

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### Executive Responsibility.

IN this centennial year since the framing of the Federal Constitution—"the most wonderful work," as Gladstone has styled it, "ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man"—nothing could be more timely and fortunate than the occurrence of incidents in the administration of the government which pointedly demonstrate the wisdom of its distribution of powers. The closing weeks of the Fortyninth Congress were fruitful of such illustrations. Throughout its existence this body seemed strangely devoid of any sense of responsibility to the people. The Democrats controlled the popular branch, and their leaders in the House should have been prompt in responding to the wise suggestions of their President, especially in the urgent matter of reforming the tariff, and thus reducing the surplus. Democrats in each branch should have welcomed the opportunity to signalize the restoration of their party to power by a revival of its traditional principles, particularly those which restrict within proper limits the prerogatives of the general government, the undue enlargement of which was becoming a source of danger. The Republicans, as the minority, were not expected to attempt the initiation of any policy, but they were none the less bound because they were out of power to treat upon their merits questions which might arise, and to throw their influence in favor of economy and efficiency.

Each party violated its obligations to its constituents. With only a very few exceptions, the Republicans in the House twice cast their votes against even the consideration of a measure aiming at tariff reform; and, despite the most binding pledge of their party platforms, enough Democrats joined the minority on this point to make it a majority, and thus prevent any legislation to reduce the surplus. This pledge broken, there were found Democrats ready to violate still another by championing extravagant measures as a proper way of getting rid of the surplus. A House committee, of whose fifteen members nine were Democrats, reported a bill which came to be known as "the Pauper Pension Bill," and which, had it become a law, must inevitably have added tens of millions of dollars to the annual expenses of the government for a generation to come. This committee even had the assurance, when its course was challenged, to attempt justification by the demagogic plea that, from the standpoint of "money expediency" alone, "the surplus will be best restored to the people in the manner proposed by this bill," inasmuch as "no bonded interest or huge monopolies can claim it as their own," and "it will go among the people in small amounts and will be spent in their midst." The bill received the support of every Republican in the House and of enough Democrats to give it more than a two-thirds vote, while it passed the Senate without a division.

Meanwhile Congress had committed another piece of folly. A bill appropriating ten thousand dollars of

the money raised by taxation for the support of the general government to buy seeds for some farmers in Texas, who were in want through a long-continued drought, slipped through the House, and was passed by the Senate with its eyes open, eleven out of eighteen Democrats supporting it, although its grossly unconstitutional nature was forcibly pointed out by Mr. Hawley, of Connecticut, a Union soldier and a Republican, who has stoutly defended State rights more than once of late. Both these bills, bad in themselves and even worse as precedents, went to the President. Senators and representatives had thus done their part toward committing the country to one measure which would in all probability add hundreds of thousands of names to the pension roll, and to another which would help to overthrow the constitutional restrictions upon the powers of the Federal government. They had done this, too, without the slightest sense of personal responsibility being manifested by the overwhelming majority of those who had voted for the bills.

In his admirable exposition of the Constitution, which so wonderfully vindicates his prevision, Story points out that "unity in the Executive is favorable to energy, promptitude, and responsibility." After alluding to the bad effect of dividing the power among several persons, Story enforces this feature of superior responsibility in the single Executive. "His responsibility," he says, "is more direct and efficient, as his measures cannot be disguised, or shifted upon others; and any abuse of authority can be more clearly seen, and carefully watched, than when it is shared by numbers." Elsewhere, in vindicating the bestowal upon the President of a qualified negative on legislation through the veto, Story remarks that "the power is important, as an additional security against the enactment of rash, immature, and improper laws."

Story's language could not have fitted the case better if he had foreseen, half a century before, what was to happen in the year 1887. They were "rash, immature, and improper laws" which Congress had tried to enact, passed with scarcely a pretense of discussion in either branch. The responsibility for their passage was so "disguised" that any senator or representative could "shift upon others" his share. But when they went to the single Executive, the situation was immediately revolutionized. Now there was one man whose responsibility was "direct and efficient." The Pauper Pension Bill would become the law of the land, and commit the government permanently to a radical and unjustifiable departure in legislation regarding Union soldiers, unless within ten days after he received it the President should return it to Congress with his objections. The public appreciated the exigency, and the press appealed to the President for a veto. Union soldiers of high character and standing, hostile to the bill, who would have despaired of affecting either the Senate or the House, where abuse of authority was "shared by numbers," wrote to the Executive with assurance that their words would be duly weighed. For days the

attention of the country was fixed upon the incumbent of the White House, and he was made to realize that, if the bill should become a law, the country would hold him alone more responsible than both branches of Congress together.

Primarily, of course, it is to the Constitution, which created a single Executive and invested him with a qualified negative upon legislation, that we owe our escape from the Pauper Pension Bill folly and from the vicious Texas Seed Bill precedent, for without these provisions the measures would inevitably have become laws. But the constitutional possibility of thus defeating the schemes would have been of no avail if the man who enjoyed this power had not employed it. The President of the United States as an official possessed the prerogative of vetoing the bills, but it was Grover Cleveland the man who exercised a veto power which the President of the United States need not have employed, and which many another man in the place would not have employed.

In concluding his discussion of the Executive department, Story declares his conviction that "it will be found impossible to withhold from this part of the Constitution a tribute of profound respect, if not of the liveliest admiration," but he adds that in order to realize public expectation it is essential that the man who occupies the office be "one who shall forget his own interests and remember that he represents, not a party, but the whole nation." If he had consulted his own interests in a narrow personal sense, Mr. Cleveland would have signed the pension bill. It is notorious that self-interest was a potent motive with the average senator and representative who supported it. "The soldier vote" was supposed to be behind the measure, and in all the States north of the Potomac only three congressmen out of both parties in both Houses were recorded against it. As the representative of a party solely, Mr. Cleveland would have signed the bill. Democratic congressmen insisted that a veto would hurt the prospects of the Democracy in Indiana and other close States where it wants to gain votes.

But Mr. Cleveland examined the bill with great care, and became convinced that it was a thoroughly bad measure. He perceived that "the race after the pensions offered by this bill would not only stimulate weakness and pretended incapacity for labor, but put a further premium on dishonesty and mendacity." He believed that "the probable increase of expense would be almost appalling." He held that the measure would "have the effect of disappointing the expectation of the people, and their desire and hope for relief from war taxation in time of peace." He concluded that the interests of the whole nation required him to withhold his approval.

The Texas Seed Bill called for no such display of moral courage as the pension issue, but it offered an opportunity, no less striking, for enforcing a similar lesson, which Mr. Cleveland is to be commended for improving. The pension bill proposed to assist, through the Federal government, those old soldiers in the North "who are willing to be objects of simple charity and to gain a place upon the pension roll through alleged dependence." The seed bill proposed to relieve, through the Federal government, some suffering farmers in a Southern State. It was more than a chance coincidence that the two bills were in the President's

hands at the same time. They represented a long-growing tendency, which was fast coming to pervade both sections of the country, and which needed to be reprobated in a way that would impress both sections. The twin vetoes served this purpose almost ideally. Their force was strengthened by Mr. Cleveland's use in the later message of a most telling phrase, one destined to a long and useful life: "The lesson should be constantly enforced that, *though the people support the government, the government should not support the people.*"

Mr. Cleveland has made some unpardonable errors and committed some grievous faults since he became President, but he has gone far to atone for them by the manly way in which he met the responsibility that a demagogic Congress devolved upon him in these measures of legislation. The great danger which threatened this nation when Congress met for its last session was the drift toward paternalism, the disposition to seek aid from the Federal treasury, the decay of the ancient American spirit of self-reliance. That this danger has already so largely vanished is due chiefly to Mr. Cleveland's wise and courageous use of the veto power in behalf of what he so well calls "the sturdiness of our national character."

#### The Nation's Recent Debt to the South.

THE North fought to save the Union because it believed that it would be better for all the States, South and North alike, that they should continue for all time one nation. The Union was preserved, and for years its members have again stood upon an equality in the government of the country. Southern men who vainly sought by force of arms to establish the right of secession have sat in Congress beside Northern men who shared in overthrowing that claim on the field of battle. They have voted together for generous pensions to soldiers of the Union army, and an ex-officer of the Confederate service now presides over the Executive Department which includes the Pension Bureau, while the present head of that Bureau was an officer on the Union side.

The vote in the House on passing the Pauper Pension Bill over the veto brought into strong relief the advantage which the North already reaps from having the South back in the Union. While the measure was in the President's hands, many old Union soldiers, Republicans as well as Democrats, besought him to disapprove it. "It originated with claim agents and professional pension-seekers," wrote a western Massachusetts veteran, "and is not the cry or plea of the great body of veterans." "I constantly meet with soldiers, privates as well as officers, who repel with deep feeling the assumption that they desire more money in return for the purely patriotic service they gave the country," wrote General J. D. Cox, of Ohio, a Republican ex-governor, in urging Mr. Cleveland not to approve the bill. "I think the President justified in vetoing such a bill as this," said General Joshua L. Chamberlain, of Maine, another Republican ex-governor, "and believe he will be supported by the sentiment of the country." No candid person who watched the expression of public opinion can doubt that the President's course in this matter was approved by the sober

second thought of the North, including the great mass of self-respecting and self-reliant veterans themselves.

The President was not only "supported by the sentiment of the country," as General Chamberlain predicted he would be, but his veto was sustained by Congress. It was, however, only through the votes of "the States lately in rebellion" that the action of Congress was made to conform with the sentiment of the country. This is rendered plain at a glance by the following summary of the vote on passing the bill over the veto:

	Yeas. Nays.	
From the eleven seceding States.....	7	71
From the rest of the country.....	168	54
Total vote.....	175	125

In other words, if the question whether the President's veto should stand had been submitted to the representatives of those States only which adhered to the Union, Mr. Cleveland would have been overruled, more than three to one, and a bill would have become a law which, in the opinion of such a Union soldier as General Chamberlain, "offers an incentive to fraudulent claims, which degrade the deserving, and to too ready a resort to a plea of dependency, demoralizing to manliness." That there were cast on the right side twenty-four more votes than were necessary to sustain the veto was due to the fact that the States which sought to secede from the Union joined in deciding the issue. "The only cry they [the great body of veterans] have now," said the western Massachusetts soldier from whose letter to the President we have quoted, "is that you will spare them the honor of having served their country because they loved her, and not as mere bounty and pension seekers." That honor has been spared the Northern soldiers, but only through the help of Southern representatives, many of whom fought against them a quarter of a century ago.

In a broad and elevated view it may well be doubted whether history has ever recorded a sweeter triumph for the victors in a righteous cause than men like General Cox and General Chamberlain have thus lived to witness. They fought to keep the South in the Union, and they have survived to see the honor of the Northern soldier preserved from the taint which demagogues and claim-agents would have cast upon it through the votes of the Southern men in Congress.

Looking back over the history of the nation, we can now see that the civil war was inescapable. The view of the Constitution in which the South had been educated rendered an attempt at secession inevitable, and as Webster said in his famous 7th of March speech, "peaceable secession is an utter impossibility." Or, as Lincoln put it in his second inaugural: "Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish." That the time would come when the South would rejoice that the war ended as it did, and when the North would find itself indebted to the South for efficient help in securing the good government of the reunited nation, was also inevitable; but it might well have been expected that it would not come till after the generation which fought the war had passed from the stage. Less than a quarter of a century, however, has sufficed. The New South frankly confesses its satisfaction with the issue

of the struggle for secession; the New North has now been brought to realize its indebtedness to the South for indispensable help in maintaining good government. Such champions of the Union cause twenty-five years ago as General Bragg of Wisconsin, Colonel Morrison of Illinois, General Warner of Ohio, and Mr. Curtin, the "War Governor" of Pennsylvania, spoke in defense of the President's veto during the debate in the House, and at its conclusion the veto was sustained, in part through the votes given by men like them from the North, but chiefly through the votes of men who came from the States which once sought to disrupt the Union. Fair-minded Northern men thus see that they owe to the South this arrest of the pension craze and of the alarming drift toward paternalism which the Pauper Pension Bill typified. The confession of this indebtedness is the epitaph upon the grave of sectionalism in American politics.

#### The Problem of Government by Guilds.

AN "Open Letter," on another page, grapples with the problem of municipal reform in a courageous fashion. It is not to be wondered at that thoughtful men, confronting the extravagances and abuses that seem to have entrenched themselves in most of our city governments, and observing that the dispersion of one swarm of the vermin that infest our city-halls and court-houses only makes room for another and hungrier swarm, should be reaching out after some radical reforms in the methods of government. They are not at all mistaken in supposing that the case is becoming critical; they are justified in bestowing upon it patient and anxious thought. The typical citizen is too much inclined to exult over the material gains of a "triumphant democracy," and to ignore the chronic villainy of his city government.

It is a little curious that this New York merchant, pondering the question of municipal government, should have hit upon the same device as that which the great German philosopher, Hermann Lotze, has been proposing. Lotze deplors the haste and passion with which "the antiquated forms of companies, guilds, and corporations" were swept away in the rush of the revolutionary movements that ushered in "the modern era," and declares that they ought to have been transformed, not abolished. The most essential fault of modern society is, he declares, "its low estimation of the corporate element." "Of course," he argues, "we do not want to go back to corporations for the subsistence of which we can find no even plausible reason, in order to accumulate privileges for which there is still less any conceivable rightful claim; but on the one hand, a living bond between those who are really connected would maintain the discipline which we so greatly need, but which yet we cannot enforce by means of general laws; on the other hand, such combinations, representing partly the most important callings (agriculture, manufactures, commerce, art, and science), partly the special local interests of different districts,— would form the true unities, the representatives of which, by equilibration of the interests of each, would cover the wants of the whole."

Can it be true that the mediæval communities held, in these ancient craft-guilds and fraternities, a form of social organization which it was unwise to destroy, and to which we would do well to return? Wise or unwise,

their destruction was inevitable. Not merely for the economical reason that they obstructed the free movement of labor from one occupation to another, but still more for the political reason that they furnished no soil in which the sentiment of nationality could take root, they must have been abolished. The "notion of a citizen of the State," of which Lotze speaks rather slightly, but which is the one great conception of modern times, needed to be planted and nurtured in the minds of men. When the member of the guild found himself the citizen of the State, his horizon was widened, and his thoughts were enlarged. There was reason then, underneath the rashness and passion which Lotze deplures, and by which the guilds were destroyed. Reason there almost always is, even in the blind fury of the populace. Wickliffe denounced the guilds, and Bacon stigmatized them as "fraternities of evil." It was the *Zeit Geist* who said that they must go, and they went. But it is not at all certain that they may not return. Many customs, fashions, social forms have been pushed aside by one age and taken up by another. The organization of government by guilds was obstructive to liberty five hundred years ago, but it might be conservative of liberty to-day. At any rate the proposition is worth considering.

Two of the reasons urged by our correspondent for this reform seem to be cogent. That it would break the connection between municipal government and national politics, and that it would give all classes of the people a voice in the municipal government, seems probable. Both these results are greatly to be desired. The root of most of the evils of city government is in partisan politics and in the mischiefs which either accompany or flow therefrom. It is doubtful whether city politics will ever be permanently divorced from national politics unless some such radical reorganization as is here suggested can be effected; and it is pretty certain that until municipal government can be separated from national politics, the vilest elements of our cities will generally bear rule. Doubtless under the plan proposed, the machine politicians would make strenuous attempts to capture the several guilds; nevertheless the desire of each guild to be represented by its ablest men, and to secure by this means the protection of its own interests, would greatly interfere with the schemes of the office-seekers.

The other result promised — the fair representation of every class of citizens in the city government — is equally desirable, and under such a plan it would probably be secured. The enormous preponderance of some classes in our municipal councils is now notorious; and there are large classes, and these the most intelligent and capable of government, that are now rarely represented in these councils. Any scheme which would bring them into an active participation in the management of municipal affairs deserves to be patiently studied.

It is almost certain that a city council, chosen according to this plan, would be incomparably superior, intellectually and morally, to those which are usually found in our council chambers.

Several practical difficulties suggest themselves. The classification of the voters might not be easily accomplished. In the smaller cities, especially, it would not be possible to give to each separate trade its representatives, for the number of trades and professions is

great, and the number of those practicing some of these trades and professions is small. It would be necessary, therefore, to combine those of several different, though related, vocations into one guild — as, for example, the metal-workers might include blacksmiths, tinsmiths, boiler-makers, etc.; and the guild of instruction the clergy, the teachers, the authors, etc. The arrangement of these classes would be attended with some difficulty; nevertheless, the problem is not hopeless.

The serious question is whether the representatives of these guilds would act unitedly for the public welfare, or whether their devotion to the interests of their several classes would not lead them to sacrifice the interests of society. Would the feeling that Lotze curiously deprecates, the sentiment of loyalty to the state or the municipality, be strong enough to hold in check the class feeling to which the system makes direct appeal? Could these representatives of guilds and classes agree together to promote the general good of the community? The danger would be that those who now give up to party what was meant for mankind would then make the same debasing surrender to the interests of their guild. The misery of that state into which we are now fallen results from the fact that public spirit is overborne by private greed and party passion; would not the same causes continue to operate under every possible form of political organization? In a government by guilds the obvious method by which these evil tendencies could find expression would be the device that is known among the politicians as log-rolling. There might be combinations among guilds, by which some would help others and receive help in return, at the expense of the rest. It is scarcely necessary to say that this kind of abuse is prevalent under existing conditions. Everybody knows the way in which appropriations for internal improvements are secured in Congress and the way in which the tariff is adjusted. Something of the same nature often occurs in municipal governments. There is log-rolling in the interest of wards, as well as of States and sections. The only question is whether this organization of government by guilds would not foster these corrupt and selfish methods. Obviously, the guilds whose numbers would be largest and whose interests are most closely related — the various guilds of wage-laborers — might, by combination, control the government. It is possible that they could do as much now, if they knew their power, and there are signs of such an issue; but the adoption of the scheme which we are considering would offer new facilities for an enterprise of this nature.

Under any form of political organization selfish men will behave selfishly; but there are some political methods that offer larger opportunity and more encouragement than others for the exercise of the virtues of public spirit and patriotism; and the question to be determined is whether the organization by guilds would have this effect. Some of the more obvious objections have been suggested above, rather for the sake of eliciting discussion than with the design of pronouncing against the measure. In fact, the discussion of any branch of this subject cannot fail to do good, as it will call attention to the crying evils that exist. But there is a more immediate and practical reform now "in sight," which we shall discuss in a future number.

## Food.

FEW of those who toil for moderate returns will take exception to Mr. Edward Atkinson's conclusion, that half the cost of living is the price of materials for food; their grocers and butchers have long since convinced them of that. But the reader who prides himself upon sometimes being thoughtful must be able to recall certain discouraging moments in his early housekeeping days, when ignorance of the laws of nutrition and the economy of foods had led him into extravagance and waste; perhaps he is quite aware that ignorance and extravagance and waste followed his purchases home to his kitchen and his table, and there became not only a drain upon his modest purse but a sapper of his health and vitality. Very probably, too, he in time ceased to grow thoughtful over the subject, and continued to walk the path his ignorance trod out. There seemed no other path. Now make our supposed buyer not a reader, and not thoughtful, and only a common laborer, his purse not merely modest, but well nigh empty, and you have come face to face with the portentous problem of the hour.

Some one has, in effect, said that certain forms of religious doctrine bore thorns and bitter fruit, and not rose leaves and sweetness, for the simple reason that their founders' digestive organs were impaired. We

may neither agree nor disagree with this, but if we were to become prophetic, and were to call it a truth of coming generations, that our civilization came to its downfall through the neglect of its wise men to teach its poor how to *live*, we would not be treading entirely upon air. For what can we expect in the future from the sons and daughters of men and women who starve while we in ignorance lay waste the fruits of the earth? We are glad to know of the site of ancient Troy and the presence of sodium in the stars, but to make plenty where want now cries for bread, to teach the poor to live well on the half of what they now starve upon, to shame anarchy with universal sweet bread and strength-giving foods,—we might with advantage barter many of our boasted wonders for this.

No one has gone so far upon this road as Professor Atwater, of the Wesleyan University, Middletown, whose series on "The Chemistry of Foods and Nutrition" is begun in this number. He has studied food and nutrition as no other student in this country has studied it. He has had one of the rewards of patient endeavor, inasmuch as his success is beyond all question. What he has found no one can afford to ignore. His discoveries are like the discovery of a new food-producing earth, since he can teach us to double the value of this.

## OPEN LETTERS.

## City Government by Guilds.

WHAT is the cause of the failure of municipal government in our larger cities? It is useless to disguise the fact that it has failed. In most of the cities government is becoming corrupt, inefficient, burdensome to an intolerable degree. It cannot be that the majority of the people wish to have it so. Doubtless the root of the evil is the indifference and neglect of the honest citizens; yet the question arises whether the present forms of municipal organization do not discourage and prevent the active participation of the best citizens, and whether other methods might not secure this desirable result.

Our present methods of nomination for office were devised when we were a rural people, and they still answer very well for that portion of our population. But we are rapidly changing the character of our social life, and concentrating our population in commercial and industrial centers; and these social changes make a change in our political methods indispensable.

If the political unit of a democratic government must always be a geographical one, and if we must always vote by wards or districts for municipal officers, then the voters are almost certain to range themselves according to party lines, and national politics will complicate and disturb municipal elections.

Is there not a better way? Would it not be possible to group the people of New York by occupations, and allow them then, by guilds, to elect their representatives to the city council? Some of our citizens have now their trades-unions. Might not the whole city be organized into trades-unions, to each of which representation

in the city government should be allowed in proportion to its membership?

The census enumerates the males of lawful age according to their vocation. These might be grouped into one hundred guilds, more or less, and each allowed one or two or three representatives in a city council, which council should elect a mayor with full power to appoint and remove heads of departments. This council should also make appropriations and frame city ordinances. There should be a guild hall, where all elections should be held. Each guild should have allotted to it one or two days in the year for its meetings and one day for its election. If the membership were so large as to cause delay at a single ballot-box, the list of members might be divided alphabetically,—A to G; —H to N, etc.,—and thus several ballot-boxes might be brought into use. The records of each guild could be kept at the guild hall. Each guild should control its own membership and canvass its own elections.

It seems to me that such a method of electing a city government would shut out partisanship, and give to the very lowest classes an opportunity not now enjoyed to exercise their right of suffrage intelligently. Can we expect a man who cannot read to judge wisely of the qualifications of the candidates nominated for the office of mayor? He does know his fellows, and of his companions he can select the best. Have we not expected too much of our humble voters? Could not a man see one step ahead of him who could not see from the bottom to the top of the political ladder?

This method of voting would emancipate the lower classes from the domination of professional politicians.

The longshoremen would no longer be mere retainers of some shyster lawyer or rum-seller, but would have the privilege and the duty of selecting one or more of their own class to represent their craft and its interests. The entire guild would watch the official course and conduct of its representatives and hold them to account. But what, in the meantime, has become of their quondam leader, the lawyer? He has retired to his own guild and dropped to the bottom, helpless and harmless. The rum-seller, too, in his own guild would have a voice in the selection of one of its members to represent its interests; but never more could that fraternity alone have the whole city council under its control.

A man's associates, whether he is professional man, merchant, or artisan, are more likely to know what his qualifications are than are his neighbors, residing in the same ward. The voter in the city knows very few of his neighbors. Geographical divisions are, therefore, purely artificial; it would be better to sweep them away, and substitute for them the existing lines of social organization. In a word, let us take men as we find them, already harnessed in business or occupation, and require them thus grouped to perform their political duties, instead of calling on them once a year on election day to break ranks, scatter, and vote as a mob.

*John D. Cutter.*

NEW YORK, Feb. 5th, 1887.

#### Toynbee Hall, London.

##### AN INTERESTING SOCIAL EXPERIMENT.

ONE of the most interesting features of London of to-day is the work of the "West End" among the poor of the "East End," and chiefly in this the University settlement housed at Toynbee Hall, Commercial Road, Whitechapel, next to that center of working religion, St. Jude's Church. The Rev. Samuel A. Barnett, rector of St. Jude's, whose name is known to all students of charity organization, is also senior warden of Toynbee Hall, and his assistant, the Rev. T. C. Gardiner, is sub-warden. With them are fifteen or twenty men, most of them graduates of Oxford or Cambridge, some of them busy in the city, others men of leisure and wealth,—all of them giving more or less of their time to the work of making the lives of the East End poor more wholesome and beautiful than they could be without such help.

The hall is named after Arnold Toynbee, one of the scholars of Balliol College, Oxford, who had interested himself deeply in social questions, and through whose efforts in great part the Coöperative Congress was invited to Oxford in 1881. He was a reader in political economy in his college and its bursar or business man, so that he had both a theoretical and practical knowledge of economics, and his interest in the subject was therefore two-sided. When Henry George's lectures attracted so much attention in England, Toynbee thought that some features or results of them should be counteracted, and he therefore arranged to give two lectures at St. Andrew's Hall, London, in which he discussed the betterment of the condition of the working classes from his point of view. The audience, I was told, was a curiously mixed one, containing a good many from the social stratum to which Toynbee belonged, as well as the

workingmen hearers whom he particularly invited; and among the latter there was a decided undercurrent of criticism and not a little interpellation of the speaker. In the course of the lectures he had confessed that his own class was largely responsible for the discontent among the working classes, and he said frankly that the evil would not come to an end until "we" were willing to live for and if necessary to die for "you." He was frail; the lectures had excited him greatly; and at the close of the last he fell back in his chair fainting. He was taken to the house of friends in the country, and there died. His sudden end threw a halo of pathos upon his lectures and his work, and when the University men decided to start this colony in London the buildings became a memorial to him. His family is well known in London for its devotion to philanthropic work, and several of his brothers and sisters are still active in the work to which he gave his life.

Toynbee Hall had its actual origin in Oxford. In the spring of 1884, a few months after Toynbee's death, Mr. Barnett read a paper at a small meeting in St. John's College, in which he shadowed forth his idea of what a colony of University men might do for industrial centers such as East London. The paper, though read to a small knot of men, was published and soon won its way, and a small group of University men made an experiment in associated life at a disused public-house, under Mr. Barnett's guidance and help, when the success of the experiment justified a permanent home. The friends of Arnold Toynbee, who had been anxious to erect some memorial of his work and enthusiastic self-devotion, provided most of the funds for a lecture-hall, and the cost of the rest of the buildings was defrayed by a company formed for this purpose, which raised about £10,000 on the security of the freehold land, bearing interest at 4½ per cent. Toynbee Hall, while a memorial to Arnold Toynbee, is also a monument to Samuel A. Barnett, whose ideas it embodies.

One enters from the Commercial Road through the ordinary English gateway into a sort of quadrangle, on one side of which is the residence part of Toynbee Hall, and on the other a lecture-hall which is filled nearly every evening for some purpose or other with East End people. This latter building is also used as a general headquarters for organized charity in the district, including, for instance, the office of the Beaumont Trust, from which the People's Palace, prophesied in Kingsley's "Alton Locke," and made almost real in Walter Besant's "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," is now rising into solid fact. The East London Antiquarian Society, the Adam Smith Club, the Toynbee Natural History Society, the Education Reform League, the Pupil Teachers' Debating Society, the Toynbee Shakespeare Club, the Students' Union, and still other organizations, hold their meetings in Toynbee Hall or in St. Jude's school next door. The hall is as beautiful a club-house as one would wish at the West End itself, and certainly no more charming host could be found through Belgravia and Mayfair than the junior warden. Each man has his room or suite of rooms, as he would have at college, and the charming drawing-room, with comfortable and cozy furniture and beautiful adornments, forms a general gathering-place for the club-men and their guests. We had "afternoon tea" there, in strange contrast with the surroundings of poverty and squalor in the

streets about, and here Mr. Gardiner told us something of the practical work of the colony and its difficulties.

Four evenings of the week are devoted, in the lecture-room opposite, to courses of lectures respectively on history, physiology, astronomy, and English Literature, the fee being one shilling for each complete course. Another evening there is a concert, and always on Saturday evening a "popular" lecture. The sixth evening of the week is given to a social reception in the drawing-room of the club-house, where the men of Toynbee Hall are assisted by friends from the West End in receiving and entertaining the poor people of the neighborhood. The difficulties of mingling classes are, after all, much the same in England as at home. There is a good deal of human nature everywhere. I asked Mr. Gardiner what kind of people proved the best entertainers. He replied that those who were popular at the West End were popular at the East, and there was, indeed, great difficulty in getting the right sort of people, because they were so much in demand in their own class of "society." Some practiced "entertainers," as they call them, could interest easily eight or ten of the poorer people, whereas others could take care of only one or two. The chief difficulty to overcome was the narrow sphere in which the poorer people did their thinking and their talking, and the whole purpose of these receptions, and of much of the other work, was to broaden the mental horizon of these people, and give them more and pleasanter things to think and talk about outside of the narrow circle of their tenement-house or neighborhood gossip. These men were hoping to accomplish much through the "national teachers,"—young men and women selected from the ranks of trades-people and the like, without much culture themselves, but who could be made the means of spreading the wider life among their pupils when they came to teach. To this end they organized reading-parties, as was the fashion at the universities, for those who showed special interest in the weekly lectures, and one or two of their best outdoor men were charged with forming cricket and tennis clubs and other outdoor circles, to broaden the life of their *protégés* in those directions.

The classes and reading-parties are organized into groups, each under the management of an Honorary (unpaid) Secretary. One group comprises one class studying the Old Testament, another studying moral philosophy, a course of Sunday afternoon lectures on the Ethics of the Ancient and Modern World, three classes in Victorian literature (one entirely of women), one in English history, two in political economy. A second group includes reading-parties on Mazzini, Ruskin, and literature, to each of which admission is by election, and classes in French, German, and Latin. Another group covers the physical sciences and includes an ambulance class. A fourth comprises singing-classes, instruction and entertainment for deaf and dumb, drawing-classes, elementary evening classes for boys, lantern illustrations in geography for boys, musical drill for boys, and several classes in shorthand. A fifth provides instruction and practice in carpentering, in wood-carving and in modeling, both for boys and men.

The work of Toynbee Hall is in the right direction, and, moreover, it is justified not only by its results but

by the enjoyment which men have in the doing of it. "I could not give up this East End work," said one of them to me; "I could not live my life in content away from the people I have learned to know and love here."

R. R. Bowker.

#### Notes.

##### LINCOLN AND EMERSON.

BEFORE our editorial in the April CENTURY on "Lincoln and Lowell" was published, Mr. Lowell had added another to his sayings concerning the martyr President, in his speech at Chicago on the evening of Washington's Birthday, in which he referred to Lincoln as, "on the whole, the most remarkable statesman of all times."

In this connection it should be noted that while Emerson did not write in verse of Lincoln, yet in prose he divides with Lowell the honor of early appreciation and fortunate characterization. In "Miscellanies" will be found an essay entitled "American Civilization," which, according to a note by Mr. Cabot, is "part of a lecture delivered at Washington, January 31st, 1862, it is said, in the presence of President Lincoln and some of his Cabinet, some months before the issuing of the Emancipation Proclamation." Mr. Lincoln may have been present, but his secretaries have no memorandum showing the fact, and the Washington papers of the next day throw no light on the subject: in fact, Mr. Emerson's son now believes that Lincoln was probably not present. The lecturer praised the "angelic virtue" of the Administration, but urged emancipation; and at the close of this essay, as printed, is a supplement commending the President for his proposal "to Congress that the Government shall cooperate with any State that shall enact a gradual abolition of slavery." Next comes his address on the Emancipation Proclamation, in which the President is greatly praised for his moderation, fairness of mind, reticence, and firmness. "All these," Emerson says, "have bespoken such favor to the act, that, great as the popularity of the President has been, we are beginning to think that we have underestimated the capacity and virtue which the Divine Providence has made an instrument of benefit so vast. He has been permitted to do more for America than any other American man," etc. After this, in the same volume, comes Emerson's brief but memorable essay on the death of Lincoln, in which he says: "He is the true history of the American people in his time. Step by step he walked before them; slow with their slowness, quickening his march by theirs, the true representative of this continent; an entirely public man; father of his country, the pulse of twenty millions throbbing in his heart, the thought of their minds articulated by his tongue."

Again, in the essay on "Eloquence" ("Essays and Social Aims"), Emerson praises the Gettysburg speech, and in the essay on "Greatness" in the same volume he gives Lincoln as an example of the "great style of hero" who "draws equally all classes": "His heart was as great as the world, but there was no room in it to hold the memory of a wrong."

SINCE the publication of the reference to the death of Black Hawk given in the "Life of Lincoln," in the December CENTURY, the authors have learned that Black Hawk was not buried on the bank of the Mississippi, as certain authorities have stated, but on the Des Moines river, and without unusual honors.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### Lord Wolseley's Estimate of General Lee.

PROMPTED by the appearance of General Long's "Memoirs of Robert E. Lee," Lord Wolseley has followed in the trail of the expert reviewers who allude to a new book as an excuse for enlarging the subject with the fruits of their own study and observation. His critique is printed in "Macmillan's Magazine" for March, and is worthy of general perusal for two reasons: It affords a view (from the English standpoint) of the war of secession and the best-known Southern chieftain; and although it has little to say that is important or true with regard to General Lee, it sheds a flood of light on the military learning and mental strategy of the most conspicuous general in the British army.

No people are better acquainted with Lee's merits as a soldier than the Army of the Potomac. They admire also those traits of character which endeared him to his fellow-Confederates. So if Northerners cannot assist Lord Wolseley in placing him "on an equal pedestal with that of Washington," it is from no contempt of his abilities. The chief reason is the fact that Washington labored to create a Union of States and that Lee, with sorrow, but with greater love for a particular State, labored to divide the Union. But now that the Union he would yet have been glad to see preserved, is preserved, General Lee is for the whole country an American hero.\*

In 1862 Lord Wolseley was a visitor at General Lee's headquarters, where he undoubtedly had opportunities of taking a studious interest in Confederate persons and affairs. He assures us frequently in the course of his paper that he has been a student of our war, and the following sentiment, alone, would point to such study as a duty for a man in his responsible position, since he says that "the influence which the result of this Confederate war is bound to exercise upon man's future history will seem very great."

Lord Wolseley's enthusiasm for Lee springs from personal knowledge, for he says that Lee "is stamped upon my memory as a being apart and superior to all others, in every way." But it is fortunate for Lee's fame that the admiration of his countrymen, North and South, rests upon solid facts, and not, as in Lord Wolseley's case, upon misconception of his character and ignorance of the leading events of his career. It is remarkable also that with all his admiration Lord Wolseley has not allowed his opinions to be influenced by those of his hero, even where Lee might be supposed to be an authority; nor consulted Lee's orders and reports for clues to his motives in strategy and battle. He would seem also to have imitated the traditional reviewer who found it bad method to read a book before criticising it, for certainly he has not leaned heavily on General Long for information.

\* In his recent speech at Nashville, Senator John Sherman, referring to the losses and sacrifices of the war, said in part: "The courage, bravery, and fortitude of both sides are now the pride and heritage of us all. Think not that I come here to reproach any man for the part he took in that fight, or to revive in

For convenience let us catalogue some of the points in which Lord Wolseley differs from General Lee and other esteemed authorities:

1. At the outset he says that any "unprejudiced outsider will admit the sovereign right, both historical and legal, which each State possessed under the Constitution to leave the Union when its people thought fit to do so." But General Lee thought differently. In a letter to his son dated January 23d, 1861 (see General Long's "Memoirs," page 88), General Lee says:

"Secession is nothing but revolution. The framers of our Constitution never exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forbearance in its formation, and surrounded it with so many guards and securities, if it was intended to be broken by every member of the Confederacy at will. It is intended for 'perpetual union,' so expressed in the preamble, and for the establishment of a government, not a compact, which can only be dissolved by revolution or the consent of all the people in convention assembled. It is idle to talk of secession."

2. "As I study the history of the secession war," says Lord Wolseley, presumably with a wink at the Muse of History, "these [Lee and Lincoln] seem to me the two men who influenced it most."

Whatever parallel might be drawn between the native integrity and manliness of Lincoln and of Lee, it has been accepted hitherto that Lincoln was the chief executive on one side, and that Lee, shrinking from the responsibilities of civil war, "save," as he writes, "in the defense of my native State," devoted his energies to the command of the Army of Northern Virginia, while other Southerners of great abilities wielded the executive power, and other Southern generals, whose services Lee was great enough to admire, worked faithfully under the executive power, like Lee himself, for the common cause. The early victories that nerved the Southern heart for great sacrifices were won by other men. Lee's first service in the field, in West Virginia, though wisely conservative in view of the difficulties, was a public disappointment. Later he fell heir to Johnston's good beginnings at Seven Pines, in which action the latter was severely wounded. Though almost a fruitless battle, it checked McClellan's aggressive policy, so that Lee had to do at the outset with an enemy whose ardor had subsided; who, in fact, was more concerned about his own safety and "a change of base" than about the capture of Richmond. Lee's daring campaign in the Seven Days' fighting was no compliment to General McClellan, though Lord Wolseley remembers that Lee expressed greater admiration for McClellan than for any other Union general. From this time on Lee was, without question, the chief prop to the military confidence of the South; but he was responsible only for the leadership of the Army of Northern Virginia, until—and now comes a fact for which Lord Wolseley should have the credit of accuracy—

the heart of any one the triumph of victory or the pangs of defeat. . . . No man in the North questions the honesty of purpose or the heroism with which the Confederates maintained their cause, and you will give credit for like courage and honorable motives to Union soldiers, North and South."



he "was given the command over all the Confederate armies a month or two only before the final collapse."

3. Lord Wolseley with superfluous inaccuracy strips Mount Vernon of its historical associations and moves them up the Potomac to General Lee's home of Arlington, which he describes as "General Washington's beautiful property" and as "the cherished home of the father of the United States."

4. With calm fatuity he mentions a Confederate "folly" which "led to a serious evil, namely, the enlistment of soldiers for only ninety days"; and he adds that "Lee, who understood war, pleaded in favor of the engagement being for the term of the war, but he pleaded in vain." It is true that Lincoln issued a call for 75,000 three-months men, but at that time Virginia was disregarding the "call of Abraham"; nor is there any record that Lee made an opportunity to plead with Lincoln on the subject. Lee was soon after busy with the organization of the forces of the State of Virginia, that were required to enlist for twelve months or for the war. Most of them favored the longer term because public as well as military opinion favored it, and public opinion at the South was inexorable. Anybody who entered the Southern army was in effect enlisted for as long as he could get about and shoot.

5. Lord Wolseley recalls that in describing to him the constitution of his army General Lee most deplored the fact that the politicians insisted upon the officers being elected by their men. In this his lordship would appear still to have one leg on the Federal side of the line, for such things were done at the North. In Virginia, as General Lee's orders show, all field-officers were appointed, "in conformity to the ordinance of the convention," by the "Governor and Council." In fact, after the demand for field-officers had been met, there were no professional soldiers left in Virginia to fill the captaincies, even if it had been desired to do so by appointment.

6. He states that Lee in two months "created a little army of 50,000 men," though Lee's report to Governor Letcher of June 15th — seven days after the State troops had been transferred to the Confederate authorities — estimates the Virginia forces at, surely, 35,000, and possibly 40,000. This error would be trivial but for the aberration to which it leads, for with this army of 50,000 in his mind, Lord Wolseley adds that "in another month this army at Bull Run gained a complete victory over the Northern invaders, who were driven back across the Potomac like herds of frightened sheep." The Union soldiers who were there remember the precipitation. But Confederates will wonder whether his lordship, in omitting to state that Johnston and Beauregard led the Confederates to that victory, intended to imply that the credit belonged to General Lee. Lord Wolseley will surely pardon a little doubt as to the meaning of his omissions when the fog of uncertainty so completely shrouds his explicit information.

Nor was it the army that Lee had created which fought the battle of Bull Run. The State troops were scattered at points between Norfolk and West Virginia, and were blended with forces from other Southern States. Of the 50 regiments in the armies of Johnston and Beauregard, only 20 were Virginians.

7. Lord Wolseley offers a novel reason for the fail-

ure to follow up the Bull Run victory by seizing Washington. He ascribes it to "political considerations at Richmond," where the politicians, as he conceives, were engaged in an "attempt to allay the angry feelings of the North," while the dogs of war were being held in. Lord Wolseley evidently has not read the writings of Johnston, Beauregard, and Davis on this subject, or he would know that the political power in Richmond ascribed the failure to the dilatoriness of the generals, while they, on their part, claimed that there was a lack of resources for such an enterprise.

8. In some places Lord Wolseley's aim is more wild than in others, but he sweeps the whole horizon in the remark that "a battle to the Confederates meant a new supply of everything an army required. It may be truthfully said that, practically, the Government at Washington had to provide and pay for the arms and equipment of its enemies." To be sure, there was considerable exchange of the materials of war, and in the East, Lee's army got rather more than its share; but in the West the Confederates had to make the Eastern reckoning more than good. The Federals were wasteful of clothing, and the Confederates were economical by dint of bitter want that drove them even to the dead. Union soldiers did not covet the threadbare raiment of the Confederates, or find much use for their equipments, unless the surrendered muskets and cannon had been made by Federal means or, as often happened, were of the newest English brand.

9. "What most strikes the regular soldier," continues his lordship, "in these campaigns of General Lee is the inefficient manner in which both he and his opponents were often served by their subordinate commanders." If General Wolseley might have had another conversation with General Lee, after the war, that magnanimous chieftain would have told him something about Stonewall Jackson, Longstreet, D. H. Hill, Ewell, A. P. Hill, "Jeb" Stuart, and scores of other able subordinates who were maimed or killed in the performance of brilliant deeds. Only one opinion, we believe, prevails either North or South with respect to Lee's army: It was a splendid body of fighters, surprisingly well officered.

10. Lord Wolseley has cultivated the belief that Lee's strategy and tactics were always "everything that could be desired, up to the moment of victory, but there his action seemed to stop abruptly." True, the Confederates were not Titans. They seemed never to be wound up for more than a week or more of hard marching on scant rations, followed by two or three days of continuous battle, usually against superior numbers, which left them at the end without fresh reserves. After a terrible and exhausting victory a longing for rest seemed to overcome them. General Lee could not furnish physical strength to his men from his own sinews, but he did know how to fight them to a shadow and then how to keep them going on something that from the other side of the line looked like very thin hope. Once, as Lord Wolseley recollects, but with vagueness as to its events, there were seven days of continuous fighting near Richmond. Lee with sublime daring dashed his columns time and again upon McClellan's superior but separated forces. His losses were frightful, but the bravery and energy displayed by his troops were tremendous, and possibly might have proved fatal to his cause if McClellan had assumed the aggressive after Malvern

Hill instead of retiring six miles to a secure position at Harrison's Landing.

11. Yet Lord Wolseley exclaims: "*Was ever an army so hopelessly at the mercy of another as that of McClellan when he began his retreat to Harrison's Landing after the Seven Days' fighting round Richmond?*" For succinct ignorance, there is something unexampled in this statement. Malvern Hill was a staggering repulse to Lee's exhausted infantry, who were not able to confront McClellan at Harrison's Landing until the third day after that battle. And even then Lee withdrew, as he says, on account of "the condition of our troops." McClellan was well-nigh impregnable at Harrison's Landing. If Lee had been able to get at him there, the military situation would have improved, for the Confederates could not long stand such destructive fighting as "the Seven Days'." But Lee preferred to leave McClellan in his camp security resting at the outer gate of Richmond, while he started in the opposite direction to bowl over Pope and startle Washington.

12. Equally remarkable for visionary confidence is Lord Wolseley's next question, "*What commander could wish to have his foe in a 'tighter place' than Burnside was in after his disastrous attack upon Lee at Fredericksburg?*" Lee has explained in his reports, in effect, that he was so much pleased with the tight boot Burnside was wearing, so long as Burnside was the aggressor, that he had no thought of exchanging foot-gear with his enemy, as he surely would have done if he had attacked Burnside within range of the Union cannon on Stafford Heights, across the river. So secure was Burnside at the town that when it was proposed, on deciding to recross the river, to keep hands on Fredericksburg the council of officers believed that 10,000 men was a sufficient force for the purpose.

With less particularity but more discretion, Lord Wolseley concludes the subject with the remark, "*Yet in both instances the Northern commander got safely away, and other similar instances could be mentioned.*"

13. "*The critical military student of this war,*" says his lordship, with a fine compliment to himself, "*will, I think, agree that from first to last the coöperation of even one army corps of regular troops would have given complete victory to whichever side it fought on.*" There is something in this suggestive of Gilbert and Sullivan's "modern major-general." Inasmuch as this was an American war, it had to be fought in the American way. As neither side had a standing army of any importance, each side must create an army out of nearly raw material. But there are those who remember that American "raw material" once battled with "regular" troops, during the scrimmage of 1776, and again at New Orleans in 1815, and that the "regulars" did not then complain of the inferiority of their foes. McClellan's army had a splendid division of regulars, well officered, that did good service, but their deeds do not shine brighter than those of the volunteers on either side. It was not the need of "regular" troops which prolonged the war, but the equality of grit, and daring, and skill, and devotion to ideas. Lord Wolseley cannot "*blind himself to the hyperbole of writers who refer to these armies as the finest that have ever existed.*" It is true that they were not handled in the "regular" European fashion; for the rough, wooded country over which they fought would not permit; but will he deny that the two armies which

grappled for the death-struggle from the Wilderness to Appomattox were sufficiently "regular" as regards discipline, experience, and valor?

14. With Lord Wolseley's historical method, an anecdote or two is sufficient data for such a statement as this: "*The usual proportion throughout the war between the contending sides in each action ranged from about twice to three times more Federals than there were Confederates engaged.*" His lordship would appear to be unaware that there were Western battles in which almost equal numbers fought terrible battles with surprisingly equal losses. But to confine our examination, with him, to the Eastern armies, the records tell us that, save at Antietam, Lee always had on the field of battle within a fourth or a third as many men as his opponent, and that when he was the aggressor he was clever enough as a soldier to strike his blow with forces superior to the wing or detachment smitten; as witness Gaines's Mill and the blow on the Eleventh Corps at Chancellorsville. When Grant began his Wilderness "campaign of attrition," the Army of the Potomac was for once twice as large as the Army of Northern Virginia, and, considering the relative advantages of assault and defense and the steel-like temper of the Confederates, Grant's army was none too large for the job. But his lordship condenses his opinion of those veteran armies in this complaisant simile: "*A trial heat between two jockeys mounted on untrained horses may be interesting, but no one would ever quote the performance as an instance of great racing speed.*"

15. In repeating Lincoln's playful reply to the man who wanted the President's opinion of the number of Confederates in the field, which Lord Wolseley does "*with reference to the relative numbers employed on both sides,*" the drift of Lincoln's humor would have been more apparent if his lordship had stated a fact which has interested students of the "Seven Days' fighting." The day before the battle of Gaines's Mill Lincoln telegraphed to McClellan acknowledgment of three dispatches received the day before, and added, "The later one of 6.15 P. M. suggesting the probability of your being overwhelmed by 200,000, and talking of where the responsibility will belong, pains me very much." But McClellan on July 11th, when safely encamped at Harrison's Landing, returned to the subject with this: "Prisoners all state that I had 200,000 men to fight. A good deal more than two to one, and they knowing the ground." Lincoln did not need the after-testimony of the Confederate records to convince him that this was nonsense; and he must have been aiming at that unique incident when he waggishly said, "*Whenever one of our generals engages a rebel army he reports that he has encountered a force twice his strength. Now I know we have half a million of soldiers in the field, so I am bound to believe the rebels have twice that number.*"

16. But the most surprising of Lord Wolseley's conclusions on the Confederate war pertains to Lee's "faults," such as his "*softness of heart,*" his "*devotion to duty and great respect for obedience,*" [which] seem at times to have made him too subservient to those charged with the civil government of his country"; also his appearing "*to have forgotten that he was the great Revolutionary chief engaged in a great Revolutionary war*" when "*the South could only*

*hope to win under the rule of a Military Dictator.*" In other words, his lordship is disappointed that General Lee, after obeying the commands of his native State to fight for a new constitution and government, did not prove a traitor to the trust reposed in him. After this confession of the character Lord Wolsley would have preferred to find when he visited General Lee, if his lordship's shade (when there is no longer waging or studying of war) should seek to renew the acquaintance with the calm spirit that bowed its head, in honor, at Appomattox, it is to be feared the insulted chieftain would exclaim: "Insatiate Englishman, will not one Benedict Arnold suffice?"

17. Lord Wolsley has as little sympathy with General Lee's real virtues as with his illusory "faults." Apparently he is far away from any possible comprehension of a great leader raised up to command wisely and unselfishly an army of democratic freemen. Nor can he appreciate how General Lee would feel, to know that the most famous English general of the time has written about him as though there were only one side to the civil war, and that the Confederate; and only one soldier on that side, and he Robert E. Lee.

#### Landscape-Gardeners Needed for America.

THE architectural profession, we are told, is already crowded, and bids fair soon to be so overcrowded that even creative ability will find it hard to make a path for itself, and executive intelligence will be a drug in the market. Demand strictly limits supply in this art at least; whenever it comes to pass that there are not enough architectural commissions to "go round," some aspirants will be compelled to turn to other tasks. But, fortunately, the demand for the services of a sister-profession seems to be fast outgrowing existent sources of supply. Our landscape architects are very few, and we are yearly awakening to a clearer recognition of our need for them.

As yet we do not recognize it half clearly or half generally enough. But it is only a few years since the case was even worse with the architects themselves,—in their true estate as differentiated from the "builder." And ideas develop rapidly in America—wants and wishes define and extend themselves with marvelous celerity when once a first faint prompting has been felt. Therefore that young American will be wise in his generation who takes note of current signs and now begins to fit himself to answer the imperious call that will soon be made upon the art of the landscape-architect,—or, to use the older, equally dignified, and exacter term, the *landscape-gardener*.

It is interesting to remember that—far as it lags behind to-day in the number of its professors and in the degree of public interest which attends it—this art showed earlier promise of vitality in America than architecture. Downing wrote excellently of landscape almost forty years ago, when certainly no American had written well of brick and stone; did admirable landscape work when our building was at its very worst; and published helpful illustrations of schemes of planting side by side with the most helpless and hideous designs for cottages and villas. The Central Park, which was planned in the 'fifties, when Richardson was still at college, may be called—considering the difficulties of the site, and allowing for the incom-

plete way in which first intentions have been carried out—almost as great a work of art as any Richardson created. But the public, now so quick to recognize success in the one art, did not then, and does not now, really appreciate success in the other. As a consequence, a hundred aspirants are ready and eager to tread in Mr. Richardson's footsteps, while the path which the success of Messrs. Olmsted and Vaux ought to have made tempting remains almost untrodden by younger feet. If we name these artists, Mr. Parsons, and but one or two others, we name all who are known by repute, it appears, even to those architects who are seeking help,—certainly all who stand visibly before the public as professed landscape-gardeners, anxious to work, as the landscape-gardener always should work, hand in hand with the architect.

Yet how vast is our need for the ministrations of such men. How immense is the number and how various the nature of the tasks which should no more be intrusted to the gardener-artisan than should the construction of public buildings and beautiful homes to the carpenter or mason. A whole huge continent has been so touched by human hands that over a large part of its surface it has been reduced to a state of unkempt, sordid ugliness; and it can be brought back into a state of beauty only by further touches of the same hands, more intelligently applied. Public parks are yearly being laid out in our larger towns. Our customary schemes of village building call imperatively for the landscape-artist's help. And there is an ever-growing demand for country homes of a more sumptuous sort, where the best of architects can but imperfectly do his work if he must do it quite alone. Look at the *châteaux* of France, for instance; at the older country homes of England; at the villas and palaces of Italy, and we see how intimate a union of the two arts produced their magnificent charm. We find it hard to decide where the work of the architect ended, the work of the gardener began. But we find it easy enough to imagine how infinitely less would be the impressiveness of the architect's work had not the gardener's been as good,—had he not set off and emphasized constructed beauty by making nature beautiful about it, and helped to connect and unify the two by an intermediate arrangement of terraces, fountains, balustrades, and more or less formal plantings.

Let it not be supposed that because the landscape-architect works with and in deference to nature, he can trust the light of nature to teach him how to work. The training he needs is as long and as serious as that needed by the architect, and even more varied in its character. He must begin—since his work so emphatically demands *good taste*—by cultivating himself in every possible way, and especially by cultivating his powers of observation and that feeling for natural beauty which comes by effort quite as often as by birth. He must study botany,—must acquaint himself not only with the aspect but with the habits and needs and idiosyncrasies of all sorts of plants, and in particular of all sorts of trees and shrubs. He must know of soils and drains and exposures and fertilizers, and all such matters, as the practical agriculturist knows of them. He must study architecture in a general but not a superficial way. He must travel widely,—in his own land to see how nature works towards beauty, and in older lands to see how men have worked

with her materials and with architectural materials towards the same great end. He must go through a term of pupilage in a busy office like Mr. Olmsted's to learn how the new problems of our own day may be met, how complicated are the considerations which affect any large problem, and how fully it must be worked out on paper before a spade is lifted. He must cultivate patience and imaginative power,—for his works will grow very slowly to completeness, and their final estate will be scarcely foreshadowed in their first. And he must cultivate tact,—the art of dealing with men,—even more diligently, perhaps, than the intending architect must; for he will have to

meet and often "manage" not only the client and the artisan, but the architect himself.

All this is slow work and costly work. But most of it will be found pleasant work, provided *pleasant* is not thought a synonym for *easy*. And once well accomplished it will open a delightful life, an ample outlet for the broadest and deepest artistic endowment, and, we believe, a surely prosperous career. The day is very certainly at hand when the gardener-artisan must and will be relegated to his proper place,—beside the builder; and wise, we repeat, will be the youth who will then have fitted himself to stand in this artisan's former place,—beside the architectural artist.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Church Union.\*

FROM A UNITARIAN POINT OF VIEW.

THE simple truth seems to be that Christian Unity exists in America now, for any one who wants it. Those people have it who were born, out-of-doors, in the open-air freedom of the Christian church, and those also who, having been born in one or another Egypt or closed tabernacle, have had the courage to go out into the freedom of the world of God.

This would never be doubted, but that, as I dare say you have seen, people not used to the freedom of the open air are at first a little puzzled by it. It is somewhat as, on your summer "outing," you have seen people who have been so much shut up in the winter that they do not at first enjoy the strong light of the sea-shore or the open pastures. But, indeed, they soon learn. Most people really want Christian Unity. I observe that most of your correspondents do. But some people are hand-tied, and, may be, tongue-tied, by some old shred of what is called a symbol, written in a dead language and in another time, which they are expected by somebody to subscribe in good faith. So you may see a boy on the sea-shore who wants to go into the ocean, but does not, because he is afraid to wet his clothes.

But when there is any real Christian work to do these people almost always strip off enough rags to be able to plunge into God's own infinite sea, and help the others who are doing it. At first, very likely, some stickler, or Pharisee, insists on a formula to say who may come and help and who may not. The word "Pharisee" means sectarian or lover of division. But once past this reef at the harbor's mouth, when they are all out on the infinite ocean, the initial difficulty is all forgotten. I belong to a society which had to meet many times before it could adjust the delicate balance of its formula. It discussed, even to a syllable, the language of its constitution. Finally, all were happily agreed, and it went to work. It has now been at work for nearly a generation. New members have joined it, eagerly, without so much as asking what was the language of its constitution. If they did ask, they would

not learn. For I have put away my copy so carefully that I do not know where it is, and the secretary's was burned in the Boston Fire; but fortunately he does not know that. There are no other copies. The society itself, all the same, does good work for God and for man, every day. It is judged by its fruits, as everything else is judged and must be judged, in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. And yet no man can tell in words what are the conditions of membership.

Any one who wants Christian Unity in America at the end of the nineteenth century has simply to walk out of his own house and go to work with other men in some enterprise which the good God wishes to have carried through. He will find all the unity he wants. This is nobly illustrated in the charity organization societies which are now at work in all the larger cities of the country.

A man may enter any one of these charity organization societies, whether he be Arminian, Baptist, Calvinist, "Disciple," Episcopalian, Free-Baptist, Greek, Gentile, or Galilean, Hicksite, Independent or orthodox Friend, Jew, Karaite, or Coptic, Lutheran, Methodist, New-Church, orthodox, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, or Reformer, Sandemanian, or Supralapsarian, Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Universalist; or, indeed, if he be one of those Variorum or Wild-Cat come-outers, the unorganized and un-creed believers in Xavier, Yahveh, or Zinzendorf, or Et-cetera himself, who bring up the alphabet of the older and the younger churches.

All these people are eagerly welcomed in any of these practical organizations. Dr. Wayland's rule was, is, and will be, the only working rule. "Can they cast out the devils?" he used to ask. If they could, he did not push his questions further. Before the charity organization has been running three months these people are at work together, without a thought of the verbal or technical formulas by which, on occasion, they could divide into their several companies.

It is easy to say that the work of the church is better done by its several sections when they keep up a strict organization among themselves, and each lets the other sections severally alone. But this is only "say so," and Americans are not ready or apt to believe it. They have read their own history enough to understand the lesson taught in the twelve years between 1775 and 1787, when Massachusetts governed herself, and kept

\*See Professor Shields on "The United Churches of the United States," CENTURY for November, 1885; also subsequent Open Letters from ministers of various denominations.

up her own army and navy; when New York did the same, and Virginia the same. The common enemies were not kept at bay as they are by the United States. Now there are so many common enemies that the United Church may well wish to act as a unit in the business of advancing against them and securing the advance of God's Kingdom. I suppose it was Dean Stanley who, in England, first of all, devised that real Union of the Church for one purpose, which was brought about when a commission of members, from every communion, united for the Revision of the Bible. The objective result, an improved English Bible, is a great reward for that enterprise. But the great truth, that the church can unite for such a purpose, is a result still nobler.

There is no lack of similar enterprises which the United Church can undertake in America. This of charity organization is one, and the result, in the harmony and good-fellowship which it brings about, is admirable. Such work might be pushed a great deal further, and will be.

Take Castle Garden, to-morrow, for an instance. There will arrive there, probably, one or two thousand exiles from Europe, perhaps five or ten thousand. If by good luck they are Mormons, they will be met at the landing by kind, intelligent, and skillful agents, who know they are coming and where they are going, who are on friendly terms with the officials, who are experienced in the whole matter. Within three hours, perhaps, of their arrival, without one hitch or jerk, they will all be on their route, under competent superintendence, to their new homes.

But what if, by bad luck, they are not Mormons? What if it chance that they are *only* "Christians"? Nay,—it may happen,—by bad luck that they are *only* sons and daughters of the good God. Is there not in the Christian church of America intelligence enough, love enough, tenderness enough, resolution enough, to treat these poor people as well as if they happened to swear by Joseph Smith's Bible, or to believe it? And if the Christians of a dozen different communions chose to unite, to maintain at Castle Garden a ministry of welcome, such as the Mormon church alone does choose to maintain there, does any one believe that the difference between Ultra-Montanism and ultra-montanism will prevent the two extremes of Christianity even from harmonizing in such an enterprise?

Or if this reader, by good or bad fortune, as he may consider it, does not live in the city where THE CENTURY is published, let him lay down this journal and look in the Police-Report in the daily paper of the city nearest to him. It is certain that he will read the names of one, two, or three poor creatures who have been sent, on the yesterday, to the nearest House of Correction. Would he not return to his CENTURY the more cheerfully if he knew, as he does not, that there was waiting at the court which sentenced these poor criminals an official minister, sustained by the United churches of that city, simply and only to go to the families of the criminals, and to make sure that punishment does not fall where it is least deserved. There is a place where Christianity, pure and simple, may be at work every day, without the slightest danger of quarrel about symbol or formula.

Such are my reasons for saying that when people want Christian Unity they can find it by going

out-of-doors. But if they prefer to live in their tabernacles or badger-skins, they will probably not find it.

*Edward E. Hale.*

CHRISTIANITY in the concrete, as believed and professed by the various sects calling themselves Christians, consists of Divine truth on its manward side, Divine truth on its Godward side, and the forms and observances by which Divine truth is made efficient for man's moral and spiritual well-being. Under the first head we must of course include the attributes of God so far as man is affected by them, the relation of Jesus Christ to man, the consequences of moral good and evil, and the eternal life of the soul. These all have an essential bearing upon character, furnishing man with adequate reasons for doing, and, still more, for becoming and being all that is just and true, pure and good. God's attributes are motives to trust and love, praise and prayer, obedience and service. Christ in the divineness of his humanity shows all that man can fully know of God, and all that he must be in order to make his own humanity in any humble measure Divine; and by his sacrificial life and death he in the intensity of his love makes the strongest possible appeal to man's emotional nature in persuading him to repentance, virtue, and holiness. The certainty of retribution not only works upon man's hope and fear, but — what is of ineffably more importance — it affixes to moral distinctions the seal and sanction of Omnipotent Wisdom and Love, thus making the characteristics of the right and the wrong not arbitrary and mutable, but intrinsic and indelible. The eternal life alone can attach their true value to objects of desire and pursuit in the present life, so as to give the due preponderance to the interests of man's moral and spiritual nature over those of his brief and precarious earthly being.

As to these truths there is a virtual and — when technical terms are excluded — even a verbal agreement among persons belonging to widely different Christian bodies. It might not seem so at first view. Thus the several creeds of Christendom give statements as to the nature of Christ that appear mutually inconsistent and irreconcilable; but yet the phrase "Divine humanity" expresses all that Christ can ever be to man in this world, and embodies what is felt and owned by those of every name who are conscious of Christian discipleship. So, too, the human side of all the various theories of the atonement resolves itself into this, — that there is between the deserts even of the penitent and believing soul and the pardon and blessedness for which it hopes an immeasurable distance, an impassable chasm, which can be spanned and filled in only by the mercy of God as revealed and manifested in Christ.

Still further, Christians, however far apart they seem, agree in defining the Christian character as consisting in the soul's vital union with Christ, in fine, in its conscious Christlikeness. Now this Christlikeness those who possess it cannot but recognize in every section of the visible church, and with equal distinctness and with equal beauty of holiness in Ritualists and Quakers, Calvinists and Unitarians, Romanists and Swedenborgians. What is common to them all is what they have received from Christ, and this common part of their Christianity is confessedly the greatest part, — that without which the soundest belief or the most

truly apostolic ritual would be utterly worthless. Why should not then the possession of this common element of Christlikeness constitute a bond of union that should far transcend in strength all separating dogmas and rituals?

As to the Godward aspects of Divine truth there are and there probably always will be irreconcilable antagonisms. This is the case in philosophy. From Thales till now many of the strongest minds of our race have made it their specialty; the theories have been innumerable; but in this entire field there is not a single principle or proposition established beyond controversy. The reason is that philosophy has for its scope a realm which no human mind can comprehend. In this sense the Godward side of Divine truth corresponds to the philosophy of mind and of the universe. Its subjects transcend the capacity of the human intellect. They are infinite and many-sided, while man can take in but a finite portion of a single aspect; and who knows but that his errors may often be partial truths, and falsities only because he makes them universal? But these separating doctrines, though worthy and ennobling themes for speculation, have no shaping power over character. Thus the triune conception of God—not without a philosophical basis—cannot be an aid to devotion. Every Christian, however he may formulate his theory of the Divine nature, worships God and prays to him as Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. So there is, no doubt, profound truth in Christ's words, "No one knoweth the Son but the Father;" but there is no possible way in which a dogma professing to solve this mystery can enhance or diminish the reverence, trust, and love which we owe to Christ. As to the atonement, there may have been governmental reasons, so to speak, on God's part for the death of Christ; but no theory concerning them can add to or take from the fervor with which he who has received the atonement, in looking at the cross, exclaims with his whole heart, "Herein is love," and expresses the mandate of that love in the simple and sweet words of the old hymn:

"Love so amazing, so divine,  
Demands my soul, my life, my all."

As to the ritual of religion we can hardly expect agreement, so long as there remain several tenable theories as to the authority from which that ritual is to be derived, whether from the Scriptures, or from the church, and if from the church, at what age or from what branch of it. But that outward forms, however important, are unessential, is manifest from the fact that the spiritual influences that can come only from Christ have come through very diverse mediums, and with manifestly equal genuineness, to some through the open Bible, to others through the preaching of the Word, to this person through parental example, to that through sacraments and holy rites, to many immediately, as to all the rest mediately, from the Spirit of God, which has avenues of entrance to every soul.

Now the union possible and desirable among Christians is not the ignoring of differences in dogma or in ritual. Each theory of the philosophy of religion has its own natural and accustomed dialect, which its believers may fittingly prefer in the services of Christian worship; and attachment to the ritual which has been the special medium of spiritual benefit is as inevitable

as home-love in a well-ordered family. But the union which is both desirable and practicable is, *first*, a heartfelt recognition, without abatement or reservation, of the Christian estate of all who manifest a genuine Christlikeness; *secondly*, a cordial readiness, on the part of those of every Christian name, to work together in all means and measures for the advancement of Christian righteousness; and *thirdly*, union in worship whenever and wherever the interest of the common faith may be best promoted by such union, or must of necessity suffer detriment by the multiplication of separate churches beyond the capacity of the worshippers to sustain them honorably and usefully.

A. P. Peabody.

#### Applause as a Spur to Pegasus.

I LIGHTED the other day upon these things in my reading. Byron writes to Murray, his publisher:

"Dec. 10, 1819. I have finished the third Canto [of 'Don Juan'], but the things I have read and heard discourage all further publication,—at least for the present.

"Feb. 7, 1820. I have not yet sent off the Cantos, and have some doubt whether they ought to be published, for they have not the spirit of the first. The outcry has not frightened but it has *hurt* me, and I have not written *con amore* this time."

Moore, biographer of Byron, relates:

"So sensitive, indeed,—in addition to his usual abundance of this quality,—did he at length grow on the subject, that when Mr. W. Bankes, who succeeded me as his visitor, happened to tell him one day that he had heard a Mr. Saunders (or some such name), then resident at Venice, declare that in his opinion "'Don Juan" was all Grub-street, such an effect had this disparaging speech upon his mind (though coming from a person who, as he himself would have it, was 'nothing but a—salt-fish seller'), that for some time after, by his own confession to Mr. Bankes, he could not bring himself to write another line of the poem, and one morning, opening a drawer where the neglected manuscript lay, he said to his friend, 'Look here, this is all Mr. Saunders's Grub-street.'"

Mr. Ruskin has in his "Arrows of the Chace" a striking passage about the intolerably depressing effect experienced by his friend Turner, the painter, from the disparagement with which his efforts in art were met by the public. As for Byron, in the particular case of his "Don Juan" one might perhaps well wish that his sense of discouragement had been sufficient to prevent altogether the finishing of the poem, splendid as is the iridescence of genius that plays over the surface of that dark and miasmatic water. Still, the illustration serves all the same. Immediate appreciation is a great stimulus to production, a stimulus which only the greatest can miss and yet go on successfully producing.

Shelley, I remember, dashed, dazed, browbeaten by his ill fortune with the public, obliged to be his own publisher, or at least to defray himself the expense of his publishing, exclaimed, in a fit of despondent self-reassurance, of despairing triumph, over his "Adonais" completed, "This, let the critics say what they will, this at least, I *know*, is poetry." How much costly and exhausting effort in sustaining himself for the

great task of poetical creation underlies expressions such as that from a genius such as Shelley!

Webster testified that he never before spoke in an atmosphere of such sympathy and appreciation as braced him on the occasion of his Reply to Hayne. That atmosphere was no doubt an indispensable condition of the supremely triumphant effect of the speech. Who that has read the *memorabilia* of that remarkable man, Robert Hall, but has noticed how his pulpit oratory was fed and supported by the praise that surrounded him.

It takes a man enormously buoyant with self-estimation, like Wordsworth, for example, to do without the help of present appreciation and sympathy. And under the inspiration of applause Wordsworth would have written better poetry than he did, merely and sheerly persistent through that inextinguishable sense in him of his own genius which was at once the strength and the weakness of this least inspired of all real poets.

I, for my part, should like to know what the result would have been in the case of Walter Scott, had he lost for a term of years his standing with the reading public. Scott was a vastly courageous man, and he had quantity and reserve of animal spirits, the fruit of health and temperament, on which to draw for self-support against a slack time in his popularity. But I feel sure that heaviness of heart would have clogged that joyous play of the great brain had the sense haunted him that he was writing what no one would praise.

Almost ten years of his early manhood Tennyson was voiceless, chilled, as would seem, from singing, by the neglect or the contempt with which his poems had been received. Fortunately he lives long enough to outlive several of those reactions and vicissitudes of alternate challenge and acclamation which assure at length the poet's fame.

How it enhances one's estimation of the majesty of Milton, his genius and his character, that, "unchanged to hoarse or mute," he could go on, amid the ribald noise of the Restoration, to chant the great symphony of the "Paradise Lost." This, with a contemporary authority in letters like Waller to say of his work: "The old blind schoolmaster, John Milton, hath published a tedious poem on the Fall of Man; if its length be not considered a merit, it hath no other"; and with, no matter whom, to express the "general feeling of his age" in saying, "That 'Paradise Lost' of Milton which some are pleased to call a poem"!

Well, what of it all? Shall we agree together to praise more, that we may have more to praise? Doubtful wisdom. There is, in fact, praise enough bestowed, and dispraise enough. The trouble is that these, both of them, get famously ill distributed. What remedy? None. To admire wisely is one of the last triumphs of wisdom. There is at least nothing for us, but to be as wise here as possible and do our utmost to make others so. Our authors will have to get on as best they can with what chance praise, fit or unfit, falls to them. Let each man and woman live and write, as far as possible, in hope to deserve the fame that God himself pronounces lastly on each deed, and other hope of fame surmount and forget.

*William C. Wilkinson.*

John Tyler.

MR. JAMES O. HARRISON, on "Henry Clay," in THE CENTURY for December, 1886, page 182, says:

"It is well known that Mr. Tyler signalized his administration by betraying the confidence of the Whig party, by which he had been elected Vice-President. Suspicions and rumors were soon afloat that Mr. Tyler would not be true to the platform on which he was elected, and . . . these suspicions were absolutely confirmed by his own subsequent action," etc.

Messrs. Nicolay and Hay, in THE CENTURY for January, 1887, page 393, say:

"After the treachery of Tyler had turned the victory of the Whigs to dust and ashes," etc.

Certain facts should be recalled to the attention of your readers, in connection with the above erroneous statements, as follows:

*First.* There was no "platform," and none was intended or implied.

*Second.* The "Whig party" did not nominate Harrison and Tyler. The Harrisburg Convention which nominated these candidates, December 7th, 1839, was known at the time to be a joint convention of Whigs and Democrats, in which the Democrats accepted Harrison, while the Whigs accepted Tyler. It would be as just to accuse Harrison of "treachery" to the Democrats as to accuse Tyler of "treachery" to the Whigs. The case was one of pure political bargain, in which each side took its chances.

*Third.* Harrison and Tyler were agreed as to the state in which affairs were when they were elected. After Harrison's death, when Tyler became President, an entirely new state of affairs came up, in which Tyler not only had the right, but was bound to follow his Democratic principles, even to the disappointment of his Whig allies.

*Ben. E. Green.*

DALTON, GEORGIA.

### The Cosmic Day.

#### AN OBJECTION ANSWERED.

THE objection made to the adoption of a Cosmic Day, "that it would be impossible for us to associate noon with 7 o'clock instead of 12," as stated in a recent number of THE CENTURY, is altogether fanciful and has no basis in fact. This assertion rests on no mere theory, but on actual personal experience. The Turks have a theory that the sun sets at the same time throughout the year, and that the apparent difference from day to day is but a popular delusion. Accordingly they have called sunset 12 o'clock, and begin reckoning the hours of the day from that point. Watches, to be correct, have, of course, to be changed every day, and are regulated by the muezzin's sunset call to prayer.

On first coming to Turkey, it seemed as if we should never become so accustomed to this anomalous method of reckoning time as to adopt it mentally as our own. But a residence of only a few months has shown how easy it is to adapt one's self to prevailing customs, even when so entirely contrary to those we have been born and bred in as is this method of chronology, and now it seems as natural to look for our noonday meal

at about 7 o'clock as six months ago it did to expect it at 12. Without any thought of former times and seasons, we breakfast (at this time of year) at 2 o'clock, take tea at 12, and if mindful of the proverbial recipe for acquiring health, wealth, and wisdom, go "early to bed" at 4 and rise at 1.

Unless the opponents of the adoption of the Cosmic Day can bring forward some more valid objection than the alleged difficulty of associating certain periods or certain acts with certain names of hours, their objections may, in the language of pleading, be dismissed as "frivolous, irrelevant, and impertinent," on the testimony of actual experience.

H. M. Jewett.

SIVAS, ASIA MINOR.

#### The Death of Mrs. Cartwright.

ON page 522 of the number for February there is a note on the death of Mrs. Cartwright. The meeting referred to was in charge of the Rev. Hardin Wallace, now a resident of California. By request of the Rev. John P. Brooks, editor of the "Banner of Holiness," I was at Bethel Chapel as a reporter for that paper, and I wrote the account of "Mother" Cartwright's wonderful death for that paper.

Permit me again to state the facts of her death as I witnessed it all, seated as I was not more than six feet in front of her, and with my eyes upon her at the moment. It was about two o'clock in the afternoon. Some ten persons had spoken, or given their "testimony." She was not called upon to speak, but was about to rise from her seat, when the Rev. Mr. Wallace requested her not to rise, and turning to the congregation said, "We will now listen while Mother Cartwright gives her testimony." She spoke of her long and arduous life as the wife of an itinerant Methodist Episcopal minister, of the goodness of God, of the joy and peace she then enjoyed, and with much feeling concluded by saying, "The past three weeks have been the happiest of all my life; I am waiting for the chariot." I wrote her words as she spoke them. The meeting continued in a quiet way, others speaking for about twenty-five minutes longer, when I observed that Mother Cartwright leaned her head on the shoulder of Mrs. Huett, who sat beside her, and as she did so,

closed her eyes. I arose and stepped to her seat, opened the window, and found her dead. Then it was that the Rev. Mr. Wallace said, "The chariot has arrived."

Yours truly,

Francis M. Hayes,  
Pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, Colfax, Illinois.

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

A CORRESPONDENT of ours fails to appreciate the force of Mr. C. S. Percival's open letter with the above title in *THE CENTURY* for January. After stating that Smith, Vassar, Bryn Mawr, and Wellesley are too expensive for the poor, and at the most can only accommodate a limited number of students, she asks what is to become of the Western girl who has college aspirations, with not a single college for women west of the Alleghanies or south of Pennsylvania? Is she, she asks, to rest in the hope that time may bring to her grandchildren what she herself had craved, or ought she to bless, with reasonable men, the colleges that have thrown open their doors to women?

IN an article on "Ashland, the Home of Henry Clay," in *THE CENTURY* for December, 1886, Mr. Charles W. Coleman, Jr., suggests that Mr. Clay may have called his home Ashland in tender memory of Ashland, his native place in Virginia. A correspondent informs us, however, that Mr. Clay's birthplace was called Slash Cottage, and was not given the name of Ashland until many years after the Kentucky Ashland received its name.

Another correspondent writes that Mr. Clay did not study law with Francis Brooke, but with his brother, Robert Brooke, who was afterward Attorney-General of Virginia, and subsequently a governor of that State. The correspondence that Mr. Coleman refers to was with Francis Brooke, and not with Governor Brooke, as Mr. Coleman states.

FOR "of all times," read "of our times," in the quotation from the report of Mr. Lowell's speech, in the *MAY CENTURY*.

#### BRIC-À-BRAC.

##### Uncle Esek's Wisdom.

THE world has had but few teachers; a score of men have furnished us all the wisdom and philosophy we possess.

THE man who knows but little, and tells only what he knows, is a hard man to bother in a cross-examination.

IT takes the evidence of two or three witnesses to prove a man's virtues, but one is enough to fasten his vices upon him.

THE reason why there is so little real friendship in the world is because most of the compacts are based upon policy rather than upon principle.

A WEAK man is harder to steer than a vicious one,—he won't take the bits.

PITY is treacherous; most of it is a secret satisfaction that I am not so badly off as you are.

A LAZY man in a great hurry is very amusing; he is continually stepping on himself.

IF we ever do reach the top round of the ladder, we shall find it a dreadfully cold and lonesome place.

WHOEVER reasons from the heart will make many blunders, but none that will not be forgiven.

THE line between folly and wisdom is often an imaginary one, and men are often seen traveling along with one foot on each side of it.

A GREAT deal of learning has been lost, but not one single precept of wisdom.

Uncle Esek.



## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### A New Era in our History.

BEYOND question the feature of the national administration since the 4th of March, 1885, which has engaged the largest share of public attention has been its attitude toward the civil service. This very significant fact marks the opening of a new era in our history, an era in which, for the first time, the proper conduct of the government, Federal, State, and municipal, assumes the first rank among political questions.

The United States as a nation started with a Constitution which challenges the fresh admiration of each new generation of Americans, and with methods of administration well suited to the small population of a thinly settled region on the eastern slope of the continent. In local affairs as a rule the town-meeting excellently served all the purposes of the community at a time when there were only about half a dozen cities, and the present metropolis itself, then barely ahead of Philadelphia, had but thirty-three thousand people. The young Republic had scarcely reached its majority before there came another war with England, and the "era of good feeling" which succeeded was soon disturbed by the first Nullification mutterings of the rising storm over the extension of the slave power. There were brief periods, as notably upon the introduction by Andrew Jackson of the spoils system in 1829, when statesmen found time and secured attention for the consideration of vital questions concerning governmental methods; but all the while, and more and more with the passage of the years, much as they tried to conceal it from themselves, people were chiefly concerned with the more fundamental question as to whether the Union itself were to endure. At last came the four years' struggle to determine whether the Government should survive. That ended, there ensued a long and most engrossing controversy to decide how "the fruits of the war" could most surely be garnered, and how the relations of the reconstructed States to the reconstituted Union should permanently be adjusted.

Meanwhile the nation had been growing from less than four millions of people to more than fifty; cities of great size had sprung up in what a century before had been a wilderness; nearly a quarter of the population had drifted into the cities and large towns; the office-holders of the Federal government alone had become an army more than one hundred thousand strong; old methods had been outgrown and become antiquated; new questions of administration, previously undreamed of, had arisen in national, state, and municipal affairs alike. The salvation of the Republic from the danger threatened by secession was no sooner assured than far-sighted men pointed out a fresh peril to its perpetuity. The war, which so largely widened the scope of government operations and increased the number of office-holders, greatly aggravated the evils which men like Webster, Clay, and Calhoun had predicted as certain to come when that most immoral of dogmas, "To the victor belong the spoils," was

adopted by both political parties as an article of faith. The late Thomas A. Jenckes, who unhappily died in 1875, a dozen years too soon to witness the triumph of his principles, must always be remembered for having possessed the insight to detect the danger, the wisdom to perceive the cure, and the persistence to extort attention from a reluctant Congress in the troublous years of the Andrew Johnson administration. Looking back to that stormy period and recalling the grave character of the reconstruction disputes, which culminated in the impeachment of the President, the country can better appreciate the force of the man, who, coming from the smallest State of the Union, secured a hearing for civil-service reform in 1866.

But it was scarcely more than a hearing that even Mr. Jenckes could secure, and he could not long keep the public ear. The slave had been freed; he was soon after enfranchised; but "the negro question" still remained the engrossing one. The attitude of the Federal government toward the States which had attempted secession was a subject of constant discussion for years after their Senators and Representatives again sat in Congress, and the frequent recourse to the use of Federal troops for the settlement of disputes in State capitals made the condition of the South the overshadowing subject of national attention. An experiment in the direction of carrying out the ideas of which Mr. Jenckes had been the apostle was made during Grant's administration, but although it received the hearty support of many thoughtful men, it never gained a strong hold upon the general public. There was always something else which the politicians insisted, and made the people believe, was the main issue. When Congress killed the experiment in 1874 by refusing the modest sum required to keep it going, only a small element felt any indignation, or, indeed, had any pronounced feeling on the subject either way.

Mr. Hayes rightly declared, in his letter accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1876, that the plank regarding civil-service reform in the party platform was "of paramount importance," and during his Administration the subject secured more general attention than ever before. But two great events were needed to make the proper conduct of the Government the most prominent question of the day. One was a proof, so startling as to impress the dullest mind, of the danger to the Republic which lurked in the spoils system. This was furnished by the assassination of Garfield at the hand of a disappointed office-seeker. The other event was a change in the control of the Government without the dreaded ruin to national interests and prosperity.

In 1881 the nation was made to feel the necessity of reform; in 1887 it sees that it can give its well-nigh undivided attention to the consideration of reform, and it is evidently going to do so, not merely so far as Federal offices are concerned, but State and municipal offices and administration as well.

## Reform in Municipal Government.

THE passage by Congress early in 1883 of the Pendleton bill, applying the competitive principle to the minor places in the Washington Departments and in the chief custom-houses and post-offices of the country, was the corner-stone of a system which it is already certain will ultimately be developed throughout the Federal government. The contemptible failure of the feeble attempts in the Forty-ninth Congress to repeal the Pendleton law and to starve out the civil-service commission show that the reform "has come to stay." The public is far ahead of Congress in this matter. The changed tone of those newspapers which have always ridiculed the new system shows that they recognize their defeat. Experience has spoiled all their old arguments. There was the "college graduate" bogey, for instance. If we were to have examinations for admission to the service, it was declared "only college graduates would stand any show," and the young man who had never been beyond the common school "would be nowhere." Statistics showing that more than four-fifths of the successful contestants were men who had received only a common-school education have effectually disposed of this *ad captandum* plea, and the other clap-trap appeals to prejudice have fared no better. The old-time champions of the spoils system in the Federal government virtually confess their defeat, and the success of the competitive system in the State governments and chief cities of New York and Massachusetts assures its ultimate adoption by other States and municipalities.

Another reform no less important is now to be achieved. What is commonly called civil-service reform, so far as it has hitherto been carried in Federal, State and city governments, is chiefly a system for procuring good clerks, whose competency has been established by a competitive test. This is a matter of great importance, because it is fundamental. With the entrance to the service properly arranged, it is only a question of time when the whole service will be conducted upon sound principles. But this is only one phase of the great undertaking involved in a thorough-going reform of governmental methods. In a popular government the health of the body politic depends upon pure elections. The theory of the fathers was that when an office, like that of congressman, was to be filled, the people of a district would look about to see who was the fittest man to represent them, and elect him without the necessity of his doing anything in the matter. Cases are still known where the theory is carried into practice. A dozen years ago certain citizens of a Western Massachusetts district, disgusted with the ring which dictated the course of the dominant party, nominated President Seelye of Amherst College as an independent candidate for Congress, and elected him. His only connection with the canvass was to write a letter in reply to the notification of his nomination, consenting to be voted for. It was in the days when postage stamps were a cent higher than now, and Mr. Seelye used to say that his campaign expenses were only three cents—the cost of the stamp which he placed upon his letter of acceptance.

In New York City now, it costs a man from \$5000 to \$10,000 to run for Congress. In other words, he must pay out beforehand the salary for one, if not both, of

the years of the term. If he aspires to a position on the bench, he must expend in advance of the election \$10,000 or \$15,000 for one of the lower courts; perhaps \$20,000 for a place in the Supreme Court. If he is ambitious to become mayor, he must be willing to contribute as large a sum as \$24,000. These are only samples of the astonishing facts as to "assessments" which Mr. William M. Ivens, who has enjoyed exceptional opportunities for learning the truth, made public in his speech to the Commonwealth Club not long ago. Mr. Ivens showed exactly how the system works; how the "machines" which have been built up control on election day a well-disciplined force of 45,000 men, or one-fifth of the entire voting population, all of whom are under pay and have a pecuniary interest in the result. Mr. Joseph B. Bishop, in a speech at the succeeding meeting of the same club, presented the remedies, which he found in removing the necessity for assessments, by having the ballots printed and distributed by the city and at the city's expense, thus doing away with the army of machine workers at the polls; in limiting by law the expenditures of candidates; and in enacting a statute similar to the English "Corrupt Practices Act," forbidding bribery and undue influences of all kinds and fixing penalties.

The speeches of Mr. Ivens and Mr. Bishop, which were printed in full, attracted the notice not merely of the New York public, but of intelligent people throughout the country. The press of other cities appreciated that they must anticipate, where they have not already begun to suffer, the same evils unless a halt were called in New York; the rural press realized that the country cannot escape the introduction of similar abuses if they are allowed to remain permanently in the cities.

## College Expenses.

THE commencement season brings its usual supply of newspaper articles on the inordinate expense of education in our modern colleges. In this case, as in so many others, the supply of articles meets a general demand. It is not easy for a father to foot enormous bills for his son at college with any patience, when he remembers the narrow fund which carried him through college, or for want of which he was compelled to give up the idea of going to college altogether. The newspaper article not only states his feeling in vigorous English, but gives him a tangible foundation for his feeling. It meets his case, and the case of countless others, too exactly not to find favor in their eyes. And so the newspapers brim with notes of the "average cost" of going through this college and that, and with reflections on the extravagance which is encouraged by the methods of the modern college life. There are, however, certain correctives which should go with the annual statistics.

An average may be mathematically true, and yet altogether delusive. "I make a statement that the average age of my friends is 20 years. If my friends are 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 years of age, the average 20 is a useful and true expression. If, however, they are 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30, it is less useful; and if they are 4 of them 10 years old and 1 of them 60, the average 20 is still numerically correct, but it is absurd and untruthful in the impression it gives." The last case is quite parallel with the "averages" of the expenses of

classes at the various American colleges, as they are annually published in the newspapers. The few extravagant students are able to do so much more effective work at their end than the great body of the students can do at theirs, that the "average" goes up to a figure which is quite misleading. Meantime, in the teeth of all the averages, the great body of the students go on as their fathers did, and, even at those colleges which are selected as the most expensive of all, there is always a smaller body of students who are working their way through college and showing that the "average" has no real relation to the question. There is not a college in America from which poverty alone need debar a student; there is not one from which he may not graduate, provided he has that amount of ability which will make a college education a benefit, and provided, also, he is willing to work before and through his course, and deny himself, as was the custom in our fathers' days.

It is this last custom which is going out of existence; and that is enough to show that the root of the evil does not lie in the college, but in the home. The very parents who speak so bitterly of the encouragement given to young men's extravagance by the modern college life have carefully trained their sons for just the life which they have found. Usually men in moderate circumstances, they have never compelled their sons to earn a dollar in their lives, or to know the cost or value of money, or to deny themselves anything within their reach, or to do anything except spend money when a favorable opportunity offered. The sons, passing for the first time beyond the father's eye, and able to plead circumstances which parents cannot deny from personal knowledge, are in a fair position to deplete the paternal pocket-book, and have never been trained to refrain from improving such an opportunity. It is not for his own selfish gratification that the son joins this or that college society, or takes all the college papers, or "goes with the nine" to watch an inter-collegiate game in another college town, or does any of the other things for which his father has to pay,—not at all; it is only because he would be ostracized in college if he refrained from such indulgences. Such are the statements which accompany the periodical petitions for checks; and the father, finding it easier to curse college extravagance than to take the trouble of ascertaining the true state of the case, continues his mis-training of the boy by paying his bills until, at the end of the college course, the son is turned loose upon the world, to find at last what a dollar really means.

In nine cases out of ten, the student's self-control, if it led to a refusal to be enticed into unnecessary expenditures, would be simply ignored by the other students of his college. There are always cliques which would ignore himself as well; and, to this extent, the dreaded "taboo" might be endured. But this difficulty is purely subjective; it is in the student himself, and its roots are in his home-training. If he has come to college to cultivate or value the society of such cliques, the penalty has an effective force; if he has been trained to undervalue or ignore the penalty, it has no power over him. When he yields to it and writes home that he "must have" money for this, that, or the other purpose, the father who supplies this demand is cultivating further the son's vanity, and

further preparing vexation of spirit for himself. For him to pay the money and thus increase the evil, while he considers it the unperformed duty of the college authorities to suppress all the societies, expel the editors of all the college papers, and abolish the inter-collegiate games, is merely another example of the decadence of American home-life and discipline. The father expects the college to do for the son what the home no longer does for him; he sends the college flabby material, and expects the material to be turned into such strong, self-poised, self-controlled manhood as the American home once furnished to the college. If the children's teeth are set on edge, it is largely because the fathers have eaten sour grapes.

There can be little doubt that two-thirds of the material now sent to college would be bettered by being put into a workshop of some kind for two years between the ages of twelve and sixteen. The spread of comfort among the people has been steadily increasing the number of those who can spare their sons the necessity of work even through their years of early manhood; and we have not yet come to understand the full measure of the injury which is thus done to the character of the boy. At the same time, the colleges have been developing in a direction which gives greater and still greater freedom to the student, and thus brings into constantly greater prominence the evils resulting from the modern American system of home-training. To check the college in its natural course of development, to demand that it shall cease its proper work and attend to wrapping the student in cotton-wool and keeping him from the temptations incident to every really manly life, would be merely to make permanent and irreparable the damage which is being done to young American manhood. Things must be worse before they can be better. American parents must learn that education is not an affair of books alone; that it is not complete when so many books have been finished and so many term-bills paid; that a true education consists even more largely in the training of the character and of the will than in book-knowledge. When American homes send to American colleges boys who have been trained to discriminate between the accidents of life and its essentials, the complaints of college extravagance will disappear, and a good many other evils will go with them.

#### The Metropolitan Spirit.

THE current year has been remarkable for its conspicuous proofs that matters æsthetic and scholarly are taking a wider and deeper hold upon the people of the leading American city. New York is becoming metropolitan not merely in intention, but in fact. The metropolitan spirit is abroad in society, and the year 1887 will be memorable for the long step then taken in advancing our gigantic community in the right direction. The city has never been behind in religious and charitable exertion; of late years its politics have been not a little improved, and the work of purification was never more active than now, nor ever was urged more strongly and directly toward fundamental reforms. But the artistic revival of a dozen or fifteen years ago has had a sudden fruition within the last year or two that goes along with a revival in all

æsthetic matters and should be especially noted for encouragement and example.

The recent celebration of the centennial of an important date in the history of Columbia College has drawn public attention to an institution which shows abundant signs of rejuvenation. The college is still a college in name, but its tendency toward a genuine university establishment is emphasized in many ways; notably in the conduct of its library, which, in its printed treasures and in its lecture courses, is a college in itself, the benefits of which are wisely and generously extended with few restrictions to the entire community.

The dinner to James Russell Lowell, Charles Waldstein, and the trustees of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, was an event in line with the general movement; and it is evident that the proper endowment of this school is sure to follow soon. The Metropolitan Museum has shared in the æsthetic generousities of the time, and has received some splendid legacies and gifts. There is already the surety, also, of the generous endowment of a new and highly important scheme for the direct advancement of American art, in all its branches. Along with these signs of the times have come annual exhibitions of special interest—exhibitions which proclaim that the new generation of painters and sculptors have something in them beside suggestion and promise.

The prosperous and growing Free Library scheme,

and the Tilden bequest to the same general purpose, are a part of the new movement.

It is evident that New York is yearly becoming a better city to live in.

#### The Lincoln History.

THE current installment of the *Life of Lincoln and History of his times* reaches and includes an account of the famous Lincoln-Douglas Debates. Although Lincoln had for years been opposed to Douglas in political discussions, the great struggle between these giants of debate did not occur till in 1858 they simultaneously appealed to the people of Illinois for election to the United States Senate. The readers of the *Life* will fully appreciate the necessity felt by the authors to record amply and clearly the occurrences in Kansas, in Congress, and in the Supreme Court which led up to the political situation of 1858 and the celebrated canvass of that year in Illinois. This momentous debate, which sent Douglas to the Senate and Lincoln to the White House, cannot be fully understood, in all its subtleties of argument and allusion, by those who are unfamiliar with the political events of immediately preceding years.

The *Life*, which will certainly lose nothing in interest as it approaches more nearly the war period, will deal in August with Lincoln's Ohio speeches and the Cooper Institute speech, and in September with Lincoln's nomination and election.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Labor and Capital.

#### A CONNECTICUT EXPERIMENT.

IF Mr. Walter Besant wishes to see a working model of the "Palace of Delight" so movingly described by him in that "impossible story" of his which bears the preposterous title, "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," let him cross the ocean and visit the thrifty Connecticut town of Bridgeport. The novelist's notion is that the chief trouble with the working people is their lack of pleasure; and that pleasure enough is within their reach, cheap and wholesome, if they only knew where and how to find it. His theory is, therefore, that the philanthropist who can show the poor how to enjoy themselves is a better friend than the one who can increase their income; that he who can make one innocent pleasure grow where there was none before is a greater benefactor than he who puts two dimes into a purse where there was one before. Therefore he would turn the efforts of those who seek to improve the condition of the people in our cities toward the problem of brightening their lives by providing them with social amusements, or, better, toward the task of teaching them how to amuse themselves. That this kind of philanthropy, like every other, will cost something, his fable teaches; but his contention is that money and effort expended along this line will produce the best results.

What Mr. Besant would see, if he came to Bridgeport, is a beautiful building, nearly ready for occupation, somewhat less magnificent than the airy nothing of his creation, and bearing the less ambitious desig-

nation of "Seaside Institute." It stands near Seaside Park, in the western suburb of the city, directly across the street from the factory of the Warner Brothers, by the side of which it has grown as the honeysuckle grows upon the cornfield wall,—the flower drawing its beauty and its fragrance from the same kindly soil that nourishes and ripens the grain. The Warner Brothers are manufacturers of corsets, and they employ about one thousand women of various sorts and conditions, most of them young and unmarried. A bright, comely, wholesome-looking company of young women they are; four or five hundred of them might be picked out who, judging their intelligence by their faces, would not look out of place in the chapel at Smith, Wellesley, or Vassar. The average weekly wage of this thousand is about seven dollars each,—a larger amount than women in such callings generally earn,—which indicates that the dealings of the firm with its employees are not wholly regulated by competition.

For a long time these employers have been studying the problem of the working-girl, and trying to find out how they could best improve her condition. They knew that a large share of the earnings of these girls must go for board and room-rent; that it was possible for few of them to afford any but narrow, ill-lighted, ill-ventilated, unwarmed lodgings, and that no cheerful and comfortable place was open to them in which they might spend their leisure hours. They knew that the presence of so many of these girls in the skating-rinks and on the streets in the evening was due, in large part, to the fact that they had nowhere else to

go. They knew, moreover, that the kind of food furnished in such boarding-houses as they must patronize was in many cases inferior and unwholesome. Under such conditions it is not strange that the working-girls of the cities often develop abnormal appetites, and vicious tastes, and rude manners; the wonder is that so many of them keep their health unbroken and their characters unsullied. And these men of good-will, studying with what seems to be a sincere philanthropy the welfare of the thousand women by whose labor they are accumulating their fortune, determined to build for them, if not a "Palace of Delight," at least a Hall of Comfort, in which shelter and care and companionship and opportunities of wholesome diversion and of mental cultivation should be freely furnished them.

This "Seaside Institute" will cost the builders about forty thousand dollars. It is a shapely building externally — no mere barracks, but a well-proportioned and winning structure, seventy-five feet square and three stories in height, proclaiming in its very form the presence of other than "economical" motives. In the basement is a large refectory, with kitchen attached, in which the best of plain food will be furnished at cost. Those who wish will be permitted to order by the card; a glass of milk for a cent, or a cup of coffee at the same price, indicate the scale of the charges. An experienced and popular caterer tells me that the actual cost of the food is not more than this — that the project is feasible from this point of view. Those girls who wish may obtain regular board at this refectory, at prices not to exceed two dollars and a half a week. It is hoped that the charge may be less than this. "The food will be prepared," say the proprietors, "by experienced cooks, and served in the best manner." The value of this provision for the comfort and health of the girls can be estimated only by those who have tested the cooking of the average cheap boarding-house. To be permitted to sit down in a bright and airy room, at a clean and prettily furnished table, to a well-cooked meal, will seem to many of these young women a foretaste of Paradise. In the determination to make this part of their plan serviceable to their employees, the proprietors will not haggle about the cost. If the refectory should not quite pay expenses, the bill of fare will not be cheapened, but the deficiency will be provided for.

The floor above is entered from the street by a wide porch which opens into a generous hall, on the left of which is a reception and conversation room, connecting by sliding doors with a music-room in the rear. Back of this is an ample lavatory with numerous bath-rooms — a most sumptuous provision for the comfort of the girls, and one which they are sure to appreciate. On the right of the hall is the great reading-room or common-room, a spacious and beautiful apartment, and in the rear of this, and communicating with it, the library, surrounded by low cases whose shelves will be filled with books for the use of the girls. Here, too, will be found numerous writing-tables and full supplies of writing-materials.

An easy stairway leads to the second floor. The first apartment on the right of the hall is a room to be furnished with sewing-machines, where the girls will be able to do their own sewing. Farther on are two or three class-rooms, in which evening classes will be taught in any branches which the young women may

desire to study. The plan is to permit them to organize these classes for themselves, in any branch in which they may desire instruction,—singing, penmanship, book-keeping, type-writing, stenography, fancy needlework, or whatever they wish; for all classes so organized, containing a certain number, teachers will be provided. The other side of this story is occupied by a large assembly-room, seating five or six hundred, with stage and anterooms, in which lectures, concerts, and entertainments of all kinds may be given to the inmates. It is hoped that they will take Mr. Besant's hint with respect to the use of this room, and learn how to furnish with these facilities a large part of their own diversion.

Several pianos will be located in different parts of the building, on which students of music will be permitted to practice. A competent matron will be put in charge of the Institute, to whose wisdom the general management will be largely intrusted. The whole building is warmed by steam and lighted by electricity.

The design is to furnish an attractive and delightful home for these young women during all the hours when they are not at work or asleep. The question about lodgings has been considered by the Messrs. Warner, but they have not been satisfied of the wisdom of furnishing these. It is possible that they may yet need lodging-houses in the neighborhood of the Seaside Institute; but at present they are not convinced that it may not be better for their women to keep their rooms in private families. The proprietors have found by investigation that half of their employees live within half a mile of the factory, so that the Institute will be easily accessible to most of them. Several rooms in the third story will be furnished as lodgings into which any of the women who are ill, or temporarily without homes, may be received, under the matron's care.

"All of the benefits afforded by the establishment," say the proprietors, "will be substantially free, except food, which will be furnished at or below cost. All the women who are in the employ of Warner Brothers will be entitled to any of the educational, literary, musical, and social privileges that may be furnished." There has been a question whether a small fee, say one dollar a year, might not secure a more general and freer use of the privileges of the Institute; whether the girls would not more readily avail themselves of a provision which was not entirely gratuitous. If any such charge should be made, it would be nominal, and only for the purpose of extending the benefits of the Institute.

Another feature of the institution is thus described by one of the proprietors: "We shall have connected with the building a savings bank, in order to encourage our hands to save some portion of their earnings. I have long since learned that what one earns has little to do with what he saves. One with an income of ten thousand dollars is no more likely to lay aside a portion of his earnings than one with an income of one thousand. The principle of saving is either inherited, or it must be cultivated, and it is to encourage this principle that this branch of the institution will be established. This privilege will be extended to all our help, male and female." Every employee who deposits two dollars a month is also promised that a half-dollar will be added to the deposit by the employers; and interest will be paid on all deposits, besides the bonus allowed.

It is evident that a considerable amount will be re-

quired to pay the operating expenses of this institution, and although this will be taken, at present, from the profits of the business, it is not to be left unprovided for in the event of a change in the proprietorship; for a sum of money is being set apart as a permanent fund for the endowment of the Institute, that it may go on doing its beneficent work after its proprietors have passed to their reward.

In these days, when the hearts of the compassionate are torn by so many harrowing tales of man's inhumanity to working-women, it is pleasant to be able to set forth the good deeds of these two chivalrous employers. Under the law of competition, which always pushes the weakest to the wall, women are the slaves of the labor market. They have not learned to combine; they have no power to resist the oppression of conscienceless capital; the price of their labor is therefore fixed by the most rapacious employers. Against them "the iron law of wages," in its bitterest sense, is continually being enforced. By a logic which is as inexorable as the grave, their compensation tends to starvation-point, nor does any merely "economical" force appear for their deliverance. The less they receive, the less they are able to earn; the labor-force in them is weakened by their impoverishment. The pictures that Helen Campbell has been showing us of the "Prisoners of Poverty" in New-York exhibit the natural result of unrestrained competition. If the women who work are to be rescued from their wretchedness, it must be done by the appearance on their behalf of such knightly employers as these, who decline to build their fortunes upon the woes of women, and who determine to share their gains with those who have helped to gather them. Of course all this is done in sheer despite of the economical maxims. In the thought of such employers, "business is business," and something more: it is opportunity; it is stewardship; it is the high calling of God. Not being omniscient I cannot pretend to discern all the motives of these employers, nor have they shown in my presence any disposition to make any parade of their philanthropy; but I visited their manufactory, by the side of which is planted this fair flower of their charity, and I have seen with my eyes what they are trying to do, and the thing which appears is this: that these two men are working as studiously, as resolutely, as patiently to improve the condition of their employees as they are to enlarge their fortunes. I believe that the one purpose lies as near their hearts as the other.

Are they alone in this? By no means. The number of those employers who find the vocation of the captain of industry to be a humane and a benign vocation is steadily growing. It was never growing so fast as it is to-day. The past two years, with all their strifes and turmoils, have wrought wonders in this realm. It begins to be evident enough that no organization of industry is stable and productive which does not bring in goodwill as one of the working forces. It is just as true of industry as of art, that

"He that shuts Love out, in turn shall be  
Shut out from Love, and on her threshold lie  
Howling in outer darkness."

The age of the soulless money-maker is passing; the new nobility is coming to its own.

It may be asked whether a higher justice, if not a true charity, would not require these employers to distribute directly in wages the money which they are

devoting to this institution. I do not think so. They are giving their employees more than the market rate of wages for such service; and this institution will be worth far more to these women than the money which it costs would be if it were divided among them. The aggregate amount of comfort, of enjoyment, of health, and of welfare which this institution will produce will be indefinitely greater than they could purchase for themselves with the same sum. This is due, in part, to economical causes; for comfort is a commodity that like most other commodities can be far more cheaply produced on the large scale. The benefits of coöperative housekeeping, after which a generation of burdened housekeepers have struggled in vain, are secured for these employees by the good providence of their employer. There are moral reasons, also, for preferring this method of distribution; for many of these beneficiaries would not, in their present state of mind, be likely to receive any real benefit from an increase of wages; a little more candy, a few more ribbons, an additional number of evenings in the skating-rink or the cheap theater would tell the story of their added income. They need, most of all, higher tastes, simpler enjoyments, and habits of frugality; and the Seaside Institute is intended to lead them gently toward these higher things. When they have found this kingdom, many things can be added unto them.

*Washington Gladden.*

#### Christian Union.

FROM THE BAPTIST POINT OF VIEW.

THE recent articles in *THE CENTURY* on the general subject of Christian union have been in a high degree interesting and instructive. He must be a very blind observer of "the signs of the times" who does not discover strong tendencies toward a closer union among all denominations of Christians. At the New York State Baptist Pastors' Conference held last fall at Poughkeepsie, a unanimous resolution was passed expressing this desire in explicit and emphatic terms. No body of Christians is more earnest than is the great Baptist denomination — numbering in the United States its millions — in offering the prayer of our Lord: "That they all may be one." By no formal appointment do I represent the denomination in this "Open Letter"; but I am quite sure that I do not misrepresent its spirit and efforts.

Three facts seem very plain to many at this time.

*First.* The great denominations are drawing nearer together in their forms of service. Churches which have not a liturgy, in the technical sense of that term, are adopting more elaborate forms of worship than they formerly used. On the other hand, some churches, which come into the category of liturgical churches, are omitting, in some of their services, some of their usual forms. In some of the revival or "mission" services everything which once distinguished liturgical churches is wanting. One might think in attending these services that he was at one of Mr. Moody's meetings. These "missions" are themselves an illustration of the tendency here named. They are simply "revivals," as the term has been used for generations among the more fervent Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. The Roman church adopted them in forms adapted to

their other methods of work; and some Episcopal churches have now come into the line of work long followed by other bodies. The same unifying tendency is seen in services in connection with the reception of new members and in preparation for the observance of the Lord's Supper. This two-fold modification of services indicates progress along the line of union; it is prophetic of greater progress soon to be made. It is greatly wise in every way. The oldest forms of creed, prayer, litany, chant, and hymn are the property of no one denomination. To claim a monopoly in their use is to manifest hopeless ignorance and unpardonable bigotry. As well might one claim a monopoly of the sunshine or the evening breeze.

*Second.* The different denominations to-day have essential union. At present organic union is undesirable. It is possible only by making dangerous compromises. A union which is possible only to those who believe anything or nothing to secure it, is bought at too dear a price. Honest convictions must be respected. Better that men differ honestly than agree by being indifferent to all creeds. Essential union is possible and actual to-day among the great majority of our Protestant churches. There are to-day wider differences among some of the branches of the Roman church than between some of the different churches in our great Protestant host. There are churches in this city, not Roman, of the same name, which differ more widely in spirit and life than do certain other churches bearing different denominational names. Rationalism and Romanism, in many of their distinctive features, may be found under the same church name and authority. Here is organic but not essential union. When churches of different names work along the line of their honest convictions of the teachings of God's word, they have essential union; coming near to their common Lord, and coming near to lost men, they come genuinely near to one another. Such union is worth much. An organic union, secured by concessions, compromises, and concealments of honest convictions, is a positive damage to all concerned.

*Third.* Christian union, both essential and organic, is greatly retarded because many Christians refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word, and the conclusions of the highest scholarship regarding the subjects and the act of baptism. Baptists hold that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice. They believe that this word teaches with unmistakable clearness that believers are the only subjects of baptism, and that baptism is the immersion of believers into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If the Bible does not clearly teach these truths, what truths does it clearly teach? More explicit are its utterances on these subjects than regarding the divinity of Christ, or any article in the orthodox creeds. As a matter of fact, there are in this country to-day millions who cannot accept sprinkling or pouring as baptism. But all men, always and in all places, accept immersion as baptism; not to accept it, is not to accept baptism. If ever there is organic union it will be at the baptistery. *Baptists care little for the mode of baptism.* The person to be baptized may kneel in the water, and be baptized forward; or he may stoop until the water flows over his head; or he may be baptized backward. But Baptists insist upon baptism. They cannot accept a substitute for the

act honored by the audible or visible presence of each Person in the Trinity when Jesus was baptized; honored in this respect as was no other act of obedience in our Lord's life. The so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" does not call anything baptism but immersion. It gives directions for baptism, and then, when the conditions of baptism are wanting, although we find them always possible, it gives permission for something else, not called baptism. This "teaching" Baptists alone live up to; it is especially their document. Their views the highest scholarship indorses. Lexicographers such as Donnegan, Schleusner, Greenfield, Stourdza, Liddell and Scott, Robinson, Wahl, Grimm, Wilke, and many more distinctly and emphatically affirm that baptize, which is properly a Greek word, means to dip, to immerse, to plunge. Such religious teachers as Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Archbishop Leighton, Wesley, Conybeare, and Dean Stanley say that immersion was the original mode. Such commentators as Chalmers, Zwingle, Ewald, De Wette, Meyer, Godot, Alford, Plumtre, Bishop Elliott, and many more, representing various churches and countries, say in substance that same thing. Such historians of our Lord's ministry and of the apostolic church as Mosheim, Neander, G. A. Jacobs, Geikie, Pressensé, Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, Dean Stanley, Edersheim, Farrar, Weiss, Hagenbach, and Dollinger, and such recent learned theologians as Luthardt, Van Oosterzee, Schmidt, Dorner, and Rothe, agree substantially with the learned Dr. Schaff when he says, "Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original form." Luther, Dr. Wall, Neander, Olshausen, and Professor Lange agree with Dr. Hanna when he says, "Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants." If scholarship can prove anything, it has established the Baptist position regarding the subjects and the act of baptism.

The point I make is this: All are agreed on immersion as baptism; all cannot agree on anything else. All can be baptized without doing violence either to conviction or to conscience. High Roman, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Methodist and other authorities can be cited — and their exact words given — to prove all these statements regarding the teaching of the highest scholarship; and the plain teaching of the Bible to the unlearned is in harmony with the conclusions of the highest scholarship. Baptists have no option but to be separate so long as others refuse to follow Christ in baptism. If a pastor in any of the churches not Baptist were to teach and practice our views, he would be driven out. What then could he do but be separate from his former brethren? If others than Baptists will not do what conviction and conscience permit them to do, it is certain that they do not much desire union. Surely in such a case the charge of bigotry and schism does not lie at the door of Baptists. We shall continue to pray, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, . . ." that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

R. S. MacArthur.

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, New York.

#### American Students in Germany.

Now that multitudes of American college graduates annually migrate to Berlin, Leipzig, Göttingen, and Strasburg, it may not be out of place to call attention

to some widespread misapprehensions concerning the charms and advantages of life in a German university town.

No impression concerning Germany is more widespread than that the cost of living there is exceedingly cheap. This is always a potent argument in deciding students of limited means in favor of life in Germany. This is certainly, however, a wrong impression, as far as it applies to the expenses of the American student in Germany as compared with his expenses at most of our colleges. A few figures will put the facts in the most definite shape. In Leipzig, which is probably the cheapest city in the German empire, the average price of the boarding-houses which rank as good — though their fare would be counted rather scant and poor in America — is about twenty-five dollars a month, for room, fuel, and board. In Berlin the best boarding-houses set somewhat better tables than those of a corresponding grade in Leipzig, but their prices are much higher.

Many German students, it is true, subsist upon much less, but how they do so must be to an American an insoluble mystery, unless there be a marvelous potency of nourishment in beer. There are also Americans who keep soul and body together at rates considerably lower than those mentioned. But in a good many such cases it is perfectly apparent that these students are working with only half their native force. The writer is cognizant of several cases in which men broke down entirely either during their stay in Germany or shortly after their return, their failure of health being almost unquestionably due to lack of proper diet and self-care while abroad. Cheap German living is not adapted to an American constitution.

As far as the social life of Germany is concerned, the American student must in the main content himself with an outside view. The ideal German household into which he is to be received as one of the family, and whose members are to devote themselves to teaching him the language, is a pure illusion, or at best a boarding-house where he joins with a tableful of his countrymen in speaking poor German. In fact, the presence of a host of English-speaking people in every prominent German city is a serious hindrance to the facility with which the American might otherwise learn the language and assimilate himself to the manners and customs of the country. It is probably better, however, to submit to this hindrance than to refuse, as some do, to mingle at all with those who speak English; for, in so doing, one loses the opportunity to become acquainted with many of the finest representatives of English and American learning. The students who gather from America and England in Göttingen, Leipzig, and Berlin, are, in the main, a choice representative company. Not even in America itself can one gain so comprehensive a view of the educational work of our nation, as by mingling in a German university town with students from almost every State of the Union.

A great mistake of fully half the American students in Germany is that they have fixed upon no definite department of study before coming, or, if they have done so, have not prepared themselves sufficiently at home to undertake it to advantage in the university. As is well known, the German student, on entering the university, decides what his profession is to be, and se-

lects his studies accordingly. The thorough drill of the *Gymnasium* or *Realschule* has fitted him for the independent study demanded of him in the university.

Now the American just out of college has not only the difficulty of the language to cope with; he finds fully as great a difficulty in the lecture system and in the use of books of reference. He has had no adequate training for the work he must do, and he is pretty sure to end his first semester, if not his first year, in a state of almost hopeless confusion.

I think no American can listen to many courses of lectures in a German university without becoming convinced of the superiority of the better class of American college professors in the art of *instruction*. Except in the occasional interviews of the *Seminar*, the German professor has none of that training which comes from meeting the intelligent questions of a clever class. An American professor learns in the course of a few years' experience to feel the pulse of his class, as it were, and to know in an instant whether he has made himself understood. Many of the most famous German professors, on the other hand, elaborate with tedious detail the simplest matters, and sometimes merely hint at the explanation of real difficulties. They are for the most part closely confined in their lectures to what they have carefully prepared beforehand, and any occasion to think or to answer on the spur of the moment is pretty sure to throw them into confusion. With some brilliant exceptions, remarkable for their clearness, systematic arrangement, and beauty of language, they pay no attention to the "art of putting things," their style frequently being execrable.

One thing that greatly annoys the American student in Germany is the lack of such library privileges as he can enjoy in the best colleges at home. Not but that the German libraries are very large and complete, but their availability is so limited by various restrictions as well as by the lack of comprehensive and accessible catalogues, that in despair many American students soon give up trying to obtain books.

I have purposely spoken only of certain disappointments and disadvantages which the American student is likely to experience in Germany. Of the delightful sensation of personal freedom from all rules and restraints, and the powerful inspiration to independent study which he also experiences, as well as of the enormous debt of gratitude which American scholarship owes to the German university, it is needless to speak — as, indeed, it would be difficult to speak in too glowing terms.

Morris B. Crawford.

#### Photography and American Art.\*

THERE is a great deal that is worth watching in American Art at the present time; and one of these things is the effect of photography upon art,—not merely the effect of the Muybridge revelations, which

\*"Book of American Figure Painters," with introduction by Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

"The Blessed Damozel," by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, with drawings by Kenyon Cox. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

"She Stoops to Conquer," a comedy by Dr. Goldsmith, with drawings by Edwin A. Abbey, decorations by Alfred Parsons, introduction by Austin Dobson. New York: Harper & Bros.

"A Book of the Tile Club," with sketch of the club, by F. Hopkinson Smith and Edward Strahan. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

"The Art Review," Vol. I., Nov., '86, to May, '87. New York: George F. Kelly, 59 Carmine street.



though of great value may easily be overdone as assistants to the artist; not merely the general and undoubted effect of all photography from nature—an effect extended and made more intimate by the spread of amateur photography; not merely the general diffusion of art instruction and influence by means of photographic copies of the old masters, etc.; not merely the great and important use of photography in wood-engraving, but also the growing use of photography in various reproductive methods, and the effect of their use upon illustration in particular, and upon current art in general.

The success of Elihu Vedder's "Omar Khayyâm," and of William H. Low's "Lamia" in previous years, was the occasion of such volumes in the last season as the "Book of American Figure Painters," and Kenyon Cox's "Blessed Damozel";—possibly such success may also have had something to do with the book form in which Edwin Abbey's illustrations of "She Stoops to Conquer" were brought out. These photographic processes have, therefore, become a strong factor in American art development, and have given the opportunity to publishers to employ our better artists upon continuous series of congenial subjects; as well as to present to the public good-sized reproductions of unrelated original designs, either made for the purpose or already completed, as in the "Book of American Figure Painters." This volume, though its pictures are not of uniform merit, deserves the attention of the connoisseur. Kenyon Cox has not yet surpassed his "Evening" in this collection. Here, too, are Dewing's exquisite "Days," Winslow Homer's "Lost on the Grand Banks," and Bunker's "Dozing Tar"—with examples of La Farge, Wyatt Eaton, Vedder, Julian Weir, Eastman Johnson, Volk, Dielman, Shirlaw, Millet, Chase, and other painters of ability. A better collection is easily imaginable,—but single pictures in this gallery are worth the cost of the whole sumptuous volume. The "Blessed Damozel" of Cox, it is natural for each critic to assume, is not the "Blessed Damozel" of the poet; and we find moreover, in this series, that tendency to stick too closely to the model, which is this artist's danger; but we find also a keen and unusual decorative and pictorial sense, as well as undoubted evidences of imagination. Mr. Abbey is indebted to the actinic, and other processes in which photography comes into play, in the preparation of his illustrations for "She Stoops to Conquer," a work as near perfection in its illustrative and artistic qualities in its own line as contemporaneous art can show. The delightfully illustrated "Book of the Tile Club" also owes much of its attractiveness to the photographic processes. If we were not speaking especially of the photographic side of the subject, we should like to enlarge upon the art qualities displayed in the covers of all the four books here mentioned; but instead will call attention to the extremely successful use of the photogravure in the new American "Art Review," whose bound volumes are an invaluable storehouse of current American art.

## Notes.

THE NEW ENGLAND EMIGRANT AID COMPANY.

TO THE EDITOR: There are what I regard as grave errors in relation to Kansas, in the life of Lincoln, in your April number, which I would gladly correct in your columns without delay. But you inform me, in your note of the 25th inst., that it would be some time before a reply could appear.

I beg leave, therefore, to say that these errors are partly refuted in some lectures which I gave by request of the Worcester Society of Antiquity. In its "Proceedings for 1886" an abstract of these lectures has been published. A much more full and elaborate refutation will appear in the book which I am now writing, to be called "The History of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, and its Influence, through the Kansas Contest, upon our National History." It is my purpose to have this book ready for the reader by the end of the present year.

*Eli Thayer.*

WORCESTER, MASS., April 30, 1887.

## THE GOVERNMENT OF CITIES.

THE plan of John D. Cutter, in the May CENTURY, to better the government of cities by securing in the City Council members elected by guilds which represent various business interests, to be complete should include a representation from the house-mothers.

The home-makers represent the largest and, in a sense, the most important of all the interests. The women who compose it are preëminently law-abiding and orderly. Their chief occupation is the care of the children and of the family. Hence, all their interests are opposed to everything that endangers the peace and well-being of the whole community.

Any change in the form of city government which looks to its improvement should include women, with the right to vote.

More than thirty years ago Wendell Phillips said, "The suffrage of women has much to do with the government of great cities." Has not the time fully come when it should be brought in as an added power on the side of law and order?

*Lucy Stone.*

A CORRESPONDENT objects to the phrase, "Treeless and birdless," in a poem on Dakota recently printed in THE CENTURY. He writes that many ten-acre groves have been planted, and that the Territory is noted for its birds.

In the "General Recollections of Louis Blanc," by Karl Blind, on page 80 of the May number, the sentence: "Thiers cast his vote against declaration of war, first, last, and ever," ought to read thus: "Finally, Thiers practically voted for 'the war by way of granting the supplies, like the other members of the Opposition.'"

weave together certain lines which, though not entirely suited to the John Brown music, were yet capable of being sung to it. I lay still in the dark room, line after line shaping itself in my mind, and verse after verse. When I had thought out the last of these, I felt that I must make an effort to place them beyond the danger of being effaced by a morning nap. I sprang out of bed and groped about in the dim twilight to find a bit of paper and the stump of a pen which I remembered to have had the evening before. Having found these articles, and having long been accustomed to scribble with scarcely any sight of what I might write in a room made dark for the repose of my infant children, I began to write the lines of my poem in like manner. (I was always careful to decipher these lines within twenty-four hours, as I had found them perfectly illegible after a longer period.) On the occasion now spoken of, I completed my writing, went back to bed, and fell fast asleep.

A day or two later, I repeated my verses to Mr. Clarke, who was much pleased with them. Soon after my return to Boston, I carried the lines to James T. Fields, at that time Editor of the "Atlantic Monthly." The title, "Battle Hymn of the Republic," was of his devising. The poem was published soon after in the magazine, and did not at first receive any especial mention. We were all too much absorbed in watching the progress of the war to give much heed to a copy of verses more or less. I think it may have been a year later that my lines, in some shape, found their way into a Southern prison in which a number of our soldiers were confined. An army chaplain who had been imprisoned with them came to Washington soon after

his release, and in a speech or lecture of some sort, described the singing of the hymn by himself and his companions in that dismal place of confinement. People now began to ask who had written the hymn, and the author's name was easily established by a reference to the magazine. The battle hymn was often sung in the course of the war, and under a great variety of circumstances. Among other anecdotes, I have heard of its having once led a "forlorn hope" through a desperate encounter to a successful issue.

The wild echoes of the fearful struggle have long since died away, and with them all memories of unkindness between ourselves and our Southern brethren. But those who once loved my hymn still sing it. In many a distant Northern town where I have stood to speak, the song has been sung by the choir of some one of the churches before or after my lecture. I could hardly believe my ears when, at an entertainment at Baton Rouge which I shared with other officers of the New Orleans Exposition, the band broke bravely into the John Brown tune. It was scarcely less surprising for me to hear my verses sung at the exposition by the colored people who had invited me to speak to them in their own department. A printed copy of the words and music was once sent me from Constantinople, by whom, I never knew. But when I visited Roberts College, in the neighborhood of that city, the good professors and their ladies at parting asked me to listen well to what I might hear on my way down the steep declivity. I did so, and heard, in sweet, full cadence, the lines which scarcely seem mine, so much are they the breath of that heroic time, and of the feeling with which it was filled.

*Julia Ward Howe.*



## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### An Urgent Measure of National Defense.

ASIDE from the construction of ships and fortifications, to which there is reason to believe that the next Congress will give serious attention, the most pressing question of national defense relates to the naval *personnel*. Not that our officers and blue-jackets are of inferior quality: far from it. Given the materials necessary for training in modern war, and our naval force, as far as it goes, will challenge comparison with any of its rivals. The difficulty is not that it is inefficient, but that it is insufficient. It is a mere nucleus, a navy on a peace footing. Alike in the Revolution, when our enemy had a powerful navy, and in the Civil War, when he had no navy at all, the Government felt from the outset to the close the urgent want of a large body of trained man-o'-war's-men. Men were gradually enlisted, but the absence of a previous enrollment made it difficult and expensive to get them, and the absence of a previous training deferred the period of their efficiency until long after they were got.

In accordance with that sound maxim of American policy which forbids the maintenance of a large stand-

ing force, our regular army will probably never exceed twenty or thirty thousand men, and our regular navy ten or twelve thousand. But the army makes up for its small size by an ample reserve, composed of a well-organized, well-equipped, and well-trained militia. If a war should break out to-morrow, it would be easy to put into the field, in the course of a fortnight, from fifty to one hundred thousand men, officered, armed, and, to some extent, trained for war. They would be raw troops, no doubt, but they would still be troops: all the preliminary work—the enrollment, by which the Government could lay hands on them immediately, the arrangement in working organizations, the elementary training—would have been provided for beforehand, and when the crisis came, would be an accomplished fact.

The navy, on the other hand, upon which the country must place its first reliance for defence, whose forces are always scattered, and whose statutory number, of seven thousand five hundred seamen, falls short of actual peace requirements, is absolutely without a provision for enlargement. In our population of sixty millions there is not a single individual known to the

Navy Department by name, residence, or occupation,—and much less is there any organization,—upon whom or upon which it could call in an emergency to perform duty in ships of war. Plenty of men there doubtless are who would be glad to offer their services, and who might in the course of time be enlisted, assigned to duties, and made available for purposes of training; but the enlistment and assignment of any large number would take two months at least, and the training would require a month or two more. During the four months thus consumed, a properly prepared enemy would have destroyed all our construction-yards and naval stations, to say nothing of our commerce and our commercial cities.

To remedy this glaring defect, a plan must be prepared which shall receive the substantial approval of the mercantile and maritime community on the one hand, and of the Government on the other; for these are the two forces whose coöperation is necessary to insure success. Its two underlying features are the enrollment of volunteers from the merchant service, the fishing fleet, and the yacht squadrons, as officers, petty officers, and seamen of the United States Naval Reserve; and secondly, their training from time to time, for short periods—three weeks or a month at the most—in regularly commissioned ships of war, organized, if possible, as a squadron of evolutions. The volunteers should receive compensation while actually in service, and, the period of training finished, they should be free to return to their vocations, retaining their connection with the service by a permanent registration. The details of the plan require careful deliberation, but they present no serious difficulties, and call for no great outlay. Registers opened at the commercial seaports should be inscribed with the names of those desiring to associate themselves with the naval reserve. The Navy Department should devote to the work some of the modern ships of which its home squadron will shortly be composed, with selected officers in sufficient numbers to provide for the instruction of the volunteers. The latter, wearing the uniform of the service, and subject to its regulations, would perform their tour of duty at periods that would cause the least possible interruption of their ordinary occupations.

The plan would not make sailors out of landmen, but that would not be its object. The volunteers, being seafaring men, already know half their business, and they would be given an opportunity to learn the other half,—the handling of weapons, the routine and discipline of a ship of war, and the intelligent use of its manifold mechanical appliances. The adoption of such a plan would enable the Government, at the first sign of war, to fit out at once all the ships laid up at its yards, instead of marking time while its squadrons returned from distant stations, or, worse still, while Congress deliberated upon the best method of mobilizing a force that was not yet organized, trained, or even recruited. Certainly no measure of national defence is more reasonable or practical than this, and there is none that calls more urgently for immediate action.

#### The Niagara Reservation.

Few public measures, based upon considerations other than those of economic benefit, have met with such wide-spread and hearty approval as has greeted

the establishment of the Niagara Reservation. No question involving simply the public's chances of future pleasure can have a greater interest than the question, What now is to be done with this property which the people of the State of New-York hold in trust for the people of all the world?

Entrance-fees have already been abolished, and many eyesores and incumbrances in the shape of mills and fences and vulgar places of amusement have already been removed. But it will easily be understood that a great deal of further work—and of a constructive as well as of a destructive character—will be required if the Reservation is to show that its owners appreciate its value and the responsibility which its possession lays upon them. We are sorry to say that there is no immediate prospect of this work being undertaken. That is, no money has yet been appropriated by the Legislature to begin it. But the Board which has the Reservation in charge has accepted the plan of improvement suggested by the landscape artists to whose consideration the matter was submitted;\* and we think it only needs that the outlines of this plan should be laid before the public to excite a strong wish that it shall as soon as possible be put in execution. Seldom, we think, has a task of the kind been approached in a spirit which so unites common sense with artistic feeling, and so carefully holds the balance true between what is due to the property itself and what is due to the persons who will visit it.

The problem was by no means an easy one to master. Its very first theoretic stages were, indeed, simple enough. Of course, as Messrs. Olmsted and Vaux begin by saying, it is desirable "that whatever is done shall tell toward a general result that shall be lastingly satisfactory, nothing being wasted on matters of temporary expediency"; and of course this means that preparation must be made for the presence of even greater crowds of visitors than have been in the habit of assembling in the past. Again, it is obvious that "the greatest good of the greatest number" is the one aim to be kept in view. The rights of local property-owners have already been made to yield to it; and to it must be subordinated also the privileges of individual tourists in so far as they seem likely to conflict with general enjoyment.

Up to this point no great difficulty presented itself. But then to decide what really is the greatest good in such a case, and, this having been settled, so to elaborate a plan of improvement that it might be thoroughly well secured, but that individual privileges might be interfered with no more than strict necessity compelled, and in such a manner as to excite the least possible feeling of constraint in the most selfish of tourists—these were matters which demanded the exercise of patient thought, clear judgment, wise foresight, and that practical knowledge which could only have grown from long experience with similar problems.

As revealed in their lucid, full, and logical statement,

\* "General Plan for the Improvement of the Niagara Reservation." New York: Martin B. Brown, 49 & 51 Park Place. 1887. (A pamphlet containing the report addressed to the Hon. William Dorsheimer, President of the Board of Commissioners of the State Reservation at Niagara, by Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux, Landscape-architects; and a large map of the property as it will appear if remodeled in accordance.)

Messrs. Olmsted and Vaux's primary idea is that the greatest good which they can secure to their clients is the enjoyment of natural scenery in as pure and unadulterated an aspect as the decent, safe, and comfortable accommodation of great throngs of visitors will permit. That is to say, people will in future be expected to come to Niagara to look at Niagara, not to picnic or to play, and not to gaze at mountebanks, or peep-shows, or "galleries of art," or collections of natural curiosities. And they will be shown it as nearly as possible as nature made it, neither desecrated nor, in the cant sense, "improved," and under the beams of the sun and moon, but never again of colored calcium-lights. Its beauty and its wonderfulness are to be given the freest chance to speak to our emotions, while the petty and discordant tones of humanity's creations are as much as possible to be suppressed. And, with keen artistic taste, this rule is so extended as to war against all artificial accentuation of natural charms, all deliberate emphasizing of natural impressions. Every opportunity will be given the visitor to see all there is to see, but no effort will be made to enhance astonishment, to excite amazement, or to stimulate mere curiosity.

Surely these decisions are wise. So, also, is the cogent decision that, as "the more artificial features fill the eye the less will be the effect of natural features," no object or arrangement "of an artificial character should be allowed a place on the property, no matter how valuable it might be under other circumstances, and no matter at how little cost it may be had, the presence of which can be avoided consistently with the provision of necessary conditions for making the enjoyment of the natural scenery available." Those objects and arrangements which, in the pursuance of this end, cannot be avoided will be only too numerous, and will be only too conspicuous despite the care that will be taken to make them unobtrusive in both form and color. Roads and walks must be constructed in greater numbers than they exist to-day, if all other portions of the surface are to be guarded as carefully as they should be—much more carefully, that is, than they have been in the past. Standing and turning places for carriages must be laid out. Abundant seats and various bridges and stairways are of course a necessity. Shelters must be built containing ample accommodations for the guardians of the place and for the comfort of the greatest possible crowds of visitors. Especially when the narrowness of the long belt which forms the Reservation is considered, do we feel how wise, therefore, is the judgment which would exclude all other objects save those which nature intended the ground to bear; not only all appliances for "amusement," but all works of art, all exotic ornamental trees and shrubs, all "decorative" flower-beds,—everything that could further interfere with the natural aspect of the place or (quite as important a point) could attract the eye to details when it should be contemplating broad general effects.

Another thing which this precept obliges (and which the comfort of the great body of visitors also necessitates) is that there shall be no places of entertainment, or of more than temporary shelter except at the very entrance of the Reservation, and that stringent care shall be taken to prevent the monopolizing of attractive spots by picnic parties and the littering of the ground with sandwich-papers, soda-water bottles, and

tomato-cans. Vast numbers of people—sometimes as many as ten thousand a day—come every summer for a brief look at the Falls, who neither would nor could come were they obliged to refresh and rest themselves at the village hotels. For these, and their babies and baskets, ample and even luxurious accommodation will be provided in a large (but low) reception-building at the entrance to the Reservation in the Upper Grove, and in adjacent half-open pavilions. But beyond these buildings no carrying of food will be permitted, and nowhere else will it be supplied. The hardship resulting from this rule will be very small, for the distance from the site of the old eating-house on Goat Island to the new reception-rooms or to the village hotels is scarcely greater than a ten minutes' walk will cover. In truth, it will be no hardship but a positive benefit to the average unthinking tourist if he is thus persuaded to rest and refresh himself before he does his sight-seeing.

The good sense shown by another decision is perhaps less immediately obvious, but is quite as evident when the reasons for it are studied in the report and by the aid of the map. Involving as they do calculations with regard to the numbers who are likely to visit the Reservation in future years, statements as to the insecurity of certain portions of the water-front, descriptions of the lay of the ground in various directions, and a balancing of the relative claims of accommodation and of natural beauty, these reasons are far too long and complicated to be quoted here. But they clearly show, we repeat, the wisdom of the decision that the carriage-drives and halting-places, both on the mainland and on Goat Island, shall be kept a little away from the shore, and that the best points of view shall be approachable only on foot. Nor is the hardship which this decision may seem to involve much more than an apparent one. To make some thirty paces on foot is but a small exertion for the able-bodied, and wheeled chairs are to be supplied for the use of invalids. The greatest good of the greatest number will be promoted by this arrangement almost more than by any other that is proposed.

One or two additional intentions may be noted. All hazardous points along the brink will be rendered as safe as possible, and carefully guarded against overcrowding. All plantings will be made with native trees in desirable variety, more regard being paid to permanent than to speedily effective results; and they will be so arranged as to screen off the village from the Reservation, while allowing constant views or glimpses of the water from all the roads and paths. The shore line above the falls will be restored to naturalness of aspect and protected against the encroachment of the water in inconspicuous ways. The present staircase to the Cave of the Winds will be retained for immediate use; but as the recession of the cliff will eventually necessitate its removal, it is advised that at some future day a shaft and tunnel containing an elevator should be built, the entrance to be placed some fifty feet from the edge of the bank. Further to reduce the inconveniences and expenses which hitherto have afflicted the tourist, a cheap omnibus-service will be established, and modest guide-posts will direct pedestrians.

This then, in its main outlines, is the scheme for the execution of which we hope the next Legislature will

be asked to vote sufficient funds. Of course not everything which it suggests need be done at once; but with regard to some things there is the greatest necessity for immediate action. It is especially desirable, for instance, that the new drives on Goat Island should be at once constructed, for those which exist are so insufficient that visitors are seriously inconvenienced, and many intervening stretches of ground are month by month more seriously injured by trampling feet. But the truth is that there is scarcely a yard of the entire Reservation which does not need treatment of some sort — either for alteration or for conservation; and as all the work requires much time for its completion, none of it can be begun too soon.

Even after it is, so to say, completed, much additional time must elapse before its full results will be apparent, for a landscape-artist must wait years for his labors to finish themselves after he has finished upon the soil the plan he had sketched on paper. The main thing, therefore, is, to begin. But when once we have begun, the main thing will be to remember through all coming years that the property must not only be made, but kept, what its wisely chosen name implies,—*a piece of nature defended as strictly as possible against all*

*intrusion of artificiality.* As such it will have no more room for certain kinds of beauty to display themselves than for any kind of ugliness. To try to prettify it with fountains and statues, and exotic shrubs and brilliant flower-beds, would be as unwise, as inartistic, and as vulgar almost, as to try to add to its attractions by merry-go-rounds and menageries, and illuminations, and ice-cream stalls. One feels sure that the Reservation will never again wear that disgraceful resemblance to a country fair-ground which it has worn so long. But we wish one could feel just as sure that it will never be made into a park or a garden or a pleasure-ground of any kind, even the most sumptuously "aristocratic."

We wish too that it were entirely certain, that if the year of Queen Victoria's jubilee is indeed to be signalized by the forming of a Government Reservation on the Canada shore, this too will be planned and managed in accordance with this general idea. The views from the Canada bank are much more extensive and imposing than those from our own. There is all the greater reason, therefore, why their effect should not be lessened by "ornamental" park-like foregrounds, or forced into unworthy rivalry with the attractions of places of amusement and bodily refreshment.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Education of the Blind.

NO. I. AS CHILDREN.

NOTWITHSTANDING the attention given to this subject during the past two or three decades by able and philanthropic persons, and the excellent work in certain directions and within certain limits now done in many of our State institutions, the matter is still but very imperfectly understood, even by those who make it a specialty, and scarcely at all by the general public. Yet it is one of almost universal interest. There are, comparatively speaking, but few families in this or any other country which are not sooner or later, directly or indirectly, called upon to exercise their thoughts and sympathies in behalf of some afflicted member, friend, or acquaintance, for whom, in their ignorance of possibilities and precedents, they entertain the most exaggerated compassion, the most needlessly doleful and hopeless ideas.

The experience and observation of many years enable me to speak with definite, vivid, personal knowledge upon this theme; and though I have by no means the intention, nor perhaps the ability, to formulate a complete system of study and training for those deprived of sight, I may possibly, by a few practical suggestions, throw a little light into some darkened existences, render less appalling the roar of life's battle to some about entering it under fearful disadvantages, or show a gleam of hope to the heavy heart of some discouraged mother, who sees her child, in all the glad bright promise of the future which her fond maternal pride has pictured in advance, entombed alive in midnight blackness, blighted with the curse of useless, joyless dependence — for such its fate appears to her. If I can succeed in giving aid or comfort to any of these, my labor will be repaid tenfold.

The chief difficulty in the past, and perhaps an unavoidable one in the way of more satisfactory results in the education of the blind as a class, has been that most of the theorizing and experimenting, as well as the practical work in this direction, has been done by seeing persons, who are never wholly able to divest their minds of certain prejudices and misapprehensions with regard to those under their charge, nor to enter fully into their real condition and actual needs. Many of them have been intelligent and earnestly devoted to their task, and a few have really hit upon some very rational projects and ingenious contrivances to ameliorate the condition and add to the comfort of their pupils and protégés; but the majority have been led astray by erroneous conceptions of the state with which they had to deal, which rendered their best-meant endeavors fruitless; while no small number have been fantastic dreamers or pig-headed hobbyists, erratic cranks of every description, who have either used this form of philanthropy as an easy means of gaining a livelihood, or have regarded the unfortunates under their charge as only important in the light of suitable and legitimate subjects for every variety of experiment, psychological and physical, from fanatical, monomaniac piety, to hydropathy.

Some of the theories put in practice, in defiance of common sense, by men whom the state supports and the public applauds, would be boundlessly ludicrous, if their results were not pitifully sad. For instance, the superintendent of a large and richly endowed institution for the blind at Naples maintains that all sightless persons should be kept in utter ignorance of sight; that in justice and mercy they should never be allowed to know what they miss,— that is, should never be permitted to meet, either in their specially prepared

literature or conversation, any reference whatever to light, color, or any purely visible phenomena; in short, should never be told of anything which they cannot themselves hear, taste, or touch; should live in vast cloister-like asylums, supported by charity, strangers to every experience of actual life—pictures, scenery, sight itself, to them unknown, even by name. Following this theory out to its logical conclusion, it is difficult to comprehend how any brain outside a madhouse could conceive it, still less harbor it for a moment; yet upward of three hundred wretches are to-day being *educated*, as it is termed, in accordance with this theory.

Another superintendent of a similar establishment in Germany told the writer, not long since, that "prayer and Christian resignation" were the only things of value which the blind could learn or practice; that for them, as for the lepers of old, life in this world was over, and it was their duty and privilege to fit themselves early for the next; that any effort to change their condition materially, besides being entirely fruitless, would be equivalent to rebellion against the restrictions of their divinely appointed sphere. In his establishment, therefore, the chief and only important exercise of the pupils was to kneel regularly every half-hour at the stroke of a bell and mutter through a lot of senseless prayers, learned by rote, to render them more contented with their lot and resigned to its necessary limitations, as was claimed by their judicious instructor, who, like many others, was entirely satisfied with divine restrictions for other people.

In America the conditions, prospects, and educational opportunities of this numerically important class are of course incalculably superior to those in Europe. There the outlook, even to the casual observer, is hopeless and heart-rending; here it presents many elements of encouragement. Our sound national common sense helps us to take the lead in this, as in most practical matters; but we have still very much to test and demonstrate.

An important source of misunderstanding and consequent mismanagement in dealing with the blind, especially as children, is the exaggerated sympathy and commiseration felt and expressed toward them by parents, teachers, and others. Those to whom total darkness is synonymous with mental depression, vague terror, and utter physical helplessness, naturally suppose that never to see the light at all must mean positive, poignant, perpetual misery. To them it would, for a time at least; and they cannot realize how completely circumstances alter cases. The blind child knows nothing of this feeling, and never would, if it were not dinned into his ears by the stupid, over-officious kindness of those about him. He is accustomed to his condition, has pretty much forgotten or has never known any other, and lives his life contentedly enough within its necessary limitations, unconscious of any lack, save when reminded of it by some practical difficulty to be overcome, or, far oftener and more painfully, by the injudicious remarks and demeanor of others. Many a day that for him would have passed cheerfully, filled with play or study, without a thought of his misfortune, is embittered and made wretched by a few ill-timed, ill-chosen words from some well-meaning friend or curious neighbor. For he is, as a rule, abnormally sensitive upon this score; and though it

should be his aim and that of his guardians to overcome this tendency, it cannot be done by continually and heedlessly irritating the sore spot.

Let him alone; treat him and think of him as if he were not different from other children, and he will become far less so than you suppose. Assume that he is to feel, think, and enjoy as others do, and he will surprise you by the clearness of his perceptions, the accuracy of his intuitions, and the thoroughness of his participation in things which you had supposed were wholly beyond his scope. Help him to forget or ignore rather than to realize and lament his infirmity; not by anxiously avoiding every subject that has any connection with sight, but by tacitly granting that he has other not necessarily inferior means of obtaining the same impressions of the outer world as yourself, which is approximately true. You will thus greatly contribute not only to his practical well-being and personal comfort, but to his good opinion of your own tact. It may be here remarked that the sufferer from blindness or other bodily affliction is always able to gauge the taste and breeding of those he meets by the length of time it takes them to get round to this, for him, disagreeable topic. With the coarse, illiterate man, it is the first and about the only thing spoken of; others arrive at it by more or less ingenious colloquial meanderings, displaying a rude curiosity behind a flimsy veil of every degree of transparency. Comparatively few succeed in overlooking it altogether, and these are proportionally appreciated. Fred Douglas is reported to have said: "I regard Mr. Lincoln as the finest gentleman I ever met, for he is the only one who never directly or indirectly reminded me of my color," a pregnant and suggestive remark, well worth a second thought.

Another terrible obstacle to the proper development of the blind is the overweening caution of their friends for them, and the unreasonable, incredulous distrust of their capabilities which they must meet on every hand, and either combat, with all but superhuman energy, or succumb to, as they, alas, too often do. One is reminded of a man who has all his life long taken the same local paper, till he has come to live in and swear by it, and finds it impossible to believe that his neighbor, who subscribes for a rival sheet, can be posted upon current events, or capable of judging of anything, merely because his communication with the world is through a different medium. Those who have all their lives been in the habit of depending upon sight for everything, from the study of philosophy and the Scriptures to the tying of a shoestring, cannot seem to understand that hearing and touch may with practice be made to serve nearly all purposes about as well, and some very much better. For example, because they cannot find the door of their own parlor at first trial if the lamp suddenly goes out, they consider it incredible that a person without sight can go all over a large city alone as independently and safely as they; yet he finds it just as hard to believe or understand that they can tell, through the glass of a closed window, how many persons are in a passing carriage, or whether the gas is lighted, from the other side of the room. Both judge from limited personal experience, a very unreliable criterion when applied to things outside its range. The fact is that the blind child, if given a chance, will discover or develop

means to do nearly everything that others do, in its own way and with somewhat more trouble, it is true, but well enough for all practical needs and for its own satisfaction. If not hemmed in at every turn, anticipated in every wish and effort, warned against and prevented from making every self-reliant attempt, the sightless child will gradually attain to an independence as natural and necessary to his well-being as it is marvelous to his over-anxious friends. Here, again, leave him to himself; let him meet his own necessities, find his limitations, test and train his powers. Let him hunt his own lost playthings, even if he be slow about it, and your tender patience be tried almost beyond bearing by the spectacle. Let him grope for them; the next time it will not take half so long, and in ten years he will find a dropped coin or cuff-button as quickly as you can. Let him help himself at table, at the toilette, and on all occasions as others do. Let him go alone, not only over house and grounds, which many think so wonderful, but on the streets of town or city, wherever he pleases and others of his age are allowed to go. Encourage him to compete with them in all they undertake, whether physical or intellectual, and he will very likely astonish you often by excelling them. In a word, help him to independence, the first essential of his happiness, the corner-stone of his life's edifice, the key-note of its harmony.

Fortunate indeed is he who, when entering earth's lists, the odds against him doubled, his own forces crippled by such an infirmity, finds himself blessed in a mother with brains as well as heart, who can curb maternal fondness and fears in accordance with a far-sighted plan for his good. To the credit of such a mother and for the encouragement of others like her who may be beginning a similar task, the writer may be permitted to state in support of the above assertions that, thanks to such a judicious training, he was able, without either memory of or aid from sight and without material assistance from any institution or corps of teachers, to compete fairly and successfully with his boyhood companions, not only in the different grades of the public-school and the higher branches of academical study, but in most of the bodily exercises and sports, such as swimming, skating, running, rowing, etc.; to ride horseback alone anywhere within ten miles of his suburban home; in short, to take an enjoyable part in nearly every occupation and amusement entered into by other boys; later, to travel alone over the greater part of this country and Europe, to wander through the streets of many foreign cities, enjoying their different languages and customs. Though this required, no doubt, a closer attention and a greater keenness and alertness of the faculties than the average person would have needed to exercise, it was not therefore less beneficial or pleasurable, and was certainly done with as great freedom, safety, and comfort, and as few mishaps or inconveniences as fall to the lot of an ordinary traveler. Only another proof of the old saying that there is more than one road to Rome and more than one means to an end, if one searches with a will.

The question is often asked: By what means does a person unable to see find his way from place to place, or know when to turn a corner, or even keep on the sidewalk, etc? That some such power is possessed, to a greater or less degree, by most blind people, is well

known; but just what it is or how far it may be carried, few understand; and even among those using it, to whom it is a matter of course, a simple every-day experience, few, if any, have succeeded in analyzing it satisfactorily. Though the faculty is as difficult to explain clearly to those not gifted with it as would be the perception of the difference in colors or as sight itself to the blind, I will try to give some little idea of it for the benefit of those wishing to learn for themselves or others.

It does not consist, as is sometimes fancied, in the skillful use of a cane or the exact memory of distances, though these are minor aids. It results from the union of hearing and the sense of touch, both trained to extraordinary delicacy and habituated to unusual services, coming to form a sort of *sixth sense*, as instinctive, instantaneous, and trustworthy in its activity as any of the familiar five. To illustrate: If you walk rapidly along a quiet street, listening carefully to your footsteps, you will notice that the solid buildings and walls close to the sidewalk give back a distinct echo, which instantly ceases at the openings and crossings. This to the blind is equivalent to light and shadow, and is in its crudest beginnings the first element in the "sixth sense" above mentioned. Again, if you walk slowly, in the dark, up against a wall or closed door, you will feel, just before striking it, upon the delicate nerves of the exposed portion of the face a slight sensation like that which might be produced by an infinitely fine and light gossamer veil. It is caused by the increased compression or resistance of the elastic air when forced up against one solid body by the approach of another. Repeat the experiment, and you find that the same thing is noticeable at a greater distance than at first. This is the germ of the second element already spoken of. These two perceptions, blended into one consciousness and trained to perfection by long years of practice, enable one to become aware at a considerable distance of any obstacle in his path, to determine the size and approximate shape of objects he is passing, to tell the height of a wall without touching it; in short, to take cognizance of any and all landmarks necessary in making his way or finding a given locality.

This faculty, based upon simple though generally unfamiliar natural laws, is, in some of its many forms of application, the source of most of the seemingly remarkable feats performed by sightless persons in this connection; and it is with them so habitually in use, so much a part of daily life, that its exercise is instinctive and unconscious, and the blind scarcely realize that others employ a different process to arrive at the same results. It is susceptible of almost immeasurable development. The writer has known a number besides himself who could count the shade-trees when riding at full gallop along the middle of the street, tell the difference between a close or open fence, the distance of buildings from roadways, etc. The position of corners, gateways, and the like are much more easily learned. In walking, everything is of course much nearer, and the difficulty is greatly diminished. So every change in sidewalk or fence, every inequality beneath the feet or smallest post by the wayside, is a guide, as definite and trustworthy as are buildings or signboards to him who sees.

The only things which seriously interfere with the

exercise of this faculty are a high wind, which prevents the differences in atmospheric density being perceived, and a constant monotonous noise, like the clatter of machinery or the rapid roll of wheels over a hard road, by which all echo is drowned. These make the real darkness. Hence, though many are able to ride with ease and safety, I never knew one who could drive in a carriage at all, and I do not think that will ever be feasible. I will also say that wheelbarrows, trucks, etc., left in the way by careless boys, are the blind man's bane. They make no noise, and have no voice of echo in them, nor are they high enough to give warning of their presence to any exposed portion of the skin; but humble and unpretentious though they are, they may prove a grievous cause of stumbling in the path of the peaceable pedestrian.

Save for these hindrances, which after all are no worse than being tied to a candle half of one's life, one may make sight quite easy to be dispensed with in most matters. Courage then, heartsick mother, dependent youth! The greater the odds, the more tempting the victory. Arouse ambition; strive, not to equal, but to excel what others do with better chances; at first in the little commonplaces of life, later in its more important work. What has been done can be; and what never has been done is not therefore impossible, but is rather the more worth doing.

*Edward B. Perry.*

#### Ministerial Bureaux.

IN most of the great Protestant communions in the United States much complaint is heard of a failure to utilize the ministerial forces. On the one side is a great array of vacant churches, on the other a multitude of unemployed ministers. Churches are begging for teachers, and preachers are praying for churches, and there seems to be no way of bringing the demand and the supply together. In the statistics of one religious body now before us, out of a total of 4016 churches, 941 are reported vacant; and out of a total of 3796 ministers, 1137 are "not in pastoral work." A large proportion of these last are employed as teachers, or as journalists, or in the work of benevolent societies, or in some other calling; nevertheless it is certain that several hundreds of them are available for the supply of the 941 vacant churches, if only the proper adjustments could be made. What a misfortune that so many flocks should be shepherdless, while there are so many shepherds searching for flocks!

A state of things quite similar exists in nearly all the Protestant denominations. The Methodists alone escape the reproach. It is their boast that every minister who desires to work is furnished with a field of labor, and that every church wishing a pastor is supplied. Over against the confessed disadvantages of their system, arising out of its imperfect adaptation to work in the larger cities, this great fact must be set. Some degree of freedom and flexibility may well be sacrificed to secure so perfect an economy of force. It is not likely, however, that any of the other denominations will adopt the itinerant system; it is much more likely that the Methodist church will relieve its stringency by important modifications; but it is a question often asked whether some advisory agency might not be contrived that would bring the idle ministers and

the empty pulpits into communication; and whether, in this way, the advantages of the itineracy could not be secured without suffering its drawback.

In the Protestant Episcopal church the bishop fulfills precisely this function; and it is probable that he accomplishes as much in this direction as is possible under any system which leaves to the local church unlimited power in the choice of its minister. The number of unemployed clergymen and of vacant parishes is smaller in this church than in any of the non-episcopal churches, and this is a strong reason for episcopal supervision. "A church without a bishop" has, beyond a doubt, many advantages; the liberty which it boasts is a great good; whether it more than compensates for the lack of episcopal oversight and direction is a question into which we do not propose to enter; we only wish to point out that the polity which the non-episcopal churches deliberately renounce works well in the matter now under consideration.

It has been proposed in some of the non-episcopal churches that each local ecclesiastical body—synod, or presbytery, or conference—appoint from its own members a ministerial bureau or committee of ministerial exchange, to serve as a medium of communication between ministers wanting churches and churches wanting ministers. One of the most distinguished of the Presbyterian ministers, the Rev. Dr. Crosby, of New-York, forcibly urged this plan in a lecture at the New Haven Theological Seminary. "The church," he says, "should have an organized system of bringing together unemployed ministers and vacant pulpits, by which, in a quiet way, consistent with the dignity of the church and the self-respect of ministers, churches will be able to act intelligently, without the pernicious practice of candidating. A committee should be intrusted with the delicate matter,—a committee of experienced and judicious men appointed by the chief ecclesiastical body of the district, and to this committee churches should apply, and on this committee ministers should rely."

This plan seems entirely rational and feasible; can any one suggest a serious objection to it? How great would be the gain, if the ministers who are now writing and traveling hither and thither in search of work, and the churches that are reaching out blindly after pastors, could be introduced to one another by some such judicious committee! No flaw appears in this reasoning, yet when the method is tried it does not succeed. The great Northern Presbyterian church, to which Dr. Crosby belongs, has made full experiment with it, and with discouraging results. This church would seem to possess, in its centralized organization and its admirable discipline, better facilities for the working of such a scheme than most of the other non-episcopal churches can command, yet a strenuous effort, continued through several years, to put it into operation, almost wholly failed. The presbyterial and synodical committees of supply were duly organized, and announced themselves as ready to mediate between vacant churches and idle pastors, but they have had little to do. Neither ministers nor churches resorted to them; the evil against which they were to provide is not abated; the "hungry sheep" still "look up and are not fed"; the starving shepherds still wait in the market-place because no man has hired them. The result of this experiment indicates, in the



words of a late temperate report on the subject, "that neither churches nor ministers can be brought, by any new form of machinery, to leave their concerns in other hands than their own. The committees are left idle, while the parties transact their business for themselves."

The reasons of the reluctance of churches and ministers to avail themselves of such an agency does not immediately appear. Is it partly a result of an overstrained independence—an excessive jealousy of ecclesiastical control? Is it due to a fear that the committee thus appointed would learn to domineer over the churches? Such an apprehension seems altogether irrational. The Episcopal churches appear to have preserved all their liberties of choice: they avail themselves constantly of the good offices of the bishop in the selection of their rectors; but it is probable that they are as free in their action as the churches of any other communion. The danger that an advisory committee, appointed by themselves year by year, would usurp authority over the churches in this matter, seems to be exceedingly remote. The fear of losing liberty sometimes degenerates into a ludicrous apprehension. "Give me liberty or give me death!" is a heroic sentiment, no doubt; but the man who prefers to die in the woods rather than surrender the liberty of finding his own way out by inquiring at the door of the wood-chopper's cabin, is a cheap variety of hero.

So far as the clergy are concerned, this unwillingness to make use of the ministerial bureau arises probably from a different cause. The larger number of these vacant churches are weak churches, and the unemployed minister hesitates to ask advice of such a committee lest they should commend him to one of these places where the labor is abundant and the support meager. To refuse such an opening would be ungracious; to accept it would imply a degree of self-denial to which he has not attained. Therefore he thinks it more prudent to keep his own counsel and conduct his own negotiations.

If such are the reasons which operate to dissuade the pastorless churches and the churchless parsons from availing themselves of this sensible provision for their mutual benefit, it is to be hoped that they may be reconsidered. A slight accession of common sense and consecration would be likely to make both parties willing to receive advice, and to agree upon some plan by which the neglected vineyards and the waiting laborers may be brought together.

In the absence of such a plan much labor of this nature falls on those who are already overworked. Home Missionary secretaries and superintendents in all the new States are necessarily burdened with such cares, in behalf of the feeblers churches. Yet even they might be relieved to a considerable extent by the coöperation of local committees. Every pastor of a prominent church, East or West, by no consent of his own, finds himself regularly installed as a ministerial bureau.

No small share of his time is consumed in mediating between idle ministers and vacant churches. If this work could be organized and subdivided, much relief would be afforded to a few very busy men.

In some of our larger cities local bureaux of temporary supply have been established. Ministers on their vacations, and ministers without charge, resort to these bureaux; and churches of the vicinity, needing supplies for their pulpits, make application during the week and take whatever is sent then on Sunday morning. Such a bureau may be a great convenience at times; but, considered as a benevolent institution, its indirect results are questionable. The value of such an agency cannot be estimated until it is known to what extent the churches are encouraged by its presence to neglect or delay the settlement of pastors, and to rely upon a hand-to-mouth provision for their pulpits which saves them considerable money; and also to what extent restless ministers in distant towns are led to resign their pulpits and make pilgrimages to the places where the bureaux offer employment. The comparison is rude, and may seem invidious; but, if things sacred may be likened to things profane, the establishment of such an agency may be said to operate, to some extent, like the opening of a soup-kitchen; and the wisest philanthropists are now agreed that the effects of free soup-kitchens are not salutary.

*Washington Gladden.*

#### Landscape-Gardening.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY:

Allow me to thank you for your "Landscape-Gardeners Needed for America," in your "Topics of the Time," for June.

The so-called landscape-gardener is in many cases not as intelligent as an ordinary every-day laborer; his object seems to be to have as many narrow and contorted walks as possible where they are not needed, to plant many trees and shrubs in the most inappropriate places, to make ridiculously-shaped beds, and to plant them with but one object,—to use as many plants as possible without regard to suitability. It is surely worth the attention not only of those engaged in the business, but of gentlemen who have country houses, to consider at least the fundamental features of landscape-work and landscape-art. There can be no stereotyped plans for the embellishment of grounds; each domain calls for different treatment and different grouping.

The natural surroundings should be the first consideration, instead of being, as now, often ignored. Unfortunately, we have but few good works which treat this important subject in a right manner; but, in spite of all this malpractice and ignorance, it is evident that we are progressing, though slowly.

*John Thorpe,*

Secretary of the New-York Horticultural Society.



## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### The First Century of the Constitution.

THE month of September, 1887, naturally suggests the completion of the work of the Convention of 1787, just a hundred years ago, in its successful formation of the Constitution of the United States. The difficulties which attended the Convention's work are detailed elsewhere in this number of *THE CENTURY* by a distinguished historian, and a discussion of an important feature of it occurs in two Open Letters, one by a lawyer of Indiana, and the other by one of our leading historical students. It may be well for us, with the light of a century's practical experience of the Constitution, at the end of which that instrument fits the new nation as comfortably as in 1789, to consider what the difficulties of the Convention would have been if it had been called upon to frame, with prophetic vision, a Constitution for the United States of 1887.

The strongest argument which the "Federalist," and the defenders of the new Constitution in the State conventions, could advance in favor of ratification and in justification of the expectation of the practical success of the Constitution, was the comparatively small size of the country. Hamilton, in the "Federalist," lays down this rule: "The natural limit of a republic is that distance from the center which will barely allow the representatives of the people to meet as often as may be necessary for the administration of public affairs." He estimates the length of the country, from north to south, at  $868\frac{3}{4}$  miles, and its breadth at 750, adding this comfortable comparison: "It is not a great deal larger than Germany . . . or than Poland before the late dismemberment." In another place he says: "If there be but one government pervading all the States, there will be, as to the principal part of our commerce, but one side to guard,—the Atlantic coast." With what feelings would he and the Convention have set about their work, if they could have realized that they were in reality framing a scheme of government for a country which was to stretch from north latitude  $25^{\circ}$  to  $49^{\circ}$ , and from the 67th to the 125th degree of west longitude, 2600 miles by 1600 through the center, to say nothing of Alaska, in itself two-thirds the size of the country of which Hamilton was speaking? That the commerce for which they were caring was to whiten the waters of both the Pacific and the Atlantic, of the Gulf of Mexico as well as of the Great Lakes? That the Congress which they were providing was to deal with an *internal* commerce greater than all the *foreign* commerce that the country has ever known; with a manufacturing capital of \$2,800,000,000 and an annual product of \$5,400,000,000; with a population of 60,000,000, instead of 4,000,000? That the time would come when a member of Congress would be compelled to travel 6500 miles in going to the Federal Capital and returning to his State? It is a fortunate thing for the United States that the Convention which framed its Constitution knew nothing of the future, and devoted its care and energies to the establishment of a government for the country which it knew.

The Convention sent forth the instrument which it had framed to meet the future, and the most marvelous feature of its first century of trial has been its apparently inexhaustible power of accommodating itself to the growth and changing necessities of the people. Its judiciary system has expanded in its territorial jurisdiction from thirteen districts to sixty; its Presidential office has had control of a million of armed men; its imports have risen from \$22,000,000 to \$640,000,000, and its exports from \$20,000,000 to \$720,000,000; steam, electricity, and all the other forces which modern civilization has harnessed for the service of man, have altered the life and needs of the people; and still the national government established by the Constitution remains unchanged in substance. The natural divergence of its lines has brought larger and still larger fields within their scope; the few employees of 1789 have increased in number until they are an army; but the Treasury officer of 1789, if he could examine the organization of to-day, would still be able to trace clearly the lines of the original formation, though he might be bewildered in the effort to follow out all the ramifications by which the system has met the requirements of later development. The case is the same in every department of the national system: it has developed, but it has not changed. The Convention of 1787 could hardly have provided a more satisfactory system for 1887 if, with prophetic vision, it had been able to forecast the needs of 1887 and adapt its work to those needs.

Nations, like individuals, can live but one day at a time, and their business is to live that day as wisely, honestly, and justly as may be; not to essay the part of a Providence, and attempt to legislate for millions yet unborn. They cannot legislate for posterity: they can only provide the molds into which following generations must be poured; and, unless those molds are wise, just, and honest for the generation which makes them, they will assuredly be broken by some succeeding generation, or they will compress and mar the whole life of the people. In this sense, we, who stand on the threshold of the second century of the Constitution, are as actually constitution-makers as the members of the Convention of 1787. Let it be our care to make our institutions wise, just, and honest for the people of 1887, and to hate and repudiate every proposition that savors of dishonesty or of injustice, however it may seem to our temporary advantage, knowing that we are thus doing all that man can do for the people of 1987.

### A Great Teacher.

THE teachers of men are many; the teachers of young men are few. To turn the faculties of a mature mind to the education of youth is something willingly undertaken by many, but success does not depend upon willingness or knowledge, or even enthusiasm. The art of teaching is a gift and an inspiration equally

with poetry and music. In the vast majority of even good teachers, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that they become accommodated in their own minds to the minds of their pupils. Sympathy being the essential requisite, they unconsciously fall into the habit and scope of thought of their students,—“subdued to what it works in, like the dyer’s hand.” It is the fatal tendency in teaching to shrink towards the capacity of those taught—a tendency that able teachers resist by constant watchfulness and severe studies.

When a great man gives himself to teaching young men, and successfully resists this tendency, and when also he has the gift or genius for teaching, we have that rarest of men—a great teacher. This century has furnished two eminent examples: Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, and Dr. Hopkins, of Williams College. There have been other great teachers, but these two men pre-eminently wear these marks,—greatness and genius in their work. Dr. Arnold taught boys, but he kept even with his own powers, and was as great as if he had spent his days at Oxford or in Parliament. Dr. Hopkins taught young men, but it is difficult to conceive of him as greater in any other possible sphere. The success of each is due to the fact that they preserved the full measure of their mental powers, and at the same time had the faculty of laying powerful hold of the young mind. A great mind, enlisting young men, and drawing them by the secret charm and power of his divine gift up to himself without descending in his own mental habit to them,—such was Dr. Hopkins.

It would not be quite correct to say that Dr. Hopkins had a theory of teaching. Great men do not work by theories. He taught spontaneously, out of his own nature; and here lay the value of his work. He carried into the class-room the free action of his own mind and also its total action. Many men are able to do this who fail as teachers, but Dr. Hopkins possessed the knack of bridging the space between his own lofty thought and the mind of the pupil, and so getting him up to his own level. This is true teaching—inducing in the pupil the thought and feeling of the teacher.

But Dr. Hopkins did far more to get his pupils to share in his thought and ideas: he taught them to think in the same fashion. It was not a prime or even a subordinate purpose with him to induce his pupils to agree with his opinions. He rather aimed to get them to thinking in a certain way. His idea was that if he could arouse the nature of the man to the full, and start him into vigorous natural action, he would think safely. Hence he taught principles, and, above all, the nature of man. Scholasticism, formal logic, dogma—these were remote from his methods, as they were remote from himself. “Know thyself” is the heathen phrase which he put to a use that carried his pupils to the heights of Christian morality. It is for this reason that his teaching and his pupils wear the plain marks of freedom and catholicity.

It was also a distinguishing mark of Dr. Hopkins’s instruction that it had a peculiarly germinant quality. Teaching by principles and by the nature of man, and avoiding a too close deduction, his pupils were left free to develop in their own way. Dr. Hopkins taught the catechism for many years, but the students carried away more of their teacher’s breadth and rationality than of the dogmas of the Confession.

It was a characteristic of his teaching that it had a directing rather than a binding influence. Room was left in it for growth, for variation, and adaptation to new conditions. He founded no school of philosophy, but did the better work of grounding young men in the fundamental principles of thought and feeling and conduct. If his teaching had a specialty, it consisted in unifying truth; the truth of one realm was the truth of all realms. Thus a well-taught pupil stood with the whole earth under his feet and all heaven above his head.

Dr. Hopkins’s long life was spent in one of the most rural parts of New England, and one of the most remote from the centers of culture. Shut in between the Hoosac range on the east, and the Taconic on the west, miles of untouched forest on every side, in a little village that clustered about the college as cottages nestled at the foot of a friendly castle, he drew to himself, like a medieval teacher, pupils from all parts of the country, kept them about him for four years, and sent them out, stamped with his impress, to the towns and cities to repeat in themselves what he had taught them, and to convey far and wide something of the keenness of thought, of moral earnestness, and religious wisdom which they had learned and felt in him. Such a life is at once great in its humility and in the breadth and power of its influence.

#### Shall we Plant Native or Foreign Trees?

THE relative value for planting in America of native and foreign trees is a question of wide and deep and of rapidly increasing interest; yet it is one to which the public has scarcely begun to give the attention it deserves. As the destruction of our native forests progresses, planting for the sake of timber must be ever more largely engaged in; and this destruction cannot but progress with considerable rapidity, even though the legislation which is so greatly to be desired as a check upon it should soon be brought to bear. Year by year, too, it becomes more desirable that the worn-out fields of our Eastern States should be put to arboricultural service, and that the settlers on the prairies of the West should be accurately informed as to what trees they may best set out. And as our love for art increases we shall wish to do even more than we are doing now in the way of private and public planting for ornamental purposes. In short, there is no American who is not interested, directly or indirectly, in the question as to the kinds of trees which are best adapted to American uses.

The extent to which we have hitherto planted foreign trees is probably ignored by a great majority of our readers. Not indeed in very earliest years, but ever since the first advent among us of the nursery-gardener we have given them the preference, in our more thickly settled districts, over trees of native origin. The first nurserymen were Europeans, and brought both their stock of knowledge and their stock of plants from the Old World; and even when their knowledge had extended itself their stock remained largely the same; for, from some inexplicable reason, a great many species of European trees may be far more easily raised, and therefore more cheaply and profitably sold, than our own. Thus the private planter, getting his materials from nursery gardens, has generally been led to

choose foreign trees. Again, those who first began to plant on a large scale with an eye to economic results — to the production of timber — were inspired by English examples, and naturally selected those species whose utility had been proved by centuries of experience. So when ornamental planting over large areas was undertaken, what more natural than that the landscape-gardener should most often try to reproduce European successes and guide himself by the recommendations of those European books which were his only printed helpers?

The result has been that the foreign representatives of many important genera are as familiar to American eyes in populous districts as their native cousins, and in certain cases — in the case, for instance, of the willow, of the spruce, and of the horse-chestnut — are much more familiar. Signs of a change in practice may now be perceived. A few years ago it was impossible to buy American trees in any quantity in any nursery, but now they may more easily be had and are more often chosen. Still, the comparatively recent introduction of novel species from Asia has added to the exotic temptations of the purchaser, and even now, we are told, "where one native tree is planted in Massachusetts, five foreign trees are planted here."\*

It will easily be guessed that this is not a desirable state of things. But how deplorable a state of things it really is, few understand as yet, save those who have specially studied the behavior of foreign trees upon American soil. Such study has been carefully carried on by more than one scientific observer during a number of years, and of late an effort has been made to test the value here, as sources of timber supply, of many of the species which had made the best records in their native habitat. Of course all observers do not agree upon all points, and of course it is too soon yet to decide dogmatically with regard to many imported species. But with regard to many others the evidence is practically conclusive and of a most unfavorable sort.

Take, for instance, the Norway spruce (*Abies excelsa*), which all through the Northern and Eastern States has been planted in such numbers for so many years that it can surely be said to have been fairly tested. It is a most remunerative tree to nurserymen, and a most tempting one to planters — easily raised and transplanted, and growing with remarkable rapidity and great beauty of form while young. But in the pamphlet just quoted, Professor Sargent says that its general introduction into our plantations "must, nevertheless, be regarded as a public misfortune. . . . In spite of its early promise, it must be acknowledged to be a complete failure in eastern America. It has passed its prime here, and is almost decrepit before it is half a century old; it will never produce timber here, and it becomes unsightly just at that period of life when trees should be really handsome in full and free development." The most cursory glance at the condition of this tree in the neighborhood of New York will prove that it is not unsuited to the climate of Massachusetts only. The Central Park is disfigured by hundreds of half-dead specimens which are not yet

half grown; and even where the soil is better, ragged, blackened forms almost invariably prove a want of health and vigor. Again, Mr. Robert Douglas, of Waukegan, Ill., one of the oldest and most widely known nurserymen in the country, writes† that he has never seen a Norway spruce in the East fifty years old that was not failing in its upward development, or one in the West forty years old; and that when he went purposely to Canada to examine a large number which he had seen planted forty-nine years before (believing that they might have done especially well in a northern climate), he found that not one was living, and that many which had been planted in later years were already failing. And he adds, that he speaks with a sense of responsibility, as he has "grown more Norway spruces than any man in America and than all other men in America."

As it is with this favorite conifer, so it seems to be with many others almost as often planted. The Scotch pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), for example, will bear more exposure than any other tree, and will sooner make an effective "wind-break." It is therefore invaluable in certain positions to planters on the prairies; but as regards long life and the production of timber, Mr. Douglas pronounces it "an abject failure" in any part of the country where he has ever seen it, and his words are fully confirmed by the Massachusetts report.

With deciduous trees the case is similar. Neither the foreign lindens nor the foreign ashes are long-lived in this country. The sycamore maple (*Acer pseudo-platanus*) — so widely cultivated abroad for its valuable timber — grows rapidly at first, as is the way with many other European trees, but seems likely to prove quite worthless at least for economic purposes. Of the European oak (*Quercus robur*) Professor Sargent writes: "Tens of thousands of these trees have been planted in this State during the last century, but it is now almost impossible to find anywhere a healthy specimen more than thirty years old, while all the older trees have now almost entirely disappeared from the neighborhood."

These few instances are examples of a number more which might be given of the proved unfitness of European trees to withstand our climate. With other species, as has been said, the question still remains an open one; and with others, again, the evidence seems distinctly favorable. The white willow of Europe (*Salix alba*) not only flourishes, but has become thoroughly naturalized, in New England, and is of greater economic value than any native species. Though as much as this cannot be said of any other European tree, the English elm (*Ulmus campestris*) does thoroughly well and affords by its very different habit a desirable contrast to our native elms, while the Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) and the European larch (*Larix europaea*) also promise to thrive. In such cases the needs of the landscape-gardener justify their continued cultivation, even though related native species may be still better fitted to supply us with timber.

As the climate of eastern Asia is much more like our own than that of Europe, one is not surprised to find the trees which have been brought thence giving, as a whole, a better account of themselves. Their chief value is for ornament and shade, but from these points

\*"Some Additional Notes upon Trees and Tree-planting in Massachusetts." By C. S. Sargent, director of the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard College. (Reprinted from the Annual Report of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture.) Boston: Wright and Potter. 1886.

†In one of a number of letters recently published in the "Philadelphia Press."

of view some of them are very precious acquisitions. The curious gingko-tree, which has a beauty all its own, is now largely planted in the streets of Washington and is perfectly hardy as far north as Massachusetts. The paulownia, so interesting in form, so valuable for shade, and so splendid in its spring bloom, thrives in all the cities of the Middle States; and its masses of purple flowers appearing every now and then in the wild woods of Maryland show that there at least it has made itself perfectly at home. Of the ailantus it is hardly necessary to speak. Despite the disagreeable odor of its blossoms, it is one of the most valuable of all trees for city planting—growing very rapidly, affording a wide expanse of shade, being free from insects, and keeping the freshness of its foliage uninjured through the heats and dusts of summer.

But it is not our present aim to weigh the evidence for and against this tree or that. What we desire is simply to show that such evidence has already been collected in a considerable body; that it is the duty of every experienced planter still further to inform the public; and that it is for the interest of every intend-

ing planter that he should consider carefully before he buys his stock. Yet we feel justified in adding to these general statements a word of strong recommendation in favor of native as against foreign, or at least as against European, trees. At the best the latter are uncertain in almost every case, while the former have an inborn and a well-proved title to be trusted. The most successful ornamental planting that has ever been done in America shows its results in the streets of such towns as Stockbridge, Great Barrington, Salem, and New Haven, and was the work of men who went to the forest and not to the nursery for their infant elms and maples. Certainly our more recently planted parks offer small promise of a like maturity of beauty, with their European oaks and ashes, their Scotch and Austrian pines, in almost as deplorable a state as their Norway spruces. When not ornamental but economic plantations are in question, past experience tells very strongly against European trees, while the evidence of recent experiment with native trees—as in the plantations of indigenous conifers in eastern Massachusetts—is of the most encouraging kind.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Centennial Considerations.

#### Two Views of the Relation between the State and the General Government.

##### I. GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE.

**I**F a small community can govern itself, and do it better than others can govern it, a larger community composed of like individuals can do the same, and so any still larger community of like individuals, even to the largest.

There is no reason why a government by the people, through their representatives, should not wisely and well govern the inhabitants of a whole continent, provided the people are sufficiently civilized to enable those occupying the various parts of it to govern themselves.

This will appear more clearly the more accurately we distinguish what are the proper functions of government, and all that is necessary for it to do.

The only warrant for the existence of government of any kind is, that it makes possible for the people a greater degree of happiness than would be possible without it. In the earlier stages of civilization, war is the chief business of the government, and success in war is the chief good, and to it all else is made subservient. When civilization has advanced somewhat, it is found that in some degree each individual should be protected from aggression by other individuals, and then the power of government is, to some extent, exerted for that purpose; and as civilization progresses, this purpose increases in importance as compared with the other, and could we imagine wars entirely to cease, it would be the only necessary function of government.

From our position in relation to other nations, and from our strength as compared with those on this continent, the danger from aggressions by other nations is exceedingly small, and the probability of any resort to arms, unless we are the aggressors, is very remote, so that the preventing of aggressions by other nations

has come to be with us of comparatively small importance. Our government should every year become less military and more industrial; that is, less occupied with the duty of preventing foreign aggressions, and more occupied with preventing the aggressions of individuals on each other, and promptly and sufficiently repressing the wrongs done by such aggressions.

This, the paramount duty of government, has been very imperfectly performed in the past, and there is little reason to hope that it will be better done in the near future. Much of this imperfection is due to the low standard of the average morality of the people. But is not more of this imperfection the result of our governmental machinery not being adapted to the performance of this duty? Can it be performed efficiently so long as the national and State governments coëxist, and each is expected to perform undefined and undefinable parts of this duty?

When our national government was formed, slavery existed in most of the States, and presented an insuperable objection to any arrangement by which the people of the whole country could be intrusted with unlimited power over any part of it. The part of the people among whom slavery existed, and who intended to retain it, would not, and could not, consent that the part among whom it did not exist should regulate the relations between master and slave. Where these relations existed, laws were required which would not have been tolerated elsewhere, and it was only by the agency of the State governments that slavery could be continued.

For the repression of crime and for dealing with the criminal class, the single agency of the nation would be more efficient than the one compounded of the nation and the several States, each acting separately. There are as many criminal codes defining crimes and the mode of dealing with them, and with the criminal class, as there are States, and to them is added the code of the nation.

Whatever is properly a criminal act in one locality

should be so in every place in the nation, and the criminal laws with the mode of enforcing them which would be the best possible in any subdivision would be the best in every subdivision. How to prevent the ingress of paupers from abroad, and how to deal with those here, would be problems more easily solved through the single than through the complex agency.

There are many matters which in the near future will need regulation. Among these may be mentioned the relation of employers and employees; gambling in stocks, grain, etc.; the extent to which accumulations of wealth in the hands of individuals or corporations shall be permitted; what restraints shall be imposed on monopolies of every kind; whether there should be a limit, and what one, upon the right to acquire and hold lands. With these and like questions the State governments are incompetent to deal, for if one State legislated effectually as to any such matters, its only effect would be to drive from its territory those who regarded themselves as injuriously affected by such action, and they would seek a State where there had been no such legislation.

As to matters with which each of the civil codes of the States deal. Why should there be different land tenures, why different rules of descent and distribution of decedents' estates, different laws as to wills, as to marriage and divorce, as to parent and child, as to guardian and ward, as to contracts, as to corporations, etc., etc.? Why should there be as many different modes of administering justice? Why should that be held to be just in the courts of a State which is held unjust in the courts of the nation, or in the courts of other States? why a right enforced, if claimed against a citizen of the same State as the claimant, and denied as against a citizen of another State?

If there was but one code of laws and one judiciary, that of the nation, justice would be the same in every locality, and the rights and duties of the individual and all aggregates of individuals would be alike everywhere within the national limits. Is there any reason why this should not be?

The tendency has been in the direction of the exercise of larger powers by the nation and restrictions on the power of the States. Except as to a few matters, this has not been the result of changes in written constitutions, or conscious action on the part of the people. The nation, through its courts, from time to time, has asserted jurisdiction not given by the Constitution, as understood at and soon after its adoption. As instances may be mentioned the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1806, that the courts of the nation had no jurisdiction of a controversy between a citizen of one State and a corporation of another State, if any of the stockholders of the corporation were not citizens of the last State. This ruling was repeatedly followed; but in 1844 the court overruled all these cases, and asserted the jurisdiction over all such con-

troversies, without reference to the citizenship of the stockholders. It is under this later ruling that the courts have assumed jurisdiction over all matters in which the railroad, telegraph, and other great corporations are interested. The same court, in 1825, ruled that courts of the nation had no jurisdiction over any navigable waters except where the tide ebbed and flowed, and repeatedly so decided until 1851, when it asserted jurisdiction over the great lakes, and in 1857 extended it over all navigable rivers. Now Congress has but to declare any locality navigable water, and legislate in regard to it, and the courts of the nation hold that Congress has not exceeded its powers.

Congress has assumed a supervision of elections, it has declared certain promises to pay to be money and a legal tender, and the courts of the nation affirm its power. It is unnecessary to multiply instances. As to no matter has the nation exercised a doubtful or prohibited power, but in a short time such power has been recognized as belonging to it, and a new reading given to the Constitution as the proper warrant for it.\*

The small powers still exercised by the States over railroads and telegraph lines will probably soon be taken from them and absolute control of them be assumed by the nation, and this with the approval of the people. For they feel that it is almost intolerable that the rights of these great corporations should change with the passage from State to State; and this feeling will grow until it finds expression in legislation by the nation, and its assumption of entire control.

The nation has assumed the power to make regulations for the preservation of the health of the people, and for the extirpation and prevention of cattle-plagues, etc., and there is no limit to the powers it will exercise for such purposes whenever it is deemed proper by the people.

Public education is likely soon to be declared a matter of national concern, and if the people so wish, the nation will take charge of it and exclude the States. This will probably be, in the future, the history of every matter which equally interests and affects the whole people.

Why should it not be so? Why should not all law-making be done by the nation? Why should not all general laws operate alike everywhere within the nation, making the rights and duties of each individual, and of all aggregates of individuals, the same in all places?

It may be asked, How can the nation deal with the matters which are of interest only in particular localities? The answer is that, under proper general regulations and restraints, all such matters should be placed within the control of minor subdivisions. Each county, each city, or other subdivision, should be given full power over whatever affects only the people of the subdivisions. If the State governments should cease to exist, the only class which would suffer would be the office-holders. Almost, if not quite, half of the great army of office-holders could be disbanded, and a

\* Without any desire to inject counter-arguments into the article, an exception may be taken to this very essential portion of it. Four "instances of the exercise of doubtful or prohibited powers" are here assigned, but at least three of them are quite irrelevant. (1) Admiralty law, like equity, is "judge-made law": the Constitution merely gives Federal courts "Admiralty jurisdiction," leaving the judges to work out the jurisdiction for themselves. The change of ruling in 1851 was therefore clearly provided for, and made possible by, the Constitution itself. (2) The power to pass a general election law is explicitly given to Con-

gress by the Constitution, within well defined limits, and those limits have been carefully respected. (3) The Supreme Court's decision in favor of the constitutionality of legal-tender paper currency has not been received with unanimous or enthusiastic applause. At best it is but permissive, and the decision of but one branch of the government. When we shall have a Congress which will issue legal-tender paper in time of peace, and a President who will not veto the act, the "instance" will be a fair one; until then, *nil dicimus*.—EDITOR.

like part of the great sum now yearly paid to this army would be saved to the people.

Is there a single duty performed by the State governments, or any of them, which could not be done as well, or better, by the government of the nation? If not, why should the State governments continue to exist? Why not dispense with them, erase the State lines, make of the whole population one people, governed by one code of laws, and have in reality a government "of the people, by the people, for the people"?

LAFAYETTE, IND.

Robert Jones.

## II. THE FEDERAL BALANCE.

ON the deck of a westward-bound Atlantic steamer, one breezy September day, some years ago, I was asked by a distinguished gentleman, who had indeed been an English cabinet minister, to recommend some book from which he might get a rudimentary knowledge of the system of government in the United States. "For," said he, "we don't understand you. We cannot see why your vast size does not lessen cohesion and make you fall apart; nor do we understand why you will not go to pieces in the dangerous process of electing a chief magistrate." Of course I pointed out to him the fact that the President had neither the power nor the responsibility of an English prime-minister, and, in short, that ours was not a parliamentary government. This surprised him, and he replied with frankness: "Ah! we do not understand you."

But on thinking over the words of this right honorable and very intelligent gentleman, I have to confess that one of the dangers that he pointed out was a real one. So long as a hope of party advantage prevents the legislature of the country from agreeing upon some authoritative board of arbitration in case of a difference regarding an electoral count between the two Houses of Congress, the national peace will be threatened whenever we have to pass the ordeal of electing a chief ruler.

Against the danger from incohesion I urged the good fortune of our Federal system — that the central government was relieved of severe strain by the localization of a great part of our legislative work. Massachusetts, with her Puritan history, regulates all matters pertaining to morals and manners — all matters that have to do with the degree and character of civilization — by her local legislature. Louisiana, with her French antecedents, is allowed to respect her traditions and those sentiments that are the slow growth of generations, and to evolve a civilization on her own soil, in her own way. The danger which this English statesman saw in the vast extent of our country and the heterogeneity of its people would be a real one, if it were possible for a body of Pennsylvania Presbyterians and Massachusetts Puritans to organize a party to make Sunday laws for New Orleans. It would be real if reformers could not pass a law regulating the liquor traffic in Maine without consulting the representatives from Nevada, Arkansas, and the Bourbon district of Kentucky.

This notion of a lack of stability in the American government from the heterogeneity of its people is an old one with Englishmen. In 1759, not to mention any earlier example, there came to this country the Rev. Andrew Burnaby, afterward Archdeacon of Leicester, who entered the colonies by way of York River and journeyed to the northward as far as the

Piscataqua. When the American opposition to English schemes for taxing the colonies had raised the whirlwind, he published in 1773 his "Travels Through the Middle Settlements in North America." In this he ventures to make some forecasts. He does not think that the colonies can ever be voluntarily associated in one government, "for fire and water," says he, "are not more heterogeneous than the different colonies in North America. Nothing can exceed the jealousy and emulation which they possess in regard to each other." "Indeed," he says in another place, "it appears to me a doubtful point, even supposing all the colonies of America were to be united under one head, whether it would be possible to keep in due order and government so wide and extended an empire."

The trouble with Burnaby's forecast is a trouble with all such predictions. It is impossible to take into account beforehand all the elements of a complex problem. Among a good many elements here which he did not foresee is the Federal system, which is more the offspring of fortunate accident than of wise statesmanship. The centrifugal jealousy of the several colonies, with their separate histories, local sentiments, and particular interests, offered resistance to the centralizing theories of statesmen; the result was not a perfect balance between central and local governments, but an adjustment that has proved itself to be most useful and truly conservative. Railroads, newspapers, telegraphs, and the abolition of slavery have made us much more homogeneous than we were. But differences of climate and productions, of inland and sea-coast location, of mountain and plain, of local history, derivation, and traditional sentiment, will happily intervene to prevent our falling into a flat uniformity of character. And society will advance more rapidly and more safely if each State is allowed to work out its own destiny by the attrition of the forces that make up its life. Among these forces history and tradition are everywhere of the strongest. To all time New England will show traces of the town-community, independent-church, and common-land systems of her infancy; Virginia must on the other hand grow by counties, for there every county has its traditions of the ancestors who administered justice on the bench of magistrates in the county court, and who now and then maintained the old notions of gentlemanliness by notifying royal governors of their unwillingness to sit with a man, no matter how high in court favor, who was of doubtful integrity. Louisiana again will cast her history into the mold of a territory checkered off into parishes, as that of Delaware is into hundreds.

I do not discuss the Federal system with any apprehension of danger that in any proximate time a serious attempt will be made to change the skeleton of the government. Any arguments for or against a radical change in our system can have only an academic interest. It is hard to abolish organized history by enactment. Political *vis inertiae* is too great. Even among an idealistic people like the French, so great a change could be wrought only by the devastations of some great social upheaval. Our danger is of a different sort. The Federal system offers a barrier to many respectable movements for social reform, where reforms seek the aid of law, and there is always a temptation to take a short cut by appealing to Congress. There are temperance reformers, for example, who think that if they can

prohibit the making of spirits by a clause in the Constitution of the United States they will dry up the fountains of evil. There are labor-reformers, anti-monopolists, and anti-divorce reformers who believe that the easiest way to achieve their ends is to get sweeping enactment by Congress. Even so cautious a paper as the New York "Evening Post" has advocated the passage of a uniform marriage law. Reformers are prone to forget the impotence of law when it is not reënforced by public sentiment. Nor is it to be expected that a special reformer, consecrated to one cause the importance of which is naturally magnified in his own eyes, should be publicist enough to understand that every load of this sort put upon the Federal government is a disturbance of adjustment in a system that is strong enough to hold a great and growing empire only so long as its balance is maintained. Civilizing work must in the main be done locally. A short leverage is highly advantageous in the distribution of funds.

A better illustration of the necessity for cherishing the independence of local communities can hardly be found than the evil harvest reaped by all attempts to govern the city of New York at Albany. City bills are oil-wells for the local legislator, who knows that constituencies on the lakes will hardly ever inquire why the streets of the metropolis are voted to corporations, and its funds wasted on fruitless jobs.

Pennsylvania, in making laws for capital and labor, keeps her eyes on the multitudinous miners and toilers in car-shops, blast-furnaces, and rolling-mills, with their trades-unions, sometimes their Molly Maguires. The conditions are very different in South Carolina, where the planter often hires a negro laborer at a stipulated price "with board," which board means a peck of meal and a definite ration of bacon for each week, to be cooked and eaten at the pleasure of the working man, who also is content to add to this allowance any "luxuries" at his own expense. All such questions, in so vast a country, ought to be handled on the ground in the light of local customs; any attempt to regulate them from Washington would produce an unheard-of crop of demagogism and corruption. How poorly the central government of a republic can administer local affairs is shown in the abuses of the reconstruction period and in the calamities of the District of Columbia.

The Federal arrangement which came to us by the good fortune of the diversity of interest and character of the thirteen colonies, is now in process of application with deliberate purpose to the British Empire, which will have its American and its Australian confederation. One day it will have, perhaps, an East Indian system of a similar sort. The hold of Great Britain on her colonies has not been weakened but visibly strengthened by the gift of local autonomy to remote provinces. The laws for Scotland are virtually made by the Scotch members before they are finally adopted by the British Parliament. And the only apparent solution to the Irish difficulty will be in some similar division of power between the local and the imperial authority.

The moral for us on this side is that we must keep the imperial government of the United States for imperial purposes, that it may be strong and free to deal with the collective interests of a vast empire, liable some day to become yet greater by the force of gravitation and absorption; and that we ought to resist the best re-

form in the world if its ends can only be achieved by reducing the liberty of the States to deal with questions of manners, morals, minor commerce, and local interests.

*Edward Eggleston.*

**Pundita Ramabai Sarasvati.\***

THIS distinguished high-caste Brahmin woman is the daughter of a Marathi priest who suffered persecution for educating the women of his family. But, retiring to the seclusion of the Ganga-mûl, their studies were continued amid the sublimities of nature, which have left their impress on Ramabai's mind. At the age of sixteen years Ramabai was left an orphan, and three years later, fully convinced of the importance of woman's education, she traveled under the protection of her brother across India, urging in all places the emancipation and education of women. Arrived at Calcutta, the older pundits paid her homage, and the title of Sarasvati was conferred upon her. The simplicity of her manners and her earnest, eloquent arguments won distinction at home and commanded attention abroad. In her travels Ramabai had mingled freely with the people, disregardful of caste, not electing to be the leader of a new sect, but everywhere seeking truth for truth's own sake and inspiring others with the same wholesome ambition. After a short illness her brother died, and six months later she married a Bengalese gentleman—a Sanscrit scholar and a pleader-at-law, the man of her own choice. His death in less than two years after marriage left her at twenty-four years of age to face the future as a Hindu widow. Again she sought the rostrum. Two particular measures now filled her mind,—the introduction of women physicians and the preparation of widows for teachers in girls' schools. The plans now taking shape in India for the establishment of hospitals and the investiture of women physicians are believed to have had their origin in the faithful labors of Ramabai. The fruitage of her efforts for girls' schools has also appeared. In the city of Poona, Ramabai formed a society of the leading Brahmin ladies, called Arya Mâhila Somaj, for the encouragement of the education of women, with branch societies in the cities she visited. Poona now has not only primary schools for girls, but also two high schools; Bombay has two or three high schools, and Calcutta has the Victoria school, from which women may enter the university.

To acquaint herself with better methods of advancing her work, Ramabai went to England. Another book in native language to speak in her absence was her parting gift to India. In England, whither her fame had preceded her, Ramabai was warmly received. Professor Max Müller and other Oxford professors approved her scholarship, and she was appointed to the chair of Sanscrit in the Woman's College at Cheltenham. Here she remained until February, 1886, when her cousin, Dr. Joshee, also a Hindu Brahmin lady of high caste, took the degree of doctor of medicine at the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and the Pundita extended her travels to "this holy land of America." That a Hindu woman should leave her country and journey alone beyond the seas, could not be without a tinge of romance

\*See also "The High-caste Hindu Woman," by Ramabai, with an introduction by Dean Rachel L. Bodley, of Woman's Medical College, Philadelphia.



or a spirit of lofty courage and consecration. In this instance it was the latter, and even the heart of this resolute woman, who had twice crossed the kingdom of India, would have quailed had she not trusted in him who led Abraham forth to find riches, honor, and power. The conversion of Ramabai to Christianity illustrates her sincerity of soul and her love of truth. Having renounced Brahminism and not yet accepted Christianity, her marriage ceremony was performed by a civil magistrate. With other progressive Hindus, Ramabai accepted Theism as an advance on Hinduism, and, without becoming identified, was closely associated, with the Bramo-Somaj. The progressive Hindus accepted Ramabai's leadership and hoped through her philosophy "to regenerate society and establish a pure Theistic religion." But Theism vanished with a clear conception of Christianity. Ramabai says of her brother, "His great thought during his illness was for me, what would become of me left alone in the world. To relieve his anxiety, I answered, 'There is no one but God to care for you and me.' 'Ah,' he replied, 'if God cares for us, I am afraid of nothing.'" Ramabai's soul was gradually unfolding to divine truth, and she and her daughter Manorama were baptized, after their arrival in England, into the church universal, and accepted the Bible and the Apostles' Creed. Ramabai believes in the unity of the world and the unity of the Church.

*Emily J. Bryant.*

#### A Ministry of Welcome.

IN Dr. Edward E. Hale's paper on "Church Union," in the June CENTURY, he says: "And if the Christians

of a dozen different communions choose to unite, to maintain at Castle Garden a ministry of welcome, such as the Mormon Church alone does choose to maintain there," etc. Will you permit me to say that the Mormon Church is not *alone* in maintaining such "a ministry of welcome"? More than a score of years ago the Evangelical Lutheran Church placed a missionary at Castle Garden to welcome, direct, and assist emigrants from Germany. This work was subsequently enlarged, to embrace those coming from Scandinavia. Out of this there came, in time, two large buildings, opposite Castle Garden, in which the spiritual and material interests of immigrants are cared for. These institutions are in correspondence with similar institutions in the old world, so that emigrants leave the old world with letters to the "ministry of welcome" in the new.

*G. F. Kvotel,*  
Pastor of the Evan. Luth. Church  
of the Holy Trinity.

NEW YORK, June 17, 1887.

#### The Lincoln History.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY.

SIR: If your note on the "Lincoln History" in the July CENTURY was intended as an apology for the space given to preliminary facts, let me have the pleasure of saying that not many of your older readers, and certainly not *one* of your younger readers, could afford to have one sentence in the chapters thus far published omitted. Let us have a fitting historical perspective for such a grand figure as the writers of that history are painting.

AMSTERDAM, N. Y.

Sincerely, *M. D. J.*



## BRIC-À-BRAC.

#### Transformation.

IF it be true that Time doth change  
Each fiber, nerve, and bone,  
That in a seven years' circling range  
New out of old hath grown,

Time's a magician who hath made  
A mystery passing strange:—  
No outward symbol is displayed  
To hint the subtle change.

Whate'er the magic he hath wrought  
Within his seven years' span,  
Your life is yet with beauty fraught  
As when the charm began.

The rounded form of other years  
Still keeps its crowning grace;  
And June, for April's earlier tears,  
Plants roses on your face.

But your great beauty touches me  
Now, in no other way  
Than doth the splendor of the sea,  
The glory of the day.

I dreamed I loved you in past years,  
Ah! that was long ago.  
How far the time-blown love-vane veers  
This rhyme may serve to show.

The shifting seasons soon enough  
Beheld the bright dream fade:—  
I learned to know the fragile stuff  
Of which some dreams are made.

We meet now, with a kid-gloved touch,—  
Mere courtesy, each to each;  
That earlier hand-clasp overmuch  
Outvies our later speech.

And so, perhaps, it may be true  
That, as you pass me by  
In careless wise, you are not you,  
And I'm no longer I.

*A. C. Gordon.*

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### Soldier and Citizen.

GENERAL J. D. COX, in writing of the policy of the War Department in 1861 of retaining the old organizations of the regular army instead of assigning its officers to command volunteer regiments, has recently said:

"Less than a year afterward we changed our policy, but it was then too late to induce many of the regular officers to take regimental positions in the volunteer troops. I hesitate to declare that this was not, after all, for the best; for, although the organization of our army would have been more rapidly perfected, there are other considerations which have much weight. The army would not have been the popular thing it was, its close identification with the people's movement would have been weakened, and it perhaps would not so readily have melted again into the mass of the nation at the close of the war.\*"

Herein is recorded one of the chief glories of the Union veteran. Like Grant, he was without any liking for war. His enlistment was for a definite purpose and as a solemn duty, its term being in most cases for "three years or during [not after] the war." He never had any doubts as to what he was fighting for, and when that object was accomplished, so far as it could be accomplished by his musket, he came home rejoicing as from exile and without resentment, and looking upon himself *not as a soldier whose duty it was to vote, but as a citizen whose duty it had been to fight.* His theory was that he came back to be part of a restored civil government, and not of a perpetual standing army. Valuing peace thus highly, it is natural that he should have become the chief of peacemakers. The distribution of the military element into the employments of ordinary life was a hardly less wonderful phenomenon than its composition from the farms, offices, and workshops of 1861. In a few months these men became again an integral part of our civil life, abreast of their fellows in the pursuits of peace. This recuperation from the ravages of war and absorption into the life of the citizen, was naturally even more noticeable in the South, which has since given not inferior evidences of forbearance and good citizenship.

Since the war the country has owed much to the Union veterans for services in many capacities—as Presidents, Governors, Senators, Representatives, and in other stations to which a grateful people has elevated them. It was natural that they should receive honor and distinction; moreover, so long as there could possibly be any doubt of the faithful acquiescence of the South in the results of the war, it was natural that, in a political point of view, they should receive special consideration and exercise special influence as a class. Individually, such will doubtless be the case for years to come, but there are distinct evidences that as a factor in the politics of the future the "soldier vote," in the mass, is likely to play a less important part. Such an event will be fortunate for their fame and for the country. The traditions of the veteran will always be held in honor, and the story of his deeds in the greatest war of modern times—one of the few moral and necessary conflicts of arms—will never cease to be a cherished part of our

\* Article on "War Preparations in the North," in "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War."

literature. But it is as true as the equation of action and reaction, that the soldier vote must disappear with the conviction on the part of the veterans that their cause, the cause of national unity,—which all now clearly see to have been the cause of human progress,—is no longer in danger. Many came to this conclusion years ago; the man who does not admit it now must be deficient either in intelligence or in candor. For what sentiment of alarm can exist in the presence of the reiterated expressions of loyalty and patriotism which have been heard from all parts of the busy South within the past three years,—a sentiment which even the burning discussion of the disposal of the battle-flags has not served to diminish in the least! With some opportunity of knowing the feelings of Southern soldiers on this subject, we believe that they are expressed in the fullest measure by the speech of Colonel Aylett of Pickett's division at the memorable meeting of Union and Confederate veterans on the battle-field of Gettysburg last July. "The flags which have been won," said he, "are yours, and what is yours is ours; we have made them lustrous with American heroism. Keep them, return them, destroy them, as you will." The cordial feeling on the Union side was not less noticeable. To take a true measure of the importance of such reunions (and this is but one of scores) the reader has but to fancy how impossible their counterpart would be twenty-five years after the battle of Sedan between survivors of that memorable field. No, it would be unwise to send back the flags in a body so long as their voluntary return by the separate commands who took them thus widens the area of inter-sectional good feeling.

In the face of these multiplied evidences of a Union restored in sentiment as well as in fact,—and it was surely for the larger and truer Union that the Northern soldier fought,—we hold that the man who attempts to revive or trade upon the dead issues of the war should be regarded as a public enemy, to be held in deeper contempt than an ordinary disturber of the peace as his offense is more far-reaching and his motives more deliberate. There can now be no motive for sectional feeling that is not personal, partisan, or mercenary, and we believe that recent events indicate that the public is in no mood to tolerate its revival, whether exhibited in the cant of ambitious party leaders, in the public bad manners of political boycotters, or in the adroit and interested flattery of pension agents. Not the least of the reasons why the veteran should disavow this misuse of his honorable history is that the ultimate object of all such class movements is to distract public attention from the evasion by political parties of their real business and their only reason for existence,—namely, to take a definite stand on questions of the day, to the end that the public will may have through them an unmistakable expression in the guidance of the government. Any other conception of party is a farce and a delusion, under which the purposes of the party managers and not those of the voters become successful. This tergiversation of parties can measurably be reduced by the completer fusion of the soldier element, as well as of every other class,

with the great body of citizens. The endeavor to play the veteran as a pawn in the political game is one which may well excite his indignation, since it degrades that which should be his highest honor.

It would result in an enormous service to the country if the men who fought for the preservation of the Union would ask themselves whether their work is complete,—whether, unapproachable as is our system in theory,\* it is, as administered, the model which they would be satisfied to hand down to posterity. Let veterans who are properly sensitive in regard to the *emblems* be sure that also they do not fail to cherish the *substance*, of their victory. Many evils menace us—far too many for us to waste our energies in combating fancied ones. What has been preserved by the war, fundamental as it is, is merely the possibility of a continuously great and happy nation. Constitutions and laws “can only give us freedom”; it is the use we make of this freedom that will determine the value of our national life and its place in history. The Union, therefore, will have to be saved over and over again, first from one danger and then from another. Just now it needs very much the help of the best thought and energy to save it from “the mad rush for office” which has wrung despairing cries from our later Presidents. At this most critical stage of the Merit System,—the stage of partial success,—and when special efforts are making to array the veteran element against it, one may bespeak for it the thoughtful consideration of those who gave their best years that “government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth.” We regard the complete reform of the civil service as the cause of the people, and as the reform before all others, since it is the reform of the machinery by which other reforms are to come. So long as the personnel of the executive and legislative service is in the control of party workers, the expression of the people’s will is in the control of partisan conspiracies, backed, as they always are, by the capital of vested interests. Have our people not already suffered enough on this score? Let veterans consider whether they will lend their influence to the impairment (even, apparently, in their own favor) of a system which substitutes for the will of the party henchman an equitable test of fitness for that part of the civil service which properly has no more relation to party policy than has the regular army.

#### Personal Records of the War.

ANY one who has attempted to settle a disputed point of war history or to construct a map of an engagement knows how desirable it is to have the fullest consensus of evidence in order to establish the smallest circumstance. The official records are invaluable and in themselves compose a large part of the history of the war. But they are far from justifying the blind faith with which they are appealed to in some quarters. Who, from the unassisted reports, would be able to reconstruct the character, the *eidolon*, of Grant, or McClellan, or Hooker, or Lee, or Jackson, or Hood?—and yet, in war, the personal equation is everything. Moreover, the official records are often inconsistent with themselves, because they are not free from human imperfections and the bias and exaggerations of the moment; and they will therefore acquire a larger

\* Lord Salisbury is said to have called it recently the most conservative government in the world.

value as time goes on from comparison with the often more candid and circumstantial diaries and letters of the time and even with general recollections. In the preservation of extra-official history much has been done by the veteran organizations and historical societies—on the side of the South (where many data remain to be supplied) by the Missouri and Virginia Southern Historical Societies, among others; in the North notably by the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Historical Society of Rhode Island and by the Boston, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and other Commanderies of the Loyal Legion. It would be well if these bodies could add the important function of editing to those of collecting and publishing historical data. This could often best be done locally, by comparing the concurrent testimony of the survivors of each regiment in the neighborhood in which it was recruited. In this way it may yet be possible, by the aid of letters from the field, to sift out errors and to establish a body of historical evidence concerning the regiment which will have authority in the verdict of the future. The regimental record is, after all, the unit of army history. Happily regimental and State pride have produced a considerable body of this writing. But no veteran should consider himself released from the service until he has made the most accurate record possible of what he saw and knew. The large number of such manuscript narratives which we have received in the past three years, and which lack of space and the topical plan of our series have made unavailable, have included many of importance as cumulative or direct evidence. This material, carefully edited, and prefaced by a schedule of the subject-matter, may well be deposited with the archives of some historical society where in years to come it will be accessible to those students who will take the trouble to examine and weigh it. We have already presented to our readers many important narratives of the military events of the great struggle, written by privates and officers on both sides. We are now about to take a broader look at the War for the Union from another point of view,—through the kindly eyes of him who wisely directed its policy, and whose principles triumphed to a fuller nationality. From the story of the man in the ranks to that of Abraham Lincoln let no true record of the contest perish and no lesson of it be lost to the new, united nation.

#### The Last Hope of the Mormon.

THERE comes a time, in pitched battle, when one of the two opposing lines begins to show those signs which, to a military eye, indicate failing energy and a readiness to give up the struggle. The charges which have hitherto been rapid, successive, and resolute are succeeded by an inexplicable pause and a wavering of the whole line; or the crowning charge, on which the eyes and hopes of the whole line have been fixed, becomes slower and slower in its advance until it halts irresolute; or the last reserves are hurried into action, without increasing the energy of the defense. It is at such an instant that Waterloos and Gettysburgs are lost and won; and the indications are that such an instant has come at last to the Mormon hierarchy.

No warfare has been more intolerable to the American people than that which its Government has been compelled to wage for years past on the so-called re-

ligious system known as Mormonism. For the warfare has never been directed against any tenet which could in fairness be called religious. The Mormon has as much constitutional right as any other American citizen to found his faith on Mormon, Moroni, Lehi, and the rest of the tribe, to look with reverence to the hill of Cumora, and to govern his practice by the revelations of any leader who pleases him. The American Government has never attempted or desired to interfere with this right. But, when the practice inculcated by the revelations is criminal by the laws of the land, equal-handed justice to the non-Mormon citizen demands that the Mormon be compelled to obey the laws, as others are compelled to obey them, or to find another land which will allow him superior privileges. Such a government is responsible to God, to history, to international public opinion, and to the opinion of those who make the laws, but not to the Mormon, any more than to any other law-breaker. The influences which admittedly control the Government's action may produce a modification or repeal of the law; but, so long as the law exists, the Mormon must obey the law of the land in which he condescends to live.

It has thus been necessary, not for religious but for political reasons, that the Government should wage active warfare upon action which Mormons have claimed to be an article of faith and practice. And as the mass of the Mormons reside in a Territory, which is under supreme control of the Congress of the United States, the penal laws have been stringent and severe. It has been possible, and in the judgment of Congress necessary, to disfranchise the whole body of Mormons, as well as to punish any detected case of bigamy or polygamy. Such a course, involving the refusal of self-government to so large a community, and the retention of Utah as a Territory instead of a State, for an indefinite time to come, is abhorrent to every political instinct of the American people; and many of them have been inclined to doubt the wisdom of the whole policy. To such, it must be reassuring to note the symptoms of yielding which mark the attempt to put Utah before the coming Congress as an applicant for admission as a State.

On the first day of July last, a constitutional convention met at Salt Lake City. The official representatives of the two national political parties in the Territory unite in declaring that the convention represented only the Mormon Church, and their assertion has never been denied. The presiding officer of the convention admitted, with general agreement, that "previous obstacles to the admission of Utah must be faced frankly"; and this is the "frank" manner in which the Mormon Church proposes to face them. Provision for the punishment of bigamy and polygamy, even without State legislation, is made a part of the State constitution, and the repeal of this provision is forever forbidden, without the present assent of Congress. This, in brief, is the Mormon solution of all the difficulties which lie in the way of the admission of Utah as a State.

The solution is not altogether novel, nor was the success of it in its most prominent application such as to give very hopeful anticipations for the present proposition. After it had been decided, by the Compromise of 1820, that Missouri should be admitted as a State, an examination of her proposed constitution showed

that she refused to free negroes the rights given to them in other States. All the excitement which the Compromise had allayed was renewed; and it was with the greatest difficulty that another Compromise was adopted, admitting Missouri, on the fundamental condition that the inchoate State should pass just such a "public and irrevocable Act" as Utah proposes, agreeing never to construe or to execute these provisions of the State constitution so as to bar free negroes from the right of entrance to the State. In June, 1821, the legislature assembled and passed the Act required, with a preamble long afterward stated by Senator Douglas as follows:

"Whereas, Congress has prescribed these terms as the only condition on which the State of Missouri can be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and *Whereas*, the said terms are in palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, and grossly insulting to the people of this State, and such as Congress had no right to pass and as the people of this State ought not to accede to; and *Whereas*, the people of Missouri do not intend to respect or be bound by the said conditions, or to acknowledge the right of Congress to impose them; but inasmuch as we cannot obtain our constitutional rights in any other mode than by giving our assent to the same, with the protest that we shall not respect them: Therefore, be it known that we, the people of Missouri, do declare by this fundamental and irrevocable Act," etc., etc.

The State was declared admitted, by President Monroe's proclamation of August 10th, 1821, but, remarks Douglas, the President took good care not to publish the terms of the "public and irrevocable Act" of Missouri.

If the establishment of bigamy or polygamy, as a legal relation, depended upon the positive action of a State legislature, one might see some force in the proposed "public and irrevocable Act" of Utah; but, even then, the preamble of the Missouri Act should be added to it in order to reach its full significance. But, in the Utah case, no positive action is needed; the State authorities need only take a negative position, and do nothing, in order to give the Mormon Church all that it wants; and no State constitution can bind State authorities to do anything which the mass of their constituency support them in refusing to do. It is evident, then, that the plan of a fundamental condition, worthless as it has proved in practice, would be a mere farce in the case of Utah.

But what more can Utah do? This proposition is not only the last hope of the Mormon; it is our last hope of getting anything from him, for he can do no more at present. It is true that he may repent and do works meet for repentance; but are we to keep this miniature Ireland on our hands until we are satisfied of his repentance? How many years can we afford to wait? And after all, when we become satisfied as to his repentance and admit Utah as a State, what are we to do if we find that his repentance was feigned, and he is still really unregenerate! He will then in his legislature have complete control of the subjects of marriage and divorce, and of all offenses connected therewith.

The fact is that every new development only adds force to the belief that the only solution of the question is in making bigamy and polygamy Federal, not State, offenses. When this subject of marriage is transferred to Congress, then, and not until then, will it be safe to admit Utah as a State. Until then, the Federal Gov-

ernment cannot solve the problem, and must keep Utah under tutelage as a Territory; until then, the Mormon himself can give us no assurances which a man of ordinary prudence would be justified in accepting. From the latter point of view, this proposition of the Mormon Convention, encouraging as it is in its indications of weakness, is even more important in its warnings of the future. The crisis of our battle has come, and it finds both parties stalemated; the successful line cannot win the battle, and it is just as impossible for the conquered to lose it. We have now come to the end of discussion, under present conditions.\*

#### The Jury System.

SCARCELY any other wheel of our political system is in such constant motion as the jury system. From the little country court-room, where a petty jury sits to decide a matter of debt or ownership of property, to the crowded city building, where a jury sits to decide on the facts in the prosecution of a great criminal for murder or fraud, or on the existence of a great corporation, juries, in all degrees of importance, are at work on every calendar day of the year. Remove this one wheel suddenly from our system, and every other wheel would run whirring to a stand-still. Even though an entire removal of it be impossible, any influence or set of influences, which tend to sap the power of the jury system, is evidently at work on all the rest of the system, and may bring with it results which are quite impossible to measure.

The English jury has gone through many and fundamental changes from its original form until the present day. Originating in the Teutonic notion that all disputes between man and man were to be decided by the popular meeting, before which each disputant brought his "suit," his following of friends and supporters, the deciding body, was gradually reduced to a definite number, selected from the citizens who made up the popular body. But this "jury" was carefully taken from the "vicinage," from the immediate neighborhood of the seat of the dispute, and was composed of men who were presumed to have complete knowledge of the circumstances, and to decide the dispute from antecedent knowledge. When this condition had become an evident failure, outside persons, the modern "witnesses," were added, with the power of imparting their knowledge to the jury, but not of taking any part in the ultimate decision. As this new feature became more firmly established the antecedent knowledge of the jury became antagonistic to the general system, and the law was slowly settled that the juror who had antecedent knowledge could only use it as a witness. This was diametrically opposite to the original notion, though the forms and purpose of the jury were generally preserved. But, from that time, whatever the law may say, the fact of antecedent knowledge has been an objection to a juror: he who knows anything of the facts of a case in advance may be a good juror, but the prejudice is against him. Counsel for one side or the other, or for both sides, regard his appearance as an intrusion if not a gross injustice; and the court is sometimes driven to bring in its whole force in order to secure as a juror a man who has knowledge and an

intelligent opinion, but can nevertheless give a verdict on the weight of evidence.

How is this feeling to be reconciled with the existence and characteristics of the modern newspaper? The reconciliation might be possible if a criminal could be caught, the legal machinery set in motion, and a jury empaneled, within twenty minutes after a crime had been committed. But, in the natural course of events, the newspaper is weeks, months, even years ahead of the law. It spreads before all the world the facts, colored and uncolored, which are to be in dispute in the coming trial. The citizen who desires to be exempted from the troublesome jury service has only to read the newspapers with assiduity, to form an opinion and to express it in good set terms when summoned as a juror, and his object accomplishes itself. Thus the system, instead of a school of instruction, has become a corrupter of citizenship. It might be made a means of teaching the citizen a lesson which would be of the highest service to the State in all his relations to it and to his fellow-citizens,—the lesson that an intelligent and reasonable man may and should hear statements of fact, and still be able to hold his final judgment so far in abeyance as to take into the balance any new evidence which may be offered. This is to be not only a good juror, but a good citizen, a good politician, and a good member of society in all its relations. The man who, when examined as a juror, states with regret that he has read the newspaper accounts of the case, and has formed an opinion which is too strong to be overcome by evidence, ought to receive a public rebuke from the court, and be sent from the court-room to read, in his newspapers of the following day, the record of this rebuke. If exemption on this ground must come, let it come in this shape, and it will be the less longed for.

But the more serious danger is in the administration of our cities. It has come to pass that more than a fourth of the American people dwell in cities; and the percentage is increasing. Inefficient, slovenly, or fraudulent methods in the preparation of the lists of citizens from which jurors are to be chosen come in with bad city administration, and they constitute an influence which, acting directly on the jury system, acts indirectly on the whole political and social system of the United States. Even a tolerably good administration in other respects could never keep pace with the increasing dangers which city life tends to array against the jury system. The conditions are no longer the same as those under which the jury was born and bred; the locality is no longer one in which everybody knows his neighbor, and can tell whether the person summoned as a juror is lying or speaking the truth; the nearest neighbors in a city may know nothing of one another, and the statement of opinion on the examination of possible jurors has been very much released from the control of public or social opinion. Under these circumstances, that part of city administration which deals with the enrollment of citizens liable to jury duty can no longer be simply tolerable: it must be the best, the most intelligent, and the cleanest feature of the city government. How far this department of American city governments answers these requisites may be learned from any city lawyer in active practice.

Lawyers, however, do not like to say anything on the subject. The lawyer who has lost a case by reason

\* See Topics of the Time, THE CENTURY for September and October, 1886.

of a jury's incompetence or faithlessness, would not wish to bear the additional odium of seeming to throw the responsibility upon the jury: it is better to say nothing. It is not safe, moreover, for one man in active practice to get the ill-will of a debased system, and he will prefer to take his chances another time. The judges alone are in a position to do the state this service. When they speak, the public listens; the newspapers direct public opinion to the exact point of the evil; and the whole system feels the influence. It is hardly possible to overestimate the weight with which the sharp words of a competent and respected judge come to the public intelligence and conscience, or the service which he thus does for the whole political system.

If these conclusions are correct, the judiciary is the key to the whole difficulty. The judge can hold the citizen to his duty as a jurymen, can hold the city authority to its duty as an enrolling power, and can direct public opinion in the punishment of any dereliction on either side. The dangers which surround the jury system in this country, then, are another lesson to impress us with the necessity of obtaining good judges. Whether they be appointed or elected, the citizen who feels that their character is no concern of his, that he never expects to go to law and has no interest in the selection of judges, and that he may allow the political prostitution of the judiciary to pass without a protest, may as well understand that he is aiding to corrupt the very springs of our social and political system. For the influence of the judges on the selection of juries is vital to more than this one feature of our governments; the distinct failure of our jury system would indicate a political degeneracy of which no man could see the end.

#### Shall Immigration be Restricted?

HARDLY any other change of feeling and expression in the American people is more significant of the entrance of a new political era than the rising and already very general demand for some restriction of immigration. From the beginning of English colonization in North America until now, the feeling has been diametrically opposite; the material gains from immigration have been paraded in books and speeches; the more sentimental influence of the country's almost unique position, as the natural refuge of the downtrodden and the oppressed of every clime, has come in to reinforce the material arguments; and the occasional outbursts of Know-nothingism have served mainly as a background, to set off and bring more plainly into view the general and fixed popular aversion to any restriction upon the right of immigration.

In this feeling, also, the future historian will probably find an explanation of a large part of the process which led up to our civil war. Immigration affected the North and West almost exclusively. There were Macs and O's, Vons and Des, both North and South, and in both armies; but there was this great difference: in the North and West they were the product of a comparatively recent immigration, while in the South they were the really native product of two centuries of a far slower immigration. Even in 1880, excluding Florida and Texas, the South had a foreign population of only about two per cent., and that, too, after slavery had ceased for fifteen years to oppose its silent but almost impregnable barrier to immigration. Between 1847

and 1861, the North and West had received an influx of foreign-born population amounting to nearly half the aggregate population of the seceding States. Whatever feeling this new Northern and Western population had was for "America": it had neither comprehension of nor sympathy with the intense loyalty to a State be-gotten by decades of common trials and the traditional reverence for the State's supreme power; and the influence of this new element could not but affect popular opinion and the action of public men at almost every critical point in the history of those pregnant years. The Carolinian of 1780 and 1860 were very much the same; the New Yorker of 1860 and 1780 were very different beings. The North and West were constantly changing and developing, while the South was standing still; and the result could hardly have been anything but a rupture in the end, even though it had not been forced in 1860-61.

But now it is from the North and West that this cry for restriction of immigration is coming; the South is neutral or indifferent, for it has little interest in the matter. Sectarian differences have little to do with this new phase of the demand. The very immigrants of 1847-61 are now the leaders in urging that the bars be put up, at least for a time; and the restrictions on Chinese immigration stand as a precedent and a tempting suggestion. The Protectionist, who has taken the "protection of American labor" as a conclusive argument, begins to think that "a tariff on Castle Garden" is a necessary corollary to the argument. His natural opponents, more intent on securing individual freedom than protection for the workman, see with disgust that the individual workman is subjected to a tyranny of selfish imported stupidity. The sober, work-a-day citizen, compelled to stop his work and listen to the ravings of an imported mob, whose natural platform is Drink, Dirt, and Disorder, begins to wonder whether he has really been given the providential mission of bearing with this scum. And the tax-payer begins to feel some concern when he finds his country regarded as a preordained poorhouse by every local board of magistrates from Ireland to Hungary. Protestants of every sect hurried forward to resist the tide of Native Americanism when sectarian passion was its moving force. But where are we to look for a voice which will be raised against the coming attempts to restrict immigration, impelled by the notorious happenings of the past two or three years? The system of unrestricted immigration, which was so lately the standing refuge of every Fourth of July orator of the North and West, waits only for the first shock of attack, and there will be few to do it reverence as it falls.

The restriction, when it comes, can hardly take any other shape than the requirement of a consular certificate as a prerequisite for passage to the United States, leaving the consuls to the guidance of instructions from the State Department in the performance of their duties. To the returning tourist or business man, to him whose record of previous American citizenship is clear, or to the *bona fide* farmer or workman, whose immigration is as clear a gain to the republic as ever, the consular certificate would be almost a matter of form. To him who cannot read the consular certificate, or sign his name to the affidavit on which it is granted; to him who is merely leaving his own country for his country's good; to him who comes

not as an intending American citizen, but as a reënforcement to a hierarchy which the United States Government has proclaimed to be its enemy; to him who is the known and irreconcilable enemy of society itself,—to all such, the law may easily be so framed as to make the necessity of a consular certificate, under the instructions given to consuls, a very serious impediment to immigration. It would be impossible, no doubt, for such a filter to catch all the objectionable elements which might assail it; but the result would be at least somewhat clearer water than we have been receiving from the old continent for years past.

The desire for such a purification of immigration is no mere product of a sentimental admiration of cleanliness. Our "dangerous classes" have been increased, of late years, by the addition of a still more dangerous class, one which is amenable to none of the influences by which society has hitherto dealt with the others. Its numbers are no larger than those of our bears or panthers or other wild beasts. But it has human intelligence, superimposed upon the instincts of the wild beast; its members have the power and will to work destruction to which the mere brute is incompetent; and yet their human lineaments prevent society from dealing with them in their proper capacity until after they have wrought their evil work. They are in, though not of, the country; and their presence has only added to the responsibility of those men to whom the preservation of the public peace is intrusted. But why should their base of operations be left unattacked?

Why should they be left to draw reënforcements from abroad *ad libitum*? Such a restriction on immigration as has been suggested would cut off at least a percentage of their reënforcements; and every chief of police in the United States would feel that, difficult as his task in dealing with this class might still be, it would no longer be an absolutely hopeless one: daylight might be indefinitely in advance, but it would be daylight at least.

The hardships of the proposition lie mainly in the visions, which the imagination unconsciously conjures up, of United States marshals lining the shores of the great republic, ready to treat as criminal the desire of any immigrant to enter her jurisdiction. But the reality would be far from correspondent with any such spectacle. There would be a few cases of stowaways, whom the steamships or sailing-vessels which brought them would be compelled to carry back at their own expense; and then the mere fact of the known restriction would obtain all the good that can ever be hoped from it. Nor is there any constitutional objection to the power of Congress to enact such a restriction. The section of the Constitution, forbidding Congress to interfere with the "migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit" until the year 1808, carries with it a complete power to interfere in later years. The importation of negro slaves, of Chinese, and of contract labor has already been forbidden; are there not other classes of immigration which yearn for restriction?

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Christian Union and Baptism.

IN the July number of THE CENTURY, an "Open Letter" writer says: "Christian Union, both essential and organic, is greatly retarded because many Christians refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word, and the conclusions of the highest scholarship regarding the subjects and act of baptism. Baptists hold that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice. They believe that this word teaches with unmistakable clearness that believers are the only subjects of baptism; and that baptism is the immersion of believers," etc.

Now, all the world knows that, in these matters, other Christians hold, and Presbyterians, among others, plainly declare, just what this Baptist represents as the great faith of his denomination,—namely, "That Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice." Therefore, if they differ from Baptists, *why*? This writer says: They "refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word," etc. To "refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word," they must know that teaching. And if, as this writer charges, they believe that God's word does not teach what they practice, as to the mode and subjects of baptism, then they are all hypocrites, acting in opposition to "conviction and conscience." To brand them all the more deeply and darkly, as living in the impen-

itent practice of known sin, he says of God's word: "More explicit are its utterances on these subjects than regarding the divinity of Christ, or any article in the orthodox creeds." That is, as he means: "*Believer's baptism*" and *immersion* — to the exclusion of all other modes and subjects — are more explicitly taught in God's word, than is the divinity of Christ, or any other doctrine! Is this true or not? All other Evangelical denominations accept the divinity of Christ as a teaching of God's word, and hold that it is heresy not to accept it. So clear is the teaching of the Bible on this subject. Now, as this writer says, the baptism of believers only, and immersion as the mode, are more explicitly taught in God's word, than this essential doctrine of the common acceptance and faith, we do utterly and emphatically deny the statement. We affirm that there is not *one verse* in the Bible proving immersion as the only mode of baptism or the only baptism, and not one verse in the Bible proving that only believers are to be baptized, and not one verse in the Bible proving beyond doubt or controversy — that is, in *express words* — that any one was ever immersed in being baptized.

But this writer claims that "all men, always and in all places, accept immersion as baptism; not to accept it, is not to accept baptism."

And we ask: Why is it *recognized* as baptism? (We do not say it is *accepted*,—for that would not be true.) Simply because, thereby we wish to recognize Baptists as an *Evangelical denomination*, and be-

cause we wish to *respect every brother's conscience in all things doubtful, or not essential*. This, God's word commands.

Good and wise men differ as to the Bible-teachings touching the mode and subjects of baptism. Since these differences are not about "things essential," ought we not to show Christian charity? If it be said that we are disobedient to a plain command of Christ's own giving, we must deny it. We believe that baptism is commanded; and we *believe we obey the command in our mode and subjects*. We believe this more firmly than we believe that the "Baptists" are right! And, certainly, in the Presbyterian Church (South, at least, if not North also) we do not accept nor practice immersion. Some cases of immersion there were, formerly; but, because of our great doubt as to the Scripturalness of this mode, it is now disapproved among us, in practice. Notwithstanding all that this Baptist writer says, we do not "agree on immersion as baptism" for ourselves; and we cannot be immersed "without doing violence either to conviction or conscience."

As to the "highest scholarship," etc., we have good reason to know and say that when writers and others are *fairly and fully represented or quoted*, their "Concessions" to Baptists are worthless, and in many cases merely imaginary. But were it otherwise, we cannot depart from our law, "that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice." The baptism given in the example of Christ is found in Acts ii. *It is the only case in the Bible where mode cannot be argued at all. It came from above, was "poured" (v. 18) upon the heads of those receiving it.* Not one case of immersion is mentioned in all the Book! This is not the place to argue the meaning of the original word, as used before Christ adopted it. Suffice it to say that neither classic Greek, nor any other, justifies immersion as the one mode; and *the Bible does not justify it at all, in our view!*

We must not conclude without remarking upon the very strange assertion that "the so-called 'Teaching of the Apostles' does not call anything baptism but immersion"; that "it gives directions for baptism, and then, when the conditions for baptism are wanting, . . . it gives permission for something else, not called baptism." In the directions about baptism in that document, *immersion is not once mentioned, nor even hinted at!* Two kinds of water are mentioned; "Living," that is, fresh, or running water, is preferred. "But if thou hast not both (kinds), pour water (the kind thou hast) upon the head," etc. *And this is called baptism, afterwards!* "προσθε του βαπτισματος." No one can read that document, then say truly, "Baptists alone live up to it."

His further claim that "all are agreed on immersion as baptism . . . All can be baptized (immersed) without doing violence either to conviction or conscience," we object to, most emphatically. We have explained why we *recognize* immersion. But for ourselves we cannot conscientiously accept it, nor administer it to others.

Herbert H. Hawes,

Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va.

#### Christian Union and Pending Public Questions.

THE discussion which has been maintained of late, in THE CENTURY and elsewhere, on the subject of Christian Union, has thus far established at least these three propositions:

*First.* That there is a strong and a growing desire for such union—a desire discovering itself among some of the leading ministers of several distinct denominations.

*Second.* That the Christian union so desired is not only nearer and more harmonious relations between different and still separate churches, but, certainly by some, *an effective organic unity*; not the general absorption of all others by any one, but reunion based on reconciliation of differences or on the discovery of mutually satisfactory terms upon which those distinctive differences can be coördinated.

But, *Third*, that in none of the churches is there felt, as yet, any great motive power pressing them on with sufficient force to overcome either the general inertia or the many and serious practical difficulties and obstacles which arrest actual progress in that direction.

In other words, while many Christian thinkers greatly *desire*, the churches clearly do not, as yet, feel the *necessity* of Christian unity.

Meanwhile, however, it is evident that a question is beginning to present itself, as perhaps worthy of serious consideration, which is nearly allied to this, and which must practically involve this very issue of Christian unity.

From no principle of English social and political life did the revolution separate our fathers more effectively and more thoroughly than from that which recognized an established religion of the State. That the new nation should have, as such, no religion, was assumed to be one of the corner-stone principles on which rested the guaranty of our liberties. So far has this assumption been carried, so widely and continuously has it entered, ever since, into all our writing, speaking, and thinking upon matters of public interest, that it has come to be accepted as a virtual axiom of American social and political philosophy, that religion is concerned only with a personal and private life of the individual; and that it has no natural, much less necessary, relation with social problems and political issues.

This experiment of relegating Christianity to the individual and to private life,—the attempt to conduct business, to develop social interests, to work out an American economic science, and, above all, to administer the affairs of the nation without reference to Christian laws or to Christian principles,—on the ground, that is, that these laws and principles do not apply to the affairs of this life, has, in consequence been tried thoroughly; and there are not a few who are now beginning to look around them, to consider the utter disorganization of our accepted economic system; to analyze and search for the causes of the labor troubles and of the inchoate anarchy of the last few years, of the confessed moral failure of our boasted public-school system, and of the corruption of our politics,—and to ask how far these are the outcome of that experiment.

Without attempting to anticipate the results of such inquiries, it may, at least, be said that they open up before us some of the most serious questions ever pro-



posed to American thinkers and students. They remind us of the plain, direct language of Isaiah: "The nation and kingdom which will not serve thee shall perish," and they constrain us to consider whether those words be not deserving of a larger and a more modern application than we have been wont to give them.

But this inquiry also brings us face to face with another grave question. If we should be led, eventually, to admit that Christianity is a necessary factor in the settlement of our labor troubles, in the solution of the most perplexing problems which now present themselves in sociology and even in public politics, how is it possible to bring this factor into effective action, so long as Christianity presents itself to the public embodied only in a number of wholly distinct and at least supposedly antagonistic sects and churches? Even were the community to be persuaded of the necessity of taking counsel, in its extremity, of the church of Christ,—who shall or who can decide for the community, from which one of all these several Christian bodies, each claiming to be at least the nearest approximation to the ideal of that church and most faithfully to teach Christian doctrine?—society is to ask and receive instruction in the oracles of God. Even were the business community ready to accept a new Christian social economy or the nation to conform its public policy to Christian principles, is not Christian reunion a condition precedent of the power of the Church to give such guidance or to teach such principles?

National Christianity, where it still exists, has come down from a period which antedates these divisions among Christians. In a pure monarchy, so long as the ruling family—in an aristocracy, so long as the ruling class, continues to be identified with one organic form of Christianity, so long can that national Christianity be maintained, even after Christian unity, among the people, had been broken up. But, in proportion, as the actual power of government passes into the hands of those who are themselves divided on organic religious issues, in that proportion must such divisions prove fatal to anything like a national Christianity. The exclusion of Christianity from all but purely personal and private interests is, therefore, the inevitable corollary of Christian divisions in a democracy.

Conversely, then, among us, must the restoration of such a lost Christian unity precede all hope of anything like a real social or economic or national recognition of Christianity; and any one who honestly believes that a non-Christian social economy and a non-Christian political philosophy have been failures; every one who is convinced that the great issues which have been raised by the conflicting interests of labor and capital can only be adjusted stably on Christian principles; every one who is now ready to confess that a public-school system, in accordance with which the intellect only is educated, while the conscience is left undisciplined, is worse than a failure; every one who believes that the attempt to ignore the laws of Christ in national politics is fatal to all national prosperity and stability;—all these must, of necessity, therefore, whatever their personal or private religious convictions or character, sooner or later seek the restoration of some effective Christian unity.

That the social disturbances of these times and the present state of party politics have brought many to

consider these questions as never before, is not to be denied. That they will awaken and stimulate discussion, in the drawing-room and at the table, in the religious press, the magazine and the review, on the platform and in the pulpit, is equally beyond a doubt.

In the presence of such considerations and questions the wide distinction, heretofore so generally accepted and so steadily maintained on both sides,—between the domain of public interests and duties and that of private and personal Christianity,—fades away and utterly disappears. The Christian finds himself called upon to consider his relations, as such, to every social question and to every political issue of his times. The economist, the publicist, and the statesman find themselves equally called upon to ask what Christianity has to say upon the question in hand, and what modifications are introduced into the problems of the hour, by that which, at all events potentially, if not in actuality, is the overruling factor—the law of Christ.

Wm. Chauncy Langdon.

ST. JAMES' RECTORY, BEDFORD, PA.

#### Secret Societies in College.

THE time has arrived again when the classes are gathering in our various institutions of learning over the land, and many young men are just beginning the new and strange life embraced within those eventful four years which mold and in a great measure fix their after career among scholars and professional associates in the real world outside.

I should like to say a few words about one matter concerning the societies which have place, rightly or wrongly, in most colleges. The process of what used to be called "electioneering" commences almost at once when the freshmen come on. The secret and the anti-secret associations alike select their members; and so most of the new students are compelled to take sides on a question which grows more and more intricate as they advance in years, and are able to mark the workings of an experience thoroughly unique and prodigiously influential, upon themselves and upon others. The least that can be said at the beginning, and the least that can be urged to the end, is that men should be conscientious at the beginning and consistent to the end of their course.

Let me tell an old true story: When I was in college, it was an admitted custom for the secret-society students to attend at pleasure the regular meetings of the anti-secret association, then called there the Social Fraternity. On one occasion the news went around that the delegates of a number of affiliated institutions had assembled in some central city during the vacation, and formed a *quasi* national consociation, embracing all the local ones, which hereafter were to be understood to have become auxiliaries. Curiosity was at its height, and the assembly convened to accept the report was visited by a large number of outsiders also, and the small chapel was nearly full. Even the "neutrals" doffed their dignity in order to witness the novelty.

The committee proceeded to read their preamble and constitution for a formal adoption. It was in the regular form. It began by saying that the name of the new organization should be the "Anti-Secret Society

of the United States." It then rehearsed the purposes, the aims, and the hopes of the members in thus banding themselves together. The officers were fixed, their duties prescribed, and all that. By and by an article was reached which specified and described, somewhat particularly, the way in which it should be known. Of course I am not going even to try to quote anything more than the substance of the language. It was like this: "The badge of this Society shall, consist of a bosom-pin about six-tenths of an inch in diameter, circular, a black disk of jet surrounded by a wreath of gold, bearing in the center the initials of the Society's name in raised letters of gold in the enamel."

Thereupon there was an instant explosion of laughter from one of the visitors—the unfortunate writer of this article. He meant no derision, and indeed was as innocent in his indiscretion as he was mortified by such a disclosure of it. The usual shout, with all its precipitation of student-wrath, was started for his comfort: "Put him out!" He replied with the usual Greek: "Strike, but hear!" Then the ordinary amount of intellect was invoked to perceive that really there was some incongruity in such noble and scholarly men wearing on their bosoms the great golden letters "A S S" before all the college. Anger gave place to fun; and ultimately the convention did their work better by changing the name of the society to Anti-Secret Confederation; and through the rest of our course members were labeled "A S C."

Such a discomfiture would have been fatal in most cases, and inevitably would have given a most unphilosophical advantage to the other side of the question. But the fact was, those men were the chiefs of the college. They had among them some of the maturest and best the classes loved to honor. They managed the rest of the meeting skillfully. Before we retired, they forced in a splendid chance for an appeal to all that was decent and generous in our minds; they stood up in the power of real manhood, and told us the meanness of cliques and the injustice of exclusiveness, and the wickedness of oaths. Some of the Social Fraternity men of that year have done magnificent work in this old world since then; and I speak simple justice when I own they shook many of us that night with their arguments and their truths.

For one, I like conscience when I see it; I always did; and more than that, I like outspoken words for what is right and good and true. But I like consis-

tency also; and now I must tell the rest of my story. On the day we graduated, sobered and thoughtful, gentle and pensive in the backward look and the forward dread, a new secret society, running through all the four classes, "swung out" before the eyes of us all in complete organization. Among the men who spoke their commencement orations in our class were three or four wearing the badge of that association. They were the men who argued and pleaded two years previous to that day in the small chapel. They repudiated their principles and defied their former record, when it was too late for an apology or for an explanation. The Social Fraternity was wounded and betrayed by its leaders in the whole four classes; the secret-society men were not inclined to feel complimented; and the conversation was worried and perplexed, when the young fellows asked and wondered what it meant. Some said that these men had always been shamming because they had not for themselves been taken, and so were spiteful instead of conscientious.

Simply and earnestly I say again, as I close the tale, let those who take ground on this unsettled question of secret societies in college put conscience and consistency together. If any one changes his mind, because of fresh convictions, let him own it frankly, and take a clear stand early enough to retain the respect of those who have loved and trusted him in the days gone by. For I soberly declare that it is my pain to this day to recall how my confidence was broken then.

*Charles S. Robinson.*

#### Henry Clay, the Slashes, and Ashland again.

HENRY CLAY was born within three miles of Hanover Court House, south, and some four or five miles eastward of the present pretty little summer town of Ashland. His birthplace was known locally as "The old Clay place," or "The place where Henry Clay was born," and as long ago as 1832, and many years earlier, I believe, had passed into other hands.

The first name of the railway station where Ashland stands was called, in 1836, "Tayler's Sawmill"; then the name was appropriately changed to "Slash Cottage," being in the heart of the Slashes of Hanover. That name held till after 1850, when Mr. Edwin Robinson, of Richmond City, conceived the project of building a town at "Slash Cottage," and formally christened it "Ashland," after Mr. Clay's residence in Kentucky.

*W. A. W.*

