. Nothing but this policy is wanted to prevent Prohibition from ever thinning out into some modified remedy. It is not difficult at any time to prove "the saloon" to be an enemy of morality: let it now prove itself to be a public enemy, and the end will no longer be difficult to predict.

Much may be done by the Prohibitionists also to determine the final question. The common charge against them is that of unreasonableness. A very large measure of this criticism has certainly come from the anxiety of politicians that their party necessities or convenience shall rank as modifying circumstances, to be tenderly considered by the Prohibitionists, and from the refusal of the Prohibitionists to do anything of the sort. Quite apart from all this, however, is there not ground for the criticism in the frequent refusal of Prohibitionists to make allowance for the existence of universal suffrage, and for the absolute necessity of popular backing for laws? He who, having control of the destinies of a savage and drunken tribe, should first grant them universal suffrage, and then declare that he will accept from universal suffrage nothing but absolute Prohibition from the beginning, would be thought not reasonable, perhaps not sane. What is the difference when he merely finds universal suffrage in existence, instead of being himself its grantor? He must at least recognize its existence. If he cannot limit the right of suffrage for a time, he would do well, in either case, to accept from it the nearest approach to his final object which he can get from it, not making this an excuse for stopping his own work, but not balking his own work in advance by refusing to consider circumstances which will not cease to defy him simply because he ignores them. Why should not a sincere Prohibitionist accept from time to time the best he can get for the

state, without thereby giving up the special work in which he must always find success, that of forcing issues upon the "liquor interest"?

Still less rational is it to make up the issue against those who conscientiously hold that large communities may need different treatment from small ones; or against those who are possible converts even to extreme views—instead of against the "liquor interest"; or to attack opinion through the lowest methods of the boycotter, and to endeavor to gain a doubtful vote by denouncing its possessor in public

and private as a "friend of rum." And the lowest depth has been reached in those few cases in which the lawless methods of their worst opponents have been imitated, and violence has been resorted to as an agent in converting opinion. Opinion is not successfully controlled in that fashion. Neither pro-slavery nor anti-slavery men ever succeeded in so dealing with public opinion, least of all with American public opinion. It will yield to instinct, to persuasion, or to reason: it has never had anything but defiance for compulsion or menace.

OPEN LETTERS.

Greek and Latin—Shall they Stay or Go?

NOTHING stays settled. Everything flows. Here is the old question, ever new, of classical culture to be discussed again—and yet again.

I have been considering whether there is not a rational view of the matter in which, could we all get the true standing-place, we all might agree. Let us, point by point, see what are some of the things wherein, upon mere statement, without discussion, we shall generally concur.

First, we all know well enough that few, very few, college students learn their Latin and Greek so as to be able to read and understand text at sight. Nearly all graduates must puzzle out the meaning of their classic author with much recourse to lexicon; and at that it is not the majority that succeed swimmingly.

Secondly, for most of the practical purposes of life, it is not to be reckoned loss to a man than he cannot read Latin and Greek with vernacular facility. Except for a limited number of persons, Latin literature and Greek are far less profitable than the living literatures of to-day.

Thirdly, the best Greek and Latin works have all of them, or nearly all of them, been translated into English. Of the versions accessible, some at least are scarcely inferior, as literature, to their originals. I have just been reading "Thucydides" throughout in Mr. Jowett's translation; and I am ready to pronounce that there is therein little lost from the simplicity, the terseness, the point, of the Greek text; while assuredly even the best of our Greek scholars would feel that of clearness, smoothness, coherency, there was actually some gain—fallacious gain, perhaps, not a few might say. This praise is of Mr. Jowett's work considered as literature. That it represents faithfully the sense of the original is a merit which it shares with many translations from Greek that, considered as English literature, are far inferior. It is the indisputable fact that the substance of classic literature, whatever may be the value rightly placed upon that substance, is open to be secured by any English-reading person through the medium of his own tongue.

Do I seem thus to have been giving reasons why Greek and Latin should cease to be studied? Well, that has by no means been my purpose. Have I been pointing out imperfections that ought to be remedied in our ways of teaching and studying Greek and Latin? That also has been far from my aim. Perhaps

there are improved methods of classical education possible. Professor Shumway, with his admirable *Latine et Græce*, certainly thinks that there are. I hope we shall be willing to learn from him, if he can teach us.

I emphatically do not admit that Greek and Latin should be displaced, or replaced, in our schools. There is nothing suitable to replace them. Let them stand. But if they are removed, it cannot be for long. There will follow a revival of letters. But we cannot afford even an interregnum.

Why is the maintenance of the classics in their place as part of education desirable?

Answer, because the study of language is important, and to study language, *in* Latin and Greek, and *through* Latin and Greek, is the best method available. There is a strong set of tendency now toward studying things, as the phrase is, rather than words. The phrase itself is an argument—but it is an argument existing in words, and in words only. In short, the phrase is a capital instance of precisely what it ostensibly condemns; namely, barren practice in empty words. But not all dealing with words is such. For words are things, in a most true and most momentous sense. When we study words, if we study them right, we are studying things. And words are things eminently worth studying. They are the highest natural product of the highest animal in the circle of nature. To distinguish words, as it is often sought to distinguish them, from things, is unscientific.

But besides this, language is the great instrument of life. Nearly everything that men do in the world is done with the use of it, and I venture to say that there is no other single study whatever so immediately and so immensely practical, fruitful, as is the study of language. In this you undoubtedly could get along without Latin and Greek, and accomplish much that is desirable. But these tongues furnish us the best means existing to the study of language, and our own language is itself largely rooted in these ancient tongues. Once more, the process of translation is an unequalled exercise in two important activities of the human mind, namely, the obtaining and expressing of ideas through words.

The mind may be comparatively remiss in studying French and German. Of course, to acquire knowledge enough of them to use them freely for conversation is not easy, or rather, it takes time, and a condition not to be supplied in any scheme of general edu-

cation; that is, actual residence among people that speak the language studied. Replace Latin and Greek with French and German in our colleges, and the result would be only to produce a generation of smatterers in French and German, instead of smatterers in Latin and Greek. And there is something in the study of Latin and Greek that at least makes intellectual muscle, by providing occasion of effort to the mind; and I fear that the just-mentioned result, certain to follow the substitution of French and German, would not be solitary. I fear that easy-going drill in French and German would melt intellectual muscle, in place of making it.

While we Americans are discussing this question as if our minds were not yet made up, the Germans, across sea, having made up their minds through experiment, are restoring Latin and Greek to the schools from which the urgency of scientific propagandism had excluded them — convinced that no drill but drill in the ancient languages qualifies satisfactorily even for scientific study.

William C. Wilkinson.

The Cultivation of the Cantata.

A GREAT deal of attention is being paid to concerted vocal music and the oratorio, cantata and opera have everywhere found an appreciative and steadily increasing public. New oratorios written and composed by Americans are almost wholly unknown, and certainly are seldom, if ever, played in public. In opera a few new works are written, but the difficulty of getting them performed is so great that the task of writing them is thrown away. The cantata, occupying a middle place between the oratorio and opera, has been more successful, and there are a few cantatas written by Americans, and these few, such as they are, have been performed many times — one at least; Mr. Root's "Flower Queen" has been sung for twenty years or more and is still given in all parts of the country.

The cantata requires no scenery, costumes, or action, and this makes its performance less expensive and every way more easy. It is shorter and should be less difficult than the oratorio, and this is also in its favor. The original form of the cantata appears to have been a series of arias and recitations for a single voice. As it is now written, it is practically a short oratorio or an opera without action, and based upon either a theme from the Scriptures or upon some poem.

Under our present ruinous system of international copyright, or want of it, the American composer is helpless against the flood of music from Europe. Why should he write a cantata? The choral societies will not sing it because they can get foreign works without paying for the right of performance. This state of affairs raises the question why the Handel and Haydn Society of Boston and the Oratorio societies of New York and others do not do something to encourage American composers and writers.

In the first place, the words of the cantata must be obtained. To do this, let them offer a prize, a worthy one — say five hundred or one thousand dollars. Let the writers select their own subjects and choose their own manner of treating the theme, stipulating only that the work shall be of a convenient length for one performance or part of one performance. In other words,

the work should not demand, when fully set to music, more than one hour for its performance unless in two or more parts. Let a committee examine these new cantata librettos and award the prize, the work then to become the property of the society. At least, the right of performance should belong to the society, even if the writer is permitted to publish the work in book form. The right of performance being the property of the society, there would be no difficulty in recovering the cost of the competition in after performances of the finished work.

Having secured the words of the cantata and protected it by copyright, a few copies should be cheaply printed, and a second prize offered for its musical setting. Use the printed copies to send to composers desiring to compete for the prize. The prize for the music should be, if possible, much larger than for the words, for the work of composing the music is vastly greater than the work of writing the words. The musical setting should be only a vocal and piano score, and when all the different versions and settings are in, they should be played by a competent performer, with perhaps some vocal assistance, before the committee who will award the prize, or in some way they should be examined by competent critics and the prize fairly placed, because on this depends much of the financial success of the venture.

The prize for the music having been awarded, the right of performance should belong to the society, and they may proceed to put the new work in rehearsal, with or without the orchestra (and a piano is generally quite enough for the first trials), and advertise a public performance of their new work. Curiosity alone will be sufficient to fill the concert-room the first time, and with proper management the larger part of the cost of the competition and prizes might be recouped to the society. If, as there is every reason to suppose it might, the work should become a success, it is a good piece of property. Having the sole right of performance, the society could command the market on its hearing and on its rental to other societies for public performance. In case the society felt unable to offer cash prices to the writer and composer, they could give a bond agreeing to pay a royalty on every performance wherever given in the United States so long as the copyright should be valid.

The cantata must be simple and direct in theme, and the music must be adapted to a mixed chorus and a few, say from four to eight, solo voices. The subject, the words, and even the treatment of the words, must be wholly subservient to the music. The story, whether sacred or profane, should lend itself to musical treatment, or the composer will be hampered, and perhaps unwilling to set it. The story should always be given to the solo voices, the chorus acting the part of commentators or sympathizing observers, or friends, or the populace in the background, who reflect the story or enhance its strong points. The most important parts of the story must invariably be recited, and not sung, because in singing the thread of the story is invariably lost, and the listener becomes confused and disappointed, and in trying to catch the thread of the story loses much of the pleasure in the performance. The story being told without action, it must be very simple, clear, logical, and consistent. These are a few of the limitations; outside of them the writer is free

to do what he pleases, have single or double chorus, male or female chorus, have few or many characters (within the limits mentioned), and indulge in any arrangement of the numbers he thinks effective.

To the musician a really fine cantata offers a most inspiring theme, and, if he is satisfied with the work and it suits his poetic temperament and musical feeling, he may spend on it the best efforts of his genius. Even while we have so few chances to have a cantata performed or even published, there is still a wide field for good work, particularly in short, easy cantatas for the use of children. The great difficulty is the want of libretto writers, or persons who can create or adapt a good story, put it into musical and singable verse, and fit it to the wants and limitations of our choral societies. The wonder is that our poets have not thought it worth while to enter this admirable and sometime to become profitable field of literature.

Charles Barnard.

Shall Young Men go to Vassar? If not, Why Not?

ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM — FEMINAMQUE.

WHEN Antalcidas heard that a eulogy had been written upon Hercules, he said: "Who blames him then? Are we not all friends of Hercules?"

And so, through two-thirds of Professor Sill's article in the June CENTURY, entitled, "Shall Women go to College?" I kept saying, Who doubts it then? There are Vassar and Smith and Wellesley and Hellmuth and Bryn Mawr. By all means let women go to college and learn there all it is possible to know of science, literature, and art.

But when it finally leaked out that it was colleges for men to which he would have women admitted, I changed my question and said, Why then shouldn't young men go to Vassar?

This argument will doubtless convince the Professor that I "fail to appreciate the gravity of the subject"; but if it makes Vassar a nunnery and Yale a monastery, the girls of the one and the boys of the other will be logically amused at the discovery.

C. S. Percival.

Lincoln in the South.

IN the spring of 1865, during the armistice between Johnston and Sherman, I had gone from camp into Atlanta to learn the news. Senator Wigfall of Texas was in Atlanta, on his way, I think, to the Trans-Mississippi. I was in the rooms of the commandant of the post with some gentlemen, listening to the interesting conversation of Wigfall, when the news of the assassination of Lincoln was brought in. The words of Wigfall and the impression produced by the news upon those present—all Confederate soldiers—so impressed me that I wrote his expressions down in my note-book the same day. An impressive silence of some moments was broken by Wigfall: "Gentlemen, I am—sorry for this. It is the greatest misfortune that could have befallen the South at this time. I knew Abe Lincoln, and, with all his faults, he had a kind heart; but as for Andy Johnson—" Here he assumed an expression of intense hate and brought his clenched

fist with force upon the table—but what he added is too profane to print in these pages.

FRANKFORT, KY., 1886.

J. R. P.

In this connection we quote from the article by the Ex-Confederate General Longstreet in THE CENTURY for July, 1885: "Without doubt the greatest man of rebellion times, the one matchless among forty millions for the peculiar difficulties of the period, was Abraham Lincoln."—EDITOR.

Liszt and David.

IN an article on Liszt in the September number of THE CENTURY magazine, an incident is related, which, if it took place as represented there, casts a slur on the memory and name of my father, Ferdinand David. Between Liszt and him—in spite of deep-going differences of opinion on musical matters—a close personal friendship and frequent musical intercourse existed for many years up to my father's death in 1873. My father had the greatest admiration for Liszt's phenomenal talent, and I remember him frequently, and many years before the date of the alleged scene at Berka, enlarging on Liszt's almost miraculous powers of reading at sight the most complicated scores and of deciphering the most crabbed manuscripts. Now, any one acquainted with the unpretentious and simple style of the piano accompaniments for my father's violin compositions cannot fail to see that any remark made by him to Liszt on the difficulties of such an accompaniment could only have been made by way of a little fun; and that Liszt, quickest of men, should have taken it seriously appears to me an absurd assumption. That a third person—the one who related the incident to the writer of the article in your magazine—should not have seen the joke is, of course, quite possible.

Nothing could better illustrate my father's relations to Liszt than the following letter, which he addressed to him on the night after a concert in which Liszt had met as a composer with a demonstratively hostile reception on the part of the audience of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Concerts. The German autograph, of which I add an English translation, is in my possession.

Yours faithfully,

UPPINGHAM, RUTLANDSHIRE, ENGLAND. *Paul David.*

(Mazepa.)

ff

A - way! A - way!

LEIPZIG, 26 Feb., '57., 10 o'clock night.

Before going to bed let me render to you, my very honored friend, the thanks I owe you for this evening, you have once more in this concert-affair so completely proved yourself the thorough gentleman* and high-minded artist. That is not saying anything new about you, but it gives to me, your old friend, satisfaction to repeat old things.

I remain forever your gratefully devoted,

F. LISZT.

* Liszt uses the English term: "gentleman."—P. D.

but the thing itself is enough to put him in the first rank of great teachers. The system of philosophy which he expounds is partly that of the Scotch school, but also in great part his own. Its conscious influence in the history

of American thought has already been great, its unconscious influence even greater. In the philosophic record of our somewhat unphilosophic times his name is sure to have a prominent position.

John van Cleave.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

National Strength and National Weakness.

MR. ATKINSON'S studies in the application of statistics to social science, the second of which is published in *THE CENTURY* for this month, are the culmination of a process which the author's readers must have noticed in his previous work. He is not peculiar among economic writers for the relentlessness with which he follows out comparisons of results so much as for his energy and persistence in seeking accuracy of definition in the preliminary statistics. The modern introduction of graphic methods into statistics has enabled him to reduce facts which are in themselves too large to handle into a shape in which they are easy to grasp; and to deduce therefrom conclusions which the business man can no more resist than he can deny the result of an accurate balance-sheet.

No stronger or sounder plea has been made for the application of common sense to national concerns, for the abandonment of the old notion that a nation lives for the gratification of national greed or "glory," and for the substitution of the prosperity and happiness of the people as the end of national existence. It is not easy to realize the strong hold which the residuum of ancient ideas retains in the countries in which, to adopt one of Mr. Atkinson's felicitous antitheses, dynastic principles still contest the field with democracy. Even where the people have obtained more or less control of the government, the mouth-pieces of public opinion remain bound by the spirit of the past. The knight-errant still tilts full-armed through the columns of the daily press, careers through the aisles of parliamentary bodies, and too often usurps the place of the proper occupant of the pulpit. Why is the pressure to look upon every trespass as an insult to some piece of bunting, deserving only of an instant declaration of war, so strong among the armed nations of Europe? It is not from love for the true interests of the people: peace is the one thing needful for them. It is because the nightmare of obsolete ideas still rides the expression of public opinion.

Individual life has been compared to a game of chess with an invisible antagonist, who knows every move on the board and takes remorseless advantage of a false move to crush the one who makes it. Nations must pay the same penalty. The growing commercial wealth of Europe has been made an instrument of gratifying national vanity, and of all the foibles of the modern representatives of the former privileged classes. And thus the race between European peoples has been brought to a deadlock; the contestants, with energies chilled and congested by debts, taxation, and the nameless weights arising from uncertainty of

peace, are unable either to proceed or to get out of the way of others. Their natural development has been arrested; and their time is occupied in watching one another, and in holding every muscle in tense readiness to spring at some neighbor's throat at the first sign of hostility. Is this the true end of national life? And a new participant in the race has appeared from beyond the Atlantic; his energies are not weighted as are those of his competitors; and his increasing speed is carrying him swiftly past them. To him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but the lesson of these articles is that, unless Bismarckism and Czarism and Chauvinism cease to control the peoples of Europe, they must lose even what they now have to the unnumbered American racer.

We may see, too, the absolute profit of the enormous expenditure of our Civil War. The reason for it was the blind but correct national instinct that the introduction of independent States, international relations, and dynastic ideas into the territory now occupied by the United States must be prevented at any cost, for the sake of the people to all future generations. The justification of the national instinct needs no more than Mr. Atkinson's methods. He puts the cost of the war at about \$1,135,000,000 per annum for the seven years' period of actual warfare and the settlement of terms of peace. It is now a time of profound peace in Europe. Even the Servians are quiet for the time. And yet there are now in active service, in the armies and navies of Europe, over four million men, who do no work except to undergo drill and look warlike. Even Portugal, not quite as large as the State of Indiana, must have its standing army of thirty-four thousand men, about as many as the whole United States army, and thirty-nine vessels in its navy. All this, it must be remembered, is what they call peace in Europe; it is not a circumstance to the mustering of men that would follow the first shot of actual warfare when the 10,129,541 reserves are called out. The direct annual money expenditure upon all these armies and navies in time of peace is about \$750,000,000; and if we include the indirect losses and the effects on the amount of the civil list, as in the estimates for the American war period, the amount would approach \$1,000,000,000 per annum. The somewhat startling conclusion is that the seven years during which we waged a tremendous war and settled the terms of peace really cost us, after all, no more than eight years of the present profound peace costs in Europe under the modern system of international suspicion and armament. By approaching the European standard for seven years, we obtained a permanent insurance against the necessity of any future approach to it.

Mr. Atkinson has done the country a service by recalling its attention to the homely but essential fact of the bearing of taxation on the comfort and prosperity of the laboring class, which is so large a part, indeed, so nearly the whole, of American society. It behooves his audience to take his sermon to heart, and to apply the principles which it discloses to all our national conditions. What will be the influence upon our prosperity and comfort of any attack on society which compels society to strengthen itself, to increase taxation and expenditure, and thus to approach more nearly to the conditions under which labor groans elsewhere? Will that part of our labor which has fled from such conditions attempt to reintroduce them here? And in any event, will American labor submit to such an imposition?

Labor Parties.

THE organization of political parties in the interest of the working class and composed in the main of members of that class seems likely, for a time at least, to continue in America. Such organization is in no way surprising, in view of the discontent among the working classes and of the tendency, now so common, to invoke the aid of Government for every scheme of social reform or amelioration. The capitalists of this country have not been backward in asking for Government help for all sorts of enterprises, and it is natural that working-men, if they have objects of their own to promote, should pursue a similar course. But when we come to inquire what objects they are really seeking, we find ourselves somewhat at a loss for an answer. We find in the platforms adopted by the party caucuses strong denunciation of capitalists and corporations, and of Government officers for yielding to their influence; we find also the expression of a desire for higher wages for working men and women and for the removal of poverty, and various minor grievances are sometimes alluded to. But when we ask how the new party proposes to remove the evils it complains of, we get no adequate reply. The principal definite measures we have seen proposed are the confiscation of the rent of land and the purchase and operation of railways by the State. How much support the second of these measures may have among the working people we do not know, though we have seen no evidence of its popularity, but as for the land measure, we doubt if it has any great number of adherents outside of the large cities. In fact, we doubt if the workmen have any clear idea of what they would do in case they could get control of the Government in state or nation. Indeed, the want of a definite policy and the disagreement known to exist among working-men in regard to protective tariffs, the ownership of land, and other matters, make it tolerably certain that the attempt to organize a national working-men's party will for the present have no great success. Nevertheless, such a party may be organized on a small scale, and in any case the movement in question cannot fail to have an influence on the older parties and thereby on the politics of the country in general. It is important, therefore, to ascertain as near as possible what the bases of the new movement are, in order that it may be resisted so far as it is wrong, and guided in a better way.

The charge that has been preferred against the new

party in some quarters that it is composed of anarchists and organized in the interest of social disorder may be very briefly dismissed. There is no evidence that any considerable number of working-men are in favor of any but peaceful means for the promotion of their interests; indeed, the organization of a working-men's party may be taken as proof of the contrary. Men do not organize political parties in order to abolish government, but in order to get control of the Government; and if the history of trades-unions counts for anything, the tendency of a working-men's government would be rather toward despotism than toward anarchy.

Again, it is apprehended by some that the Labor party is socialistic in character, and aims at the abolition of private property; but this also we believe to be a mistake. There is a tendency to socialism in certain portions of our population; but it is not confined to laboring men, and we suspect that it is not really so powerful as it sometimes appears to be. The vast majority of our people, both native and foreign-born, are either owners of property or desirous of becoming so. The Irish, for instance, are prominent in the ranks of labor parties; but there is no man more eager to possess property of his own than an Irishman, and when he has got it he holds on to it. It is in the cities chiefly that socialism finds adherents; yet even in the cities they are a small minority of the population, while in the country districts they are rarely to be met with. The farmers, especially, are sure to oppose socialism, and no movement among working-men has any chance of success without the support of the farmers.

The truth seems to be that the political labor movement is merely one manifestation of the general discontent of the working people, and of their desire to improve their condition. Working-men are dissatisfied with their present life and earnestly desirous of improving it; but how to improve it and make it nobler and happier, they very imperfectly understand. At present they are intent on gaining material comfort and power, as, indeed, most other men are in our time. Many of their number, especially in the large cities, are in extreme poverty; and so to most working-men the question of improving their life seems to be mainly a question of increasing their income. The wisest of their number seek to effect this object by the sure method of industry, skill and economy; but even the wisest of them, and still more the unwise, think they can effect something in this direction by political and social influence. Hence the policy of strikes and combinations, which, however, have done little toward attaining the end in view; and hence, also, the tendency now visible toward political action.

The political labor movement is not a transient phenomenon, destined to speedily disappear, but a movement of more permanent character, which will continue in some form until its objects, so far as possible, have been attained. For this reason it behooves our statesmen, and the educated and thinking classes generally, to consider what they ought to do in order to guide the movement aright. An exclusively working-men's party is an undesirable thing, even if its aims are right; and no such party can be maintained for any length of time if an honest attempt is made by the educated people to help the working-men improve their lot.

That much may be accomplished, if all classes will work together for this end, there can be no reasonable doubt. Moreover, the duty cannot be shirked. The question of improving the life of the toiling masses is the main political and social problem of the age, and will remain so until it is solved—if solution be possible; and it can only be solved by measures that are just to all other portions of society. While American working-men are desirous of attaining their ends by just means, they are liable to be misled by their passions or their supposed interest, or by designing men who pander to both. It is the duty of the best men among us to do all they can to help the working-men in their legitimate aspirations, and at the same time to show them their errors and rebuke them when they go wrong. With popular leadership of the right sort, parties made up of laborers mainly would soon cease to exist, and working-men would attain their ends by means of parties composed of all classes and aiming at the good of all.

The Harvard Celebration.

IN looking back upon the Harvard celebration, every one who was present will remember that there were a few notes constantly recurring in the progress of the festivity like the theme of a symphony. Every time these notes were touched by the speakers, the assembly showed its approbation by unmistakable signs of sympathetic response—not always by applause, but sometimes by the emphasis of silence. Doubtless the same impressions were conveyed—only less sharply—to those at a distance who read the reports. It is not easy to translate these dominant thoughts into formal propositions, yet it may be worth while to point them out—for their reception no less than their utterance was indicative of the present attitude of American scholars. We say "American scholars," because the Cambridge assembly was national and not provincial, and it included the leaders of educational, scientific, political, and religious thought.

"They builded better than they knew" was the testimony of all the speakers who had occasion to allude to the Puritans of the seventeenth century who laid the foundations of Harvard. Firm in their own narrow beliefs, they did not endeavor by charters or confessions to perpetuate their creeds. They expected growth.

Another note was the persistence of moral and religious forces in education. This idea was suggested in the oration before the law school, reiterated in the sermons, and enforced in the chief address. Those who have been alarmed lest the tendency of scholarship should be away from spirituality and from righteousness must have heard with satisfaction from the lawyer and from the man of letters words like these: "Nearly all the education which men can get from others is moral, not intellectual," said Judge Holmes. "Nor will our university ever be discouraged in the attempt to establish the foundations of that noble and high character which makes useful men able in their own persons to exhibit exalted lives," were the words with which Judge Devens began a paragraph upon the moral earnestness of Harvard graduates in modern times. "The motto *Christo et ecclesie*, when rightly interpreted," said Mr. Lowell, "is the same as *Veritas*, for it means that we are to devote ourselves to the highest conception we have of truth and to the preaching of it."

Not less pronounced were the utterances which referred to the purification of political life. No allusion to John Harvard, or to the Alma Mater, or to the illustrious sons of the university, called out such applause as followed every mention of purer politics. The President of the United States and his secretaries could not misinterpret the ringing words of successive speakers, and the still louder ring which surged from the audience at every mention of the honest administration of government.

Finally, there was constantly manifest an adherence to lofty ideals of scholarship and learning not devoted to selfish advantage, but consecrated to the public good. Although the occasion was historical, there were but scanty allusions to antiquarian lore; although the university is a leader in science, the voices which were heard at its festivity were those of literature and philosophy; although increased resources are required for the expansion of this great foundation, money was not mentioned. The most liberal culture, the most earnest search for truth, the study of the noblest literature, the perpetuation of thoughts that live and words that burn—these were the aspirations of that representative assembly.

It is by a beautiful process of development that the college, begun in poverty by exile and Separatist, in the wilderness, at the dawn of civilized life in America, has grown to be the great university of our land, liberal, hopeful, useful. May its youth and vigor be perpetual; religion, politics, literature, and science will be promoted by its growth!

The American School at Athens.

THE determined attack upon classical education, which looked for a time like a successful rebellion, has been in reality of signal service to the cause against which it was directed. Among other offensive measures adopted by the friends of the old learning was the establishment at Athens of a school where rising American Hellenists could enjoy the same advantages as were afforded to their co-workers from Germany, France, and England. The practical man would have flouted the scheme as chimerical. But, four years since, a few professors from leading colleges, full of an old-fashioned quality known as faith, met and devised a plan. Each was to appeal to his own constituency for an annual subscription toward the necessary expenses. The school was founded. At the present moment it has the active assistance of no less than sixteen colleges. It owns a fine site on Mt. Lycabettus, presented by the Greek government; has in process of erection a commodious and solid building to cost twenty thousand dollars; possesses a library of between fifteen hundred and two thousand volumes; is free from debt, and has an established reputation. Cholera closed the Levant to travelers for one of these years; but no less than eighteen students have been in regular attendance, and scores of travelers have enjoyed its advantages, received counsel in their sight-seeing, and disseminated its influences among their friends. The regular students are now instructors and investigators in their own land, and have brought back the enthusiasm for their work which is so strengthened by the seeing of the eye, the touch of the hand, and a general experience of classic lands. One of them, by the generosity

of Miss Wolfe, was enabled to extend his researches to Asia Minor, from which he brought away a collection of over nine hundred inscriptions which, in the opinion of the great European epigraphists, is second to no other in historical value, and will, when edited and published, add great luster to American scholarship in the person of Doctor Sterritt.

To secure it in its permanent usefulness the School must now be intrusted to the care of a larger public. It is proposed to raise a general fund of a hundred thousand dollars for the development and endowment of the School and in particular to employ a director of the highest fitness and ability. Our readers need no introduction to the archæologist Charles Waldstein, a native of New York, but now connected with the University of Cambridge, England, and with the Fitzwilliam Mu-

seum. The committee in charge of the School wishes to redeem the character of America, and to secure him and his work for the benefit of his own countrymen. A beginning has already been made. The kindness of the Philadelphia students and the untiring efforts of Professor Ware brought together for the rendering of the Acharnians in November last such an audience as the old Academy of Music never before sheltered under its roof. From that performance and subscriptions since received, a few thousands are already in the treasury of the permanent fund. The colleges appeal for final success to the wider circle of their friends in the same spirit of faith which, of itself, and in results already splendid, is a sufficient guarantee for the worth and permanence of the School at Athens.

OPEN LETTERS.

Indian Education in the South-west.

THE present demand of the friends of the Indians is for their immediate citizenship and settlement on lands owned in severalty, and the possession of all the legal rights of American citizens, including voting. It is also asked that the processes of education be used *after* this change of their condition, to make Indians equal with others in ability to maintain their possessions and improve their life. My recent experiences convince me that :

1. The value of the lands upon the South-west reservations has been misrepresented. My visits have carried me into the most distant and remarkable parts of the immense territory of New Mexico. They led me across the broad table-lands of Socorro and Lincoln counties, each as large as ordinary States, and over three lofty ranges of mountains in the South-east. One of these included the Cerro Blanco peak, which is said to be 14,269 feet above the sea. These plains and mountain-sides were waving with the richest kinds of grass a foot and a half high. Their surfaces were often crimsoned for miles with our cultivated flowers that require rich soil. Pine timber fifty feet high was growing upon the hillsides and in the natural parks, and clear streams were running from the mountains. In such a region Mescalero Apache reservation is placed. In the extreme north-west part of the territory and in Arizona, the mountain parks and great plains of the Navajo reservation were traversed as far as the famous Cañon de Chelly with twenty-six miles of marvelous sandstone walls, at the foot of which runs a broad stream, with scores of ancient cliff-dwellings clinging to their sides, and in the recesses of the cañon were plats of corn and beans and melons and flourishing peach orchards. These extensive mountain-tops had abundant timber and grass. The plains were sometimes very barren, but often cultivated with corn along the river-sides, and dotted with mud-covered huts made of poles and small branches of trees. On this reservation of 8,000,000 acres, one and a third times as large as the State of Maine, are feeding 1,200,000 sheep and goats and 75,000 horses, property of the patriarchal kind in which this tribe is rich.

2. The Apaches are probably the hardest, shrewdest, most warlike, agile, and capable of all the American Indians. In New Mexico and Arizona there are about 35,000, who speak nearly the same language. Of these 20,000 are Navajos, who have doubled in number within twenty years. From the plateau pierced by the tremendous gorge of De Chelly, we looked down on two thousand mounted Navajos gathered at the mouth of the cañon to witness a great medicine dance. On their finest horses and in their brightest array of costly blankets, gay leggins, and silver trappings, they swept across the plain like a whirlwind, a vision of Tartars in their charge. I addressed them for an hour on the education of their children and the change of their mode of life, to conform with the American people, who would soon come in like a flood to cover their lands and possess their country. Their intelligent faces and shrewd questions as to the benefits of an education which would make them like the rapacious, greedy, and murderous white men were very convincing of their ability. I could but believe that they were quite equal to the clever frontiersmen who sometimes shoot them for sport, though they live in utter ignorance and indifference to our civilization. I am sure that their tall, lithe, sinewy bodies would be a profitable addition to the physique of our nation.

3. The reservation system will never graduate the Indian out of barbarism unless through disgust with it by the tribes wholly supported by the Government, or through an enforced education of the tribes who are supporting themselves on the reservation. When the Indian can hunt or occasionally go on the war-path he can be made content with the feeding system, if he has enough to eat; but he is even then constantly moving his tepee or deserting his hogan, to satisfy his desire for roaming. To shut the Apaches up like sheep or horses in a corral and feed them in idleness from year to year is to aid and quicken the processes of natural selection by which they turn into civilized men, demons, or brutes. The men will break away from the reservation and seek self-support; the demons will find the way to all the atrocities of the war-

path till exterminated, and the brutes will sink into the apathy of all moral and manly qualities which breeds vice, disease, and death. We saw at the Mescallero agency every Saturday seventeen fat steers slaughtered, and seven thousand two hundred and twelve pounds of beef and four thousand one hundred pounds of flour distributed to one thousand two hundred and two Apaches changed from warriors into a crowd of beggarly dependents on the nation which they had ceased to fight. Their tepees were scattered over thirty square miles of hillsides and pine-covered grazing-fields, and moved every two or three weeks to save house-cleaning. These stalwart Indians had nothing to do but to gamble or ride from camp to camp and pester the agent every day for something to eat or to wear, or to watch the growth of their girls, who at the age of ten or twelve years will be sold for horses, to increase the number of wives of some old Apache, or be the first slave of an ambitious young man who need not woo, if he can buy a wife. Forty boys and half a dozen girls are, by threats of arrest by police, gathered into the agency boarding-school and there, separated from their parents, are well taught and trained under the supervision of the intelligent and efficient agent, Major Cowart. But out of his own experience he said emphatically to me, "No pupil taken away from these reservations to school ought *ever* to be permitted to return to sink again into their barbarism."

Some, however, are capable of disgust with such a life. Within a few weeks a hundred Jicarillas Apaches have cast the Government rations behind them, broken away from this reservation, and purchased cultivated lands north of Santa Fé, giving their horses in trade for them. They have put their girls at the Ramona School at Santa Fé to be educated for three years, and formed a colony which is erecting houses and making irrigating ditches to lands which shall furnish them with homes and food for self-support. This has been the effect, joined with other causes, of the leaven of education given to their boys and girls at Albuquerque and Santa Fé, and their own frequent observation of the progress of their children towards civilization. "I desire," said to me an old chief who had led in this movement, "to earn my bread by the sweat of my brow," expressively wiping his forehead, "and to livelike a man."

But on a reservation like that of the Navajos and in a people so independent of Government aid, it is very difficult to stir any ambition for knowledge or for the civilized ways of American life. There the agency school gathers only about fifty out of seven thousand youths, and these are from the vicinity of the agency. To watch sheep and horses at eight years of age, to be sold or married at twelve, to shear flocks, to weave blankets, cultivate a little corn, build a hogan, and ride hundreds of miles to attend dances, is the life of the Navajo. How can they be made to feel any desire for anything higher? By offering the rewards authorized by the Indian office, their agent, Mr. Patterson, has persuaded twenty-two of this large tribe to begin the erection of houses and to locate lands. They do not, however, value farming implements or care for the improvements of their live stock, and generally refuse medical attendance. It is difficult to induce them by any rewards looking towards civilization. The invitations of the Government are disregarded and despised. Without compulsory measures such as are imposed

on white people in our country, these Indians will never rise from the slough of the reservation. A few may struggle out, but, if returned to their people, they will sink back where the majority live and die, a disgrace to the nation which from generation to generation holds them as its wards, whose shame it is forced to exhibit every year in the Indian Appropriation bill of Congress.

4. The education of Indian girls of these tribes is one of the first obligations of Christian philanthropy, because of the singular position which women hold among them. They regard their girls, who are sold so early for marriage, according to their value in horses. Yet among the Navajos, the brother or the uncle receives the price. As soon as marriageable, the fact is proclaimed. The Navajos, being polygamists, have no limit to the number of their wives, except in the number of horses they can spare for their purchase. But these women own the flocks of sheep they have been tending, and the wool is theirs at the shearing. They weave blankets with great skill, manufacture all their woollen garments, and sell the remainder of the wool. In 1886 they sold one million pounds. They therefore became influential not only by their skill but by their property. They have the right of voting as well as of discussion with the men in their councils, and also of divorcing themselves from their husbands. They keep control of their girls, build the hogans, and plant the fields. If these women shall be educated under Christian influences, the homes and children of the next generation cannot be savage. But the girls must be taken very early from the evil impressions of the reservation if they are to be truly civilized women. Since women are the progressive element of the Apache tribes, this power over barbarism should be seized upon in the first movements towards civilization.

In the Ramona School at Sante Fé the effort is made to separate the young Apache girls from the gross tendencies of barbarism, to which they are inevitably exposed when educated with Indian boys just taken from the camps. In later years co-education may be advantageous, but it cannot often be in the first stages of their progress towards civilized life, unless their teachers are perfectly familiar with their native language. When these girls have been transformed in their tastes by education and long familiarity with our manner of living, it will be safe and profitable to encourage their marriage to husbands likewise civilized, with whom they can begin life on land given to them by such legislation as is proposed in Senator Dawes's Land in Severalty bill. But let them begin citizenship with some qualifications for it, which the savage in his present condition does not possess.

5. It is time that the Indians of our own country were evangelized. Sixty-six tribes, numbering sixty-eight thousand and thirty-six, are still without a Christian missionary. Thirty-five thousand of these are the Navajo and other Apache tribes of New Mexico and Arizona. These American Indians have the claim of being our neighbors, our prisoners, our dependents, or our creditors, and nominally our fellow-citizens to whom we have been under the obligations of Christianity for a full century, but whom, at enormous expense, we have tried to slay rather than to save.

had his knapsack knocked from under him by a solid shot, and he "straddled" half a dozen soldiers, who were covered with a cart-load of dirt. This was the first shot from the "Johnnies" on our left. Their second shot passed over the river and struck a paymaster's tent. The struggle between that paymaster and the stragglers for possession of the flying greenbacks was both exciting and ridiculous.

The next day, December 13th, our officers and the enemy's batteries kept us on the jump. During a moment's halt, behind a slight rise of ground, we lay down. A soldier facing to the rear was in earnest conversation with a comrade. Suddenly he made a terrific leap in air, and from the spot of ground on which he had been sitting a solid shot scooped a wheelbarrow load of dirt. It was a clear case of premonition, for the man could give no reason for having jumped.

General Smith also speaks of "the Veterans' ridicule of the bounty men." The Twenty-fourth Michigan became part of our brigade shortly after Antietam, and we soon learned they were mostly bounty men. We made unmerciful sport of them, but never a word of joke or abuse did I hear after the Twenty-fourth had shown its mettle in this battle of which General Smith writes.

On the evening of December 14th, General Doubleday wanted our regiment (the Second Wisconsin) to go on picket and make an effort to stop the firing upon

the picket line, for the shots of the Confederates covered the whole field and no one could get any rest. We had not been in the picket line more than twenty minutes before we made a bargain with the "Rebs," and the firing ceased, and neither they nor ourselves pretended to keep under cover. But at daylight the Twenty-fourth Michigan came to relieve us. Before they were fairly in line they opened fire upon the Confederates without the warning we had agreed to give. We yelled lustily, but the rattle of musketry drowned the sound, and many a confiding enemy was hit. This irritated the Confederates, who opened a savage fire, and the Twenty-fourth Michigan (the bounty men) were put upon their good behavior; so it was with difficulty a general engagement was prevented. All that day, until about four o'clock, the picket-firing was intense, but was abruptly ended by a Confederate challenging a Sixth Wisconsin man to a fist encounter in the middle of the turnpike. The combatants got the attention of both picket lines, who declared the fight "a draw." They ended the matter with a coffee and tobacco trade and an agreement to do no more firing at picket lines, unless an advance was ordered. It was this agreement that enabled Lieutenant Rogers to save a long picket line that was to have been sacrificed when we fell back.

George E. Smith,

Late Private Co. E, Second Wisconsin Vols.

RACINE, WIS., Oct. 3, 1886.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Voting Power of Ignorance.

ILLITERACY in the United States has been the subject of frequent newspaper and magazine articles since the Census of 1870 brought the matter into plain view. It has generally been treated, however, rather from the standpoint of national pride than from that of national danger; and when danger has been referred to, it has been rather the undefined danger of an ignorant vote than any specific risk. Further, there has always been a general feeling that the bulk of the illiteracy, after all, was among the negroes, and that time and hard work would alleviate most of the evils arising from an inevitable consequence of the Civil War.

That column of the Census reports which defines the illiteracy of white males of twenty-one years old and upwards, that is, of white voters, should be enough to destroy any complacency as to the future. Out of 11-343,005 white voters, 886,659, or 7.8% were unable to write. If we take this as the illiterate vote, and compare it with the pluralities and majorities in the Presidential election of 1884, a still more noteworthy result comes out to view. Thus, Cleveland's plurality in Connecticut was 1284, while the illiterate vote was 9501; Blaine's plurality in Massachusetts was 24,372, while the illiterate vote was 30,951; Cleveland's plurality in Kentucky was 34,839, while the illiterate vote was 54,956; Blaine's plurality in Illinois was 24,827, while the illiterate vote was 44,536. Thus one might go on through State after State, in which the illiterate vote was larger than the plurality which decided the electoral vote of the State, and, if united, might have

been the controlling factor in the election. It will be enough to give the general result; there are eighteen such States, and they cast 243 out of 369 electoral votes. So large is the possible field for the voting power of ignorance.

It is undoubtedly true, and it has been one of the advantages of universal suffrage, that this illiterate vote has been nullified to a certain extent hitherto by its division, and that the more intelligent vote, which changes on occasion from one side to the other, has been a percentage large enough to decide elections. Nevertheless, there must be a constant pressure, as the steady descent of parties shows, to deal tenderly with the prejudices of the ignorant vote. The pressure is not so strong as it would be if the ignorant vote were united into a party, holding the balance of power in eighteen States, with 243 electoral votes; but it is strong enough to exert a steady influence toward the degradation of parties and party politics. Massachusetts tries, and fails in practice, to disfranchise those who cannot read and write, just as Connecticut fails to disfranchise those who have not a good moral character.

The ignorant vote, being the residuum of universal suffrage, is the most helpless element of a democracy. It is the first to be bought up, the first to be deceived, the first to be assailed by any form of coercion or terror. Election laws, and every variety of protection for the ballot, have been primarily compelled by the existence of this class, and are designed for its protection. It is a necessity for a democracy to see to it that vote-buying is prevented; otherwise the power of money might consolidate this ignorant vote into an instrument of dangerous, perhaps fatal, effect. The

case has been exactly parallel with all the forms of coercion which have thus far come to the surface; the State has attacked them in self-defense, in order to prevent them from consolidating the ignorant vote into a dangerous power. It is regrettable that the efforts of the State have failed so often; but it must be admitted that they have at least served their principal purpose until now, for the ignorant vote has not yet assumed the place of a balance of power.

Boycotting, in one or another of its shades and varieties, promises to change all this. Of what avail is it that the law has forbidden the purchase of votes, when the pressure of sheer terror is so much cheaper and more effective? Why should one pay two dollars for a vote, when the threat of a boycott will give him a hundred votes at a time? The threat is enough; for the more ignorant, the more helpless the voter, the more effective is the new political force. The man who is unable to write his own name may yet be too conscientious to sell his vote. Threaten him with loss of work, and he is far less able to resist the pressure than the more highly educated voter: it is impossible that he should not yield. Such cases are not new. They were bad enough when an employer or corporation used this threat to coerce employees into voting as they did not wish to vote; but such a coercing power must of necessity do its work more or less imperfectly. It must use agents; and no agents will work perfectly. It must contend with the possibilities of the secret ballot. It must feel some fear of the force of public opinion. But the labor organization is a far more effective force than any individual or corporate employer, for it is under no such restrictions. Its watchers are its own members, all eager to prove their own usefulness and loyalty by the detection of traitors. It is Argus-eyed as well as merciless. Above all, it is almost freed from consideration for public opinion, for it is governed by a public opinion of its own. The weaker classes of voters are helpless when its full power assails them. Its little finger is more powerful in its effects on the ballot than the loins of the individual or corporate employer.

We have, and are likely to have, two great political parties in this country. If the new system is to be allowed its natural effect, both parties must bid for the support of the new power; right or wrong, neither can afford to let its opponent have the controlling vote in so many States, with so large a portion of the electoral vote. The party which secures success through this ally in one election must do so by large concessions to its ally's demands; and the defeated party, in its bids for future assistance, must inevitably raise the market value of the new political factor. Nor will it be possible to restrict the coercive force of the boycott to labor organizations in politics, and to give them a monopoly of the punishment of political "scabs": equality of privilege in respect to this must be a claim of every political organization, and each will exercise the privilege to just the extent that its opportunities enable it to go. Degradation of political purposes is bad; but degradation of political methods is in many points even worse, and is more fatal in a democracy. The former can be met by argument, by instruction, by influence; to the latter there is no answer, in the last resort, but money or force. And when both of these two evil remedies have failed, the "Savior of Society" enters.

So far as State elections are concerned, the remedy must be left to the States; and Presidential elections are legally no more than State elections. Congressional elections are a different matter; it is here that the evil would have its clearest field, and it is here that the application of the remedy is easiest, though it is not yet a familiar idea. Congress is empowered to make rules and regulations for "the time, place and manner" of choosing Representatives and to alter the rules and regulations which any of the States may have made. English political thinkers are studying American methods in order to find a way out of their difficulties: is it not wise for us to borrow a leaf out of English experience in the conduct of our elections? Parliament has not found it difficult to prescribe by statute the manner of nomination, to enforce a limit to the amount of money to be spent at the election, to furnish ballots at public expense, and to provide rooms where the voter may prepare his ballot for deposit, without the possibility of the knowledge or interference of any other person. All these safeguards, the latter being particularly important as excluding all forms of boycotting, are quite certainly included under the "manner" of elections for Representatives, for which Congress is empowered to make rules and regulations. All that is necessary is that an Act of Congress shall apply to these elections the safeguards which have been evolved by similar experiences across the water.

If our Congress were a wise political body, with proper methods of procedure, its first step would be the application of something like the English system to our elections for Representatives. We can only hope that our rulers may have the foresight, in spite of their limitations, to begin the work at once, even though it should involve leaving the decision of disputed election cases to the courts, instead of resting them on the decision of a partisan majority in the House. But it is much to be feared that Congress will, as usual, do nothing until the mischief has been done, and then it will be too late.

The New North.

PROFESSOR TILLET of Nashville, in his article in the present *CENTURY* on "The White Man of the New South" takes a new view of an old subject, but a view so similar to that of Mr. Grady of Atlanta in his recent speech before the New England Society of New York that it may be as well to state that Professor Tillet's paper was in our possession some time before the delivery of Mr. Grady's address. In fact, this phase of Southern opinion is not unfamiliar to the readers of *THE CENTURY* ever since the publication (in 1873 and onward) of Mr. Edward King's Great South series of illustrated articles.

The eloquence of Mr. Grady still reverberates throughout the country. The brilliant young journalist turned a pleasant social occasion into a national event. The scene was indeed a notable one. Near President Russell on one side sat the Union conqueror of Georgia, on the other stood the young orator from Georgia—the first representative of the South to address the Society since the close of the civil war. Mr. Grady had just that sense of anxiety and that necessity for daring which gives the orator his opportunity for failure or for distinguished success. In his manly statement of the

present relations of the two sections, as he conceives them to be, he staked his standing at home upon the intelligence and patriotism of his own people; and he threw himself fearlessly at the same time upon the generosity and good faith of an untried Northern audience, an audience of hereditary adherents to ideas once the most inimical to those of his own section. The enthusiastic reception of his sentiments by his Northern audience and the warm indorsement of them by his Southern fellow-citizens prove that he made no mistake in either direction.

When Mr. Grady heard the New England Society cheering his allusions to the Cavalier, and to the beaten but not crushed or disheartened Confederate soldier who turned his charger into a plow-horse and went to work to create a prosperity more firm and desirable than that which was based upon human slavery, and when he heard from Delmonico's gallery the familiar and inspiring strains of "Dixie," his surprise at the New North may have been quite as great as that of any of his audience at the New South pictured in his own fervent and patriotic oratory.

One of the most striking points in Mr. Grady's speech was his tribute to Lincoln—a tribute which, as coming from a Southerner, could surprise no one who has watched the growth of the national feeling of late in our Southern States. Rather for its typical value as the expression of a rapidly growing sentiment, than as an exceptional and individual view, we reprint it here:

"Great types, like valuable plants, are slow to flower and fruit. But from the union of these colonists, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slow perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first typical American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace of this Republic—Abraham Lincoln. He was the sum of Puritan and Cavalier, for in his ardent nature were fused the virtues of both, and in the depths of his great soul the faults of both were lost. He was greater than Puritan, greater than Cavalier, in that he was American, and that in his homely form were first gathered the vast and thrilling forces of this ideal government, charging it with such tremendous meaning and so elevating it above human suffering that martyrdom, though infamously aimed, came as a fitting crown to a life consecrated from its cradle to human liberty. Let us, each cherishing his traditions and honoring his fathers, build with reverent hands to the type of this simple but sublime life, in which all types are honored, and in the common glory we shall win as Americans there will be plenty and to spare for your forefathers and for mine."

The Shop-Council.

Who can estimate the evil influence of secrecy on the labor difficulties? The employer is trained to secrecy as he is trained to business. He must learn to keep the conduct of his business in his own hands and head, to guard his trade secrets, to confine each employee's knowledge to his own department, and general knowledge to partners; to "let things out" is to tempt bankruptcy. The trades-union is, in its turn, as secretive as the employer, for it feels that secrecy is essential to the successful struggle which is to prove

its reason for existence. In its secret debates, petty grievances are swollen into unnatural proportions through the desire to maintain the "dignity of labor" by showing that "an injury to one is the concern of all." On both sides that first blow which is to be half the battle is to come like a thunder-clap from a cloud of secrecy.

Two men, taking such an attitude toward each other, would not be far from a conflict; the first motion, perhaps unconscious or instinctive, by one would be met by more effective movement by the other. The present attitude of employer and employee toward each other is too often that of the frontier ethics of the Far West, where a well-furnished pistol-pocket and the ability to "draw" most promptly are the supreme tests of the better man; and where, consequently, the first motion toward the pistol-pocket is the signal for decisive action by the other. Could the employee get into the secrets of the employer, he might be surprised to find that the supposed millionaire was really "shinning" around the street in the desperate effort to make one note take the place of another; and that an attack upon him at the juncture, resulting in suspension of work, would be suicide rather than victory. Could the employer get at the secrets of his employee, he might be surprised to find that the supposed loud-mouthed demagogue was really borne down by a double burden of anxiety for his family, by fear of the direct consequences of a strike or lock-out and of the indirect consequences of any apparent treachery to "the cause of labor" on his part. Could the two parties know each other better, how many struggles would be averted, and how many others would never rise to the dignity of a strike or lock-out.

Mr. James C. Bayles, the editor of "The Iron Age," has suggested in a pamphlet the institution of "shop-councils," in which employer and employee are to be equally represented—the decisions not to be binding on either party unless approved by both, and all functions to be purely conciliatory. As a means of eliminating something of the element of secrecy from the relations of the two parties, of keeping petty matters out of secret discussion and decision, it seems all that can be desired. It is the antipode of compulsory arbitration; and it avoids that suspicion which often attaches even to voluntary arbitration. It is rather symptomatic than remedial, just as a general disuse of the pistol-pocket would be an excellent accessory to a law against street-combats. It is a most proposition; but, even in the din of high-sounding schemes and associations, is it too much to hope for a fair trial of it somewhere?

Art in Our Coinage.

It must indeed remain a dream, as Mr. Stillman expresses it, that modern coinage can ever become, like that of ancient Hellas, a chief vehicle of the expression of art. It is not, however, too much to hope that it may come at least to reflect the contemporaneous attainment of art. Greek medalists were untrammelled by the requirements of regularity of contour, and thickness, and excessive flatness of relief, which are in this practical age demanded in money for the greater convenience of its use as a medium of exchange. Our

power-presses, too, are, in truth, necessary to secure swiftness and economy of manufacture; but they can never produce the artistic effect of the blow struck by the hammer of the ancient coiner, deftly modulated and directed, as it always was by experienced workmen, so as to bring out the full value of any particular die. Moreover, perhaps we cannot expect the designer of to-day, whose mind is free from all mist of mythological illusion, to work with quite the inspiration of Evainetos and Kimon and their great unknown brother-artists. But after every allowance has been made, the fact remains that, with a few exceptions, the coinage of the modern world is unnecessarily inartistic. And none will gainsay Mr. Stillman that, among all, the products of the United States mint are the most barbarous—the most contemptible in the weakly grotesque design of their eagles, in their ill-drawn and commonplace Liberties, and in the vulgarly staring lettering of their legends.

Modern coinage must, of course, always conform to modern conditions of evenness and regularity. But living art—and to see that art is not yet dead, we need look no further than to the work of French sculptors and to that of some that we have among ourselves—makes light of such restrictions. The Parthenon frieze proclaims for all time what can be done within fixed lines and in the extreme of low relief. It rests simply with the Treasury Department to consign to oblivion when it will our gawky fowls and disjointed goddesses, and to set an example to the world by the issue of a series of coins bearing for each denomination independent designs—the most meritorious attainable. Such series, renewed at fitting intervals and presenting, within the possible range, the best contemporary conceptions of personified civic virtues and the best portraits of our great men, would surely exert a potent educating influence upon the eyes and thought of our people, and would emulate, even if from afar, the interest of ancient coinages as an enduring record of history and art. The Administration which is the first to adopt this reform will win for itself high and deserved honor, and will at the same time give to the medalist's art an impetus greater than it has enjoyed since the day of its generous patrons of the Renaissance.

A Breach in the Chinese Wall.

THERE is a provision in our tariff law concerning which it would seem that all educated Americans should be of one mind. We refer to the duty of thirty per cent. imposed on the works of foreign artists. An opportune occasion for bringing this subject once more to public attention is afforded by the recent gratifying Treasury decision secured by Mr. Henry G. Marquand, followed by the judgment of the United States Circuit Court in favor of Mr. H. H. Arnot,

that pictures painted before 1700 are entitled to admission free of duty, as "antiquities." It is humiliating to American pride that such a question could ever have been raised. But the Treasury Department must execute the laws as it finds them; and we should be grateful that its interpretation of the law is liberal-minded, and grateful above all to Mr. Marquand for the service which he has rendered to American culture and American reputation by establishing the fact that the masterpieces of Renaissance art, to obtain which all other nations will make almost any sacrifice, will not, at least when the rare opportunities to secure them come, be kept from landing here by our custom-house. But, though the splendor of the names of many of the old masters renders their case, now happily decided, the more conspicuous,—that of living foreign painters and sculptors whose productions are still subject to our almost prohibitive duty, should, for obvious reasons, concern us hardly less. The great majority and best of our native artists protest against this art tax. The most materialistic of them know well that, in this case, "protection" cannot "protect." The duty may prevent the connoisseur from buying the foreign picture which he fancies, but it cannot make him buy any native picture which he does not fancy—as he might buy a home-made hat or umbrella. He will have in art what he likes or nothing. Again, the artist knows that the more good pictures and statues the public sees, the more its taste for such things grows, and the wider becomes his market—not to speak of the advantage to himself of having in this country as many as possible of the works of genius which, otherwise, he must, to perfect himself, go abroad to study.

And here, again, is a consideration which for the very shame of it should impel Congress without delay to set art free. Scores of Americans go to Europe yearly to improve themselves in their high gift. To these young men and women, rich generally only in talent and in hope, the doors of the great French national schools are open wide; the *ateliers* of world-famous masters extend their welcome; the hospitable museums and galleries of Italy offer without stint their priceless treasures. Yet if the teachers to whom these Americans owe much of the success which life may give them desire to send here their own beautiful creations, they are stopped by a customs officer! Could a nation claiming to be enlightened place itself in a position more ignoble?

Our artists, as a class, have done what they could to protest against the tariff on art; our President has more than once recommended officially the repeal of this duty. Let Protectionists and Free-Traders join hands for once in Congress, and prove to the rest of the world that the American Republic has attained, even if tardily, a civilization advanced enough to rank works of art, æsthetically and practically, upon a higher plane than whisky and pig-iron.



OPEN LETTERS.

Lincoln's Ancestors in Virginia.

THIS brief notice of the ancestors of Lincoln who lived in Virginia is designed to throw, if possible, some additional light upon the history of the fathers of that great man, and perhaps correct some errors of fact growing out of the unsettled—almost illiterate—condition of affairs during the period of time involved.

That the early ancestors of Lincoln lived in Berks county, Pennsylvania, and moved thence to Virginia, as Messrs. Nicolay and Hay state, there is no reason to doubt. It is confirmed by the statements of the President himself. It may be accepted, too, as correct that the great-grandfather of Lincoln, whose name was John Lincoln, lived in that county and State and emigrated from there to Virginia. The precise date of his settlement in Virginia has not as yet been definitely ascertained.

It is true, as stated in *THE CENTURY*, that the records belonging to the Lincoln family during their residence in Rockingham county, Virginia, were destroyed by the Federal army during the civil war, but fortunately there are yet in existence certain official and indisputably authenticated documents, only discovered upon a recent search, which the torch of war did not touch and which disclose some interesting information on these subjects. In the year 1768 that portion of the Shenandoah Valley, Virginia, now contained within the county of Rockingham constituted a part of the county of Augusta, from which county Rockingham was detached and organized in 1777. Prior to this date—1777—all transfers of real estate in the country now comprising Rockingham county were recorded in the clerk's office of Augusta county at Staunton, the county seat. The records of this office disclose the fact that on the 16th day of August, 1768, there was recorded a deed from the heirs of Robert McKay to John Lincoln, conveying a tract of six hundred acres situate on Linvill's Creek in the county of Augusta, now in the county of Rockingham. This tract of six hundred acres was a portion of a very extensive body of land patented to McKay and others as early as 1739, and was doubtless regarded then, as it unquestionably is now, as among the finest tracts of land in the fertile Shenandoah Valley. The consideration that passed from John Lincoln to McKay's heirs as set forth in the deed is merely a nominal one, "the sum of five shillings, current money of Virginia." In view of this purchase of land in Virginia by John Lincoln, it may certainly be regarded as settled that he—the great-grandfather of the President—located in what now constitutes Rockingham county, Virginia, as early as 1768.

Messrs. Nicolay and Hay intimate in the Lincoln history, and Mr. Nicolay states in his article on Lincoln in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," that Abra-

ham, Isaac, Jacob, Thomas, and John, sons of John Lincoln, were born in Virginia. Unless it can be shown that John Lincoln located in Virginia a considerable time prior to the year 1768, it may be fairly assumed that his sons just named were all born in Pennsylvania and accompanied their father to Virginia upon his settlement in that State. This idea receives corroboration from certain conveyances to his sons made by John Lincoln. On the 11th of August, 1773, only five years after the date of the conveyance from the McKays to John Lincoln, he with his wife, "Rebeckah R.," transferred to their son Isaac two hundred and fifteen acres of the original six-hundred-acre tract, and on the 17th day of August, 1773, they also conveyed to their son Abraham—the grandfather of the President—two hundred and ten acres of this same tract, each conveyance being made for a nominal consideration only,—“five shillings current money of Virginia.”* It may be noted that the elder John Lincoln, as well as his sons, all spelt and wrote their name "Lincoln," and in no instance do these documents disclose any other method of spelling.

At what time did Abraham Lincoln, the grandfather of the President, remove from Virginia to Kentucky? Messrs. Nicolay and Hay fix the date as 1780. The date of the land warrants to Abraham Lincoln, the 4th of March, 1780, and the subsequent entries of the land in Kentucky thereunder certainly confirm the time of his leaving Virginia as being as early as 1780, but the statement by Messrs. Nicolay and Hay "that he took his wife and five children with him" at this time is not borne out by record evidence in Rockingham county. There is still in existence the original deed from Abraham Lincoln and Bersheba, † his wife, to one Michael Shanks, dated the 18th of February, 1780, whereby, "in consideration of the sum of five thousand pounds current money of Virginia in hand paid," they granted and conveyed to Shanks a tract of two hundred and fifty acres, consisting of the two hundred acres received from John Lincoln, his father, and another tract of about forty acres obtained from one Munsey. There can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that this was the sale of Abraham Lincoln's real estate preparatory to his emigration to Kentucky. The deed was recorded on the 17th of June, 1780, but without the privy examination of "Bersheba," his wife, attached to the transfer. Consequently, in order to remedy this defect in the conveyance, there was issued on the 8th of September, 1781, by the county court of Rockingham, a commission of privy examination of his wife "Bersheba," "she being unable to travel to our said county court of Rockingham to be privily examined apart from her husband whether she is willing to relinquish her right of dower in the land in the said deed mentioned, as the law in that case directs." This commission was executed by the commissioners named therein

*The rest of the original six hundred acres remained vested in John Lincoln until the date of his death in 1792, when it was conveyed by his executor to his son Jacob Lincoln. The executor's deed as well as the will of John Lincoln

were destroyed during the war by the burning of the records of the county.

† It appears from these documents that Lincoln's great-grandmother was named "Rebeckah" and his grandmother "Bersheba."

SIGNATURES OF THE GRANDPARENTS OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

on the 24th of September, 1781, returned to the county court, and recorded the same day; and the acknowledgment of "Bersheba Lincoln," grandmother of Abraham Lincoln, that she "had signed the said deed of her own free will, without any threats, force, or compulsion of her said husband, was complete," and with it, doubtless, passed all remaining material interest of the President's grandparents in Virginia. Lincoln himself states that his grandfather settled in Kentucky about 1782, and this privy examination certainly shows that his grandmother was still in Virginia as late as September 24, 1781.

If Abraham Lincoln the pioneer removed to Kentucky prior to this date — September, 1781 — his wife did not accompany him, and it may be reasonably supposed, considering the difficulties and dangers attending travel at that time, that his wife and children did not migrate until the spring following. Nor is it improbable that Abraham Lincoln, having already visited Kentucky on a prospecting trip, and selected his new home, returned to Virginia to carry back with him his wife and children.

John T. Harris, Jr.

HARRISONBURG, VIRGINIA.

The following letters from Lincoln on the subject of his family, which Mr. Lamson refers to in his life of Lincoln as having been destroyed during the war, have been since discovered, and for the first time are given to the public. They are addressed to David Lincoln, the son of Jacob Lincoln, a brother of Lincoln's grandfather, who remained in Virginia, and the originals are now owned and highly prized by Abraham Lincoln, a son of David Lincoln, a much-respected citizen of Rockingham county, Virginia, to whose courtesy we are indebted for their publication.

J. T. H., Jr.

WASHINGTON, March 24, 1848.

MR. DAVID LINCOLN.

DEAR SIR: Your very worthy representative, Governor McDowell, has given me your name and address, and as my father was born in Rockingham, from whence his father, Abraham Lincoln, emigrated to Kentucky about the year 1782, I have concluded to address you to ascertain whether we are not of the same family. I shall be much obliged, if you will write me, telling me whether you, in any way, know anything of my grandfather, what relation you are to him, and so on. Also if you know where your family came from, when they settled in Virginia, tracing them back as far as your knowledge extends.

Very respectfully,

A. LINCOLN.

WASHINGTON, April 2, 1848.

DEAR SIR: Last evening I was much gratified by receiving and reading your letter of the 30th of March. There is no longer any doubt that your uncle Abraham and my grandfather was the same man. His family did reside in Washington county, Kentucky, just as you say you found them in 1801 or 2. The oldest son, Uncle Mordecai, near twenty years ago removed from Kentucky to Hancock county, Illinois, where, within a year or two afterwards, he died, and where his surviving children now live. His two sons there now are Abraham

and Mordecai; and their post-office is "La Harp." Uncle Josiah, farther back than my recollection, went from Kentucky to Blue River in Indiana. I have not heard from him in a great many years, and whether he is still living I cannot say. My recollection of what I have heard is, that he has several daughters and only one son — Thomas. Their post-office is Corydon, Harrison county, Indiana.

My father, Thomas, is still living, in Coles county, Illinois, being in the seventy-first year of his age. His post-office is Charleston, Coles county, Illinois. I am his only child. I am now in my fortieth year; and I live in Springfield, Sangamon county, Illinois. This is the outline of my grandfather's family in the West.

I think my father has told me that grandfather had four brothers, Isaac, Jacob, John, and Thomas. Is that correct? and which of them was your father? Are any of them alive? I am quite sure that Isaac resided on Wataga, near a point where Virginia and Tennessee join; and that he has been dead more than twenty, perhaps thirty, years. Also, that Thomas removed to Kentucky, near Lexington, where he died a good while ago.

What was your grandfather's Christian name? Was he, or not, a Quaker? About what time did he emigrate from Berks county, Pa., to Virginia? Do you know anything of your family (or rather, I may now say, *our* family) farther back than your grandfather?

If it be not too much trouble to you, I shall be much pleased to hear from you again. Be assured I will call on you, should anything ever bring me near you. I shall give your respects to Governor McDowell, as you desire.

Very truly yours,
A. LINCOLN.

[Since the November number of THE CENTURY was printed, Messrs. Nicolay and Hay have become possessed of information which goes to show that John Lincoln, the President's great-grandfather, sold his property in Pennsylvania in 1748, and moved to Virginia about 1750.—EDITOR.]

Notes on Village Improvement.

THE first step in village improvement should be to promote its healthfulness. It is a very poor sort of improvement which occupies itself with laying out walks and smoothing door-yards and lawns, and planting trees and preparing flower-beds, while it leaves the air around the dwellings to be polluted by the noxious effluvia arising from a neighboring drain or from foul substances left upon the surface of the ground for lack of any proper provision for their disposal, or which leaves households to depend for the water which they use upon wells situated so near to barn-yards or cess-pools that they may be contaminated by them. It is a cleansing of the outside of the cup and platter, while within it may be full of all uncleanness.

A committee should be appointed, composed of energetic and capable persons who shall examine the entire village or town district, to see where the laws of health are infringed, and then to institute the proper correctives and safeguards, remembering that what endangers the health and life of one household threatens to some extent the health and life of the whole community. Having attended to what lie deeper than the surface, health and life itself, heed may then properly be given to those

things which are upon the surface, such as streets, walks, trees, lawns, the disposal of grounds, and a hundred other things of more or less importance.

Village improvement is sometimes village misimprovement. The first impulse of many organizations for the former purpose is to straighten streets, to level elevations, to plant in rigid lines, to cut everything after a geometrical pattern, to make the architecture of buildings follow, so far as possible, one model, and this they call improvement. When their taste has become further developed, it begins to dawn upon them that in proportion as they have made their paths straight they have lost the peculiar charm of the village without gaining the advantages of the town.

Many of our villages are threaded by sparkling streams which necessitate bridges for their passage; but this is no reason why these bridges should be the positive disfigurements of the landscape which they so often are.

In regard to the planting of trees in village streets much might be said. This is, probably, one of the first things thought of and undertaken by Village Improvement Societies. This is well. And perhaps it may be said that every tree thus planted is a positive gain both in regard to appearance and comfort. But there is often so little care taken in planting trees or in their subsequent management, that we get many sickly and imperfect specimens where we should have noble and stately growths. Here it is emphatically true that what is worth doing at all is worth doing well. Then we make the mistake of limiting ourselves to a very few species of trees, when we have an almost countless variety from which to choose. No other country is so rich in the variety and beauty of its trees as ours. Yet we have restricted ourselves in street-planting for the most part to the elms and maples. Why should we not make use of the ash, the birches, the beech, the basswood or linden, the locust, the chestnut, the hickory, the sycamore, the magnificent tulip-tree, the cypress, the larch, with the cedars and other evergreens, not to speak of the many other trees by a wise selection from which we may secure endlessly varied effects of form and color?

In planting about our dwellings, care should be taken not to plant many trees, nor so near our houses as to overshadow them or prevent light and air from having free access to them. Trees are good and greatly to be desired, but we must not allow them to shut away from us the sunlight. The fountain of light is also the fountain of life. Sunshine is absolutely essential to healthy life and growth, whether animal or vegetable. Bright green turf with a few low-growing trees or shrubs are better near a dwelling than a growth of forest trees.

N. H. Egleston.

Young Men and the War Issues.

THE growing disposition on the part of political orators and on the part of the press to be careful not to give offense in their references to the war partly explains why so liberal and patriotic a feeling is gradually spreading. One reason why politicians have changed their course, outside of the result of the many essays, etc., calling for a burial of dead issues, is the fact that each succeeding year brings to the front a host of young men who

for the first time take up the mantle of citizenship. They are young men who have never known a divided country, whose only knowledge of the war is gained from history; who have never known and can never appreciate (unless they experience them later) the deep passions that could sever even the ties of blood, and place brother against brother, father against son, on the dreaded battle-field. These young men in studying history read of Washington and his band, and the spirit that actuated them, before they reached the story of the Civil War. The story of the original struggle for independence is just as fresh to them as is the incomplete narrative of the Civil War. When they turned the first page of history they found the States a Union, and when they reached the last page they found that Union still intact. These young men know only one country, without sections; they are looking forward, not back; they demand that the "bloody shirt" and all it once covered shall be buried, and that at once, or they will renounce the party that waxes it as an enemy of its country. Political leaders realize this, and in catering to the young vote, which though still in the minority will soon be the majority, are obliged to resort to new themes, and abandon the planks that have served them so long at the country's expense. The men whose passionate fires of sectional hate will only be extinguished by death itself will soon be in a hopeless minority, if they are not so already, and the story that has fanned the flame in their hearts for so long will not suffice for coming voters, North or South; and consequently, is it not reasonable to expect that with the absence of the so-called issues from their accustomed places the spirit that seems to exist, slight though it may be, in consequence of their presence, will soon entirely die out? The social evils of the South arising from the unsettled state of the country at the close of the war and from the process of reconstruction we have ample evidences are fast giving way before the earnest appeals of gifted writers, and to them let all credit be given. But give to the young men of the country, North and South, credit for forcing from our politics many, and soon all, of the issues arising from the war.

A Young Voter.

The Poetic Outlook in America.

THERE seems to be a wider diffusion of the literary art in America than of any other. The number of good if not of great story-writers yearly increases, and so does the number of writers of good if not of great poetry. When Heaven gives us our next great poet, we may be slow to recognize his Pegasus, and will probably waste no little time in looking the gift-horse in the mouth. With so much good poetry being written all the time, the great poet runs, perhaps, more danger than ever of being snugly tucked into his last bed before the day of his "recognition."

Until a poet has become a convention the official critic will surely misprize him. Keats while alive forms no part of England's conventional literary glory. A reviewer, unless through personal acquaintance or some such chance, would not think of mentioning the living Keats as a name belonging to the roll of England's greatest men. The poor boy dies; Shelley and others take up his memory; generations of com

parison and appreciation do their work, and then, "the great poets of that time were Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Keats;—when will England again possess such a galaxy!" The despicable of the living goes on, till one day, thanks to longevity, the living Browning and Tennyson are fully acknowledged. We look backward or forward for the great novelist, poet, artist,—he who dares to find contemporary greatness is regarded as partisan or fool. And yet just fame has not always waited upon dissolution, and a little overrating of the living is less dangerous than the cynical tone which discourages and robs of the necessary opportunity.

We are no friends of indiscriminate adulation and misplaced encouragement. But think for a moment of the deadening indifference which in these days the poet has to overcome. The modern rush for gold is remorseless; drawn on with it are many minds who think themselves outside the pressure. The poetical mood and accomplishment are apt to be looked upon in modern society as an impertinence or a weakness. Plastic art, though often ill rewarded, is fashionable in at least some of its forms; but poetry— we mean the essential thing, not the pretty printed books which contain it— will not decorate a wall; therefore the æsthetic discussions of our day turn largely on the relative merits of etchings, rugs, or vases, on the latest prize picture or newest statue, but much more rarely on the merits of the latest poem. The only form of literary art which society cares to discuss is the novel. We do not begrudge the novel the attention it attracts; we merely note the fact that while poetry is praised as perhaps the highest form of art, its serious votary is very apt to be regarded by the world at large, just so far as he is able to be entirely faithful to his calling and ideal,—giving up everything else for that one thing,—as a being of inferior character and intelligence.

We blame the world at large for its indifference; but what example is set in this regard by those who really are lovers of poetry and sincere devotees of the beautiful?

Are these last alert for the evidences of literary talent among the men and women of their own day? In fiction, yes; but we are pleading now for poetry. Are we not, all of us, the public and the literary classes as well, apt to be indifferent, ungrateful, cynical? The "genius," when he comes, you say, will need no eodding. But have we no duties? no desire to be "right on the record"? Is it not too much to expect that a poet should be forever "mouthing toward the waste"? Joseph Jefferson says that an actor actually gets some real emanation from an audience which enables him to sustain the nervous strain of acting. Is it not so with every artist? Do we want to be among those who let slip out of the world a Keats and a Lanier, without the need of appreciation to which they were most justly entitled?

To our thinking the poetic outlook in America is encouraging. There are scores of men and women who are capable of writing now and then poems far above the average. Almost too many, indeed, write verses well,—too many only because attention is thus distracted from the lesser number who are destined to pursue the art to the furthest limit of their capacity. We do not speak now merely of those who have published books and attained reputations within a short

time past, such as Edith Thomas, Egan, Thompson, Riley, Sill, Bunner, Miss Hutchinson, Miss Cone, Abbey, Boyle O'Reilley, Lathrop, Miss Bates, Fawcett, Miss Lazarus, DeKay, Miss Guiney, Arlo Bates, but of still others who have not yet printed a single volume. Magazine readers have had the opportunity of becoming familiar with the lyrics of John Vance Cheney which have lately passed into a more serious tone; with the deeply imaginative and growingly artistic verses of Robert Burns Wilson; with the sonnets of W. P. Foster, which for grandeur of thought and language compare not disastrously with the best written in this century; with the musical and often profound note of James T. McKay. All that we have named—and it would not be difficult to extend the catalogue—(Montgomery, Henderson, Tooker, Sherman, etc.) are poem-writers of proved capacity. Some of them assuredly have "the makings" of as genuine poets as America has yet produced; whether they will attain to the height of their hopes and capabilities rests largely with their own consciences, but partly depends also upon their opportunities and the sympathy they shall receive from their fellow-countrymen,—from their contemporaries rather than from posterity.

We are confirmed in our opinion as to the wide distribution of poetic capacity in America by the large number of poetic books recently published, and by the excellence of much of the work. To one who for the first time should meet with the poems of their respective authors, in the latest volumes recently issued, bearing the names of Julia C. R. Dorr, Elizabeth Akers, Celia Thaxter, Mary Bradley, Margaret J. Preston, Nora Perry, and H. H., we can imagine how strong would be the general impression of lyrical ability, propriety of diction, and dignity and sincerity of thought,—with here and there a note of startling intensity and beauty. Each volume would, of course, show a separate individuality,—traits that we need not dwell upon here, so well are they known to students of recent American literature. In the books just mentioned, how little is there of triviality,—how just and pure is the view of life; how much there is of freshly told, homely human experience; how much of spirituality. The unforgettable "Birthday" poem of Mrs. Akers on the dead child who still grows yearly by its mother's side; the late H. H.'s calm, heroic outlook into eternity,—such poems as these lift themselves from a level which is far from being uniformly commonplace.

In a volume as unpretending as Henry Abbey's "Poems" (containing all his works), where one may not always, though he will sometimes, be interested in the versified story, one comes upon such a notable piece of mixed sentiment and description as "Recompense," and such a perfect lyric as "Donald"; while in a first book, half prose, half verse, "The Saunterer," by Charles Goodrich Whiting, the reader finds, here and there, a vigorous and imaginative lyric, like that on "The Eagle's Fall," and as tender a lament as that "For Ronald in his Grave." Whoever reads "The Saunterer," let him not omit "The Girls of Bethany," "Summer Thefts," "Home," "What More"—poems as true in feeling as in form.

Among other recent first books of poetry is James Herbert Morse's "Summer Haven Songs," a title singularly descriptive of the subject and tone of the collection: here we find the reflection, as in a country

brook, of a refined, scholarly, cheerful, nature-loving mind. Another first book, with an accurately descriptive title, is Margaret Deland's "The Old Garden," a book to which the generally misapplied term of " quaint " may fitly and with praise be applied. Like the old shawls in the poet's attic, there is here

"The scent of cedern chest . . .
And ling'ring sweetness of dried lavender,
Or pale pressed rose-leaves."

If this were a review of all the recent American books of poetry which deserve attention, something should be said of the lighter touch, often most happily successful, of Clinton Scollard, Oscar Fay Adams, and Samuel Minturn Peck. But without further reference to these, or anything more than a reference to the latest volumes of the veteran Whittier and the younger veteran Cranch, we prefer to close this sketch with especial mention of two anonymous books of verse which have recently appeared, so far as we are aware, with little or no heralding. The author of "The Heart of the Weed" writes sonnets that are not dull: that itself is something; but to write sonnets so genuine in feeling and with such firmness and purity of expression, that tell the impersonal story of a woman's heart so freshly, so poetically,—this is to make a real addition to the literature of the emotions. (Read "Grief," "I'd Give Release," "A Prisoned Bird," "Song," p. 34, "I give Thee Naught," "A Year," "Return," "To —," p. 56.) Entirely different, more imitative, more immature in its grasp of life, but with a marvelous lyrical sense and at times an astounding imagination and passion, is the poetry of the anonymous

author of "Sylvian and other Poems." Surely the author, among the "other poems," of "To One having a Talent for Music," "Love Unspoken," "Written at the End of a Book," and "Mary, the Mother, sits on a Hill," has already done enough to win the gratitude of all who have the *flair* for the real thing in poetry. But the chief interest in "John Philip Varley" (the name that goes with "Sylvian") is his promise. If we may assume that the author is young, then all his volatility and imitativeness may be forgiven, for the virility and music of his verse.

We have not attempted to criticise, but rather to furnish data in proof of the statement as to the present extraordinary diffusion of the poetic talent in this country.

Many books of verse issue from the press in which there is scarce a notable stanza from cover to cover. But though all the writers noted here are by no means on a plane of ability, though some of the collections mentioned are extremely unequal in quality, we have named not a single writer whose work does not somewhere show an artistic sense. It is not, of course, necessary that poetry should be great in order to be good; there is, we hold, a vast amount of good at this time. How much, if any, of current verse is likely ever to be ranked as a permanent part of our literature it is not possible to determine. But the sentiment and workmanship of casual verse is improving; certain individuals among the younger writers rise into a high region of thought and expression; and a smaller number, still, give unusual promise of distinguished future performance.

* *

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Applied Astronomy.

HE took me out to see the stars,
That astronomic bore;
He said there were two moons near Mars,
While Jupiter had four.

I thought of course he'd whisper soon
What fourfold bliss 'twould be
To stroll beneath that fourfold moon
On Jupiter with me.

And when he spoke of Saturn's ring,
I was convinced he'd say
That was the very kind of thing
To offer me some day.

But in a tangent off he went
To double stars. Now that
Was most suggestive, so content
And quite absorbed I sat.

But no, he talked a dreary mess,
Of which the only fraction
That caught my fancy, I confess,
Was "mutual attraction."

I said I thought it very queer
And stupid altogether,
For stars to keep so very near,
And yet not come together.

At that he smiled, and turned his head;
I thought he'd caught the notion.
He merely bowed good-night and said,
Their safety lay in motion.

Esther B. Tiffany.

An Epitaph.

A LADY (who will doubt her home?)
Whose blood was Bay State's bluest,
Once near St. Botolph's town did roam
Among its suburbs newest.

Beside the way she saw a stone—
Small, neat, of plainest granite;
And on one side, with moss o'ergrown,
A lettering: thus ran it—

"I M FROM BOSTON"—"Ah!" she cried,
"What more could he desire
When, after Boston's joys, he died
And went up one step higher.

"A traveler lies here at rest
Who life's rough ocean tossed on;
His many virtues all expressed
Thus simply—'I M FROM BOSTON.'"

Charles E. Whittemore.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Lincoln and Lowell.

"But democracies have likewise their finer instincts. I have also seen the ablest statesman and most pregnant speaker of our generation, a man of humble birth and ungainly manners, of little culture beyond what his own genius supplied, become more absolute in power than any monarch of modern times through the reverence of his countrymen for his honesty, his wisdom, his sincerity, his faith in God and man, and the nobly humane simplicity of his character."

The reprint in Lowell's latest volume, of his Birmingham address on "Democracy," containing the above tribute,—one of the most complete and satisfactory summaries of character ever packed into the very pith of prose,—reminds us that James Russell Lowell was the first of the leading American writers to see clearly and fully, and clearly, fully, and enthusiastically proclaim the greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

The allusion to the martyr-president in "The Commemoration Ode" (some of whose lines were given in fac-simile in connection with the portrait in our November number) was in its nature prophetic,—because it presented a view of the President to which the world is only now fully awakening.

"Such was he, our Martyr-Chief,
Whom late the Nation he had led,
With ashes on her head,
Wept with the passion of an angry grief;
Forgive me, if from present things I turn
To speak what in my heart will beat and burn,
And hang my wreath on his world-honored urn.
Nature, they say, doth dote,
And cannot make a man
Save on some worn-out plan,
Repeating us by rote:
For him her Old World molds aside she threw,
And, choosing sweet clay from the breast
Of the unexhausted West,
With stuff untainted shaped a hero new,
Wise, steadfast in the strength of God, and true.
How beautiful to see
Once more a shepherd of mankind indeed,
Who loved his charge, but never loved to lead;
One whose meek flock the people joyed to be,
Not lured by any cheat of birth,
But by his clear-grained human worth,
And brave old wisdom of sincerity!
They knew that outward grace is dust;
They could not choose but trust
In that sure-footed mind's unfaltering skill,
And supple-tempered will
That bent like perfect steel to spring again and thrust.
His was no lonely mountain-peak of mind,
Thrusting to thin air o'er our cloudy bars,
A sea-mark now, now lost in vapors blind;
Broad prairie rather, genial, level-lined,
Fruitful and friendly for all human kind,
Yet also nigh to heaven and loved of loftiest stars.
Nothing of Europe here,
Or, then, of Europe fronting mornward still,
Ere any names of Serf and Peer
Could Nature's equal scheme deface;
Here was a type of the true elder race,
And one of Plutarch's men talked with us face to face.
I praise him not; it were too late;
And some innate weakness there must be
In him who condescends to victory
Such as the Present gives, and cannot wait,
Safe in himself as in a fate.
So always firmly he:
He knew to bide his time,
And can his fame abide,
Still patient in his simple faith sublime,
Till the wise years decide.
Great captains, with their guns and drums,
Disturb our judgment for the hour,
But at last silence comes;
These all are gone, and, standing like a tower,

Our children shall behold his fame,
The kindly-earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, the first American."

This portrait of "the first American" leaves scarce any detail for the future poet to dwell upon,—so remarkable is the passage for its sympathy and penetration, as well as for the beauty, tenderness, and dignity of its cadences. If Lowell had only linked his name with that of his immortal subject in such immortal verse he would deserve the congratulations and thanks of his fellow-countrymen.

But Lowell has done more than this. In the very thick and fury of the struggle for the salvation of the nation,—a struggle, be it remembered, not only of arms, but of intellects as well,—he came out in "The North American Review" (of which he was one of the editors), not with the usual patriotic flag-waving of that time, but with a full, statesmanlike, and characteristically witty and eloquent essay in support of the policy of the Administration, an essay including an estimate of Lincoln's character which, when read in the light of subsequent history, has more of the tinge of prophecy than even the "Ode." In an article in "The Atlantic Monthly" for July, 1862, Hawthorne had written of the President with a respect which is all the more creditable when one remembers how opposite in politics they had hitherto always been. From Hawthorne's article "Chiefly about War Matters," we quote the following passage:

"Good Heavens! what liberties have I been taking with one of the potentates of the earth, and the man on whose conduct more important consequences depend than on that of any other historical personage of the century! But with whom is an American citizen entitled to take a liberty, if not with his own chief magistrate? However, lest the above allusions to President Lincoln's little peculiarities (already well known to the country and to the world) should be misinterpreted, I deem it proper to say a word or two, in regard to him, of unfeigned respect and measurable confidence. He is evidently a man of keen faculties, and, what is still more to the purpose, of powerful character. As to his integrity, the people have that intuition of it which is never deceived. Before he actually entered upon his great office, and for a considerable time afterwards, there is no reason to suppose that he adequately estimated the gigantic task about to be imposed on him, or, at least, had any distinct idea how it was to be managed; and I presume there may have been more than one veteran politician who proposed to himself to take the power out of President Lincoln's hands into his own, leaving our honest friend only the public responsibility for the good or ill success of the career. The extremely imperfect development of his statesmanly qualities, at that period, may have justified such designs. But the President is teachable by events, and has now spent a year in a very arduous course of education; he has a flexible mind, capable of much expansion, and convertible towards far loftier studies and activities than those of his early life; and if he came to Washington a backwoods humorist, he has already transformed himself into as good a statesman (to speak moderately) as his prime-minister."—Vol. x., p. 47.

Before coming to Mr. Lowell's "North American" essay, we wish to refer to an article by the same writer on "The Election in November," published in "The Atlantic" for October, 1860 (the month before Lincoln's election), in which the political situation is summarized

and the question of slavery discussed with a breadth, a penetration, and a humor that make the paper worthy of permanent preservation among his writings. In this essay Mr. Lowell says that Lincoln "has proved both his ability and his integrity; he has had experience enough in public affairs to make him a statesman, and not enough to make him a politician."

In quoting, now, from Mr. Lowell's "North American" essay we go back of the condensed reprint in "My Study Windows" (entitled "Abraham Lincoln") to the "Review" article on "The President's Policy" written in 1863 and printed in the number for January, 1864.

"That a steady purpose and a definite aim have been given to the jarring forces which, at the beginning of the war, spent themselves in the discussion of schemes which could only become operative, if at all, after the war was over; that a popular excitement has been slowly intensified into an earnest national will; that a somewhat impracticable moral sentiment has been made the unconscious instrument of a practical moral end; that the treason of covert enemies, the jealousy of rivals, the unwise zeal of friends, have been made not only useless for mischief, but even useful for good; that the conscientious sensitiveness of England to the horrors of civil conflict has been prevented from complicating a domestic with a foreign war: all these results, any one of which might suffice to prove greatness in a ruler, have been mainly due to the good sense, the good humor, the sagacity, the large-mindedness, and the unselfish honesty of the unknown man whom a blind fortune, as it seemed, had lifted from the crowd to the most dangerous and difficult eminence of modern times. It is by presence of mind in untried emergencies that the native metal of a man is tested; it is by the sagacity to see, and the fearless honesty to admit, whatever of truth there may be in an adverse opinion, in order more convincingly to expose the fallacy that lurks behind it, that a reasoner at length gains for his mere statement of a fact the force of argument; it is by a wise forecast which allows hostile combinations to go so far as by the inevitable reaction to become elements of his own power, that a politician proves his genius for state-craft; and especially it is by so gently guiding public sentiment that he seems to follow it, by so yielding doubtful points that he can be firm without seeming obstinate in essential ones, and thus gain the advantages of compromise without the weakness of concession, by so instinctively comprehending the temper and prejudices of a people as to make them gradually conscious of the superior wisdom of his freedom from temper and prejudice,—it is by qualities such as these that a magistrate shows himself worthy to be chief in a commonwealth of freemen. And it is for qualities such as these that we firmly believe History will rank Mr. Lincoln among the most prudent of statesmen and the most successful of rulers. If we wish to appreciate him, we have only to conceive the inevitable chaos in which we should now be weltering, had a weak man or an unwise one been chosen in his stead.

And certainly no one ever entered upon office with so few resources of power in the past, and so many materials of weakness in the present, as Mr. Lincoln. Even in that half of the Union which acknowledged him as President, there was a large and at that time dangerous minority that hardly admitted his claim to the office, and even in the party that elected him there was also a large minority that suspected him of being secretly a communicant with the church of Laodicea. All that he did was sure to be virulently attacked as ultra by one side; all that he left undone, to be stigmatized as proof of lukewarmness and backsliding by the other. Meanwhile he was to carry on a truly colossal war by means of both; he was to disengage the country from diplomatic entanglements of unprecedented peril undisturbed by the help or the hindrance of either, and to win from the crowning dangers of his administration, in the confidence of the people, the means of his safety and their own. He has contrived to do it, and perhaps none of our Presidents since Washington has stood so firm in the confidence of the people as he does after three years of stormy administration.

Time was his prime-minister and, we began to

think at one period, his general-in-chief also. At first he was so slow that he tired out all those who see no evidence of progress but in blowing up the engine; then he was so fast that he took the breath away from those who think there is no getting on safely while there is a spark of fire under the boilers. . . . Mr. Lincoln, as it seems to us, in reviewing his career, though we have sometimes in our impatience thought otherwise, has always waited, as a wise man should, till the right moment brought up all his reserves. *Semper nocuit differre paratis* is a sound axiom, but the really efficacious man will also be sure to know when he is *not* ready, and be firm against all persuasion and reproach till he is.

"One would be apt to think, from some of the criticisms made on Mr. Lincoln's course by those who mainly agree with him in principle, that the chief object of a statesman should be rather to proclaim his adhesion to certain doctrines, than to achieve their triumph by quietly accomplishing his ends. In our opinion, there is no more unsafe politician than a conscientiously rigid *doctrinaire*, nothing more sure to end in disaster than a theoretic scheme of policy that admits of no pliability for contingencies. . . . Mr. Lincoln's perilous task has been to carry a rather shakily craft through the rapids, making fast the unrulier logs as he could snatch opportunity, and the country is to be congratulated that he did not think it his duty to run straight at all hazards, but cautiously to assure himself with his setting-pole where the main current was, and keep steadily to that. He is still in wild water, but we have faith that his skill and sureness of eye will bring him out right at last."

Not the least interesting part of the essay is the author's comparison of Henry IV. of France with the American President,—before the assassination of Lincoln had completed a certain likeness in their careers. "Henry went over to the nation; Mr. Lincoln has steadily drawn the nation over to him. One left a united France; the other, we hope and believe, will leave a reunited America."

We are yet to quote, however, what is perhaps the most remarkable and prophetic portion of the essay. The very phraseology of the paragraph which closes the essay has such a similarity to recent utterances that one can hardly believe that it was written twenty-four years ago, and at a time when, though there had been notable Union victories, the issue was still far from being determined. Not only did Lowell thus early recognize the peculiar genius and the dominance of Lincoln, not only did he predict the triumph of the national cause, but he foresaw, in the midst of strife and bitterness, a near future of unprecedented harmony and prosperity. Never in the history of the world has internecine strife been followed so quickly by reconciliation; never before has a reunited nation more suddenly risen to the very height of material well-being and power. It is now a familiar history; but when Mr. Lowell wrote it down it was all yet beneath the veil of the future, only to be penetrated by the pure eyes of faith and inspiration:

"The danger of slavery has always been in the poor whites of the South; and wherever freedom of the press penetrates,—and it always accompanies our armies,—the evil thing is doomed. Let no one who remembers what has taken place in Maryland and Missouri think such anticipations visionary. The people of the South have been also put to school during these three years, under a sharper schoolmistress, too, than even ours has been, and the deadliest enemies of slavery will be found among those who have suffered most from its indirect evils. It is only by its extinction—for without it no secure union would be possible—that the sufferings and losses of the war can be repaid. That extinction accomplished, our wounds will not be long in healing. Apart from the slaveholding class, which is numerically small, and would be socially insignificant without its privileges, there are no such mutual antipathies between

the two sections as the conspirators, to suit their own purposes, have asserted, and even done their best to excite. We do not like the Southerners less for the gallantry and devotion they have shown even in a bad cause, and they have learned to respect the same qualities in us. There is no longer the nonsensical talk about Cavaliers and Puritans, nor does the one gallant Southron any longer pine for ten Yankees as the victims of his avenging steel. As for subjugation, when people are beaten they are beaten, and every nation has had its turn. No sensible man in the North would insist on any terms except such as are essential to assure the stability of peace. To talk of the South as our future Poland is to talk without book; for no region rich, prosperous, and free could ever become so. It is a geographical as well as a moral absurdity. With peace restored, slavery rooted out, and harmony sure to follow, we shall realize a power and prosperity beyond even the visions of the Fourth-of-July orator, and we shall see Freedom, while she proudly repairs the ruins of war, as the Italian poet saw her,—

* "Girar la Libertà mirai
E baciar lieta ogni ruina e dire
Ruine sì ma servitù non mai."

It is a pleasure to know that Mr. Lincoln had the satisfaction of reading the "North American" essay. As it was, according to the custom of the day, unsigned, he wrote to the publishers, instead of to the author, concerning a certain point in his policy which had been criticised and which he wished to explain. This letter, which was dated January 16, 1864, appeared in the next number of the Review. It was characteristic of Lincoln to think only of the benefit of so notable a demonstration in favor of the cause to which his life was dedicated. "Of course," said the President, "I am not the most impartial judge; yet, with due allowance for this, I venture to hope that the article entitled 'The President's Policy' will be of value to the country." How like him to add—"I fear I am not quite worthy of all which is therein said of me personally."

Several of the leading American poets have shown their appreciation of Lincoln in verse or prose—either during his life or since his tragic death. Indeed, an interesting study could be made of the tributes and allusions to the great Liberator by the principal writers of the country. Such a study would not omit mention of Stedman's sonnet on Lincoln's death, and his poem on the cast of Lincoln's hand, a part of which was reprinted in the December CENTURY, of Dr. Holmes's memorial hymn, of Whitman's two poems on the death of Lincoln, or of Stoddard's stately and pathetic ode, and his sonnet published ten years ago in THE CENTURY. During the war the relations of Bryant with Lincoln were, perhaps, more important than those of any other of our poets with the President. Bryant had met him first when Lincoln was a Captain in the Black Hawk war,—and had presided at the Cooper Union meeting where the Western statesman delivered his now famous speech. Lincoln was Bryant's choice as a candidate as against Seward, and in personal interview as well as by letter and editorial, he encouraged, advised, and criticised the Lincoln administration throughout its existence. At Lincoln's death Bryant wrote the noble threnody which is familiar to all readers of American poetry. But we think it will be found that the literary record of Lowell in connection with Lincoln is more remarkable than that of any other of the distinguished authors of America.

* "I beheld Liberty go 'round,
Kiss every ruin joyfully, and say
'Ruins, if so must be, but Slavery never.'"

The Injustice of Socialism.

SOCIALISTS themselves maintain that their system alone is equitable, and that the present industrial methods are all wrong, since they lead necessarily to inequality in wealth and power and in the means of happiness. The object of socialism is to put an end to these inequalities, and to found a society in which all would fare as nearly as possible alike; and this, as socialists maintain, would be truly equitable and just. But when we inquire into the fundamental principles of their system, we find the element of justice conspicuously absent. Their main principles are the ownership of all means of production by the State, and the payment of all workmen according to what is assumed to be the rule of justice. This rule is expressed in the formula with which all students of the subject are familiar, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." According to this rule, a man of superior talents or creative genius would receive no higher recompense than the most inefficient workman, and, indeed, if the latter had a larger family, he would apparently receive more. The obvious intent of this rule is to prevent men of superior abilities from rising above the mass; and socialists proclaim that the privileges of higher intelligence must fall with the privileges of wealth and birth.

Such being the law of recompense in the socialistic system, let us see how it accords with the principles of justice as commonly understood among men. To determine this, we must inquire how a man would be recompensed for his labor if he worked all alone for himself. Suppose a man on a desert island, like Robinson Crusoe, with no goods of any kind except what he could cull from the bosom of Nature or produce by his unassisted labor. In this case it is plain that his wealth and prosperity would depend on the ability and energy with which he worked. If he tilled twice as much ground, he would raise twice as large a crop; if he contrived a way to kill game, he would have its flesh to eat; if he laid by a store of food for the winter season, he would have enough to eat, and if he did not, he would suffer and perhaps die of hunger; if he invented tools of various kinds, he could produce vastly more goods for his own use than he could without them; and, in short, the rewards of his industry would depend on the intelligence and enterprise with which he labored in his own behalf. If we suppose two or more men, each living on his own island, their comparative gains would depend partly, indeed, on the natural resources of the several islands, but mainly on the comparative skill and energy of the men themselves. This truth is abundantly illustrated in the life of nations. Why are Americans and Englishmen richer and more prosperous than Russians and Turks, and these latter more prosperous than Hottentots and Maoris? Clearly because of the greater intelligence and skill and the higher moral qualities of the more prosperous races; so that both of individuals and of nations it is true that, when working in their own behalf, they are recompensed according to their abilities, and not according to their needs.

Since a man is recompensed according to his ability when working for himself, he ought to be recompensed on the same principle when he works for society; for

otherwise he will be deprived of the natural reward of his labors. On the other hand, society itself would suffer an injustice if it paid the incompetent or inefficient workman a large salary simply because he had a large family dependent on him for support. Thus the socialistic principle that every man ought to work for society according to his ability, but be paid according to his needs, is palpably unjust; and this of itself is sufficient to condemn the system, even if otherwise desirable.

It may be said, however, that all socialists do not hold the principle here attributed to them, but that some of their number would recompense every man "according to his deeds." It is admitted that this rule has some advocates among socialists, but its adoption in a socialistic state would be practically impossible. For in the first place, there is no means of ascertaining the value of a man's deeds, except by competition, which the socialists abhor. The only way to determine who are the most efficient servants of society is by giving each man a chance to do his best, and this means individualism, and competition among men for employment and public favor. But again, if it were practicable under a socialistic system to recompense public servants, such as all men would then be, according to their deeds, this would be directly opposed to the main object of the socialists, which is to abolish inequality. If men are to be paid according to their deeds—whether regard is had to the value of the deeds or to the difficulty of performing them—it is obvious that some men will receive a vast deal more than others, and this will bring back the reign of inequality. It is true that the more highly paid workers could not invest their earnings in the form of capital as they now do—they would spend them in personal enjoyment; but this would only make the inequalities more glaringly conspicuous. If one man received ten thousand dollars a year for his services and another only one thousand, the former would have his spacious mansion, his costly furniture, his luxurious dress and equipages, and all the pleasures that a large income gives, just as rich men do now; and the poorly paid man, if of an envious disposition, would feel the same jealousy and discontent that such men now feel. It would be impossible, therefore, in a socialistic state to adopt this method of payment; and thus there is no escape from the flagrant injustice of paying a man according to his needs, while requiring him to work according to his ability.

If, now, we consider our existing society, we shall find that in it men are recompensed for their labor, partly, indeed, according to their opportunities, but mainly according to their abilities. That this is true in the great majority of cases is certain, however strongly excited orators may assert the contrary. It is conspicuously true in the case of nations, whose differing prosperity and power is almost wholly due to

difference in their mental and moral qualities, notwithstanding the difference in their natural resources. It is also true in the main of individual workers of almost every class. The skilled and efficient laborer gets higher pay than the inefficient and the lazy, and the professional man higher pay than the ordinary laborer. So among capitalists and business managers the most successful are, as a rule, those who invest their capital most prudently and manage it with the greatest skill and discretion. Only the higher kinds of intellectual workers—the great thinkers, moralists, and others of that order—fail to get pay in proportion to their work; but their case is exceptional, and they are few in number.

"English as She is Taught."

NOTHING could be more amusing than the unconscious humor of "English as She is Taught," in this number of THE CENTURY, yet where is the thoughtful reader whose laughter is not followed by something very like dismay? Here are examination papers taken from many schools, evolved from many brains; yet are they so like in character that all might be the work of one puzzled school-boy struggling with matters too deep for him.

Undoubtedly many of these children have been poorly taught, and poorly taught in the same way, but the trouble lies back of indifferent teachers, and even back of indifferent or ambitious school-boards. It rests upon us all as a people. We are too heedless of detail, and too ambitious for number or size or appearance. We know too little of thoroughness; we demand impossible things; naturally, one of the things we get is the result embodied in "English as She is Taught."

Every conscientious teacher can tell how he is hampered by his overruling school-board or constituency. Sometimes it may attempt to guide; more frequently it suspects. His individuality is stamped out; his freshness of method and organization is distrusted. He knows that too many subjects are taught in a superficial, hap-hazard way, but he can make no change, for the genius of the people is against him. He knows that his assistants are working without adequate direction or organization; but his own hands are too often tied. Too often, too, the teacher is untrained and heedless,—often a mere sojourner in the school, preparing for other things; often the creature of a board dominated by a political or a sectarian majority. We need trained and enthusiastic teachers; unbiased, nonpolitical, and carefully chosen school-boards; less ambition and more thoroughness; less of the *what* and more of the *why*; less immaturity striving to appear mature, and less ignorance masking itself under assurance. But the question arises: Who is to teach the American people this?



OPEN LETTERS.

International Copyright on Music.

OPINIONS OF AMERICAN MUSICIANS.

[IN THE CENTURY for February, 1886, was printed a collection of opinions from the most prominent authors of the United States, to the number of forty-five, on the subject of an International Copyright Law, contributed in response to a circular from us, and unanimously demanding such a measure, in the name of justice to authors and of an honorable public policy. In the following pages we print replies to a similar circular addressed by us to American musicians. It will be remarked that these responses, like those of the authors, recognize the preëminence of the ethical issue which is involved. Looking merely at the indifference of our legislators on this and other moral questions, one might think with Emerson that

"Things are in the saddle,
And ride mankind,"

were it not for the widespread and unsophisticated sense of right which is shown by such protests as these from authors and composers, who we are sure are in this matter the truest representatives of American sentiment. How long will it be before Senators and members will recognize that this is primarily a moral rather than an economic question; and that the conviction of large classes of thoughtful people that we are pursuing a disgraceful policy is a source of weakness in the national self-respect for which legislators individually are every day newly responsible? — THE EDITOR.]

AS TO an International Copyright Law, I should hail it with joy. At this stage of the world's progress such a legal protection should be everywhere recognized as an author's inalienable right.

BROOKLYN.

Dudley Buck.

THE artistic injustice to which composers are subjected for want of an adequate copyright law can scarcely be appreciated by the general public.

The recent litigation in regard to the original orchestration of Gounod's "Redemption," and of the Gilbert and Sullivan operas, developed the fact that it is the common practice to rescore, rearrange, reharmonize, republish, and otherwise maltreat, *ad lib.*, the works of any foreign composer that may be found profitable for trade purposes. So shameless has this practice become that the defendants in one of these lawsuits actually made a point of the fact that they had altered all the chords of the seventh in the original composition to common chords in their "edition" (!) and made claim to copyright on that account.

It is a notorious fact that American composers have suffered in the same way in England. The genuine creator in music may be content to wait for recognition, and may even be reconciled to having some one else reap the benefit of his artistic labor; but that any one should have the right to distort and misrepresent his works, which happens every day to *tone* artists, is a shame which no one can endure with equanimity. Common justice demands that the artist shall have the right to the fruit of his labor. *Artistic* justice demands that his creation shall be protected from dis-

figurement and vandalism, and *common law* as well as international law ought to afford such protection.

BOSTON.

G. W. Chadwick.

THE first thing to determine in regard to the lack of an International Copyright Law is not the injury it may be to American composers, but the injustice it inflicts on composers of all nationalities. The laws of all civilized countries recognize and protect the right of the inventor to the rewards of his ingenuity; the patentee of the most trifling mechanical contrivance, the compounder of the most impotent "cure-all," can at small cost secure the profits of his labor in every land; but the author, whether literary or musical, is not deemed worthy of the same just protection. His work, the result of years of labor, is — by a strange irony — deemed of so much value to the world at large that it would be an injustice to the world to expect them to pay him a fair price for it. He must be content, perforce, to find his highest reward for instructing or amusing the world, in fame, and — in filling the coffers of piratical publishers. So long as American publishers can republish the best class of music produced in Europe, without cost, except for stamping and printing, just so long they will refuse equally good compositions by native authors, unless they get them for nothing.

It would seem that the mere statement of the existence of such a state of things ought to be enough in the name of justice and honesty, to end it, in spite of the "vested interests" — viz., publisher's capital, stock, etc., etc. — that are constantly referred to, when this question is agitated, as something too sacred to be meddled with; as if equity can or ought to recognize any "vested interests" in in-equity, or the success of never so many publishers outweigh the plain right of the humblest author to a fair share in the profit of his work.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILA. H. A. Clarke.

THE absence of an International Copyright Law is working directly to the grave injury of our native composers. So long as American music publishers can reprint the most successful foreign compositions without paying a farthing of royalty to their authors, so long will they prefer doing so instead of printing American works of possibly equal merit. An International Copyright Law will encourage our composers by giving them a chance to see their scores printed. Surely, commercial equity and the interest of our musicians, nay, of musical progress among us, here go hand in hand. The absence of such a law benefits solely our music publishers; its enactment would remove one of the chief obstacles to our eventually taking rank as a musical nation.

BOSTON.

Julius Eichberg.

THERE is no need to argue at this stage of the controversy that copyright is property. The question at issue is now whether this property should have an international protection the same as the money a man carries abroad in his pocket. To reduce the matter

to a strictly logical basis, copyright is money. Any man possessing a copyright may sell it for what it will bring in the market, precisely as he would sell his railroad stock, or his old clothes—for there are copyrights which are worth little more. The question is, shall civilized countries recognize these facts and give copyright an international safety, or shall the inhabitants of each country still have the privilege of poaching on the mental products of other countries at their pleasure? American composers have so far had a hard time of it, and have found it a very difficult matter to introduce their works to their own countrymen. Nor is this so much to be wondered at when it is remembered that in the present state of lawlessness any publisher here can issue cheap reprints of any foreign composition at any time when he may choose to do so; he merely pays for the plates, the paper, and the printing, the composer, of course, receiving nothing. This is certainly very agreeable and nice—for the publisher; but it naturally puts American composers in the shade. Lastly, it must not be overlooked that an International Copyright Law would not only be a matter of justice, but also a stimulus to mental activity, and it would certainly tend to discourage robbery whose chief excuse seems to be that it is wholesale.

NEW YORK.

Otto Floersheim.

JUSTICE and expediency alike demand an International Copyright, and every educated person in the country should ask for it.

One example of the result of the present system of piracy is worth more than any amount of argument. Three years ago, in Paris, I saw a man whose music is admired and loved wherever the pianoforte has made its way,—Stephen Heller,—old, poor, and almost totally blind. If the money justly due him from publishers in the United States alone could have been made his by law, he would have been made comfortable for the rest of his life. Fortunately his friends in France and England raised an annuity for him, and so in part made up for the wrong; and his is the case of many. No American who lives wholly or in part by the work of his brains should rest until that work is as much protected as a brand of whisky or soap.

BOSTON.

Arthur Foote.

IN observing that in the United States the author and musical composer alone are left unprotected by the law, one might be inclined to think that America's great law-makers had all been publishers! Luckily it is otherwise. Nevertheless, so long as there is no international copyright, "*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*" will remain in American translation: Enrich the pirates; authors may starve!

NEW YORK.

F. Korbay.

WHILE the present wrong state of affairs causes more injustice to European authors and composers than to Americans, it will not be long before the latter will begin to suffer more or less acutely. It may be that for many years musical composition here will bring no pecuniary reward (so far as regards the higher forms), but without an adequate international copyright this condition might exist forever.

An American composer now has to contend against

the tremendous competition that is caused by the fact that our publishers reprint, without the cost of authorship, works of every European composer of reputation. It is not only against such works themselves that our composers must measure themselves—they must face a surfeited market; surfeited, because his works have but one publisher, while the others have all. The publisher has little reason to pay for what he can get for nothing. It seems to me that there is no honorable defense for our present thievish attitude on the subject of international copyright.

BOSTON.

B. J. Lang.

IT seems to me that every right-minded person must most emphatically condemn the unprincipled piracy of literary, and especially musical, works, that has been continued for so many years. Why should not the products of a man's brain be as much his personal property, and therefore protected by law, as his money or anything else belonging to him? If an American appropriates an Englishman's money and is caught, he is punished; if he appropriates his book or musical composition, republishing and selling it for his own profit, he goes free. Such a state of affairs is so entirely opposed to all principles of modern civilization, that there cannot and should not be two opinions on this point. Let us have an International Copyright Law, by all means, and the sooner the better.

BOSTON.

Louis Maas.

MANY pianoforte and other musical compositions by Americans are at present constantly being republished in foreign countries and ordinarily without remuneration to the composers. It seems to me that the arguments in favor of International Copyright as regards works of literature, apply with equal force to musical compositions. I should, however, prefer what the Rev. Lyman Abbott, in *THE CENTURY* for February, 1886, calls "Universal Copyright,"—not as a matter of policy, but because of its broad and more liberal scope and because founded upon principles of honesty, equity, justice, and humanity.

ORANGE, N. J.

William Mason.

It has been said that there are two sides to every question, but from the author's and composer's standpoint there is in the copyright question only one side which contains the elements of justice.

The consuming public naturally desires to have the advantage of reprints of foreign matter, and for this advantage ought to be willing to pay a price by which the originator, who has given his time for their enlightenment or enjoyment, should derive some benefit.

Without an International Copyright we shall never develop to any extent the literary or musical talent which is lying dormant in this country; for so long as we can have the vast resources of European countries to draw upon without taxation, so long will our native authors and young composers be deprived of a working-field, and we who boast of equality in all things will have to acknowledge the superiority and supremacy of other nations in literature and art. For no enterprising American, no matter how much genius he may possess, will wholly devote his time and talents to work from which he can derive no profit

owing to the concurrence of publications by foreign authors which can be reproduced here without paying any royalty, and consequently at less expense to the publisher.

NEW YORK.

Harrison Millard.

MY name is at your service to help swell the number of petitioners for the passage of an International Copyright Law. In spite of my honest endeavor to find out the injury done to American composers by the absence of such a law, I must confess my inability in this direction. My only feeling is, that moral justice ought to be done to the right of property of the brain as well as to that of the purse.

NEW YORK.

J. Mosenthal.

EVERY American composer will rejoice when an International Copyright Law is adopted in this country, whereby the right of an author to legal protection for his published works is recognized as universal. The absence of such a law is not only a grave injury to foreign masters, but a fatal obstacle in the path of our own composers.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

John K. Paine.

ALL the arguments advanced in the controversy regarding an International Copyright Law for the protection of authors are equally applicable in the case of composers. Speaking from the standpoint of an American composer, the musical market is flooded with cheap reprints of the most popular and profitable modern European works, to the great detriment of American compositions of merit. These cannot of course compete with works of foreigners in price, since the publishers not only may, but do, take without remuneration and use with impunity what ought to be the property of foreigners. For no long argument is needed to convince any right-thinking man that the result of brain-labor is as much the maker's own property as the work of his hands. Moreover it is a melancholy fact that there is in this country at present a prejudice against American music. Given two piano-pieces of equal merit, one by an American, the other by a foreigner, probably not one teacher in ten would give preference to the former for constant use. The passing of this law would give to American composition an impetus and encouragement which it greatly needs, by tending to place the American composer, at least at home, on the same footing as the foreigner.

The whole question seems naturally to resolve itself into one of simple morality: Has a man the right to the product of his work? It is unreasonable and selfish to expect a composer, after he has labored for years and spent both time and money to acquire his ability, to use that ability merely to enrich the man who buys the paper and has it printed; while he himself who has created something to print is forced to subsist by other means, although by appropriate legislation there could be secured to him a just proportion of the fruits of his toil.

GARDEN CITY, L. I.

H. W. Parker.

IF it be obvious justice to a literary or artistic worker to afford him copyright protection in his own country, it is equally obvious justice to grant him similar protection in all countries that are linked with his own by likeness of knowledge and taste. Upon

general principles of fair dealing, therefore, I believe heartily in an International Copyright Law, and in a law that shall apply to musical compositions as well as to books. Hitherto, the absence of an International Copyright Law has been an injury and an injustice mainly to *foreign* composers and publishers. But within the last ten or fifteen years American music in all departments from the primary instruction-book has been commanding more and more attention in Europe, so that the evil is beginning to be felt keenly on our side also. This reciprocity of interest is certain to become rapidly more noticeable. The sharp goad of personal interest is thus being added to the slow sense of abstract justice to make most American musicians decided advocates of the International Copyright idea. It is surely disgraceful that the United States is one of the last of the great powers to accept and adopt this idea.

HARTFORD, CONN.

Waldo S. Pratt.

LAST summer I looked into the musical catalogue of the British Museum for English reprints of American music, where every publisher in England is expected to deposit a copy of every publication he issues, to be catalogued and kept for reference. This I did at the suggestion of a London publisher who favors an International Copyright Law, and who wished to give me an idea of the loss I have sustained by the absence of such a law. This catalogue consists of blank-books into which are pasted the titles of each author's compositions, so arranged that they are kept together and in alphabetical order and four or five on a page. My list, beginning back in the Fifties and taking in the war songs on their way to the present time, occupies twenty-three of these pages and a part of the twenty-fourth. This does not include a good many singing-class pieces and some Sunday-school and Gospel songs that appear in books by English compilers. It goes without saying that I favor an International Copyright Law.

CHICAGO.

Geo. F. Root.

ON most subjects there may be diversity of opinions. On the subject of International Copyright it seems to me there can be but one view, and that in favor of security to American writers, and, I may say, to all writers. As a composer of music who is, fortunately, not dependent on the material result of his publications, I do not fail to appreciate the fact that music publishers in this country have no paramount interest to push the sale of their copyright publications. The reason is, they can reprint with such facility the works of others *after* they have proved a success, and it pays them so much better to do this because they are not hampered by royalties or bonuses to European composers; thus they have not the same incentive to further the sale of their publications which English, French, or German publishers have. A successful American composer, whose works do not aspire to so-called cheap popularity, does better to-day, from a pecuniary point of view, to publish his works in Europe than in this country. This is not as it should be. It is time that wholesale stealing of, or simply voluntary payment for, the productions of the brain should be stopped.

NEW YORK.

Sebastian B. Schlesinger.

INTERNATIONAL Copyright is a legitimate and logical extension and application of the principles involved in our present copyright laws, and secures to the author, dramatist, or composer full and perfect recognition of property rights, in place of the partial and imperfect protection afforded by existing laws.

That our statutes signally fail to furnish to literary workers that security in the pursuit of an honorable calling to which every citizen is entitled, must be conceded, and the injustice of further delay becomes more apparent, in view of the fact that the advocates of purely material issues rarely fail in securing favorable legislation.

The comparative ease with which musical productions are reprinted, and the fact that the medium of expression is the same in all countries, render the native composer subject to a competition even more intense than that which literary workers are obliged to endure. It must be borne in mind that at the present time, when American composers are beginning to assert their right to a respectful hearing, this burden is especially hard to bear. It is significant that the association (Music Teachers' National Association) which has done more than any other agency to arouse an interest on the part of our musical public in the work of our native composers, has repeatedly and emphatically indorsed the principle of International Copyright. It was the good fortune of the writer to assist in securing an expression of opinion from the musical profession upon this question, and the unanimity with which the better class of musicians indorsed the proposed legislation proved conclusively that its necessity was fully appreciated. The manly spirit shown in demanding fair play for the foreign composer, while insisting on just treatment for themselves, indicates a self-respect which may prove no unimportant factor in developing American musical art.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Albert A. Stanley.

WHEN a young artist, or an old one for that matter, carries to the publishers a work that will compare in usefulness as well as excellence with any contemporaneous production, he is met by the question, "What is the use of my buying a MS. from you when I can get the compositions of Sullivan, Dykes, Goss, and all the best English composers for *nothing*?"

The English music unquestionably has done much good here in arousing the latent talent and energies of our American composers. We awake only to find that we have been aroused in vain. There *must* be an International Copyright, and that without delay, or American music will sink into oblivion. If any considerable number of our Congressmen knew anything about art or literature, we should have had it long ago.

NEW YORK.

Eugene Thayer.

THE present state of the law is an inducement to swindling and is degrading to us as a nation. An International Copyright Law that would compel American publishers to pay foreign composers for their works might also prove an encouragement to home talent by giving our own composers an equal chance with others.

NEW YORK.

Theodore Thomas.

I AM most decidedly in favor of an International Copyright Law, by which musical composers and authors in other arts and sciences will be protected against the outrageous doings of many publishers in America and in Europe. A man's brain-work should be respected by all, and every profit and advantage that may be gained through it should be for his own benefit, and *not* for those who furnish the paper and the ink for the reproduction of works which in most cases have taken years of study and hard labor to conceive and to execute.

BOSTON.

Carl Zerrahn.

COMMENT OF A CRITIC OF MUSIC.

THE musicians whose appeal for International Copyright is published in this number of THE CENTURY have in one respect a stronger claim upon the protection of their country than even the writers of books. The author of a literary work is exposed to the direct competition only of those who use the same language. But the language of music is universal; and the American composer of songs, cantatas, and operas must face the fact that the publishers of whom he asks pay can take without pay the productions of Germany, France, Italy, Hungary, Russia, and Scandinavia, as well as the countries of the English tongue. They can pillage the whole world. This is one reason why American music gains so little headway. Our historians, novelists, and poets by pluck and ability are beginning to make a scanty living; but American music, on its creative side, remains very nearly where it was a generation ago. An American cannot earn bread by composing music. The law shuts him out of both foreign markets and his own; and yet music of a high class needs the markets of all countries, because its sale, under the most favorable circumstances, is so much restricted by the difficulties of performance. We pride ourselves upon our progress in the execution and appreciation of music; but while we boast of our culture we starve the creative spirit of art, and fill our dishonored halls with ill-gotten spoils from every land where we can find anything to steal.

The Hawley Bill, supported by the American Copyright League, during the last Congress proposed a simple measure of reciprocity, placing upon a perfect equality with our own citizens, as to copyright, the citizens of every nation which should grant a parallel equality to Americans. Interesting and forcible arguments in behalf of the reform were made by Mr. Lowell and others before the Senate Committee on Patents; but to the general disappointment the committee reported a bill devised by one of its members, Mr. Chace, which nobody seems to have asked for, which authors and composers certainly do not want, and which virtually denies the principle upon which International Copyright is demanded. Whether we rely upon the moral or the economical argument, the paramount object of an International Copyright Law is to protect the creators of intellectual property against unauthorized reprinters of it. But Mr. Chace, in reporting his bill, declared in effect that his paramount object was to protect the interests of reprinters, and that he should consult the property rights of foreigners only so far as he could do so without injury to our

material profits or the "income of labor." As for the property rights of American authors and composers, he did not consult them at all, for he left out of his scheme the reciprocity clause, which was an important part of the Hawley Bill. What he did was to offer a foreigner copyright in this country provided he got out an American edition, printed here within three months of the original publication abroad. This condition failing, the copyright was to lapse permanently, and piracy to be free. In the meanwhile, and as long as the copyright lasted, the importation even of a single copy of the work was to be prohibited. The author could not send it to publishers with whom he wished to treat, and if he came to the United States he could not bring a copy with him. Take from the three months the time necessary for the shortest correspondence across seas and the time required for re-manufacture, and how much is left for negotiations? Our foreign friend's dealings with the American reprinter must be quick and sharp. This man of business has the game in his own hands. "Give me your work at my price," he can say; "it is too late to try another house. In a few days your privilege of copyright will lapse, and then I can have your production for nothing." So instead of protecting literary property, Mr. Chace has only invented a plan by which the "vested interests" concerned in reprinting can protect themselves against the competition of rivals in the business, whenever they think it worth while to pay something for that advantage. Authors of established fame and popularity can indeed make their own terms; but in the case of nine writers out of ten it would be optional with the reprinting firms, under the Chace scheme, to allow copyright or not. The time clause, which takes away a man's rights unless he can sell them by a fixed day, makes the buyer master of the trade. The situation is not essentially changed by the fact that authors might sometimes make their bargains here before the publication abroad. They could not always do that. In many cases the success of a work depends upon the haste with which it is put to press, and the manuscript must be given to the printer as fast as it is produced. And in dealing with all but the foremost authors and composers, it is probable that the "vested interests" would generally elect the piracy system, so that they could test the market for a work abroad before risking its republication in America. This would be the rule especially with musical compositions, the popularity of which cannot be judged until the public has had ample time to hear them.

The Chace Bill, therefore, does nothing for the protection of American authors and musicians abroad. It does so little for them at home that the relief is hardly worth considering. It violates the moral principle of copyright for the benefit of the capital invested in piratical reprinting; and it assumes that our paramount duty is to protect manual labor even to the extent of stealing the raw material for it to work with. This is the measure which the report of the Senate Committee on Patents has placed before the country. The American Copyright League is now striving to have the Hawley Bill reported also, that the people may judge between them. The contrast would be instructive. To show the difference between a bill for the protection of literature and art and a bill for the

protection of the vested interests employed in plundering literature and art is a telling argument for honesty.

John R. C. Hassard.

General Shields.

TO THE EDITOR: As a friend of the late General Shields, who has intimately known him from the time he made his first appearance in Illinois until his death a few years ago, I trust to your known impartiality for allowing me to make a few observations on the harsh judgment which the biographers of President Lincoln have passed on the character of General Shields in the January number of *THE CENTURY*.

Shields, while under age, came to this country, either at the instance or under the auspices of an uncle who settled in South Carolina. After reaching manhood he went North teaching school,—the beginning of so many of our most distinguished politicians and even statesmen. In 1835 or 1836 he opened a school at Kaskaskia which, though it had ceased to be the capital of the State, was still the residence of a highly intellectual and polished society. There lived the families of Elias K. Kane, then United States Senator from Illinois; of the eminent Judge Nathaniel Pope, United States District Judge; of the able lawyer David J. Baker, of William and Robert Morrison, of Governor Menard, of the Maxwells, and of many other prominent citizens.

General Shields had not received a thorough classical education; but he had some knowledge of Latin and French. He was an excellent English scholar, familiar with the best literature of England and America, and had a more than usual knowledge of history, particularly of that of modern times.

He was quick of perception, lively in conversation, ardent but by no means as touchy and irascible as the biographers represent him. His vanity was indeed inordinate, really so much so that it rather became amusing than offensive. The best evidence of his being an honorable gentleman and a man of superior parts, was that he was most kindly received and made much of in the families I have mentioned. Judge Pope was his most particular patron and spoke kindly and highly of him to the day of his death. Judge Breese, who had, however, left Kaskaskia shortly before, became well acquainted with him somewhat later, on the circuit, and formed as much of friendship for him at that time as lay in his nature. And what is a most remarkable circumstance, all these Kaskaskia people without exception were strong Whigs, while Shields was a Democrat, though never a radical one. He did not seek to rise in his party, as a great many men of small caliber do, by professing ultra views, and to a certain extent he even despised popularity.

There was a special session of the Legislature called in 1837 owing to the suspension of our banks and to the embarrassment growing out of the monstrous system of internal improvements shortly before adopted by the State.

In the representation of Randolph County a vacancy had taken place, and Shields, though a Democrat, was elected in a county then largely Whig, he receiving the support of Judge Pope, David J. Baker, and other leading Whigs. Hardly any Irishmen were then living in that county. It was largely inhabited by French people, amongst whom Shields was always well liked

for his vivacity and probably also for his knowledge of their language. Surely he was not put up as a candidate on account of his "nationality." In the Legislature he made many warm friends and was considered an able reasoner and debater. He had studied law probably before he came to Illinois, continued it here, and was in fact very well grounded in the principles of law—rather more so than most of his rivals then at the bar. He argued closely and to the point, was much stronger before the court than before the jury, as he had not the gift of the gab, and hardly ever tried to be rhetorical or pathetic. When he did try, it was generally a bad failure. His language was always chaste and grammatically correct. He had a subtle and logical mind, though his impulsiveness made him sometimes act very illogically. He was ambitious, so much so that many people judged him to be too selfish. I, however, know of a great many instances when he acted very generously, and forgetful of himself. Very few ambitious men are free from the charge of egotism. He was careless about money matters and not the least avaricious.

In 1837, at the instance of the late A. W. Snyder, then a member of Congress, who had taken a great liking to Shields, he settled in Belleville, Illinois, as a lawyer, and, forming a partnership, entered on a very successful practice. Traveling the then very large circuit, he became well known in all southern Illinois, and his sociability, warm temperament, sprightly and intelligent conversation made him hosts of friends. While he himself delighted in being flattered he took occasionally good advantage of the same weakness in others.

In Belleville he soon made many friends, particularly amongst the educated Germans, who found his conversation interesting and cosmopolitan. There were few Irishmen then in that county, and he was not particularly popular amongst those few.

His election for State Auditor in 1840, by the Legislature, was owing to the fact that he knew most of the members personally, to his social qualities, and to his reputation of an able and honest man. It is just barely possible that his nationality may have had some influence with some of the politicians; but it was his tact, and the friendship of Douglas, who was then Secretary of State, and of other leading Democrats, such as General Whiteside and Colonel W. H. Bissell, late Governor of Illinois, that made him successful.

As regards the contemplated duel with Lincoln, the biographers remark very rightly: "We have reason to think that the whole affair was excessively distasteful to Lincoln. He did not even enjoy the ludicrousness of it, as might have been expected." It could not fail that the noble-hearted and eminently just Lincoln would, as soon as he was out of the hands of his ill-advising *friend*, most deeply regret this episode of his life.

The articles, for which Mr. Lincoln had made himself generously responsible, "covered," as the biographers themselves say, "Mr. Shields with merciless personal ridicule." But they also charged him, together with Governor Carlin and Treasurer Campbell, who had instructed the Collectors of the State revenue not to receive the almost worthless bank paper for payment of State taxes, with the most sor-

did motives. No man of the least spirit could have taken those insults without seeking satisfaction, even by arms, if necessary. Dueling, particularly amongst public men, had at that time not so much faded out of fashion, either in England or in our country, as at present, and is not yet sunk into entire oblivion. The provocation was of the strongest, and no blame attached to Shields at the time. It is no proof of Shields's irascibility. He was a young man who had his reputation for honesty at stake; and to have in addition his personal features and peculiar habits ridiculed in a small but select society in which he daily moved was more than even a saint could have borne. But there was another reason why, as the biographers say, "Lincoln would have been glad to banish the matter from his memory." Both parties had been very unfortunate in the choice of their "*friends*." General Whiteside was a very brave man; he had seen some service in the Black Hawk war, and was a good Indian-fighter. But he was no better qualified to manage an "affair of honor" than Black Hawk himself. Whatever the pretensions of Dr. Merryman might have been, he certainly was equally ignorant of the "code of honor," the first and foremost rule of which is that the combatants should, as much as possible, meet on an equal footing. Air and sun must be equally divided. Mr. Shields was just about of medium height, of light weight at the time, by no means strong; while Mr. Lincoln was of towering height, heavy, and long-armed, and of almost superhuman muscular strength. In this respect the choice of arms, "cavalry broadswords of the heaviest caliber," undoubtedly suggested by the Doctor, was an unfair one. The only excuse for him, and after all a bad one, might have been this, that as a friend of Lincoln he wanted to prevent a duel at all, and so he would propose such a sort of a fight as would bluff off Shields. But if he thought so, which is a mere surmise of the writer, he did not know the man Shields. But it would have been the duty of Whiteside to decline peremptorily such a combat, and to insist on pistols, a weapon with the use of which both parties might have been supposed to be somewhat acquainted, or with which by a few days' practice they could have familiarized themselves. Another rule of the code is that no unusual weapons must be used. Now, outside of army officers or students on the continent of Europe who are more or less trained in fencing-schools, the saber, or even the small sword, is never resorted to in dueling, and even with those classes pistols are the more customary arms. Amongst civilians it is an unheard-of thing. I am almost sure that Mr. Lincoln never before had handled a heavy cavalry sword; I am certain that Shields never had. If the duel had taken place, it would have been a ludicrous as well as a brutal affair. In the hands of novices a somewhat crooked heavy cavalry sword becomes no better than a flail or a stick. The strokes intended to cut head, shoulder, or breast in nine cases out of ten fall flat, and may knock a man down without ever drawing blood.

The blame of this opera-bouffe affair falls properly on the seconds. It is plain, however, that none attached to Shields.

The letter to Judge Breese referred to is clearly indefensible. It was the worst mistake in Shields's life, though, strange to say, it did not hurt him with his con-

stituents; for while he was rejected by the Senate on account of lack of constitutional qualification when he first offered himself in March, 1849, the moment that disqualification ceased, October, 1849, he was reelected Senator by the Legislature, called at a special session for that purpose.

He seemed to have lost his head entirely on that occasion. He had been naturalized in 1840, in September, I believe. At the December session of Congress, 1849, he would have been a citizen of nine years' standing. But he hastened to Washington soon after his election, and presented his credentials in the Senate, which had been called for an extra session for Executive purposes after the 4th of March. An objection was made to his qualifications and sustained. The letter was written to frighten off Judge Breese from having the objection raised. Whatever his motive he committed an abominable error.*

When in 1844 Governor Ford appointed Mr. Shields one of the Judges of the Supreme Court to fill a vacancy, it was surely not on account of his being an Irishman. Ford was not that sort of a man. He never cared about popularity. He only looked to the qualification of his appointees. Shields filled the office to the satisfaction of the people, and the few opinions he wrote during his short stay on the bench are lucid and forcible.

As Logan in the civil war, so Shields in the Mexican war, was the most distinguished volunteer general. Severely wounded, when leading his Illinois Brigade at Cerro Gordo, he led the Palmetto and another regiment with distinction at Contreras, and received at the storming of Chapultepec a most painful and slowly healing wound in his right wrist. In the civil war he was again wounded in the arm by a ball at Winchester. He was not a great strategist, nor even a tactician; but he was always found in front, and the soldiers liked to follow him.

He may in older days have indulged too much in reminiscences of his former feats of arms, but there are few old soldiers who are not guilty of such a charge. The writer was very near him for several years after the Mexican war, and is not aware that he ever unduly prided himself on his military performances.

He was naturally very much opposed to slavery. It was with great reluctance he voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill. But Mr. Douglas, his colleague in the Senate, had much influence over him, Douglas having always nobly supported him. He had taken the view which Mr. Webster had promulgated in his celebrated speech, that slavery could not exist in either of the territories, from climatic and other causes that nature had ordained, and that therefore the repeal of the Missouri Compromise could do no harm.

Earthly goods he never acquired. Before the generosity of Congress, not long before his end, relieved him, he spent many years in actual poverty. His mind, while eccentric, sometimes erratic, was essentially of a lofty nature. He could not have risen to all the high

stations he filled except by some intrinsic merits. Were it otherwise, not he, but those who elected him, would have to bear the blame.

BELLEVILLE, ILLINOIS.

Gustav Koerner.

The Cantata and American Composers.

By using very little of your space may I try to modify the impression which the letter on "The Cultivation of the Cantata" published in the January number of THE CENTURY has probably made? When Mr. Barnard, after saying that the cantata occupies a middle ground between the oratorio and opera, that American writers have been more successful in this form, cites Mr. Root's "Flower Queen" as an example, I am led to believe that he is not informed of the present trend of American music. To encourage Americans to compose is a leading topic among writers on music at the present time in the United States, and the cantata is one of the most desirable forms to have cultivated; but have we not outgrown the era which accepted the compositions of Mr. Root as standard in that department? Would the Handel and Haydn Society pay one thousand dollars for the counterpart of "The Haymakers" or "Esther"? Certainly it would not. Mr. Barnard, however, implies that it would, and the non-musical reader of his letter will seek for no higher values in this form of native musical achievement than these compositions represent. Such pieces are styled cantatas. So is "Pinafore" an opera, but "Orpheus" is one also. There was a time when practice of "The Haymakers" and "The Flower Queen" in uninformed and slow-moving districts was quite general; clergymen recommended such to their Sunday-schools; but the men who at present are writing what is making a name for American music did not so much as taste this fount of inspiration.

I would mention George E. Whiting and his "Tale of the Viking"; W. W. Gilchrist and his "Forty-sixth Psalm"; Dudley Buck and his "Golden Legend" and "Columbus"; Arthur Foote and his "Hiawatha"; H. W. Parker and his "King Trojan"; G. W. Chadwick and his "The Viking's Last Voyage"; Prof. J. K. Paine and his "The Nativity"—these men are cultivating the cantata. Certain of these compositions were written under such conditions as Mr. Barnard recommends. I do not take issue with Mr. Barnard's idea; I uphold that. We diverge at what constitutes the cantata. A retrograde movement among writers of music in the United States would be deplored on every hand. There is already plenty of music among us, suited to uneducated taste and an unfiltered desire for tune. Composers of this sort of music may not do very much harm; but theirs is not the best music of which Americans are capable. It is to establish this fact and show the general reader that there is already grounded among native writers a style infinitely better, the product of real art, that this letter is ventured.

BOSTON.

George H. Wilson.

* Another correspondent (Mr. R. I. Holcombe) interprets the expression in the letter to Breese, "he should never have profited by his success," to mean merely that he would represent the means employed by Breese to achieve success in such a way to his associates at Washington that his influence would be seriously impaired, if not destroyed. It should be said, however, that our

correspondent does not explain the context.—Mr. W. J. Onahan also writes to us in praise of General Shields, calling especial attention to General Scott's testimony as to his gallantry and efficiency in the field; as well as to some cordial words spoken in his behalf by General Logan.—EDITOR.