

At Gettysburg four brigades report losses aggregating 240. There was not a day from July 1 to July 20 when some portion of the cavalry was not engaged. Three thousand is not an overestimate of its loss in the campaign.

The total loss of Lee's army in June and July, 1863, was not less than 26,000.

CINCINNATI, O.

E. C. Dawes.

"Stonewall Jackson's Intentions at Harper's Ferry."

IN an article which appeared in your magazine in June, 1886, written by General John G. Walker, late of the Confederate army, entitled "Harper's Ferry and Sharpsburg," the statement is made by the author that he received a signal order from General Stonewall Jackson not to open fire on Harper's Ferry unless ordered to do so, as he (Jackson) designed to summon the Federal commander to surrender, and, should he refuse, to give him time to remove non-combatants and then carry the place by assault. This statement, I am told, has been questioned by General Bradley T. Johnson and Colonel H. Kyd Douglas, and the object of this note is to confirm General Walker's statement.¹ I was at the time assistant adjutant-general of the division commanded by General Walker, and was present on Loudoun Heights when the order in question was received; and I recollect that in consequence of its receipt the fire of our guns, which had

been in position from an early hour in the morning, was withheld until the afternoon, and was not then opened until the Federal batteries on Bolivar Heights opened on the infantry force of General Walker, under the command of Colonel (now Senator) Ransom.

My three years' daily intercourse with General Jackson at the Virginia Military Institute makes me confident that, in giving his signal orders, he would neither consult with his subordinates near him nor inform them what orders he had given or would give under the circumstances; therefore it is not surprising that the orders sent to General Walker were not known. The knowledge of the contradiction of General Walker's statement has just reached me. Hence the tardiness of my confirmation of its substantial accuracy.

William A. Smith.

"A Question of Command at Franklin."

WE have received from General D. S. Stanley a letter in reply to General Cox's statement in THE CENTURY for February, 1889 (page 630). In this letter General Stanley denies that he retired from the field of Franklin after he had been wounded, or that General Cox was the senior officer of the line from the time Wagner's troops were driven back until the battle was entirely ended. General Cox, however, does not recede from his position on these points. The details of the controversy cannot be given here.—EDITOR.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

John Bright.

SOME of us still have vivid recollections of that agony of blood and sweat through which the great North American Republic vindicated its right and title to nationality. It had fixed its boundaries and defended them successfully against assaults from abroad; now it was to prove to the world that those boundaries were not to be broken down by any force from within. Though a new generation has come into being since then, twenty-five years are too few to make us forget how the scales, which had been so long in dubious balance, began to settle slowly towards the side of the maintenance of the Union; nor can they make us forget how the waiting-time was broken again and again by the ring of good cheer in the words of the dead leader whose thoroughly English name heads this article.

The American people will not remember John Bright best as the opponent of the Corn Laws, as the uncompromising free trader, as the friend of oppressed nationalities everywhere, or as the man who dared denounce the Crimean war, though it cost him his seat in the House of Commons; they will remember him better as men remember him who stands their friend when most they need a friend. There was a time when, in Bright's own words at Birmingham, "nearly 500,000 persons — men, women, and children — at this

moment are saved from the utmost extremes of famine, not a few of them from death, by the contributions which they are receiving from all parts of the country." There was but one barrier—the blockade—between this hungry people and the prosperity which abundant cotton would bring them; and there were voices in plenty to urge them to bid their Government attempt to break the blockade. No one can say that it was John Bright's eloquence which held Lancashire to the conviction that its permanent interest was in the success of the American experiment; but it is certain that John Bright's eloquence lost nothing in effectiveness from the fact that he had given up his income, and allowed his six cotton-mills to stand idle rather than say one word which would even embarrass the American people in the throes of their struggle for national existence.

John Bright was as absolutely destitute of fear as John Knox. He was not to be moved by any social pressure from telling workingmen the truth, as he understood it, about the hopes which filled many English high places for the downfall of the American Republic. "Privilege," said he to them in 1863, "thinks it has a great interest in it, and every morning, with blatant voice, it comes into your streets and curses the American Republic. Privilege has beheld an afflicting spectacle for many years past. It has beheld thirty million men, happy and prosperous, without emperor, without king, without the surroundings of a court, without great armies and great navies, without great debt, and without great taxes. And Privilege has shud-

¹ For the comments by General Johnson and Colonel Douglas see *The Century War Book*, "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War," Vol. II., p. 615 *et seq.*

dered at what might happen to old Europe if this grand experiment should succeed." All his arguments to English workmen might be summed up in one of his pregnant sentences: "My countrymen who work for your living—remember this: there will be one wild shriek of freedom to startle all mankind if that American Republic should be overthrown."

It is not as the mere friend of America that Americans should remember John Bright; he was the advocate of his own country, and of all mankind, when he supported the principle for which the war for the Union was waged. If the "federation of the world," which was to put an end to wars and hereditary warriors and privileged classes everywhere, was not yet possible, it was to the interest of peace that one nationality should control central North America and banish war from its jurisdiction. And so John Bright, the man of peace, was the vigorous champion of the most devastating war of his time. His work was even bolder than this, more consistent beneath an apparent inconsistency: it was from the sternest sense of duty that he, the typical Englishman, brought his indictment against the English Government, the English blockade-runners, and a part at least of the English Liberal party. It was a greater crime in his eyes to condone attacks upon the republican idea than even to imagine the death of the king; and he did not stop to measure his words when he spoke of it. "We supply the ships; we supply the arms, the munitions of war; we give aid and comfort to this foulest of all crimes. Englishmen only do it. They are English Liberal newspapers only which support this stupendous iniquity. They are English statesmen only, who profess to be Liberal, who have said a word in favor of the authors of this now enacting revolution in America." And the English Liberals have come to see clearly that John Bright's denunciation of his Government and party was only a wise preference of his country's highest good to her temporary and short-sighted whim.

His own countrymen may well regret that in his later years he lagged so far behind his pupils; that the veneering of surface dignity, which he had so often stripped from others, was so quick to take fire from the criticisms of Irish members; and that, among the leaders in the last great revolution in English public opinion, the picture of John Bright should be turned to the wall. But, after all, his name is even more the property of the world than of England; and the world, and especially the American quarter of it, has had no reason to veil the face of him who loved and served God and man first, and his own country afterwards. It can only take the long list of great names that the English stock has given it, Alfred and Sir Simon of Montfort, More, Latimer, and Bunyan, Eliot, Hampden, Cromwell, and Blake, Pitt, Wellington, and Nelson, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and Cobden, and add to it a name which shall not be least in the list, that of John Bright.

The New States.

ONE of the acts of the Fiftieth Congress, almost in its closing hours, was the passage of a comprehensive Enabling Act, granting permission, on certain nominal conditions, for the formation of the four new States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington. There can be no doubt whatever that the con-

ditions will be punctually fulfilled, that the privileges and responsibilities of State-hood will be very gladly accepted, and that the "new constellation," which began its course with thirteen States, will number forty-two during the first year of its second century under the Constitution.

It is easy enough to misunderstand the sense in which this increase of States is mentioned by Americans. The numerical increase is itself indicative of a far larger increase in other forms. When there were but thirteen States, they hugged the Atlantic coast so closely that every one of them might have been called a salt-water State. As the roll of States has grown longer, it has meant that the center of population was moving westward, that orderly government and all the forces of civilization were creeping along the Gulf of Mexico and the shore of the Great Lakes, across the Mississippi, and beyond the Rocky Mountains to the Golden Gate. Each successive admission of a new State has been a milestone in the march of the American people towards the dominion of the continent. Now the system of States, which once only fringed the Atlantic, extends with but a single break across the continent. The increase of the number of States is so evidently parallel with the country's growth from a population of three millions to one of sixty millions, from poverty to wealth, from insignificance to respect, that a foreigner may be pardoned for thinking that the ideas were meant to be equivalent. He is apt to say, like Mr. Arnold: What of it? Are numbers the *summum bonum*? Was not your country happier when it was poorer, and more respectable when it was less respected? Better wish for a reduction in the number of your States, if there is any hope that such a reduction will bring you back your Washingtons, Jays, and Marshalls.

The Arnold interpretation may be a natural one, but it is exceedingly discreditable to the intelligence either of those to whom it is addressed or of him who makes it. The first of the alternative conclusions is improbable: the American has not usually been found guilty in other matters of such stupidity as would be implied necessarily in a glorification of mere numbers or size. He does not rate the Chinese Empire above Switzerland for intelligence, or the Russian Empire above the British for freedom. He cannot mean that he has any overweening pride in the number forty-two, as intrinsically superior to the number thirteen. The first business of an acute critic should have been to seek out the American's real reason for satisfaction in the growth of his country; and, as regards the number of States, the real reason is not far to seek.

It is a cardinal article of belief among peoples of European stock that the dark ages are over in their case. And yet medievalism is still most powerful with most of them in the intense belief of the governing or influential classes that it is better for the mass of the people to be governed than to govern themselves. "Constitutionalism" is represented at most in the dealings of the hereditary element with the legislative body at the capital: the peasant's advanced liberty consists rather in his share in the choice of the legislative body than in the development of his local government. Is there no value in that privilege of local self-government for which men are willing in Russia to brave the terrors of the bastion and of Siberia?—for which in France they seem to be willing to