

ONE BORN IN NOVEMBER.

HE leaps to touch again the pulse of Spring:
None quick as he that pleasure to fore-
stall!

But while he smiles in light of everything,
The cherry-blossoms suddenly take wing.
Such silky flights can have no sound of fall,
But yet he hears November in them all.

Burning with rapture on June's perfect breast,—
As if he stirred the roses breathing there,
Lo! some loose petals by his foot are prest,
And with the sum of her warm beauty blest,
He feels a sudden chillness in the air,
And sees the hint of ashes everywhere.

When summer glory shines with August height,
And his high spirits match the splendid day,
Just one soft, purpling leaf's slow, silent flight
Rustles like autumn on the ear of sight!
The forest-curves in fancy sink away,
And leave November's bony forms and gray.

Yet dream not when his birth-month draweth
near,
He is a man that maketh Gloom his guest.
Nay! from the tender droppings of the year;
From summer leaves that fall before they sear;
From autumn leaf-rain, life doth snatch a zest:
For—shadowed joys are always vividest!

Charlotte Fiske Bates.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

To the Readers of "The Century."

WITH this number of THE CENTURY the magazine begins its thirty-fifth volume and eighteenth year. Again it is our pleasure to record a very large annual growth in the number of readers which the magazine regularly addresses. It is with an increasing sense of responsibility that we contemplate the fact that THE CENTURY possesses to-day, and has for several years possessed, the largest audience that was ever gathered about any periodical of its class printed in the English language. The first edition of the present number is a quarter of a million copies. As each copy has from one reader to six hundred (the latter in a few of the large public reading-rooms), the readers of THE CENTURY throughout the world are estimated at nearly two millions.

In considering the causes which have given THE CENTURY its unprecedented circulation, there is one that should never be forgotten; and that is, the spirit in which it was founded, and in which it was conducted in its early years. Dr. Holland, in assuming the direction of a "people's magazine," determined that it should not shirk living subjects; that the great questions of the day should be treated seriously, earnestly, and continuously in its pages; that while carrying on its purely literary and artistic functions, it should tell as a constant force in the intellectual, moral, and political development of the country. That freedom of opinion, that fair play, and that hospitality to ideas which he insisted upon have been of the highest service to THE CENTURY in its history since he was called away. A notable instance of the possibilities under such a policy is the War Series of THE CENTURY (now concluded as a battle series, but to be continued, from time to time, with short papers on special and picturesque phases of the war),—a historical work of such importance as to be in itself a part of our national history—in its relation to the personal career of General Grant, in the wealth of its original testimony with regard to great events, and in its moral effect in helping to bring the

once warring sections into a better understanding and a higher mutual regard.

The publication of the War Series made possible the publication, as its continuation and culmination, of the authorized Life of Lincoln and History of his times. This work is now entering upon its most interesting stage, having reached the point where the authors themselves became associated with the President, in official and confidential relations, and are therefore able to bring to the elucidation of the story a number of unpublished documents and reminiscences of the highest interest and value.

The generous manner in which the public has greeted such enterprises as these confirms the purpose of THE CENTURY to do all in its power to help make our multitudinous American communities feel and appreciate their national unity and destiny. We have no sympathy with that false and ill-informed patriotism which flatters its audience by affecting to despise Abroad. There is a long distance between the state of mind of an American who refuses to learn anything from the past or present of that great majority of mankind belonging to the Old World and the state of mind of the American who simply recognizes the development of human freedom and thought which has taken place in the New World—recognizes not only our national faults and dangers, but also every gain made here, and every golden opportunity which is here still open to the race.

A Phase of Political Independence.

"DEMOCRACY," explains your American philosopher, "signifies the rule of the people, the whole people. It is distinguished from monarchy, which means the rule of one; and from aristocracy, which denotes the rule of a few." The American philosopher seems to have the dictionary on his side; whether history, ancient or modern, supports his assertion, is matter of dispute. Most of the democracies of history have, as a matter of fact, been governments of the many by the few. Our own ought to be an exception, but is it so?

An aristocracy, our philosopher asserts, is the rule of the few. To be quite accurate (for we are now speaking etymologically), it is the rule of the best. That is what it purports to be. Practically it is not always so. Those who assume to be the best of the people are not always the best; the selections of heredity are not infallible. If we only knew how to choose the best—the wisest, the bravest, the most unselfish—could we do better than to commit the administration to their hands? Is not this, indeed, what we mean by democracy? Is it not the fundamental assumption of the philosophic democrat, that the investiture of the people with the political power will result in the selection of the ablest and wisest men to administer the affairs of the State; or if not in all cases the ablest and wisest, yet, in the long run and as a general rule, abler and wiser men than can be secured by any other method? Is it not believed that in the open discussion of public questions, and the free criticism of candidates, truth will prevail over error, and wisdom over folly, and probity over rascality, and that thus, by the free choice of the people, the men who are best fitted to govern will be called to govern? Mirabeau said truly, "In a certain sense republics are monarchical, and again in a certain sense monarchies are republics." Quite as truly we might say, "All strong aristocracies have a democratic element in them, and all vigorous democracies tend to a genuine aristocracy." This is the test of democracy. Does it indeed secure wise and capable administration? Does it bring to the front its natural rulers?

Ask this question respecting our municipal government. Are the mayors of our cities their ablest and soundest men? Sometimes they are; but is it the rule? How about the members of the municipal councils? Here the test fails utterly. The legislative bodies of our cities, with scarcely an exception, are composed of men who are not above the average in intelligence, and who are below the average in morality. Saloon-keepers, small politicians with axes to grind, and various unsocial and disreputable characters form the majority of most of these city councils. This does not look as though our democracy were succeeding in bringing to the front its natural leaders. Instead of selecting the best to rule, it seems to be selecting the worst.

In many ways this tendency finds expression. Recently, in one of our inland cities, the mayor sent a message to the Common Council pointing out that many of the saloons were open all night; that the worst injuries of these saloons upon public morals were perpetrated in the hours between midnight and morning, and that many of the crimes engendered in these saloons were brought forth in these small hours of the night. The mayor furnished figures from the police reports to prove these statements, and asked the Council to pass an ordinance requiring the closing of these saloons between twelve at night and six in the morning. The Council deliberated, hesitated, weighed and measured, postponed, reconsidered, and finally defeated the ordinance. The facts presented by the mayor were not disputed; and it was well known that a large number, probably a majority, of the liquor sellers themselves were in favor of the ordinance; but a minority of them, and these the lowest and worst, the keepers of the vilest dives in the city, were opposed to it; and the majority of the Council made common

cause with the dregs of the population, and permitted them to control its administration. Beyond controversy, if the question of the closing of these saloons after midnight could have been submitted directly to the people of the city they would have voted ten to one in the affirmative; doubtless these councilors were perfectly well aware of this fact; they knew that they were not representing their constituents; yet they disregarded the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people and made themselves the willing instruments of that small fraction of the population which lives to propagate poverty and crime.

Such debasing subjection to the vilest elements of the people is very common, not only on the part of office-holders, but also, and more especially, on the part of political managers. In making nominations, it is not the support of the intelligent and virtuous classes that is most carefully inquired after, but the support of the vicious and disorderly classes. Your average boss, in either party, is not solicitous about the vote of the churches; his problem is to secure the vote of the saloons. He seeks first the kingdom of Beelzebub and his iniquity, confident that all the other support that he needs will be added unto him. In a convention, met for the nomination of a candidate for mayor, in one of our most reputable capital cities, the friends of one candidate boldly announced in their conferences with the rest that three hundred gamblers stood ready to make handsome contributions to the election funds if their man was nominated. The argument seemed to be conclusive, for their man was nominated, and elected. That such a reason can be urged in a political convention is itself a startling fact.

Those who watch the debates of a State legislature wrestling with any phase of the liquor question at once perceive that the policy of both parties is dictated not by the better half of either party, but by the worse half—probably by the lowest and meanest eighth or tenth of the party. These legislatures are asking, not what measures will best satisfy the great mass of industrious, thrifty, law-abiding people, but what measures will alienate the smallest number of the enemies and parasites of society.

These statements may seem to be extravagant, but it would be easy to give abundant illustrations from our recent political history of every one of them. And without wishing to take a pessimistic view of our American type of democracy; without doubting, indeed, that the tendencies pointed out are a temporary disorder which the good sense of our people will find a way of curing, the philosophic observer cannot help asking what these things mean, and what remedies are readiest and most effectual.

The fact that party managers and public officials show themselves so responsive to the vilest elements of society indicates great activity on the part of these vilest elements. Their number is not large, but their zeal is hot and their purpose is strong; what they lack in weight they make up in velocity. Their demands are incessant and insistent; their pressure upon the political leaders is never lightened. The better classes make no such demonstration of their purpose. There is little political activity among them; their numbers and their weight give them little force, because there is so little movement. The vilest prevail over the best because they are so much more active in their

own interest, and so much more positive in their demands.

They gain advantage, also, in another way. They are much less intense in their partisanship. One who watches the municipal contests in a city where the two great parties are pretty evenly balanced will see that the disorderly and vicious classes are by no means wedded to either party. Their vote goes, almost solidly, first to one party and then to the other,—always to the candidates that are the most satisfactory to them. Their political principles are precisely those which one of our prominent capitalists has so humorously avowed, and for the same reason. They are no bigoted partisans, not they. Consequently they manage, in a good many of our cities, to have things largely their own way.

If the supremacy of the vilest in our municipal governments is explained by the facts just mentioned, the way of overthrowing that supremacy is clearly indicated. A great increase of political activity and a corresponding abatement of partisanship, on the part of the best citizens is urgently called for. The latter is the simpler, and perhaps the more effective, remedy. If the upper half of each of the great parties were as fearlessly independent as the lowest quarter of the party is, the rule of the vilest would speedily cease and determine. It is the confidence of the bosses that the better citizens will be steadfastly loyal to their party obligations, that encourages them to truck and dicker with the rabble. The knowledge that they were in danger of losing the support of the reputable people would lead them to withdraw from that alliance.

The effectiveness of this remedy has already been demonstrated in several of our great cities. In these cities there is a great gain in the *personnel* of the government, and in the vigor and purity of the administration. The same remedy is within reach of the voters of all our cities.

Sanitary Legislation in American Cities.

It is somewhat depressing to look back and see how large a part of what has passed for political principle in the United States has been really only a temporary exemption from the necessity of meeting problems which had long vexed older peoples. In 1790, when there were but four American cities with a population of more than 10,000, and when the population of the largest was but about 40,000, it was easy for our people to relegate all matters relating to the prevention of disease to individual care, and to look with complacency upon this solution, as only a phase of the great political principle of individual liberty. It is a different matter in 1887, when nearly one-fourth of our people live in cities, when a single city with its environs contains almost as many persons as the whole United States in 1790, and when the consequences of individual carelessness or incompetency may be frightful. Under the latter circumstances, we can no longer leave to the individual, or force upon him, duties to which he is incompetent; nor, above all, can we any longer put such a solution into the class of political principles.

The only comprehensible relation which human society bears to the individual is that of conferring benefits on him; if it fails in this function, it is only a nuisance and an impediment to him. But the real ben-

efit which society can confer on him is not, as the socialist assumes, that of making life easier; it is rather that of enabling the individual to reach the point of the most strenuous endeavor, with the highest percentage of results. Society injures the individual when it repays to him the sum which a swindler has abstracted from his pocket; it confers a benefit on him when it locks up the swindler, and makes it more difficult for other swindlers to entrap the unwary. The dividing line is not difficult to follow, if one is honestly anxious to follow it. And it seems a natural, however unpleasant, consequence that the energy of the State should increase with the intensity of modern life; otherwise, the whole growth of the race in numbers and civilization would be a decided disadvantage to the individual, for every invention and development would merely bring in some new danger, against which he must guard himself, to the detriment of his ordinary work. When the numbers of a people have increased so that a small percentage is a large absolute number, when the individual workman finds himself menaced by an organization which is too strong for him, however weak it may be in comparison with the whole State, he has a right to expect from the State ample protection against anything which interferes with the full efficiency of his labor: it is no answer to say that the precedents do not meet the case; the State exists to make precedents in such cases. When new chemical processes in manufacture have brought into populous places odors and gases which are not only offensive, but distinctly detrimental to health, it is not fair to the individual to expect him to stop his ordinary work in order to abate nuisances of the sort: the State has found a new sphere of activity. When a city becomes packed like an ant-hill, and there is every temptation to individuals to disregard the usual laws of health in the construction and regulation of buildings, it is not fair to the individual to leave to his conscience or personal investigation the regulation or detection of defects which are so easily concealed; he is not to blame for the new conditions, and the State must do the work, in order that he may attend to his own work, and not be injured, instead of benefited, by the new developments. He who would reject at once a proposition that the State should build houses for workmen, on the ground that such a step would tend only to injure the individual activity of the recipients of the bounty, is not at all illogical in believing that the State is bound to use every energy for the prevention of preventable diseases in cities, for the latter step is merely a removal of the burden of new conditions from the individual who has become exposed to them, and an effort to enable him to do his work with as much efficiency as ever. Such legislation seems to be altogether Individualistic, as opposed to Socialistic.

That legislation can do much in this direction has been abundantly proved by experiment. England's first half-century of sanitary legislation, beginning in 1838, has just ended, and its results are full of encouragement to those who have had faith in the possibilities of such work in American cities. During this period, the death-rate of England and Wales has been reduced from 22.07 to 19.62 per 1000; and that of London from 25.57 to 21.01 per 1000. Such percentages become much more intelligible when it is added that the death-roll of England and Wales, at the rate of 1838, would have

been 102,240 larger last year than it was under a system of sanitary legislation: that is, that this number of lives was actually saved and prolonged by the intelligent direction of the energy of the State. If there is any taint of socialism in "State interference" of this sort, which goes only to the relief of the individual from the necessity of guarding him from the unhealthy influences of modern city life, and thus enabling him to work longer, with less anxiety and more efficiency, it is not easy to detect it.

The conditions of American life have thus far been in favor of a low death-rate. The death-rate of the whole United States in 1880 was stated by the Census Bureau as 15.09 per 1000; but it is difficult to believe that some failures to report did not have an influence on this very favorable showing. London's death-rate of about 20 per 1000 is extremely low for an English city, and yet Philadelphia and Pittsburg about equal it, and Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Providence, St. Louis, and San Francisco surpass it, Cleveland having about the lowest death-rate of the world's great cities. In all these cases, active municipal work has done much to reënforce the naturally healthy conditions of American cities, even under the increasing density of population; but the time is rapidly approaching when legislators must realize their duty of giving an active and intelligent support to those who have in hand the municipal work of fighting off disease, under conditions

which give every advantage to the encroachments of disease. With the increase of tenement districts, in which human beings are packed closer than an inexperienced person would think possible, while ignorance and heedlessness add to the difficulties of obtaining prompt information, a case of small-pox or cholera is really more frightful than tons of gunpowder; and yet the difficulty of the work of municipal boards increases out of proportion even to the increase of the peril.

It would be well, too, if our people could realize, before that time comes, the necessity for the entire freedom of the municipal health service from any control by the so-called politician class. As population grows denser, the debasement or elevation of this branch of the municipal civil service will be seen most plainly in the death-rate, for consistent and intelligent sanitary legislation may be passed, but can never be administered, except by a class of public servants who are not bound to any party, but to the public service. A high death-rate falls most severely on the poor; and it would seem that a wide field for watchfulness and usefulness is here offered for the proper energies of every labor organization, quite apart from all boycotts or sympathetic strikes. Good municipal civil service touches interests of the workingman which are quite as important, if he would but see it, as any for whose defense the walking delegate has yet given his signal for action.

OPEN LETTERS.

Education of the Blind.—II.

THE BLIND AS STUDENTS.

WE pride ourselves much in this country upon our special schools for this exceptional class, and with reason. Unquestionably they have done and are doing a vast amount of good; unquestionably they are, in comparison with those of Europe, the acme of perfection in system and management. Yet they are fearfully one-sided in their training, lamentably limited in their scope.

Many suppose that the only rational course, the moment an individual under thirty is pronounced hopelessly blind, is to send him at once to one of these establishments and keep him there till he is turned out a finished specimen of its educational excellence. For the child of indigent or wholly incompetent parents, this may be the only choice, to be taken for better or worse; but where a fair amount of means, intelligence, and attention can be devoted to him at home, he had much better remain there during most of his formative period, learning and doing what others do, as far as possible.

I am very far from denying the great value of these special schools to any and all pupils in the pursuit of certain peculiar branches of study, and in learning the application and use of certain inventions peculiar to the needs of the blind; and a short attendance at some institution of the kind is most advisable, say from one to three years. But this time should be amply sufficient in which to avail one's self of such particular advantages, and a longer sojourn, even at one of the best institutions, I hold to be decidedly detrimental.

It is in the actual active world, not within the sheltering walls and among the specially adapted arrangements and customs of an asylum for their class, that the blind must live and labor; and the almost unavoidable danger is that a prolonged stay at the latter will unfit them in a great measure for the former. Certain peculiar habits are too likely to be acquired, harmless enough in themselves and useful to sightless persons when together, but which attract attention and stamp one as odd in the outside world. Such, for instance, as snapping the fingers to indicate the position of the extended hand, when about to exchange a friendly greeting or pass any object; making some sound in passing one another to show exact whereabouts; groping noisily and conspicuously for any desired article; and many more of the like, all of which are roughly but forcibly classed in the school phraseology under the head of "blindisms," and, once adopted, are very difficult to lay aside.

Then the competition at such institutions is always and in every department only with those hampered by a like disadvantage; and the pupil is too apt to content himself with slow, clumsy methods and a low standard of results. He needs the constant spur to his pride of seeing those about him, many of whom he feels to be his inferiors in intellect, accomplishing more in less time, whether in study or competitive sports, to stimulate his ambition and arouse his faculties, so as to overcome the greater obstacles and equal his companions. He needs the broadening influence of being brought into forcible daily contact with subjects and with attainments which are not naturally within his

sphere, to prevent a narrow and one-sided mental development. In a word, he needs to be constantly with those not like himself, so as to eradicate, so far as possible, the differences between them, since it is among them, subject to their opinions, amenable to their laws, that he must make his way through life.

His best plan is to go through the regular public-school course, preparing his lessons at home, or between recitations with a fellow-pupil, by having them read over aloud, and be subject to the same discipline, and share in the same pastimes, as the other scholars. Of course there will be a few things he cannot do, like ciphering on the blackboard in school and playing base-ball at recess. But these he and his companions, as well as the teacher, will soon find out and cease to expect of him. He will sometimes miss in recitation and get bruised at play, but probably not oftener than his fellows; for necessity is upon him, demanding the exercise of his caution as well as his active powers. Even the few special points in which the institutions for the blind offer peculiar advantages may be successfully taken up at home, if conditions are favorable; and the earlier they are acquired, the more benefit he can derive from them.

First and chief among these is the use of the Braille-board, upon which the perforated or pricked writing is done, originally a French invention and now employed almost universally. It consists of a simple frame upon which the paper is placed, with a movable ruler to serve as guide in tracing the lines. The writing was formerly done with a stiletto, but the latest and best boards have a sliding cube attached to the ruler, supplied with six little keys, which control a similar number of points below and may be pressed singly or together. By this means ease and rapidity in writing are greatly increased. The character employed is a species of stenography, formed by the different grouping of six punctures, which cause in the reverse of the paper corresponding slight elevations. It is very easily learned, and seeing-people familiar with it prefer it to writing with the pen for an equal length of time. It is reasonably compact, occupying about twice the space of ordinary writing, may be read by sight or touch with equal facility, and is invaluable for private correspondence, taking notes, and making the first draft of all literary work.

The blind frequently learn to write legibly with pencil; but as they cannot re-read or correct such writing and must employ an amanuensis to read the replies to their letters, it is of comparatively little value. The type-writers recently invented are for such work infinitely more rapid and reliable.

Books printed in the Braille character are by far the most serviceable and legible for those who read by touch, but are so expensive and so limited in number as to be a resource attainable by few.

I regard as wholly wasted the time spent in learning to read the ordinary raised print, so long in use, and upon which so much wondering and admiring laudation has been expended. This is one of the inventions for the seeing for the blind. It is always a slow, laborious process at best, to feel one's way through one of those cumbersome volumes, though it may be interesting to the looker-on. The character employed cannot be written, so is useless save in books, and the works of any value so printed may almost be

numbered on the fingers of one hand, besides being so costly that any person who could afford one of them might buy a half dozen of equal merit in the most elegant editions and hire them read in a much more enjoyable manner.

Another very useful contrivance is the type-board, which takes the place of the slate in mathematical studies: an oblong board, closely covered with small square holes, into which a number of metal or wooden types are set in any desired position, each bearing on its upper extremity a sign to represent some figure. The most complicated problems may be wrought out on one of these boards with the same convenience and accuracy as upon a slate, and with considerable rapidity.

The raised wooden maps and globes, used by all schools for the blind, deserve mention as of real assistance in study; but an excellent substitute may be furnished by any friend at home who will carefully trace the outlines of maps in a common atlas by a succession of pin-pricks, made from the opposite side of the page. The position of cities and course of rivers can be indicated in the same manner, thus forming a map, distinct to the touch.

Whatever these contrivances lack, the native ingenuity and aptitude of the pupil must supply; and, after all, the stimulating of these is of far more value than any number of facts or theories crammed into his brain by a patent process. It is what he is, not what he has been taught, that makes him a success or a failure; the more since it is the active rather than the retentive or digestive capabilities of the blind that are in greatest danger of neglect and are most distrusted by the world.

As partial compensation, in the midst of his many discouragements, the sightless pupil possesses one vital advantage over his companions. His memory, accustomed to seize and assimilate facts, definitions, and miscellaneous information at a single hearing, acquires both a marvelous alertness and a phenomenal retentive capacity which enable him to master certain branches of study with singular ease and rapidity. Deprived of books and without any very ready and reliable method of making notes, he obtains a habit, often envied by the seeing, of appropriating instantaneously anything addressed to his intellect through his hearing. Hence the proverbially good memory of the blind person. His mind is his memorandum-book, always at hand and always open.

To the present writer, who never remembers having a lesson in anything read over to him more than twice, nothing is more strange and more amusing than a room full of school children, with fingers crammed in their ears, buzzing over a lesson of three pages for the fiftieth time. Equally incomprehensible is it to see a man making a note of a single address, or a lady referring to a shopping-list. Such observations force one to the conclusion that the art of writing, invaluable as it is, has been disastrous to the human memory. People have grown so to rely on a piece of white paper covered with black scratches, that if this be lost or misplaced, they are reduced almost to the condition of creatures without intellect.

So marked is the advantage of the blind in this respect as almost to atone for their extra difficulties in others; that is, the sightless pupil will acquire scientific and philosophical studies with a rapidity which

will counterbalance the greater amount of time demanded by his less facile methods of writing out exercises in linguistic and ciphering in mathematical branches; so that in taking the regular course at academy or university, he will require, all in all, neither more time nor more labor than the average student.

Of not less value in after life is this extraordinarily trained and developed memory. It enables the blind to derive from lectures, conversation, and general reading ten times the benefit of others, on whose minds a single mention of facts and thoughts makes little or no impression.

Thus the law of compensation is seen working in all things, making good on one hand, approximately at least, what is wanting on the other; not by the special mysterious interference of Providence or other power with natural conditions and processes, for the benefit of the individual, as many claim, but through the inevitable sequence of cause and effect, by which senses and faculties become, through unusual training, abnormally developed and their value radically enhanced.

Edward B. Perry.

Sugar.*

PROBABLY most of those who are classed as free-traders or revenue reformers, if they could fix the policy of the country in accord with their own theories, would retain the duty on sugar, because it yields a very large revenue easily collected and widely distributed, the protective feature being relatively small; for although the duty is high, being more than 100 per cent. *ad valorem* at the present time, the amount of sugar produced in this country is so small that it may be accounted a *quantité négligeable*. Some of this class, among whom the writer is one, consider the fact that sugar is an article of universal consumption (being a common and almost necessary kind of food among the poor as well as the rich) the strongest argument for reducing the duty, the condition of the national treasury admitting of large remissions of taxes. Accordingly, when we are told by the sugar protectionists that we are paying \$48,000,000 per annum in sugar taxes to the Government, in order that the Louisiana planters may get only \$7,000,000 by the enhanced price,—a total burden on the consumers of \$55,000,000,—we reply that the means are immensely disproportionate to the end, because if we could get our sugar free of tax, we could pay the \$7,000,000 and still save \$48,000,000. If we are really paying nearly seven dollars in order that the Louisiana planters may get one dollar, hardly anything could be more wasteful and extravagant. This is upon the supposition that the Government can now afford to dispense with the sugar tax altogether. It can easily afford to do so if it leaves the other sources of revenue untouched; but as it is almost certain that the internal taxes on tobacco will be repealed, it would not be prudent to wholly abolish the sugar duties until some time shall have elapsed sufficient to show the fiscal effect of that measure, together with a reduction of say one-half of the sugar tax. That the sugar duties will be entirely repealed within a very few years there can be little doubt. The outgivings of leading protectionist statesmen

like Senators Sherman and Dawes should be taken as fair notice of what is coming. With the question of bounties to compensate the planters for the loss of the protection to which they are accustomed, I do not purpose to deal in this article, except to express the opinion that even if such bounties should be allowed they would not be of long duration, and that those who advocate them can hardly expect them to be so.

In reply to the argument that the taxpayers are committed to continue paying a bonus to the sugar planters,—or to any other class, for that matter,—because they have paid it so long that the recipients have become accustomed to it and think they cannot get on without it, it strikes me that equity rather requires the repayment of some part of the \$7,000,000 per annum that has been so long contributed to the Sisyphean task of putting sugar on a self-sustaining basis in this country. The United States makes no contracts with industries, express or implied, to “carry” them beyond the next election. Taking the most favorable view of the claim made in behalf of the planters, the contract was never made to bolster them up or to bolster up any trade indefinitely. It would be safe to challenge anybody to find any speech in Congress, since the foundation of the Government, advocating a policy of perpetual protection to sugar or to anything. Nor can any such thing be found in any national platform of any political party. The doctrine of implied powers has been pretty well stretched at times, but the doctrine of an implied contract to pay \$7,000,000 per year in perpetuity to the cultivators of less than 200,000 acres of land in Louisiana is rather too absurd for serious discussion.

There are many duties the repeal of which would be equally, perhaps more, advantageous to the taxpayers than the repeal of the sugar duties; as, for example, those on cheap blankets and low woolen goods, ranging from 100 to 116 per cent. *ad valorem*. This article does not profess to deal with the tariff question at large.

Horace White.

The Incompetence of Legislative Bodies.

THE important question of to-day is that arising from the realization of the general incompetence of legislative bodies, the appreciation of the need of some change, and the query, What shall that change be? Legislatures are now meeting once a year, or in some States once in two years. A great bulk of statutes, most of them worthless, many of them dangerous and injurious, is passed at every session. The statute-books are becoming cumbered with numberless laws, whose only excuse for existence is a negative one, that they are harmless. It may be safely stated, that in most of the States hardly more than a statute a year is absolutely needed. The same may be said of Congress. It passes what is questionable, rejects what is good, discusses endlessly and fruitlessly what is indifferent—the contrary is the exception that proves the rule.

The great struggle must be, then, to change the character of our legislatures, State and National, or to prevent our present representatives from continuing this indiscriminate heaping up of laws. Thus far, the endeavor to purify the legislature has been unsuccessful. An effort to induce the men now in it to consent to a change that will decrease their own powers may prove

* For the planter's argument see “Sugar-making in Louisiana,” in this number of THE CENTURY.—EDITOR.

equally unsuccessful; but it certainly extends more hope of victory, and is worth making. This effort must be concentrated on a change that will be simple. Not only is the average legislator incapable of understanding a complicated scheme, but the simpler the bill the less opportunity there is of discussion of details, and change of incidentals, and the more hope it has of passage.

My suggestion is a change that will make a two-thirds majority necessary for the passage of a bill through either house of Congress, or a legislature. No measure absolutely demanded by the people will fail to secure such a majority. The presidential succession bill did not, for instance, at the late congressional session. And so with every such bill. If the people do not demand its passage, it ought not to pass. The bill that is simply the idea of the legislator is an unnecessary bill,—and these bills form the bulk of our new laws.

The Constitution provides for a two-thirds vote to propose amendments, deeming it necessary to make the vote more than a majority, to prevent ill-considered action. Yet, all will agree—with the possible exception of the prohibitionists—that we have as many amendments as are needed.

Ill-considered action is what we must guard against to-day in mere law-making, and the requirement that bills should receive this two-thirds vote is the simplest safeguard yet suggested. In a smaller country, perhaps, the bills might be voted on by the people after the final adjournment of the Congress or legislature. In a State, this certainly would be a safe and by no means inconvenient plan. But a movement in this direction would be more radical, and would have less of a chance of success. A measure that changes the vote necessary to the passage of a bill, from a bare majority to two-thirds, would meet with greater support, and would have a fair chance of success. If adopted, it would satisfactorily meet the evil it was intended to remedy—it would reduce the bulk of legislation; would prevent the passage of most unnecessary or dangerous bills; and would leave ample opportunity for the passage of good laws, demanded by the people; besides insuring their better execution when passed, since the larger the majority favoring a law, the stronger will be the effort to carry into effect its commands.

Charles Fiske.

Lynching.

THE number of reported murders in the United States in 1882 was 1266. There were only 93 persons executed and 118 lynched,—in all, 211. Consequently, very nearly 1055 criminals escaped. We say very nearly, because some criminals may have had more than one victim each. If any of those who were executed and lynched were innocent, then perhaps more than 1055 criminals escaped. Under any government where 1173 murderers out of every 1266 escape legal execution, it is a wonder that there are not 1000 lynched, instead of 118. A man planning a cold-blooded murder may safely calculate upon more than eleven chances for escape to less than one for his detection, conviction, and execution; and taking in the conjoint probabilities of legal and extra-legal capital punishment, he may safely calculate on five chances to one, for escape.

Lynching will hardly be defended by any man in sober mood. What is the remedy? *Increased care and*

zeal upon the part of all good citizens to secure the execution of the law. If all men, good and bad, could rely upon *that* in every case of capital felony, there would perhaps be almost no case of lynching.

Taking the figures of 1882 as a basis, it would appear that if hereafter out of every 1266 murderers, 619 were sure to be executed, the cases of lynching would probably diminish to 58; if, out of every 1266, only 66 escaped, there would probably be not more than 7 cases of lynching. Of course this is only mathematical, subject to the fluxions introduced by free human nature and ever-changing circumstances, but these would probably be in favor of the abandonment of the lynching process. We see that even when it is known that only *one* in about every *fifteen* murderers is legally punished, the people lose patience only to the degree of taking into their own hands the punishment of less than one in nine escaped murderers. This must give us the assurance that such are the restraints of our Christian civilization as to warrant the belief that if the present rate of legal executions were doubled there would be less than half the number of cases of lynching. The conviction should be strong in us all that it is the duty of each citizen to see, so far as in him lies, that the laws applying to the taking of human life be promptly and thoroughly enforced. Laxity in this increases the danger to every man. Certainty and promptness of punishment would diminish both ordinary murder as well as lynching. It is not a comfortable fact to contemplate that in each State of the Union we have on an average *forty murderers* now going about freely among the population.

In treating this phenomenon one must take the statistics of the country generally. It is only fair, however, to say that lynching is rarer in the Eastern and Middle States than in the Western and Southern States. It would naturally more readily occur in frontier communities in which it was difficult to meet the case by any accepted legal process, while it would be destruction to the inchoate community to allow the special crime to go unpunished. On the other hand, it would seem that the cases of escaped criminals are more numerous in our Eastern than in our Western States. There must be something in our compact population and in the provisions of our civilization to make it more easy for a murderer to escape. Three times murders have occurred near the residence of the writer, in the city of New York, to which not the slightest clew seems to have been found. In addition to the moral sentiment which will not acquit the guilty, there seems to be the need of an intellectual alertness which will not allow a criminal to elude both the processes of law and the violence of popular resentment.

Charles F. Deems.

The Powel Portraits of Washington.

THE oil-painting from which the frontispiece of this number of THE CENTURY Magazine was engraved was painted from life in 1784 by Joseph Wright, a pupil of Benjamin West. The portrait was a commission from Mrs. Elizabeth Powel of Philadelphia, and through inheritance is now owned by Samuel Powel, Esq., of Newport, Rhode Island, through whose courtesy we are permitted to engrave it for the first time. Of this portrait it is stated that "Washington wrote

Mrs. Powel it was the best for which he had then sat." And later, in Tuckerman's work on "The Character and Portraits of Washington," it is said: "Perhaps no portrait of Washington bears such convincing marks of genuine individuality, without a particle of artistic flattery."

The silhouettes on page 12 were drawn and cut

by Mr. Powel sometime previous to the year 1790. George Washington, John Washington, and Benjamin Franklin amused themselves after tea one evening, according to the fashion of the day, by cutting "shades." They are now in the possession of his grandnephew Samuel Powel, and have never before been copied.

BRIC-À BRAC.

A Little Comedy.

IS the world the same, do you think, my Dear,
As when we walked by the sea together,
And the white caps danced and the cliffs rose sheer,
And we were glad in the autumn weather?

You played at loving that day, my Dear —
How well you told me that tender story —
And I made answer, with smile and tear,
While the sky was flushed with the sunset's glory.

Now I shut my eyes, and I see, my Dear,
That far-off path by the surging ocean —
I shut my eyes, and I seem to hear
Your voice surmounting the tide's commotion.

It was but a comedy slight, my Dear —
Why should its memory come to vex me?
Can it be I am longing that you should appear
And play it again? My thoughts perplex me.

'Tis the sea and the shore that I miss, my Dear —
The sea and the shore, and the sunset's glory —
Or would these be nothing without you near,
To murmur again that fond, old story?

I know you now but too well, my Dear —
With your heart as light as a wind-blown feather —
Yet somehow the world seems cold and drear
Without your acting, this autumn weather.

Louise Chandler Moulton.

The November Lady, in "The Century."

FAIR lady, seated on THE CENTURY'S cover,
Stretching thy shapely arm with tragic grace,
Around thine head the dead leaves whirl and hover,
The light of other days illumines thy face.
What dost thou see, with that far, yearning vision,
Which follows summer's train, to fields Elysian?

Thou look'st as one who stands upon the shore,
Watching some shortening sail sink down the main;
And fain in thy sad heart would'st follow o'er
Those stormy waves, to clasp thy loved again.
The gracious memory of days now spent,
Its joy and pain in thy sad gaze is blent.

Why dost thou mourn departed flowers of summer?
The flowers of song bloom bright within thy pages.
There spreads, a royal feast, for each new-comer —
The wit and wisdom of the seers and sages.
"The fair lands beckon us; the great seas roar."
Empress of this domain, what would'st thou more?

Lonely, art thou? Dost not unto thee throng
The good and great of every age and clime?
The valiant souls who live to conquer wrong,
The keen-eyed seekers after truths sublime —
All gifted ones who have enriched the earth
Thou bringest, to sit with us beside the hearth.

Rise up, dear lady! and put down thy pan;
Let those who have delayed have none at all.
Stand up, and let thy fond admirers scan
Thy figure, "fair," and most "divinely tall."
Chill blows the wind upon thy regal back —
Mourn'st thou because thou hast no sealskin sack?

Perish the thought! I have it now! I see
The hidden meaning of thy perturbation:
Why thou dost sit beside the wind-swept tree,
And gaze afar, in silent lamentation.
I understand thy countenance dejected:
Thou sorrowest for manuscripts rejected!

Courage, fair damsel! 'Tis no easy matter
The lofty heights of *serial* fame to climb;
The flinty editorial heart to batter
With fragile missiles like a maiden's rhyme.
Strive on! and haply, ere thy life is over,
Thou shalt have place within — not on — the cover.

Maria Hurlbut Burditt.

Una.

LATE — as I sat before the fire,
Perusing some old tome
That took my thoughts to Italy
And left my heart in Rome,

Where, 'mid fair scenes, the writer's skill
Had wrought a maid so well,
My fancy went a-wooing her
Long past the midnight bell —

Just then, I say, up the long path
Came pretty Una home;
She touched the latch, it startled me,
And brought me back from Rome.

I closed my book. We two sat down,
She leaning on my knee,
With cloak unclasp'd, and hat thrown back,
Her fair face turned on me.

I made her tell me of the Ball;
Her frankness won me quite.
To see the child so act it all —
It was a lovely sight.

Such graceful things the elders said:
But when I took her hand,
And questioned of the youths, she said
I "would not understand."

You see I had forgot myself
While reading that old tome;
My beard is turning gray, and I
Am only young — in Rome.

James Herbert Morse.

In "Face to Face," in the September "Bric-à-Brac," the second line of the sixth stanza should read:

"Two forces ever warring in the soul."

In part of the edition it did not so appear.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Municipal Patriotism.

IT is always much easier to die for one's country than to live for it. The headlong gallop; the desperate burst up the hill-side, guided by the colors that break out again and again through the smoke; the duel-spirit that yearns to lay the ship alongside an enemy, as if that were more than half the battle,—are all sustained and made easier by the sense of personal struggle, of great sacrifices publicly recognized, and of that magnetic influence which is in the eyes of comrades-in-arms. You shall find ten men ready to assume the burdens of war, with such incentives to sustain the war-spirit, where one is ready to espouse and take to himself the homelier virtues and duties of good citizenship,—to study the institutions of his own country, to test for himself the character and influence of candidates, the policies and methods of parties, the dangers which beset the State and the most hopeful remedies for them. Happy is the man who can take contentedly the duties of citizenship as they are carved out for him and presented to him by others; but more implicitly does he serve his country who looks on such duties as his personal service, never to be intrusted to another.

It is quite too much the fashion, just now, to talk as if good citizens, in this sense, were rarer than they really are; as if the mass of American citizens took party as the primary object of their devotion, and looked at the country only through the party. If this were true, it would be the most terrible indictment of democratic institutions by their results that ever was framed; and every one who is interested in the century's history of the great American experiment ought to take a pride in every indication that it is far from true—farther to-day than it ever was before. At no previous time have parties been so much like a bundle of nerves, answering to the slightest touch of circumstance. The smallest tendency to party tyranny is met no longer by willing submission, but by mutterings of discontent, or even by open revolt; and the apparent danger is rather of party disintegration than of party despotism. The man who grumbles about the "slow train," which makes but twenty miles an hour, is simply a personified proof that the day of the stage-coach has passed away; and the man who grumbles at the tyranny of party is merely a similar proof that the Essex Junto and the Albany Regency no longer provide ready-made political opinions for a contented people, or pull Adams down or Jackson up, but that party machines are, more than ever before, the servants of those who support them.

It is mainly, however, on the larger and more state-ly and imposing boards of the national theater that this tendency has thus far shown itself. The voter who has come to claim for his individual conscience the supreme power of private judgment in national politics is still far too apt to accept without hesitation the guidance of his party "machine" in State politics, while he looks upon city politics as practically beneath his notice. He is

affronted by the action of his national party, in any of its attempts to control the action of its minorities, while he gazes tranquilly above and beyond the grossest abuses in his own city government. His Common Council spends months in a "dead-lock" over the appointment of three or four policemen, with "deals" and diplomatic negotiations enough for the management of an empire and hardly enough success for the management of a kitchen; the Fire Department, the Health Department, the Building Department, the Department of Public Works, the Police Department, and the Department of Education, which should be in active and harmonious coöperation, spend the time and effort which should be given to the city service in dealing one another vicious blows through the newspapers and elsewhere; taxation results merely in providing a livelihood for incompetent officials and in thrusting inefficient public service upon the citizens; and still the citizen refuses to learn the essential lesson that there is such a thing as municipal patriotism, and that municipal politics is its only practical mode of expression.

Why should the politics of the city be tied down to the politics of the nation or the State? Is there any identity of interest between the two, such as would be apt to secure efficient city administration by a selection of city officers based upon national party preferences? Every one knows the contrary, from practice as well as from theory: in a few of our cities, the lesson has already developed a strong and effective independent city vote; and yet, take the country through, the individual conscience seems to be almost as inert as ever in this matter. The man who, moved by conscience, takes up his own burden of battle against the abuses of his own city government, is pretty certain of the pity of those who know him personally and of the criticism of those who are strangers to him; he need not expect that which he deserves—the cordial sympathy of his fellow-citizens, their consideration for his inevitable errors, and their rejoicing in his successes. His fellow-citizens have not yet been educated up to that point. We still lack that essential factor in political development—municipal patriotism. Thousands of men have been found ready and willing to die for the United States or even for the individual State. Where are the men who would die for Brooklyn, or Chicago, or San Francisco? Where, indeed, are the men who would *live* for them?

It is an indication of progress, at least, that this last question has every year a larger answer: the growth is not so large as it should be, but it is a growth, not a degeneration. Every year sees an increased number of men who find their most interesting field of investigation in the various problems of city government; who study the American city, its methods of administration, its methods of voting, its abuses and their remedies, with all the intensity which once was peculiar to national politics. Men have even been found willing to abandon wide fields of national usefulness to enter the new battle-ground of municipal administration. Are

their efforts to be forever thwarted by the ill-advised experiments of State legislatures, governing bodies which are removed from the city by every sympathy and interest? Nothing can prevent such a result, unless the municipal patriotism of the citizens has a parallel development, as the essential sustaining power to the new development of municipal leadership. The American city must be left to work out its own salvation, released from the meddlesome interference of the American State legislature; and the only means of attaining such a result is the development of an alert and even irritable patriotism in the city itself. When the time comes in which the citizen shall feel the same sense of personal outrage in the State's interference with his city government that he is prompt to feel in the nation's interference with his State government, the problem of the American city will be very far on the road to solution.

Human history seems to run in circles: new conditions are introduced, run their round of development, and bring the race back to a new phase of the old beginning-point. The tangible current of history began in the cities of the Orient. When fully developed Oriental despotism swept into Europe, individual liberty found its bulwark in the Greek cities; and these, in their decadence, yielded to the new type of individual power represented by the Eternal City. When this power had become a despotism, the individual still cherished his city as his main defense against the tyranny of the Cæsar. In the downfall of the great Empire, it was the cities that stood out like islands in the stagnant waters of tyrannical stupidity which over-spread the civilized world; and the cities, again, led in the rising struggle for individual freedom which has given modern history its character. We may not have all the incentives which led the Hollander to personify his city, to speak of it almost as of a mythological goddess, to count its buttresses and foundation-stones as even dearer than his hearth-stone, and to die on its walls or before its gates with all the patriotism which marked Marathon or Gettysburg. But, when one considers the importance of the American city, the increasing drift of American life into it, the magnitude of the interests, political as well as material, which hang upon its development, and the possible influence which the failure of the American city could exert upon the future history of the American people, he must believe that the field for municipal patriotism is even wider and more important in America than it ever was in Holland, and that nothing is more desirable for our political peace than the growth of an intelligent devotion of the citizen to his own city, and a personal dedication of himself to its healthy and honorable development.

The Seventieth Year of Our National Disgrace.

WITH the 15th of February next we shall enter upon the seventieth year of the United States Government's official license of literary piracy. It was on that day of the year 1819 that Congress formally excluded the foreign author from the protection then first accorded to the American. It may be that at that time this issuance of letters of marque and reprisal upon the literature of other nations was thought to be the best way to build up that of our own, but the protests from business interests which were made against the attempts under the

leadership of Clay, Webster, and Everett to remedy the defect in 1837 and 1838, indicate that less patriotic considerations were at the bottom of this exclusion. However this may be, the failure to repeal the excluding clause has not only dwarfed the growth of American letters and given an abnormal impetus to the spread of foreign ideas among our people, but has exposed us for three-quarters of a century to the just reproaches of the civilized world; and to-day, when the intelligent opinion of the country demands the reform—as for years it has demanded it—the indifference of our legislators to the fundamental question of principle which is involved shows the moral callousness which gathers upon a long-existing wrong. Possibly we underrate the open-mindedness of Congress on this question, but the fact that it is thought absurd to expect on moral grounds the speedy redress of so manifest and grievous a wrong is an evidence of the dangerous disrespect with which the legislative office in this country is invested. The idea is certainly widely prevalent that a question of pure morality has little chance in Congress when there is any opportunity of protest from so-called vested interests. No doubt this conclusion does injustice to many upright legislators, but it is nevertheless a conclusion for which their supineness is largely and especially responsible.

But while Congress, by its inaction, is feeding this sentiment of distrust, it is much to be said of the tone of the literary classes in this country that their innumerable appeals in favor of this reform have been almost invariably on the line of the moral argument. They would be less entitled to the respect of their fellow-men, as in large measure conservators of the ideal, were they to take a less sincere position. Better a thousand times that a copyright law should be delayed another half century, than that this ground should be abandoned for that of mere political expediency. Justice is so necessary to the continuance of the race that it often occurs that there are many reasons for doing a just thing. But it may be questioned whether the moral tone both of him who demands justice and of him of whom it is demanded is not lowered by demanding it on any ground other than because it is right. Expediency has been defined as a lower kind of right, but even admitting this, it is confessedly a *lower kind*, and the acceptance of the lower motive is particularly perilous to a conscientious nature,—character being the attitude toward evil rather than the mere accomplishment of certain conventional acts called virtuous. For surely the habitual acceptance of a ground of expediency tends toward the abandonment or suppression of the higher point of view. And yet this higher point of view is the chief distinction in morals. Who would not be insulted to be asked not to lie because it may lose him consideration, or not to steal because he can make more money by being honest? Indeed, the comparative distances of men from the point of view of the criminal classes may be determined by their sensitiveness to the affront of assuring them that "Honesty is the best policy."

American authors, therefore, do themselves honor in holding out for a settlement of the question on the plane of justice rather than on that of commercial advantage, and in declining to take responsibilities in the matter of copyright legislation which do not appertain to them and which commit them to a line of policy in

which as authors they have little or no interest. Their position has been one of dignity and self-respect; they have contented themselves with urging upon Congress what they regard as the proper remedy—a pure and simple copyright law. They stand ready to give their frankest opinions as to the probable working of any other measure that may be introduced; individually many of them favor one or another of the proposed commercial conditions, but to expect them as a body to urge the particular schemes of other interests, which as a party to the compact they would be obliged hereafter to defend, is one more indignity added to those which they have endured for nearly three-quarters of a century. They are not “irreconcilables” in this matter, and will welcome the establishment of the principle of copyright, with any conditions which, after a full examination of the subject, Congress may impose. These conditions, however, should be proposed and defended by those who profess to believe them wise; and the responsibility of determining what, if any, conditions should be imposed should be made to rest where it belongs,—with the legislative power.

“Constitution Day.”*

THE reflection that it would be wise to make a national holiday of the 17th of September is one which must have occurred to many who witnessed or read of the celebration at Philadelphia of the centenary of the Constitution. A venerable justice of the Supreme Court has pronounced this celebration the greatest public occasion of the kind in our history, and those who witnessed the pageantries of peace in which shone so conspicuously the public spirit of Philadelphia—a constant quantity, it must be said—can pay no higher compliment than to say, as they do, that the celebration was worthy of the event commemorated. Its significance was enhanced by the fact that it was the first public opportunity for the whole country to unite in a reverential recognition of the supreme body of our national law, which now includes—in a settlement not alone of force, but of reason and experience—the national decision upon those differences of interpretation which, like the dragon’s teeth in the fable, sprang up into a harvest of armed men. It is not to be wondered at that so long as the Constitution meant one thing to one section and another to the other, there could be no real unity of appreciation of it: each section dwelt not so much on the grandeur of a common inheritance as on the wisdom of its own theory of government. Happily the danger in this condition of affairs is past, and we have learned from it that it is the part of statesmanship and patriotism not merely to admit but to cultivate kindly relations among all the sections of our diversified country. The serious uses in this direction of such an occasion as the Philadelphia celebration are not likely to be overrated. It has been wisely said that the quickest way to cure the quarrelsome tendencies of children is to provide them with some common ground of in-

terest, even the simplest, such as marching together; and the rule is not without value for the children of a larger growth. Merely to group about a national idea intersectional courtesies and social relations—the want of which kept us sorry strangers before the War—is an incalculable influence in making our people homogeneous and sympathetic. We cannot but think that this influence would be broadened and perpetuated by a formal recognition of the day as a national holiday.

In another aspect the day could hardly fail to have great value. We are not likely, from the nature of the Declaration of Independence, to have any serious differences over its axiomatic pronouncements of political principles; but the fact that the Constitution is likely to change with the needs of a growing country is a reason for cultivating a popular knowledge of its past benefits and an intelligent regard for its conservative influence. Future changes in that instrument—and the day would lead to the consideration of its defects—are likely to be made against the wishes of large minorities and after burning discussion, and it is well that they should have the sanction of the broadest popular acceptance *per se*—such as the later amendments could not have had without a war. Moreover the debates over such questions as the regulation of commerce between the States and the proposed national aid to State education indicate that our future political history is likely to deal largely with questions involving the powers of the legislative branch. Our people, who have the faculty of not crossing bridges till a long time after they come to them, are not less likely than heretofore to rely on chance to take them over future constitutional chasms. But we need the preventive of a broader popular study of the functions of government,—an understanding of what it may and what it may not do. The use of such a holiday would be to aid in supplying from year to year that strength of intelligent sentiment which in national emergencies is the most practical support of all law.

It is easy to say that our national holidays have become occasions for mere rest and frolic. Even thus, since the national foible is not idleness, it would be better to retain them. But aside from the direct patriotic influence of their celebration, the mere existence of Washington’s Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, or “Thanksgiving” is the challenge of a great idea to the mind. The leaders of the “Labor Party” are shrewd enough to see the advantage to their cause of getting a recognition of it into the national calendar, and they are not likely to lose time in setting about it. The contrast in significance and value between “Constitution Day” and “Labor Day,” as one imagines them, well exemplifies the uses to which a national holiday may be put. If the 17th of September needs any other recommendation to the favor of the American people, it may come from the fact that upon that day also was given to the nation one of the wisest and most notable of our State papers,—the “Farewell Address” of its great, unselfish First President.

*On the 8th of June, 1861, Mr. Charles Dudley Warner published in the Hartford “Evening Press” an editorial article favoring the establishment of two new national holidays, namely,—Flag Day, June 14th, and Constitution Day, September 17th. This project—the more appropriate by reason of the national crisis of that year—received considerable attention in the press. September 12th of the same year Mr. Warner published another editorial on Constitution

Day, and that year the day was celebrated in several places, especially in Connecticut and Ohio. On the 12th of June, 1862, Mr. Loomis of Connecticut introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution recommending the establishment of the two holidays. On the 13th, after brief debate, this resolution was laid on the table by a vote of 67 to 33. In 1877, the centenary of the adoption of the flag was generally celebrated throughout the North.

OPEN LETTERS.

Cheap Books.

IT is one of the assumptions of those who oppose International Copyright, either ignorantly or willfully, that this reform will raise the price of books in the United States. We are all agreed that the American people must have cheap books, yet the ordinary answer to this plausible assertion is modeled on Mr. Lowell's memorable saying that "there is one thing better than a cheap book, and that is a book honestly come by." I think it is possible to make a broader answer than this by boldly denying the assumption. The passing of the bill proposed by the American Copyright League will not raise the price of any class of books in the United States, with one possible exception. To this exception I will return shortly; in the meanwhile I wish to repeat my assertion, that books will not be any dearer in America after we have passed the copyright bill than they are now. The absence of International Copyright makes books cheaper here only in so far as American publishers are willing to take foreign books without paying for them. A consideration of the present condition and annual statistics of the American book-trade will show that the legal right to pirate is not now utilized by most American publishers, and that those who are still privateers seek their booty chiefly, if not solely, among books of one exceptional class.

From the figures published annually in the "Publishers' Weekly," the following table has been prepared to show the different kinds of books published in the United States during the past five years. (The classification is not quite that of the "Weekly," but has been modified slightly by condensation.)

	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886
Education and language.....	221	197	227	225	275
Law.....	261	397	455	431	469
Science (medical, physical, mathematical, political, and social).....	406	407	511	443	499
Theology, religion, mental and moral philosophy.....	347	390	399	460	395
History.....	118	119	115	137	182
Literary history and miscellany, biography and memoirs, description and travel, humor and satire.....	559	521	529	501	719
Poetry and the drama.....	182	184	222	171	220
Juveniles.....	278	331	358	388	458
Fiction.....	767	670	943	934	1080
Et cetera.....	333	265	329	330	379
Total.....	3472	3481	4088	4020	4676

Taking up these classes in turn, we shall see what will be the effect on each of the passage of the bill of the American Copyright League. On the first class, education and language, there would be no effect at all, as the text-books now used in American schools were written by Americans and are covered by copyright: it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the American school-boy never sees a book of foreign authorship in school-hours; — I know that I never did until after I had entered college, and then very infrequently. For-

tunately for the future of our country, young Americans are brought up on American books. The foundation of American education is the native Webster's Spelling-book. In some respects the making of school-books is the most important branch of the publishing business, and the passage of the copyright bill would not influence it in any way; American school-books would be neither dearer nor cheaper.

In the second class, law, are included a tenth of the books published in the United States last year, and from the inexorable circumstances of the case most of these books are of American authorship and are already protected by copyright. All reports, and all treatises on practice and on constitutional law, etc., are of necessity national. Now and again an English treatise of marked merit may be edited for the use of American lawyers with references to American cases, but this is infrequent; and not often would the price of any work needed by the American lawyer be increased by the passage of the copyright bill.

Of books in the third and fourth classes — science and theology — very few indeed are ever pirated. Once in every three or four years there appears in England or France or Germany a book like Canon Farrar's "Life of Christ," the American price of which is lowered by rival reprints. A large majority of these books are written by American authors; and in general the minority by foreign authors are published here by an arrangement with the foreign author tantamount to copyright. Although purely ethical considerations ought to have more weight with readers of books of this class than with those of any other, yet it would be only infrequently that the price of any book of this class would be raised by giving to the literary laborer who made it the right to collect the hire of which he is worthy.

Taken together, the next three classes on the list — history; literary history and miscellany, biography and memoirs, description and travel, humor and satire; and poetry and the drama — include nearly all of what used to be called Belles Lettres (except fiction), and they supply nearly a quarter of the books published in America. In these and in the preceding classes most of the books are of American authorship, and most of those of foreign authorship are published at just the same price as though they were by native writers. It would probably surprise most readers who imagine that the absence of International Copyright gives us many inexpensive histories and biographies and books of travel and poems, if they were to consider carefully the catalogues of the paper-covered collections which furnish forth our cheap literature. Among the chief of these collections are the "Franklin Square Library" and "Harper's Handy Series." In 1886, there were issued fifty-four numbers of the "Franklin Square Library," one of which was by an American. Of the remaining fifty-three, forty-six were fiction, and only seven numbers could be classified as history, biography, travels, or the drama — only seven of these books in one year, and they were less than one-seventh of the books contained in this collection. In the same year there were sixty-two numbers in "Harper's Handy Series." Deducting four by American authors

we have fifty-eight books issued in cheap form owing to the absence of International Copyright. Of these fifty-eight books fifty-two were fiction, and only six belonged in other branches of *Belles Lettres*,—only six of these books in one year, and they were less than one-ninth of the series. In these two cheap collections then, there were published in 1886 one hundred and eleven books of foreign authorship, and of these all but thirteen were novels or stories. Not one of these thirteen books was a work of the first rank which a man might regret going without. It may as well be admitted frankly that these thirteen books would probably not have been published quite so cheaply had there been International Copyright; but it may be doubted whether if that were the case, the cause of literature and education in the United States would have been any the worse.

In the class of books for the young there are probably more works of foreign authorship sold than in any other class that we have hitherto considered, but in most cases they are not sold at lower prices than American books of the same character. Indeed, I question whether many English or French books for the young are sold at all in America. At bottom the American boy is more particular and harder to please than the American woman; he likes his fiction home-made and he has small stomach for imported stories about the younger son of a duke. He has a wholesomer taste for native work; no English juvenile magazine is sold in the United States, although several American juvenile magazines are sold in Great Britain. We export books for the young, and we import them only to a comparatively slight extent.

I come now to the one class of books the price of which would be increased by the granting of International Copyright. This is the large and important class of fiction. Of course American novels would be no dearer; and probably translations from the French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian would not vary greatly in price. But English novels would not be sold for ten, fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five cents each. We should not see five or ten rival reprints of a single story by the most popular English novelists. There would be but a single edition of the latest novels of the leading British story-tellers, and this would be offered at whatsoever price the authorized publisher might choose to ask, sometimes much, generally little. English fiction would no longer cost less than American fiction. The premium of cheapness which now serves to make the American public take imported novels instead of native wares would be removed; and with it would be removed the demoralizing influence on Americans of a constant diet of English fiction. That American men and women should read the best that the better English novelists have to offer us is most desirable; that our laws should encourage the reading of English stories, good and bad together, and the bad, of course, in enormous majority, is obviously improper and unwise. A well-nigh exclusive diet of English fiction full of the feudal ideas and superstitions and survivals of which we have been striving for a century to rid ourselves, is not wholesome for those who need to be strengthened and enlightened to do their duty as citizens of a free republic. The strongest argument against novel-reading just now is that the novel which an American is most likely to read is Brit-

ish. "Society is a strong solution of books," Dr. Holmes tells us; "it draws the virtue out of what is best worth reading, as hot water draws the strength of tea-leaves." And in like manner society draws the vice out of what is least worth reading. Unfortunately under the present state of the law, society in America is far less likely to get what is best worth reading than what is least worth reading.

The passage of the Authors' Copyright Bill would tend to correct this evil: it would make English novels dearer, probably; but it would have very little effect on the prices of other books.

Brander Matthews.

Occupations of the Blind.

(EDUCATION OF THE BLIND—CONCLUDED.)

ANY person of average endowments, if deprived of sight in the early part of life, before his habits of seeing have become too firmly fixed, will be able after a few years' experience to overcome all the actual difficulties directly occasioned by loss, and to do the same work that others do in his chosen vocation and do it equally well, though it may be at the expense of rather more time and strength and by somewhat different methods. He will not need or wish to ask for sympathy or special favors or partial judgment from his patrons, but will be glad to stand alone, fight his own battles and rely on his own resources; but he ought in justice to be allowed an equal chance with his seeing competitors, to be able to demand that no discrimination be made against him without a fair trial, that his work be valued wholly upon its merits, irrespective of his manner of performing it, or of the fact that the majority, failing to understand how he is able to do it, hasten to presuppose him unable by consequence.

In reality there are comparatively few occupations in which, so far as they are themselves concerned, the blind may not compete with a fair chance of success; though among those possible, some present far greater intrinsic difficulty than others, and the amount of public credence and support to be counted on in each depends largely upon the number of familiar precedents which can be cited in that particular branch.

It may be laid down as a general rule that those departments of activity which are purely intellectual, or in which the physical elements employed are within the reach of touch and hearing, are all feasible; while those will be the most advantageous in which special demand is made upon the faculties which the blind are forced to cultivate to an unusual degree, such as hearing and memory.

To begin with manual labor: Certain kinds of farming offer an excellent opening, like market-gardening, the raising of poultry and small fruits, dairy work, and like occupations which are carried on within circumscribed limits and all parts of which may be brought within arm's-length. Besides chair-seating and broom-making, upholstery and cabinet work might be undertaken with ease and profit. Great skill with tools is no uncommon thing with the blind, and the joining and polishing of furniture can be done as well by touch as by sight. The qualities and differences in woods and stuffs could easily be distinguished by their texture and weight, and their colors would be a simple matter of memory.

It is a popular fallacy, widespread and wholly baseless, that the blind can tell color by feeling. I regret to say that considerable humbug has been carried on in this respect at certain public institutions and in private, by persons who knew better and ought to have been ashamed of it, for the purpose of astounding and interesting the public. It is a very simple matter to keep beads or worsteds of different hues in different compartments, or to recognize each, when mixed, by size or quality or some slight peculiarity unnoticed by the casual observer, and thus to select with accuracy, as if by the color, and keep up the delusion.

Among the higher forms of skilled labor peculiarly adapted to the blind is that of tuning musical instruments, especially the piano,—an entirely creditable and quite remunerative occupation, in which their exceptionally fine sense of hearing is utilized to the full.

In the higher intellectual spheres the employment of teaching affords a wide and promising field, philosophical and metaphysical branches, as well as languages, furnishing probably the most favorable opportunities; the latter, in particular, giving fullest scope to a fine ear and exceptional memory. There is many a professor's chair in the country to which a gifted blind person might aspire, so far as his ability to fill it is concerned, though to secure the appointment might be another matter. The pulpit and the lecture-platform also offer opportunities and attractions, and have already been honorably represented by members of this class. But the realms in which sight may be most easily dispensed with, and which present the fewest barriers to the entrance and successful progress of those deprived of it, are music and literature. Given a fair amount of ability and natural aptitude, they offer an open, easily accessible plane of activity, with few disadvantages, save for some minor technical points, which may be overcome with scarcely a third more work than others would require. The intense inner life and strong personality, the habits of concentration and introspection, the accumulated imaginative and emotional power of minds in a measure cut off from natural outlets and forced in upon themselves, here find free vent and are brought into active requisition; while in music a superiority in the faculties of touch, hearing, and memory may be utilized to the full.

It may be asked why, then, have so few sightless persons attained preëminence in this branch, while so many who have attempted it have reached only mediocrity. Because, until very recently, few, if any, of their guardians and instructors have had sufficient faith in their capability to give them even a fair training and average opportunities. While their seeing competitors are spending years of time, and thousands of dollars upon their studies, at the art centers of Europe, they are kept at special schools, under the musical guidance, for the most part, of inexperienced, indolence, and incompetency, any patient person who can be had cheap being considered good enough to fill the post of teacher at such institutions. I am glad to recall a few exceptions of teachers who are doing good work, and if their number can be increased till a really high standard becomes general, the results of the future in this regard will tell a different tale.

Though not, perhaps, within the limits of my theme, I would fain touch here upon one point, than which none is more erroneously regarded in connection with the blind. I refer to the probabilities for them of domestic relations and happiness.

The prevailing opinion of the world is, that a young person deprived of sight is necessarily doomed to a single and solitary existence; that for him the experiences of love and marriage are altogether out of the question, unless he be united with an unfortunate person suffering from his own or some equal infirmity, or, in very exceptional instances, chance upon a mate so imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice as to espouse, from sheer pity, a person thus afflicted.

This seems at first a fair statement, and would, indeed, be a just conclusion, were it not deduced from unjust premises. That is, if the blind all were, or necessarily must be, the helpless, useless, whining objects of charity which they are generally—alas! often with reason—considered, there could be no two opinions as to the right of expecting any normal man or woman to be doomed to their society for life. But on the other hand, if a sightless person, by undue efforts, or unusual talents, or both, has succeeded in overcoming his misfortune, and in placing himself on a par with others, I see no reason why he may not deserve and expect a fair share of life's happiness in this as in other respects.

I have endeavored in these papers to treat the class under consideration with strict impartiality and candor—as children, as students, as active self-supporting citizens and heads of families—and to prove, for the encouragement of fellow-beings similarly burdened, the comfort of their friends, and the enlightenment of the public, what has long been my own opinion, justified by facts and experience, that loss of sight, though always deplorable, is not necessarily the hopeless and overwhelming misfortune which it is universally thought to be.

Edward B. Perry.

Re-Unions.

It is desired to print in *THE CENTURY* a compact record of the various formal meetings which have taken place between the veterans of the Union and Confederate armies; and in order to make the list more complete, the Editor will receive with thanks information of the less widely known occasions of the kind, including place, date, and names of war-organizations participating,—and accompanied, so far as possible, by printed reports of the proceedings. Address "Reunion," *THE CENTURY MAGAZINE*, 33 East 17th street, New York City.

The Frontispiece Portrait of Lincoln.

THE photograph from which the frontispiece to this number was engraved was taken in Springfield, Illinois early in 1861, soon after Lincoln's election. A steel engraving of this picture was used on the original ten-dollar greenback and, later, on one of the issues of 5-20 bonds. This photograph belonged to the late F. W. Ballard, to whom it was given by Mr. Lincoln.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Manual Training in Common Schools.*

THE argument against common schools has been put in its strongest form by a distinguished English thinker, as follows: "Conceding for a moment that the Government is bound to educate a man's children, what kind of logic will demonstrate that it is not bound to feed and clothe them?" The argument ignores and refuses to meet the only excuse which has ever been offered for a common-school system,—the political basis. The system is not a largess to the recipient, but a natural measure of self-defense on the part of the government which educates. It is necessary, in a democratic form of government, that the voters should be so far educated as to be reasonably relieved from danger of deception by interested parties; when that is accomplished, the duty of the government ceases. To look at the function of government in the matter, as so many of those interested in public education are apt to look at it, as "the prevention of ignorance," is really but another phase of the feeling that the function of government is "the prevention of poverty."

While the purpose of the system is political, it seems legitimate to attempt to attain as much other good as possible on the way to the goal. If, as a part of the process of making the boy a reasonably good voter, it is possible also to give him the rudiments of a mechanical training, surely time and money spent in this way are very far from being wasted. It is on this ground that the appeal has been made for a certain proportion of manual training in the public schools. It is not intended that the public schools shall be diverted from their proper work into that of graduating expert plumbers, carpenters, or shoemakers: the basis of the system, as above stated, should guard one from any such error. All that is meant is that the training of the hands and eyes should have a place alongside of the training of the mind, body, and heart. There are elementary principles of execution which are common to all trades, or most of them. The boy who has mastered these is prepared, in a measure, for any trade, though he is master of none. It is only asked that boys in the public schools who desire it should have the opportunity, as a part of their ordinary work, of receiving instruction in these elementary principles. They would thus receive education which the State is under obligations to provide for all its voters, and, at the same time, a preparation through which they will be better apprentices and better workmen when they pass out of school.

The argument is offered in reply that the public schools are for all, while this is a preparation designed for a special class. In this form the argument has little weight so long as German, French, music, the higher mathematics, and most of the features of a preparation for college are a recognized part of the educational system of so many States. But the argu-

ment really has a different foundation. It implies that the proposition is a disguised attempt to develop a permanent artisan class, to fit a part of our boys for "that state of life unto which it shall please God to call" them, and to make it pretty certain that they shall stay there. Nothing could be more baseless than such an idea. It is quite sure that this feature in education would incline boys to be *good* mechanics, and not mere bunglers; and that this training, if it should become general, would tend to increase the total working force of the country, even though it did not increase the number of mechanics. But it is far from true that this training would be of benefit only to him who is to be an artisan. Even the clergyman or the editor would be the better as a man and in his profession for a practical knowledge of the proper use of those wonderful tools, the human hands. There is no man, in any profession, who would not be better able to do his usual work, at times, for just this training. It is, above most others, a training whose benefits are not restricted to a special class, but are bestowed upon all.

The argument assumes, also, the odd position that the better artisans are the most likely to remain permanently in the artisan class. There are too many examples to the contrary to make it necessary to do more than state this position. So far as the proposition for manual training touches the "special class" which has been spoken of, it aims only to clear the way of the artisan's children to any position which he may think higher and better for them. But the essence of the proposition has no such restricted aim. It aims to help eradicate that pestilent feeling of contempt for work which is the bane of this generation. Better that the rich man's son should be compelled to work with his hands for a year or two than that he should grow up to feel, and to impress upon others, that work is degrading. Better that the sons of our men of moderate means should learn that there is a science and beauty in manual labor than that they should come to believe that there are easier ways of getting a dollar than by working for it. Better that we should have manual training in our public schools than that all our public-school boys should want to begin life as clerks in brokers' offices, or in any position which is not smirched with manual labor. That feature which has made our country what it is, work and the love of it, is at stake, and the new proposition is a means of saving it.

The only other objection which has been seriously offered caters to one of the worst errors of our modern labor organizations. They aim to restrict the number of apprentices, in order to "make more work" for those already in the trade. What will they say when they see apprentices of a higher grade of intelligence and ability swarming out of our public schools? In answer, it should be said frankly and distinctly that the effect which is implied would be one of the most weighty benefits of the new system. Suppose the lawyers should form an organization for the purpose of

* See "Open Letters," in this number.

abolishing all the law-schools, restricting the number of students in each office, and so "making more work" for the present number of lawyers: would that accomplish their object? They know that the higher the standard of law in a country is, the more confidence the people feel in the lawyers, and that this is the proper way to "make more work" for all of them; and they wisely multiply law-schools and aim to increase their efficiency. Is it wiser for plumbers, for example, to fight against manual training? Or rather should they encourage it, better the grade of their apprentices and their work, and thus gain a public confidence in their capacity which is very far from existing now? Work is "made" by raising the character of the work. Mr. Carroll D. Wright has most acutely pointed out the fact that the introduction of nickel-plating into the manufacture of stoves in this country has "made work" for 30,000 additional operatives, and crowded no one out. It is in this way that thorough manual training is to help the workingman in the future, by making possible branches of work which did not exist before.

A proposition to add fully developed trade-schools to our common-school system is open to objections which do not apply to that of simple manual training. The latter would do no more than show the pupil, by a practical test which is clear to his own apprehension, whether he has an aptitude for such work, and give him an insight into the principles of symmetry and order which underlie it. If there is any valid objection to giving it a place in the State's scheme of common-school education it should be considered at once, for the support of the manual-training proposition is a growing one.

A Southern Man Ahead of his Time.

ON page 435 of the present number of this magazine, the authors of the Lincoln history have referred briefly to the opposition made to disunion in South Carolina by James Louis Petigru in 1861, and on page 432 is given a photograph of his bust.

Something in the character of the independent, far-seeing man, and in the peculiarly generous appreciation of his worth displayed by his fellow-citizens, calls for further attention. Clear-eyed and just, he rarely failed to see and follow the eternal truth that underlies all prejudice, education, and passion. In his private practice, in the courts, in his personal relations to all men, in the nullification troubles in South Carolina, where nothing but his efforts and those of James Hamilton kept the State from civil war, this was always shown. But the time came, when, foremost man of the State as he was, he had no power to stem the flood of passion setting in toward disunion. Not for a moment then did he lose his keen insight nor the firm hand with which he held himself in check. He was not an abolitionist, and he had no feeling against slavery; but he had no hope or faith in revolution. He felt that it was wrong in policy and false in principle. He put no trust in the prevailing faith of the Southern people, that a State would be permitted to secede in peace. He saw that secession would put into the hands of the North a power over the South and slavery that nothing else could give,—a power to gain the aid and sympathy of the whole world, to make war on Southern soil, and to free the slave. If the South

were alarmed at the possibilities of danger in a raid like that of John Brown's, what remedy, he asked, could be gained by rushing into war with the wealthy and populous North—with the civilized world? He saw in secession ambition and wounded vanity; he saw anarchy and civil war; he saw the abolitionist triumphant; he saw the South devastated; he saw division, and sorrow, and ruin; he saw crime. On the other hand, he felt that there was nothing to fear in Lincoln's election. He recognized the fact that the North was outstripping the South in numbers, and wisely counseled the South to yield her political supremacy with good grace. He discerned many reasons for Lincoln's success, but in none read danger. Time, he claimed, would right all wrongs, and avert all disaster. But his arguments were less than useless: secession came; war followed. For the rest of his life he was never again in sympathy with the purposes of his people, though he yielded to their decision, and held common cause in their sorrow. He was a solitary scholar in a world where all others were fighting men. He went his way, and his people went theirs. Whenever their paths crossed he was unflinching in courtesy and kindness; but he never concealed his regret for their action, nor his fear of the ultimate downfall of their hopes.

On the part of the people of South Carolina there was displayed a more generous tolerance of his obnoxious views than would seem possible. Even during the tumult of secession they elected him to their highest salary and most important trust—to codify the State laws. In spite of the satire and ridicule that he hurled at them, they continued to elect him until the work was done. His freedom of speech never destroyed their confidence in him, nor lessened their magnanimity; neither did he restrain it to gain their favor. The case can have few parallels in the history of any country.

The fame of such a man, renowned lawyer and great private citizen, is necessarily fleeting; it is forgotten when the generation in which he lived has passed away. That there might remain some slight token of one who was great in many ways, and, above all, great in his faith in the indissolubility of the Union, it was a fitting incident in the centennial celebration of Charleston, in 1883, that Mayor William A. Courtenay brought about by presenting to the city a bust of James Louis Petigru. It ought to stand to the city as a perpetual reminder of the magnanimity of its people and the faith in the Union which its great citizen held in an hour when apparent self-interest and patriotism and right all cried out against his firm belief. It is a token of the renewed love of his fellow-citizens for our common country; it is a sign that the past is utterly past, and that the same future lies before us all.

Our Daily Bread.

IN commenting upon a paper in which this subject was presented by Professor Atwater at the meeting, last August, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the "New York Times" speaks as follows:

"It is much to be wished that his conclusions might be presented to the people who most need them, and in a form that they could understand and would accept. These people are manual workmen, both skilled

mechanics and common laborers. Their extravagance in food is reckless and is one important cause why, with the high rates of wages that prevail here, workmen save so little more than in countries where wages are lower and where food is dearer. . . . If the facts could be brought to the knowledge of the spendthrifts who most need them, a very great work could be done. It is one which the priests of the Roman Catholic Church have peculiar facilities for doing, and they would doubtless undertake it if they appreciated its importance."

These suggestions are excellent. But why not other clergymen as well? The people of limited means are not all Catholics, nor do Protestant ministers fail to appreciate the need of caring for the material as well as the spiritual wants of their flocks. They, too, are anxious for the great mass of humanity outside the churches, and know that such means as these are among the most efficient for getting the multitudes who ignore the Church to feel that it and its spiritual ministrations are for them. Is it not a matter for all who are intent upon bringing New Testament Christianity more and more into the affairs of daily life and using it to elevate the masses of mankind? Christianity and the Church are the great agents of the world's charity and its "higher education." In different ages these functions have necessarily been exercised by the Church in different ways. One way which the present phase of material and intellectual progress makes essential is the application of the teachings of science to the material, and hence the moral, elevation of men. Not that churches should set up cooking-schools or clergymen become experts in chemistry, but that the rightfulness of economy should be taught, its simpler principles explained, and people encouraged to think and learn about them, and helped to use them. The members of the medical profession, too, might aid greatly, as indeed they do. They see the practical needs and can, in their daily intercourse with the families they visit, suggest much that is helpful.

Of course the facts of food-economy must be got into popular shape, but this is being done. It is only in these later days that science is getting hold of them. In the series of articles now appearing in *THE CENTURY* it has been necessary to devote many pages to explanations of the fundamental principles of nutrition and the experiments upon which they are based, because much that is important has not yet been put into English: even the latest text-books do not contain these things. Further articles, like the one in the present number, will give practical details and their application in the directions of domestic and social economy, health, and morals. In due time simple manuals and other publications will doubtless become common, and the subject thus be placed more fully before the people.

The industrial schools are taking up the chemical, physiological, and economic phases of the subject. There is a demand that instruction in this, as in other branches of applied science, be given to the pupils of the public schools, and the first steps in this direction have already been taken in some cities.

But one great difficulty is the lack of information. More research is needed. The work of some of our boards of health and labor bureaus is beginning to tell. The agricultural experiment stations established and to

be established in each State and Territory of the Union, by an Act of the last Congress, will acquire information of value. But much that is pressingly demanded requires peculiar facilities for its production, such as are found only in the laboratories and libraries of the great educational institutions, and is dependent for its best development upon the intellectual attrition and the opportunities for continuous study which such establishments alone can offer. In the European universities these facilities are provided by the Government; with us they depend upon private munificence. The investigations which Professor Atwater has told of in *THE CENTURY* as carried on in this country have been largely dependent upon private aid. Those in which he has been engaged at Wesleyan University would have been impossible without it.

The endowment of research is one of the most useful forms of public benefaction. Here is a way in which it may be made extremely useful. A few hundreds of dollars will make a valuable piece of investigation, a few thousands, an important research, possible. A laboratory built and equipped for a sum which many a man invests in a house at a watering-place, or a pleasure yacht, and an endowment that would yield a revenue equal to the annual cost of the house or yacht, would bring results of untold value to the world.

A gratifying illustration of the progress in this direction is being shown by one of our popular scientific journals. "Science," taking up the subject as treated in the columns of *THE CENTURY*, is instituting an inquiry into the subject of the wastefulness in the purchase and use of food by wage-workers and the poor. The results can hardly fail to be of great value.

America is not Russia.

WE do not see how anything could more clearly demonstrate the folly and crime of an anarchical movement in America than the papers by Mr. Kennan, on the condition of affairs in the Russian Empire, now being published in *THE CENTURY*.

These criticisms proceed from a country whose relations with Russia are particularly cordial. They are printed in a periodical where "The Life of Peter the Great," published as a two-years' serial, did much to increase the amicable interest of Americans in the affairs of Russia, and they are from a hand that has shown conspicuously its friendliness toward the Russian Government.

Without favoring or defending the methods of the Russian revolutionists, Mr. Kennan shows that the violence which individuals, or groups of individuals, are guilty of in Russia, is a natural result of the absence of civil liberty. The Russian Liberals (not revolutionists) demand — what? The readers of the November *CENTURY* have seen the moderation of their demand: they desire freedom of speech, freedom of the press, security for personal rights, and a constitutional form of government. America, above all nations of the world, means these very things. Anarchy, and the dastardly methods of the anarchist, have no slightest color of excuse to exist in a free country. And, thank Heaven! America is continually making it evident that a free country is abundantly adapted to the defense of its own freedom; that is to say, of its own existence.

OPEN LETTERS.

Industrial Training in the Public Schools.

PHILADELPHIA.

IT gives me great pleasure to state that the efforts made to introduce industrial training into the public schools of Philadelphia have been attended with the most unqualified success. The provisions thus far made for carrying it into operation are as follows:

1. *The Kindergarten.* This feature of our school system is of recent origin, and is as yet imperfectly organized. It is our purpose, however, ultimately to make the Kindergarten the foundation of all the education given in the public schools of the city.

2. *Instruction in Sewing to Girls.* All the girls above the first two years of the school course receive systematic instruction in sewing. The classes now number about twenty-five thousand girls. Our experience has been that from the age of nine years it is possible for girls to make rapid progress in the elementary processes of sewing, and, as they advance, to make practical application of these processes to the making of garments. The sewing lessons do not interfere in the slightest with the other work of the schools. They afford a pleasant rest to the children, who seem greatly to enjoy the hour devoted to this occupation. My opinion is that there is a good deal of educational value in the sewing work, over and above the practical application which will be made of it in real life.

3. *Industrial Art Training.* A school is maintained for the children attending the grammar schools, in which instruction is given in free-hand drawing, modeling in clay, wood-carving, and simple joinery work. This school is open to both boys and girls, who receive two hours' instruction per week. The training has a marked influence upon the productive faculties of the pupils, and the results prove how strong the artistic tendency is in the general average of children.

4. *The Manual Training School.* This is the chief feature of our industrial education. It is a school to which boys who have finished the grammar-school course are admitted upon examination. In addition to a good secondary education in the English language, history, mathematics, and science, and a thorough course in drawing, instruction is given in the nature and use of the fundamental tools, and in their application to the chief materials used in the industries of the world. The success of this school has exceeded our highest anticipations. The manual training has a marked influence upon the mental and moral character of the boys—producing a thoroughness and earnestness in every task which is quite unusual among boys of their age. The average age of the pupils when admitted is about fifteen years. The course of instruction occupies three years.

It will thus be seen that in Philadelphia we have made a beginning in several directions with industrial, or as I prefer to call it, manual, training. The problem remaining to be solved is such an extension and coördination of these elements as shall furnish a con-

tinuous and progressive course of manual training all along the line of the pupils' education.

It is scarcely three years since these efforts to graft industrial training on the public schools of the city was begun, but it has already won the confidence of the community, and there is a growing demand for its further extension throughout the school system. I believe that the incorporation of industrial training into the public schools of this country is only a question of time. The misunderstanding as to its purposes arises chiefly among those who have no personal knowledge of its practical operation and management. My conviction is that before a great while it will be universally accepted as the greatest advance which has been made in the public education of the United States for half a century.

Yours very truly,

James MacAlister,
Superintendent Public Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.

NEW HAVEN.

IN trying to incorporate industrial training as a part of our public-school course, we have avoided attempting anything that would interfere materially with work already established. Plain sewing has been introduced in all intermediate schools, much to the satisfaction of both parents and children. Although only one hour per week is assigned to this branch, considerable skill has been acquired, and very neat specimens of needlework are now to be seen in many schools.

An attempt to adapt the occupations of the Kindergarten to primary schools has been measurably successful. This "busy work," so called, is intended to train the hand and the eye, assist the teaching of reading, writing, and numbers, employ the activities of children in a pleasant way, and lay the foundation for drawing and higher manual work.

During the past year, Prang's models for teaching form have been introduced, with exercises in clay modeling. This furnishes the best basis for industrial drawing, which is now a part of our curriculum.

Early in the year a manual-training shop, capable of accommodating twenty-four boys at once, was opened, and ten classes, selected from the several grammar schools of the city, have received two hours' instruction each week. The boys thus instructed have, as a rule, been full of interest, and with about thirty lessons have become fairly proficient in the use of tools.

The effect of these several forms of industrial effort upon teaching generally is good. The value of dealing with things rather than with words is becoming an axiom in all our schools.

Very truly yours,

S. T. Dutton,
Superintendent Public Schools, New Haven, Conn.

AN ADVERSE VIEW.

THE public-school system of this country has developed steadily for more than two and a half centuries. It has been modified and improved from time to time, and adapted to new conditions and different localities.

Consequently we have a highly intelligent citizenship, great business activity, and a high degree of inventive skill by which machinery is made to do the work of man and to cheapen every product which his need requires.

Now these very results of our education are so much admired that they are used as an argument against the system which produced them. Mental training has resulted in great industrial progress; and now we are exhorted to abandon that training and work directly for industrial progress. Industrial education is the popular fetich; and if any one tries to advocate anything else he is suppressed by the old cry of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

Technical schools undoubtedly are in demand; and they are essential and highly useful. Special industrial schools are also to be encouraged, and they may be beneficial. But the public schools should not be subverted or overthrown in order to make a place for such schools.

In the first place, a distinct phase of this kind of education was begun more than fifty years ago, and it proved a dead failure. It has been my fortune to be connected with three institutions of this kind, in the States of Maine and Massachusetts, where were to be seen the decaying ruins of a system as promising to its advocates as any which is now proposed.

In the second place there is a fallacy in the claim that manual training in school is necessary in order to produce intellectual honesty; that accuracy of thought and statement can not be secured without muscular work in the production of material things; that geometry, for example, can not be learned thoroughly without cutting out blocks, nor astronomy without going up in a balloon to see the stars;—for this is what the advocates of manual training claim when their claim is reduced to its bald and concrete form. In the third place there is a materialistic tendency, in the present advocacy of manual training as an adjunct of public-school education, which is destructive of that virile quality of thought and mental power which it is the province of education to beget. Within a fortnight one of these advocates is reported to have said: "The important thing to keep before a boy's mind in school is, 'How will all this help me in getting a living?'"—as if the American people need to be stimulated in money-getting; and as if the high object of education is the almighty dollar!

Finally, when the public-school system undertakes to do everything for a pupil; to train his mind to clear and vigorous thinking; to develop all his physical powers and teach him a trade by which he may earn a livelihood; and to train his moral nature so that he may have a clear passport to heaven, then this system will fall to pieces of its own weight. For ours is not a paternal government whose design is to care for each individual, but a democracy in which each has not only to take care of himself but to help also in making regulations for all; and till the family relation is overthrown in the onward "progress" of our age, something must be left to parents; and it can best be left there in spite of the protestations of those self-constituted philanthropists who so much desire to educate every child for his "sphere in life."

A. P. Marble,

Superintendent Public Schools, Worcester, Mass.

Industrial Training in the New York Catholic Protectorsy.

THE New York Catholic Protectorsy is a remarkable instance of a reformatory in which industrial training is carried on to an extent unsurpassed by that of any similar institution in the world. The work and methods of the Protectorsy are but little known to the people of the State, although it is annually visited by many European educators and economists, and has been repeatedly noticed and extolled in the columns of such papers as the London "Times," "Standard," "Chronicle," "Post," and "Pall Mall Gazette." The superiority and excellence of its industrial training consist chiefly in the variety of trades taught, thus affording a scope for differing tastes and aptitude; the thorough, efficient nature of the instruction; the size and superior appointments of the shops; and the high standard attained as workmen by boys trained there. The following trades are taught: printing, electrotyping, silk-weaving, shoemaking, tailoring, chair-making, blacksmithing, carpentry; the business of machinists, wheelwrights, bakers, and practical farming and gardening. The girls, who are under the charge of the Sisters of Charity, are instructed in sewing, embroidery, kid-glove making, dress and shirt making. Last year the proceeds of the sewing and glove-making departments alone amounted to \$11,031.32.

Mental and manual training are combined in the most admirable manner, the time of the children being about equally divided between the school-room and the work-shop, with ample opportunities for recreation. From October until May evening classes are formed in free-hand, mechanical, and architectural drawing, and in designing and modeling. In all the trades the precision and taste which the habit of drawing gives are clearly perceptible. The children of the Junior Department, who are kept entirely separate from the others, have their own work-shops, where, for a few hours daily, they are initiated into the elementary principles of trade instruction, as a preparation for the real shop-work of the Senior Department. Every boy in the Protectorsy is taught some trade in its entirety, and if, for any reason, he leaves before finishing his particular trade, he is at least thoroughly grounded in an elementary knowledge of it, and can readily find employment outside.

The various work-shops are each under the supervision of one of the Christian Brothers, who watches over the manners and morals of the boys, and maintains order and discipline; but the trade instruction is, in every case, given by skilled, trained mechanics, who are paid liberal salaries to act as instructors and foremen to the youthful workmen. The superior quality of the work done by very young children proves conclusively what may be done by judicious, intelligent training. Take, for example, the shoe-shop, which employs 260 boys and turns out over 300 pairs of shoes a day; or the printing-office, which does the entire work of two large publishing houses. The average age of the boys is twelve years. At the New Orleans Exhibition the work of the Protectorsy attracted universal attention, as it had done the year before at the London International Exhibition. Among the exhibits were finely woven silks, engravings, exquisite carvings and designs, beautiful specimens of printing, electrotyping, embroidery and sewing, well-made and really finished shoes,

suits of clothing, and gloves. The work in wood was well represented by tables, chairs, and excellent examples of carpentry.

The production of work for a regular market by the Protectory is also an important factor in promoting the efficiency and value of the industrial training. Thus, in filling an order for a certain amount of work to be ready at a stated time, many practical questions must be taken into consideration, a knowledge of which is of the highest value to the workman. So a boy is taught not only the execution of the work, but the time required for its performance; the cost of production; the quality and nature of materials; and many other practical matters which can only be learned by the production of work destined for actual use.

Boys trained in the shops of the Protectory are eagerly sought as workmen by the leading manufacturers, and many now fill positions as foremen and superintendents in large establishments in New York and neighboring cities.

Ida M. Van Etten.

The American Book.

THERE is one thing which, more than any other, would nationalize our literature. It is a question of a little common honesty — a matter of a little every-day sort of justice; and it would be twice blessed in the giving and in the receiving. We need a broadening of our copyright laws, a better protection for ideal and intellectual property, which is, after all, a more natural property than lands and corporeal hereditaments. It is a case where the ideal is most real; but it is also a property most liable to theft, most easily stolen, and least protected of all property.

It is gravely urged, in opposition to copyright legislation, that it would be wrong to force people to pay for what they can now have free — that to allow copyright to foreigners would be to pay an enormous tax for what we can have for the taking. Shoes and shirts are an enormous tax paid to decency and comfort. Shall we, therefore, in order to evade the tax, take the wares of the shoemaker and the tailor without compensation? It is the argument of Captain Kidd and the banditti. Proudhon said, "Property is robbery." America says, by her attitude on the copyright question, property in brains is robbery, if the brains are under a foreign scalp. A foreign author has no rights an American is bound to respect, and because of this theory, and this only, the converse is true in fact — that an American author has no rights in the hands of a foreigner.

We bear with composure the charge, and the fact, of being robbers in the fields of literature, but our blood runs cold at the thought of the torch of the mob applied to the tinder of a factory, or at the vision of a piece of gas-pipe, charged with dynamite, flung into the streets of a great city. We can not afford to suspend the truest maxims of our freedom at the call of interest or expediency. We can not allow our love of dollars to overshadow the future and forge fetters for our principles, nor let communism of brains emasculate our literature and make us a nation of literary beggars. There is something better than cheapness. The smuggler's goods are cheap. Is the smuggler, therefore, a great reformer and a public benefactor? The people

must read, they must educate; but to do these things shall we steal or smuggle? James Russell Lowell says, "There is one thing better than a cheap book, and that is a book honestly come by." The argument that cheapness is a national blessing largely resolves itself into an argument that is individual and selfish. If it is of any force as against international copyright, let us carry it out to its logical sequence and abolish home copyright as well, and then sit down and forecast the result.

It is true that it is the duty of the State to legislate primarily in the interests of its own citizens. But "there is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." American progress can not be built up on cheapness alone. We sometimes buy cheap and ask no questions, glad that our wants and our purses so nearly agree; but there is, after all, a universal sentiment of honesty that is always glad to see one's neighbor come into his own. And it would seem to be the simplest possible proposition, that if one has made anything, whether a baby-jumper, or a book that is sufficiently valued by his fellow-men to be used by them, he has an ownership in his work, and is fairly entitled to a profit therefrom. Justice is better than cheapness, honesty is more to be desired than culture, righteousness is higher than expediency.

But expediency seems to be the highest reach of international law, and, abandoning any higher principle, it is full time for America to get into line with other states and nations, and amend her copyright laws on the ground of policy.

Competition is desirable, but our copyright laws put us beyond competition, and, as we have seen, into the range of pillage. Commercial monopoly tends to robbery. Mercantile competition is a matter of public policy. But an honest merchant can not compete with the pirate and the smuggler. Piracy and smuggling under governmental protection would soon destroy all home market and home manufacture, and home honesty as well. It is a regular "Stand and deliver" to all fair trade. This is just what the United States Government is doing in literary matters. It puts the American book in competition with the book for whose production nothing is paid. It is not "Chinese cheap labor," but stolen and absolutely unpaid labor!

If the alien's book is to be forever the cheapest book, it will be the book most read. American thought and action fed on foreign diet will, in time, be but an echo of foreign types. If we are to promote a national culture, we must keep abreast of our neighbors in all that tends to the advancement of a sound national literature. The state ought to have a literature in sympathy with it, for literature is one of the strongest forces in shaping social life and national character.

It is argued against international copyright that it will increase the price of books, and that cheap reading is a large factor in cheap education. Cheap reading is, perhaps, desirable, and cheap education may be a blessing, but things may sometimes be too cheap. I think the facts would be, that new foreign books would be higher in price, by reason of copyright, and new American books would be cheaper, by reason of a wider market. There is a large class of books which would not be affected by copyright, for it would not be retroactive. Year after year the books that age can

not wither nor custom stale—the books that are “immortalities”—are dropping into the common fund by the expiration of the “limited period.” Let us take these spoils of time freely and without price, under the policy of all governments, but in all justice and good conscience let us recompense the author for his work, under whatsoever skies he writes, for the statute time.

The United States, whose literature owes more to the world than that of any other nation, is, in the matter of intellectual property, behind the age. She wraps the mantle of selfishness about her and legislates for her own family only, saying to her citizens, “Thou shalt not rob thine own brother, but if there be a stranger within thy gates, thou mayest plunder him with a high hand and a free conscience.” It is one against the world, and her plunder weakens her capacity for producing work that is good at home, or work that the world will even steal. A governmental policy in copyright, that would grant common rights to others, would secure for ourselves rights which we need, and rights which would largely help us to higher standards, purer taste, and added nationality in our literature.

John E. Cleland.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

The Piedmont Exposition, Atlanta.

COUNTY and State fairs are locally advantageous whenever they are intelligently conducted. If planned so as to attract wide attention and induce general interest, they always arouse a spirited rivalry among the contestants for awards of merit, and such competitive efforts necessarily result in material benefit to all branches of industry and all departments of husbandry that are represented. Likewise inter-State and national expositions, when successfully managed, are proportionately beneficial throughout the wider fields of their influence. They are all eye-openers to the possibilities of energy, incentives to enterprise, and powerful factors in the creation of thrift and prosperity.

In these respects it is impossible to estimate what they have done for the South within the last ten years. Probably all of the others together are not equal in the value of their effect to the Piedmont Exposition, which occurred at Atlanta, Ga., about three months ago. It is now sufficiently a thing of the past to be reviewed calmly, with some chance of determining its practical results and substantial benefits.

It was only 104 days in course of preparation, and it lasted just two weeks. The fair-grounds, consisting of 197 acres, were farm-lands in cultivation when the Exposition was organized; and yet 104 days from that time, when the gates of the great fair were formally thrown open, all the necessary buildings and other arrangements, including an excellent race-track, stood in such admirable readiness that they seemed no less than the creditable result of many months of laborious preparation.

The Exposition itself was undeniably higher in its aim, wider in its scope, greater in its magnitude, and fuller in its success than any affair of the kind which has ever been held in the South.

If asked to express in one word the best result and most invaluable benefit of the Piedmont Exposition, I

should say—revelation! Revelation, deep and wide, of a common interest in our common country; revelation of local pride without the slightest disposition to insist upon the perpetuation of sectional lines between the States; revelation of a sincere desire for the profitable development of every resource of our broad land; revelation of that true patriotism which should make Massachusetts rejoice in the prosperity of Georgia's cotton-mills, and make Pennsylvania glad at Alabama's mineral wealth; revelation of the truth that we are one people, with no violently conflicting interests, no ground for jealous ambitions, and no cause for internal dissensions, but bound together by a union of purposes, a sympathy in aspirations, and an indestructible fellowship in destiny. These were the revelations of inter-State significance.

Locally the Piedmont Exposition was a revelation of marvelous excellence in all varieties of manufacturing industry; of surprising advance in every phase of mercantile enterprise; of vast improvement in stock and cattle-breeding; of admirable progress in methods of farming; and of an inexhaustible wealth in mineral and other natural resources.

It showed too that the Southern people “have pulled themselves together,” and so energized their ambitions as to insure a rapid march in all ways of material development and substantial prosperity. In this spirit of revived hope they are greatly sustained by the constant realization of encouragement from all the other branches of our great family of States.

It can not fairly be claimed that the immense crowd which gathered in Atlanta during the Exposition was all attracted by the exhibition of the Piedmont resources. It must be admitted that the President and his wife were incalculably strong magnets. No doubt thousands went to Atlanta to see them who never approached the Exposition grounds. But the crowd was great enough to stand a very liberal allowance for the hero-worshipping element, and still leave a balance altogether ample to attest a deep and wide interest in the purposes and success of the Exposition itself.

The visitors numbered more than twice as many as the resident population. I mean it as no complaint against the provision which Atlanta made for her guests, but only as evidence of how the city was packed do I mention the fact that several churches and other public buildings were thrown open as sleeping-houses for strangers who were without shelter. I saw at least five hundred men, women, and children sleeping on their trunks in the Union Depot; and the cold marble steps of the Kimball House, for three flights up, were every night literally packed with men who dropped down on them in absolute exhaustion and slept.

If most of these people suffered all these discomforts merely for a glimpse of the President, it argues powerfully the Southern interest in national affairs. If, on the other hand, even a fair proportion of them were simply in attendance upon the Exposition, it proves a lively awakening of interest in the vast wealth and infinite resources of the Piedmont region. The fair was the first of its kind in the South which I ever knew to be profitable. The total cost was \$199,530. The total receipts from all sources were \$209,096. Thus is shown a net profit of \$9566. In this calculation the permanent buildings and the grounds are put down in the

receipts at their cost, and counted as property on hand fully worth in cash the estimated value.

I think possibly the most astounding fact in connection with the affair was its freedom from serious casualties. There was but one accident of any sort reported during the two weeks; a young boy working around the machinery in one of the main buildings was caught in a wheel and had his leg broken.

When it is remembered that there are eight railroads running into Atlanta, and that for ten days extra schedules were operated over all of them, and that during that time no train ever came into or went out of the town that was not packed to its utmost capacity, the escape from accidents seems almost miraculous.

The mineral exhibit alone would have justified the total cost of the Exposition. With one display in this department there was a casket of jewels (in the rough) found in North Carolina, which an expert valued at over \$30,000. But I dare not trust myself to specify even the most conspicuous exhibits. The effect of the Exposition will be felt far beyond the bounds of the region it embraced, and its results will be manifested in endless phases of energy and usefulness. It is only just to say that to Henry W. Grady is due the credit for the conception of this important enterprise, as well as the chief praise for its successful fulfillment.

Marion J. Verdery.

Hawthorne's Loyalty.

AN autograph letter of Hawthorne, dated July 20th, 1863, has recently been brought to an auction sale, but without the knowledge or consent of the person to whom it was addressed.

Its publication touched me deeply, I confess, especially as Hawthorne indicates, in the letter itself, the confidence in which it was written. He says:

"I do not write (if you will please to observe) for my letter to be read by others, for this is the first time that I have written down ideas which exist in a gaseous state in my mind; and perhaps they might define themselves rather differently on another attempt to condense them."

The publication of this letter has led to harsh and bitter comments, and to inferences entirely at variance with Hawthorne's opinions as expressed to me at different periods during the war, in our various conversations and in his letters herewith printed. There is in the letter spoken of intrinsic evidence that all its statements were not intended to be taken literally. For instance (in controverting the charge that Pierce was a traitor), Hawthorne exclaims, "A traitor! Why, he is the only loyal man in the country, North or South." Again, he says, in a jocular strain to the lady addressed, "I offer you the nook in our garret which Mary contrived as a hiding-place for Mr. Sanborn."

Remarks like these show that the letter was written in a careless manner, and ought not, all, to be taken seriously.

It should be observed that Hawthorne did not—in this letter or elsewhere—speak of the Peace Democrats as if he were one of them; and I believe there is no proof whatever that he could fairly be so classed.

Did he at any time utter a wish that the "rebels" might succeed? Did he ever rejoice in any victory of theirs? Did he praise resistance to the military draft?

or discourage Union enlistments or the granting of liberal military supplies? Did he, in any case, send messages to the enemy or encourage them to persevere in rebellion? Did he express respect or esteem for the Southern people while at war with us? If he did none of these things, but, on the contrary, always approved and applauded the vigorous prosecution of the war after it had broken out, then there is no justice in calling him a Peace Democrat. While Hawthorne made no pretension to the character of a statesman, he felt deeply the importance of the national interests at stake; and some of his expressed views were wise and far-reaching. Certainly he was an ardent well-wisher for the success of the North.

Speculating in this letter upon what the rebels might do in a certain contingency, he gives it as his own opinion that "the best thing possible, as far as I can see, is to effect a separation of the Union, giving us the west bank of the Mississippi and a boundary line affording us as much Southern soil as we can hope to digest in another century."

Looking at the condition of the country to-day after the successful termination of the war and the settlement of our national difficulties, it should not be forgotten that—during the struggle—there were times when the most earnest lovers of the Union contemplated in sadness the probability of a division of the States, whose interests were then so widely different.

Letters from distinguished Republican statesmen and loyal editors are in existence which show that under the terrible financial, political, and military strain to which the North was subjected, they seriously considered the prospect of being obliged—especially in case of foreign intervention—to accede to some such settlement of the contest as the one suggested by Hawthorne in the letter in question.

Many thoughtful men now living, who were of mature age at the time of the war, will remember that they themselves, though loyal to the core, from time to time had doubts and fears as to the outcome of the struggle, and speculated as to the terms of settlement most advantageous to the North that could be obtained. Nor was it cowardly or disloyal, under the trying circumstances continually occurring, for any man—while doing his utmost for the success of our cause—to think and talk in confidence to his friends of the contingency of separation from the "diseased members," as Hawthorne called them.

In the dark days of the war (and they were frequent almost to its end) many true men echoed the opinion that it would be wise to "let our erring sisters go." But, happily, a stronger and wiser policy prevailed. With these remarks I submit the following extracts from letters of Hawthorne to myself, which show his deliberate judgment—expressed at various times—upon the subject of the War of the Rebellion:

CONCORD, May 26th, 1861.

DEAR BRIDGE: . . . The war, strange to say, has had a beneficial effect upon my spirits, which were flagging wofully before it broke out. But it was delightful to share in the heroic sentiment of the time and to feel that I had a country—a consciousness which seemed to make me young again. One thing, as regards this matter, I regret, and one thing I am glad of. The regrettable thing is that I am too old to shoulder a musket myself, and the joyful thing is that Julian is too young. He drills constantly with a company of lads, and means to enlist as soon as he reaches the minimum age; but I trust

we shall be either victorious or vanquished before that time.

Meantime (though I approve the war as much as any man), I don't quite understand what we are fighting for, or what definite result can be expected. If we punnel the South ever so hard, they will love us none the better for it; and, even if we subjugate them, our next step should be to cut them adrift. If we are fighting for the annihilation of slavery, to be sure, it may be a wise object, and offers a tangible result, and the only one consistent with a future union between North and South. A continuance of the war would soon make this plain to us; and we should see the expediency of preparing our black brethren for future citizenship by allowing them to fight for their own liberties, and educating them through heroic influences. Whatever happens next, I must say that I rejoice that the old Union is smashed. We never were one people, and never really had a country since the Constitution was formed.

CONCORD, October 12th, 1861.

DEAR BRIDGE: I am glad you take such a hopeful view of our national projects, so far as regards the war; but my own opinion is that no nation ever came safe and sound through such a confounded difficulty as this of ours. For my own part I don't hope (nor indeed wish) to see the Union restored as it was. Amputation seems to me much the better plan; and all we ought to fight for is the liberty of selecting the point where our diseased members shall be left off. I would fight to the death for the Northern Slave States, and let the rest go. I am glad Mrs. Bridge has had a little rest from Washington life, and heartily wish you could have been with her.

CONCORD, February 13th, 1862.

DEAR BRIDGE: . . . Frank Pierce came here and spent a night, a week or two since, and we mingled our condolences for the state of the country. Pierce is truly patriotic, and thinks there is nothing left for us but to fight it out; but I should be sorry to take his opinion implicitly as regards our chances for the future. He is bigoted to the Union, and sees nothing but ruin without it; whereas I (if we can only put the boundry far enough South) should not much regret an ultimate separation. A few weeks will decide how this is to be; for only a powerful Union feeling shall be developed by the military successes that seem to be setting in, and we ought to turn our attention to the best mode of resolving ourselves into two nations.

It would be too great an absurdity to spend all our Northern strength for the next generation in holding on to a people who insist upon being let loose. If we do hold them, I should think Sumner's territorial plan the best way!

P. S. I ought to thank you for a shaded map of Negrodome which you sent me a little while ago. What a terrible amount of trouble and expense in washing that sheet white! And, after all, I am afraid we shall only variegate it with blood and dirt. [The map referred to was

one showing the comparative destiny of the slave population of the several Southern States.]

On his return home, after a visit to me in Washington, he wrote:

CONCORD, April 15th, 1862.

DEAR BRIDGE: Yours inclosing two photographs of Professor Henry's received.

I reached home safe and sound on Thursday. It is a pity I did not wait one day longer, so as to have shared in the joyful excitement about the Pittsburg victory and the taking of Island Number Ten.

In a letter to me, dated April 19th, 1862, he wrote:

"I feel a tremendous anxiety about our affairs at Yorktown. It will not surprise me if we come to grief."

It may be pertinent to add that, just after the first battle of Bull Run, Hawthorne says, in his answer to a dinner invitation from James Russell Lowell, quoted by Lathrop in his "Study of Hawthorne":

"Speaking of dinner, last evening's news will dull the edge of many a Northern appetite; but if it puts all of us into the same grim and bloody humor that it does me, the South had better have suffered ten defeats than won this victory."

From an unbroken friendship beginning with our college days and ending only with his life, I believe that I enjoyed Hawthorne's confidence and understood his personal and political character as thoroughly as any one, and I should hold myself false to the memory of my friend if I did not give my testimony, and furnish the proofs in my possession, of his loyalty to the North, which has recently, and most unfairly, been called in question.

Horatio Bridge,

U. S. Navy.

"THE MOORINGS," ATHENS, PA.

Corrections.

ON page 77 of the November CENTURY, a picture of Gov. Israel Washburn of Maine appeared over the title of his brother E. B. Washburne. A portrait of the latter will appear in an early part of the Lincoln history.

ON page 134 of the same number, a picture of the Washington Monument in the Capitol Square, Richmond, was in a part of the edition incorrectly called the Jackson Monument.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

Recollections of Grant.

"I KNEW him well," the old man said.

"We were together in fight:
I with the Left when the charge was led—
The General of course had the Right.

I stood by his side," the old man said,
"When a bullet whizzed down the line:
Scarce forty feet from the General's head—
And but little farther from mine.

"Nay, his friends were many," the old man said,
"A greater distinction I want—
Just say I'm the one who when all was done
Wrote no 'Recollections of Grant!'"

Did I blench at the storm?" the old man said,
"Ah, sir, the bravest may;
And from childhood up I've been always afraid
Of finding myself in the way."

"Shall I write thee down, O hero," I said,
"As a friend of the fallen chief,
And blazon thy name beside that of the dead
In a glorious alto-relief?"

Charles Henry Webb.

this sort, for not only did the French republic preserve the Legion of Honor, but two more decorations were recently established in that country—one for literary and artistic pursuits, to be conferred by the Secretary of Public Instruction; and another for agricultural merit, whose supreme chief is the Secretary of Agriculture. Several of the American republics have established similar decorations, as Honduras, Nicaragua, and Venezuela.

Aside from the decorations mentioned in the official "Almanac de Gotha," that old-established *vade mecum* of royalty and nobility in Europe, each government gives a number of other crosses and medals for civil and military merit, for art and science. Writers, poets, singers, and actors of reputation, and of either sex, are usually favored with a number of them; and many instances could be quoted where salaries have been paid in medals instead of hard cash. Extraordinary occasions, as the visit of a foreign monarch, the opening of a new theater, and jubilees of festival performances, are the occasions for such showers of medals, although some states confer them parsimoniously. I remember an amusing incident of this kind at the opening of a large new theater in Germany. The director of the theater was known to be an exceedingly vain man, whose gaping buttonhole was wide open, like a young sparrow's beak longing for food. He was expected to receive a little cross or medal on this occasion. After the first act of the festive opening performance, a chamber-

lain of the king entered the box of the director, and ceremoniously informed the latter that the king wished to confer upon him a mark of his esteem and a recognition of his services, and that he was sent to present to him the royal thanks. With this he handed to the director an elegant, small, leather case, and left. We congratulated him warmly, for at last his long-looked-for ribbon was in his hands! Was it the Crown? was it the Red Eagle? At last the case was opened with trembling hands, and the contents were found to be—a silver snuff-box! I shall never forget the manager's face at this solemn moment. Disgusted and disappointed, he left the theater and was not to be seen for several days. In the papers, however, it was jokingly reported that he had received the "Royal Snuff-box for Art and Science."

From the contents of this paper it will be gleaned that, aside from the knightly institutions of England, Germany, Austria, and some other countries, the system of decorations has deteriorated in no small degree, and in many instances is little more than a farce, unworthy the giver as well as the receiver. A few years ago, an envoy of a certain kingdom in a European capital used to pay his bills in decorations. Thus, his shoemaker, tailor, and butcher became knights, his landlord commander, of a certain order. Fortunately, "society" in Europe is well acquainted with the value of this or that distinction, and the sale of certain crosses has become a harmless sport.

Ernst von Hesse-Wartegg.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Real Nature of Politics.

Stranger. And that common science which is over them all, and guards the laws, and all things that are in the State, and truly weaves them all into one, if we would describe under a name characteristic of this common nature, most truly we may call Politics. . . . This, then, according to our view, is the perfection of the web of political action. There is a direct intertexture of the brave and temperate natures, when the kingly science has drawn the two sorts of lives into communion. . . .; and, having completed the noblest and best of all webs of which a common life admits, and enveloping therein all other inhabitants of cities, binds them in one fabric, and governs and presides over them, omitting no element of a city's happiness.

Young Socrates. You have completed, Stranger, a very perfect image of the Statesman. — PLATO, *Politicus* (Jowett's translation).

Jailer. "What is your trade, Mr. Tweed?" *Tweed.* "Well, you may put me down as a Statesman."

THE degradation which has come upon the words "politics" and "politician," in their American use, their degeneration from the high estate to which the precedents of two thousand years have entitled them, mark a degeneration in political methods which deserves the attention of every lover of his country. "Politics" has become simply the work of managing a party for its own advantage, or that of its leaders;

and the term "politician" is applied only to the campaign director, the local committee-man, the appointment-broker—in short, to the men who manage parties and distribute the public offices. If we wish a great public question—such as the labor question, the tariff question, the currency question, and others of the class—to be treated with ordinary common sense, we must "take it out of politics"; while if any party perpetrates a particularly mean act for mere partisan advantage, we are told that it was done for "political purposes." So evident has been the tendency that an effort has been made to differentiate terms, and, while leaving "politician" in its degradation, to use "statesman" as a designation for a real master of the art of government. But so sure are the laws which have been working in the case, that the only result has been a corresponding degradation in the new term also, and the only differentiation is this: the "politician" is still one who is "in politics" for the sake of what he can make there; while the "statesman" is now a *bouffe* politician—a politician with an element of conscious humbug about him.

All this is not due to loose thinking by Americans: this people is rather characterized by acute thinking in such matters, and the degradation of the word politician is but the outward sign and symbol of the degradation in political methods, which the people recognize as if by instinct, and which they mark by their use of the old words. It is the spoils system, combined with the lack for some years of any clearly defined issues in our public affairs, that has degraded our politics and politicians in fact as well as in name. While the chief work of Government officers is held to consist in getting and distributing offices, while matters of real public importance are neglected and not even discussed, it is inevitable that politics should be considered an inferior business, and its real nature and importance temporarily lost to view. There are, however, many signs among us now both of increased interest in politics and of a better understanding of what it really is; and with the progress of this improvement we may expect that the term will recover something of its old and honorable meaning. The recent courageous and remarkable surplus-and-tariff annual message of President Cleveland has greatly helped to lift current political discussion to a higher plane.

We purpose at this time to inquire a little more particularly what the old meaning of the term "politics" is. It has been said that politics is the government of nations; but the precise sense of so important and comprehensive a term cannot be fixed by a single phrase. To make the definition perfect, it would be necessary to state what are the true functions of government — a work of great difficulty, which we have no intention of undertaking at the present time. Again, it may be said that nations, or at least civilized nations, are governed by law; but politics, in every sense of the word, is clearly distinguished from law. It may be thought that the true function of politics, as distinguished from law, is to make new laws and amendments to old ones, so as to adapt the legal system to the wants of a changing and advancing society. And this is true; but even this does not reach the heart of the matter. The work of framing and enacting new laws would not be so difficult a task as it is, and would not excite the intellects and feelings of men as it does, if this was a complete account of it. The making of new laws, or changes in existing laws, is undoubtedly the ultimate outcome of politics; but the real nature of the work becomes apparent only when we consider why it is that new laws are needed and why it is often so difficult to get them enacted.

There are in the human soul many conflicting motives which display themselves in society no less than in individual character. Each of us has his own interests and his own views of what is desirable and right, and none of us is so absolutely right as never to do wrong to others. We are all likely not only to be mistaken in our opinions, but also to push the advancement of our interests beyond the line of strict justice to our neighbor; and hence the need of an overruling authority to maintain justice and keep all legitimate interests in harmony. Now, so far as the acts of individuals are concerned, the police and the courts are generally sufficient to maintain justice; but interests that are common to large numbers of men lead inevitably to great combinations seeking to control the law itself in their own interest, or to carry out some Government policy in which they believe. Thus the real work of

politics, or statesmanship, consists in adjusting these conflicting social interests, which are too powerful for the ordinary law to control, so as to secure equal justice to all, and thus to enable all members of society to work together in harmony and for the common good. That this is the real nature of political work the political history of the world abundantly shows. The domestic history of every nation, and especially of every free nation, is full of the conflicts of interests and classes; while international politics in all ages has been little else than the endeavor to adjust the disputes which nations have had with each other.

Such being the real nature of politics in the higher and true sense of the word, it is not difficult to apply its lesson to our own affairs. American politics does not consist in winning elections and distributing offices, though these things are necessary as means to the end. It consists in harmonizing the various conflicting interests in American society; the interests of labor and of capital, of the farmers and of the railroads, of the manufacturer and of the importer, of the East and the West and the South — in short, of all classes and regions and individuals. To this end we must not only find out what laws are needed, but persuade the people to have them made; and when they are made we must have them impartially administered. This shows how important and how difficult and how dignified real politics is.

Honesty at Elections.

AN editorial in the July number of *THE CENTURY* referred to recent addresses before the Commonwealth Club, by Mr. W. M. Ivins and Mr. J. B. Bishop, and advocated the adoption of the English system of managing elections, from the belief that its methods were far more democratic, far better calculated to obtain an expression of the general popular will and feeling, than our present unregulated system of nomination. A consideration fully as important, perhaps more important, is the probable influence of the success of Mr. Bishop's proposal (also made in a book on "Machine Politics" written by Mr. Ivins) of the best remedies for the universal evil of bribery at elections.

That the bribery of voters is an evil, and a general evil, of American elections will be the inevitable conclusion of any one who has had occasion to go below the surface of politics. And there is no truth in the common notion that the evil is peculiar to city elections, or even more common in them; the differences are only of methods. The large assessments of city elections are of course really corruption funds; but the multitude of election districts and of party employees makes it possible to bring most of the purchasable class of city voters into the actual or nominal service of one or other of the parties, and thus to cloak bribery under the form of wages. In agricultural districts bribery is not so completely disguised. The political evils of the former case are fully treated by Mr. Ivins and need not be repeated here; the purpose of this article is to show that the remedy may be successful in eliminating bribery from the elections outside of the cities.

Mommsen fastens on the appearance of organizations for traffic in votes as the first unmistakable sign of the fatal degeneration of the Roman popular body; and he traces from this the successive steps which followed

until Augustus sat in the place of the consuls, and the Republic had fallen. An American looks at the appearance of parallel evils in our own history as calls to a reformation, not as indications of the downfall of our republic. And yet the most optimistic of Americans may well see danger signals in many a sharply contested rural election. The ordinary party machinery is changed at once into something closely approximating an organization for traffic in votes; men who have taken little or no interest in more languid contests now begin to appear and reappear at the polling-places, each bringing with him, at each return, a voter of that large class of indifferent men who need the spur of personal and persistent solicitation, or a bribe, to undertake what they consider a burdensome task—for the sole benefit of the candidate for whom they are asked to vote. The appearance of bribery is always exaggerated, partly through braggadocio, partly through the desire of the "worker" to exalt himself before the party-managers and the people—there is never any fear of punishment. But there is bribery enough to be a danger, though the disgusted spectator may attempt to find comfort by persuading himself that after all, in the long run, each party will buy about the same number of votes, and the honest vote will decide the election.

Such comfort is of the very barrenest. It pays no regard to the most serious evil of all, the constantly increasing degeneration of our political ideals, with all the consequences which in practice have their root here. The degeneration of ideals shows itself in the fact that bribery is no longer confined to the originally purchasable class, the hirelings who vote for the side which bids highest; the virus has already spread farther. Political managers know that it is now not at all uncommon for well-to-do voters of good repute in the community to refuse to vote for their own party unless they are paid for the trouble of doing so; while lump sums to secure the presence of entire families at the polls have taken their place among the fixed expenses of party organizations. The venal vote may be over-slaughed again and again by the honest vote; but an exclusive reliance on this remedy must result only in the decrease of the honest vote itself. And yet, what other remedy is open to us? The anti-bribery laws are notoriously the most difficult of all laws to be enforced, under present conditions. We have left the voter so utterly unguarded at the polls that the attractiveness of an offense so easy of commission quite outweighs any terrors to be found in an almost impossible detection.

How is the voter to be guarded further? In answering the question, we may as well get rid of the notion that there is honor among thieves, or among other rogues: on the contrary, the surest way to destroy the rogues' trade is to drive the rogues into a compulsory reliance upon honor, trust, and confidence. The first step of a prosecuting attorney, in attacking a criminal conspiracy, is to spread abroad the rumor that this, that, or the other confederate is about to "squeal"; he knows that it will be but a few days before one or more of the rogues will hurry to his office to anticipate the traitors by turning State's evidence. Bribery at elections is possible still, mainly because our laws release the briber from any necessity for reposing special trust and confidence in the voter whom he bribes: the

briber is allowed to accompany the voter all the way to the polling-window, and to see that the vote paid for is deposited. Let communication between briber and voter be cut off for even a brief period just before the deposit of the ballot, and it is easy to see that the foundation of the trade of bribery at elections is greatly weakened.

Indirectly, then, honesty at elections outside of the cities ought to be very greatly promoted by the provisions, common to the English and Australian plans, that the voter, just before entering the polling-place to deposit his ballot, shall pass through another room and there have a few minutes of absolute seclusion. That seclusion, it is true, is primarily intended to give the voter an opportunity to prepare his ballot; but it just as certainly applies with peculiar force to a large part of our elections, in that it cuts the connection between the voter and any possible briber, and compels the latter, if he will pay money, to get in return only the bare word of the venal voter. Such an influence cannot but show itself in a steady decrease of the purchasable class, but the effects could not well stop there. Neither party dares now to enforce the statutory punishments for bribery at elections, for the offense is too common to all parties. But, as the offense itself lessens and becomes a less important weapon in the party armory, a party which feels itself to have been injured at any election by bribery will for the first time have an interest in seeing that the laws against bribery are enforced. This one provision, then, of the separation of the voter from other persons, not only makes bribery more difficult, but increases the probability of its punishment, while our present system makes the offense easy and its punishment difficult.

It is the unanimous testimony of those who have studied the working of the English and Australian laws that the complete exclusion of the voter from espionage or supervision while he is preparing and depositing his ballot has of itself put a stop to bribery.

There is, therefore, no shadow of reason why any reader, in any part of the country, should look upon the proposals of Mr. Bishop and Mr. Ivins as foreign to his interests, or as relating exclusively to New York or any other large city. The Ballot Act, on the general lines of the English statute, is essential as a foundation for the laws against bribery at elections, and it is therefore of interest everywhere. The effort is to be made, in several of our legislatures, at their sessions this winter, to pass such a ballot act, making the expense of printing and distributing the ballots a charge upon the State, providing for double rooms, or rooms with compartments, at polling-places, and securing to the voter a period of separation from all other persons while in the act of voting.

A bill providing for both these reforms was passed by one branch of the Michigan legislature last year, and we trust will be revived and made a law this year. It was based, in its main provision, upon the principles of the English law, and was the most carefully considered application of those principles to the needs of our American system which has yet been made. A similar application has been made in a bill which has been prepared for the New York legislature, and which ought to be made a law at this session. It places the expense of printing and distributing the ballots upon the State,

provides for secret ballot-rooms, with compartments in the proportion of one to every fifty voters, into which a voter can retire and, free from all observation, prepare his ballots, which he folds and deposits in the boxes. No "boss" or briber can follow him to see how he votes. As the State has entire charge of the ballots, there can be no peddlers of tickets about the polls. As the State pays the expense of printing and distributing, there will be no excuse for raising funds; and there being no funds, there will be no money with which to employ workers.

A law has already been adopted in Wisconsin, putting the work of distributing the ballots into the hands of the State, and providing for two polling-rooms, one in which sworn State officials shall distribute the ballots, and another, connected by a hall-way or passage, to which the voter shall pass and deposit his ballot without observation. But the printing of the ballots is left with the political parties, as heretofore. A bill providing for the State printing and charge of ballots was prepared, but not introduced, in the Connecticut legislature last year.

There is no State of the Union where honest and intelligent men have not reason to work for the adoption of a reform ballot act, not only as a positive good in itself, but as an essential prerequisite to the real and earnest enforcement of the laws prescribing punishments for bribery at elections.

"No Successful Substitute for Justice."

It is somewhat surprising that the agitation in favor of abolishing, by means of just laws, the disgrace of American literary piracy should have been until lately carried on almost exclusively by those supposed to be directly interested: namely, writers and publishers.

Only lately have there been signs that the clergy—the guardians of both private and public morals—take any vital interest in the subject, or that the people at large are aroused to the national dishonor. But the stolen

books with which the country is deluged are read by the country. How many among our citizens are alive to the shameful fact that American pirates and the American public have for generations been living upon stolen literature? Congress has been blamed for its indifference—but who among us can escape reproach; who among us has done his whole duty in attempting to right this gigantic wrong; to wipe out this unendurable national disgrace?

Mr. Lowell, in presiding over the very successful Author's Readings in New York last November, added to the number of his admirable sayings in favor of international copyright. He repeated two most fortunate phrases of his own on this subject—phrases used by him in his notable address to a committee of Congress: "There is one thing better than a cheap book, and that is a book honestly come by"; "Our authors are the only workers among us who are forced to compete with men who receive no wages at all."

In the course of his Chickering Hall address, in which the above watch-words were again given out, Mr. Lowell said: "To steal a book I have bought is theft; to steal a book I have made—what is that?" In referring to the effect of the absence of international copyright upon the country at large, he put the question, "Whether it be prudent in a nation to allow its literature, or a great part of its literature, to be made for it by another nation—in other words, to allow the shaping of its thought, and therefore of its character, to be done by that other?" But the deepest word of all was this: "I prefer that the argument should rest, not upon interest and expediency, but upon honesty and justice. No successful substitute for justice has ever been discovered—nothing with the lasting quality of justice."

These are golden words, the key-note of a great national reform; or, to take another figure, shafts of light heralding the dawn of a new era of justice, a new era in the literature of the English-speaking race.

OPEN LETTERS.

About Mr. Irving.

A GREAT deal of space has been devoted in THE CENTURY, early and late, to the discussion of Mr. Irving's characteristics as an actor and as a manager. I should like, however, to tell briefly what it is that I like about this extraordinarily individual actor. I delight in going to see Mr. Irving; I delight more and more in going. I discover, in fact, that I give myself up more and more completely to the enjoyment of what I do find in him,—after having ceased to look for what I did not find.

Although so much has been said about Mr. Irving's pictorial qualities, I do not think that his pictorial genius is even yet duly appreciated. It is true that at times he does appear to think too much of this side of the dramatic art. But even if the virtue be overdone, for how much pleasure and satisfaction must we thank the virtue! Now, I do not refer merely to the general setting of the stage, the costumes and grouping, his own

costume and get-up—all generously done and with an exquisite pictorial sense;—I mean something more subtle, more rare, and to me more remarkable than these. Mr. Irving is always making a picture of his own person, of his own figure and face: he is always in the right relation to the picture, which includes the whole stage; and the picture that he himself makes, by himself, is almost always fine. I follow him about with my eyes, fearing to miss each new, effective design. If it were pigments alone that he used, one would say that Mr. Irving had a strong feeling for landscape and was at the same time one of the most admirable figure-painters of our day. He is a master of color and of intense, picturesque expression.

I like Mr. Irving's humor. I like it immensely. It fascinates, it genuinely amuses me. It is a very individual and grotesque sort of humor. I never saw anything like it before and never expect to again. The more Mr. Irving gives me of his humor, the better I am pleased. "Jingle" races on so merrily, with such

a quick and saucy wit, that it is all over in the crack of a whip. I like the humor of Mr. Irving's *Mephistophiles*. The conception of the part is open to criticism. That uncertain-stepping, much-illuminated harlequin-devil seldom really scares me; but I often greatly admire his picturesqueness and sometimes his unearthly dignity, as when he warns his creature Faust, "I am a spirit!"—the finest piece of acting in the play; and I am entertained by his impish, satanic waggishness. It is, moreover, the humor of Irving's *Louis XI.* that adds force and humanity to the part.

In fact, I would almost wish Mr. Irving to play only a certain sort of comedy, did I not remember with what expressiveness he can interpret, in his own peculiar way, ideas of tragic intensity. Salvini is my ideal of tragedy—of perfection in detail and of sublimity in feeling. Two actors more unlike than Salvini and Irving cannot be named. But along with my most ineffaceable tragic impressions are certain memories of Irving—in "The Bells," in "Hamlet." But, no; it was not Irving, it was *Shylock* himself that I saw one night in Venice,—hunted, foiled, perplexed, dismayed; his sinister face and form sublimed for the moment by the shadow of all the woe and wrong wrought upon that race, which, in the language of Emma Lazarus, has "served through history as the type of suffering."

I like, it seems, many things about Mr. Irving aside from his managerial rôle; but I like him because he has brought before English and American audiences the world-tragedy of "Faust." He has led, as no one else has led, the English-speaking people, "the masses," to the study of Goethe's immortal poem. He has, in his own way, put a version of this work effectively upon the stage. It is right that the version and the way should be gravely reviewed, and that exceptions should be taken to them; but the obligation to Mr. Irving for what he has actually accomplished in this play, and in his whole interesting career as actor and manager in the Old World and the New, must never be lost sight of. It is for the serious, intellectual aims and accomplishments of his career that I like Mr. Irving; and, let me add, I like him too for letting us in America see, and see again, so individual and delightful an actress as Miss Ellen Terry,—one who so gracefully complements the sterner and more graphic qualities of the leading English-speaking actor-manager of our time.

G.

Miss Terry as Gretchen.

FROM Mr. Irving's production of "Faust" I brought away the deepest impression of the art value of Miss Terry's impersonation of the heroine. By her emotional genius she seemed to heighten the spiritual sig-

nificance of the play. In the scene where the jewels are found, her simplicity divested the gewgaw motive of worldly taint; and at the crowning point of the action, kneeling before the Mater Dolorosa, she reached a height of human despair and devotional fervor which for its rarity on the stage and its spiritual elevation might well be noted as the greatest achievement of this remarkable actress. Coming after such a supreme revelation of human feeling, the closing scene of madness and death has in some degree the elements of an anticlimax, while the tableau at the end relieves by enforcing the sentiment of forgiveness and rest.

B.

"Lynching."

In an open letter on the above subject published in the November number of this magazine, the writer says:

The number of reported murders in the United States in 1882 was 1266. There were only 93 persons executed and 118 lynched,—in all, 211. Consequently, . . . 1055 criminals escaped.

Judge James A. Creighton of Springfield, Ill., objects to this statement on the ground that all degrees of homicide are here classed as murders, and that the writer has made no mention of the very large number of the 1055 criminals who have been sentenced to imprisonment for terms ranging from one to ninety-nine years, or for life, according to the degree of guilt.

He also objects to calling the 118 who were lynched "escaped criminals," saying that lynching is not resorted to by men who have lost patience because criminals have escaped punishment under the law, but by men excited by aggravated cases of crime not murder, in which the law would in all probability have taken its course.

Henry A. Davis of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, writes in relation to the same article as follows: "In no single State of the Union is a murderer punishable capitally unless the murder was willful, deliberate, and premeditated,—that is, unless the act was done with the fixed design and premeditated intent to take life, or was done in the attempt to commit some atrocious felony. So it will be seen that Dr. Deems's statistics, showing only the number of homicides, capital and otherwise, on the one hand, and the number of executions on the other hand, can have no value in showing what proportion of murderers were legally punished. A murder to be punishable capitally must not only be a willful, deliberate, and premeditated killing, but every element of such offense must be shown beyond a reasonable doubt."



TOPICS OF THE TIME.

"English as She is Taught."

WHEN last year, in the April number of this magazine, "English as She is Taught" was published, and editorial notice of the article was taken, it was hoped that something for the good of the schools might come from the discussion. Unfortunately, not many of the letters received have been of a character to justify the faith. They have been, as a rule, either hopelessly acquiescent or helplessly resentful. Many teachers have sent us similar lists of answers, but few have made suggestions; others have admitted that such lists might be made by any teacher, but protest against the conclusions drawn from them. The range of protestation has been wide, and some fierce minds have even accused us of attempting to overthrow the public-school system of the country and of unpatriotic criticism of one of the elements of our national greatness.

Tacitly, and often irritably, the teachers who have taken exception to "English as She is Taught" have recognized the fact that it is not the child, but the system and, indirectly, the teacher that these examination-results bear most severely against. Briefly stated, the main points of their arguments run in this wise: Such answers as Miss Le Row has collected—annotated by Mark Twain in "English as She is Taught"—are valueless, because they can in no sense be considered representative of the character of the work done in our public schools. They are, they claim, the attempts of exceptionally dull or careless pupils; of pupils absorbed in thoughts of sport or completely unnerved by the examination; or of those few found in every school who have a genius for misapprehension and misstatement. Instruction in our schools, they say, is of necessity given by classes, and examination-papers must have reference to the average capability or advancement of the class examined. In each class may be found pupils of all degrees of capacity, individuality, and environment, and the surprising results of Miss Le Row's collection must be ascribed to the incompletely assimilated elements in these incongruous masses. Therefore, they add, in order to obtain from examination-papers any trustworthy information as to the quality of the teaching, one must take into consideration all the answers of the child who makes one absurd error, and the answers of his classmates, and must know, besides, the temper and condition of the children's minds.

All this is true, but it does not entirely satisfy. Now, at the very beginning, it may be admitted that the public schools have many difficulties with which to contend. In the city there is overcrowding; in the country there is a multiplicity of classes. This demands too great an amount of mere police duty of the teacher, and renders individual teaching, with too great ambition, impossible. Straightway mechanical methods creep in, and the child is treated as one of an average, and not as an

individual. So this assumption becomes the foundation-stone of our public-school system,—that what one can do another must. The practical result is, that if the same work cannot be done by all, the next best thing is to appear to do it. So long as a teacher feels that his reputation, popularity, and position depend in a great measure upon his ability to "pass" nearly all of his class, the temptation to promote thoroughly incompetent pupils, from motives of policy or cowardice, or from a desire to get rid of stupid or troublesome pupils, is too strong to be wholly disregarded in considering the causes of failure in the working of our school system.* Now, much as may be said of the share of the dull and careless pupil in the poor work of Miss Le Row's collection, it is painfully apparent that the questions are too ambitious and that the children are beyond their depth. No one who has watched our schools in the past ten years can fail to note the influence of a growing class of teachers who are working out results that are steadily becoming better and better; but improvements in our schools have too often been the heaping of accretion upon accretion, the multiplying of studies. We attempt too much; we strive for all knowledge, and we load childhood with a jargon of confused facts and theories that disciplines nothing, that effects nothing, that is forgotten as soon as the brilliant hour of its parrot-like repetition has passed. The truth is that most of what we teach is simply thrown away; and, were it not for the negative evils that keep step with all this misdirected direction, it would not matter. We have too little sense of proportion, and entirely lose sight of the fact that thought and expression should be the first qualities to develop in a pupil. The child—not examinations, not promotions, not courses of study—should be the objective point in all teaching. Develop habits of strict attention, and you have gone far towards developing powers of thought and quick comprehension.

The fatal element about such answers as, "*Mendacious*, what can be mended," and "*Parasite*, the murder of an infant," is, that the words are but sounds to the child, and the effort to express them and their meanings is but a dull, unreasoning groping after a set of sounds committed to memory in a perfunctory way. And in the answer, "The chyle flows up the middle of the backbone and reaches the heart, where it meets the oxygen and is purified," it is evident that the pupil has no understanding of the matter, though it is manifest that he has gone through the form of studying the subject. He is simply the victim of a stupid theory that we are trying to harbor; namely, that a wide acquaintance with facts and phenomena means education, and that examination-papers are the highest expressions of culture. A wise man might be glad to know that a boy of his, in a walk with him through the fields, could correctly name the beech and

*See "The Public-School Problem," in "Open Letters."

the white-oak, could spy out greenstone and granite, and could tell which was snakeroot and which saxifrage, or name the bird whose song was heard in the green hedge beyond, if his knowledge were the natural growth of healthy methods; and if he found that his words were to the point and his sentences well constructed and idiomatic, that he knew his vocabulary thoroughly and could write it automatically, unhampered by ignorance of words or expressions, he would have but a large and kindly fellow-feeling for him if he knew that he had defined quaternions as "a religious convention held every hundred years," and he would certainly wonder why a child were asked such a question; and if he found that the boy had been taught to think, and bore himself well, he would not be greatly troubled if he knew nothing about the chyle, and had a very fleeting knowledge of Chaucer and Addison. Now, it would be well enough to let the boy learn of Chaucer and Addison, of Bryant and Byron, and the host of other names of whom he had committed dreary and barren paragraphs, if it were the beginning that would lead him up to literature and wide reading. But too often it is the end, so far as public-school teaching goes. There is no beyond to such teaching. It bears with it a sense of completeness; it incites to nothing; it is content with low results and incompleteness; it has no high aims; it is satisfied with itself.

The Growing Independence of American Journalism.

WHILE there are phases of current journalism which are discouraging, there are others which are most hopeful. Chief among these is the remarkable development of the spirit of independence. Until comparatively recent times the party newspaper — and every political journal in the old days was a party newspaper — was an organ, which made it a part of its regular business to praise every action of its own side and to condemn whatever was done by the opposition. To admit that the other party had nominated an unexceptionable candidate, or had taken a praiseworthy position on some issue, was a thing not to be thought of.

The course of the press since the advent of the present Administration at Washington shows that a change has occurred which amounts almost to a revolution. We have only to refer to the support given by a large part of the Republican press to certain of President Cleveland's vetoes during the Forty-ninth Congress. There has been remarkable independence, too, among Republican party papers in the reception of the views of the President on the surplus as given in his Message to the Fiftieth Congress.

The Southern press, being very largely Democratic, has not had such opportunity as that of the North for the display of fairness towards a political opponent in the White House. But the leading newspapers in the South have manifested of late years a spirit of independence quite as striking and even more creditable. Throughout the whole period of the renaissance in that region the conductors of the chief journals, as a rule, have been far in advance of their readers. They early saw that the new South must learn the necessity and dignity of labor; that it must drop the "code," and abandon the false social theory upon which the code was based; that it must make the education of blacks

as well as whites the corner-stone of its future, and must tax itself to provide schools for the children of the men and women whom under slavery it had been a crime to teach the alphabet. To a large element in their constituency — in some cases, at first, probably to a majority — this was an unwelcome gospel, which it required no little courage and faith to preach. It is now so generally accepted that we are in danger of forgetting that there has really been a revolution in public sentiment throughout a great region within a score of years, and that the chief element in bringing it about so quickly has been the independence of a small number of journalists, who were brave enough to speak frankly to those upon whom they depended for support.

It is thus evident that a spirit of real independence characterizes the press of the whole country more generally now than at any previous time in our history. Discouraging as certain manifestations of journalism may appear, they are offset by this pronounced drift in the right direction of the underlying motives of action.

American Architecture in English Eyes.

"THE progress of American architecture has been remarkable within the last few years, and though there is much that is bad, vulgar, and pretentious, it has begun to exhibit artistic and peculiar features of a very high order. The best specimens are scholarly and refined in detail, but adhere less slavishly to precedent than European work. New combinations are introduced, dictated by, and growing out of, the necessities of the building, without violating the character of the style. The best work is accordingly living and interesting — less the production of a dry-as-dust archæology, and more in accordance with the true principles of all great architecture."

These words sound like an echo of many that have already been printed in these pages, but gain a new significance from the fact that they were spoken by an Englishman and an architect. At the annual meeting of the Royal Institute of British Architects in March, 1886, Mr. John B. Gass, an Associate of the Institute, submitted full reports upon the architectural works which he had seen during a recent trip through the United States and Canada, and exhibited a collection of pictures representing many among them. He also read a paper in which the results of his observations were summarized, and it is from an abstract of this (as published in the Institute's official report) that the foregoing sentences have been quoted. The mere fact that his journey had been thought worth making speaks a great deal for the growing reputation of American art; for he made it, not as a tourist seeking private pleasure, but as the holder for 1885 of the Godwin Bursary — a prize which entails upon its recipient the obligation to study for a time foreign works of sufficient importance to promise that his report shall be of interest and profit to the profession at large.

Most of Mr. Gass's address was devoted to the consideration of American methods of construction, to which he gave great praise, especially as regarded fire-proof construction and systems of ventilation. In the discussion which followed, and in which several eminent architects took part, his views in regard to these matters were echoed with emphasis. Mr.

John Slater, for example, remarked: "It appears to me that with regard to the structural methods of America there is a boldness, a thoroughness, a directness of aim, and lack of conventionality which are extremely refreshing. Whether the same lack of conventionality on the art side is a success is open to question, but as to the structural part there can be no doubt of the success attained"; and Professor Kerr said: "With regard to ingenious construction the Americans, in their own language, beat all creation. The whole population of America seems to grasp the necessity for new inventions, and when an invention is brought to bear fully upon any requirement it seems to be done, not in the rough-and-ready way as we are too much accustomed to think it is, but in a precise and practical way which, to my judgment, shows the Anglo-Saxon intellect at its very best. . . . I have no doubt in my own mind that in the course of the next generation American inventors in respect of building will do a great deal, for there is a great deal to be done. We seem in this country to be too much trammelled with old traditions; we do not seem to get beyond the instruction that we received at school. The Americans throw all that to the winds and strike out for themselves."

As regards the purely aesthetic side of American art there was less unanimity of almost unmixed praise. But enough praise was here also given to fill us with a righteous pride. Most of the speakers had visited America themselves, and spoke, therefore, with full knowledge of the relative proportion which our good works bear to our bad, and of the rate of speed at which the former are increasing. Mr. Thomas M. Rickman remarked: "Seeing the buildings in Canada and the United States, one sees in all their phases a very great change from the architecture of this country. One sees the survivalism which we have here, which has been transplanted, and also buildings in every style corresponding to our own; but one also sees, when one gets to the United States, a class of buildings altogether different. There architects have thrown aside survivalism and have worked according to their own ideas. Now, one thing I noticed when there was, that, though there were buildings most objectionable according to any canon of taste, one was not so much struck with the *bizarrierie* of their appearance as was to be expected." The President of the Institute, Mr. Ewen Christian, spoke in a similar strain: "Nobody can pass through any city of America without learning at every step. He will see much that will disgust him, no doubt, because people who go ahead in the way the Americans do, do a great many things that we should be ashamed of here in matters of art. But the impression that I derived from what I saw in America was that there was a great revolution going on, that a great deal of bad work had been done, but that there was a foundation of good work laid, and that a grand future was before its architects."

"With regard to Mr. Richardson's work" (which naturally had received the chief share of praise from more than one speaker), the President added, "I was never more surprised in my life than when I saw the tower of the church that he built at Boston. It is a tower that is a real pleasure to look upon on account of its enormous mass. It must be double the size of any tower with which I am acquainted that has been erected in modern times in England. . . . It is not a

lofty tower, but its grand square mass is very striking indeed. Then the plan of the church itself is very good. . . . I cannot say that I agree with Mr. Gass as to the details, because I do not think them up to the mark; but it is a question of growth. American art is a giant that has grown rather too rapidly, and therefore there is not the amount of finish about it that there should be." As against these last phrases, however, we may quote Mr. R. Phené Spiers, who called especial attention to the photographs of Mr. Richardson's Harvard Law School, saying that they "contain a large amount of original and peculiar refinement mixed with extreme breadth and boldness of treatment. It would have been impossible," he continued, "for an English architect to have dared to go to that extent; he would have had against him all the criticisms of all those who are afraid of sinning against the laws of recognized archæology. I remember I could not help thinking that when Professor Ware went home he would be in one sense a happy man, because he would be able to found a style upon principles; his pupils would not always be bound by precedent, and he would be able to bring materials into use which we find it difficult to do in England. That has been borne out, I think, in the work of his pupils."

Not the least welcome part of the praise given by various speakers is that which refers to this same point of education. One gentleman said that he heard Mr. Richardson was not only producing exceedingly good work himself, but "doing one of the most useful things that can be done for American architecture in that he is training in his office men who will worthily succeed him"; and another referred to the course of study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, because it seemed to him that "the student in that country has before him an opportunity of acquiring which is wanting here. . . . They are a young nation and we are an old one, yet they have done infinitely more" [in respect to providing thorough courses of training].

The degree to which we recognize the necessity for supplementing home instruction by foreign study and travel was also commented upon with approval, and many judicious references were made to the strong influence which French architecture has had upon American in recent years. In some instances, however, the extent of this influence was exaggerated — as, for example, with regard to Mr. Richardson, who owed France an enormous debt for the thorough training which he received in her schools, but chose to owe her modern art a very small debt as regarded the conceptions, features, and details which he put to use in his subsequent work.

It has seemed worth while to quote these verdicts here because, as regards matters of art at least, we are still timid in estimating our own successes — we are still too apt to appreciate them and believe in their prophecies only in proportion as they are indorsed by foreign critics. Many Americans certainly now appreciate the exceptional excellence of our best recent buildings, the exceptional talent of our foremost architects, and the rapid way in which their influence is spreading through the profession at large. But the public as a whole does not appreciate them, intrinsically considered, and is very far from knowing how great is their excellence when judged by the standards set by contemporary work abroad. The praise of these distinguished

Englishmen may therefore do a useful work among us ; but at least as useful a work ought to be done by the sentences of blame with which it was interspersed.

It would be well, for instance, if we should give ear to the note of warning struck by one speaker, who referred to Mr. Gass's statement that when he went to examine the ventilating-shafts which we had so cleverly constructed, he most often found them all closed up. It would be well, too, if we could realize the pity of the fact that, despite most excellent opportunities for study, "the Americans cannot bear to go slowly. They will not give the time for studying which they ought to do." But it would be still better if we could distinctly realize and determine to remedy an unfortunate state of affairs to which the President of the Institute referred as "the universal tendency to jobbery" in public work. This he truly affirmed to be the most damaging thing with which we have to contend in our public buildings. "At Chicago," he explained, "I saw a great building in progress, and I do not know how many architects had been employed upon it. When the Government changes the architect changes, and the consequence is you get all kinds of styles mixed up, and a building which ought to be a fine one is utterly discreditable. There is only one comfort—that in a place like Chicago, where they think more of business than of beauty, they cover up the whole façade with such a net-work of telegraph and telephone wires that you cannot see it. This tendency to jobbery is a very serious matter for architecture: we are not entirely free from it in this country, but we are freer from it than they are."

In conclusion, a fact may be referred to which our visitors overlooked, or the unfortunate nature of which they were not in a position to understand. It is not only jobbery in municipal and State architecture which makes our public buildings inferior as a class to those built by private enterprise. It is not only because the architect of the United States Government is changed from time to time that the works for which that Government is responsible are so often discreditable. The whole system by means of which the Government manages such matters is a bad one—bad not merely in the sense that it is not always well administered, but in the sense that it cannot be so administered as to result in an average of works which would rightly represent the standing of American architecture to-day. Until the system is radically changed—until the architectural business of the United States Government is put upon such a basis that it will tempt the hands of our very best architects, and will permit that many of them shall join in devoting to it a portion of their time—until this good day comes, American *citizens* may feel sure of being as well served (if they wish) as any individuals in the world, but the American *people* must be content with a worse service than any other nation accepts. It must be satisfied to put itself on record as too blind or too indifferent to see and appreciate and secure a quality of work which year by year excites an ever-growing admiration among our foreign visitors. It must submit to perpetuate the sins of a past generation of architects when it might be giving immense assistance to the virtues of the generation which is now at work and of those others which are to follow in its steps, if we may trust our English critics, with still greater freedom of effort and power and skill.

Landscape Gardening and Forestry.

A FEW months ago we spoke in these columns of the status and needs of the landscape-gardener's art in America. A little later we drew attention to the relative value of native and foreign trees for American planting. In both cases we believed that the subject would prove as interesting to the public as it certainly was important, and in both our belief has been justified. Many letters have come to us asking where further information could be obtained. Perhaps the most welcome have been those which showed a desire on the writers' part to study landscape gardening with a view to its professional practice. As was said before, few professions offer so good a future to the young American of to-day. There are few in which laborers are so scarce and in which a growing demand for intelligent labor is so clearly promised. The renewed interest with which New York City has turned to the improvement of its partly completed parks and to the establishment of others is but one hopeful sign among very many. The success of Tuxedo Park has already led to the projecting of other suburban resorts of the kind. A scheme is on foot in Boston to redeem the islands in the harbor from the deplorable state of nudity to which they have gradually been reduced. In Boston also and in many Western towns new parks are under way. Everywhere there seems to be a nascent desire to preserve or to restore the beauty of the water-fronts of cities. And to those who keep a keen eye upon such matters, private owners as well as corporations seem to be taking a new interest in the art. Senator Stanford, for instance, in establishing his great university for California has chosen a rural site, and has associated Mr. Olmsted with his architects in its arrangement; and the same artist's services were demanded not long ago for so purely utilitarian a scheme as the building of a new hotel near Salt Lake City.

One of the most encouraging facts to be mentioned, however, as affecting both the subjects discussed in our previous articles is the recent establishment in New York of a weekly journal devoted to the interest of horticulture, forestry, and landscape gardening. It is not a botanical journal properly so-called; but the name of its editor—Professor C. S. Sargent of Harvard University—guarantees scientific accuracy to all its presentations of facts, and its special departments have been intrusted to gentlemen as well entitled to confidence as he. Its discussion of flowers, shrubs, and trees will supply a necessary basis for its discussion of the forest interests of the country and of the artistic aspects of the gardener's art. There is no place in America where this art can be studied as a whole. There is no place where preparatory teaching in its problems can be obtained except the office of one of the few artists who practice it with success. The books which relate to it are not very numerous and are sometimes hard to get, and the best of them are in foreign tongues. We have had no medium for popular instruction with regard to our existing forests or to questions of economic tree-planting, and no recognized organ for bringing such subjects to the notice of our legislators. All these wants "Garden and Forest" gives good promise of meeting in so far as they can be met by printed words. We have therefore called attention to it as the best way of answering our numerous correspondents.

OPEN LETTERS.

Longfellow on International Copyright.

FROM A LETTER TO MR. WILLIAM DULLES, JR., DATED OCTOBER 8, 1878.

* * * Whatever is just, is
for the benefit of all; and I
wish we could have a Law
providing, between England
and America, that "a Copy-
right taken out in either
country shall be equally
valid in both." * * *

Yours very truly
Henry W. Longfellow.

The Public-School Problem.

THE statement is made editorially by THE CENTURY, "We need [in our public schools] less ambition and more thoroughness; less of the *what* and more of the *why*," and the question is asked, "Who is to teach the American people this?" My answer is, that a large part of the people are already convinced of it. If the genuine evils of the present system can be shown still more plainly and a remedy for them suggested, surely the progressive American spirit may be trusted to apply it.

One of the best instructors in the country asserts that "in no work to-day is there so much quackery as in the so-called educational work of the schools."

Of what is the public-school system accused? As Herbert Spencer forcibly states it, "The wrong things are taught at the wrong time and in the wrong way." Whether this sweeping assertion is entirely true or not, it is certainly true that our schools teach too many things at the same time, even if — which is not the case — every one of them was taught as it should be.

There is no time given in our schools to the development of a strong and symmetrical body; no time to allow the reasoning faculties to draw the breath of

life; no time for anything but to crowd the memory with facts, the *why* of them all being as utterly unknown to the pupil as it is to the wooden desk upon which he piles his many books.

There is no need to argue the statement that the health of many children suffers in this process of holding the metaphorical nose and pouring instruction down the metaphorical throat. Why should the word of the majority of parents, teachers, and physicians be doubted? Because a child does not drop dead or have a fit on the spot, it does not follow that he is uninjured. Even ignoring all physical evils resulting from this cause, what vast and dreadful mental damage is done him by the starvation of his reasoning faculties in proportion to the stuffing of his memory, by requiring him to grapple with many subjects, some beyond his intellectual strength, and even, under such circumstances, to do the work of a year in six months' time!

Teachers are not responsible for this state of things. They are, in common with their pupils, the victims of this great crime — "the assassination of intellect." Teachers work for wages as do the other laboring classes of the community, and in this special pro-

fession the supply is always in excess of the demand. The overworked and discouraged teacher has her choice of evils,—to resign her position and with it her bread and butter, or to keep it and make the best of a bad matter.

The remedy for this condition of affairs lies in the creation of a public sentiment against the universal and destructive "cramming" process. Let a strong public sentiment demand a reform in this matter, and the reform will follow as surely as the earth will continue to revolve upon its axis.

The courses of study for our public schools and the amount of time to be given to each branch are planned by committees, trustees, and boards of education. Generally they are the most influential and honored men of the community. They spend gratuitously much time and labor in the interests of the schools. But it is not enough that they should be moral and "well-meaning" men. They should comprehend the duties required and possess the necessary sort of ability for their performance. The overseers of these great mental mills should at least be as familiar with their workings, and as good judges of the quality of the material produced, as the foreman of a woolen factory would be. It is a stupid and illogical procedure to elect to such positions men who, though they may be skillful manufacturers or successful merchants, know little or nothing of the laws of mental development, and possess no practical knowledge of school-room work.

Caroline B. Le Row.

Mind Training.

IS IT not plain, in order that the student of average ability shall obtain the power and intelligence that is expected, in view of her so-called advantages, that either the years spent at school must be extended, or some more efficient methods of acquiring knowledge must be employed? As to the former, every teacher of private schools knows that no more time will be allowed. The years granted to the school-girl are grudgingly given, and often from these much time is pilfered by social distractions.

Persuaded that some *direct means* must be found for the development of more intelligent and efficient working power, and aided by the observation and experience gained in contact with the minds of nearly two thousand pupils, I was led to conclude that the power our pupils need lies in *the ability to concentrate the attention*. Then arose the question, How may the powers of perception and of concentration be gained at school, and made to become habits of the mind? Plainly, in no other way than by regular and systematic training to this end. Then was formulated a variety of exercises, to be practiced by the pupils from ten to twenty minutes each day, with no effort at learning or memorizing, although these would be attained, but solely to the end of acquiring the power of attention.

To insure *quickness and accuracy in seeing*, the reversible blackboard may be made a valuable auxiliary. A collection of figures, groups of circles or marks for unconscious counting, lists of words, and long sentences may each be presented for an instant, and the pupils be required to write or to repeat precisely what they have seen.

These exercises, it must be understood, are as distinct and apart from the work of learning lessons as are gymnastic exercises from the habits which follow their use, and, like such physical exercises, are to be considered only as means to an end.

Various and multiform are the means to which the awakened teacher may resort to quicken the minds of her pupils, and to obtain that all-important result of attention—accuracy in seeing and hearing. One of the most renowned of French educators was accustomed to require the boys under his charge to run with all speed past the shop windows of the streets, and on returning to write the names of all the articles exposed to view. It has been proved that the power to concentrate the attention may be cultivated and strengthened to such a degree, the mind becoming more and more obedient to the will, that pupils thus prepared are able to learn lessons, within their comprehension, in less than one-half of the time formerly required.

I venture to assert that a very large part of the time spent in studying lessons in school and at home is wasted for lack of early training to habits of perception and attention.

Instead of vexing the mind of the delinquent with persistent questioning, for the mere sake of "hearing the lesson," an endeavor as hopeless as that of trying to pump water from an empty cistern, let the teacher first make clear the meaning of the lesson, emphasizing with marked distinctness the principal points; this done, require the learner either to write or to repeat the precise words, or words of the same meaning, which she has just heard. This requirement, be it understood, is not for the sake of committing the words to memory, but is a means of holding the pupil's entire attention until she has full possession of the lesson to be learned. To know that the results must be produced at once will stimulate the dullest mind to its full measure of activity, and in the effort to recall the exact meaning, and the corresponding words, all other issues must be laid aside: the teacher is calling her to a quick account, and there is no escape.

The teacher will find it expedient to set apart, each day, short periods of time, varying in length from ten to twenty minutes, according to the age of her pupils, for the single purpose of developing and strengthening those faculties which will, at last, enable them to study, according to the true meaning of the word.

In order to show how much may be accomplished by training the mind to *accuracy in hearing*, when the power of attention has been acquired, some examples, by way of results, are here given. In my school were assembled about forty girls from fourteen to eighteen years of age. A poem by Wordsworth, consisting of twenty-four lines, was perfectly recited by the entire class in seven minutes; the teacher, as is her invariable rule, read each verse once only. An extract of seventeen lines from one of Charles Lamb's stories was accurately repeated after nine minutes. Twenty-one lines read from Washington Irving's "Sketch Book" were instantly reproduced without an error.

A part of the description of the battle of Waterloo by Victor Hugo was read aloud once, and the listeners immediately recalled thirty-six lines, or four hundred and sixteen words, precisely as they had heard them; and this was done without the least mental strain. The power had been acquired by a slow and

systematic process of training, lasting but a few minutes at once.

Many specimens of good literature have been learned in a minute portion of the time which would be found necessary to the untrained student.

It is undeniably true that the mind retains longest that to which it gives the closest attention; therefore, it need be no matter of astonishment that the pupils are able to recall selections, or lessons, thus learned, after months or even years have passed.

Classes in history, literature, and art have been conducted with little use of text-books. There have been readings, lectures, and familiar talks on the part of the teacher, the oral method having been found to impart more of the substance to be learned than the pupil could gain from the mere study of the book. Many examples might be given proving the efficacy of a system which strives to develop to the fullest extent, in each individual, the power of attention and concentration.

With this important part of the mental machinery in efficient working condition, the judicious teacher, ever watchful of the physical welfare of the youth intrusted to her care, will gladly dispense with many brain-wearying hours for her pupils, and will rejoice in being able to afford them sufficient time for play and physical development. She will not insist upon a verbal recitation, in order that she may "hear a lesson," but will require of the scholars an oral or written account of what has been learned in listening to her instructions, and as the result of their own research and observation.

In a school where the pupils are daily exercised to the end of securing habits of attention, much time will be economized, more instruction will be imparted, fewer text-books will be used, a clearer and broader intelligence will be secured, by direct contact with the teacher's mind; and last, but by no means least, a truer sympathy will exist between teacher and pupil.

Catharine Aiken.

The Education of the Blind.

A REPLY.

It is in no spirit of controversy, but from a feeling that the schools and institutions for the blind are placed in a false light, that I enter a protest against certain sentiments expressed in the "Open Letter" entitled "The Blind as Students," in the November CENTURY.

After the faint praise of the opening sentence we are told that the schools "are fearfully one-sided in their training, lamentably limited in their scope." First, let us see what their scope is. That of one, according to the words of the director, taken from its prospectus, is, "in all cases to fit them [the pupils] for usefulness in life, and for maintaining themselves, if necessary, by their own efforts"; of another, "to furnish to the blind children of the State the best known facilities for acquiring a thorough education, and to train them in some useful profession or manual art, by which they may be enabled to contribute to their own support after leaving the institution." There seems to be nothing "lamentably limited" thus far, and these are but specimens of many which might be cited.

Just what is meant by their being "fearfully one-

sided in their training" is not made very clear. They are charged with conducting to "blindisms," such as "snapping the fingers to indicate the position of the extended hand when about to exchange a friendly greeting or pass an object." How it may have been in time past I am unable to say, but in an experience of three years' teaching, and having witnessed their greetings and hand-shakings scores of times, I have never yet noticed the "snapping of fingers," nor until the perusal of Mr. Perry's letter had I heard of such an expedient. On the other hand, however, I have known cases where pupils have come to the school with "blindisms" acquired at home, such as moving the body and making grotesque motions with the hands and arms, which gradually disappeared under the timely and friendly admonitions of teachers and the influence of their new companions, many of whom have gone through the same experience and are on the lookout for these peculiarities in new-comers.

It is true that not all is accomplished that might be wished, but the same is true of the public schools. The course of study pursued in the schools for the blind with which I am acquainted is at least equal to that up to and including the ordinary high school.

Last year a lady, known as a lecturer in an adjoining State, visited a class of blind in algebra. After listening to the recitation, which consisted in solving problems of two and three unknown quantities, from books printed in the ordinary raised type, the time spent in the learning of which Mr. Perry considers "wholly wasted," she told them that they recited as well as any seeing scholars she ever heard. A young man from the same school last year entered a theological seminary, passing the required examination without a single "condition," while several other candidates, some of whom were college graduates, were "conditioned" on two or more subjects. I give these merely as examples of what the institutions are doing educationally. I would not discourage the education of the blind in the public schools, as the writer recommends, if it were practicable. But we must take the facts as they are, and as the case now stands it is unquestionably impracticable. Of this, however, it is not my purpose now to speak.

We are told that our methods are "slow and clumsy." It is only fair to judge of the methods by the results. The young man referred to was congratulated upon his successful examination by a seeing classmate, who said, "If my college had done for me what your little school has for you, I should be satisfied." It is further objected that "the competition at such institutions is always and in every department only with those hampered by a like disadvantage," and that the pupil "needs the constant spur to his pride of seeing those about him accomplishing more in less time, to stimulate his ambition." What stimulus can there be to the ambition of a pupil capable of learning a lesson from one or two readings, in surrounding him with children who, "with fingers crammed into their ears, buzz over a lesson of three pages for the fifteenth time"?

The efficiency of wooden maps and globes in teaching geography is admitted; but "an excellent substitute may be furnished by any friend at home who will carefully trace the outlines of maps in a common atlas." "Whatever these contrivances lack, the native ingenuity and aptitude of the pupil must supply." This is

followed by the sage remark that "after all, the stimulating of these is of far more value than any number of facts or theories crammed into his brain by patent processes." Why should not this hold as true for the "clumsy methods" of the schools in question? Why should the writer take into consideration, at all, the methods of instruction if, as he further says of the pupil, "it is what he is, and not what he is taught, that makes him a success or a failure"? A casual reader would be led to infer that a school for the blind assumes to take in hand any "individual under thirty" and turn him out a "finished specimen of its educational excellence." As, however, the school age is usually placed at from six to twenty years, it will be seen that this does not fall within its "scope."

In short, Mr. Perry, notwithstanding his characterization of the methods pursued in the schools as "clumsy," recommends, especially in the home, the use of the Braille-board for writing, maps in relief, and the type-board for arithmetical calculations.

These constitute in effect nearly all the apparatus, designed specially for the blind used in the schools, with the exception that here their use is directed by experienced teachers.

J. T. Morey.

PERKINS INSTITUTION FOR THE BLIND, SO. BOSTON, MASS.

The American of the Future.

IT has been observed that the bulk of American citizens now engaged in the attempt to free labor from the tyranny of capital were not born in this country; and this fact has been mentioned as if, in some way, it cast a reflection upon the expediency or wisdom of the attempt in question. Native-born Americans, it is urged, trained from birth and by inheritance in the traditions of American independence and in the principles of the Constitution of the United States, would never lend themselves to such "foreign" and aggressive measures as the boycott, the strike, and the bomb. This position, however, will be found upon examination to be both logically and morally indefensible. In the first place, it is much to be doubted whether one native-born American in ten could repeat from memory a single clause of the Constitution of his country; and this ignorance bears practical point in the uncomplaining submission with which most native-born Americans endure insolence, imposition, and robbery that would stimulate to rebellion the least warlike denizens of the effete monarchies of Europe. Our foreign-born population, on the other hand, especially those of recent importation, are still instinct with something of the same enthusiasm for liberty and for having their own way which distinguished the Pilgrims of 1620 and the patriots of 1776; they have not yet succumbed to the apathy and timidity which seem inseparable from a prolonged residence in the land of the free. It is not the descendants of the "Mayflower," in short, who are the representative Americans of the present day; it is the Micks and the Pats, the Hanses and the Wilhelms, redolent still of the dudgeon and the sauerkraut barrel; and it is to them that a prudent public sentiment will intrust the reins of power and the destinies of the republic. Nor should we stop here. There is a further step to be taken; one which the increasing enlighten-

ment of this age will be certain, sooner or later, to force upon us. America, unlike all other countries of the world, is an idea rather than a place; a moral rather than a geographical expression. It is not so much the land, as the principle, of Freedom. To be an American, therefore, it is by no means necessary to be an inhabitant of the United States. In a higher and truer sense, an American is a man of European birth, who renders himself obnoxious to the land or social proprieties of his birthplace. And since, as has been shown, the genuine American spirit deteriorates in direct ratio with the length of the individual's residence in America, it follows that the most genuine Americanism must be that which has been free from this enervating influence altogether. If this reasoning be valid, an amendment to the Constitution should be introduced without delay, providing that no person of American birth or descent should be allowed to hold any political or public office in the United States; that the most recent immigrants should be intrusted with the most controlling offices of government; and that no man shall be eligible for the Presidency unless he can prove that he is an outlaw in his own country, and that he has never set foot in this.

Julian Hawthorne.

Christian Union.

IN reading the profoundly interesting second paper on the "United Churches of the United States," in the December CENTURY, I was struck by the omission of all reference to an episcopal church (probably on account of its numerical weakness) which, owing to its peculiar history, would have been deserving of mention in Professor Shields's scholarly essay. I refer to the Moravian Episcopal Church, with its historical name of *Unitas Fratrum*. Taking its rise in the forces set in motion by the Bohemian-Moravian Reformation of Huss in the fifteenth century, and experiencing a renewal under German influences in the eighteenth century, it possesses the oldest Protestant historic episcopate, antedating the Anglican, continuing in an unbroken succession to the present day from 1467, at which time the episcopate was obtained from the Romish Church through the medium of two Waldensian bishops, regularly consecrated by Roman prelates. After a searching examination, the church was legally acknowledged as an "Ancient Episcopal Church" by an act of the English Parliament in 1749, and thus, so far as I know, is the only church whose clergy is officially acknowledged by the Anglican church.

So early as 1840 the late Right Rev. B. B. Smith, the then Presiding (Anglican) Bishop of Kentucky, proposed an organic union between the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches through the medium of Moravian ordination, *i. e.*, that the Methodist clergy were to be ordained by Moravian bishops, as "this was an episcopate which both churches acknowledged." The two Wesleys, John and Charles, were converted through the instrumentality of the Moravian bishop Peter Boehler.

The Moravian Church, while admitting of the greatest freedom of worship, has a rich scriptural liturgy, which, with its pure historic episcopate, it prizes as its richest treasure.

Although historically an episcopal church, its government is largely synodical and confederal, and thus presents an example of a church combining these two forms of government.

It has from its origin always been of strong union tendencies, and of a truly catholic spirit, ever recognizing, even in times of prevalent bigotry, all sister churches, and standing in friendly relations with them where they would let it. It possesses this same spirit to day, and hails with delight all signs of union in the great denominations of our country, for its churchly watch-word has ever been the high-priestly prayer of Christ, "that they may be one."

Paul de Schweinitz.

MEDFIELD, MINN.

To the Deaf.

THE conditions and troubles of defective hearing may not interest the general reader, for none but the sufferers themselves have any idea of the burden of sorrow imposed by the impairment or deprivation of the sense of hearing. Nothing save blindness is so hard to bear, especially for those full of ambition, and otherwise capable of the full enjoyment of life.

But there are comforts even in deafness. We can see the faces of our loved ones, we can enjoy all beautiful sights,—the lovely flowers, the rich landscapes, the glorious sunsets, and all the beauties of nature,—while all arts save music lay their treasures and achievements at our feet. The pleasures of travel, too, are not less to us,—perhaps in many respects they are rather enhanced.

We can make the pen available by correspondence, and so benefit ourselves and our friends. We can use the brush, and enjoy our labor at the easel; and we can employ our hands for our own and others' comfort and happiness in a thousand ways.

Deafness is far more common than is generally supposed, and is especially prevalent among the middle-aged. Medical works assert that fully one-third of our population between the ages of twenty-five and fifty are partly deaf, the trouble having come on so gradually that fully one-half of those afflicted are unaware of it until sufficiently advanced to become troublesome.

We believe the best aurists agree that there is no help for hereditary and congenital deafness, or those cases where the nerves are paralyzed. A very common cause of temporary deafness is hardening of the wax of the ear; and the trouble may become serious if not relieved by prompt and proper treatment at the hands of a good aurist. Where such aid is not available, it is safe and possible to remove the wax by putting into the ear two or three drops of pure glycerine three times a day for three days, and then syringing with warm water (as warm as can be comfortably borne) in which a little carbonate of soda has been dissolved. Use a teaspoonful to one quart of water.

The ear being a very intricate, delicate, and sensitive organ, no patent nostrum should ever be introduced into it nor any quack ever allowed to tamper with it. Only the very best aurists should treat it. Many disorders and conditions of the inner parts of the organ are beyond the reach of medical skill. Such cases are disheartening. Obstruction of the Eustachian tube (the tube that connects the tympanum, or ear-drum, with the back upper part of the throat) is a frequent cause

of deafness. Inflammation of the throat, affecting this tube, also causes it. In either case, a good aurist can afford speedy relief by removing the obstruction or allaying the inflammation.

Catarrhal deafness usually disappears when the cause is removed, if the trouble has not become too deeply seated. Early manifestations of deafness should not be overlooked or neglected. Elderly people are often deaf because vitality is declining generally; the hearing, in common with the other powers, shows the approaching weakness and decay of age. Some persons whose hearing is ordinarily very acute are quite deaf when extremely weary.

Rupture of the drum membrane by an accidental puncture, by whooping-cough, or by a blow on the head, is among the causes of deafness. The sudden concussion of air against the delicate tympanum, caused by the discharge of heavy artillery, has often more or less impaired the sense of hearing, and, strangely enough, in some reported cases where the hearing was already weakened, has restored it. Many soldiers were made deaf during the war. The ears sometimes seem entirely stopped up by a severe cold; but let them alone, treat and remove the cause, and the effect will probably disappear.

Climatic causes produce deafness. We have visited a county in central Pennsylvania where deaf people are the rule and those with good hearing the exception. In districts in Alpine Switzerland the same peculiarity has been observed. Another cause of deafness is thickening of the lining membranes of the ear, and for this there is no known remedy. It may be constitutional, or caused by ulceration after scarlet fever, or by other diseases; but it sometimes comes on without any known or apparent cause. All that can be done in this case is to palliate the trouble by using an ear-trumpet, or, better still, an audiphone. The latter is now oftenest made in the form of a fan of vulcanite, and being black, and a seeming accessory to the toilet, is in no respect objectionable, as was the large ear-trumpet of former days. There is a very small ear-trumpet made that is helpful. These instruments are of great assistance in hearing lectures and the like, as well as in lending distinctness to conversation.

It has been said that "Deaf people are always proud." Call it pride, if you will; but why needlessly proclaim a misfortune (which, unlike blindness, is not often evident) by using a conspicuous and forbidding instrument? One does not care to emphasize his own personal afflictions for the observation and comment of others.

If people only knew how to talk to the deaf, a great many heart-aches would be saved. First, have a little consideration, and by a very trifling motion, which they readily see and understand, call their attention to you; then articulate clearly and distinctly—not too fast, and not too loud. It is this shouting into the ear of a deaf person that fills him with confusion and sends all the blood to his face; by his wavering and equivocal responses he sometimes hardly gets credit for due intelligence, although he may really be very well informed on the subject under discussion. He had hoped you would speak low and distinctly; he could then have heard you, acted like himself, and been himself; but now all within hearing know he is deaf, think he is very deaf, and look upon him with com-

miseration perhaps, as well they may; perhaps gaze at him much, and long and rudely too. This only adds to his perplexity, and induces fresh resolves never to go again where there is any danger of the occurrence being repeated. Strange as it may seem, some deaf people often hear much better in the noisy street, or traveling in the cars, than in a quiet place.

This is the reason why deaf people shun society, for there lie the rough places in their pathway, because few know *how* to talk to them. We do not mean the very deaf, but those who enjoy a chat or a conversation with a friend without discomfort. Their greatest trouble is to hear mixed conversation, sermons, and the like. Familiar voices are easily heard by the partly deaf: so they are happiest at home, and avoid general society. The annoyances that seem to accompany the deaf are numerous, and often very hard to bear. It leads them very often to renew their determination to stay closer at home, plunge deeper into books, and try there to find compensation for the unattainable pleasure of social intercourse.

Katharine Armstrong.

Names.

AN amateur painter was once strolling through the streets of a coast town, when he suddenly espied, standing in the door of a little cottage, a beautiful young woman with a sturdy child in her arms. The pretty picture framed in the dusky doorway attracted him, and with an eye to a "study" he accosted the unconscious Madonna. The young mother answered that she was n't particular about herself, but that she should admire to have Iddy's picture taken. "Iddy!" rejoined the painter; "what's the rest of his name?" "Oh," said she, with an air of pardonable pride, "you know he's our first baby, and we did n't want him to have a name like everybody else; so *he* found some nice words in a book, and Iddy's name is one of 'em—Idiosyncrasy!"

That the above is a true story as to the main fact makes it none the less melancholy. But at the same time there was the germ of reform wrapped up in the idea of an original name for the child. This motive governed our friend Mrs. Kenwigs, when she composed the immortal cognomen of her Morleena; and I knew a lady who bravely carried about the appellation of Gaphelia Mohalba. This was certainly unique, though for purposes of convenience it had to be dwarfed to the commonplace and every-day Garry.

In these complex times it is useless to hope that the simplicity and truth of the old Hebrew nomenclature can ever be restored. But what an amazing effect might be predicted if names were all at once to resume their old-time elasticity, and could be donned and doffed as character suggested. Think of being known as "Supplanter," or "Dishonest," or "Repentant," as the case might require. And what an immense stimulus to self-righteousness there would be, supposing a man had really begun to mend his ways, in being addressed as "Virtuous," or "Excellent," or "Pure." It would never do. It would be "living in a lantern" with a vengeance. The present fashion of newspaper publicity would be retirement and secrecy compared with it, and something more serious than "dramatic situations" would inevitably result. It is probably for

the general good, therefore, that the moral condition of language renders such a state of things impossible. No doubt speech was originally an honest interpreter of thought, but the interpreter has trifled with his moral sense until it is hopelessly degraded, and he has no longer even the courage of his opinions left. So we give a child his father's name just because it is his father's name, and not from any special fitness. Indeed, the whole question of fitness seems to be lost sight of, except in rare cases. The original significance of baptismal names is buried under a mountain of associations, and we characterize certain ones as stately, or somber, or piquant, chiefly because of the qualities of some former possessor. And as with "Iddy's" parents, the mere sound of a name goes far to recommend it to many people. The melodious arrangement of vowels and consonants is, after all, one of the main motives; and as tastes differ in regard to what constitutes melody, the standard has to vary in a somewhat trying manner. A large class of excellent people confine themselves with praiseworthy fidelity to Bible names, on account of which a girl now and then finds herself weighted in the race of life with such a burden as Keren-happuch, or a boy is forever jeered by his mates on account of being known as Tiglath-Pileser. Even this, however, is an improvement on the Cromwellian style of using whole formularies of theology, such as, "Through much tribulation we enter into the kingdom of Heaven" (which was irreverently condensed to Tribby), or the famous Praise-God Barebones. That was a quaint and not unpleasing usage of two generations back which gave our aunts and grandmothers such names as Patience, Mercy, Thankful, Submit, etc. But how an occasional "high-strung" maiden must have rebelled against the meekness of such an appellation. A mode which finds more or less favor in the Western States has at least the merit of being patriotic. Thus a boy born on the Fourth of July was christened Independence, and I remember such combinations as Indiana Martin, Peoria Frye, and Minneapolis Forsyth. There is a certain breadth and freshness, as it were, about these specimens which smack of wide rivers and wider prairies.

There is one aspect of the case against which the writer feels bound especially to protest. It is the nefarious practice of altering a child's name, now happily taking its place among other relics of barbarism—a very different thing, you will perceive, from the honesty of the Hebrew usage; but it has been largely sanctioned, even among the most intelligent people. Say, for instance, that a child has, after much anxious thought and search, been given her great-great-grandmother's majestic and honorable name. All the associations of early infancy naturally cling about it. The baby's silver cup and the little spoon and fork bear the three stately initials, and various precious heirlooms are held in trust for the future pleasure of the fortunate namesake. But an elder sister dies, and straightway, through some occult law of sympathy or sentiment, away goes the grand old name to give place to—Susie! It is nothing short of robbery. That obnoxious "ie" reminds me of another practice which is almost too absurd to combat. Can any reasonable being give a valid excuse for the strange fatuity which makes grown-up women, and business women at that, announce themselves to the world as Jennie, Mattie,

Maggie, etc., *ad nauseam*? How can they help seeing the increased dignity of Jane and Martha and Margaret? May a new baptism into the eternal fitness of things come to the rescue!

I have known several bright children who refused to be known by the name which had been given them, and desired to be called by a name of their own choosing. "I am not Mary; my name is Rosalind," or whatever it was. I also knew one child who was act-

ually not named at all till she was seven years old, when she proceeded to take things into her own hands, and name herself. What a comfortable way is here suggested of shirking an alarming responsibility, and at the same time revolutionizing the whole matter. Let there be some convenient generic term for children till the age of six or seven years, and then boldly rely on the genius of the coming generation to name itself!

E. W. Denison.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

To a Little Girl in "Punch."

WHO SAID:

GRANDMA, after giving the subject every consideration, I have come to the conclusion that—the World is Hollow, and my Doll is stuffed with Sawdust; so—I—should like—if you please, to be a Nun!

Here still in "Punch's" page you stand
Where younger eyes may view you,
Quaint as when Leech's skillful hand
For older laughers drew you.

Here grandma sits, and, type of joys
By Fate untimely shattered,
In sad confusion dolls and toys
About the floor are scattered.

So early wise, Life's vanity
With prescient gaze discerning!
How found you out the truth that we
Are all our lives in learning?

Alas! what cynic moralist
(Few, let us hope, as youthful)
But proves, O tiny pessimist,
Your quaint conclusion truthful?

Yet, we may trust *your* words expressed
A transient melancholy,
From which you soon, with gayer zest,
Returned to play and Dolly.

With *us*, alas! — But why pursue
The dismal allegory?
Far pleasanter to laugh at you,
And trace in "Punch" your story.

For surely in the magic glass
Of those delightful pages
We see your little figure pass
At various youthful ages.

And later, smiling through your curls,
You greet us, kind and witty,—
One of your artist's English girls,
Fresh, rosy, round, and pretty.

And still you live (but older grown)
In some gay land of fable,
And have for children of your own
Du Maurier's "Jack" and "Mabel"!

Robertson Trowbridge.

Uncle Ezek's Wisdom.

OBSTINACY is the characteristic of the ignorant; and, after all, it is their only safety.

WHEN I look around me and see the bickerings and strifes among us Christians here on earth, I sometimes wonder what we shall do to enjoy ourselves when we reach heaven, where all bickerings and strifes are unknown.

INTEREST is remorseless; it knows no rest, no mercy, no limits. One penny put at interest when Adam was created, and compounded, would bankrupt creation when Gabriel comes.

AS base as slander is, it is never lost for the want of listeners.

VANITY is the one thing that every one seems to have more than his neighbor has.

COMMON sense is the rarest of all possessions, and those who have the most of it seem to know it the least.

ACT natural, my friend, and though you may not be very strong, you won't be ridiculous.

OPINION is a kind of half-way house, where people meet to exchange lies and guess at what they don't understand.

AN old man in love is as helpless as a blind kitten.

It is very rare indeed that a man is too great for his creditors, and it is equally common that his condition is too great for him.

IGNORANCE makes a man impudent; you would think it ought to make him modest.

GHOSTS are a thin package — so thin, that only one man can see them at a time.

THERE is one instrument that no clever woman has ever learned to play on, and that is a second fiddle.

WHAT a miserable time we should have in this life if we were obliged to mind our own business and let our neighbors mind theirs.

MY friend, don't forget this, — if you lie down, the world will go out of its way to drive over you; but if you stand up, and look severe, it will give you half the road at least.

THE man who has no home generally does n't want one; he is ever verging towards vagrancy, and is pretty sure to reach there at last.

A SPOONFUL of molasses will catch more flies than a barrel of vinegar; every one will tell you this, but how few try it.

It is easier to control a hundred men than one man.

YOU may argue ever so elegantly against a success; the success wins every time.

THERE are certain things that virtue won't mix with; ingratitude is one of them.

Uncle Ezek.

Strength of the Confederate Army at Chickamauga.

ON this moot subject an examination of the original returns in the War Department, which I have personally made, shows the following result:

General Bragg's return, 31st of August, 1863, shows under the heading "present for duty," officers and men, 48,998.

This return does not include the divisions of General Breckinridge or General Preston, the brigades of Generals Gregg and McNair, or the reinforcement brought by General Longstreet. The strength of each is accurately given in Confederate official returns. The

total Confederate force available for battle at Chickamauga was as follows:

General Bragg's army, 31st of August, 1863, for duty.....	48,998
Longstreet's command (Hood's and McLaws's divisions), by return of Army of Northern Virginia, 31st of August, 1863, for duty.....	11,716
Breckinridge's division, by his official report in "Confederate Reports of Battles," for duty.....	3,769
Preston's division, by his official report in "Confederate Reports of Battles," for duty.....	4,509
Brigades of Gregg and McNair, by General Bushrod Johnson's official report (So. Hist. Soc. Papers, Vol. XIII.), for duty.....	2,559
Total.....	71,551

CINCINNATI, O.

E. C. Dawes.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Shall Fortunes be Limited by Law?

THE leveling instincts of a democracy are apt to answer the question with an emphatic Yes. The equalization of men in their standing before the law, in their political privileges, in their opportunities in the administrative service of the country, in their educational advantages, and in the position of their sects before the State is apt to find in the eyes of many only its next step in the equalization of wealth, or at least in the prevention of the development of extremes. On the other hand, he who pins his faith to the political power of the State, who believes that the State has the right to regulate property because it makes property possible, has only to be convinced that great fortunes are dangerous to the State to echo the democratic answer with another and as hearty an affirmative. The proposal finds even a more favorable soil in our own country for the reason that our whole political system has been consciously set from the beginning against the development of permanent great fortunes, and that with a success in which we have taken considerable pride. Our legislation has aimed at removing every artificial obstacle to the dispersion of great fortunes: primogeniture has been forbidden; entails have been limited; equal division of the property of intestates has become the legal rule; and the result has been, until comparatively recent years, that "from shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves were three generations."

The old rule, however, no longer holds good. Representative fortunes have come to be enormously larger—larger, indeed, than were really conceivable fifty years ago; and this one fact has quite altered most of the conditions of the case. Almost any division of the "large fortune" of a half-century ago gave as a result several small fortunes, usually so small as to have in them no power of recuperation and self-increase. But a reasonably equitable division of a fortune of two hundred millions gives at least one fortune whose annual income is so much beyond anything that the heir is at all likely to spend, that its own natural increase will carry the principal up again to its original limit within an ordinary life-time, without any special ability in the owner beyond that of care-taking. The general principle that all the children ought to have a share will no longer suffice to break up and disperse all the fortunes of the republic; the very magnitude of

the estates has already given us some of the phases of a system of primogeniture, from which it had been persistently assumed that we had escaped at the Revolution. An entire escape from all its phases can now be found only in a failure of direct heirs or in the succession of an incorrigible spendthrift. And it is a fact too, to be carefully kept in mind, that the succession of incorrigible spendthrifts is no longer so common as it once was. The larger the estate, the more apt is the heir to be a plain, hard-working young man, who shows more signs of uneasiness at assuming the responsibility of managing the property than of elation over his opportunities of squandering it. Every indication goes to show that our very large fortunes, instead of being dispersed, are to hold their own and even to grow from generation to generation until they reach that natural limit placed by the ability of one person to manage an estate.

It is very natural, then, that those who feel that law and social conditions together have failed in the work which they were considered competent to do should every year have a stronger desire to put new legal limitations on the growth of American fortunes. The dangers of enormous accumulations of wealth in the hands of single persons in a republic, the contrast between the daily income of the "plutocrat" and the amount which the long struggle of a workingman's whole life will bring, the passions aroused by the vulgar display affected by so many of the smaller "large fortunes," are all forces bearing in the same direction. The proposals of prohibitory succession duties on inheritances above a limited amount, of prohibitions of gifts above the same amount, unless to public or charitable uses, or of an income tax rising in percentage with the amount of the income to a prohibitory tax on all incomes above a legal limit, are various forms of a single purpose—that the very rich shall become no richer, and that they shall not be permitted to transmit their present wealth undiminished to an indefinite line of successors.

It is well, however, to weigh carefully the fact that, in the mass of cases, wealth means the sum of some service done to the public, which would not have been done but for the reward found in the legal permission to accumulate and transmit wealth. He who has retired with a snug fortune has been engaged in a life-long struggle to provide dry-goods for the public a

cent a yard cheaper than they were before, or to lower freights a tenth of a cent per ton-mile, or to see that the money of bank stock-holders or depositors is loaned to just the persons in the community who will make the best and safest use of it, or to accomplish some one of the public services in which human activity is continually finding its field of operations. We darken many questions hopelessly when we speak, as we always do, of the individual's success in making money, as if he had been engaged in abstracting something from the general pile; there are ugly cases of this kind, but they are the exception, not the rule. He who has "made money" legitimately has done it by leaving the general mass of wealth just so much larger than he found it, by furnishing long years of useful and profitable work to others less well equipped than he for the race of life, and by performing for years some specific service, in addition, to the public at large.

If we acquire the habit of now and then looking at the case from this side, from which we unhappily so seldom look at it, the proposal to put legal limits to the amount of fortunes will take an entirely new aspect. We shall see that we are, in reality, making the definite proposal that our law shall henceforth forbid any citizen to make the world more than so much richer in his life-time, to provide employment for more than a legally limited number of those who need and desire employment, or to be more zealous than the law allows in seeking out commodities or doing any similar service for the general public. Franklin once attempted to reach the common sense of the British public in a pamphlet entitled "Rules for reducing a Great Empire to a Small One." If a second Franklin should address us, must he meet as little success in combating the proposal to put legal limits to the wealth of the country?

If the proposal needed any further illumination, it would be found in the impossibility of limiting the injurious results of its adoption. Human ability is in the habit of taking very fair average care of itself: it persecuted in one city, it will not be slow to seek a refuge and a welcome in another. If New York could place a progressive income-tax on her statute-book prohibiting incomes above a fixed limit, one result would certainly be a diminution of New York incomes; but that would be far from all. The incomes thus limited would rapidly disappear from New York, while Connecticut and New Jersey would show a sudden, surprising, and coincident increase of large incomes. So, if the scheme should be adopted by the whole United States, that country would meet an indefinite dead loss, to the gain of Canada or Europe. Human ability would find its natural refuge and enjoy its natural income somewhere unless the whole world could be united against it as implacably as the Roman Empire used to be against the victim of the Emperor. Until the proposal to limit fortunes by law can be supplemented by a recipe for securing the acquiescence or neutrality of those who are to be most directly affected by it, it must be considered as really outside of the province of discussion. If the great fortune is the result of defiance or prostitution of law, let the law be made to fit the case; but if it is the natural result of human ability, why should it not go on benefiting the community up to the natural limit of human powers of management?

President or King?

DURING the long period through which republicanism stood on the threshold of Europe, knocking for the admission which was peremptorily denied until it was forced through the terrors of the French Revolution, the applicant came in an ill fashion; her name had become synonymous with riot and disorder as an internal condition, and with reckless aggression as an international policy. However urgently the man of republican leanings might deny the accusation, his consciousness that the universal belief of Europe was against him always forced him into an apologetic attitude on this point. And when the issue was at last brought to the arbitrament of force, it was not so much the execution of the king, the massacres of the aristocrats, the overthrow of the Church, on which the Anti-Jacobin relied to make out his case against the French Republic, but rather the irascibility, the unreasonableness, the proneness to make war on few or no grounds, which must, he declared, always characterize a government controlled by the mob. A republican government in the heart of Europe would be a fire-brand, constantly scattering or threatening destruction; and the natural desire for security from such an infliction was the official reason for the renewed and re-renewed confederation of the kings.

There would seem to be considerable reason, *a priori*, for doubting this belligerent disposition of republics; it surely cannot require a profound experience in the art of self-government to teach "the mob" that the soldiers and taxes to support war must be its contribution, and to give it a hearty distaste for military glory. If, however, in spite of theory, there is in republicanism anything of this overbearing tendency to aggression upon neighboring nations, who should personify it if not the President of the United States? He is a politician, chosen for but four years to the highest office open by election to man, and conventionally estopped, at least in modern times, from essaying any other line of public preferment after leaving the presidential office. The popularity to be won by successful warfare would go far to give him at least one reelection; and the obstacles to indefinite reelection, however strong they have proved in fact, have never been in themselves more than negative. To the observer of 1787, with his preconceived notions of the bellicose temper of a republic, it must have seemed a most probable result that some military adventurer, enticing the country into war, and thus securing for himself one reelection after another to the presidency, should gradually change the essence of the government until, as in so many other so-called republics, the President should assume the dignity and title of royalty.

No such result has taken place. On the contrary, the history of the United States has shown that the American chief magistrate, however efficient he may be as a leader and manager after war has once begun, is up to that time not only the most pacific of rulers, but the most pacific organ of his own government. Other departments of his government have shown an occasional disposition to fall under the malignant influence of the war-spirit; but the American president (with perhaps the exception of a single case), whether he has been soldier or civilian by profession, has always seemed to feel himself personally and peculiarly

charged with the duty of maintaining peace. In the midst of perfervid orators, legislative statements of grievances, and even intense popular passion, the President has always thrown the whole weight of his party, personal, and official influence into the scale of peace, and, in the last resort, has usually shown no hesitation in arraying his constitutional prerogatives across the path to war, even though he has thus seemed to peril his own political future.

Time would fail for enumerating all the cases in our history where the office of President has been the direct barrier between the United States and war. The first attack upon Washington's popularity came in 1793, when he interfered publicly and successfully to prevent the country from drifting into war as an ally of France against England. Six years afterward, when the country was ready for war against France, when the President's own party was clamorous for it, and when the first tidings of successful sea-fights were already coming in, John Adams flung himself into the breach and secured peace, though he lost the presidency. Bitterly as he disliked the English Government of that day, Jefferson had but one thought when he heard of the *Leopard's* attack upon the *Chesapeake* in 1807—to check the popular disposition to answer the outrage by war, and to first exhaust every possible means of peaceable redress. His successor, Madison, struggled more hopelessly for peace, until it became evident that his political fate was to be that of John Adams, when he at last gave way. So one might go on to find in every administration, even in that which has been held responsible for the Mexican War, new instances of the normal bent of the presidential office towards peace. Some of them may not have been successful in securing peace; in others there may never have been imminent peril of war; each of them has at least served to emphasize anew the intense anxiety of all American presidents for peace.

But, it may very well be said, it is the people, not the political system, that has made the American office what it has been. The objection has truth, but it is easy to permit it to disguise as important truths on the other side. If the South American president has not always been so peaceful a figure, is even he, after all, any worse than his dynastic rival who, representing Germans, Austrians, or Russians, is concentrating *his thoughts* on the power of explosives, the bore of rifles, and the number of cartridges which the soldier can carry? There is strong reason to think that even here the elective ruler would show a tendency to peace such as has not been a marked characteristic of hereditary rulers. Even if the present system of European armament were a really popular movement, a king must find provocations to the use of the national armament in circumstances which would seem of comparatively little significance to a president by election. The hereditary ruler, *ex vi termini*, is limited in the work of ruling by considerations bearing on the family which he represents; his regret at the outbreak of war must be tempered, if the young princes of his house should find in popular applause a substitute for popular election; he breathes a family atmosphere of militarism. He may try to think only of national interests, but his influence will be swayed by other considerations. President Cleveland may be no better, wiser, calmer, or more pacific person than the Emperor

William, but his judgment is free from at least one cloud which must always obscure that of the emperor: in the emperor's eyes, every question of peace and war properly affecting Germany alone must be looked at through the mirage raised by the conventional honor of the house of Hohenzollern; in the eyes of the President, the question is one solely of his country's welfare.

It is but a few months since France passed through the crisis which was to decide whether her coming ruler was to be president, emperor, or king. Was there no significance in the rise of stocks, in the "better feeling" in neighboring capitals, and in the reviving confidence in peace, which followed the election of a president? Sadi-Carnot may cease to be president; the French Republic itself may cease to be for the time; but the "European situation" can never escape from the damning stigma of last December—the consensus of the international armament of crowned heads that a president in France was in so far a pledge of peace. Perhaps, if there were more presidents in Europe, there would be fewer wars and a brighter hope of disarmament. As republicanism spreads more widely over the continent, even while a simulacrum of royalty is still retained, it cannot but become more evident from results that the wars of the past were due to other influences than popular passion. Perhaps, before the process is completed, the people of Europe may for once enjoy the spectacle of a war in which the monopoly of actual fighting is reserved for two of the remaining royal families and their respective officers of hereditary influence. One may be pardoned for believing that these two elements are responsible for more wars in the past than all coming presidents will ever have to apologize for.

Postal Savings Banks.

THOSE who are not brought directly into contact with the savings bank do not always appreciate fully the popular work which is done by the system. In these banks we can see practically that which is not always easy to understand in theory—the close relationship of wages to capital, and the possibility of the conversion of the former into the latter. The savings banks of the United States had, in 1887, some \$1,200,000,000 of deposits. Almost all this was the savings of labor, the natural result of high wages and growing ambitions. Saved in dribbles, it would have been spent in dribbles and would have passed out of reckoning without doing the world any service, but for the savings banks' unification of countless little savings into this imposing mass of wealth, this \$1,200,000,000. To enable themselves to pay interest on these deposits, the savings banks must in their turn loan them, immediately or mediately, to men who wish to borrow the money for use as business capital. That is, the country's generous treatment of labor, its high wages, the hopes of social advancement which it holds forth, and the desire of saving which springs therefrom, have been profitable, even in the lowest sense of the word; they have added to the active capital of the country some \$1,200,000,000 which otherwise would never have existed. But it would be telling far less than half the story to leave it on this low level. This mass of wealth has not only served the country as capital; in a higher politi-

cal sense, it has been a pledge of social peace, security, and hope. Those who have saved it are not growing poorer, but richer; they have founded an Anti-Poverty Society of their own. With it, they have put so much the greater interest at stake in the country; while those who have borrowed and are using it have so much the greater respect for those who have saved it. Every savings bank is in its way worth a thousand policemen and several regiments of regular troops, for it builds order on a foundation stronger than force.

This showing of the savings-bank system, however, becomes meager when we begin to realize how small a part of its possible field has been filled. Of the twelve hundred millions of savings just mentioned, nearly eleven hundred millions are the property of New England and the Middle States alone. Indeed, if we except these two sections and California, with her \$60,000,000 of savings, the system is practically non-existent in the remainder of the United States. The rest of our people are still practically ignorant of the powers of the system in transforming wages into capital. And it is for this reason,—for its educational advantages rather than for its superiority to individual banks,—it is for the controlling purpose of introducing the system into those sections of the country where it is still practically unknown, that Congress may fairly be called upon to imitate Great Britain's Act of 1861, establishing a system of postal savings banks. Wherever the system is introduced it must commend itself; and then the superiority of banks formed by individual corporators may safely be trusted to hold the Government institutions down to their comparatively narrow field.

There is one section, however, in which the call for such a step seems almost a national duty, instead of a mere question of expediency. If there is any class of our people who should be encouraged to save,—for the sake of their own welfare, for the sake of the higher respect which the known habit of saving will bring them, for the sake of the social security which will find guarantees therein,—it is the Southern negroes. No other class have a more immediate and urgent need of the savings-bank system than they; no other class see so little of it. Indeed, what they have known of it has rather been calculated to make them distrust it; and for this our national legislation is largely responsible. They have not forgotten, if we have, the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, chartered by Act of Congress of March 3, 1865, which failed in the autumn of 1873 with liabilities of more than \$3,000,000. Dealing, as the Act did, with an ignorant and helpless people, the wards of the nation, whose economic future was so largely dependent upon the success of this project, the Act should have been regarded as an act of state rather than a mere charter; and every effort should have been made to give the deposits a character for security as absolute as the pledge of the whole wealth of the country could supply. That was the time for the introduction of the principle of the postal savings-bank system, for reasons of state if for no others; instead, Congress chose to hazard the economic development of the freedmen on the wisdom of random trustees, and the ups and downs of the investments on which that wisdom should decide. In partial compensation for its error of 1865, and for the economic injury thereby done to those whom the nation was

bound to care for, let Congress proceed, by establishing postal savings banks throughout the South, to show the negroes that there is a more excellent way than the Freedman's Savings Bank.

Such Government savings banks have their points of inferiority to corporate banks. In order to establish the system, the Government bonds would still be available as an absolutely secure investment for the postal bank deposits; and those who should deposit their half-dollars or multiples thereof at the money-order offices or postal savings banks would really be buying shares of these Government bonds. Corporate banks loan their deposits directly to be used as capital by the borrowers, while the postal savings bank would act only indirectly, releasing for use as business capital the same amount of money which would otherwise have been invested in Government bonds. In other words, the corporate banks not only inculcate the habit of saving, but add to the business capital of the country more directly than the postal banks. If, then, the proposal were to give the Government the same monopoly of the savings-bank business which it has in the post-office, the proposal would be open to serious objections. No such proposal is meant. On the contrary, it is easy to show that the postal bank can do no more than open the way for the more effective corporate bank. The purchase of Government bonds for postal bank investment, at the current market rates, will net only an interest of less than 3 per cent. on the amount invested—in all probability, not more than 2½ per cent. Even if there were no expenses of management, then the postal bank could not offer more than 2½ per cent. interest on deposits, unless the Government should increase the rate as a gratuity, which would hardly be proposed. There would, however, be expenses of management to be provided for; and in practice the postal bank could hardly offer much more than 2 per cent. interest on deposits. The usual rate of the corporate savings bank is 4 per cent.; so that the corporate bank, when established in a place, would at once drive the postal bank out of competition. It seems evident, therefore, that the postal bank would be no real rival to the private or corporate bank—that it would, in effect, be nothing more than introductory to the present corporate system. It would be a convenience, in a town which had no corporate bank: it would teach the people the virtue of saving, and thus stimulate the desire for a corporate bank; but it would not rival or oust the corporate bank.

The proposal that Congress should establish a system of postal savings banks is not dictated, therefore, by any desire to widen Government functions, or to take out of private hands a work which they can do better than the Government agents can. The present savings banks would continue their work without becoming conscious of any change: it is not likely that a single half-dollar would ever be deposited in the New York City post-office if it were made a postal bank. The advantages would come in carrying the old system into new places, in teaching a whole people a system under which one-fourth of their number already have \$1,100,000,000 on deposit.

In a former article we discussed the plan for postal savings banks without any interest at all.* The whole question of postal savings banks may have to be de-

* See this magazine for February, 1886.

ferred, we are well aware, till the merit system in the civil service has been much further extended; and in the present condition of the Treasury there are grave doubts as to what wise disposition could be made of the deposited savings.

George Kennan's Siberian Papers.

THE illustrated papers descriptive of the Siberian experiences of Mr. George Kennan, the author, and Mr. G. A. Frost, the artist, will begin in the May number of THE CENTURY. Their appearance has been deferred on

account of Mr. Kennan's desire to group in preliminary papers—the last of which is printed in the present number—an account of the conditions and events in Russia directly related to the exile system. This system is now to be minutely described and elaborately pictured; and by way of preface to the first illustrated paper Mr. Kennan will, in a brief statement, answer the question as to how he came to enter upon his arduous and somewhat perilous investigations, and why he and his companion were accorded such extraordinary facilities by the Russian Government itself.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Department of State and the Diplomatic Service.

ONE of the suggestions which President Arthur made in his last message to Congress was that the President should be authorized by law to fix the grade of the diplomatic agents sent by our Government to other powers. The change thus proposed would undoubtedly have been in the right direction. If we are ever to have an organized diplomatic service, it will be necessary that the control of the service, or at any rate of most of its details, shall be left to the Executive and the Department of State to a far greater degree than is now done.

The fact, but little commented on, that the present Administration has made but few changes among the secretaries may perhaps be taken to indicate a disposition on its part to prepare the way for an organized diplomatic service. It is time, therefore, that it should be made clear that the management of such a service by the Department of State will be necessary to its successful operation.

The incessant and capricious meddling of Congress in the affairs of the service has been productive of much harm. The abolition, so common in our legislation, of a mission or a secretaryship one year, to be restored the next, has had no effect but to make the holders of these positions unhappy, to disgust and demoralize other members of the service, and to lower our Government in our own eyes and in those of the world. The matters of which the Department has cognizance are of such a delicate nature that it should not be necessary to submit them to the public criticism of several hundred persons, some of whom will not scruple to make the Government ridiculous if by such action they may gain any advantage for themselves or a little amusement.

But it will not be enough that the control of the diplomats be left to the Executive and the Department. The President and the Secretary of State, however able and patriotic they may be, are not likely to be versed in foreign habits and traditions. The administration of the diplomatic and consular routine should be mainly in the hands of the permanent officers of the Department. These should themselves have had considerable experience of diplomatic and consular life. They should be paid salaries proportionate to the dignity and importance of their duties; and their places should undoubtedly be permanent.

Such a staff of officers would have—partly, at any rate—under their control many important subjects. In the matter of promotions they would give the Secretary the advantage of their knowledge of the men and of the requirements of the posts. It may be asked whether under such an administration of the service there would not be room for favoritism. The answer to this is that favoritism in the administration of human affairs is one of the things inevitable. It is possible to devise no system of administering a service in which favoritism will not play a part. Has there been no favoritism under the old system? But the chance that merit will be considered in making promotions is certainly greater if the service is under the control of responsible individuals, open to public criticism, than if the appointment is the work of a vague syndicate of President, Secretary of State, confirming senators, and appropriation committees.

It is easy to perceive that there are many things which could be left to the discretion of a well-organized department which are not fit to be made matters of public discussion. Take such a question, for instance, as the comparative social fitness of men for some post the demands of which are peculiar. This is often a proper subject for consideration. The discrimination in favor of a person with a peculiar gift for distinguished society need not be of an aristocratic nature. It is not necessary that the man promoted upon this ground should be of distinguished connections. The reverse would be the usual case. A talent of this sort is apt to be inborn. It is particularly so in this country, where the man who suits European standards of manners is as likely to come from one set of people, or from one part of the country, as from another. The quality is apt to exist in men of bright intellects. Fine manners and a fine accent are likely to go with fine perceptions. Then the clever fellows learn rapidly. A little experience does wonders if the material is of the right sort.

The Department, of course, would have ample opportunities for knowing the men whose merits it would have to pass upon. Besides having their work before it, it would know them in person. We should, of course, adopt the excellent custom of other countries. In most services a diplomat begins the career by a period of employment in the Foreign Office, and often returns there, either by an exchange with one of the clerks or otherwise.

As an example of the class of subjects which should be left to the discretion of the Department, I may refer to the matter of dress. This is evidently not a proper matter for the interference of Congress. It happens, indeed, that the present law prohibiting to diplomats any kind of official dress or uniform has certain advantages. These uniforms are expensive, a full equipment, even for an attaché or secretary, costing from five hundred to a thousand dollars. This would be more than a secretary who was receiving a salary of \$2000 a year, and who was liable at any time to lose his place, could afford to pay. It might seem to be just as well, therefore, that the diplomat should have the law as an excuse for his not going to this expense. Still, this is obviously not a subject upon which there should be a hard and fast rule.

I am aware that these are suggestions which would not be well received by the American politician of the old style. They are, indeed, of a kind one would not have thought of making a few years ago. The truth is, the spirit of reform has already accomplished so much in this country that it is very cheerful about its prospects of success in the future. It is less and less afraid to support any principle which has justice on its side. I do not believe that it will cease its endeavors until the Government shall be an example in the midst of us of honor, reason, and good taste, which last, as has been said, is only a finer kind of justice.

E. S. Nadal.

An American Diplomacy.

THE questions which have been pressed upon the minds of many citizens by recent incidents of our diplomatic service go much deeper than mere matters of organization and administration. The occasions on which, of late, the service has been brought most conspicuously to the public attention have been the persistent efforts of certain traveling Americans to secure introduction into a certain circle of society into which they claimed a certain indefeasible right, as American citizens, to be introduced by the official representative of the Republic. And this functionary has been seriously criticised in the public press for his course concerning these grave cases, and has been censured for his too great ease in consenting in some cases, in others for his excessive scrupulousness in refusing. But through the whole discussion it seems to be assumed or conceded, first, that the Government of the United States is maintaining a great and costly system of "diplomatic service," one main function of which, in quiet times, is to aid the aspirations of certain citizens to be introduced in a social circle where they are not, as a rule, very much wanted; and secondly, that honorable gentlemen like Mr. Lowell and Mr. Phelps are officially charged with the function of rating the standing in the social scale of their traveling fellow-citizens, and of smelling out the antecedents of republican women who yearn to be presented to royalty. Is it strange that the disinterested spectator of this paltry business should begin to raise some radical questions—as (1) whether the Republic has any interest in aiding its traveling citizens to be presented at court, and (2) whether the business of determining on the eligibility of aspirants to such honors, and of making the inci-

dental inquiries, is a business which ought to be imposed on a gentleman of dignity and honor, and not rather upon some such person as the late Mr. Brown of Grace Church, with such assistance as he might occasionally need from the office of Mr. Pinkerton?

There is serious danger that the people, in their disgust at such exhibitions of the silly side of the diplomatic service as have been witnessed, may rush some time to the extreme measure, which has more than once been urged, of abolishing the diplomatic service, and so solving at a stroke these momentous questions of costume, and eligibility, and fitness for distinguished society, which now perplex the councils of the nation. This would be a pity, for there is no doubt that the Government has business to transact with other governments, from time to time, sufficient to justify the keeping of a competent agent in communication with the office of foreign affairs in each important capital. The Administration which should succeed in rigorously cutting down the whole diplomatic service to this business basis, and should say boldly, the United States, having no "court" at which to receive embassies, is not in a position to send ambassadors to court, but only ministers to "reside near" the Foreign Office, would at once unload itself of a multitude of vexatious and contemptibly paltry questions, and set our Government and our people in a logical, consistent, and dignified relation towards other governments. Let it be added that this measure would be one of appreciable economy and of general popularity. Only Miss Flora McFlimsy and her friends would seriously lament, and the young gentlemen whose talents for distinguished society inspire them with longings for the position of attaché.

Will any one tell us what danger it would involve to the Republic if our business with the British Government should be intrusted no longer to an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Court of St. James, but to a competent attorney, like Mr. Phelps, near Downing Street; and if this functionary should be instructed that he had no official duties whatever, either at Buckingham House or at Windsor Castle, and that to the Government which he represented it was a matter of utter indifference where he dined or danced, or whether he dined or danced at all, so long as he behaved himself with propriety and paid strict attention to business?

I am aware that these artless questions will have a barbarian sound to the ear of the average attaché; but none the less they suggest the outlines of the true American Diplomacy.

Leonard Woolsey Bacon.

Moral Teaching in our Schools.

RECOGNIZING the fact that there are serious defects in the moral results of our school training, we have given below certain plans for improving our schools in this respect which have met with much success.

One very good plan is something like the following. From two to four pupils are selected, and it is made the duty of each to look up and copy a short moral sentiment or maxim to be read at the opening of the school in the morning. Another set is selected to present similar maxims the next day, and in this way all the

pupils are selected in turn. When the pupil has read or repeated his sentiment to the school, it is illustrated, or commented upon, by the teacher, till the meaning is not only clear but well impressed. After the reading of the sentiments they are copied on the black-board, where they remain all day, and each pupil in the room copies them into a blank-book. After the first day, the teacher calls upon volunteers to repeat sentiments given on preceding days. Five or six sentiments may be called up in review each day. Some pupils, not much accustomed to general reading, may find it difficult to look up new sentiments; but let it be understood, that if a new one cannot be found, an old one will be accepted. Under judicious management there will be no trouble here. Children do not like to be parrots, repeating the words of their mates; and when review sentiments are presented they will be quite sure to be such as deserve repetition.

This plan leads to several valuable results. It keeps children on the lookout for fine moral sentiments. It often leads to more extensive reading, and quite generally to better reading, and it directs the attention to the moral import of what is read, and thus keeps before the mind high ideals of thought and action. With this plan pursued for a year, the pupils will each have copied into his book five or six hundred excellent maxims.

Most of the shorter and better of these will have been repeated a good many times in the school, and will have become well fixed in the memory of a large number of the pupils. The frequent repetition and illustration of the more striking maxims is of more importance than the number of new ones. Children need the foundation principles of right in a condensed form ready at hand, and as thoroughly inculcated as is the multiplication table. Variety is required to keep up a lively intellectual interest, and the same sentiment found in different authors, couched in different words, will contribute to this variety, and impress the thought more deeply. Occasionally a day, or a week, or a month may be given to anecdotes illustrating the favorite maxims, or to the biographies of men whose lives have illustrated them; or subjects may be chosen and maxims found to embody them; as, for instance, some days may be devoted to patriotism, when pupils will be invited to bring in sentiments that embody this virtue. Truth may be selected for another time, or any other moral attribute. It will be found wise to keep to one subject as long as a lively interest can be maintained. More moral momentum will be acquired in this way than by too frequently changing the current of thought.

Sometimes the sentiments may be restricted to poetry, at other times to prose; sometimes to some particular author,—and what a rich fountain Solomon or Pope would prove,—sometimes to one particular nation, or period in literature. These are only suggestions. A live teacher, determined to lop off vicious excrescences in character, and to train the pupils into a noble manhood and womanhood, will see what is needed, and invent a thousand ways to hold the interest of the children till the sentiment is impressed.

Religious instruction with children had its moral effect, not so much because it was derived from the Bible, as because of the pertinence of the stories and maxims, and the frequent repetition and the serious earnestness the teacher imparted to it. The simple maxim, "Hon-

esty is the best policy," can be heard a good many times with profit, and yet such a worldly-wise maxim will not intrench itself in the imagination of a child as a finer one will, nor will it be heard with quite as much favor.

Ten minutes a day is probably enough to give to explicit moral instruction; children must not be cloyed with it, and an intelligent teacher will have little difficulty in finding something fresh for his short everyday lesson. The work of inculcating good moral principles could probably be accomplished if it was scattered irregularly through the school work and given only as occasions arose; but if there is no especial time set apart for it, the pressure of the lessons is almost sure to crowd it out.

It is far better to make it an essential part of each day's work. The very fact that it is given a definite place invests it with dignity in the child's mind. Just when and how the instruction is given is of little consequence, but it is of imperative importance that there be a determined aim to give a strong and sound moral education in our schools, a determined aim that moral instruction shall have just as recognized a place as any other branch of education, and that teachers shall be held as responsible for their results in this as in arithmetic. This is not impossible, nor even very difficult. The fault is simply that it has not been attempted. Religious instruction has slipped out of our schools, and the public have not called upon teachers to substitute anything in its place. That teachers have not more generally taken up the work themselves seems a singular oversight, resulting probably from the fact that our teachers are accustomed to depend upon text-books, and no text-book of moral instruction has been put into their hands; and just this right one has not been made. A quarter of a century ago, William Ellis, an English political economist, prepared a little digest of moral and civic duties, designed for schools, which developed and explained in a series of questions and answers, in catechism form, our duties in the various relations of life. Though never finding its way into many English schools, the little books, if not just what are needed, have much merit, and are full of hints and suggestions in the right direction. If teachers earnestly begin the work of moral instruction, the needed text-book will soon appear. Many teachers have done more or less of this work, and, in some cases, all the schools of a city have had moral lessons in their programme, but the work has been unorganized and irregular; it has not become permanent,—has not secured its recognized place by the side of spelling, and writing, and arithmetic. In the kindergartens moral instruction has been systematically and effectually begun, and it only needs to be extended to all children and carried on through all grades of school work.

With careful moral instruction permanently established in our schools, our children would have reason to feel that in the public mind a knowledge of right and wrong is of as much consequence as a knowledge of accounts. They do not feel so now. Our greatest educator, Horace Mann, believed if the school, and the home, and the social environment were right, right men and women would be the result; and William T. Harris, only desiring a little element of time added, holds the same view.

Mary E. Beedy.

Christian Union.

It is now very generally believed that there is a tendency towards some organic union of the churches of Christ in the United States. The leading men of the different denominations are, for the most part, declaring themselves in favor of an attempt at some form of union. They clearly perceive that the missionary interests, home and foreign, demand it. The strange thing is that such convictions do not lead to practical results. When one enters the mission field and makes observation of what is going on there, he finds that the rivalry of the societies for the possession of the field, not in the name of Christ, but in the name of sect, is as great as ever it was. For example, there is in the new West a field containing a population of three thousand souls. Nine years ago this became a home missionary field. An effort was first made to establish a Presbyterian church. This having failed, a Congregational church was organized, composed of the Presbyterian and Congregational people in the community, and largely supported by the missionary society of the Congregational church. In the mean time the Methodist, Baptist, Christian, and United Presbyterian societies established successful missions in the same field, and two other societies organized small churches. Recently the Congregational church came to self-support, and seemed in shape to do good work and to make some return by its benevolences to the general work in other fields. But at this point the Presbyterian society came in. It organized its church; called a pastor; made an attempt, which succeeded in part, to build itself up from the membership and congregation of the Congregational church, before that time in a harmonious and prosperous condition; asked for and received from its society a grant of a considerable sum of money; and offered its pastor a salary of one thousand dollars. The result of the movement was to give to a town, already having five very good Christian churches and two weak organizations, an additional church at the expense of the missionary society of the Presbyterian denomination, and also to weaken and discourage the Congregational church, and make its struggle for self-support, for some time to come, a severe one.

In the example cited, it happened that the Presbyterians were the ones to come into the field. In other fields some other denomination might be the one. The writer of this article does not here criticise the Presbyterian denomination, but aims to show that in the mission field the rivalry of sects is the same as formerly. It is not to be expected that a great conviction will work its way into practice in a day, but would it not be a simple and easy matter for the denominations to come to an agreement on union in the mission fields of the country? How foolish to cry about a want of money and ministers for Christ's work when both are wasted in sectarian warfare. Instead of theorizing in papers and magazines about union, let us try some scheme for union regarding the expenditure of our forces in fighting infidelity, worldliness, and vice in the land. The Christian minister who, wherever he works or wherever he makes observations, feels that his work assumes, to a considerable degree, a struggle to keep up the courage and faith of a weak church, in a field which has too many churches, may well ques-

tion whether he might not more profitably to the Lord and himself engage in some other kind of work than the ministry, for he must labor under great discouragement, his efforts only partly succeed, and his church remain in a measure weak and helpless.

C. A. Wight.

The "Ach!" School of Literature.

ONE of the most deplorable tendencies in our modern literature is that tone of melancholy resignation which finds its way into much of our prose fiction and criticism, and still more of our poetry. "Ach!" exclaims Goethe; and "Ach!" repeats Carlyle monotonously after him, with remorseful variations. It seems a pity that when a great writer is dyspeptic, or happens to have seated himself at his desk on a dreary, drizzly day, or has been reviewing his past life with unpleasant results to his self-complacency, he must inflict his blues upon his hundred or thousands of readers, according as he is famous. If Schiller misses the dryads and fauns in his morning stroll, is it kind of him to immortalize his disappointment? How helpless Heine and his brethren would be without their favorite guttural sigh, which not only serves to give the line a vigorous start (Schiller begins five distinct verses thus in the "Götter Griechenlands"), but, quite as expressive in its way as the Frenchman's shrug, embodies a host of dismal reflections, and puts the reader into a proper state of gloom for what is to follow.

It is alarming to observe that the same influence is felt in some of our cheeriest as well as strongest poets on this side the water; while many of the secondary authors are always holding up their little umbrellas, and piteously entreating us to come under them.

"But it does n't rain!"

"Ach! but it's going to."

"And just now the sky seems very bright."

"Then let us keep the sunshine from your weary brows."

Blessed be those who feel it their duty and privilege to bring brightness into the world, rather than clouds. Let us swing our hats for cheery faces and glowing hearts that diffuse gladness and courage wherever they go; that substitute light for gloom, smiles for tears, hope for despair, glad energy of action for stolid resignation. Who can estimate the good accomplished by that masterpiece of Christmas stories, Dickens's "Carol," pervaded as it is by the very spirit of peace on earth and good-will to men?

There are those, to be sure, to whom the minor chords are most grateful. I do not mean by "minor," or by the use of the words "sad," "gloomy," and the like, a mere allusion to some pathetic incident or phase of life; a deep, uncontrollable cry of anguish, such as often breaks from a sensitive heart, and finds echoes in only too many others,—but a morbid tone of despair, over the irretrievable past, the unmitigated unpleasantness of the future, the worthlessness of life in general, and the writer's prospects in particular. Even these desperate sentiments, I was about to say, are eagerly seized upon by a certain honest but unhappy class

in the community, and devoured as the most delectable of morsels.

Akin to these mournful singers and their special admirers are perhaps our good Church friends whose creed is unvarying solemnity in all matters pertaining to their religion. Some one of them, I am certain, invented the strange notion regarding our Master which MacDonald's Alec Forbes treats in characteristic fashion:

"We dinna hear 'at the Saviour himsel' ever sae muckle as smiled," said he.

"Weel, that wad hae been little wonner, wi' what he had upo' 'm. But I 'm nae sure that he dinna, for a' that. Fowk disna aye tell whan a body lauchs. I 'm thinkin' gin ane o' the bairnies that he took upo' 's knee — an' he was ill-pleased wi' them 'at wad hae shewed them awa'—gin ane o' them had hauden up his wee timmer horsie, wi' a broken leg, and had prayed him to work a miracle an' men' the leg, he wadna hae wrocht a miracle maybe, I daursay, but he wad hae smilit, or maybe lauchen a wee, and he wad hae men't the leg some gait or ither, to please the bairnie."

The immediate and practical bearing of this whole tendency towards the lugubrious *Ach* is important. Every editor who has to deal with purely literary contributions will bear witness that nine-tenths of the verses offered by young writers nowadays are of this morbidly melancholy class. To look over the manuscripts in a single morning's mail would lead one to

suppose a sort of moral pestilence had jumped the quarantine the night before and descended upon America, depleting its victims' lives of all that was fresh, youthful, hopeful, and pessimizing them, as it were, beyond cure. It is *Ach! Ach! Ach!* over and over again, every translator giving his own version and application. Poems and stories relating to Christmas and Thanksgiving with the true ring of gladness and good cheer in them are rare; while autumn leaves, particularly the "sear" variety, are as popular mediums for the transmission of woes as were the Sibyl's of old.

There is real trouble enough in the world, a pitiful God knows. Let us have words of sympathy, of grave, sweet counsel in our sorrow, you pen-wielders whom we admit to our inmost selves at times when no living presence could be borne. Tell us, if you will, of your own sad experiences, and how you found consolation in them; remind us, and we shall be grateful, that life is a solemn, earnest thing, by no means to be laughed at or lightly tripped through: but do not call upon us to shudder over vaguely impending terrors; do not scrape from your palette the living colors of crimson petal, and golden maple-bough, and the changing sheen of the rainbow, bidding us solace ourselves with mist and ashes of roses. It is the feet of him that bringeth good tidings that are beautiful upon the mountains; he who publisheth peace is the true benefactor of his fellow-men.

Willis Boyd Allen.

BRIC-À-BRAC.

The Postman.

ST. VALENTINE'S DAY.

How fast the postman goes
Laden with joys and woes
Along the street!
Young eyes watch with delight;
Eyes not so young, with quite
As quick pulse-beat.

He carries painted hearts
Transfixed with harmless darts;
Live hearts too hide
Stowed in his swinging bag
And doubtless make it wag
From side to side.

Here, prayer of parted friends
And shaft that malice sends
Elbow for space;
The pang that hurts and stings,
The balm that healing brings,
Run equal race.

A scentless rose, a verse
That hardly could be worse,
A soul's despair,
A tear blot, and a jest,
A happy love confessed,
A laugh, a prayer!

Is he a man or elf?
Pandora's box itself
Could scarce send wide
Such motley crowd and fleet,
Save that gifts fair and sweet
Its ills divide!

Bird-like, he mounts and swoops
Swift up and down the stoops;
He 's drawing near.
Though I may moralize,
I, too, have waiting eyes —
Oh, please stop *here!*

Mary Ainge DeVere.

Love's Dilemma.

WERE ever maidens more unlike?
How shall a lover choose?
One seems to me amusing;
The other seems a muse.

Kate madly laughs at all the men,
May only smiles at one;
Kate fairly dotes on tennis,
May worships Tennyson.

If May could only ride like Kate
If Kate could sigh like May,
Why then I would not hesitate
To wed — but which one pray?

N. P. Babcock.