

he had humorous intervals on other subjects, and at all times he was a man who obeyed orders whether he liked them or not.

The thing about the man from the Potomac that the Westerners thought most peculiar was his persistent admiration of McClellan. They could not understand why he should think a man a great soldier who had organized so much victory that never came to pass, and avoided so many defeats by reversing the theory of Hudibras, that military honor is to be won, like a widow, with brisk attempt, "not slow approaches, like a virgin." It seemed to them that while their Eastern brother's McClellanism, as they denominated it, included certain technical virtues that were undoubtedly worth having, it also tended to confuse and hamper him in the presence of circumstances to which they were always superior. He excelled them in drill, they frankly acknowledged; he wore his uniform as if he had never worn anything else, and in all his actions there was a distinct and self-conscious air of martial propriety. It was not true, as was grotesquely asserted, that he wore a corset, used cosmetics, and slept with gloves on. But it was true that he was remarkably fastidious, and attached much importance to his wardrobe. The deprivations of the siege of Chattanooga would probably not have vanquished him, had he been there to bear them, but his endurance would have lacked the capital cheerfulness which was displayed in that extremity of hunger and raggedness. Perhaps he would have joined in the search for undigested kernels of grain which had already served as food for horses and mules, but it would have been with a countenance bereaved of the power to smile; and certainly he could not have surveyed himself in patches and tatters and found it possible to exclaim, as did a Western soldier under those conditions, "Oh, no, I ain't sufferin' for clothes, but my heart 's a-breakin' for a diamond breast-pin!" He was

not so constituted. His home life had not qualified him for sacrifices of that kind. He could and did make them, let it be remembered to his honor; but he never learned how to do it in the Western mood of ready and tonic buoyancy.

The Western soldier felt that the victory of Chattanooga, following so soon after the successes of Gettysburg and Vicksburg, should bring the war rapidly to an end; but when he ascertained that such was not to be the case, he made the best of it, as he did of everything. He went on, as fast as the enemy could be persuaded to get out of the way, from Chattanooga to Atlanta; from Atlanta to the sea; thence to Richmond; and at last to Washington. His work was done, and done so well that it was its own most vivid and eloquent commendation. So they mustered him out. He was a soldier no longer, but a visiting citizen at the National Capital, who was to take the first train for home. His uniform was discarded with a sense of surpassing relief. The new garments which he hastened to put on made him feel stiff and awkward, and somehow his thoughts seemed to be affected in the same queer way. It was like beginning life all over again. His talk was not so much of what was past as of what was to come. The Union had been saved,— he had known all the time that it would be,— and he was eager now to get back to his folks. It cost him a little pang to give up his gun; he had come to regard it with a kind of affection. The pungent scent of battle smoke still lingered in its joints and creases. By that sign he had conquered. And having conquered, he was ready to go home. He had gone away under a heavy obligation to his country; now he was his country's creditor, and it acknowledged the debt with pride and gladness—

The debt immense of endless gratitude;  
Still paying, still to owe.

*Henry King.*

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### No New Sectional Division.

THE old sectional line in the United States is fast vanishing. It may even be said already to have been wiped out a part of the way, when Delaware breaks her long succession of senators from one party, and West Virginia is claimed for weeks by both parties. It is obvious that neither North nor South can be counted upon as "solid" in future national struggles.

This result was as inevitable as it is desirable. The ancient division between the two sections was due to a single cause, and it could not long survive the final removal of that cause. It is an abnormal state of things

in a republic for a great group of States always to support the same party in an election— almost as abnormal as for all the men in a community to hold the same political opinions. The natural order is one of divergences among States as among individuals. No better illustration of this truth could be desired than is furnished by the experience of New England. Of all parts of the country this has always been regarded as the most distinctly defined and differentiated. The Yankee has been considered a type, almost a race, and one would have expected to find Yankees in every Yankee State taking the same side of a great public controversy. So far, however, has this been from the case that even such close neighbors as New Hamp-

shire and Vermont have over and over again parted company politically; indeed, they were for many years stoutly opposed to each other. Lying side by side, with only a river between them, similar in physical geography, settled by pioneers of the same character, one of them has gone overwhelmingly one way for more than a generation, while the other was long a "stronghold" of the opposite political party, and still continues a close State.

There were similar divergences in the South originally, and they continued until a special cause broke down all minor differences and fused rival States. In 1840 the Whigs carried Mississippi for Harrison, while Alabama, its next neighbor on the east, went Democratic by a good majority; North Carolina was strongly Whig, South Carolina strongly Democratic. In 1848 North Carolina remained a strong Whig State, while Virginia on one side and South Carolina on the other cast their electoral votes for the Democratic candidate. Even in 1852 Kentucky and Tennessee held aloof from the other Southern States in their adherence to the Whigs, and it was not until 1856 that all of the commonwealths in that part of the Union were found united in a Presidential election, and "Mason and Dixon's line" became an actual line of political division.

As only an overmastering interest which affected them all could weld together States that had differed sharply upon other questions, so the disappearance not only of that interest, but also of the issues which for a while survived its removal, must cause them to fall apart. For some time past it has been chiefly sentiment which has preserved the solidity of the section. The political struggles of the reconstruction era naturally maintained the feeling that the South must make common cause still, as in the years before the war, but the issues of that era have been settled, so far as they can be settled by any agency except that of time. The most urgent appeals to "stand firm," for fear that harm might yet be done to their common interests if they should divide, were not powerful enough last year to hold together the old Whigs and the old Democrats of Virginia, and enough ex-Confederates took sides against the majority of their old associates in the defense of slavery to leave the two great parties almost even in the total poll. It must be accounted one of the brightest auguries for our national future that the last Presidential election of our first century showed that the old sectional division in our politics is not to lap over into the second century.

Is a new sectional division to supplant the old? Now that the South is no longer to be solid, are we to see the West arrayed against the East? Such has been the forecast of some political prophets, and the suggestion is plausible enough to merit attention.

That the West should boast of its growing strength is most natural and justifiable. The centennial of Washington's inauguration serves to bring out in strong relief the wonderful advancement of Western progress. Washington received every electoral vote, but he received not one from beyond the Alleghenies. At the last Presidential election the States west of that range and north of the Ohio River line to the Pacific (counting Missouri among them, as obviously should be done) cast 151 out of 401 electoral votes — almost two-fifths of the whole number. "Beyond the Alleghenies," says Irving, in speaking of Washington's inauguration, "ex-

tended regions almost boundless, as yet, for the most part, wild and uncultivated, the asylum of roving Indians and restless, discontented white men." The last census showed 17,209,492 people, out of a total population in the whole country of 50,155,783, in the States already organized out of those regions. The census of 1890 will undoubtedly increase the proportion of the whole population to be found in those States. Moreover, the creation of four new States from the Territories in the North-west will raise still higher the percentage of the electoral college allotted to that portion of the country. It seems safe to say that more than two-fifths of the electoral votes in 1892 will be cast by States beyond the Alleghenies.

Meanwhile the East steadily loses power. Applying this term to New England and the "Middle States" of the old geographies, — New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, — we shall find that the region cast 76 out of 135 electoral votes after the census of 1790, and not until thirty years later failed to hold more than half of the whole number. Now these ten States have only 116 out of 401, or but a little more than a quarter. The proportion is likely to sink a little lower under the next apportionment. Already therefore the West, which, politically speaking, did not exist when Washington was inaugurated, far outweighs the East, and its preponderance seems bound steadily to grow for a long while to come.

That the West could rule the East and the country, through a union of its strength with three or four neighboring States to the southward, is evident enough. That it should be hastily suggested that a new sectional line of this sort may be drawn, is not strange. But reflection will show that such an alignment is both a moral and a physical impossibility. To begin with, the West is itself the offspring of the East. Its institutions are those which were carried by advancing settlers from the Atlantic seaboard. Its political traditions and associations have always been the same as those of the East. No peculiar interest has ever separated these two portions of the North, as slavery once put apart the North and the South. There is nothing in its political development to incline the West towards sectional action against the East. On the contrary, all those underlying causes which in the long run most profoundly influence men work irresistibly towards continued harmony.

The notion that an artificial line of division has been drawn which may array West against East on economical questions is equally fallacious. It is easy to say that the West is an agricultural section and the East a manufacturing one, but the statement will not bear analysis. As long ago as 1880 Ohio reported much more than half the amount of capital invested in manufactures which she should have had relatively to New York on the basis of population; Illinois, nearly half her quota on the basis of Pennsylvania; even Missouri, more than a third of the total needed to place her on an equality with New Jersey in the ratio of such capital to population. Clearly it will not answer to call such States agricultural communities.

Moreover, experience has shown that not even manufacturing States can be lumped together in politics. In the East, Pennsylvania and New York went one way in 1888; New Jersey and Connecticut, the other. It is already coming to be the same with the newer

manufacturing States in the West. Indiana has rapidly growing interests in this direction, and it is the closest State in all that region. Illinois has many more manufacturing than in 1880, but it gave Harrison a much smaller majority than Garfield. Call the West agricultural or manufacturing, as you please, it cannot be counted as solid any more than the East. The country has suffered so much from sectional politics in the past that the prospect of another line of division might well arouse apprehension, but happily it is plain that no such prospect exists.

#### Office Seeking the Man.

To a right-minded man, with a taste for public affairs and a conviction that he has the ability to render his country some service, scarcely anything can be more grateful than the spontaneous tender by his fellow-citizens of a position suited to his talents. To such a man also the idea is intolerable that he should have to seek an office in order to secure one; that he must go into the market and cry his own wares; that he may even need to establish "headquarters," and draw people to become his patrons by methods little above those employed by the "puller-in" of a Bowery shop-keeper.

It is always difficult to make comparisons as to the relative amount of office seeking the man and office-seeking by the man at different periods in our history. The longest memory can cover only a portion of the century, and the most trustworthy recollection is liable to err. Newspaper files afford little assistance, for the press of two and three generations ago was apt to overlook or disregard the very matters of detail which are necessary to afford material for a sound judgment. The unanimity with which the highest honors were thrust upon Washington is known to everybody, but the most careful investigation leaves the inquirer uncertain how large was the proportion of such cases and how often an Aaron Burr was ready for any intrigue to secure place.

The decline of rotation as regards representatives in Congress, and the tendency to reëlect senators term after term, are signs which indicate a decided gain in the attitude of the public. But there is a dark side to the picture. Even in a State where a senator is given a third term without a word of protest, lower offices may be sought and won by the hardest workers. "Nominations, nowadays, do not come to men who make no effort to get them, but rather go to those who organize and labor and expend money to secure them," was the melancholy confession last year of a newspaper in Massachusetts, in speaking of an impending vacancy in a congressional district which is largely composed of farming towns. "The idea of office seeking the man is nearly 'played out' in this State. An honest, deserving, and every way capable aspirant for a responsible position has little chance to obtain a nomination before a convention if his rival is a prominent politician, with an abundance of party workers to 'whoop it up' for him." Such was the bitter comment of a Boston paper a few months later. "Oh, what 's the use of talking about ——? He is n't doing anything. He is n't making any trades or giving any pledges, and men don't get elected speaker nowadays without trades and pledges." So spoke a busy Massachusetts politi-

cian, himself actively working last winter for another candidate, who had no such scruples.

Massachusetts is not a sinner above all other States in this matter; indeed, it is perhaps the memory of other traditions which were once exceptionally strong there that prompts the bitter confessions of her own people and fixes the surprised attention of outsiders. There is more than one State which at once occurs to the careful observer of national politics where a governorship or a United States senatorship has been carried off by a man whom nobody would have suggested as qualified for the place by eminent talent or distinguished public service; where every one recognizes that it is either money or "push" which secured the place that should have been awarded to merit.

Taken by themselves, such incidents are most discouraging. Even when viewed along with other more hopeful tendencies, they are calculated to depress one. The optimistic attitude is certainly the most agreeable — that they represent temporary and local set-backs in a current which on the whole makes for better politics. But this will only prove to be the case if the offenders are made to feel that public sentiment is outraged by such conduct. This is emphatically one of those cases where silence will be held to mean consent, and the press has a duty which it cannot afford to neglect.

#### Soldiers' Memorial Services.

WITH every repetition of the ceremonies of Memorial Week the true meaning and import of this unique festival is more fully disclosed. Just after the war the annual gathering of companies of old soldiers to strew with flowers the graves of their comrades who fell in the service was looked upon by the public as a natural and beautiful remembrance of the heroic dead; still, as then exercised, it was a rite affecting only a limited class in each community. When, however, the ceremony was followed up year after year, and the citizens in a body were invited to take part by the donation of flowers and other decorations, and to join in the services,—either in the parades, at the cemeteries, or in the general public exercises of the day,—it was apparent that the occasion appealed to the sentiments of all. Instead of being a narrow rite, and restricted to a class, it was a broad, patriotic symbol, and belonged to the whole nation. The nation adopted the new idea and to-day it is an institution; one, too, that promises to last long.

The world honors martial bravery, and it is not a sign of false civilization that such should be the case. Theoretically, wars in modern times have a moral purpose, and almost always there is a moral issue involved in every great strife. The traditions of this Republic, especially, are that war is justifiable only in a conflict of conscience. And for a man to risk his life for his belief is universally held to be the sublimest duty allotted to mortal. It is this lofty idea — this conviction which to many has the sacredness of a religious creed — that runs through all the ritual services of the military orders in commemorating their dead, and it is becoming generally adopted by orators when addressing public assemblies during Memorial Week. Even the martial bravery of the late enemy is remembered by the Grand Army veterans at the tombs of their own dead comrades, and they there solemnly pledge to their enemy "a soldier's

pardon." Upon the common ground of honoring the brave, the Union and Confederate veterans unite to offer tribute to departed valor.

There is another feature of this memorial work that makes the rite a broad one. It is not alone those who died for the cause that are thus honored by the Grand Army, but every Union soldier who has since passed away, so far as the graves can be identified. It does not matter that a veteran has devoted a quarter of a century to civil pursuits since his military service ended, or that changes of opinion on the issues of the war have been openly declared by him: all is forgotten except the fact that he once answered the call of duty. Mere partisan feelings are tabooed, and the veteran, though he died but yesterday, is remembered at his burial with military honors. To his comrades he has become a "dead soldier," whose "march" is just "over," and whose spirit has joined the "long column"

above. There is in this catholicity of soldier sentiment, winning, as it does, the admiration and sympathy of former foes, an earnest of civil security in the future.

In that strong fraternal impulse also, which is expressed in the most touching manner in the joint memorial services along the old border, and in some of the chief interior cities of the South, there is a trace of further development of that true national sentiment which has had such remarkable growth in the South since the war. Lincoln said of the people of the North and the South, in 1865: "Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God." To-day the veterans' memories of the conflict that called them to arms are on both sides turning to a single noble ideal—martial heroism. Surely the worshipers of that ideal will know no North and no South while twining chaplets to immortalize the brave.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Fraternization—The Blue and the Gray.

IN the number of this magazine for July, 1888, I gave a list of the important reunions of organized bodies of Union and ex-Confederate veterans. The list was as full as the available records would permit.<sup>1</sup> Other instances of fraternal meetings were the receptions given to the Gate City Guard, of Atlanta, Georgia, in 1879, at Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Hartford, Boston, and elsewhere, by local military organizations, composed in part of Union veterans, and a reunion at Elizabeth, New Jersey, October 19, 1875, participated in by ex-Confederates living in the North and numbers of Union veterans who responded to the call.

Since the publication of my article on reunions, Mr. William G. James, Assistant Adjutant-General Department of Louisiana and Mississippi, G. A. R., has sent me the following item from the New Orleans "Picayune," in an account of the Confederate Memorial Services of April 6, 1878:

During the day a deputation from the Grand Army of the Republic visited the Confederate monument with an offering of two baskets of flowers and a number of bouquets, with this inscription attached:

IN MEMORIAM. A TRIBUTE TO THE FALLEN BRAVE FROM  
JOSEPH A. MOWER POST NO. 1, DEPARTMENT OF  
LOUISIANA, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. James adds:

On the 30th of May following this occurrence, just as the steamboat with the comrades of Mower Post and their friends was landing at Chalmette National Cemetery, there came alongside a tugboat with a barge, evidently fitted up for the occasion, filled with ladies and gentlemen, who proved to be the members and guests of two Confederate veteran organizations, with floral offerings for our dead. This party was followed by another composed of the Continental Guards (ex-Confederates), also bringing offerings. On each Memorial Day since, these Confederate organizations have presented offerings and participated with us in our memorial services at Chalmette National Cemetery, and it is a question whether there are not more ex-Confederates than Union veterans present on these occasions.

<sup>1</sup> In the account of the Antietam reunion of September, 1887, the "50th N. Y. Volunteers" should read "20th N. Y. Volunteers."

Mower Post was organized April 3, 1872, and now has nearly 150 members in good standing.

George L. Kilmer,

Abraham Lincoln Post No. 13, Dep't New York, G. A. R.

### General McClellan's Baggage-Destroying Order.

L. BY JAMES F. RUSLING, LATE BREVET BRIGADIER-GENERAL, U. S. V.

IN Messrs. Nicolay and Hay's "Lincoln," referring to General McClellan's conduct after the battle of Gaines's Mill, June 28, 1862 (see THE CENTURY MAGAZINE, November, 1888, p. 142), in a foot-note they say:

Lieutenant-Colonel B. S. Alexander, of the Corps of Engineers, gave the following sworn evidence before the Committee on the Conduct of the War (p. 592). He said he saw, on the evening of the 28th, at General McClellan's headquarters at Savage's Station, an order directing the destruction of the baggage of the officers and men, and he thought also the camp equipage; appealing to the officers and men to submit to this privation because it would be only for a few days, he thought the order stated. He went to the general at once, and remonstrated with him against allowing any such order to be issued, telling him he thought it would have a bad effect upon the army—would demoralize the officers and men; that it would tell them more plainly than in any other way that they were a defeated army, running for their lives. This led to some discussion among the officers at headquarters, and Colonel Alexander heard afterward that the order was never promulgated, but suppressed.

Now is it not very singular that nobody has ever produced a copy of that "order"? General McClellan in his official report of the Peninsula campaign, and also in his "Own Story" (1887), makes no mention of it. And yet it is the truth of history that just such an "order" was "issued" and "promulgated" by him on that occasion, for I myself saw and read it. I was then a captain and assistant quartermaster of Carr's (Patterson's) brigade, Hooker's division of the Third Army Corps (Heintzelman's). The order was received at brigade headquarters from the division headquarters about 8 P. M., June 28, and handed to me and others there for our official guidance. The brigade

itself was out on picket, in front of Fair Oaks, with headquarters pitched near Fair Oaks, just south of the railroad. After showing the order to me and others, the adjutant-general (C. K. Hall, now deceased) mounted his horse and rode to the front to promulgate it to the regiments of the brigade (the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th New Jersey and the 2d New York). What became of this order afterward I do not know, but suppose it was destroyed, with most of the official desks and papers of the brigade, near Bristow Station, Virginia, in the August following, when Stonewall Jackson got possession of the railroad there, in the rear of Pope, and burned several hundred cars, including the baggage of our brigade. But the substance of the order I entered in my "Army Journal" a few days subsequent to the issue of it, and it is recorded there as follows:

On the night of Saturday above mentioned (June 28, 1862), about dark, we received orders from army headquarters to load the trains with ammunition and subsistence, to destroy all trunks and surplus baggage, to abandon all camp equipage but not to burn it, and to decamp across White Oak Swamp, in the direction of James River, with as much expedition as possible. . . . Ordered headquarters train to gear up, then galloped to the regiments and directed regimental quartermasters to report with their trains to me near Savage's Station as soon as possible. Then returned to camp, and proceeded to arrange for the skedaddle. Resolved to save all private baggage and official papers at headquarters at any rate, and packed my train accordingly. . . . This done, I packed three tents, and abandoned the rest (only three), first cutting them to pieces, and with this exception loaded up everything. About 11 P. M. bade the staff "good-bye," and soon after 12 M. reached the plain by Savage's Station.

My recollection is that the "order" came by telegraph, and read about as follows:

The general commanding directs that the trains be loaded with ammunition and subsistence, and dispatched as promptly as possible by Savage's Station, across White Oak Swamp, in the direction of James River. All trunks and private baggage, and all camp equipage, will be abandoned and destroyed, but not burned. The general commanding trusts his brave troops will bear these privations with their wonted fortitude, as it will be but for a few days.

In obedience to this order, all of the regiments of our brigade abandoned and destroyed their camp equipage, and most of their private baggage, such as officers' trunks, valises, etc., as well as a large amount of new army clothing just received. The First and Second Brigades of the division received the same order, and of course obeyed it in the same way. Trunks and valises were knocked and hacked to pieces; clothing was cut and torn to rags; tents were ripped and slit to ribbons. Our wall, Sibley, and hospital tents — many almost new — were cut and ripped, and the poles chopped to pieces, but nothing was set on fire that night, lest the enemy should learn of our movement prematurely. Next morning, when the troops fell back to Savage's Station, fire was set to many things, including the commissary depot at Fair Oaks.

That extraordinary order certainly was "issued" and "promulgated" to Hooker's division of the Third Army Corps, and hence, I presume, to the rest of the corps. The truth, I think, is that it was promulgated to the Third Corps, and perhaps to another, but not to the rest of the army, because of the vigorous protests of Colonel Alexander and others, who saw its demoralizing tendency at a glance.

TRENTON, N. J.

## II. BY GEORGE E. CORSON.

ON the twenty-eighth day of June, 1862, I was commissary sergeant, and acting quartermaster sergeant, of the first battalion, 17th regiment, United States Infantry, and as such on that date was with the wagon train of Sykes's division of Porter's corps, which was parked near and a little to the south-east of Savage's Station. About 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon of the 28th the quartermasters in charge of the train received orders to empty the wagons under their charge of the baggage of the officers and men, and of all camp equipage, and to destroy the same at once by burning. The order was immediately executed. All the personal effects of the officers, consisting of their clothing, bedding, mess-chests, etc., the knapsacks of the men, — left by them in our camp at Gaines's Mill on the morning of the 26th, when the troops were ordered off in light marching order in the direction of Mechanicsville, and which had been brought along in our wagons, — and the tents and other camp equipage, were removed from the wagons, made into large piles, and set on fire.

Strict orders were given the teamsters, guards, and others on duty with the train not to rifle, interfere with, or attempt to save from the flames any of the effects of the officers or men, though it was known that many of the officers' valises and knapsacks contained money, watches, revolvers, and other valuables. One or more of the teamsters or train-guard were, of my personal knowledge, wounded by the discharge of loaded revolvers from the burning piles. I narrowly escaped the same fate myself, while superintending the destruction of the property in my charge. After completing this destruction the now empty train was taken to Savage's Station and there loaded with hard-bread, pork, coffee, sugar, and other commissary stores. The remaining commissary stores, among which there was said to be three hundred barrels of whisky, and the vast amount of quartermaster's stores which had been accumulated at the station for the use of the army, were set on fire, and by the light of the great conflagration our train wended its way towards the James River.

It will be seen from these facts that the order of General McClellan, referred to by Colonel Alexander, was promulgated in the afternoon of June 28, to the officers in charge of the wagon-trains in the immediate vicinity of Savage's Station, to the great loss and hardship at least of the officers and men of Sykes's division; but whether said order was intended for the whole army, or made known to them, I never knew, and have no means of determining. Having assisted in executing the order, and the recollection of the scenes connected therewith being among the most vivid of my memories of the war, I was surprised, when I read Colonel Alexander's statement, to find that any officer connected with McClellan's headquarters should be ignorant of the fact that the order was promulgated and duly executed.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

### The Abuse of Applause.

ONE of the canons of art insisted upon by Richard Wagner as an essential reform was that all applause during the acting of a drama or an opera was to be censured as interfering with the purpose of the represen-

tation. Take any one of our performances of Italian opera in recent years and consider for a moment the absurdities of the audience heaped upon the absurdities of the stage. We have each act interrupted by applause half a dozen times, and for the most frivolous reasons. When the chief singers of the evening come upon the stage for the first time the house breaks out into applause, no matter what is going on at the time; when the soprano shrieks out her highest note and the ushers trot down the aisle burdened with floral harps, ships, anchors, and other devices of the kind known in newspaper vernacular as trophies, the *Juliet*, *Lucia*, or *Amina* of the evening forgets her despair long enough to receive the flowers with an expression of counterfeit amazement and many smiles of gratitude. The same performance is gone through by the tenor, and perhaps by the baritone. Viewed seriously, it is a farce, for which nothing can be said. Thanks to Wagner's protests, many attempts have been made to remedy these absurdities; but, outside of the notable performances at Baireuth and some other German towns, little has been effected. In New York, until recently, we have had to suffer under the worst of such abuses. Under Mr. Mapleson's régime we had the flowers, the applause right in the middle of an act, the ten or twelve recalls after the performance.

This winter, in the course of the French class at Palmer's Theater, the same thing was observed. Possibly in the case of a theatrical performance there is less to be said in excuse than where an opera is concerned, for music implies something peculiarly artificial. Think of the absurdity of it all. Take, for instance, Dumas's "Camille." Here we have a dramatist striving to create an illusion. We have a young woman who dies of grief and consumption after a stormy career. The play traces her life through some of its most stirring and pathetic passages. Every act closes with a dramatic incident. Notwithstanding that the whole work of the dramatist and the actors is intended to produce in the audience an illusion, the curtain is raised after every act, and *Camille* appears bowing and smiling, evidently in the best of spirits and full of good-will towards every one. In other words, what has just been built up with so much care and hard work is knocked down again. If we take the case of opera, the same criticism holds good. The singers work hard to fill us with sympathy for some unfortunate person who goes mad and dies, as does *Lucia*, or who stabs himself, as does *Edgardo*. But after harrowing up the feelings of the audience, these people come forward and virtually say that it is all a joke, and that *Lucia* is going forth to refresh herself with beer.

Against such absurdity Wagner inveighed. He tried to the best of his ability to make his art a serious one. That he succeeded no better is no proof of the fallacy of his position, but rather of the persistent wrong-

headedness of the Philistines. I take it that any one who goes to the Metropolitan Opera House and hears such noble masterpieces as "Tristan," "Die Walküre," or "Die Götterdämmerung" goes away profoundly impressed with the dramatic story. There, at least, no singer is allowed to notice the audience while the act is going on, and not one of the noted German artists whom we have had among us of late years—Frau Lehmann, Herr Niemann, Herr Fischer, and others—pays the slightest attention to the indiscreet applause which greets their entrance upon the stage for the first time during the evening. Nevertheless the practice of allowing the singers to come forward at the end of an act in order to bow their thanks to the audience still obtains. It seems to me that this also should be done away with. If we object to the audience breaking in upon the music and drowning it out with their applause, it is because such vicious practices destroy the illusion which the poet and the composer are striving to produce. Does not the appearance of the singer between the acts destroy this illusion? Take any one of Wagner's dramas. We have persons supposed to be in love with each other, or in deadly enmity, coming forward hand in hand between the acts; and in the case of many of the master's works we have, at the end of the opera, a lot of dead persons waking up in order to bow their thanks again and again.

In order to maintain the poetic illusion, there ought to be no appearance of the singers or actors of the evening except during the acts and in their characters. Neither between the acts nor after the final fall of the curtain ought the singers to be seen; they ought never to remind us that we have not been listening to *Wotan*, to *Siegfried*, and to *Brunnhilda*. We ought not to be compelled to take into consideration Herr Fischer, Herr Niemann, or Frau Lehmann. I admit that many persons will cry out that this is unfair to the public and to the artists. How are these admirers of Wagner's operas and of the work done by these great singers to testify their admiration? This is very true; and yet the public ought to be trained to rest satisfied with applause at the end of an act or at the end of a performance. In the case of an opera the conductor may be considered as the representative of the performers, and Herr Seidl may bow his thanks. In the case of a symphony concert the members of the orchestra do not rise to answer the applause. If any one can make out a valid defense for such sins against art as the appearance of the dead *Siegfried* and *Brunnhilda* bowing and smiling at the end of "Die Götterdämmerung," I should like to hear it.

Philip G. Hubert, Jr.

YORK CATHEDRAL.—On page 731 of the *MARCH CENTURY* a distant view of Durham Cathedral was accidentally inserted as a view of York Minster.—EDITOR.



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 forced 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.<sup>1</sup> 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-

<sup>1</sup> 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



surrender the shadow, if not the substance, of the national republic?—for which, in every country, the awakening human mind longs as a higher privilege than any national system can give? This privilege has been extended by the American system of self-governing States, without a struggle, without the repression of a single revolutionary throes of humankind, with the very minimum of human unhappiness, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, over all central North America. Surely no political result has ever furnished more conclusive evidence of the advisability of leaving a people to work out their own natural solution of their own political problems. It is this crowning success of the American system, in some respects the crowning success of the century, which is summed up and embodied in the growth from thirteen to forty-two States. And Americans have a right to be proud of it.

There is, perhaps, a technical question whether the admission of the new States is so far accomplished by the mere Enabling Act that their representative stars may properly be placed on the flag for the approaching Fourth of July. It is not probable, however, that the question will ever assume any practical importance. The older States of the Union will not be apt to cavil on points of etiquette in the welcome with which they meet their new sisters, or to stickle on the exact location of the threshold. The field of forty-two stars may not be legal for Federal agencies until next year, but there is assuredly nothing illegal in the prior recognition by States and private persons of the practical relations of the new States to the remainder of the Union. Such a recognition would be at the worst but a brief and passing irregularity; and that is hardly to be placed in the scale opposite to the comity of States. The fortunate design of our national flag enables the older States to signalize at once the cordiality with which they add to the roll of their sisterhood the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington.

#### How to Preserve the Forests.

A PLAN for the conservation of the forests on the lands which belong to the nation has recently been presented by "Garden and Forest." Almost the only forests remaining on the public lands are those of the mountain region of the Pacific States, and these forests have a special interest and value because of their relation to the agricultural capacity of a vast extent of country lying along the streams which have their sources in these mountain woods. These regions adjacent to the streams, or near enough to be irrigated from them, are not fertile in their present arid condition, but they are capable of great productiveness. All the elements of fertility are in the soil in abundant proportions, except water. This can be supplied only by irrigation. It does not come to these thirsty lands naturally, by rainfall, but must be assisted by the ingenious devices of man on its way to thousands of fields which will thus be made to blossom as the rose, where nature, unhelped, leaves wide expanses desert and unproductive. This water, which is the magical element by which this wilderness is transformed into a fruitful and populous country, is stored in the everlasting hills, where the rivers have their springs, and the forests are its natural

custodians and distributors. The water supply is abundant, and while the forests stand guard around the sources of the rivers, their flow is as everlasting as the hills themselves.

A mountain forest has more functions than most people have considered. It covers the hills with a vast mat or net-work of living root-fibers, and holds in place the ever-accumulating mass of mold and decomposing vegetable matter, which absorbs and retains the water of the rainfall and the melting snows. Such a forest is a great sponge, which receives all the water that falls on the mountains, and allows it to escape gradually, so as to maintain the steady flow of the rivers which it feeds. A forest is thus a natural reservoir for the storage and distribution of the water which falls upon it; and it is far more efficient, as well as far more economical, than any system of artificial storage reservoirs that can be substituted for it. If the forest is removed, this mighty sponge is destroyed, and there is then nothing to perform its function of holding back the water, which will rush down in overwhelming floods and torrents.

The first thing to be noted is that the water will thus all run away at once, at a time when but little of it is wanted, and there will be little or none of it left for the season when it is most needed. The rivers which have been fed by the mountain springs will soon be dry a great part of the year.

The next thing to be observed is that when the forests are destroyed the hills themselves are not everlasting. When the great sponge-like mass or cap of living root-fibers, mold, and decaying vegetation which the forest held in place as a crown for the hills is destroyed, the mountains themselves begin to crumble and melt away. The soil which for thousands of years has been meshed and matted along the steep slopes and around the shoulders of the hills has now nothing to keep it in place, and it begins to slip and sink away. When it is heaviest with accumulated water whole hillsides are dislodged from their supporting framework of rocks, and descend with resistless force to the plain below, carrying ruin in their path, and leaving the once beautiful face of the mountain seamed and scarred. The rivers are choked, their channels silted up, and the valleys and adjacent plains are buried irrecoverably beneath the vast accumulations of sand, gravel, and *débris* which the resistless annual floods bring down from the dissolving hills.

All this has been tried in every part of the civilized world, with the same unvarying result. There appears to be serious danger that these disastrous and fatal experiments will be repeated in our treatment of the mountain forests of the western part of our country; but as the forests now belong to the nation they should be effectively guarded against the short-sighted selfishness which would thus ruin them, and, by destroying them, forever prevent the development of the regions along the course of the streams below.

The plan proposed by "Garden and Forest" for the protection of these important forests embraces three essential features.

The first is the immediate withdrawal from sale of all forest lands belonging to the nation.

The second step is to commit to the United States army the care and guardianship of the nation's forests. It is shown in the article referred to that there is in

time of peace no other work of national defense or protection so valuable as this which the army can perform, and that the national forests cannot be adequately guarded and protected by any other means. It is obvious that the measures which have been tried, including those now in operation, or nominally in operation, have proved almost entirely ineffective. The officers of the army are picked men, educated at the expense of the nation, and already in its paid service.

The third step in this plan is the appointment by the President of "a commission to make a thorough examination of the condition of the forests belonging to the nation, and of their relation to the agricultural interests of the regions through which the streams flow which have their sources in these forests, and to report with the facts observed a comprehensive plan for the preservation and management of the public forests, including a system for the training, by the Government, of a sufficient number of foresters for the national forest service. . . . A National School of Forestry should be established at a suitable place in one of the great mountain forests on the public lands, and its equipment should be as thorough and adequate for its purpose as is that of the National Military Academy at West Point."

The plan thus proposed has the merit of being practical, and of providing the means and instruments for its own effective and successful administration.

Nothing else at once so direct and efficient, and so thoroughly adapted to accomplish these most important objects, has hitherto been presented for the consideration and action of the American people in connection with this department of our national interests. It should be adopted and put in operation as soon as possible.

#### The Dark Continent.

FROM the beginning of time, men have been accustomed to associate with the name of Africa only such conceptions as darkness, ignorance, helplessness, and the opportunity of oppression. Sir John Hawkins and the Roman conqueror of centuries before may have had little else in common, but they agreed in their belief that Africa and the Africans were fair game, the storehouse from which were to be drawn supplies of slaves, and in which Rob Roy's was the only law.

Since the Pharaohs' kingdom, with its supplies of grain to the Mediterranean region, and Carthage, with its more universal commercial intercourse, international relations have for centuries felt hardly any disturbing influences from the side of Africa, with the exception of the den of pirates so long permitted to exist in the Barbary States. Lord Salisbury's recent invidious speech about "black men" and their implied incapacity for national or international affairs, though applied to Hindus, was merely another curious survival of the feeling of absolute contempt bred from centuries of supreme international indifference to everything African except the plunder of Africa. This indifference was the product of the feeling that international interests and the balance of power were purely European affairs, a feeling which does not really date from the struggles of William and Louis, but from time immemorial,—from that time, at least, when the headlong retreat of the Persian from the shores of Greece

gave the first great shock to rudimentary international relations. From that time international law has virtually been founded on the notion that international rights were confined to the nations of Europe, while the nations of other continents had at best only international privileges.

One may well fancy the rudeness of the shock that would have been given to this notion by the appearance and geometrical increase of the great American Republic but for the self-control of the latter power. Silas Deane's wish for three thousand miles of fire between Europe and America has been pretty fairly fulfilled so far as international law is concerned; and diplomacy has been permitted to assume that the center and circumference of all its real rights and interests are in Europe. It has often been wondered that American diplomacy should have been so constantly successful; perhaps the wonder would be less if one could weigh exactly the natural desire of the diplomacy of the old school to maintain the *status quo* in order to neutralize its American rival by granting all the latter's reasonable demands, and thus to retain to itself the appearance of its ancient exclusiveness.

Circumstances seem to be forming new combinations to shock the solidity of the *status quo*. Not only are torpedo-boats, iron-clads, and perfected weapons and munitions at the service of any government that has money to buy them, but some governments, once accounted only barbarous, have come to know and value these tools of destruction and to use them as a defense. The Japanese army and navy must now be reckoned with by Russia and England in any general war in which these two rivals take part. China, which once relied on junks, gingals, and stink-pots for the extermination of the foreign devils, now patrols her own seas with well-appointed squadrons of iron-clads, and doubtless will not wait for European permission to take advantage of the earliest opportunity to settle up several long-standing accounts. Cases of the kind are numerous and striking, though those who talk so glibly of a "general European war" seem to ignore them and to imagine that international circumstances have not changed since the general European peace was made in 1815.

The share of the Dark Continent in the new circumstances thus far has been mainly commercial. He who can teach the black man to want and wear one shirt where none was worn before brings a wide and welcome increase to the markets of European producers; and it is shameful to be compelled to add that Christian nations have found a still richer mine in fastening upon Africa the love for distilled liquors. Under such auspices the Congo State has been born; but is it certain or probable that this is to be the end of all for Africa? Everything seems to portend an epoch of European colonization in the Dark Continent, modeled on the Congo State; but there are some considerations to the contrary.

Africa, like every other continent, has races of every type. It has its races of cowards, and its militant, conquering peoples. In the natural process, the former should go down and the latter come to the surface of things. We are apt to judge all Africans by the former type. But Lord Wolseley should know the black man as a fighter, if any one does; and he has recently

put on record<sup>1</sup> his testimony to the courage and determination with which the really military black races face any odds in battle. Our own civil war moreover has borne testimony to the superb fighting qualities of the African. In the very month in which Wolsley's testimony appeared, it received striking confirmation in the affair at Suakin, in which the negro allies of the English forces did so unfairly large a proportion of the fighting; and there are further confirmatory cases in the African warfare of the past, familiar enough to show that the Dark Continent has an abundance of the raw material for organized armies. And it is more than probable that the militant African will be as competent as our American Indian to handle modern weapons and munitions.

Why, then, when educated leaders shall be developed, should not Africa, in her turn, evolve governments as capable as China or Japan of throwing some weight into any general disturbance of the international balance? The possible wealth of Africa is immeasurably beyond that from which the far eastern powers have armed themselves. When we hear of Chinese and Japanese war fleets now, the conception of them has gradually become familiar; but the conception of them would have seemed about as strange thirty years ago as that of a Zulu squadron of iron-clads would seem to us now. It is certain that if any African power should come to have ambition enough to

form such a fleet, no European power would have any more scruple in seeking its aid by alliance than the Roman emperor had in accepting the tax from an unsavory source, and for the same reason.

It may be, of course, that all such speculations are less than idle; that the African is hopelessly a child or a slave; that the destiny of the Dark Continent is only to be exploited for the benefit of the other continents; and that the relations between Europe and Africa are always to be commercial only, and never in any wise international. It is well to notice, however, that this last hypothesis has already been relied upon in the case of China and Japan, and that it already seems to be proving somewhat delusive. One cannot feel certain that the other hypotheses above stated are not equally or more delusive. Certainly Africa shows no signs of supine acquiescence in a commercial fate. Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, and Italians are still chipping at the edges of the Dark Continent, and seem to find advance into the interior unexpectedly difficult. There may yet be the seeds of stirring international episodes in the Basuto, the Zulu, or the Ashanti, as Wolsley describes them; or in the men of whom he uses these astonishingly strong words: "I am certain our men would much prefer to fight the best European troops rather than the same number of African warriors who were under the influence of Mohammedan fanaticism."

## OPEN LETTERS.

### American Literature.<sup>2</sup>

WHOEVER will read through this big work, of which seven volumes are now issued, will have gained a knowledge of American history, not so connected, but much more vivid than he can get from Bancroft or Hildreth. And the best way to study history is in the documents. The editors have given a liberal interpretation to the word literature; indeed, they have been forced to do so, for it is not much more than half a century that literature as a fine art has been practiced in this country with any success.

The first two volumes cover the colonial period and follow the time division adopted by Tyler in his unfinished "History of American Literature," being devoted respectively to the years 1607-1675, and 1676-1764 (Tyler makes it 1607-1676 and 1677-1765). The dividing line between the first and second colonial period is Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia and King Philip's War in New England. These volumes, in fact, make an excellent supplement to Professor Tyler's work without in the least taking its place, since they consist merely of selections from colonial writers with no comment, and no biographical matter beyond the dates and places of birth and death. In this respect the "Library" differs from such standard collections as Duyckinck's and Griswold's. It is not a cyclopaedia;

it gives, in general, longer extracts, and its material is chosen with a nicer taste and from a more modern point of view.

A glance at the contents of the successive volumes in the series will enable the reader to follow the growth of the American mind and the development of a native society and a civilization which, if in the main derived from Europe, is also in a degree original. In the first volume, as was to be expected, the place of honor is given to that delightful soldier of fortune, Captain John Smith, of the Virginia Adventurers; and the greater part of the book is allotted to narratives of voyages, reports of life in the New World sent back to England, journals like Bradford's and Winthrop's, the sermons and theological writings of New England divines such as Hooker and Cotton, and descriptions of the Indians. This was the age of settlement and discovery, and the authors represented in this volume were all born in England and in great part reared there. Perhaps the most important names after those already mentioned are Roger Williams and John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians. In New England, theology seems to have formed the sole intellectual interest of the people and almost the daily business of their lives. The Cambridge platform; the letters of persecuted Quakers, "written in the common gaol in the bloody town of Boston"; the punning epitaphs composed upon deceased ministers by their survivors; and the metrical horrors of the famous "Bay Psalm Book" (1640), the first book printed in America, round out the picture of early colonial life in New England and deepen one's thank-

<sup>1</sup> "Fortnightly Review," December, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> A Library of American Literature, from the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time. Compiled and Edited by Edmund Clarence Stedman and Ellen Mackay Hutchinson. In ten volumes. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co. 1888.

fulness that one is only a *descendant* of the Puritans. But the great interest of their subject-matter and the earnestness of their spirit redeem the work of these ancient annalists and preachers from absolute dullness. Now and then there is a touch of quaintness, of simplicity or grave humor, or a bit of graphic narrative which seems like a concession to worldly-mindedness and engages the modern reader. Mistress Anne Bradstreet, "The Tenth Muse," our first if not really our worst poet, is not so amusing as the Sweet Singer of Michigan. Nathaniel Ward, "The Simple Cobbler of Agawam," is a humorist of that distressing variety which abounded in the generation of Thomas Fuller, and is not to be compared with Artemus the Delicious. But Captain John Underhill is a pleasant soul, and Thomas Morton of Merrymount has some contemporaneous human interest as a foil to the Puritans, and, if for no other reason, then because Hawthorne has made such good use of him in his "Maypole of Merrymount." There is, in truth, a legendary and almost mythological air about this Merrymount episode.

In the second volume we reach the first native American writers. The Calvinistic gloom of the Puritans takes a still deeper tinge, and we are met on the threshold with Michael Wigglesworth's "Day of Doom"—that strange New English *Inferno* which once made thousands of readers shudder and now makes an occasional one laugh, or would make him laugh were it not for a certain intensity and sincerity, amounting almost to poetic imagination, under its hard, literal diction and doggerel verse.

Thirty years later and this Calvinistic blackness gets a streak of blood across it, and we come to the Salem witch-killings—the internal, as Indian massacres were the external, tragedy of colonial New England. Increase and Cotton Mather—what Tyler calls "the dynasty of the Mathers"—are the prominent figures in the literature of this period. The "Magnalia" is the great book of old New England. Its author was pedantic, vain, bigoted, and superstitious. His book is crabbed enough in style, but it is full of meat, and may be relished to-day by readers with a strong stomach. The editors have done well in giving among their other selections from Cotton Mather his account of Captain Phips's adventure in raising the wreck of a Spanish treasure ship from a reef near Hispaniola. The whole life of Phips, as told in the "Magnalia," reads like a romance. Judge Sewall's confession of his guilt in the witchcraft matter is given, and also the indignant exposure of the whole business of Mather's "Invisible World," by Robert Calef, a Boston merchant, whose sanity, in contrast with the wretched credulity of the ministers and magistrates, imports a little of the eighteenth-century *éclaircissement* into the darkness of the seventeenth. The editors, for some reason, have not included the fine passage from Sewall's "Phænomena" which Whittier has versified and which Professor Tyler quotes in his "History." Room might have been made, too, for an extract from Higginson's "Attestation to Cotton Mather's Magnalia," which contains some really eloquent writing.

Narratives of captivity among the Indians, and ballads of Lovewell's Fight and of the French and Indian War, continue, in this volume, the history of the gradual extinction of the aborigines begun in the first. Although the Indians had ceased to be a serious

menace to the advance of the English settlements, they were in some respects more formidable to outlying towns, like Deerfield, than they had been in the days of the Pequot and King Philip's wars, being organized and supplied with fire-arms by their French allies. The opening up of the Carolinas and the survey of the Dismal Swamp furnish new fields to the literature of exploration and wild adventure. In the eighteenth century Puritanism finds its most spiritual and most logical expression in Jonathan Edwards, who must be pronounced, upon the whole, the greatest name in our strictly colonial period. Edwards's limpid style and "that inward sweetness" in his "sense of divine things" give a beauty to some of his pages which makes them the nearest approach to pure literature in the writings of American theologians before Channing. Copious and judicious selections are given from Hubbard's "History of New England" and from the Virginia historians Beverly and Stith, whose more formal works now began to take the place of contemporary journals like Bradford's and Winthrop's. Finally, towards the end of the volume, we reach the first American dramatist, Thomas Godfrey of Philadelphia, whose tragedy "The Prince of Parthia" (1765) has nothing to recommend it to curiosity except its date.

The third volume is devoted to the literature of the Revolution (1765-1787). Politics now takes the first place, hitherto occupied by theology, and even the sermons of the time have a strong tinge of patriotism. Franklin is the great figure of the volume. He was the first American man of letters who gained a European reputation, except, possibly, Edwards; the first intellectual product of the New World that could be measured against those of the old by the same standards without allowances or qualifications. The selections from Franklin are fairly representative of his many-sided activity. They include several of his papers on electricity, letters on public questions and private opinions, amusing trifles like "The Whistler," and the "Dialogue between Franklin and the Gout," and passages from "Poor Richard's Almanac," and from the still popular "Autobiography," the most humanly interesting American book of the last century. The spirit of Franklin and of his age was very different from that of Mather or of Jonathan Edwards. He was *émancipé*—a deist and a utilitarian, distinctly secular and unspiritual. In his inventiveness, thrift, common sense, and practicality he stands out as the "primal Yankee." Matthew Arnold, who praised the crystal clearness of his English, thought him the most characteristic American in literature.

The eighteenth-century rebound from the religious tension of the seventeenth is seen also in the writings of other American deists, like Jefferson, "Tom" Paine, and Ethan Allen. The political writings and speeches of these and other patriots, such as Otis, Washington, the Adamses, Patrick Henry, Jay, Josiah Quincy, etc., make up the bulk of the volume. Revolutionary songs and ballads, both Whig and Tory, and documents like the Declaration of Independence, give fullness to the historic view of the period. The Loyalist side is represented by extracts from Governor Hutchinson, James Rivington, the official Tory printer of the "Gazette," and the famous "History of Connecticut," by Rev. Samuel Peters, the source of unnumbered slanders on the land of steady habits. There are eight pages from

the diary of John Woolman, that ancient New Jersey Friend and abolitionist, whose quaint sweetness of spirit made Charles Lamb fall in love with the early Quakers. In the prose and verse of Francis Hopkinson of Philadelphia, in Trumbull's "M'Fingal" and the pasquinades of the other "Hartford wits," we encounter satire and humor not entirely devoid of point even at this distance of time. And in Philip Freneau we reach the first real American poet. The editors would have done well, perhaps, to include among their selections from Hopkinson the description of a salt-box in his "College Examination," which is better known than anything of his except the "Battle of the Kegs." The selections from Freneau are good, but "The Indian Student" is more deserving of a place in the volume than any of the author's political or satirical verses, which are all worthless, except "Eutaw Springs."

In this volume, as in the latter part of the second and throughout the fourth, the changes in style keep pace with the advancing literary fashions of the mother country. There is the same difference between the prose of Cotton Mather and that of Jonathan Edwards as between the prose of Burton and that of Locke. Dryden and Butler, a little later Addison and Pope, a little later still Johnson and Goldsmith, become the models of our lighter literature in prose and verse. "M'Fingal" imitates Hudibras; William Livingston, afterwards governor of New Jersey, in his poem "Philosophical Solitude" (1747), tells in the manner of the "Rape of the Lock" of the coquetries of "nymphs" like Sylvia and Chloe:

Then parrots, lapdogs, monkeys, squirrels, beaux,  
Fans, ribbons, tuckers, patches, furbelows,  
In quick succession through their fancies run,  
And dance incessant on the flippant tongue.

In President Dwight's "Triumph of Infidelity" (1788) and Mercy Warren's poems (1790), Pope continues to give the law, though Dwight's "Greenfield Hill" shows some influence of Goldsmith and Cowper. Franklin's "Busybody" (1729) was an imitation of the "Spectator." Freneau shows distinct traces of Gray's and Collins's elegiac verse. There was little or nothing as yet of original value in our polite literature.

The literature of the Republic begins with the fourth volume (1788-1820). This was the era of constitution-making and constitutional interpretation in American political history, and here the important names are those of Hamilton, Marshall, Gallatin (in finance), Fisher Ames, and later, as the points at issue between the Federalists and the States-Rights party developed and the slavery question loomed ominous, John Quincy Adams, Josiah Quincy, and that line of great orators, Randolph, Clay, Webster, and Calhoun. It was the golden age of American eloquence, and the most imposing figure in the volume is that of Daniel Webster. Theology retires more and more into the background, and general literature, though still imitative, puts forth brave attempts. The forms of our first comedian, Royall Tyler, our first lexicographer, Noah Webster, and our first professional novelist, Charles Brockden Brown, come into view. Tyler was, in his day, a versatile and even brilliant figure, though his work has not worn well. His "Contrast," the first American comedy regularly produced, was acted at the John Street Theater in New York in 1786, and is somewhat after the manner—as to the dialogue—of Sheridan's plays.

Tyler's novel, "The Algerine Captive," suggests Smollett and Le Sage, and a passage given from his "The Yankey in London" (1809) shows that the differentiation between English English and American English (as in the use of *guess* and *clever*), which forms so large a part of the stock in trade of our "international" novelists, had already become noticeable. Brown's uncanny romances have recently been republished entire. He was not without genius, and faintly foretokens Hawthorne. Shelley, as is well known, fed upon his novels, and contributed to the same school of fiction his youthful performances, "Zastrozzi" and "St. Irvyne, or the Rosicrucian." There is a native touch in such anonymous ballads as "The Country School" and "Sleighting Song," the latter slightly reminding one of a very popular sleighting idyl by one of the editors of this "Library." Under John Quincy Adams we miss the clever and rather well-known verses entitled "The Wants of Man," which are a sort of anticipation of Dr. Holmes's "Contentment," as Thomas Green Fessenden's ballad "The Country Lovers," here given, is of Lowell's "The Courtin'." The beginnings of Knickerbocker literature are illustrated by passages from William Irving and J. K. Paulding; and the approach of a finer culture in New England by specimens from the novels, lectures, and poems of Washington Allston. Of pieces still current and generally familiar we may note, as falling within this period, Hopkinson's "Hail, Columbia," Moore's "Visit from St. Nicholas," and Key's "Star-Spangled Banner." A feature of this volume, repeated in some of the later ones, is a collection of "Noted Sayings," such as Commodore Perry's "We have met the enemy, and they are ours," and Pinckney's "Millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute." (What he really did say was, "Not a penny, not a penny!")

With volume five (1821-1834) we enter upon the beginning of American literature in the stricter sense of the word. There was little or nothing before this in the nature of creative or imaginative work of any permanent importance. But now we come upon the names of Irving and Cooper; of historians like Prescott; naturalists like Audubon; poets like Pierpont, Dana, Halleck, Bryant, Percival, and Drake; orators and lecturers like Everett and Choate. None of these is quite forgotten, and several of them are as fresh in interest as ever. And though the volume is in general a depository of faded reputations, it holds many single pieces which are still retained in the anthologies and preserved in popular recollection. Such are "The Old Oaken Bucket" of Samuel Woodworth, Mrs. Willard's "Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep," Wilde's "My Life is like the Summer Rose," Payne's "Home, Sweet Home!" Dr. Muhlenberg's "I Would not Live Away," and others, less known but equally worthy of remembrance, like Lavinia Stoddard's "The Soul's Defiance," the spirited anonymous ballad entitled "The Yankee Man-of-War," and Grenville Mellen's fine poem, "The Bugle." Mellen's battle-piece, with its noble closing line:

High over all the lonely bugle grieves,

which Emerson admired and inserted in his "Parnassus," is not given here. The volume opens fittingly with the name of Dr. Channing, whose "Remarks on National Literature" (1823) was the first formal

declaration of our intellectual independence of England. It shows how young our genuinely American literature still is, that some of the writers represented in this volume have died within the last decade. Bryant, *e. g.*, died in 1878; R. H. Dana and General Dix in 1879; Palfrey, the historian of New England, in 1881; Dr. Orville Dewey and Thurlow Weed in 1882.

The sixth volume (1835-1860) covers what still remains the great period of American literature — the generation that preceded the civil war. This is crowded with names of the first importance: Emerson, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Whittier, Poe, and Bancroft, whose works still form our favorite and daily reading; and with others, whose writings, though less familiar, are yet significant, and in part, at least, survive: Alcott, Pinkney, Prentice, Willis, Simms, and Margaret Fuller. Although the period was rich in pure literature, the selections continue to take in a wide range and to illustrate American thought on many sides. The speeches and political writings of public men, such as Lincoln, Seward, Garrison, Chase, John Brown, Jefferson Davis, Robert Toombs, and Caleb Cushing; the work of theologians, like Horace Bushnell, Theodore Parker, Mark Hopkins, and Orestes Brownson; of scholars in many departments, such as Lieber, Woolsey, Marsh, Hedge, Felton, Barnard, and Peirce; of literary critics, like Ripley and Hillard; and of historians, like Gayarré and Hildreth — all these are amply presented. In this period the national mind seems first to reach maturity. The authors above named are distinguished, in general, from their predecessors: in *belles lettres*, by a stronger and finer art, a greater native impulse, and a freedom from the influence of foreign and especially of English models; in the literature of knowledge, by a wider learning and a nicer scholarship, which testify to the improvements in American education; in divinity, by a more liberal spirit and a disposition to attend more to religious philosophy and less to dogmatic theology, which shows the influence of Unitarian dissent in New England and the growth of a more cosmopolitan population in the country at large; and in political literature, by a plainer style, a more earnest and sincere conviction, and a higher moral tone in the discussion of party issues, particularly of the slavery question.

The seventh volume continues the literary history of the same generation (1835-1860) and adds the names of Mrs. Stowe, Holmes, Motley, Thoreau, Lowell, Walt Whitman, and of their less famous contemporaries, many of whom are still living and writing. Politics and political journalism — the latter not ignored in previous volumes — are represented mainly by passages from the writings of Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips, Horace Greeley, Alexander H. Stephens, Henry J. Raymond, and Generals Grant and Sherman; and liberal extracts are given from Beecher's sermons, lectures, and public addresses, and several pages of characteristic sentences and paragraphs from his extemporaneous discourses. One hundred and thirty-eight authors are drawn upon in this seventh volume, whose contents exhibit a greater variety than any one of the preceding. The majority of these are fairly well known, but now and then a selection occurs which will strike the general reader as something of a rarity or a literary curiosity. Such is the passage from Delia Bacon, the originator of the "Baconian theory" of Shakspere. Such the "Table-Talk" of Thomas Gold Appleton, who

said so many good things and wrote so little. Such also the two poems from the little known volume of Sam Ward, the King of the Lobby, prince of good fellows, most accomplished of talkers and of diners. It was over the mahogany, indeed, that we first heard from his own lips his little poem "Edelweiss," and a few stanzas of his clever French translation of "Locksley Hall,"

C'est bien toi, manoir de Locksley,

either one of which would have graced a page in volume seven.

Mr. Stedman and Miss Hutchinson have performed their task with excellent judgment, knowledge, and care. We do not see how any student of American history or literature — unless he has a very full library of Americana of his own — can afford to be without this collection.

Henry A. Beers.

Buchanan, Lincoln, and Duff Green.

IN December, 1860, President Buchanan sent to President-elect Lincoln, by General Duff Green, an urgent invitation to come immediately to Washington, with assurances that he would be received and treated with all due courtesy; the object of the invitation being that they might consult and act in concert to "save the Union without bloodshed," if possible. In *THE CENTURY* for November, 1887, page 87, the authors of the *Life of Lincoln* say:

Whether this proposition came by authority or not, Lincoln could not publicly either question the truth of the envoy or the motive of the mission. In either case the appeal was most adroitly laid. Of course it was impossible to accept or even to entertain it. . . . His [General Green's] whole aim had been to induce Lincoln tacitly to assume responsibility for the Southern revolt.

Mrs. Green's nephew, Ninian W. Edwards, and Mr. Lincoln married sisters. This family alliance led to a warm personal friendship between Mr. Lincoln and General Green, which continued down to their last meeting, on board the *Maker*, at Richmond, Virginia, April 5, 1865, when Mr. Lincoln sprung forward to greet General Green with the exclamation, "My dear old friend, can I do anything for you?"

When Mr. Lincoln came to Washington as a member of Congress he took lodgings in Carroll Place, then more commonly called "Green's Row," that he might be near General Green, and his wife near Mrs. Green. The following, which is one of many letters to General Green, illustrates their friendly and confidential relations. This letter was "confidential" in 1849, but the lapse of time, the death of both parties, and the reference to General Green in the *Life of Lincoln* justify its publication now:

SPRINGFIELD, ILLS., May 18, 1849.

DEAR GENERAL:

I learn from Washington that a man by the name of Butterfield<sup>1</sup> will probably be appointed Commissioner of the General Land Office. This ought not to be. That is about the only crumb of patronage which Illinois expects; and I am sure the mass of General Taylor's friends here would quite as lief see it go east of the Alleghanies, or west of the Rocky Mountains, as into that man's hands. They are already sore on the subject of his

<sup>1</sup> Justin Butterfield, who was appointed.—EDITOR.

getting office. In the great contest of '40 he was not seen or heard of; but when the victory came, three or four old drones, including him, got all the valuable offices, through what influence no one has yet been able to tell. I believe the only time he has been very active was last spring a year, in opposition to General Taylor's nomination.

Now cannot you get the ear of General Taylor? Ewing is for B., and therefore he must be avoided. Preston I think will favor you. Mr. Edwards has written me offering to decline, but I advised him not to do so. Some kind friends think I ought to be an applicant; but I am for Mr. Edwards. Try to defeat B., and in doing so use Mr. Edwards, J. L. D. Morrison, or myself, whichever you can to best advantage. Write me, and let this be confidential.

Yours truly,  
A. LINCOLN.

Mr. Buchanan knew of these friendly relations, and therefore chose General Green as his "envoy." When the proposition was submitted to Mr. Lincoln, he not only expressed his willingness to accept it, but manifested an eagerness to start at once for Washington. He regretted being detained by an appointment with Senator Ben. Wade, whom he was expecting by every train, and said that he would start for Washington as soon as he had met that appointment. Senator Wade came and opposed the proposition successfully. Mr. Lincoln changed his mind and declined Mr. Buchanan's invitation.

Failing in this, General Green then sought to obtain from Mr. Lincoln a letter which could be used at the South as an antidote to his Cooper Institute speech and his speech of the 16th of June, 1858, before the State convention at Springfield, Illinois (see *THE CENTURY* for July, 1887, p. 386), in which he took the ground that "this Government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free," and which had led the South to believe that he and his party would be satisfied with nothing short of the "extinction" of slavery. So far from his "whole aim" being to throw on Mr. Lincoln the "responsibility for the Southern revolt," General Green's only aim was to relieve him of that responsibility by satisfying the South that they had no reason to fear that he would make or countenance in others any attempt to emancipate their slaves. In this he also failed. The letter sent by Mr. Lincoln to Senator Trumbull, to be delivered "if, on consultation, our friends, including yourself, think it can do no harm," never reached General Green.

General Green's own account of his mission to Springfield and of his interview with Mr. Lincoln in Richmond after its occupation by the Federal troops may be found in "Facts and Suggestions," by Duff Green, published in 1866 by Richardson & Co., New York, and Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

At Richmond, Mr. Lincoln told General Green that Mr. Corwin's resolution, prohibiting Congress from any interference with slavery in the slaveholding States, was passed on the last night of the session at his (Lincoln's) request. Commenting on this, General Green wrote as follows:

This resolution was unanimously adopted on the 3d March, 1861, by both houses of Congress, and, as it now appears, upon the recommendation of Mr. Lincoln, as a means of arresting the secession movement. Who can doubt that, if he had come to Washington in December, 1860, as I urged him to do, and had then exerted a like influence, it . . . would have prevented the war.

DALTON, GEORGIA.

Ben. E. Green.

#### Sea-Coast and Lake Defenses.

GLANCING through the great four-volume report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, with which I have just been favored through the courtesy of that officer, I find *one page*, out of its three thousand pages, of business-like statements of work done during the year reported upon, which, if none other, ought to interest and impress every patriotic citizen.

Describing the condition of our so-called "sea-coast and lake frontier defenses," this officer remarks, "The wisdom of providing for the public defense in time of peace and while the Government is in a condition of financial prosperity would appear to be too evident to need further demonstration." The matter has been repeatedly reported upon, and the result has been the annual expenditure, years ago, of about \$100,000 per annum, until 1885; since which date absolutely nothing has been done. The consequence of this miserable state of affairs is thus graphically stated by the Chief of Engineers; and could anything be more pitiful?

Neglect of any structure, however massive or well built, results in more or less rapid deterioration, and we find to-day everything connected with our permanent defenses, which are dependent upon annual appropriations for the maintenance and repair, going to rack and ruin: slopes overgrown with grass and weeds and gullied by the rain; walks and roads ragged and untrimmed and full of holes and breaks; ditches and drains filled up or fallen in, and pools of stagnant water on the parades and in the casemates; the sewers in bad order with the consequent evils; mortar and cement fall from the joints of masonry for the want of repointing; timber gun and ammunition platforms rotten or decayed; and permanent concrete or masonry platforms settling or out of plumb, thus preventing the proper service of the guns; casemates and quarters leaky, unhealthy, and uninhabitable; magazines damp and useless; revetment walls and water fronts falling down, and waves making serious and rapid encroachments on valuable land, thus impairing eligible sites for future works; and generally about the ungarrisoned forts an appearance of total abandonment and decay; and from the commanders of garrisoned forts continued and urgent appeals to keep the works in order for the comfort and convenience of the garrison and the efficient use of the armaments.

Was there ever a more extraordinary picture of the inefficiency of our legislative body or of the shiftlessness that may sometimes characterize the administration of such trusts? What facts or what circumstances could give the enemies of the republican system of government a better argument against government by representatives chosen by the people? A great nation like ours permits every material guarantee of the permanence of its institutions to be absolutely neglected; pays not the slightest attention to its most important defensive armaments; allows its army and navy to become weakened, demoralized, and incapable of doing the work assigned, and placidly sees the smallest of those nations with which it is liable at any time, through the fault of the stranger or the incapacity of its own administrations, to be forced into conflict, providing itself with fleets and armies such as give the enemy the power to inflict incalculable and irremediable damage on our coasts before we can even make a fair beginning in the work of rehabilitating our defenses. Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, even the smallest of the South American republics, in case of the sudden outbreak of such hostilities as may result from any folly of the least among our foreign representatives, of the pettiest consul, could to-day bombard New York

City more easily than Gillmore bombarded Charleston during our own civil war, and would do more injury in six months than could be repaired in years.

The work now in progress on our navy is a mere drop in the bucket in comparison with that constantly in progress in the dock-yards of every respectable naval power in the world. But this neglect of duty and common prudence on the part of a great nation is hardly greater as a crime than is its folly in turning a deaf ear to its own monitors, the older and wiser officers of its army and its navy,—those who know best what are the dangers of the situation,—and in plodding on after the mighty dollar while risking national life.

R. H. Thurston.

SIBLEY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

"The Place Called Calvary."

IT has come to my knowledge that surprise has been expressed in some quarters that Mr. Fisher Howe did not know what the German author Otto Thenius had once said concerning the place of our Lord's crucifixion. I suppose my own words, in the article "Where was 'the Place called Calvary'?" published in THE CENTURY for November, 1888, may have given such an intimation. I said that Mr. Howe "did not know that any one had ever spoken even casually about such a thing." This occurs in the midst of my reference to the conversation between Dr. Rufus Anderson and Dr. Eli Smith. A part of this conversation

as I quoted it was necessarily left out in the article, and so the point of my remark was lost. On page 34 of Mr. Howe's "True Site of Calvary" he has given a long paragraph concerning Thenius's testimony to the correctness of the theory which he was advocating. His language is: "While preparing this paper, we have been much interested in finding that a German author, Otto Thenius, arrived, several years ago, at the same conclusion in regard to the place of crucifixion which we are aiming to establish." Thence he hastens to couple with this the indorsement of Ritter, whose volume was evidently before him at the moment. Ritter's language is: "Thenius has endeavored to show, and has displayed great learning and acuteness in the effort, that the situation of Golgotha was separated some distance from the burial-place, and that it was in front of the Damascus Gate upon the skull-shaped hill alluded to in which the Cave of Jeremiah is found." Mr. Howe was apparently delighted to discover a hint of corroboration anywhere, for his heart was in the work he was trying then to accomplish; because he soon remarks, as if in disappointment at not finding some valuable help, "It is to be regretted that the views expressed by Thenius on this interesting topic have not been reproduced by Ritter, or his translator." It is plain that Mr. Howe had constructed his entire argument, and was already putting it into readiness for printing, with no aid from anything which Ritter had thought it worth while to quote.

Charles S. Robinson.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

## A Villanelle.

(With a copy of Jean Passerat's  
"J'ay perdu ma tourterelle; . . .  
Je veux aller après elle.")

JEAN PASSERAT, thy tourterelle,  
The dove that from thy bosom flew,  
Does not with any mortal dwell:

And with it went the villanelle—  
The art is, like thy dove, "perdu!"  
Jean Passerat, thy tourterelle

Eludes the modern poet's spell;  
To reproduce thy ring-dove's coo  
Does not with any mortal dwell.

Once from the skies a clear note fell,  
A purple pinion cleft the blue:  
Jean Passerat, thy tourterelle

It was not, though it mocked thee well—  
But thy sweet song to wake anew  
Does not with any mortal dwell:

And since thyself went "après elle"—  
Went after her the white gates through—  
Jean Passerat, thy tourterelle  
Does not with any mortal dwell!

Charles Henry Webb.

## Reflections.

STILTS are no better in conversation than in a foot-race.

FOLLY must hold its tongue while wearing the wig of wisdom.

IT is the foolish aim of the atheist to scan infinitude with a microscope.

WHEN poverty comes in at the cottage door, true love goes at it with an ax.

A VEIN of humor should be made visible without the help of a reduction mill.

THE reformer becomes a fanatic when he begins to use his emotions as a substitute for his reasoning faculty.

MANY an object in life must be attained by flank movements; it is the zigzag road that leads to the mountain-top.

ALL the paths of life lead to the grave, and the utmost that we can do is to avoid the short cuts.

THE office should seek the man, but it should inspect him thoroughly before taking him.

HUMILITY is most serviceable as an undergarment, and should never be worn as an overcoat.

THE Good Samaritan helps the unfortunate wayfarer without asking how he intends to vote.

J. A. Macon.



## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### The Day of Independence.

IT is probable that the era of "centennialism," if the coinage of such a word be permissible, which set in about 1875, is now at an end for a long time to come. The successive events of the American Revolution, of the period of confusion which followed it, and of the final establishment of sound national government, have all had their days of remembrance, concluded fittingly by the great celebration of last April in New York City; and it is not easy to see any near occasion for renewing the series. There have been events in our history for which remembrance might be suggested during the next twenty years; but they are those in which the United States can claim no peculiar property, such as the discovery of America, or events in the special history of the individual States, which can hardly excite general interest, or such as the voyages of the Cabots, which, however important, are somewhat too academic to enlist any genuine popular enthusiasm. It is most probable, then, that we are to have no recurrence of "centennial" anniversaries this side of the naval victories of 1812 at least, and that patriotism must content itself for that length of time with the simple and less heroic interests of the present, relying no longer for inspiration upon the great occasions of the past.

It should not be believed that the occasions of the present lose in real dignity by comparison with those of the past, any more than that the fathers of the Republic would have been better engaged in holding "centennial" celebrations themselves than in doing the duty which lay nearest to them. It is not by great occasions, or by the spasmodic energies of a desperate patriotism, that the rank of a people in history is to be measured. Such events are like the stamp of the die upon the coin; it may be impressed on bullion or on base metal. Spain had her Zaragoza, as we had our Bunker Hill; but when King Ferdinand resumed his throne he found no tools of his tyranny more subservient than the rural population, such as had defended Zaragoza. The true metal, to which alone the stamp can give permanent currency, is that courage which is the representative of long years of the assiduous practice of the homelier virtues of good citizenship. If Bunker Hill had represented only brute courage, or "war to the knife," the British Ministry might have found it a real victory, or some American usurper might have made it a stepping-stone to a despotism: the secret of the battle was in the fact that Miles Standish, and the Winthrops, and Thomas Hooker, and all the host of unnamed worthies of New England history for a hundred and fifty years, stood behind the breastworks, and made certain of permanent results in spite of temporary defeat. The interest of such an event is not in the mere pugilist's wonder that embattled farmers should withstand regular soldiers, but in the struggle of good citizenship, with its inevitable results, against the prizes and incentives offered by a privileged class.

It may be or may not be that the exercise of the simple civic virtues in the present is a preparation for some future Bunker Hill; but he must be strangely blind who cannot see the approach of enemies as fatal to the Republic and as easily visible as the long line of red-coats which landed at Charlestown on that June morning of 1775. Here is the professional politician, who buys votes and corrupts citizenship at its fountain-head; the venal politician, to whom office is valuable only for its opportunities of marketing his own vote; the "ring"-leader, who exploits the taxing-power and leaves behind him a broad track of speculation and debt; the demagogue, who makes political and personal profit out of religious and race differences; the machine politician, who appropriates his share of the civil service while he cants about the people's right to the offices; the man who thinks it an act of tyranny to impose limits or checks upon his right to tempt his neighbors to drink; the corporate tyranny which insists on having only helpless workmen to deal with, or the "labor" tyranny which hounds, cripples, or murders the helpless individual—every grade of civic offenders, from the petty larcenist up or down, to the imported scoundrel who prepares dynamite bombs for the police. More terrible than an army with banners, more insidious and aggressive than the assaulting line at Bunker Hill, these modern foes of the Republic are to be met and overcome, not by "centennial" celebrations, but by just those civic virtues which gave possibility to the great events of the past.

The power of the Republic in the present is great, but it is an error to believe that it was not fully foreseen a hundred years since. Franklin and others amused their leisure with mathematical calculations of the increase of population, which time has shown to have been singularly correct. President Stiles of Yale College, who, in a sermon of 1760, on the conquest of Canada, had predicted the development of "a Provincial Confederacy," and perhaps the growth of an "imperial dominion" out of the Confederacy, went further into the future in his election sermon of 1783. "It is probable that within a century from our independence the sun will shine on fifty millions of inhabitants in the United States. This will be a great, a very great nation, nearly equal to half Europe. And if the present rate of increase should be rather diminished in some of the other settlements, yet an accelerated multiplication will attend our general propagation, and overspread the whole territory westward for ages." But the preacher saw the attendant dangers with equal clearness. He warned posterity, as well as his hearers, that there was need of "vigilance against corruption in purchasing elections and in designations to office in the legislatures and Congress, instituting such efficacious provisions against corruption as shall preclude the possibility of its rising to any great height before it shall be controlled and corrected. Although, in every political administration, the appointment to office will ever be considerably influenced by the sinister, private,

personal motives either of interest or friendship, yet the safety of the state requires that this should not go too far." If a preacher's forecast made such a warning necessary then, how much more must be added now from our bitter experience? How necessary such words of solemn and prophetic admonition as those spoken by Bishop Potter at St. Paul's on the chief day of the centennial celebration—in the presence of one President and two ex-Presidents.

We saw, thirteen years ago, the scene of enthusiasm when the dawning of Independence Day commemorated the origin of the festival just a hundred years before. We may easily imagine the intense excitement which would characterize it this year if armed and alien enemies stood in military array within the boundaries of the Republic. And yet there has never been a time in our country's history when the elements of reverence for the past and anxiety for the present and the future were more necessary than in the celebration of this first Independence Day of the Constitution's second century. There are many subjects which deserve the most serious reflection of any American who aspires to good citizenship. It is high time for him to awake out of slumber and disappoint the hopes of the intestine foes of all good citizens. He can no longer afford to believe that all the voters of the opposite party are rogues; that he is serving his country when he uses his citizenship for the mere purpose of circumventing them; that he is under any obligation to transfer to local elections the issues and passions which are appropriate only to national elections; or that in general every man whom he finds labeled with his party title becomes thereby a Heaven-ordained leader, to be trusted implicitly and followed unshrinkingly: these are the familiar tricks and devices by which self-seeking politicians of all parties have kept the good people of these States divided and neutralized, taking to themselves the objects of their own desire. To repudiate such influences may seem an easy task, but human nature makes it one of the most difficult of human experience. To meet it with success, there is need of all the resources to be drawn from the training of the past and the feeling of responsibility for the future; and for such considerations there have been few Independence Days more appropriate than that of 1889, when the political passions of the past have cooled and the strong winds of coming struggles are yet at a distance. The thoughts appropriate to the day may be less exciting than usual this year, but it cannot be said that they are less important.

#### The Summer Exodus, and what it Testifies.

THE contrast between the past and the present of American life will hardly find a more striking embodiment than in the changes in the mode of passing the summer. Within the memory of many of us, a complete change of residence during the hot months was a luxury confined to comparatively few. Country people never thought of it; and it was believed that in the cities the first subterfuge of an ambitious family was to close the front of the house and to live in the back rooms, if so be that they could thus persuade the world of their neighborhood that they too had taken part in the annual flitting. If city children were sent for the summer to the grand-paternal farm, they were fortunate

beyond their fellows. Now the case is changed past recognition. Social conditions seem to be ordered to meet a general summer exodus. Summer hotels are everywhere. They form an almost continuous line along the coast of New England and the Middle States; one mountain region after another has succumbed to their invasion; the lakes of the interior have begun to prove most attractive watering-places; and the rising tide of summer travel has begun to cut new channels for itself—along the Pacific coast, on the Gulf of Mexico, and in the great pine woods and the hill territory of the South. The summer cottage has been elastic enough to meet the needs of purses of every grade: it ranges from that which is almost a palace in its extent and equipment or the wide-stretching club-park, with its reserved rights of shooting or fishing, to the economical boarding-place or the Adirondack cabin. Poor indeed is the family that cannot contrive by the exercise of forethought and thrift to secure some brief summer's outing, for the bread-winners or for all the members of the family; and when the inability seems to exist, it is more often a certain incompatibility between the family resources and the family desires. The development has even gone further, and many who cannot afford such a relaxation contrive a substitute by transferring their scene of work to summer resorts, or have it furnished for them by "fresh-air funds."

Much of this change in the habits of the people has undoubtedly been due to the increasing tendency to a city life. However great the attractions of the city may be, man retains something of the nature of Antæus, and needs an occasional renewal of direct contact with mother earth to keep him in full vigor. When the proportion of those who are habitually confined to an urban life has increased from one-thirtieth to one-third it is natural that there should be a correspondingly increased pressure for summer relaxation and for accommodations to supply it. Even this explanation, however, is by no means adequate. It would account for the increased stream of Americans who wish to leave the cities during the summer, but not for their ability to indulge the desire. The fact that school-teachers, who naturally long for a summer outing, are many times more numerous than they were fifty years ago, will not tell us why that sorely underpaid class of workers, for whom there was no provision then, has now a store of vacation resorts from which to choose.

The subject may have much more than a merely curious interest. Mr. Henry George and his disciples have strenuously asserted that the rewards of labor are both actually and comparatively less than they were fifty years ago, and others have as strenuously contradicted them. It is impossible, unfortunately, to array any undoubted or fairly indubitable testimony on either side. Those who labored and were paid for their labor fifty years ago are most of them dead, and can tell us nothing about the matter. Those who are still alive are by no means the same persons that they were fifty years ago; they cannot compare the two periods fairly and tell us whether the intervening time has given them more or less for their work. Figures are incorrigible liars. They leave out of view all sorts of conditions, which materially change their size and weight. A table of comparative wages may tell us in plain figures the workman's different rates of wages at two different periods, while it tells nothing of the varia-

tions in the price of flour or meat, or in rent or clothing, all of which the workman would find to be very serious limitations on the real purchasing power of his money wages. Even when we get figures for these latter elements they profit us little. The average price of flour for a particular year may be a high one, but this may be due either to continuous high prices throughout the year, or to an abnormally high price for some months, in which the workman has felt it very little by reason of his ability to provide substitutes for flour at that time. No mere wage statistics, moreover, will tell us whether the workman, under the wages current for either point of time, had work enough for all the year around, or for but a part of the year. Again, the price of board or the total cost of living may have remained the same, while improvements in transportation have added to the table beef and mutton from the West, fish from the Pacific coast, and canned goods from all parts of the country or of the world, thus enabling the same money, or the same wages, to furnish that prime necessity for man, a varied diet. Countless parallel reasons have led men to impeach the validity of almost every collocation of figures, and fair-minded men, while admitting the figures as conclusive upon their own judgment, have often shrunk from any attempt to impose them upon the judgment of others. The figures do seem to show that Mr. George is utterly wrong, and that the condition of the workingman has improved greatly during the past half-century. Every new collocation of figures which brings out the same result strengthens the mathematical probability of that conclusion, and yet we can hardly say that the inherent weakness of figures has so far been overcome that the case is decided.

Under such circumstances, the summer exodus may contain indications which are more trustworthy and of more real weight than any mere figures can be. A column of wage statistics may, out of willfulness, inattention, or pure ignorance in the compiler, omit elements which are essential to any complete or just conclusion; but no such imperfection can be attributed to such a social fact as that which we are considering. The summer exodus is the mathematical result of a composition of all the forces which bear on the question: it omits no consideration which is essential to the conclusion; it assigns to each its comparative importance with an accuracy which no human compilation of figures can hope to reach; and its summing-up may be of the greatest service in showing us whether the progress of the past fifty years has really been accompanied by any relative increase of poverty. If the summer exodus has grown only as the country has grown; if it is confined to the same social classes to which it was confined in 1839; if the numbers who take part in it have increased only in proportion to the increase of those classes; still more, if there has been any relative falling-off in number — then we may as well admit that there is the strongest of indications that our progress has not done much for poverty. If, on the other hand, we find that the numbers of those who can now indulge in the summer's outing have grown far beyond the mere numerical increase of population; that the annual movement has penetrated further downward to social strata which could not have thought of it a half-century ago — then we may surely take the whole development as a fair indication that progress has done something to take the edge from

poverty, unless we are to take it that the people are obstinately bent nowadays on taking vacations which they cannot really afford. It is from this point of view that such social phenomena are most worthy of study, as well as most easy of apprehension. There are not many who cannot make some contribution to the discussion; and the greater the amount of light which is poured upon it the greater is the likelihood of a just and permanent decision.

#### Outdoor Sports.

THERE comes to the American people, with the hot weather, the season in which outdoor sports seem to reign supreme. Boat-races and baseball matches follow one another in bewildering succession. The newspapers reek with championships and gossip about champions and would-be champions. You shall find the spectators at a single game of baseball outnumbering the entire population of such a city as Boston a hundred years ago. Schoolboys are no longer the only ones who are thought to suffer such amusements to come between them and their work; an equal interest in outdoor sports is attributed to judges and lawyers, editors and reporters, merchants and clerks; and it is even said that our Saturday half-holidays are in many cases due less to interest in the health of subordinates than to the desire of principals to witness some outdoor athletic contest. At any rate, it should be understood that lack of interest in open-air amusements is no longer to be included among the faults of the American people.

We may grant at once all that is claimed for the new development by its professed admirers. It will doubtless exert a strong influence against the intrusion of weak lungs, hearts, and livers into our pulpits, editorial and court rooms, and other scenes of professional work. It will make those who take active part in it more prompt to think and decide in emergencies. It will check the feverish eagerness of Americans in their pursuit of work for the sake of work. And the increasing number of those who are able to take part in it is merely another fact in evidence of the greater comfort of modern life and of our people's stronger leaning towards healthy amusements as a break in the monotony of unvarying work.

All this and more might be granted without making out an impregnable case for the modern development of athletics. It is not enough to prove the objects good, even with a likelihood of attaining them; it is often more important to attend to the correctness of the methods employed, for they may be such as to bring with them new evils which more than counterbalance all the good that has been attained. The amusements of a people are not at all beneath the attention of a sound social philosophy; they are often symptomatic of tendencies which cannot yet be seen in any other way, as the real nature of men comes out most clearly in their moments of relaxation. When the Roman noble went into the barracks of the gladiators and bet his sesterces upon their chances in the morrow's contest, the evil omen of the scene was not in the mere brutality of the sport, but in the disappearance of all that had once made up the Roman idea. No matter whether the sport in question was cruel or refined, the men and women whose souls were

absorbed in it were no longer of that breed which had brought the civilized earth under control of the Roman Peace. When the Byzantine mob went into ecstasies of excitement over the alternate victories of the blue or the green drivers in the circus there were none of the cruelties which marked the outdoor sports of Rome; but the pettiness of mind which found satisfaction in such relaxations was echoed in the bombast and conceit of Byzantine historians, and in the cowardice of the Byzantine emperors, who trembled behind their strong walls as successive deluges of barbarians, crusaders, and Mohammedans swept around them.

The relaxation of mind and body which is found in outdoor sports is by no means the most important circumstance connected with them: they are much more important as representatives of, or centers of influence in, the growth of the people. Viewed from this standpoint it is a serious question how far the modern athletic régime is a social benefit or a social injury. The development of a people is seen nowhere more clearly than in their ability to distinguish means from ends, and this is nowhere more true than in this matter of amusements. One may be glad to see a people turn work into play from time to time, from a conscious longing for relaxation, and yet see nothing admirable in an interest which makes the amusement an end in itself, and not a means to something better. Our newspapers give columns of expensive dispatches detailing the foreign "triumphs" of two American baseball nines, while they have no longer space or

readers for more than a meager summary of the debates in Congress. Crowds surround the bullet-boards to watch the reflected glories of a boat-race, while the demands of business are so imperative that they cannot spend an hour twice in a twelvemonth in keeping alive their membership and influence in their party's primary association. If we are to gauge the popular interest in outdoor sports and in any more serious occupation by their respective shares of the Sunday newspapers, what is to be thought of the mental and moral standards of our people?

The whole question is one on which no appeal is possible except to the individual consciousness and conscience. A man should be able to tell, in his own case, whether his interest in outdoor sports is for their own sake or as a means to a higher and better end; whether he is a grown-up child, "pleased with a rattle, tickled with a straw," or a hard-working man, who feels the need of decreasing the strain upon his energies from time to time in order to keep them in full efficiency. His ability to consider his own case impartially will test his ability to estimate the general influence of outdoor amusements as we have them. These amusements are of no importance whatever in themselves; they are of the greatest importance as indications of a general drift, and it is a most serious question, on which every man ought to have an opinion, whether they are now indicative of greater comfort or of popular degeneracy, of higher standards of living or of lower standards of work.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Indians, and Indians.

MR. REMINGTON'S descriptions of the Apaches and Comanches in this number of *THE CENTURY* have all the vividness of an impressionist, and are undoubtedly faithful as impressions. There is a tendency, however, among the people at large to accept a brief impression for a complete portraiture, and so to form general ideas out of a few details entirely inadequate for such a purpose. There are Indians and Indians, and he who should form his general impression of the Indian from a glimpse of the savagery of individual Apaches would find it necessary to discard his work and begin anew in the presence of the peaceful and skillful Zuni. It is true that the determination of methods of practical dealing with the Indians must depend somewhat on their character, but if the whole mass of Indians were as bad as individuals are sometimes represented to be the duty of dealing justly with them in all relations would still remain untouched. Whether or no the Indian of to-day is an attractive person to us is a small matter; the supreme matter is that he shall have no ground for a charge of injustice against us. No characterization of the Indian can be in any measure adequate which does not exhibit the various types found among the different tribes, the degrees of civilization reached, and the varying grades of material advancement represented by individuals and communities. Those who have studied the question on the

ground are agreed that while the army view, the view of the frontiersman, and the view of the philanthropist are each true in individual cases, none of them contains the whole truth. The Indian character is as varied as the character of the white man who sits in judgment upon him. Reversing the usual process, the Indian might base his impression of the whites on the indifference and somewhat scornful protection which the army man offers him, or the undisguised greed and unscrupulousness of the frontiersman who covets his lands, or the sometimes unpractical temper of the philanthropist whose whole desire is to serve him. All these types exist, and yet neither of them represents the great body of whites.

What is known as the Indian Question has made great and substantial progress during the last ten years—progress not only in the development of public opinion favorable to an award of an exact justice, but in knowledge of the real character and capacity of the Indian himself. No one who has any real knowledge of the matter ever thinks of the Indian to-day as controlled by any single passion or as represented by any single type of character. He recognizes that in dealing with them we are dealing with a body of people who differ among themselves as widely as the people of any other race. Moreover, what can be done with the Indian is no longer a matter of speculation. Much has been done in education, in agriculture, in social organization, and in diffusion of the spirit, occupations, and

habits of civilized men. The present stage is no longer experimental. So much has already been done, and, in the main, done successfully, that what still remains to be done is to complete and expand the operation of methods, instrumentalities, and laws already in operation.

The results at Hampton and Carlisle have settled the question of the capacity of the Indian for education. During the last decade Hampton alone has trained with more or less thoroughness more than three hundred students, who have been under its culture from a few months to five or six years. The record of these students has been carefully preserved, and that record shows that the great majority, in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles, are exercising a wide and beneficial influence on the communities through which they are scattered, and are doing faithfully and successfully the work of pioneers in the civilization of their people. As teachers, farmers, clerks, interpreters, scouts, and cattle-raisers they have attained, all things considered, an average success quite as high as that which would have attended the labors of an equal number of whites. The record of Carlisle's school would undoubtedly make as favorable a showing as the record of Hampton.

But the great and substantial gain which has been made in the discussion of the Indian question is the clear perception that the doing of justice does not depend on the character of those to whom it is awarded; that it is an absolute obligation independent of all such considerations. The long and terrible story of injustice to the Indians has at last borne its fruits in an awakened public conscience. The appealing paths of such a story as "Ramona" has undoubtedly reached many who would have turned away indifferent from a bare recital of facts, but if the typical Indian were Geronimo rather than Ramona our duty to him would not be the less evident or the less imperative. It is the perception of this long-neglected duty which has not only banded together individuals to secure the redress of the wrongs inflicted upon the Indian, but which has at last produced something like a coherent system of measures looking to a permanent adjustment of the relations of the two races. The breaking up of the reservation system, the allotment of land in severalty, the conferring of the privileges and protection of citizenship, the extension of the civil and military laws over the reservations, the organization of an educational commission looking to the establishment of public school education, are all consistent features of a general movement which shall incorporate into the law of the land the aroused sentiment of its citizens.

*Hamilton Wright Mabie.*

#### Industrial Education for the Negro: Is it a "Craze"?

MOST friends of the negro in the North as well as in the South agree that industrial training should go hand in hand with his moral and mental culture. That is, they think that there should be for men such a drill at least in the elementary principles and processes of farming and the most common handicrafts, and for women in cooking, sewing, domestic economy, nursing and the care of children, that they may be better able both to earn and to save money, to secure homes of their own, and to make them worthy of that sacred name.

But while there is this nearly universal agreement as to the need of training of this sort, and disagreement merely as to matters of detail and method, there are a few earnest friends of the colored man — whose long, arduous, and efficient labors in his behalf entitle their opinions to great weight — who are afraid of this movement, and speak of it as a "craze." They think that the outcome of it is almost certain to be a less extended and thorough mental and moral culture. And as some of them are in positions where their opinions must have great power to shape or modify some of the most important of the organizations and institutions whose special object is negro education, it seems as if a statement of the reasons for their opinion, and the considerations which lead many of the benevolent to disagree with them, would be timely.

One of these reasons is that it is very hard to get enough money to give the ordinary scholastic education, the equipment for which is not so costly as that for industrial training. Will not the effort to give this more expensive culture diminish the amount available for the other?

It is urged, further, that the proposed change implies too great a concession to the widely prevailing opinion that the negro is, and in the nature of the case must be, better fitted for manual than for mental labor.

They argue also that the new departure tends to foster materialistic notions of the value of education, the main object of which should be the ennoblement of the worker rather than the production of more cotton, rice, sugar, coal, iron, or lumber. It is a materialistic age at best, and the tendencies in that direction are especially strong in the South at present; and even were the object no higher than the increase of the negro's value as a factor in the production and distribution of commodities, a widely known writer contends that, since dexterity is largely a result of mental rather than muscular training, any scheme that contemplates less of the higher education for the sake of increased production will in the end defeat itself.

Then again, the surprising success in some schools, and notably in one, in mastering the more advanced branches is profoundly affecting the opinions of many of the most influential people in the South as to the capacity of the negro; and to do anything which would make the work in these high-grade schools less extensive or less thorough will push him and his friends off this hard-won vantage-ground.

Still further, we are exhorted to remember that leaders qualified to hold their own in the sharp competitions of professional life are a great, if not the greatest, need of the colored race in this country. Over wide areas most of their clergy are illiterate, immoral, self-seeking, bitter sectarians, and the most determined opponents of every kind of improvement. So, too, the lack of lawyers, editors, and physicians of sufficiently broad and thorough training to be able to defend their weaker brethren against designing or incapable advisers is a very discouraging feature of the situation. The negroes do not as a rule seek the leadership or counsel of competent and honest whites in matters of religion or of business; hence the greater need of well-qualified men of their own race.

These are strong points. What can be said against them without aiding those who disbelieve in advanced education for colored people? Some of these are warm

friends of the negro, and some, it is to be feared, are not anxious that he should have more education than just enough to keep him from voting on the side of anarchy and to make him more efficient as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. But is it not possible to unite industrial training with thorough and wide mental and moral culture? In advocating it need we strengthen the hands of the excellent people who oppose the high-school and college work, on the ground that it is better to give some book learning to the many rather than a good deal to only a few? There are a considerable number of those who believe in providing the most advanced scholastic education for those colored people who will push on to gain it who are firmly convinced that the movement for industrial education may be a help rather than a hindrance to the higher school work. What can be said in support of their position?

*First.* Only a small number graduate in the thorough college courses of the institutions that provide such advantages, and most leave them before they are qualified to pass the examinations for first-grade certificates as teachers. Hence they cannot hope for positions in the graded schools, which are kept open eight or nine months in a year. They must take those which afford them employment for only two or three months. What are they to do during the remaining nine or ten months? If they had the industrial education now given in some schools they might support themselves in the same communities where they teach, acquiring decent homes of their own, which would be a much needed example and incentive to all about them. The lack of anything worthy to be called home is the most appalling obstacle to the elevation of the negro. If these higher schools should furnish this industrial training, as some of them are beginning to do, nine-tenths, or, in many cases nineteen-twentieths, of the pupils who never finish even the grammar-school course might be put in the way of living for the rest of their lives like human beings instead of like beasts.

*Second.* The industrial training need not diminish, but may be made rather to increase the funds available for school work. Many will give to schools that afford this training who will not give to the schools that do not afford it. Many will give for this who will give nothing for school work. Besides, a large item of the expense of most of the existing schools is for "student's aid." In an institution which gives industrial training the students can earn much if not all of this aid. This saves their self-respect, avoids the danger of pauperizing them, and enables a thousand dollars given for such aid to be used over and over.

*Third.* In many cases students could stay and get a more thorough mental training if such work were furnished. There need not be such a small percentage of graduates from the normal, scientific, and collegiate courses as the catalogues show.

*Fourth.* Such work gives an entirely new idea of the dignity of labor. It was one of the greatest evils of slavery that manual labor was considered degrading. This was especially mischievous in its effects on the poor whites. The South is only slowly coming to believe that one who works for a living can be qualified for good society. In many of the industrial schools already established students are beginning to take pride in their command of tools, in their well planned and executed mechanical work, and in the thorough, clean

tillage, the enlarged and varied products, and the improved stock and buildings of the farms attached to these schools.

*Fifth.* Two or three hours a day of manual labor leave abundant time for all the study which is consistent with mental alertness and vigor. Quality is of far higher importance in mental work than quantity. It is of comparatively little moment that a certain number of facts and rules find lodgment in the mind for a time—usually a short time. The main thing is that the student acquires the power and the habit of incisive, sustained, and honest thinking. Six or eight hours of sharp attention is as much as should be required of any young person in one day. Some public schools require all lessons to be learned at home; but it is hard to see how such schools can produce anything but a lax and flabby habit of mind, or else injure the health. Just as much severe, intense study—and no other should be tolerated—can be done in a day by one who works two or three hours as by one who does not. Work that demands care and skill is really more of a relaxation than that which calls for nothing but brute force, because it is more interesting.

*Sixth.* The ability to plan or build a church, a school-house, or a dwelling, or to carry on a farm as it should be carried on, gives a man's opinion about purely professional matters greater weight in all struggling communities. A teacher, minister, or physician could hardly have, aside from his mental and moral qualities, a more effective passport to the confidence and respect of colored people.

Industrial education is in the air, and is sure to be tried extensively. Ought not those who have so long and so successfully fought the battle for purely school work to take a leading place in shaping policy under the new departure? Who can keep it from becoming too materialistic so well or so surely as they?

S. W. Powell.

Charles Thomson, Secretary of Continental Congress.

IN THE CENTURY MAGAZINE for April is a very interesting article by Clarence Winthrop Bowen on "The Inauguration of Washington." On page 813 Mr. Bowen says: "In 1774, when he [Charles Thomson] was elected Secretary of the Continental Congress, — which office he held for fifteen consecutive years, — he had just married a young woman of fortune, *who was the aunt of President William Henry Harrison, and the great-great-aunt of President Benjamin Harrison.*" The marriage referred to took place September 4, 1774, at "Harriton," in Merion Township, then in Philadelphia, but now in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The lady whom he married was Hannah Harrison, daughter of Richard Harrison, a Friend who originally came from Maryland and married Hannah Norris, a daughter of Isaac Norris and granddaughter of Governor Thomas Lloyd. Richard Harrison died March 2, 1747, and left to survive him his widow and four children, namely, *Thomas Harrison, Mary*, who died unmarried, *Samuel*, and *Hannah*, who married Charles Thomson. As neither of Mr. Harrison's sons was named Benjamin, it is very apparent that Mr. Bowen has made a mistake. John Adams, in his diary of the occurrences of a few days previous to the meeting of Congress,

says, speaking of a visit to the house of Thomas Mifflin: "Here we had much conversation with Mr. Charles Thomson, who is, it seems, about marrying a lady, a relation of Mr. Dickinson's, with £5000 sterling. This Charles Thomson is the Sam Adams of Philadelphia." In a foot-note to his article Mr. Bowen says, "*Thomson was the father-in-law of Elbridge Gerry.*" This also is an error. Mr. Thomson was twice married. His first wife was a daughter of Charles Mather of Chester County, by whom he had two children, who died in their infancy. By his second wife *he had no children*, and hence it is very clear that he was *not* the father-in-law of Elbridge Gerry. Mr. Gerry's wife was a Miss Ann Thompson, daughter of James Thompson of New York City, a man of great prominence in his day, and on his mother's side connected with some of the oldest families in New York. For details of this statement I refer Mr. Bowen to the "Memoirs of Elbridge Gerry," by James T. Austin, p. 502.

Mr. Bowen, however, is not the only person who has fallen into error about Charles Thomson. In Drake's "Dictionary of American Biography," in a sketch of Gerry, Mr. Drake says: "He married Ann, daughter of Charles Thomson, Secretary of Congress," and adds that she died at New Haven, March 17, 1849, aged eighty-six years. In "Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography," a very valuable work, it is stated that Charles Thomson "had just come to Philadelphia in September, 1774, with his bride, a sister of Benjamin Harrison, the signer."

PHILADELPHIA.

Horatio Gates Jones.

#### Imperial Federation.

IN the April number of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE Charles H. Lugin of Fredericton, New Brunswick, writes: "I do not recall the name of a prominent public man who favors the project [of Imperial Federation]; while several may be named . . . who have put themselves on record against it."

Will you allow me to correct this statement by referring to the latest list of the council of the Imperial Federation League in Canada, which I inclose, and which contains the names of two ministers of the Dominion, twelve senators, including the speaker, more than fifty M. P.'s of the Dominion, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Halifax, the Anglican bishop of Nova Scotia, four lieutenant-governors, and many well-known names in all branches of public life.

Mr. Lugin also states that "A few branches of the Federation League have been established in the Dominion." The facts are these:

A year ago branches were in existence in Montreal, Ingersoll, Victoria, B. C., Halifax, Peterboro, Ottawa, and Toronto. Since then branches have been organized in Brantford, Port Arthur, St. Thomas, Orillia, Lindsay, and county of Victoria; St. John, N. B.; Chatham, Ontario; Pictou, N. S.; Wiarton, Belleville, and Kingston; and there are in course of formation, branches at Woodstock, Picton, Cookstown, Barrie, Calgary; Yarmouth, N. S.; St. Mary's, Vancouver, B. C.; Winnipeg, Paisley, Brampton, and Hamilton.

Arthur H. Loring,  
Secretary Imperial Federation League.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

#### Salmon P. Chase's Training for Finance.

IN a recent number of THE CENTURY the biographers of Mr. Lincoln, speaking of Mr. Chase, say:

*Without any special previous experience, without any other preparation for his exacting task than great natural abilities, unswerving integrity and fidelity, and unwearied industry, he grappled with the difficulties of the situation in a manner which won him the plaudits of the civilized world and will forever enshrine his name in the memory of his fellow-citizens.*

The statement above, italicized by me, is perhaps not strictly correct. It is true that Mr. Chase was primarily a lawyer, yet it is also true that he was a trained financier. So early as 1834 he was appointed solicitor at Cincinnati of the old United States Bank.

In that year the Lafayette Bank of Cincinnati was established. I have before me as I write the original minutes of the Board of Directors of that bank for the first ten years of its existence. From these I find that Mr. Chase was one of the first Board of Directors, and continued a director for nearly ten years. In addition to this, he was made Secretary of the Board at its first meeting and solicitor of the bank. The latter office he held also for nearly ten years. At the time of this election he was but twenty-six years of age. I have looked carefully through the minutes, and they disclose the fact that he was in constant attendance at the meetings of the Board, and took a controlling direction in the affairs of the bank. He was constantly placed at the head of the most important committees, such as that of preparing the by-laws.

It also appears from the minutes that he gave minute attention to the business, and was severely exacting. The resolutions in his handwriting, which I inclose, evidence this.<sup>1</sup>

At the time he took so prominent a part in the affairs of this bank, while so young a man, his associates numbered among them some of the most famous men of that city of that day—Josiah Lawrence, the president, Judge Este, Neff, Jones, and others. This bank became a leading bank of the city, and now, transformed into a national bank, maintains its original high character. Here, as elsewhere, his work is enduring. Thus for ten years, in the formative period of his life, from twenty-six to thirty-six years of age, he had the double training of a bank director and solicitor of the bank—and this in one of the chief cities of the country.

As a bank lawyer, he ranked first in his profession.

Before he became a member of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet he had been for six years United States senator. While excluded by the pro-slavery majority from the

<sup>1</sup> The resolutions are as follows: "*Resolved*, 1. That in no case shall any mortgage upon real estate be received as security for any loan or discount, unless the applicant for such loan or discount shall have furnished a complete abstract of the material parts of the title papers of such real estate, and also of all adverse claims, legal and equitable, to such real estate, to the solicitor whose duty it shall be carefully to examine such abstract and to furnish to the President his written opinion thereon, which opinion, together with the abstract, shall be lodged with the cashier. 2. That in all cases where any real estate, received as security for any loan or discount, shall be released from the operation of any mortgage before the debt secured thereby shall have been fully paid, the attendant expenses shall be paid by the applicant for such release. 3. No discount or loan shall be granted to facilitate the payment of any debt on which suit has been commenced or judgment rendered unless the applicant for such loan or discount shall pay the costs of such suit or judgment, including attorney's fees."

committees, because he "belonged to no healthy political organization," it was yet his duty to consider the finances of the nation; and where duty called him to act it was his habit thoroughly to inform himself. He had also been for four years Governor of Ohio, with a general supervision of the finances of that great State. During this time occurred the famous defalcation of Breslin, the State Treasurer. Mr. Chase, as governor, at once took possession of the treasury, and with a master's hand brought order out of chaos, and so satisfactorily to the State that what seemed at first to be a blemish to his administration redounded to its honor. So it would seem that he had had that special training which fitted him for his mighty task. When he met the great bankers of New York he met them not as a stranger, but as one of them, initiated into the mysteries of their craft. It was well. Mr. Chase's achievement was not the flash of genius that bewilders, but the natural result of trained powers.

Allow me a word in another relation. The extracts from the diary and letters of Chase given in this history of Mr. Lincoln are not pleasant reading. But the picture has its relief. They were written chiefly in the weary, waiting year—1861-62. The most effective pages of this history are, perhaps, those relating to McClellan. The grouping of the facts presents a progressive climax that is simply crushing—but is it not reactionary? Is not the emotion it excites one of painful pity for McClellan and something akin to indignation that those in power should have borne so long with him? Remember that Chase was present and saw all—saw the grand army of the Union wasting away in hopeless inactivity; saw it again, led to battle in a desultory way, defeated piecemeal by a foe inferior in numbers; saw it when victorious retreating from its vanquished enemy; meanwhile saw the debt of the nation piling up mountain high, threatening a financial abyss that would engulf all.

The situation was without precedent. No other nation could have borne those loans. For many months Mr. Chase was in daily apprehension of a catastrophe, blasting alike his country and himself. The responsibility was his. Others spent; "he smote the rock"; and yet he was ignored! He felt himself neglected, and chafed as the strong man bound. Perhaps it would have been better had he suffered in silence; and yet perhaps complaint brought relief.

Born to command, a courtier he could not be.

A letter he wrote me of date August 29, 1862, portrays his feelings during the McClellan régime. I close with this extract from it:

Since the coming of General Halleck, I have known no more of the progress of the war than any outsider. I mean so far as influencing it goes. My recommendations had been, before he came in, generally disregarded, and since have been seldom ventured. I did, in one or two conversations, insist on the removal of General McClellan, and the substitution of a more vigorous and energetic and able leader; on the clearing out of the Mississippi; and the expulsion of the rebels from East Tennessee—all which might have been done. But though heard, I was not heeded. I hope for the best. Those who reject my counsels ought to know more than I do. At all events little is now left for me, except to administer as well as I may under existing circumstances the complicated and difficult concerns of my own department.

#### Retaliation in Missouri.

THERE are errors in the April installment of the "Life of Lincoln" relative to the part taken by me in the execution of ten rebel guerrillas at Palmyra, Missouri, in October, 1862, in retaliation for the abduction and murder of a Union citizen of that town. With the opinion of Messrs. Nicolay and Hay on what they term "a punishment tenfold as severe as that demanded by the Mosaic law" I need not concern myself. The statement that my action was under the authority of the State of Missouri is an error. The letter of General Curtis quoted to sustain that statement appears (according to a foot-note on page 860 of Vol. XXII. of the "Official Records") never to have been sent; or, if sent, he was afterwards ashamed of its misstatements, for he forwarded to Washington a copy of a letter taking entirely different ground for refusing to treat with the rebel authorities in their investigation of the execution.

The fact is that while I was at the time a brigadier-general of Missouri State troops, I held a commission as colonel of the 2d Missouri Cavalry, a regiment of State militia mustered into the United States service. As such I had been assigned, June 4, 1862, by the department commander, General Schofield, to command the district of North-east Missouri (see Vol. XIII., page 417, of the "Official Records"), and instructed by him to "take the field in person and exterminate the rebel bands" infesting that section. General Schofield expressly enjoined (see Vol. XIII., page 467, of the "Official Records"): "Do not be too moderate in the measure of severity dealt out to them. Carry out General Orders No. 18 and No. 3 thoroughly."

General Order No. 18 (see Vol. XIII., page 402, "Official Records") states that:

Rebel officers and men are returning to their homes, passing stealthily through our lines and endeavoring again to stir up insurrection in various portions of the State where peace has long prevailed, and there still remain among the disaffected who never belonged to the rebel army a few who avail themselves of every opportunity to murder Union soldiers and destroy the property of citizens. . . . The utmost vigilance and energy are enjoined upon all troops of the State in hunting down and destroying these robbers and assassins. When caught in arms engaged in their unlawful warfare they will be shot down upon the spot. All good citizens who desire to live in peace are required to give their assistance to the military authorities in detecting and bringing to punishment the outlaws who infest this State, and those who shelter and give them protection. Those who fail to do, their duty in this matter will be regarded and treated as abettors of the criminals.

It will thus be seen that I was acting directly under Federal authority as an officer of the United States Army and in accordance with my official instructions as such. Moreover, the ten guerrillas executed (not one of whom but had committed murder under circumstances of atrocity) were selected from twenty-two who had previously been formally tried by a United States military commission and sentenced to death, so that their death was but hastened by the act of retaliation, the remaining twelve of the twenty-two convicted being soon afterwards shot in pursuance of their sentence by the officers in command at Macon City and Mexico, Mo. Nor was there unseemly haste in thus carrying out the sentence already pronounced against these unfortunate men. Public notice was given that the ten men would be shot unless within ten days the



abducted Union citizen (Andrew Allsman, seventy years of age and a non-combatant) was returned unharmed to his family. During that period of ten days, my ranking officer, General Lewis Merrill of the regular army, and General Curtis, who had succeeded General Schofield in command of the district of Missouri, September 26, 1862, were fully advised of my action. In a letter to me dated January 22, 1880, referring to an attack on me in the United States Senate relative to this matter, General Merrill wrote as follows:

No notice appears to have been taken of the other executions, and no reflections were ever made that I know of on either General Curtis or myself, though equally responsible with you, and indeed having the greater responsibility, in that we were your superior officers and could have stopped your action had duty allowed it. Both General Curtis and myself had to listen to many heart-rending appeals to take this action, and both uniformly refused. The event showed it would have been weakness and failure of duty to have listened, for the executions practically ended all guerrilla operations in North Missouri, and restored peace to the community to such an extent at least that it was possible thereafter to commit to the civil authorities the trial and punishment of most of the crime which was thereafter perpetrated. Before this the civil authorities were utterly powerless. You have long suffered from falsehood and misapprehension in this matter, and it gives me great pleasure to do what I can to right you, as I know no more tender-hearted soldier than yourself ever lived, and no more painful duty could have been imposed upon you than that involved in the execution of these criminals; but I also know that you never permitted personal pain to swerve you from the plain line and demand of duty, however stern and hard it should be.

Such an investigation of this affair as President Lincoln made before appointing me a brigadier-general (November, 1863) will convince any unbiased inquirer that my action sprung from neither "mistaken zeal" nor "uncurbed passion," as my present critics infer, but from an imperative sense of duty. Since the issue of the April CENTURY an interview with General Merrill has appeared in the St. Louis "Globe-Democrat" (April 2), in which he relates that he was summoned by telegraph to report to the President, and immediately repairing to Washington, ignorant of the reason for the summons, appeared before President Lincoln at a time when the members of the Cabinet were seated about him. General Merrill then proceeds as follows:

"I was ordered to report to you, Mr. President," I said, after being presented.

"Yes, General. . . . I want to inquire about that shooting in Missouri."

"I can give you a written report in a few minutes that will explain all," I said.

"I don't want anything in writing, General. I want you to tell me the story."

I told it to him as I have to you, with this addition: "I telegraphed you a number of times asking your approval of the order and asking you, Mr. President, to issue the order yourself, but I asked in vain; and as it was a necessity, I took the responsibility. It was my duty, and I have never felt a twinge of conscience that suggested I did other than right to my trust."

The President came up, laid his hand on my shoulder, and said: "Remember, young man, there are some things which should be done which it would not do for superiors to order done."

By his manner I inferred that had he ordered me to do what it was essential for me to do, political complications would have arisen which would have been troublesome. He evidently meant that he justified my course himself, but preferred not saying so, and left me to understand that my judgment was trusted, and to be exercised by me in emergency.

Having thus the indorsement of both the officers who were my immediate superiors, the implied approval of President Lincoln (whose too tender heart forbade ordering retaliation even for the Fort Pillow massacre), and cherishing, as I do, the firm conviction that my action was the means of saving the lives and property of hundreds of loyal men and women, I feel that my act was the performance of a public duty.

John McNeil,

Late Brevet Major-General, U. S. Vols.

ST. LOUIS.

#### Governor Seymour during the Draft Riots.

In the April CENTURY, the authors of the "Life of Lincoln" have fallen into a mistake as to the conduct of Governor Seymour during the draft riots, which should be corrected. I saw the audience in the City Hall Park which Governor Seymour addressed on the occasion referred to at page 929. It was not a crowd of rioters. He did not address the rioters at all. The people whom he there addressed were a multitude of persons naturally attracted to the City Hall by the news that the governor of the State, whose arrival was anxiously expected, had actually come. He used in speaking to the multitude the expression that he and Mr. Everett commonly employed in addressing an audience — "My friends." There was no mention in the speech that the draft justified the riots, and I know that the governor used the whole authority which the law gave him to suppress the riots. Nor can it be truly said that he did all he could to embarrass the Government, or to rouse the people against it. On the contrary, he was thanked by the Secretary of War for his active and energetic cooperation in forwarding troops to meet the Confederate forces. Indeed, one embarrassment during the riots was that the city had been completely stripped of uniformed militia, who had been sent forward by Governor Seymour to meet the invading enemy.

NEW YORK.

Everett P. Wheeler.

#### The "Life of Lincoln" — a Correction.

ON page 927 of the April CENTURY the authors of the "Life of Lincoln" speak of Brevet Brigadier-General Alexander S. Diven, one of the provost-marshal generals of New York, as a "War Democrat." Mr. Ausburn Towner writes by way of correction to say that General Diven "was, originally, a 'Free-soil Democrat,' one of that faction of the old Democratic party that, uniting with the 'Free-soil Whigs,' formed the Republican party. He was a member of the State Senate of New York in 1858-59, having been elected such a Republican and by Republicans, and therefore was one of those who composed the first Republican Senate of that State. He was elected as a Republican and by the Republicans of his district, then the 27th (the Elmira district), to the 37th Congress, 1861-62, leaving his seat to help organize the 107th Regiment, which he commanded until he was appointed to the position named in the 'History.' He can hardly, with truth, be classed as a 'War Democrat,' unless you so class Secretary Chase or any other Republican leader who had been a Democrat."

## One Reason of the Inefficiency of Women's Work.

By subordinating self-improvement to her various domestic and social duties a woman not infrequently defeats her own end: the sum-total of her usefulness in these very directions is less than it might be if she gave some time each day to intellectual culture. We are standing on the solid platform of practical usefulness and are not considering the delights of knowledge for its own sake; for all of charity is not bread and butter, and all of motherhood is not mending. Many a mother, by an excess of devotion to her little son, unfits herself to be a mother to the same boy when he goes to college; for he needs sympathy as much in his higher studies as he did in his blocks and his marbles. The wisest mother will not merely see that her child is fed, and clothed, and instructed, and made good and happy for the time being. She will be careful to keep as far as possible on a level with his intellectual stature, so that his mental attitude towards her may not change with his physical — so that the man may feel, as did the baby, that his mother is not only the best, but the wisest, of women.

Honest Dick Steele's reference to Lady Elizabeth Hastings, that "to love her was a liberal education," is oftener quoted than deserved; and yet this is the friendship which every woman of intelligence and will can give to her husband and to her children. Surely an intelligent woman needs only to appreciate the value of such an equipment in order to feel that time spent in gaining it is not wasted — that it affords a sufficient reason for taking one hour at least out of twenty-four from the other duties of life, however absorbing they may be.

The actual knowledge which comes of intellectual work is of great value, but this is not all. It is not the mere facts gained, but the mental discipline acquired, which give to the habit of study its highest justification, its chief value as a sort of mental gymnastics.

The idea is notorious among men that women cannot do business, cannot carry on a connected line of thought, cannot follow and appreciate an extended argument. Like most generalizations, this admits of large exceptions, but it is in the main true. We all know, for example, how impossible it is to converse with some women. They interrupt us in the middle of what we consider an interesting and valuable train of thought, and run off on a side-track, without the slightest appreciation of the discourtesy of which they are guilty or of the fact that our conversation was making logical approach towards some definite point. Their own remarks are never directed by any other than the "word suggestion" method: one thing "reminds" them of another indefinitely, and they become confused in a hopeless labyrinth of parentheses, without attempting to extricate themselves, and without even being conscious that they are lost. The same method is followed in their actions as in their thought processes.

We do not attempt to say how much of this is owing to a native lack of logical power; but we are convinced that it is largely due either to defective early training or else to long-continued intellectual stagnation after school-days are over — probably to both. A woman's occupation, it is true, consists largely in heterogeneous details; she is subject to constant interruptions; she

is at the beck and call of her husband and children and of the world in general; she is sometimes imposed upon and tyrannized over, often without realizing the extent of the humiliation; and she is seldom brave enough to be willing to seem disobliging. The result of all this is that, to a certain extent, she loses her individuality. In short, she becomes deficient in sense of proportion and in power of analysis.

When the situation is thus viewed it becomes a little difficult to say whether intellectual stagnation should be treated as cause or as effect. Certainly the character of one's occupation has a strong reflex influence upon the character of one's thoughts, and it cannot be denied that the same degree of system is impossible in a woman's work as in a man's. However, our object is not to cavil with fate, but to consider what are the best methods of procedure under existing circumstances; and from this point of view intellectual stagnation appears as the cause of much that is defective in the work of women.

The laws of habit and of exercise hold good of the mind as well as of the body. The hands perform most easily familiar actions; the mind, kept alert by constant exercise, is ready for any emergency. If we keep our minds wide awake by constantly studying and doing genuine *thinking* in some definite direction; if we learn to analyze the various elements of a subject and see their true relative importance; if we learn to weigh and balance arguments with nice discrimination; if we keep at our command, by constant practice, the power of concentrating our thoughts — these healthy mental habits will have a wholesome influence upon everything that we do. When a thousand different claims are made upon our time and attention the habit of analysis will stand us in good stead, and we shall have the strength of mind to do the most important things, and to leave the others undone, instead of helplessly attending to whatever important item happens to be brought to our notice first. When hard problems must be solved and difficult questions answered, the habit of reflection and quick decision will be found simply invaluable. When the distractions of the kitchen, the nursery, and the street make life one vast hubbub, the habit of concentrating thought and fixing attention will make it possible to form and keep in mind fixed purposes, and to make intelligent efforts towards carrying them out. In short, an active mind is as necessary an equipment for every-day life as a strong body, and a proper early education is not sufficient to keep either the mind or the body in healthy condition. They both need vigorous and habitual exercise if the power for work is to be kept at its maximum. Moreover, if the opportunity for healthy development does not lie in the course of a person's ordinary occupation, that is just the case in which it must be sought. A field-laborer needs no gymnasium, but a sedentary man does; a professional student will naturally have an active mind, but a wife and mother, whose affections are occupied more than her intellect, needs to set up a sort of home gymnasium for intellectual culture, and to practice in it faithfully.

It is not without a keen appreciation of the inherent difficulties of the case that these suggestions are made. Probably no class of people meet more obstacles in matching practice to theory than the women of whom we speak, but it is none the less necessary that their

theories should be sound. The inherent difficulties of the case make it only the more necessary to have a sure footing and a true aim.

Subjects and methods and times for study must always vary with individual cases; several good suggestions have been given in former numbers of *THE CENTURY*. Our design is simply to suggest the proper mental attitude in the matter. If a woman considers an hour of aggressive, absorbing intellectual work as much an essential of a symmetrical day as sleep, or food, or exercise,—if her ultimate object in the study is increased power for actual work,—she will be much more likely to study than if she regards intellectual occupation as either a useless effort or a selfish indulgence. Of course there are crises in life when study must be suspended, just as proper rest and exercise are dispensed with under special pressure, and there are probably some cases in which it is actually impossible; but this does not alter the fact that it is well to be in the habit of sleeping and of exercising, and, we would add, of studying.

*Mary A. Johnson.*

#### The Decline of the Editorial.

It has been urged with pertinacity that the editorial leader should be signed by the writer, and unresponsive pity has been called upon to rise in behalf of the man whose talents find no recognition in the anonymity of the daily press. For my part, I know of nothing more unfortunate than would be such a change in custom, and I sincerely hope the desire for change, for the unusual, will not lead to its adoption generally. The potency of the editorial "we" has suffered enough in the last dozen years without this final blow, and that it has retained its power at all has been due to the willingness of great minds to sacrifice the reputation for the advantages of the freedom of the anonymous form. The decadence of newspaper influence would follow the change almost inevitably, and the fault would be the writer's, not the reader's. An appeal to all who use their pens as bread-winners would, I think, bring a response that the sense of responsibility is not less when the writer is unidentified, while a broader view is commonly taken and more courage shown in the expression of opinions which may provoke dispute, yet may, none the less, be eternally true. The tendency of the individual is to avoid quarrel, and the avoidance of quarrels is the gravest of newspaper blunders. To arouse some antagonisms is almost as necessary as to make friendships, in a progressive journal.

Journalists should need no warning, however, against the use of the first person, singular, in view of the decline of the editorial which most of them are aware of, though not so many will admit it. If Mr. Matthew Arnold had not spoken, one might appeal to the average citizen for confirmation of the declaration that the editorial has, in fact, declined. By this let it not be supposed that the leader is not so able (to use a favorite newspaper word) as in the earlier days, for a comparison of the editorial page of to-day with the page of twenty years ago shows no falling off, but rather a gain in method and matter. It is simply that the editorial is not read with the attention once given it, that it is now merely one department of the newspaper, receiving the consideration of the subscriber if

his horse-car journey happens to be long enough. Of course a good deal of this neglect has been due to the increased size of the more prosperous papers and the vast extension of the field they cover. The news columns are so much more interesting than they used to be! But there have been other causes at work, and the great increase of personalism—the word is used in a broad sense—is to blame for the loss of respect for the purely editorial utterance. The "managing editor," the executive officer of the newspaper, is the really responsible party. How dare an editorial writer advance an original opinion on a subject of national importance when the chief executive on the other side of the partition has received "specials" from Washington and every State capital giving the views of men of all shades of opinion on the issue involved, many of them speaking with an authority which readers will accept as conclusive? Why venture to discuss the prospects of European war, when Bismarck's opinions, construed by Salisbury, may be had for money paid to maintain a social lion as correspondent in London? The editor of the metropolitan journal is driven to discuss phases instead of the subject-matter, or, perhaps, devotes himself to praise of the enterprise that has obtained the important expression found in our news columns of this date! The editorial writer has, alas! not even the title of "editor" in some cases, and the conductor of more than one powerful journal to-day never puts pen to paper.

That the editorial page may soon disappear altogether is a dreadful possibility; and if it is to be committed to the care of the elegant essayist, writing over his own signature, there will remain no reason for its existence in its present form. The pressure for space in every great daily is severe, and it now requires a stern front to hold the three or four columns sacred for editorial utterances. Give the news editor his opportunity and he will abolish the essayist without a qualm of conscience.

Yet one cannot see the approaching doom of a department in journalism so powerful as this without an effort to avert it. A force so potential as the daily newspaper should be something more than the mirror of events which the executive forces of journalism are making it. Let them pursue their glorious career undisturbed and hire the Prince of Wales for special society correspondence, or the Pope for theological discussion, if they can; but let the editorial "we" remain. The leader writer must, however, give in this daily work a cause for his existence, and that can be found only by some change in method.

Far be it from me to suggest aught to the learned and "able" writers of the editorial page in the great cities, yet there have been occasions when an editorial expression of opinion might have been of tremendous value, backed by that mysterious anonymity of which I have spoken. Some readers, I know, looked in vain for such an editorial discussion of the longshoremen's strike not long ago that would have shown real knowledge of the matter and an opinion based upon that knowledge. The instance is, perhaps, hardly a fair one, but there should be, it seems to me, a more thorough study of current public agitations by editorial writers who now avoid them, or, worse yet, slur them over with vague generalities. No so-called "expert" opinion could take the place of the editorial discussion so

founded. And, to follow the suggestion to its logical conclusion, the information for the editorial discussion may often be best obtained by doing the reporter's work, while the use of the reporter as an editorial writer upon events which he has described in the news columns is to be recommended upon occasion, and has been tried with no small success. A learned judge once said to me that he had no faith in the conclusions of a court where the judges did n't travel a circuit, and I have also noticed that this same shrewd observer always uses the nominative plural in referring to any judicial act of his own. The "we" had its advantages in jurisprudence as in newspapers.

NEWARK, N. J.

W. T. Hunt.

#### Confiscation no Remedy.

IN his book Henry George clamors boldly for the confiscation of the land; for its seizure by the state without compensation to the owner. But of late, in his paper and speeches, he would reach this confiscation indirectly, by imposing upon land the whole weight of taxation. How would this operate, for example, in Ohio? In that State the land now, it may be, bears one-third of the taxes; the improvements and personal property the other two-thirds. To place all upon the land would increase its burden threefold and proportionally decrease its value, and to this extent confiscate it. Much of the land would not be worth the tax and would be given up. Thus as to this the confiscation would be complete. Mr. George sees all this and would make the change gradually. But here the first step would tell; the future would be discounted and the confiscation would immediately take place. Does any one believe that the landed interest, the farmers of Ohio, would submit to this? Could it be enforced except at the expense of a war in comparison with which the late conflict were a tame thing?

Hence, whatever its theoretic merits may be, George's plan is outside of practical politics. It is simply impossible. The cities could not force it upon the country. Therefore, with all his excellent intentions,—and I freely concede these,—Henry George is a disturbing force, an incubus upon the labor cause. He arrays the farming interest against it; he distracts its council, paralyzes its action, sows distrust and suspicion abroad. He is indeed the unwitting ally of the monopolist.

His generalization rests upon too narrow a basis: he speaks from a personal experience. His education in California vividly impressed upon him the evils of land monopoly and land speculation. He rushed to the conclusion that these things are the authors of all our social woes. He forgets that the body politic, like the natural body, is a very complex affair, and that no one specific will reach all its ills. Indeed, monopoly of any species of property is an evil; of food, for instance, even a greater evil than of land. The great monopolists, plutocrats, ignore land and escape taxation. What care they where the nominal ownership is, if they gather the fruit? They really view with complacency George's land taxation theory: it will relieve them of the little taxes they now pay.

The remedy is restraint, pruning, regulation, not

confiscation. Let all property bear the taxation that its protection entails. Let there be, as in France, income and succession taxes to prune the overgrown; regulation of and restraint upon corporations; a limitation of land ownership. These are the lines for the labor movement.

The business world tends to congestion of the brain—grows vertiginous, apoplectic. Here a little depletion is good.

The labor conventions spread themselves too much, entangle themselves in outside and doubtful matters. "One war at a time," said Mr. Lincoln.

CINCINNATI, O.

W. M. Dickson.

#### General Sheridan and his Troops.

THE admirable and graphic description of "The Western Soldier," in *THE CENTURY* for May, will interest every reader who served in the Western military departments; but all will not agree with the statement that the men "would have liked Sheridan more if he had been less severe."

Previous to being ordered East, General Sheridan commanded a division of the Fourth Corps, Army of the Cumberland, and as such made himself exceedingly popular with his men. The dash and enthusiasm he possessed made him peculiarly suited to handle Western men. They soon learned that when he exacted a difficult service there would be no undue exposure unless a definite result was reasonably certain. Thoughtfulness of his men's comfort was shown in little things. Those who were with General Buell's army during the Perryville campaign will call to mind the dusty "pikes" of Kentucky during that memorable pursuit of Bragg. Many of the troops were raw recruits under the 600-000 call of July and August, 1862; and beneath the weight of a newly made soldier's knapsack the art of war was learned under depressing conditions. At Perryville some heard the "szip" of bullets not many weeks after their enlistment. The season was dry, and water exceedingly scarce; while the dust from broken limestone was not soothing to throat, nose, and eyes.

It was the custom of general officers to make their headquarters, in the evening, at houses near the camps of their respective commands, and to start, next morning, after the army was in motion. If they wished to get to the head of the column, "open order" was the word, while officers, staff, orderlies, and body-guard galloped by, leaving us in the cloud raised by clattering hoofs. I call to mind General Sheridan's habit under like circumstances. Instead of putting his men to such discomfort, he went leisurely round them, through the fields, giving words of cheer and encouragement to the boys as he passed along.

No, General Sheridan was not severe with his men, in the sense of being arrogant towards them, or ill-treating them. And those who served under him in the West will always cherish his memory, so that the picture of "Little Phil" on his big black horse will not soon fade from their minds.

C. L. Gabrilson,

NEW HAMPTON, IA.

Co. I, 24th Wis. Vol. Infantry.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### The Lessons of Summer Travel.

EVERY summer gives new reason for wonder in the elaborate preparations which look to making the way of the summer tourist easy. The magnificent hotels which await him in every direction, the river and ocean steamers, the long trains of vestibuled cars, seem to riot in conveniences which make travel a luxury; and every year brings some new feature into the class of things which are almost necessities. The tourist whose great-grandfather was used only to short excursions in the family chaise, with occasional stops at a wayside inn, must now have his fast train, with accommodations for every need or whim; he must eat, drink, sleep, dress, be shaved, and enjoy library and writing facilities at the rate of forty miles an hour. And it is at least doubtful, withal, whether the modern tourist really pays very much more for his luxurious progress than his great-grandfather did for his summer jaunt. The expenditure of a comparatively small additional sum nowadays makes the tourist free of a great travelers' association, whose membership, however shifting, may be relied upon with safety, so that the corporations which make summer travel their peculiar care may furnish luxury at the lowest rates. They are preparing for tens and hundreds of thousands; they may therefore give each of these a share in larger preparations than a prince could formerly have expected.

But the question remains, How are such preparations possible? Is everything to be accounted for by the twin facts that there are a great many more people in the country, and that there is a great deal more wealth with which to provide for them? Many observers seem to think so; they argue as if passenger corporations were more benevolent than they used to be, or as if the people had become "more luxurious." The former proposition is hardly thinkable. The latter is begging the question. Our people, any people, would be even more "luxurious" if they dared to be; and the real question is as to the influences which have already brought them thus far upon the road. One may find many such influences, but he may be interested in tracing the connection of many phases of this progress with the apparently unrelated phenomenon of the steady decrease in the rate of interest. Indeed, if he begins to follow out this one influence through all its ramifications, it will carry him far beyond his starting-point of mere summer travel, and he will be almost ready to conclude that there is no human being who has not a personal stake in the still greater possible changes from the same cause.

The manner in which the rate of interest falls as the civilization and security of a country increase has been a familiar fact since there has been any economic discussion. Successive periods are marked by "waves" of lower interest. Seven per cent. was once not remarkable in our Eastern States; but period after period has seen the upper limit fall to six, to five, and even to four per cent. And such rates as these are for loans

which are in the nature of investments, in which he who loans the money is able to stipulate for somewhat higher rates because he is surrendering control of his capital for three or six months, or for a longer time. The more notable cases are those in the nature of "call" loans, in which the lender retains some control over his capital, and the borrower gets lower rates in consideration of his agreement to repay on demand. It is not very long since money could be borrowed in this way in New York City for one per cent.; that is, a borrower, by paying a little less than \$3 per day, could command the use of \$100,000 and obtain from it what profit he could make. If such a rate is abnormally low and temporary, it will at least serve to point the general lesson more sharply.

The most evident effect is the increased opportunities which are thus given in our times to individual ability. For the same amount of interest the individual can every year command a larger and still larger amount of working capital. Like the law of gravitation, this one principle is at work everywhere in the modern world, and under countless different forms; its peculiar interest for us is that our own country is the first theater of action on which it has operated at the same time on a people of great individual ability and on a country of boundless natural wealth, and the full consequences of such a conjunction are still beyond human speculation. We can only say that it accounts for the increased standard of private fortunes, without the implication of ideas of monopoly or extortion, or any other variations of Proudhon's theme that "property is robbery." It has given us our enormous modern productive establishments, with their saving of waste, their decrease of price, their increased purchasing power for everybody's money, and the consequent ability of everybody who will to devote an increasing part of his income to pleasure or to profit. It is ready to meet the demands of commerce by furnishing money for cutting through isthmuses, tunneling mountains, and spanning continents with rows of rails; and it is as ready to make every provision so that not even a crumpled rose-leaf shall mar the delights of summer travel. The observer who is content with attributing such phenomena to mere increase of population or of wealth will miss many a cross-light which the conditions of travel might shed upon graver questions, and in particular the force of that fall of interest which every year causes enterprises which once were impossibilities to fall into the categories of possibilities, of probabilities, of undertakings, of accomplished facts. It is, perhaps, the mysterious force with which Lytton armed his "Coming Race"—greater than that, indeed, in that there are no conceivable limits to its development.

This is not a case, moreover, in which there is any hazard in arguing from generals to particulars, from the great to the ordinary affairs of human life. If the change of conditions enables the great corporation to provide for its passengers with double lavishness at

the same annual cost, it is as ready to be the faithful servant of even the poorest, if he is willing to make use of it. It may not be able to raise him from the ranks of the hired servants to independence, but it will afford him the opportunity to make that or even a greater change in his personal position. It will enable him to build and own his house for less than he once paid for rent. It will set the wits of rich men at work for his benefit, as they endeavor to contrive ways in which he and others like him may safely borrow capital from them for such uses, at rates which, however low for the borrowers, are higher than the lenders can easily obtain elsewhere. It fulfills Richard Hooker's description of law: "All things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power."

There are darker shades, it is true, to the picture. There is no means of confining the weapon of the coming race to hands that are always worthy or judicious. The increasing facility for obtaining the use of capital, together with man's inability to resist temptation, makes speculation every year faster and more furious, as it enables the speculator, by further borrowing, to postpone the final crash until it cannot but drag down numberless others with him. It gives possibility and shape to the "trusts" and other combinations of capital which are designed in any way to coerce the actions of other men; this is the force which gives them their opportunities for phenomenal profit or bankruptcy. And yet it is just this fall of interest and these combinations of capital which have made it possible to offer the higher salaries and wages of modern life: there was once a pretty general equality among salaries, while individual merit may now be gauged more accurately by its market price. The same force works thus beneficently in such cases, and is at the same time working to decrease the purchasing power of the estates of widows and orphans, to cripple the energies and efficiency of endowed institutions, and to compel the father of a family to work far harder and longer to accumulate a fortune whose interest shall be sufficient for the support of those who are dependent upon him. And yet who is to say that the law is blind, heartless, or cruel? From its operation there is no escape, either in innocence or in insignificance; but there is a remedy for it, that he who is affected by it should turn manfully upon it and convert it into an instrument for his own and the world's good.

#### Tipping.

WITHIN the memory of many of us the practice of giving small sums of money to servants was so uncommon in this country as to be accounted altogether a foreign custom. If the recipient of such an attention happened to be a full-blooded American, the chances were that his response would be marked by anything but a sense of gratitude; and the servant of foreign birth, if he had been in this country long enough to breathe in the inspiration of its environment, was apt to look at the incident from an equally American standpoint. There is little need that any one, in the height of this summer season, should take the trouble to point out in detail the changes which mark the present system. There is no longer an American sentiment on the subject. As employers drift into the policy of estimating

and relying upon tips as a partial substitute for their wage-list, there is no longer any place in the service for him who will not be tipped. Two of the three parties in interest, the employer and the guest, have conspired to get rid of the servant of the old school, and therefore it is that the third party, the servant, whether native or foreign-born, is much condemned to have an itching palm.

The most evident injury of the new system is on its social side, in the feeling of insecurity and injustice which it has brought into a large part of our social life. The born American never used to have any of the grudges against his richer neighbor in which so much of the revolutionary feeling of other countries has its roots. He saw nothing unnatural in the notion that consumers should be graduated into classes according to their ability and willingness to pay, and that each class should get what it paid for. If his neighbor, who paid twice or thrice as much as he, got hotel accommodations which were proportionately better than his, he had no feeling of personal wrong; he enjoyed his own contentedly, in the devout belief that the time was coming when he should be able to pay for and enjoy that which would be more to his liking. His confidence in his own future made him a believer that, even in such a matter as hotel privileges, he could ask in the long run no better test than open competition and the market price. The tipping system has changed his whole position. The grades of accommodations are no longer fixed by competition alone, but surreptitiously and by corrupting the servants. The ordinary guest must still pay the rates which are proper for his own scale of accommodation, but in addition to that he must now compete with his richer neighbor in tipping the servants, or else he will not get even the accommodations for which he pays. In other words, he must pay higher rates in order that his richer neighbor may perpetuate a system under which he may decrease his rates by bargaining in part with the servants instead of with the employers. Is it wonderful that the new system brings about a chronic discontent which used to be unknown?

The corruptible servant can and will sell his services below their real value, for he is selling that which does not really belong to him, but to his employer, or to the guest whom he is neglecting because of a refusal to tip: whatever the price he gets, it is so much clear gain to him. So the larcenous servant can afford to sell napkins or tea-spoons much below their market price. So the negro laborer at the South can afford to sell to the cross-roads storekeeper the stolen cotton or the farm products at a lower price than the lawful owner could have accepted. Public opinion makes the position of the "fence" or the collusive storekeeper unpleasant; why should it deal any more tenderly with the man who tips? The only point in his favor is that he is ignorant of the full extent of his evil work; and to balance this is the fact that he is willing, for the sake of present ease, not only to bribe a servant to appropriate to him what belongs to neither of them, but to compel employers to recognize this as a system of licensed spoliation, and to drive other guests into doing even as he does.

There is, moreover, a political side to the evil which is generally overlooked. The Romans held that it was beneath the dignity of a free man to take money in

return for personal services; and the Roman law of contracts was very seriously modified by the persistence of the idea down to the latest times. Circumstances seem to show that there was some truth in the notion; and yet we must have personal service, and it must be paid for, in default of slavery—the infinitely worse alternative which governed the ancient world. So long as the employer stood between guest and servant, taking the guest's money and therewith paying the servant, the connection between guest and servant was so indirect as to obviate many of the evils which the Roman instinctively feared, and the somewhat aggressive independence of the American servant did the rest. The system of tipping, bringing in a direct but surreptitious money connection between guest and servant, cannot but result in a steady degeneration of the servant's moral fiber. It gives the servant a mercenary mode of thought which is unhappily too familiar to most men to need much specification here. The worst of all results is that it corrupts the servant's whole conception of duty: duty is no longer something to which he is bound, but something which some one else is bound to bribe him to do. When such a conception of duty is daily borne in upon the heart and practice of a circle of servants, which is steadily extending from the employees of hotels to those of railroads, steamboats, and every conceivable variety of personal service, and when all these men are not only servants but voters, how can it be expected that we shall leave a man a virile conception of his duty as a voter while we corrupt him as a servant? He will not bring you a glass of water at a hotel table, or handle your luggage on a steamer, without an extra gratuity; why should he vote even the ticket of his own party unless he is tipped for his trouble? How far is democratic government compatible with the tip system?

It is said that there is no remedy. There is none which will take effect without effort, but sincere and persistent effort could find a remedy. Some of our clubs have found already that the social evil of tipping, the sense of insecurity and inequality which it introduces among the members, is not "clubbable." They therefore pay the servants honest wages, and make the offer of any further tip or gratuity an offense against the club. Let us extend the club feeling and find in it the remedy. It was in the hotels that the evil began its vicious course, and in them the remedy must find its beginning. It would not be a difficult matter for a hotel to announce in its advertisements, in its offices, and on its bills of fare, that its servants are paid full wages, that any of them accepting tips will be dismissed at the end of the week, and that the guest is requested not to tempt the servant by offering him gratuities. Only a few cases of vigorous enforcement of these notices would be needed. The results would be profitable to the employers, and pleasant to those guests who

do not tip, and to those who are coerced into tipping. They would of course be unpleasant to those few who wish to tip; but these are just the social pests who underlie the whole system and who deserve no consideration.

We know of at least one hotel where the non-tipping plan was tried, we believe, with success.

#### The Washington Memorial Arch.

THEY were not mistaken who believed that the celebration in New York of the centenary of Washington's inauguration would not only stimulate the patriotism of the nation and of the city, but would increase, especially, the sense and pride of citizenship on the part of the inhabitants of the city itself. The most conspicuous and gratifying evidence of this has been given in the movement looking to the erection in permanent form, at Washington Square, of the temporary centennial arch designed by Stanford White. There has seldom been seen in New York a movement of the kind sustained so well by public opinion. The manner in which the various artistic, literary, and social organizations have responded to the suggestion is quite unprecedented in our history. Of course one reason for this is the fact that the public were not called upon to subscribe to an unknown object. They were assured by the very circumstances of the case that the monument would be a fit and beautiful one; that in its purity, simplicity, and majesty it would recall the character of the first President; that the form of the memorial would not be the dubious outcome of an anonymous competition. One reason, we say, that the scheme has not flashed in the pan is that the intelligence of the community stamped the monument at once with its approval. But another reason is that the "centennial" had helped to make the city "feel itself."

There never was a time when so many public-spirited citizens were determined that New York should offer something more to the eye of the visitor than a rushing stream of humanity, "something more" for the contemplation of the rest of the world "than a swift-running mill which grinds the grists of fortune." The city's private architecture has improved strikingly during the past ten years. It has acquired a few notable statues and more are being added to the number. But the Washington Memorial Arch will be the first piece of purely decorative public architecture, of first-class importance, erected in New York. It will not only greatly add to the beauty and to the interest of the city, but is sure to be the beginning of a system of arches and public gateways at appropriate places throughout the metropolis.

The more beautiful the city, and the stronger its appeal to the eye and to the heart of its inhabitants, the more apt will these be to see to it that our local government is not a reproach among the nations of the earth.



## OPEN LETTERS.

### Union Veterans and their Pensions.

THERE are two national associations, having organized support throughout the North and West, which are engaged in advocating a service pension for every Union survivor of the civil war, and the Grand Army of the Republic, the largest and the strongest society of veterans, has an extensive machinery at work agitating for the support of pension measures both at the polls and at Washington. It is true that this machinery of the Grand Army is not strictly representative, but the State and national conventions of the order, made up of delegates elected annually, are in the habit of discussing and voting upon measures which are expected to be presented to Congress by a committee acting under authority of the whole body.<sup>1</sup> Some of the measures indorsed by the Grand Army in the past have become laws. The Dependent Pension Bill, which was vetoed in 1887, originated in the pension committee representing the National Encampment.

With a view to presenting the pension question as it stands, both as regards the allowances drawn at this time and the additional allowances to be asked for in the near future, I give below an abstract of the provisions already made for survivors of the service, and also the provisions of the bills proposed, and an approximate of the cost of these new measures.

According to the report for 1888 of the Commissioner of Pensions, there were then on the rolls 326,835 survivors of the war of 1861-65, 217,580 of the number receiving allowances not exceeding \$8 a month.<sup>2</sup> The 109,255 reported as receiving an excess of \$8 a month include nearly all of the officers drawing invalid pensions (some of them are on the roll at a lower rate), and all of the enlisted men having extra disability, such as the loss of limbs, or eyesight, or hearing, or the equivalent. Out of the 217,580 reported at \$8 or less, there are 32,007 at \$2 or less, 103,556 at \$4 or less, and 153,177 at \$6 or less. Only 64,403 of the 217,580 in this class, and mainly those technically known as the fully disabled, receive over \$6 a month, and the remaining 153,177 are on at an average of \$3.50 a month. Since \$8 was deemed a fair rate to support a dependent veteran in the simple times of the first half of the century, when that rate was fixed, the present allowance as it comes to individuals in the large class here considered is not much more than a pittance. The aggregate annual value of the entire list at \$8 and under, as it stood in 1888, is about \$13,888,000.

The following table of ratings and of the number pensioned at each rate shows how the allowance is distributed among invalid survivors (war of 1861-65) on the rolls June 30, 1888:

Rates.	No.	Rates.	No.
\$1.00	283	\$13.75	16
1.87	2	14.00	6,555
2.00	31,722	14.25	35
2.12½	3	14.50	10
2.25	4	14.75	14
2.50	4	14.87½	1
2.66	7	15.00	2,334
2.66½	38	15.25	2
3.00	1,935	15.50	8
3.12	1	15.75	9
3.75	348	16.00	11,868
4.00	69,210	16.25	13
4.25	426	16.50	18
5.00	1,462	16.75	21
5.25	2	17.00	2,656
5.33	13	17.25	3
5.33½	35	17.50	31
5.66½	6	17.75	7
5.75	16	18.00	2,538
6.00	47,661	18.25	5
6.25	76	18.50	15
6.37	2	18.75	130
6.37½	2	19.00	174
6.66½	2	19.25	11
6.75	3	19.50	2
7.00	215	20.00	1,652
7.25	14	20.75	3
7.50	925	21.00	7
7.66½	1	21.25	2
7.75	21	21.87	1
8.00	63,142	22.00	1
8.12½	1	22.50	92
8.25	24	23.25	3
8.50	1,134	23.50	1
8.66	1	23.75	3
8.75	10	24.00	13,522
9.00	375	24.50	2
9.25	22	25.00	388
9.50	35	25.25	1
9.75	14	26.25	1
10.00	19,046	26.75	3
10.25	18	27.50	6
10.50	37	30.00	11,257
10.66	1	30.75	2
10.75	15	31.25	88
11.00	62	32.00	3
11.25	483	32.50	3
11.33	1	35.00	4
11.33½	9	35.50	2
11.50	25	36.00	2,927
11.75	25	38.50	1
12.00	25,078	40.00	24
12.12½	6	40.25	1
12.25	15	42.00	1
12.50	211	45.00	2,540
12.75	707	46.00	1
13.00	328	49.00	1
13.12	1	50.00	1,430
13.25	19	53.00	1
13.33	6	72.00	1,053
13.33½	1	100.00	2
13.50	40		
			326,835

#### Rates of Monthly Allowance according to Rank for Injuries incurred in Service amounting to Total Disability.

Rank of lieutenant-colonel	\$30.00
" " major	25.00
" " captain	20.00
" " first lieutenant	17.00
" " second	15.00
" " cadets, etc	10.00
Privates and non-commissioned officers (except warrant officers in the navy)	8.00

#### Rates established by Law according to Disability.

Loss of both hands or feet	72.00
Total disability in both hands	50.00
Total disability in both feet	31.25
Loss of sight of both eyes	72.00
Loss of one hand and one foot	36.00
Loss of a hand or foot	30.00
Any disability equivalent to loss of hand or foot	24.00
Amputation at or above elbow or knee, or total disability of the arm or leg	36.00

<sup>1</sup> The National Pension Committee of the Grand Army is appointed by the Commander-in-Chief, who is elected annually. The committee serves one year.

<sup>2</sup> Eight dollars a month is the total for the rank of an enlisted man whose disability, with respect to the part affected, incapacitates for manual labor. This rate was established in 1818, and has not been increased except for special disabilities.



Amputation at or near hip or shoulder joint.....	\$45.00
Inability to perform manual labor.....	30.00
Disability requiring regular attendance by another person.....	50.00
Total deafness.....	30.00

The rates for other disabilities are fixed by the Commissioner of Pensions.

The law assumes that these beneficiaries received permanent injuries incident to service during the war, or, if the injury be not permanent, that the allowance is suspended whenever the effects of the injury disappear. There is justification for this enormous pension list of survivors, in the record of casualties and diseases. There were over 250,000 wounds treated in hospitals, and in all about 6,000,000 cases of wounds and diseases. Aside from the dead on the field over 200,000 cases proved fatal.

Any reduction of this invalid list, which aggregated in 1888 an annual value of over \$37,000,000, must be made by scaling the allowances of one or both of the two classes which I have distinguished, namely: the numerous class, which includes nearly all of the enlisted men, and where the average is \$5.31+ a month, and the aggregate annual value is not quite \$14,000,000 for over 217,000 beneficiaries, or the class where the average is greater and the number of pensioners less, the beneficiaries being 109,255, the annual value about \$24,182,000, and the average \$18.42+ a month. This higher class of pensioners, however, includes nearly all of the disabled officers, and all of the enlisted men who are severely maimed.

Assuming that these pensions will remain as they are during the lifetime of the beneficiaries, what other classes of survivors, who are deserving, are unprovided for?

*First.* Those who by reason of the hardships of service and old age combined are not able to labor, and who have no case under the invalid laws.

*Second.* Those who are disabled by reason of injuries received in service, and who cannot prove their claims.

*Third.* Those who have become disabled since the war, and whose faithful services entitle them to the gratitude of the nation.

The number of these cannot be computed, but doubtless there are many thousands. Every Grand Army post has some cases of the kind on its relief list. The average age of survivors is about fifty years, and there must be a large number who have passed the age of activity. Very many who received permanent injuries in service, but were young and hopeful when the war closed, did not make application and secure evidence while the proper witnesses could be obtained, and cannot at this date prove their invalid claims. Still others had no well-defined disease when they were discharged, but have become disabled since and are now in want, and have no case under present laws.

It was to benefit, ostensibly, the three classes not now on the list that the Dependent Pension Bill, which failed to become a law, was framed by the Grand Army committee. Immediately after the veto the committee prepared a modified bill called a Disability Bill, providing for veterans as follows:

SEC. 2. That all persons who served three months or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or

who may hereafter be suffering from mental or physical disability, not the result of their own vicious habits, which totally incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive twelve dollars per month; and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Pension Office, after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability then existed, and shall continue during the existence of the same in the degree herein specified: *Provided*, That persons who are now receiving pensions under existing laws, or whose claims are pending in the Pension Office, may, by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any pensioner thereunder from prosecuting his claim and receiving his pension under any other general or special act: *Provided, however*, That no person shall receive more than one pension for the same period: *And provided further*, That rank in the service shall not be considered in applications filed thereunder.

This section was left unchanged in a bill passed by the Senate at the last session. Meanwhile there had been introduced in both houses a bill known as the Per Diem Service Pension Bill (given in full, below), a measure which its advocates declared would benefit the three classes considered above, as being unprovided for, and the House committee of the last Congress reported the Grand Army Disability Bill, with Section 2 changed to provide as follows:

A pension at the rate per month of one cent for each day's service in the military or naval service of the United States during any of the wars in which the United States have been engaged, and all persons who have served as aforesaid, and have been honorably discharged as aforesaid, and are now sixty-two years of age, shall also be entitled, etc.

Further provision grants the same pension to all who attain the age of sixty-two. In this bill the three classes above considered are recognized as deserving, but the rate to be allowed is graded according to length of service. The bill was not voted upon.

During the discussion of the Dependent Bill before and after the veto, a measure, known as the Loring, or Eight Dollar Service Pension Bill, providing eight dollars a month to every survivor who had served sixty days or more, was brought before Congress.

This bill would benefit the deserving classes to the extent of eight dollars a month; but as it makes only a slight distinction with regard to length of service, several rated service pension bills were discussed by the veterans, and finally the Per Diem Bill was formulated. It was introduced early in the session of 1887-88, and is as follows:

A Bill to grant Pensions for Service in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension roll of the United States the names of all persons specified in the following section, upon making due proof that they performed the service specified in said section.

SEC. 2. That persons entitled as beneficiaries under the preceding sections are as follows: Any officer or enlisted man who shall have served in the army, navy, or marine corps of the United States, including regulars and volunteers, subsequent to the fourth day of March, 1861, and prior to the first day of July, 1866.

SEC. 3. That the rate of pension for such service shall be at the rate per month of one cent for each day's

service rendered in the said army, navy, or marine corps of the United States.<sup>1</sup>

SEC. 4. That the period of service shall be computed from the date of muster into the United States service to the date of discharge, but no pension shall be granted under this act to or on account of any person who deserted prior to July 1, 1865, until he shall have obtained a discharge from the service from which he deserted, and no discharge which was given to any person by reason of reenlistment as a veteran volunteer, or to enable him to accept a promotion, shall be deemed a discharge from the services within the meaning of this act.

SEC. 5. That pension under this act shall be at the rate specified in section three, and shall be paid to the persons entitled thereto for the term of their lives from and after the passage of this bill.

SEC. 6. This bill is intended as a service pension bill, and is intended as an addition to all invalid pensions which have been or may hereafter be granted for disability.

The three bills, the Dependent or Disability Bill, the Eight Dollar Bill, and the Per Diem Bill, were before Congress when the national encampment of the Grand Army (Columbus, Ohio, 1888) was again called upon to meet the question. The committee on pensions reiterated the claims of the Disability Bill, and finally a resolution was adopted almost unanimously favoring a service pension of eight dollars a month for every survivor who served sixty days or more, and an additional amount of one cent a month for each day's service exceeding eight hundred.

The bill has not yet been presented, but the Grand Army committee has been active in pushing the Disability Bill. However, the resolution of the encampment is an approval of the principle of service pensions, and is in harmony with the action of many of the State departments of the order.

Upon the question of service pensions, the veterans in and out of the Grand Army are divided as to the following points: *First.* Shall the pension begin at once, or at sixty-two years of age? *Second.* Shall it be rated according to length of service, or be uniform? *Third.* Shall it be in addition to the invalid pension allowance in cases already on the roll? *Fourth.* Shall it continue to the widows or other dependent heirs?

The number of survivors is estimated, in the departments at Washington, at about 1,350,000. It is asserted by the Per Diem Service Pension Association that the average term of service is about one year, and that the Per Diem Bill would allow an average pension of \$3.65 a month. If 1,000,000 survivors called for the allowance, the cost would be less than \$50,000,000 a year. The Eight Dollar Bill would cost \$96,000,000 a year if 1,000,000 men should receive it. The Grand Army Service Pension Bill would cost, on the same basis, \$96,000,000 a year, and an additional sum to every veteran who served over 800 days; that is, for three years' service, or 1095 days, \$10.95 a month; for four years, or 1460 days, \$14.60 a month; and at that rate for all terms of service of over 800 days.<sup>2</sup>

For more than twenty years the Grand Army of the Republic throughout the Union has engaged in a vast and peculiar system of relief to needy comrades, and

the veterans have original knowledge which should make them competent advocates and judges in claims made on the ground of service. But with this knowledge and influence there is also responsibility, and it is to be hoped that the pension measures presented on behalf of the order will be based wholly upon justice for all concerned,—the interests of the country as well as that of the soldiers,—and not upon the mere fact of approval by an accidental majority in the ranks of the veterans.

George L. Kilmer.

#### "The Use of Oil to Still the Waves."

I HAVE just read with much interest the article in the March number of THE CENTURY on "The Use of Oil to Still the Waves." It so happens that lately a large ship laden with petroleum was run into by a steamer off the Owers lightship which carried away a part of her cutwater and made a huge hole in her bows. It was blowing pretty fresh from the southwest at the time, and there was a good sea on. The casks began to roll out through the hole in the bows of the *Vandalia* of New Brunswick, and the vessel to settle down forward. The crew took to the boats and abandoned her, and she drifted up channel and finally grounded off Hove, about three hundred yards from shore. Two thousand or more casks of petroleum drifted to land, and I was curious to see what effect the oil had upon the waves. To my surprise, I came to the conclusion that the effect was almost entirely negative; and I made the remark to some friends that, whatever effect other kinds of oil may have, petroleum is evidently of no use. I now find that this experience is in strict accordance with the statement of Lieutenant Beehler, "that mineral oil is not suitable, especially if refined." The cargo of the *Vandalia* consisted, I presume, of refined oil, for on observing some flow from a cask, the head of which was started, it was evidently a very limpid and perfectly clear oil, having a faint bluish tinge very similar to that observable in fluorescent liquids. Several of the casks were stove in and came to shore empty of their contents, so that a large quantity of oil had mingled with the sea water. To such an extent was this the case that the sea along the length of the shore for two miles or more presented a thin milk-and-water appearance. It appeared to me, so far as I could judge, that the heavy sea churned the oil up into minute globules, which were dispersed throughout the water and so rendered it turbid. I quite satisfied myself that the oil did not spread out into a continuous film over the surface of the water, but broke up into little patches. The surface motion of the sea seemed unappreciably affected. It broke over the bows of the *Vandalia*, and came up in heavy breakers upon the beach, but there seemed much less foam than is usually created when the big rollers break.

George Gladstone.

Hove, SUSSEX, ENGLAND.

<sup>1</sup> Two years is a fair term of service in a long war, and \$8 is the full pension established. But a soldier's service is not recorded in full years; it is from the day of actual enlistment to that of discharge. Therefore a rate of one cent a day, which would give \$7.30 for a two-years' term, would give a proportionate sum for any length of service.

<sup>2</sup> The total disbursement for pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, was \$78,775,861.92, and nearly one-third of the amount was used in payment of arrears on new claims. The

annual value of all the pensions on the roll was \$56,707,220.92, and out of this \$18,648,373.50 was for pensions to the widows and other dependents of three wars, and the survivors of 1812 and the Mexican War. On the basis of the amount on the rolls for 1888 the estimates for the Per Diem Bill would increase the annual value of all pensions to something over \$100,000,000, the Eight Dollar Bill would swell it to over \$150,000,000, and the Grand Army Service Pension measure to a still higher sum.

overcoming all obstacles, had built railroads and telegraphs to meet and supply him, and now he was advancing to Raleigh. Johnston surrendered, and at last over the military line which has been traced began to flow a tide of commercial dispatches, transmitted by the military telegraphers, Schofield's operators at Raleigh taking the business from Columbia and the south, rushing it over the Raleigh and Gaston wire, sixty messages an hour to Petersburg, whence northward flew the silent harbingers of peace. It was the first link to bind the North and the South together again.

It may surprise the reader to learn that, beyond the commendation of Lincoln, Stanton, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and all the higher officers, the military telegraphers—except a few heads of departments, who were commissioned and promoted from captains up to brigadier-generals—have never received any recognition for their great services. Though suffering captivity, wounds, and all of the hardships of the troops, the members of the corps cannot tell their children that they were soldiers, nor hail their brother veterans of the Grand Army of

the Republic as comrades. They were merely "civilians" who faithfully performed dangerous and harassing military duty with boyish enthusiasm, and some of whom have survived to learn that republics are ungrateful, or at least forgetful. Uncle Sam, who has been more generous to his veterans than any potentate of history, has forgotten them. Their widows and orphans receive no pensions.

Once a year the survivors of the corps from all parts of the Union meet to renew old acquaintance, cemented by the electric spark over leagues of wire. Many of them never met in the field, but they knew each other well by telegraph, and can still recognize the touch of a comrade's hand on the "key" a thousand miles away.

The experience of this country, which demonstrated the value of a military telegraph, induced the immediate organization of such corps, but on a more strictly military basis, in all European armies.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Lieutenant Von Treuenfeldt's "Kriegs-Telegraphie," and "Die Kriegstelegraphie" of Captain Bucholtz.

*J. Emmet O'Brien.*

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### Ballot Reform Progress.

THE record of ballot reform legislation for the current year is one of most encouraging progress. At the beginning of the year only one State, Massachusetts, had such a law on its statute books. At its close, the legislatures of nine States had passed comprehensive measures closely resembling that of Massachusetts, seven of which were approved and became laws and two of which were defeated by executive vetoes. The States which have these, all of which are to go into effect in the near future, are, given in the order of enactment: Massachusetts, Indiana, Montana, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Minnesota, and Missouri. The two States which lost theirs through vetoes are New York and Connecticut. New York has been deprived in this way twice in succession, both times by the same governor. In Connecticut a so-called secret ballot law was hurriedly passed on the last day of the session, and was approved by the governor. It is in no sense an application of the Australian system, and there is considerable doubt as to whether it will accomplish much real reform in practice. It is, however, a step in advance.

When the agitation for ballot reform was started by the discussions of the Commonwealth Club of New York City in the spring of 1887, there was no law embodying the principles of the Australian system to be found in any part of the United States. A bill proposing a partial application of that system was discussed that winter in the Michigan legislature, and finally

passed one house, but it failed in the other house. Later in the spring of 1887 the Wisconsin legislature passed a law, applying only to the city of Milwaukee, in which some of the Australian principles, notably those providing for an absolutely secret ballot, were embodied. The committee appointed by the Commonwealth Club to draft a bill for presentation to the New York legislature spent a great deal of time during the autumn and early winter of 1887 in devising a simple and comprehensive scheme for applying the Australian system to American election methods. They completed their work in time to have their bill presented to the New York legislature soon after its assembling in January, 1888. This bill has served as the model for all subsequent measures, and while the eight laws now in existence differ from it in details, its underlying principles are to be found without modification in all of them. It was used in 1888 as the basis for the Massachusetts law, which, with the exception of a very excellent law passed by the Kentucky legislature and applying exclusively to the city of Louisville, was the only advance made by the reform during that year. The New York legislature passed the Commonwealth Club bill, but Governor Hill vetoed it.

The discussions aroused in New York and Massachusetts on the pending measures called the attention of the whole country to the subject. A valuable demonstration of the practicability of the reform was furnished by elections in Milwaukee and Louisville, for in both instances the new system worked with such smoothness and success as to command the praise of its most

strenuous opponents. This helped forward the movement, but a far more vigorous impulse was given to it by the revelations which were made after the presidential election concerning the unprecedented use of money for the purchase of votes by both political parties. These awoke the public conscience in all parts of the country, and caused a general demand for some ballot system which would secure a secret and untrammelled vote. When the State legislatures came together in January last, there was scarcely one of them which did not have before it in some form a measure for a change in existing ballot systems. The Australian method was the favorite everywhere, partly because it had stood the test of experience in Australia for 30 years, in England for 18 years, and in Canada for 16 years, and partly because discussion of it had made the public to some extent familiar with its principles.

The result of the legislative year's work was the seven laws which we have enumerated. In Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, and several other States similar laws were considered but were not passed. The seed sown by the discussions of them is certain, however, to bear fruit in the near future. The leading principles of the eight laws which we now have are the same in all. They are:

1. An exclusively official ballot, printed and distributed at the public expense. The names of all candidates for all offices are to be placed upon these ballots, and none others are to be received or counted.

2. Absolute secrecy in voting. Every voter is required to take his ballots and retire alone with them to a compartment where, free from observation or espionage of any kind, he must mark them to indicate the candidates for whom he wishes to vote. There is slight variation in the methods prescribed by the different laws for this marking. In Indiana the voter is to make the mark with an official stamp, furnished for the purpose; in Missouri he must erase from the ballot all names except those for which he wishes to vote; and in Massachusetts, Montana, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Tennessee, and Minnesota he must indicate his choice by an X opposite the name of each candidate for whom he wishes to vote. In three of the laws, those of Indiana, Missouri, and Tennessee, the names of candidates are grouped under party titles, but in the others they follow the order in which the nominations are received by the officer in charge of the printing, with the politics indicated after each name.

3. Ample provision for independent nominations. All the laws contain careful provision whereby a specified number of voters can, by agreeing upon an independent candidate, and by making his nomination in writing to the official printer of the ballots, have his name placed upon the ballots on equal terms with those of the regular candidates.

It is easy to see at a glance what a momentous gain for honest elections has been secured by the engrafting of these three principles upon our electoral system. The printing and distributing of ballots at the public expense, and the prohibition of all others, takes away all excuse for assessments upon candidates, and drives from the polls all the ticket-peddlers, watchers, and political workers of all kinds. There will be nothing for them to do outside and about the polls, they are forbidden to congregate near the polls, and they are

not allowed inside. Thus we are rid at once of the chief excuse for raising money for corrupt purposes at the polls, and of the ability to use it, even if raised, with any certainty that the receivers of it will carry out their part of the corrupt bargain at the ballot-boxes. By having an absolutely secret ballot we are rid of espionage and intimidation of all kinds. The ward "boss" cannot follow his henchmen to the polls to see if they vote according to orders, or according to the terms of a "deal." The bulldozing employer cannot intimidate his employees to vote in accordance with his interests, but must leave them to vote in accordance with their own free will.

Possibly the greatest gain of all will be found in time to be that secured through independent nominations. This is the straightest and deadliest blow which has been struck at the dictatorial caucus system. Henceforth in eight States, any body of men, though a mere handful, can get their candidates' names upon the ballots and can have them distributed at the polls on equal terms with those of the regular parties. Every caucus will thus have hanging over its deliberations the threat of a formidable and easily organized independent movement in case its own nominations are not satisfactory. Heretofore the most effective obstacle to an independent ticket has been the difficulty and expense of getting it distributed at the polls.

#### Eight Hours a Day.

AGITATION is by no means a thing to be condemned off-hand. The justification of it rests on the same basis as that of any other advocacy: its ground of defense is that no other agency will take pains to defend its client; that opposing forces have their advocates who will bring out the best points on their behalf; and that this particular client should also have its advocate, to bring out the strong points of its case, leaving the balance of justice to be ascertained by those to whom that duty properly belongs. It will certainly not be asserted that any of our "trusts," or pools, or associations of manufacturers, or other employers, will make as hearty and persistent efforts as a labor organization would make to state and make clear the reasons or provocations for a troublesome and expensive strike. Nor, on the other hand, is it the primary business of the labor organization to maintain the cause of any but its own members. The case will be best understood and decided by the general public and by the parties interested when each side has been presented fully by those who feel its justice most keenly and know most about it, provided the presentation has been made in a spirit of fairness and of willingness to compromise. Even then some points will be imperfectly understood, but substantial justice can in no other way be so closely reached.

Every man, then, who is interested in industrial discussion has a right to protest against the spirit in which some industrial disputes are settled. A settlement into which either side brings personal rancor, or in which either side yields only perforce after a mismanaged struggle, with the reservation of an intention to try it again at the earliest opportunity or to gain the wished-for end by treachery and indirection, is no settlement at all. The employer who abandons a lock-out, but takes every subsequent opportunity to discharge "agi-

tators," whom he regards as troublesome, will find, when he next has need of public sympathy, that he has alienated it. And there is no more real excuse for the labor agitator who, after a complete exposure of his failure to understand the circumstances through which he has undertaken to be the guide of his fellows, refuses to admit his mistake, but seeks some new ground upon which to prepare a second failure.

It is not quite a misnomer to give the name of "discussion" to a strike. The essence of the strike is that it is a clumsy means of testing truth. With some philosophical differences as to the source from which wages are paid, there is a pretty general agreement as to the manner in which the rate of wages is fixed. One distinguished writer on the subject has even gone for his text to the summing up of an intelligent workman, who said: "When I see two bosses running after one man, I know that wages are going to be high; when I see two men running after one boss, I know that wages are going to be low." All this means that supply and demand have the same influence on the price of labor as on the price of corn. But man has found no means of ascertaining the "visible supply" of labor in any trade as he has in the case of corn: corn remains corn and cannot become wheat or oats, but the man who is a shoemaker to-day may be a farmer or a horse-car driver to-morrow. How then is the possible labor supply to be ascertained? The workman says: "The supply of labor in our trade is sufficiently short to justify a ten per cent. increase of wages." The employer denies it. In the dearth of statistics, how is the controversy to be decided? The strike furnishes a clumsy mode of decision. The men suspend their work, and the employer attempts, by engaging new men, to justify his contention that the supply of labor was not "short."

It must be evident that it is unskilled labor which is at the greatest disadvantage in such a mode of coming to conclusions. This is the class of labor, therefore, which is most interested in finding some reasonable substitute for the strike and lockout rather than in contriving new pretexts or methods for either. The strike of the car-drivers in Brooklyn and New York last winter, for example, was successful only in showing that, for every hundred men who had struck, at least five times the number, of equal or superior capacity, were waiting to take their places. Having demonstrated this unwelcome state of affairs, what were rational men to do next? The circumstances could be changed only by sheer violence; and the city government was not to be counted as a passive but as an active neutral; it was not to leave the struggle to the arbitrament of violence, but intended to protect property as well as life. The men were wisest, then, in yielding to circumstances and again seeking their old work.

What are we to think, then, of the wisdom of guides who condemn circumstances and seek only for new

reasons or methods for strikes? Yet the "lesson" which a leading labor journal drew from the failure of the street-car strike was as follows:

The state should appoint boards of arbitration to which all grievances could be referred, and enact laws to enforce the decisions of the arbitrators. Reduce the hours of labor to eight per day, and establish a minimum rate of wages. Attach a penalty for working overtime, and give an opportunity to labor to the vast army of industrious idle men who flood the larger American cities at the present time. This would render strikes unnecessary, as an employer would think twice before allowing his work to stop when he did not know where to look for men. The employer reaps all the benefit of the competition in labor under present methods.

The two branches of this proposal are apt to seem plausible, even to men presumed to be educated. And yet the first, that of compulsory arbitration, really amounts to either a stoppage of production or the re-introduction of slavery. If the arbitration is made compulsory on the employer alone, production must stop, for the scheme would be merely a legal confiscation of the property of the employer, who, if he is sane, will go out of business. In the second place, the decision of the arbitrators can be enforced on the employer through his property: if he refuses to obey, his property can be sold by the sheriff. The workman has, roughly speaking, no property on which to levy, unless his labor be accounted his property. Compulsory arbitration for workmen, then, means compulsory labor, and that always has in it something of the principle of slavery. The state could not afford even to permit workmen to consent to its admission.

The second part of the proposal, the struggle for "eight hours a day," is founded on the notion that if less work is done in eight than in ten hours there will be just so much work left for those now unemployed; while the consequent employment of previously idle men will prevent an employer from filling the places of strikers, and will guard against a decrease of wages. If the proposal were that every man should work with one hand tied behind him, for the same purpose, the naked folly of it would need no demonstration. Any man could estimate for himself the effects on the industry and prosperity of the community or nation, and could see that, instead of providing work for the unemployed, the practical result would be the decrease of work, through the ruin of industries which have now but the narrowest margin of profit to rely upon. And yet where is the essential difference between the two proposals, except that this reason for an eight-hour day is solemnly put out as an "economic" proposition?

There are more respectable reasons for the eight-hour day, which are entitled to argument. But the reason above assigned is rather the dense obstinacy which attempts to retain or regain a discredited leadership by cozening the victims into treading again the same old road to ruin.



## OPEN LETTERS.

### The Centenary of Fenimore Cooper.

MOST appropriate is it that the first literary centenary which we are called upon to commemorate one hundred years after the adoption of the Constitution that knit these States into a nation should be the birthday of the author who has done the most to make us known to the nations of Europe. In the first year of Washington's first term as President, on the fifteenth day of September, 1789, was born James Fenimore Cooper, the first of American novelists and the first American author to carry our flag outside the limits of our language. Franklin was the earliest American who had fame among foreigners; but his wide popularity was due rather to his achievements as a philosopher, as a physicist, as a statesman, than to his labors as an author. Irving was six years older than Cooper, and his reputation was as high in England as at home; yet to this day he is little more than a name to those who do not speak our mother tongue. But after Cooper had published "The Spy," "The Last of the Mohicans," and "The Pilot," his popularity was cosmopolitan; he was almost as widely read in France, in Germany, and in Italy as in Great Britain and the United States. Only one American book has ever since attained the international success of these of Cooper's—"Uncle Tom's Cabin," and only one American author has since gained a name at all commensurate with Cooper's abroad—Poe. Here in these United States, we know what Emerson was to us and what he did for us and what our debt is to him; but the French and the Germans and the Italians do not know Emerson. When Professor Boyesen visited Hugo some ten years ago he found that the great French lyrist had never heard of Emerson. I have a copy of "Evangeline" annotated in French for the use of French children learning English at school; but whatever Longfellow's popularity in England or in Germany, he is really but little known in France or Italy or Spain. With Goethe and Schiller, with Scott and Byron, Cooper was one of the foreign forces which brought about the Romanticist revolt in France, profoundly affecting the literature of all Latin countries. Dumas owed almost as much to Cooper as he did to Scott; and Balzac said that if Cooper had only drawn character as well as he painted "the phenomena of nature, he would have uttered the last word of our art."

In his admirable life of Cooper, one of the best of modern biographies, Professor Lounsbury shows clearly the extraordinary state of affairs with which Cooper had to contend. Foremost among the disadvantages against which he had to labor was the dull, deadening provincialism of American criticism at the time when "The Spy" was written; and as we read Professor Lounsbury's pages we see how bravely Cooper fought for our intellectual emancipation from the shackles of the British criticism of that time, even more ignorant then and more insular than it is now. Abroad Cooper received the attention nearly always

given in literature to those who bring a new thing; and the new thing which Cooper annexed to literature was America. At home he had to struggle against a belief that our soil was barren of romance—as though the author who used his eyes could not find ample material wherever there was humanity. Cooper was the first who proved the fitness of American life and American history for the uses of fiction. "The Spy" is really the first of American novels, and it remains one of the best. Cooper was the prospector of that little army of industrious miners now engaged in working every vein of local color and character, and in sifting out the golden dust from the sands of local history. The authors of "Oldtown Folks," of the "Tales of the Argonauts," of "Old Creole Days," and of "In the Tennessee Mountains" were but following in Cooper's footsteps—though they carried more modern tools. And when the desire of the day is for detail and for finish, it is not without profit to turn again to stories of a bolder sweep. When the tendency of the times is perhaps toward an undue elaboration of miniature portraits, there is gain in going back to the masterpieces of a literary artist who succeeded best in heroic statures. And not a few of us, whatever our code of literary esthetics, may find delight, fleeting though it be, in the free outline drawing of Cooper, after our eyes are tired by the niggling and cross-hatching of many among our contemporary realists. When our pleasant duty is done, when our examination is at an end, and when we seek to sum up our impressions and to set them down plainly, we find that chief among Cooper's characteristics were, first, a sturdy, hearty, robust, outdoor and open-air wholesomeness, devoid of any trace of offense and free from all morbid taint; and, secondly, an intense Americanism—ingrained, abiding, and dominant. Professor Lounsbury quotes from an English magazine of 1831 the statement that to an Englishman Cooper appeared to be prouder of his birth as an American than of his genius as an author—an attitude which may seem to some a little old-fashioned, but which on Cooper's part was both natural and becoming.

"The Spy" was the earliest of Cooper's American novels (and its predecessor, "Precaution," a mere stencil imitation of the minor British novel of that day, need not be held in remembrance against him). "The Spy," published in 1821, was followed in 1823 by "The Pioneers," the first of the "Leatherstocking Tales" to appear and by far the poorest; indeed it is the only one of the five for which any apology need be made. The narrative drags under the burden of overabundant detail; and the story may deserve to be called dull at times. Leatherstocking even is but a faint outline of himself as the author afterward with loving care elaborated the character. "The Last of the Mohicans" came out in 1826, and its success was instantaneous and enduring. In 1827 appeared "The Prairie," the third tale in which Leatherstocking is the chief character. It is rare that an author is ever able to write a successful sequel to a successful story, yet Cooper did more; "The

Prairie" is a sequel to "The Pioneers," and "The Last of the Mohicans" is a prologue to it. Eighteen years after the first of the "Leatherstocking Tales" had been published Cooper issued the last of them, amplifying his single sketch into a drama in five acts by the addition of "The Pathfinder," printed in 1840, and of "The Deerslayer," printed in 1841. In the sequence of events "The Deerslayer," the latest written, is the earliest to be read; then comes "The Last of the Mohicans"; followed by "The Pathfinder" and "The Pioneers"; while in "The Prairie" the series end. Of the incomparable variety of scene in these five related tales, or of the extraordinary fertility of invention which they reveal, it would not be easy to say too much. In their kind they have never been surpassed. The earliest to appear, "The Pioneers," is the least meritorious — as though Cooper had not yet seen the value of his material and had not yet acquired the art of handling it to advantage. "The Pathfinder," dignified as it is and pathetic in its portrayal of Leatherstocking's love-making, lacks the absorbing interest of "The Last of the Mohicans"; it is perhaps inferior in art to "The Deerslayer," which was written the year after, and it has not the noble simplicity of "The Prairie," in which we see the end of the old hunter.

There are, no doubt, irregularities in the "Leatherstocking Tales," and the incongruities and lesser errors inevitable in a mode of composition at once desultory and protracted; but there they stand, a solid monument of American literature, and not the least enduring. "If anything from the pen of the writer of these romances is at all to outlive himself, it is, unquestionably, the series of the 'Leatherstocking Tales,'" — so wrote the author when he sent forth the first collected and revised edition of the narrative of Natty Bumppo's adventures. That Cooper was right seems to-day indisputable. An author may fairly claim to be judged by his best, to be measured by his highest; and the "Leatherstocking Tales" are Cooper's highest and best in more ways than one, but chiefly because of the lofty figure of Leatherstocking. Mr. Lowell, when fabling for critics, said that Cooper had drawn but one new character, explaining afterward that

The men who have given to *one* character life  
And objective existence, are not very rare;  
You may number them all, both prose-writers and singers,  
Without overrunning the bounds of your fingers,  
And Natty won't go to oblivion quicker  
Than Adams the parson or Primrose the vicar.

And Thackeray — perhaps recalling the final scene in "The Prairie," where the dying Leatherstocking drew himself up and said "Here!" and that other scene in "The Newcomes" where the dying Colonel drew himself up and said "Adsum!" — was frequent in praise of Cooper; and in one of the "Roundabout Papers," after expressing his fondness for Scott's modest and honorable heroes, he adds: "Much as I like these most unassuming, manly, unpretentious gentlemen, I have to own that I think the heroes of another writer — viz., Leatherstocking, Uncas, Hardheart, Tom Coffin — are quite the equals of Scott's men; perhaps Leatherstocking is better than any one in 'Scott's lot.' *La Longue Carabine* is one of the great prize-men of fiction. He ranks with your Uncle Toby, Sir Roger de Coverley, Falstaff — heroic figures all, American or British, and the artist has deserved well of his country who devised them."

It is to be noticed that Thackeray singled out for praise two of Cooper's Indians to pair with the hunter and the sailor; and it seems to me that Thackeray is fairer towards him who conceived Uncas and Hardheart than are the authors of "A Fable for Critics" and of "Condensed Novels." "Muck-a-Muck" I should set aside among the parodies which are unfair — so far as the red man is concerned, at least; for I hold as quite fair Mr. Harte's raillery of the wooden maidens and polysyllabic old men who stalk through Cooper's pages. Cooper's Indian has been disputed and he has been laughed at, but he still lives. Cooper's Indian is very like Mr. Parkman's Indian — and who knows the red man better than the author of "The Oregon Trail"? Uncas and Chingachgook and Hardheart are all good men and true, and June, the wife of Arrowhead, the Tuscarora, is a good wife and a true woman. They are Indians, all of them; heroic figures, no doubt, and yet taken from life, with no more idealization than may serve the maker of romance. They remind us that when West first saw the Apollo Belvedere he thought at once of a Mohawk brave. They were the result of knowledge and of much patient investigation under conditions forever passed away. We see Cooper's Indians nowadays through mists of prejudice due to those who have imitated them from the outside. "The Last of the Mohicans" has suffered the degradation of a trail of dime novels, written by those apparently more familiar with the Five Points than with the Five Nations. Cooper begat Mayne Reid, and Mayne Reid begat Ned Buntline and "Buffalo Bill's First Scalp for Custer" and similar abominations. But none the less are Uncas and Hardheart noble figures, worthily drawn, and never to be mentioned without praise.

In 1821 Cooper published "The Spy," the first American historical novel; in 1823 he published "The Pioneers," in which the backwoodsman and the red man were first introduced into literature; and in 1824 he published "The Pilot," and for the first time the scene of a story was laid on the sea rather than on the land, and the interest turned wholly on marine adventure. In four years Cooper had put forth three novels, each in its way road-breaking and epoch-making; only the great men of letters have a record like this. With the recollection before us of some of Smollett's highly colored naval characters we cannot say that Cooper sketched the first real sailor in fiction, but he invented the sea tale just as Poe invented the detective story — and in neither case has any disciple surpassed the master. The supremacy of "The Pilot" and "The Red Rover" is quite as evident as the supremacy of "The Gold Bug" and "The Murders in the Rue Morgue." We have been used to the novel of the ocean, and it is hard for us now to understand why Cooper's friends thought his attempt to write one perilous and why they sought to dissuade him. It was believed that readers could not be interested in the contingencies and emergencies of life on the ocean wave. Nowadays it seems to us that if any part of "The Pilot" lags and stumbles it is that which passes ashore: Cooper's landscapes, or at least his views of a ruined abbey, may be affected at times, but his marines are always true and always captivating.

Cooper, like Thackeray, forbade his family to authorize or aid any biographer — although the American

novelist had as little to conceal as the English. No doubt Cooper had his faults, both as a man and as an author. He was thin-skinned and hot-headed. He let himself become involved in a great many foolish quarrels. He had a plentiful lack of tact. But the man was straightforward and high-minded, and so was the author. We can readily pardon his petty pedantries and the little vices of expression he persisted in. We can confess that his "females," as he would term them, are indubitably wooden. We may acknowledge that even among his men there is no wide range of character; Richard Jones (in "The Pioneers") is first cousin to Cap (in "The Pathfinder"), just as Long Tom Coffin is a half-brother of Natty Bumppo. We may not deny that Cooper's lighter characters are not touched with the humor that Scott could command at will; the Naturalist (in "The Prairie"), for example, is not alive and delightful like the Antiquary of Scott.

In the main, indeed, Cooper's humor is not of the purest. When he attempted it of malice prepense it was often laboriously unfunny. But sometimes, as it fell accidentally from the lips of Leatherstocking, it was unforced and delicious (see, for instance, at the end of chapter xxvii. of "The Pathfinder," the account of Natty's sparing the sleeping Mingos and of the fate which thereafter befell them at the hands of Chingachgook). On the other hand Cooper's best work abounds in fine romantic touches — Long Tom pinning the British captain to the mast with the harpoon, the wretched Abiram (in "The Prairie") tied hand and foot and left on a ledge with a rope around his neck so that he can move only to hang himself, the death grip of the brave (in "The Last of the Mohicans") hanging wounded and without hope over the watery abyss — these are pictures fixed in the memory and now unforgettable.

Time is unerring in its selection. Cooper has now been dead nearly two-score years. What survives of his work are the "Sea Tales" and the "Leatherstocking Tales." From these I have found myself forced to cite characters and episodes. These are the stories which hold their own in the libraries. Public and critics are at one here. The wind of the lakes and the prairies has not lost its balsam and the salt of the sea keeps its savor. For the free movement of his figures and for the proper expansion of his story Cooper needed a broad region and a widening vista. He excelled in conveying the suggestion of vastness and limitless space and of depicting the human beings proper to these great reaches of land and water — the two elements he ruled; and he was equally at home on the rolling waves of the prairie and on the green and irregular hillocks of the ocean.

*Brander Matthews.*

"Strange True Stories of Louisiana."

A CIRCUMSTANCE presently to be mentioned requires me to review and extend my inquiry into the character of the old manuscript from which I have translated the story of Alix de Morainville.

In the chapter called "How I got them" (*CENTURY MAGAZINE*, November, 1888), I suggested that the name De Morainville might be a convenient fiction of Alix herself, well understood as such by Françoise and Suzanne. I may still repeat the obvious fact that an assumed name does not vitiate the truth of the story; although discoveries made since, which I am still in-

vestigating, offer probabilities that, after all, the name is genuine.

I also gave some reasons for my belief that the manuscript is old. The total absence of quotation-marks from its many conversational passages either identified it with a time when such things were not universal and imperative as they now are, or else indicated a cunning pretense of age. But there were so many proofs that it had lain for many years filed among old papers that the theory of a cunning pretense had no room. One leaf had been torn first and written on afterward; another had been written on first and part of it torn away and lost or destroyed afterward. The two rents, therefore, must have occurred at different times; for the one which mutilates the text is on the earlier page and surely would not have been left so by the author at the time of writing it, but only by some one careless of it, and at some time between its completion and the manifestly later date, when it was so carefully bestowed in its old-fashioned silken case and its inner wrapper of black paper. So an intention to deceive, were it supposable, would have to be of recent date.

Now let me show that an intention to deceive could not be of recent date, and at the same time we shall see the need of this minuteness of explanation. Notice, then, that the manuscript comes directly from the lady who says she found it in a trunk of her family's private papers. A prominent paper-maker in Boston has examined it and says that, while its age cannot be certified to from its texture, its leaves are of three different kinds of paper, each of which might be a hundred years old. But, bluntly, this lady, though a person of literary tastes and talent, who recognized the literary value of Alix's *history*, esteemed original documents so lightly as to put no value upon Louisa Cheval's thrilling letter to her brother, and to prize this Alix manuscript only because, being a simple, succinct, unadorned narrative, she could use it, as she could not Françoise's long, pretty story, for the foundation of a nearly threefold expanded romance; and this, in fact, she had written, copyrighted, and arranged to publish when our joint experience concerning Françoise's manuscript at length readjusted her sense of values, and she sold me the little Alix manuscript at a price still out of all proportion below her valuation of her own writing, and counting it a mistake that the expanded romance should go unpreferred and unpublished.

But who, then, wrote the smaller manuscript? Madame found it, she says, in the possession of her very aged mother, the daughter and namesake of Françoise. Surely she was not its author; it is she who says she burned almost the whole original draft of Françoise's "Voyage," because it was "in the way and smelt bad." Neither could Françoise have written it. Her awkward handwriting, her sparkling flood of words and details, and her ignorance of the simplest rules of spelling, make it impossible. Nor could Suzanne have done it. She wrote and spelled no better at fifty-nine than Françoise at forty-three. Nor could any one have imposed it on either of the sisters. So, then, we find no intention to deceive, either early or recent. I translated the manuscript, it went to press, and I sat down to eat, drink, and revel, never dreaming that the brazen water-gates of my Babylon were standing wide open.

For all this time two huge, glaring anachronisms were staring me, and half a dozen other persons,



squarély in the face, and actually escaping our notice by their serene audacity. But hardly was the pie — I mean the magazine — opened when these two birds began to sing. Was n't that — interesting? Of course Louis de la Houssaye, who in 1786 "had lately come from San Domingo," had *not* "been fighting the insurgents" — who did not revolt until four or five years afterward! And of course the old count, who so kindly left the family group that was bidding Madeline de Livilier good-bye, was not the Prime Minister Maurepas, who was *not* "only a few months returned from exile," and who was *not* then "at the pinnacle of royal favor"; for these matters were of earlier date, and this "most lovable old man in the world" was n't any longer in the world at all, and had not been for eight years. He was dead and buried.

And so, after all, fraudulent intent or none, *this* manuscript, just as it is, could never have been written by Alix. On "this 22d of August, 1795," she could not have perpetrated such statements as these two. Her memory of persons and events could not have been so grotesquely at fault, nor could she have hoped so to deceive any one. The misstatements are of later date, and from some one to whom the two events were historical. But the manuscript is all in one simple, undisguised, feminine handwriting, and with no interlineation save only here and there the correction of a miswritten word.

Now in translating madame's "Voyage de ma Grand'mère," I had noticed something equivalent to an interlineation, but added in a perfectly un concealed, candid manner, at the end of a paragraph near the close of the story. It had struck me as an innocent gloss of the copyist, justified in her mind by some well-credited family tradition. It was this: "Just as we [Françoise and Alix] were parting, she [Alix] handed me the story of her life." But now I thought it well to ask my friend to explain this gloss. I had already called her attention to the anachronisms, and she was in keen distress, because totally unable to account for them. But my new inquiry flashed light upon her aged memory. She explained at once that, to connect the two stories of Françoise and Alix, she had thought it right to impute these few words to Françoise rather than for mere exactness to thrust a detailed statement of her own into a story hurrying to its close. My question called back an incident of long ago and resulted first in her rummaging a whole day among her papers, and then in my receiving the certificate of a gentleman of high official standing in Louisiana that, on the 10th of last April (1889), this lady, in his presence, took from a large trunk of written papers, variously dated and "appearing to be perfectly genuine," a book of memoranda from which, writes he, "I copy the following paragraph written by Madame S. de la Houssaye herself in the middle of the book, on page 29." Then follows in French:

#### Reflections.

THE wages of righteousness are earned by the job, not by the day.

You may pull the ox out of the mire on the Sabbath day, but don't push him into the mire for the purpose of pulling him out.

JUNE 20, 1841.—M. Gerbeau has dined here again. What a singular story he tells me. We talked of my grandmother and Madame Carpentier, and what does M. Gerbeau tell me but that Alix had not finished her history when my grandmother and my aunt returned, and that he had promised to get it to them. "And I kept it two years for want of an opportunity," he added. How mad Grandmamma must have been! How the delay must have made her suffer!

Well and good! Then Alix did write her story! But if she wrote for both her "dear and good friends," Suzanne and Françoise, then Françoise, the more likely, would have to be content, sooner or later, with a copy. This, I find no reason to doubt, is what lies before me. Indeed, here (italicized by me) are signs of a copyist's pen: "Mais hélas! *il desespéroit de reussir quand' il desespe* rencontra," etc. Is not that a copyist's repetition? Or this: "— et lui, mon mari apres tout se fit mon *mari m* domestique." And here the copyist misread the original: "Lorsque le maire entendit les noms et les *personnes* prenoms de la mariée," etc. In the manuscript *personnes* is crossed out, and the correct word, *prenoms*, is written above it.

Whoever made this copy it remains still so simple and compact that he or she cannot be charged with many embellishments. And yet it is easy to believe that some one with that looseness of family tradition and largeness of ancestral pride so common among the Creoles, in half-knowledge and half-ignorance should have ventured aside for an instant to attribute in pure parenthesis to an ancestral De la Houssaye the premature honor of a San Domingan war; or, incited by some tradition of the old Prime Minister's intimate friendship with Madeline's family, should have imputed a gracious attention to the wrong Count de Maurepas, or to the wrong count altogether.

I find no other theory tenable. To reject the whole matter as a forgery flies into the face of more incontestable facts than the forgery does. We know, without this manuscript, that there was an Alix Carpentier, daughter of a count, widow of a viscount, an *émigrée* of the Revolution, married to a Norman peasant, known to M. Gerbeau, beloved of Suzanne and Françoise, with whom they journeyed to Attakapas, and who wrote for them the history of her strange life. I hold a manuscript carefully kept by at least two generations of Françoise's descendants among their valuable private papers. It professes to be that history — a short, modest, unadorned narrative, apparently a copy of a paper of like compass, notwithstanding the evident insertion of two impossible statements whose complete omission does not disturb the narrative. I see no good reason to doubt that it contains the true story of a real and lovely woman.

G. W. Cable.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., June 21, 1889.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

BLUE blood should assert itself without the help of a placard.

LIFE is a half-way house, and each guest should take contentedly the room to which he is assigned.

THE back-log without the small sticks will never heat the room.

J. A. Macon.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### History and Current Politics.

THE LATE PROFESSOR ALEXANDER JOHNSTON.

WE recall to our readers with sorrow their loss and ours in the untimely death on the 20th of July last of Professor Alexander Johnston of Princeton College. He had been for a few years past a frequent and acceptable contributor to this department of THE CENTURY, and those who have found in his acute discussion of current themes an impulse to deeper interest in contemporary history, and a help to the more accurate knowledge and juster appreciation of the great social and political movements of their fellow-citizens, will find a sad interest in a short account of his work. He was born in Brooklyn forty years ago, on the 29th of April, fitted for college in the preparatory schools of that city, and graduated with the highest honors from Rutgers in the class of 1870. The direction of his studies up to that time was exclusively along the old-fashioned college course, and he excelled in the classics, winning the more important prizes in that department. For the next five years his time was divided between teaching and the study of law, and in 1875 he was admitted to the bar of New Jersey. Not long afterwards he removed to Norwalk, Connecticut, where he founded a classical school, still in existence, and began his literary career. His success as an author brought him in 1884 a call to the chair of jurisprudence and political economy in the College of New Jersey. He carried to his new field enthusiasm and ripe scholarship, the disposition and experience of the teacher, and enjoyed for the short but illustrious remnant of his life such unbroken success and increasing popularity as only genius and goodness can command.

The list of his published works is a long one for a life comparatively so short, and argues not only untiring industry but the possession of the literary gift in a high degree. He wrote for Lalor's "Cyclopædia of Political Science" the articles over his signature on American political history; the article on American history in the American Supplement to the Philadelphia edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica"; "The Genesis of a New England State," No. 12 of the Johns Hopkins Historical Series; edited the three volumes of "Representative American Orations," and wrote for the periods into which the selections are divided a series of comprehensive and charming summaries; Chapter VII. of Winsor's "Narrative and Critical History of America," that on Political Parties, is by him; the splendid account of our history in Vol. XXIII. of the "Britannica," itself a volume of perhaps four hundred pages; and several other articles in the same encyclopædia, notably that on Washington, are also from his pen. His separate and independent publications are his well-known "History of American Politics," a school "History of the United States," and the volume on "Connecticut" in the American Commonwealths Series. Much of his most original research, moreover, was printed from time to time in reviews and periodi-

icals. All this work is characterized by thoroughness and sincerity. He was the first to correct, and acknowledge, as he discovered them, the few errors in fact or judgment which he made. With such powers it is no wonder that his reputation had crossed the sea, and that the editors of the great "Encyclopædia Britannica" found him the fittest guide for their public as for ours in matters of American history. "The Pall Mall Gazette" playfully remarked, in reviewing the "History of American Politics," that with such a handbook the British editor would thereafter put aside his too well-known habit of blundering over American politics, and in the absence of a similar guide to the story of English parties disport himself in ignorance of his native land.

It was therefore from the hand of the lawyer, the scholar, the author, the professor, that came the terse, incisive, and intelligent criticisms of current politics which we were happy to lay so often before our readers. Professor Johnston's mind was eminently practical, and his success in the class-room, aside from his gracious manner and warm interest in his pupils, was, we hear, largely due to the concreteness of his teaching. It was his habit to make concise statements of principles and then flood them with a mass of adequate illustrations from the everyday world which enthralled his hearers and fixed his instruction in their mind, showing as it did the immediate value of correct theory. The same characteristics marked his editorial work in this department. He had learned in his studies the basis and development of American institutions, and was therefore little affected by modern sciolism. He valued above all else the old-fashioned idea of personal freedom with its corollary of personal initiative and responsibility, emphasized at all times the essential character of local rights and government, and the subservience of political theory to historical induction. Add to this the high ethical plane on which his mind worked, his keen scent for reforms and judicial appreciation of their value, and we have such an outline of his character as it is permitted a friendly co-worker to draw. It seems to us that the moral of his life is to be found in the words at the head of this notice—the value to a sane, practical mind of the study of history not merely for the construction of a science of politics, but for the formation of sound opinions about daily life and about politics as a discipline and an art.

### Disasters.

ONE of the dreadful aspects of such recurring horrors as the flood at Johnstown and the burning of Seattle and Spokane Falls, which, with the hurricane of Samoa, will probably be the extraordinary events of the year's annals, is the easy facility with which, after all, the public mind is disposed to deal with them. The Pennsylvania misfortune seems to have lacked none of the tints necessary for the darkest of pictures. The population of a whole mountain region is put into

imminent peril of life and limb; death carries off about as many as it claimed during any of the great battles of the civil war; and the scenes of pathos or despair, by day and night, from flood and flame, seem to have made our newspapers a mass of harrowing details for the possible instruction of posterity. Apart from the loss of life, the fate of the Northwestern cities seems to have had its own dramatic elements. The region is one where but a few years ago the poet found synonyms for desolation in the long roll of the solitary river, but where the enterprise, industry, and thrift of American men and women have established civilization, have built up new States like magic, and have endowed them with rich and splendid cities whose names are still hardly familiar to the rest of the country. It reads like a mockery of history that the burning of a single city in this new region should already entail losses such as, fifty years ago, constituted the "great fire" of our great commercial city. The popular impulse is the same in either case. The response of the popular heart is as instant as electricity. Money, material aid, personal assistance, are hurried to the point of need; for some time no one can think or talk of anything else; a few lessons from the pulpit or the press serve to point a moral of one sort or other; and then the débris is removed and the usual struggle for existence is renewed until, perhaps, it is interrupted by another case of the kind.

And yet there are lessons which should be scored into the popular intelligence by every new case of the kind. One is that we must no longer expect that such calamities, if they are to occur, are likely to be small ones; it is one of the penalties for our growth of population that they are now increasingly likely to be dire misfortunes. The great earthquake of 1811 has left its transient marks in a few swamps and lakes along the Mississippi and in some wild stories of the early settlers; but such an event could not occur in the denser population of our times without reviving and strengthening our memories of the overthrow of Charleston. We see the ancient track plowed by the meteorite through earth and rock: what if such a visitant should have its billet to some great house and distinguished audience in one of our modern cities? It is but in the nature of things that those natural calamities which must be reckoned with as non-preventable and inevitable should nevertheless find more and more shining marks as the surface of the country swarms more thickly with population, industry, and wealth.

But this impossibility of obviating the growing peril of modern life from inevitable natural calamities only adds a keener point to the growing necessity for care in guarding against the results of preventable events. In the case of many of these events responsibility is already fixed and measured by law; but there is still danger enough that the judicial conception of this measure of responsibility will continue to be limited by the smaller facts of the past, and will not grow, as it should, with the growth of the attendant perils. The fool who flings about firebrands and death, and says, "Am I not in sport?" becomes a greater and still greater offender with the passage of every year and the consequent development of more important human interests which may fall indirect victims to his folly. The theory of progressive culpability is one in which

public opinion may furnish the best stimulus for the judicial conscience, so that the law's perception may not stand still, or wait for statutory enactment which is likely to be weighted with obsolete circumstances.

But there remain other fields, perhaps of less definite limitation, but of probably greater public importance, in which still greater service may be done by a trained public opinion. If it be admitted, as it surely must be, that both the avoidable and the unavoidable perils to human life and property are increasing with the density of population, that fact should be enough of itself to establish a rising standard of municipal care and forethought. Indeed, the standard should rise faster than population increases, for the dangers increase more rapidly. Why, for example, should that heathen abomination the fire-cracker be tolerated in one of our growing American cities for even a single additional year? The increase of the danger from this source over last year or ten years ago is not merely in the ratio of the intervening growth of population, but very much greater.

It is not enough, then, that public opinion should rest content with public benevolence, or that it should write off its responsibility as the last car-load of supplies is shipped to the scene of disaster. Every such recurrent event is a warning to other centers of population that it is time for public opinion to push the standard of municipal care yet a little higher. In many of our cities there are still hordes of men who lay hungry claim, as political rewards, to offices for whose duties they are not competent. The disasters of this year are a new and louder warning to every such city to bar out such applicants more strenuously, and to announce more definitely and clearly that it can no longer take such risks or afford to permit its offices to serve as political rewards. The question is no longer one of money, or of taxes, or of the formation of an "office-holding class"; it has taken the more fundamental shape of the increased, the immeasurable, extent to which disasters of every grade may be multiplied beyond their natural limits, by incapacity or carelessness in the occupant of even the minor administrative offices of our modern cities. In this and innumerable relations of the kind public opinion may find its most cheering work in the regeneration of our cities; and by raising the standard of municipal management and municipal civil service it may defeat some disasters altogether and reduce and hold down the evils even of those which are inevitable.

#### A New College for Women.

THERE have been three distinctly marked stages in the higher education of women in America: co-education, pure and simple, first tested at Oberlin, in 1833; then separate colleges for women, in which line Vassar, in 1865, made the first departure; and last the "annex" plan, marked by the opening of the Harvard Annex in 1879. In England, on the other hand, the first effort to give collegiate training to women came from colleges open exclusively to women (Queen's, 1848), and in 1869 Girton made the first trial of the annex plan. No important co-educational scheme, as we understand co-education, has been tried in England.

The most popular and widely known women's colleges in England are Newnham and Girton, "annexed"

to the University of Cambridge. That is, the students of these colleges perform the same work as the university men, but in their own college building. There is no co-education such as is in operation at Cornell and Ann Arbor. The Newnham women are satisfied so long as they attain the standard of excellence prescribed by the university, and it is a matter of slight importance to them whether or not they receive instruction at the same hour, and in the same room, with their brothers.

There is unquestionably a prejudice in America against annexes. At the Woman's International Congress at Washington one delegate protested in the following terms: "Those bright, enthusiastic, large-framed, and big-hearted young women of the West, those young women who have in their eyes the distant horizon of their prairie homes, will have nothing to do with annexes." Possibly the prejudice is due wholly to unfortunate associations with the word itself. It is certainly difficult to respect the word in its educational significance, when we have annexes to hotels, to shops, and to ferryboats! The English expression for the objectionable term is "affiliated college," a description certainly more dignified.

A new affiliated college opens in October in New York City. It is new in that it is the first woman's

college situated in the heart of a great city, and, again, it is new in being the first affiliated college whose graduates are entitled to a university degree. The students of Newnham, Girton, Somerville, Lady Margaret, and the Harvard Annex must content themselves with what is called a "degree certificate," testifying that the candidate's scholarship would have entitled her to a degree if she had been a man.

The new college, affiliated to Columbia College, will bear the name Barnard, a name made eminent by one of the most far-sighted and advanced educators of America — the late president of Columbia College. Barnard College is situated at 343 Madison Avenue, five blocks from Columbia College. A student of Barnard College will do the same work as a student of Columbia, will have the same instructors, and will take the same examinations. Barnard College opens with a school of arts only, but in time she hopes to offer the broadest opportunity for scientific training.

The college will receive for the first year a freshman class only; consequently, its first graduates will receive their degrees in 1893. It is to be hoped that Barnard College will meet a support which will enable her to keep ahead of the present movement at Columbia towards encouraging and providing for graduate work.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### A View of the Confederacy from the Inside.<sup>1</sup>

A LETTER FROM JUDGE JOHN A. CAMPBELL, FORMERLY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR, C. S. A.

FORT PULASKI, GEORGIA, 20th July, 1865.

MY DEAR SIR: I learn that you have interfered in my behalf to obtain my release from arrest and confinement. I am obliged by your interposition, and appreciate it the more because that the war has made no change in my feelings toward yourself.

You are aware that I was not a patron or friend of the secession movement. My condemnation of it and my continuance in the Supreme Court were regarded as acts for which there could be no tolerance. When I returned to Alabama in May, 1861, it was to receive coldness, aversion, or contumely from the secession population. I did not agree to recant what I had said, or to explain what I had done; and thus, instead of appeasing my opponents, I aggravated my offense. This was still more aggravated by my opinion that cotton was not king; that privateering would not expel Northern commerce from the ocean, but would affront European opinion, and that privateering and slavery would prevent recognition, and that the war would be long and implacable; that the Northern people were a proud and powerful people that would not endure the supposed insults they have suffered, and that their "pocket nerve" was not their most sensitive nerve. Messrs. Toombs and Benjamin were promising peace before the winter. I had no connection with the Con-

federate Government in 1861, nor until the last of October, 1862. General Randolph, whom I scarcely knew, asked me to be Assistant Secretary of War, with an apology for doing so.

The war had then assumed gigantic proportions: confiscation acts and emancipation proclamations, and the administration of government in New Orleans and North Alabama, seemed to place a new face upon the war. It appeared to be a war upon political and civil society and government within the Confederate States.

The Southern country had greatly suffered: I had spent much time with the sick and wounded, and had witnessed bereavement, distress, destitution, suffering, as well as devotion and fortitude. The civil institutions were debilitated. Much of the business and feeling of the country centered in the War Department, and there was a want of some controlling mind in regulating its civil and judicial business. The conscription brought all persons of military age under its jurisdiction; impressments affected property, military domination very often infringed personal liberty and private right. There had been delay and vexation in the transaction of business.

I did not desire a conspicuous place, and every overture to place me in Mr. Davis's cabinet had been discountenanced with emphasis. I declined to go abroad. My wish was to be of use in mitigating the evils there were upon the country. I cannot make you feel how large they were.

<sup>1</sup> The original of this letter, here printed for the first time, is in the possession of Charles P. Greenough, Esq., of Boston. When Judge Campbell was imprisoned in Fort Pulaski his former associates on the Supreme Bench, Judges Curtis and Nelson, both

wrote to President Johnson, and finally succeeded in getting Judge Campbell released. This letter was written when Judge Campbell learned that Judge Curtis was making efforts in his behalf. The text of the original letter has been carefully followed.—EDITOR.

I never labored more. I do not know that any one man has suffered from any act of mine any aggravation of his calamity. I do know of large classes that experienced sympathy and assistance. When my arrest was known the leading member of the Society of Friends called on Mrs. Campbell to say that every member of the society in the district would petition for my release, and he actually carried to Washington City such a paper.

There are other testimonials equally grateful to my feelings. I resigned twice and attempted to do so at other times. But there were considerations that would not allow me to press the offer. I did not hold to the office from avarice, for the annual salary was never worth \$500 in specie, and became at last just \$100. When I entered the office I supposed I might become useful in the settlement of a peace if I were connected with the Government. There was no opportunity for this in 1863, and not until 1864 had nearly expired could the subject be broached with any advantage.

There were discontents with Mr. Davis, and those who desired to weaken him made use of the desire for peace to effect the object. They represented him as averse to peace and that negotiations would bring peace. None spoke of union as a basis of peace; all repudiated a disposition for peace on that basis. In 1864 I became satisfied that the resources of the Confederacy for another campaign were exhausted. The finances, recruiting of soldiers, commissariat, transportation, ordnance and ammunition, and medical supplies had all failed. None were adequate for another campaign. The Secretary of the Treasury did not make a fair and candid report in November, 1864. The unanswered requisitions amounted to \$170,000,000, and he had no means to answer them. He had issued (nearly) to the maximum limit, treasury notes, and they were at the time thirty to one as compared with specie. But his failure to supply these requisitions, and his inability to do so, prevented the making of requisitions for \$250,000,000, which were also due. This was not regarded in his report nor provided for in his estimates or budget. I brought this matter to the attention of the Secretaries of War and Treasury and the truth was admitted. It became finally to be seen that the finances were in hopeless ruin. Treasury notes to \$400,000,000 had been issued; these were selling as sixty to one for specie at the treasury. The supply of specie 15th February was \$750,000; bonds and certificates of deposit were not salable, taxes were difficult of collection, and irritation and discontent existed because the outstanding indebtedness was not liquidated. The estimates of the year for the War Department were \$1,337,000,000 in Confederate bills and the restriction on issues not taken off.

The condition as to men was nearly as bad. In April, 1862, conscription embraced those between 18 and 35; in October, 1862, those between 35 and 40 were added; in July, 1863, those of 40 and 45 were added; in February, 1864, those between 17 and 50 were added; all men who had placed substitutes in service were called for and exemptions were curtailed. During the war there had been exemptions and details for civil and industrial service. Manufactories, mechanical and agricultural employments, were sustained by details, but in October, 1864, a sweeping order of revocation was made. This order evinced extreme

weakness; it carried despondency and dismay among the people. It did not serve to recruit the army—the supply of men was exhausted.

The army was reduced by desertions, and these now became more numerous and from a better class of men. The difficulties of the time led to desertions from the workshops and manufacturing establishments. The commissariat experienced the pressure of the time earliest among the bureaux. Supplies were hoarded. Sales were refused for bonds, and certificates and bills could not be had. Impressment could not be relied on. The army was for most of the time on half-rations, and the largest supply at Richmond and Petersburg during the whole winter was a supply of six days.

The transportation was almost exhausted. The Piedmont road, through Danville and Greensborough, North Carolina, became the principal channel of communication. Its entire capacity was 192 tons daily, and the daily demand of the army was 120 tons. The road was put out of repair three days during the winter by rains, and we had to ask the citizens of Richmond for flour from their reduced family supplies, and the 1000 barrels obtained cost \$650,000. In the same woful condition was the transportation by animals. The facts in regard to arms, ammunition, medical supplies, etc. disclose a similar condition of ruin.

You would suppose there could be no difficulty in convincing men under such circumstances that a peace was required. But when I look back upon the events of the winter, I find that I was incessantly employed in making these facts known and to no result.

A committee of Congress was appointed to examine the state of the commissariat; was informed of it and did not report. The President was called upon to afford knowledge of finances, recruiting, etc.,—in a word, the state of the Confederacy,—and did not answer. Letters were addressed on single portions of the deficiency and no heed was taken of them.

In December I wrote to Judge Nelson a letter inviting an interview with him, and asking that Messrs. Ewing, Stanton, or yourself might come. I obtained a license to write this letter and to have this communication.

There were for discussion, as the issue of the war, the questions of union, slavery, confiscation, pains and penalties, forfeitures for taxes, limits of western Virginia—in fact, all civil society in the Confederacy was involved. I supposed that with these intelligent and sober-minded men the embarrassments and perils of the condition could be mitigated. I was then fully disposed for peace. I have never had a reply to the letter, though I was told there was one. In lieu of this there came Francis P. Blair.

He duped Mr. Davis with the belief that President Lincoln regarded the condition of Mexico with more concern than the war; that he would be willing to make a suspension of hostilities under some sort of collusive contract, and to unite Southern and Northern troops on the Rio Grande for the invasion of Mexico, and that after matters were assured in Mexico affairs might be adjusted here. This was the business at Hampton Roads. I was incredulous, Mr. Hunter did not have faith. Mr. Stephens supposed Blair to be “the mentor of the Administration and Republican party.”

We learned in five minutes that the assurances to

Mr. Davis were a delusion, and that union was the condition of peace. I had always supposed this to be the case, and had refused all discussions on the subject of negotiation unless that condition was first admitted. I had never regarded a peace on that basis as inadmissible; but, on the contrary, was firmly persuaded that the programme of independence had failed with the loss of the Chesapeake Bay, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Cumberland rivers, and the coasts of the Carolinas.

The change in the conditions of the war by the confiscation acts and proclamation unquestionably prolonged it. When I came from Hampton Roads I recommended the return of our commission or another commission to adjust a peace. I believed that one could be made upon the concession of union and the surrender of slavery, upon suitable arrangements. I so advised my colleagues. I wrote to Governor Graham of North Carolina a careful letter explaining all my views, for exhibition to his brother senators. A committee was raised to wait on Mr. Davis (Graham, Hunter, Orr) and conversations were had with him. This failed. I then wrote a careful review of all the conditions of the military service and of the financial and political state of the country, and recommended a negotiation for peace on the basis of union, as necessary. This was addressed to General Breckinridge. It was submitted to General Lee, and reports from the Commissary-General, Quartermaster-General, and Chief of Ordnance obtained, and the whole placed before Mr. Davis. This led him to ask Congress to repeal their resolution to adjourn. He submitted these in a secret message, without note, comment, or exposition, and at the same time submitted a public message, scolding Congress for delay and inattention and urging a vigorous prosecution of the war and the adoption of the following measures:

1. Suspension of habeas corpus.
2. Organization of militia.
3. To raise \$3,000,000 in gold.
4. To impress without cash payments.
5. To modify the law as to the use of detailed men.
6. Arm slaves.

The four last were granted, and could not have affected, and did not affect, our condition in the slightest measure.

No notice was taken of the secret message. The Congress replied with tartness to the charges as to delays and inattention, and retorted the charges. Governor Graham was ready with resolutions for negotiations, but the conduct of Mr. Davis indisposed others to consider them.

There seemed to be a superstitious dread of any approach to the one important question of settlement by negotiation. Mr. Davis, with the air of a sage, declared that the Constitution did not allow him to treat for his own suicide. All that he could do would be to receive resolutions and submit them to the sovereign States; that his personal honor did not permit him to take any steps to make such a settlement as was proposed. The result is, that each citizen of the Confederacy is making his separate treaty on the basis of President Johnson's merciful amnesty proclamation.

I have stated to you the facts. I do not pretend to have done more than to accept conditions that were inexorable, and to endeavor to stop the effusion of blood, and to husband the remnants of the resources that had not been consumed by the war. This I did with more urgency, and a more consistent and definite purpose

than any other, I believe. The idiosyncrasy of one man defeated the design. It would not be proper to speak of Mr. Davis in his present circumstances with any harshness. I do not believe for a moment that he participated in the plot to destroy Mr. Lincoln. His humanity, pride, sense of his own reputation and character, tenacious observance of the rules he esteems important, not to take into account his religious and moral principles of action, forbid me to believe this without strong and direct proof. But he was unfitted to manage a revolution or to conduct an administration. Slow, procrastinating, obstructive, filled with petty scruples and doubts, and wanting in a clear, strong, intrepid judgment, a vigorous resolution, and a generous and self-sacrificing nature, he became in the closing part of the war an incubus and a mischief.

I decided to abide the fate of Richmond—an inevitable fate; General Lee could neither hold it nor move away from it. His ruin was sealed, and with that the fate of the Confederacy. This I stated in the letter referred to; I told the Secretary of War I should remain, and should take an opportunity to see Mr. Lincoln, if possible. I would like to have his authority to do so, but should do so without it.

The United States troops entered Richmond the morning of the 3d of April. The evacuation took place the night previously. There was only wanting a licentious soldiery to make the scene appalling, but the United States soldiers behaved with propriety. There was conflagration, plunder, explosions of arsenals, magazines, gun-boats, and terror and confusion.

Mr. Lincoln came to Richmond the 4th of April. I had an interview with him. I told him that the war was virtually ended, that General Lee could not hold his army together, that the public men in Virginia would aid him to restore the Union, and that he might rely on this. I urged him to adopt a course of leniency and moderation—"That when lenity and cruelty play for a kingdom the gentler gamester is the soonest winner"; that I had regarded this war as one between communities, the one contending for independence, the other for continued union; that the successful party in any event should have made his success as little aggravating to the other as possible; that were independence to be won, still a close union was anticipated to be formed. I stated to him my position—that I had remained because I knew that the war was virtually over, and to perform my duty to the country.

It so happened that I was the only person who had occupied any position of prominence that did remain, and so I had to speak for Virginia what would have been more appropriate for a Virginian. I noticed this to Mr. Lincoln.

He concluded to remain until the next morning to have another interview. He made no reply to what I said at this time. The next morning I met him on the *Malvern*, Mr. G. A. Myers, an established member of the bar of Richmond, going with me, and General Weitzel being present.

Mr. Lincoln had reduced to writing his terms of peace. There were three indispensable conditions: 1. Recognition of the national authority. 2. No cessation of hostilities till this was entirely done. 3. No receding by the Executive in reference to slavery, as

manifested in his proclamation and other official papers. All other questions to be settled on terms of sincere liberality.

He agreed to release all confiscations to those States that would forthwith recognize the national authority, and proposed to charge those for the continued expenses that rejected this offer. He handed me this paper after explaining it. He spoke of pains and penalties. He said that it would not be proper to offer a pardon to Mr. Davis,—whom we familiarly call Jeff. Davis,—who says he will not take one, but that almost any one could have anything of the kind for the asking.

I replied to his remarks by urging the suspension of hostilities to treat.

I told him that the effect of such a measure would be peace on his own terms; that General Lee could not hold his army together under such circumstances; that our trouble had been to find the man or men who would take upon themselves the responsibility of action. Mr. Davis objected that he could not constitutionally make peace and destroy himself. General Lee had said that he could only make military conventions; Congress had been unwilling to act without Mr. Davis and General Lee; but that now there would be no hesitation, because the military situation was more critical and the necessity more urgent.

I submitted to him the draft of a convention I had drawn and placed before General Breckinridge and Mr. Davis as a mode to make peace on the basis of union. He assented to the existence of the difficulty, took my paper for consideration, and said he had been considering of a plan to call the Virginia legislature together that they might restore the State to the Union. He said that it was important for that legislature to do so, that they were in the condition of a tenant between two contending landlords, that the tenant should atturn to the successful party who had established his right. He said he had a government in northern Virginia, but that its margin was small and that he did not desire to enlarge it. He learned from Mr. Myers the condition of the legislature and whether it could be convened, and declared that he would make known his conclusion when he got to City Point.

In this conversation there was no effort to mystify or to overreach. I knew that General Lee's army would fall apart, or suffer a great disaster. The stores at Richmond were lost in the evacuation; there were no magazines in the country, and I did not believe that the stock saved in Petersburg could sustain his army five days if all were saved. But the fact was that he lost his supplies at Petersburg, and that his capture was compelled by the disorganized state of his army in consequence of a loss of his provisions. This had been made known as a probable consequence a month previously.

Three days after my conversation the capture of General Lee took place. In the intervening period commenced the work of fulfilling Mr. Lincoln's wishes. He consented in a letter to General Weitzel to the call of the Virginia legislature, but upon the capture of General Lee revoked the call, and the newspapers, with their usual and characteristic disposition to censure, have charged upon General Weitzel and myself some impropriety. The charge against me is that of having circumvented Mr. Lincoln.

Undoubtedly the capture of Lee made the use of the machinery I have suggested as unnecessary for the purpose of securing peace, and I have not complained of Mr. Lincoln. Whether a better plan to secure a prompt, cheerful, and complete pacification could have been suggested or has been adopted remains to be seen. I desired that the men who could control opinion and who commanded the public confidence, and who were ready to abide by the Union, should not be discarded or disfranchised, but their coöperation and aid should be received with cordiality. But I do not place any stumbling-block in the way of any other policy, and am content to have peace and pacification as they may be awarded by the conquering powers.

You are well aware that I was not a fanatical pro-slavery man; I had voluntarily liberated all of my slaves before the war some years. In 1847 I had, in a review on slavery in the "Southern Quarterly Review," advocated as a duty the amelioration of the law of slavery and proposed the establishment of the legal relations of slaves in the family on a firm foundation, and the removal of restraints on voluntary emancipations, on education, and to abolish all sales under legal or judicial orders or process. In articles on the same subject, and in conversation, I agreed that amelioration was a duty and necessity. In 1860-61 some of the Southern papers called me an abolitionist.

I agree too that President Lincoln's proclamation was one of that class of measures that determine the policy of a people for weal or woe. In the state of the world's opinion there could not be a step backward. Mr. Lincoln felt this, and one of his conditions of peace was "no receding by the Executive" from his position, and his explanation was his promise never to recede.

We have now to test the wisdom of the measure. In regarding the subject of slavery in former years, I have esteemed as the greatest calamity that could befall the country the introduction of emancipation except through the agency of the State governments; that the conditions of the society should be ameliorated by the society itself. I have uniformly admitted that there was a fatal error in supposing that the perils of the South were to be obviated by political or party arrangements at Washington. The remedy was in a social amelioration at home, commencing in the manner indicated in the article in the "Review" and others of a similar nature.

But the precise evil before us is emancipation by the armed force of States not holding slaves and who have enlisted in their armies probably one-sixth of the virile population of slaves as auxiliaries.

Whether prosperity will follow from this disturbance of the society is the difficult problem before us, and surely it is one that will task all the faculties of our peoples and the best qualities of their nature. It does seem to me it is a sufficient burden, and that the conquest is sufficiently embarrassing without the enforcement of the laws that Mr. Seward stated to me at Hampton Roads were the offspring of the most vehement passion in time of war. Mr. Burke, in his tract on the Policy of the Allies, has exposed with his characteristic clearness the rules by which statesmen may compose the elements of a state torn by revolutionary factions and plunged in the worst excesses of civil war. In his speech on Conciliation of America he developed

counsels for enlightened patrial statesmen, who would soothe the discontents in an empire and to preserve it from war. I should rejoice to see these adopted in the present crisis.

I was arrested the 22d of May, at 10 P.M., under a short, abrupt order from the War Department. I was at home, where I had been since the evacuation of Richmond, and expected no evil and thought none. I remained on the gunboat (*Mosswood*) in James River before Richmond a few days, and after an hour's notice was sent to this fort. I saw in the report of the military court a letter that had an indorsement of mine. I supposed it possible that this had something to do with my arrest. I addressed General Ord, commanding at Richmond, a letter of explanation, and requested that copies might be sent to Mr. Stanton and Mr. Holt. But I am still here. The officers are courteous and considerate and I suffer no indignity. But I should be glad to know why I am arrested and detained.

My affairs greatly need attention. Without any fault my fortune has been nearly exhausted. An explosion that took place at Mobile has put in ruins that upon which I depended to support my family. I earnestly desire to labor in their behalf. With kind remembrance to your daughter,

I am your friend,

*J. A. Campbell.*

HON. B. R. CURTIS, BOSTON, MASS.

**Maria Mitchell.**

WHATEVER is most characteristic and strongest in the New England type was perceived at once in Maria Mitchell. To those who are not well acquainted with that type she would have appeared perhaps a little hard and brusque. But in the genuine New England character there is always a depth of tenderness which can be depended on to appear when most wanted, and that quality was not lacking in her. She was especially fond of children, and a welcome friend to them, because at once they felt in her the sincerity which was the keynote of her whole being. Those who had only revered and respected her learned to love her after seeing her with children. Respect she always commanded, not only from those who knew her, but from strangers. I remember being impressed with this power when I heard her rebuke a rough man who undertook to smoke in an omnibus; the absolute fearlessness, the plain straightforward telling of the truth that he had no right to do this and that he infringed on the rights of others, and his instant obedience to her request, made an impression upon me which never can be forgotten.

The New England characteristics were perhaps intensified in her by the Quaker training and home influence. Those who were at Vassar during the first years of the college must all remember the silent "grace" at table, which was a tribute of respect to the old father brought to live there by his daughter as one condition of her accepting the call to a professorship. The bond between her and her father was unusually strong, and the two had a happy home together in the observatory building till the old man died. After that time Miss Mitchell still lived there, having some one of her students as a companion, so that her life was, whenever she chose to make it so, quiet and solitary in the company of her telescope and surrounded by

her professional work. The special students in astronomy were never very many, but her influence was not confined to them. She took her meals in the large hall and was familiar with all the students, and wherever she appeared there blew a fresh breeze of genuine life. Clear and strong and pure as the sea breeze over the south shore of her native island, her personality made itself felt, sweeping away all tendency to the sickly sentimentality which is apt to be found where many girls are congregated, and to the flattery of which so many women teachers weakly yield. Her absolute truthfulness of character never failed to find and fortify the honest intent, never missed striking and banishing all affectation. No girl could come before her without being self-judged. Such a presence is of inestimable value in a college like Vassar.

Nothing was more characteristic of her than the way in which she accepted the position and the salary offered her, without ever thinking to inquire whether the salary was the same as that given to the other professors. It was the chance to work that she wanted, the chance for influence in one of the first colleges for women. The money she was to receive was a minor consideration, and quite as characteristic was her indignation when, after being there for a considerable time, her attention was at last called to the fact that she, a mature woman, with a European fame, was receiving a salary less than that paid to some of the professors who were young men, almost entirely without experience, and quite destitute of reputation. The indignant protest, which then called for an equal salary, was not a personal affair. She flamed out in behalf of all women, and of abstract justice, with a glow which forced an immediate increase in salary. The excuse for this injustice must be found first in the fact that, at the time when Vassar College was established, women had not proved what they can do in professional lines, and, second, in the very conservative influences which guided the policy of the institution. In her religious belief Maria Mitchell was attached to one of the so-called most liberal sects. The children of the old Quaker families of Nantucket generally went over to the Unitarians if they departed from the strict faith of their fathers, so that in this matter also she was almost if not quite alone at Vassar. But she was appointed on the ground of her reputation as an astronomer, and fortunate was it for the college that the question of her religious belief was not raised till after her appointment.

The absolute truth which, as I have said, was the keynote of her character, could not fail to make her teaching thorough, for a love of truth is one and the same, whether in the intellectual or the moral sphere. But, as with all true teachers, it was the force of her personal character that acted most upon the young women with whom she came in contact. No one of them but was lifted and strengthened by her strength, sincerity, and single-heartedness. It was difficult for her to use diplomacy in never so small a degree, and what skill in it she did gain was the outcome of long years of experience, and she never employed it without a mental protest. She gave the New England stamp to whatever work she touched, and the lines of influence she has left on many characters are as indelible as those on the rock surfaces of New England's granite hills.

*Anna C. Brackett.*



## The Single Tax on Land Values.

IN your issue for July you publish, under the title "Confiscation no Remedy," a letter from W. M. Dickson of Cincinnati, Ohio. Pray grant me the opportunity to answer briefly the objections raised.

Your correspondent says: "In his book Henry George clamors boldly for the confiscation of the land; for its seizure by the state without compensation to the owner. But of late, in his paper and speeches, he would reach this confiscation indirectly, by imposing upon land the whole weight of taxation."

Far from having advocated any such measures in "Progress and Poverty" as those here attributed to him, Henry George expressly protests against them. In Book VIII., Chapter II., on page 364, he gives the keynote of his theory: "I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private right to property in land. The first would be unjust, the second needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call *their* land. Let them continue to call it *their* land. Let them buy and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent." No further comment is needed.

Next your correspondent states that at present the land in Ohio, his native State, pays about one-third the taxes, and improvements and personal property two-thirds; that to place this whole burden of taxation on land would greatly decrease its value and throw such of it as was not worth the tax on the market. The single tax on land values would undoubtedly act just as described—and *that is its object*. But your correspondent jumps at the conclusion that, this being so, the farmers would be most injured and would enlist in a body against the tax on land values; and probably knowing that the farmers constitute fifty per cent. of our population, he continues: "Hence, whatever its theoretic merits may be, George's plan is outside of practical politics. It is simply impossible."

This is a statement, but not an argument. The farmer is as good as any other citizen, but no better, and he is entitled to no special consideration, or special legislation. Nor is land in the country, whether under cultivation or not, any different, economically considered, from land in the city used for building sites. Land is land, and the taxation on its value will fall no heavier on the farmer than upon the manufacturer, or importer, or other citizen. On the contrary, being on land *values*, most of the tax will be paid where the value is highest—in cities, in mining districts, and upon land held under franchises. But your correspondent *having from sentimental reasons selected the farmers (of Ohio) as a standard by which to test the justice of the measure*, let us examine the effect the introduction of the single tax upon land values would have upon their condition.

There are three kinds of farmers in Ohio, as elsewhere:

*First.* Those who lease their farms and pay rent, in money or in produce.

*Second.* Those who fondly believe they own their farms, but who have them mortgaged.

*Third.* Those who own their farms free from all incumbrances.

The first class may be dismissed at once, for they have everything to gain and nothing to lose. They would pay their rent to the state in place of paying the landlord, and would be relieved of all the direct personal taxes and the indirect revenue and tariff taxes that they now pay upon everything they consume, from lumber, salt, and woolens through the whole category down to the Bible.

The second class is really part of the first class; for if their farms are mortgaged they do not own them to that extent, but are actually paying rent, and so far belong to the first class, and would enjoy the same advantages under the single tax. Another great and direct gain would be, that to start in life they would not be compelled to invest a large sum of money to buy a farm, but could lease it from the state for a moderate sum annually, and enjoy the same security of tenure as now under private ownership of land. The temptation to buy more land than they can cultivate, for speculative purposes only, thus making themselves land-poor, would also be removed. Inasmuch as they own their land clear of all incumbrance, they would belong to the third class.

This third class, holding their land free of all incumbrance, would of course, with the rest of the community, be relieved of all the direct and indirect taxes. Then it should be remembered that they now pay an annual tax not only on their land but also on their improvements. This tax, which now increases every year the more they improve their property, would be entirely removed. And, finally, consider the following:

In the census of 1880 these figures are given for the State of Ohio: Assessed valuation of real estate, \$1,093,677,705. And in another part of the same census: (Real) value of farms in Ohio, including land, fences, and buildings, \$1,127,497,353.

It will be seen from these figures that *all* the real estate of the State of Ohio was *assessed* at less than the *real* value of all the *farms* and their improvements, leaving out all city lands and mining lands, which are by far the more valuable. Two reasons or explanations exist for this: first, the undervaluation of improved property, which is practiced everywhere more or less, but especially in the large cities; and, secondly, the entire absence from or nominal valuation upon the tax-lists of tracts of unimproved farm lands. These two facts are notorious, and result in the shifting upon the shoulders of the working farmer of taxes that should be paid or shared by land speculators, city property holders, and corporations.

We therefore confidently assert that, by taking all taxes from improvements, by removing all existing direct and indirect taxes, by assessing all land at its full value, whether improved or unimproved, and by taxing all land values to the extent of their rental value, the taxes of the farmers of the third class also would be less than they are at present, and that they would for the first time get the full return of their labor. This is self-evident when we consider that under the single tax upon land values the farmer would pay *no* taxes whatever except the rent of his bare land, and that being based upon the natural advantages he enjoyed, he could *always afford* to pay. All this is more ably discussed in "Progress and Poverty," Book IX., Chapter III.

As to believing that the single tax is a cure for all

ills that flesh is heir to, Henry George does not assert, nor has he ever asserted, it. He does believe that the land monopoly is the greatest of all monopolies, and that it should be the first attacked; but the social benefits to be derived from an introduction of the single tax are so numerous and so far-reaching that even a partial enumeration of them seems indeed like setting up a claim for a panacea.

And here is Mr. Dickson's solution of the social question: "The remedy is restraint, pruning, regulation, not confiscation." But this, instead of being a remedy, is exactly what we have been doing for centuries. No! decidedly other measures are necessary.

First of all, we must stop the restraining, pruning, regulating work of those unjust laws which take from one to give to another; which in violation of the spirit of our Constitution create a privileged class. And after that we must give all the same opportunity to that element *land*, which is as much a matter of necessity to man as air. This will be doing justice; and this the single tax on land values will accomplish, by killing land speculation and practically restoring the land to the people, without disturbing security of titles or tenure.

*William S. Kahnweiler.*

NEW YORK.

#### Country Roads.

THE average country road as at present maintained and repaired is a constant source of unnecessary expense to taxpayers and an almost constant vexation to travelers. At its best the dirt road is good for only a few months in the year, and those months the time when the farmer — the man most interested in good country roads — is using his horses on the farm. In the fall, winter, and early spring, when the great bulk of teaming is to be done, the roads are in bad shape, except when kind Providence sends a snow that makes "good sleddin'." Bad roads mean small loads, and small loads mean to the farmer proportionately small profits. I know many and many a farm where the saving in time from hauling larger loads, the saving in wear and tear of horseflesh, wagons, and harness, would over and over again pay for the increased initial cost of a good macadam road.

Made of the best dirt obtainable, applied under intelligent supervision, and kept in order with proper road-making tools, the dirt road never is entirely satisfactory. What, then, can be expected of the quality of roads made of the material most easily obtained, applied by men ignorant of the first principle of road-making, working without proper tools, and supervised either by men equally ignorant, or not at all?

The true remedy for poor dirt roads is good macadam; but with no greater expenditure of money than now, the present roads might be vastly improved. The road tax should be paid in cash: the system of loafing out the tax under pretense of "working the roads" should be abolished. This money should be expended under the immediate supervision of one man for each township, selected for a knowledge of road-making, and put under bonds for the faithful performance of his duties. This would introduce into the system the element of responsibility, which is sadly lacking at present, and to the lack of which are due many of the abuses of the present methods. One man hiring his labor where he pleased, and paying cash for a day's

work, would get considerably more done for the money than a dozen or fifteen roadmasters working out the tax in conjunction with their neighbors and fellow-farmers.

Proper tools should be provided to work with. Road-scrappers are almost unknown in many country districts, and plows and shovels are the tools most commonly used. Very good road-scrappers can be bought to-day for only two or three times the cost of a good plow, and two men, two horses, and a road-scraper will do the work of an equal number of horses and ten men with plows and shovels, and do it better.

Only the best obtainable materials should be used in repairing the roads — gravel when possible, and when not, the dirt most nearly approaching it in quality. The use of "gutter-wash," sods, and stones larger than two inches in diameter should be forbidden. I have seen roads, "mended" with sods, that were for weeks impassable at any gait faster than a walk, and I have seen holes in the road-bed filled with large stones that were a nuisance for years.

The roads should be worked at proper times. The need of the dirt road is little repairs often made. The common practice is to do almost all the work just after "corn-planting." This is wrong, for two reasons: it is too late for the best results, and too much is done at one time. Six inches of earth or gravel will make a far better road if put on in layers of, say, two inches at intervals of a month or so, than will the entire amount applied at once. Just as soon as the roads are settled in the spring, and before they have become dry and hard, the scraper should be put to work leveling and filling the ruts worn during the winter, and slightly rounding the road-bed towards the center. The ground being still moist, and not compact as at the usual time of doing this, the work can be done more easily and rapidly and the road will pack better. Later, a light coat of earth or gravel, to be followed by another when the first becomes packed hard, and this in turn by a third if possible. Lastly, in the fall the entire road should be gone over to see that all gutters and bridges are free, that the road may not be washed out by winter storms and spring rains. All mudholes of course should be filled promptly at all times so that no water may stand in the road, and loose stones should be removed at least once a month.

The usual time for cutting brush — August — seems right, but some reform is needed in the way of doing it. The brush should be cut close down to the ground, and not, as often is the case, cut a foot or more above it, leaving long unsightly stubs to sprout the ensuing spring. It should be piled at once, and burned when sufficiently dry. Under the present system I have seen brush cut, left as cut, the next year's growth cut over the top of that, and the resulting tangle abandoned the third year.

With some such system as this I have sketched, the application to the road work of the business rules which govern every progressive farmer in the conduct of his farm, with the work done under the supervision of a responsible man, done at the proper times instead of whenever convenient, with the proper tools and with a proper quality of earth, by men who were compelled to give a day's work for a day's pay, the dirt road could be made not good, but vastly better than it is. But at its best the dirt road is a costly one to repair:

its only redeeming feature is its comparative initial cheapness, and in the long run repairs even this up. Country communities are apt to complain of the first cost of the macadam road, while annually spending millions of dollars and moving countless tons of earth, without having good permanent roads.

R. A. Learned.

#### The Iowa Experiment.

"How is prohibition working in your State?" is the question oftenest asked the Iowa man abroad. The inquirer as he listens to the story his question invites usually wears upon his face a peculiar expression which translated into words would read, "I acquit this man of intent to mislead, but my private opinion is, he's romancing." A rather skeptical acquaintance of mine in the East recently said to me, "Your story of empty jails, flourishing schools, and homes of thrift and comfort that were not there before, sounds like one of Washington Gladden's fascinating dreams of an ideal 'Christian League'; but don't you think you'd find it rather difficult to verify your statements with facts and figures drawn from official sources?"

Leaving to others the picturesque features of the subject, let me lay before the readers of THE CENTURY a few suggestive "facts and figures drawn from official sources"—some of the results of an investigation suggested by my practical friend's inquiry.

Permit me to say, in passing, that Iowa, far from being "a commonwealth of temperance cranks," as an Eastern journal has it, is a commonwealth of "plain people"—to borrow a phrase from Lincoln; people who do their own thinking, and have their own way of doing, and are daring enough to believe that some things can be done which the wisdom of the conservative East pronounces impossible. Taking advantage of the fact that we have no great centers of population to dictate our policies and load us down, we of Iowa have applied to the State as a whole the identical theory for handling the social evil known as the saloon which Georgia and Illinois apply to counties, and which New York applies to townships; namely, the theory that the majority shall determine whether the evil shall be tolerated and controlled, or prohibited. At a non-partisan election held in the summer of 1882, the question of prohibition *vs.* toleration was submitted to the people, and the voters of Iowa, by thirty thousand majority, declared they had no longer any use for the saloon. But the constitutional amendment which then carried had not been properly submitted, and was by our Supreme Court declared invalid. A disappointed majority then turned to the State legislature for relief, and in the spring of 1884 a prohibitory law was passed. The legislatures of 1886 and 1888 sustained the law and strengthened it by amendments. Thus steadfastly have the people sustained the prohibition, anti-toleration method of handling the saloon.

"But you will not deny the fact that there have been saloons in Iowa during all these years of prohibition? You cannot truthfully say there are no saloons in your State at the present time?"

The outlawed saloon does still linger on our borders; still maintains a precarious, characterless, hole-in-the-wall existence in many of our cities; but its social and

political prestige is gone, and in at least 70 of the 99 counties in the State there cannot be found an open saloon.

Seven years have elapsed since the voters of Iowa formally withdrew their sanction from the saloon. Five years have passed since the voters of Iowa, through their representatives, outlawed the saloon. Is there anything in the present situation to warrant a return to the toleration policy? Let us turn to the figures and see what they say on the subject.

I am indebted to Hon. Frank D. Jackson, Secretary of State, for advance sheets of the "Official Register of Iowa" for 1889. From this source, and by comparison with reports of other years, I discover that the total expense of the counties of Iowa, "on account of criminal prosecutions," was in 1882, the year in which the prohibitory amendment carried, \$401,431.18. In 1883 the total expense of criminal prosecutions was reduced to \$361,173.78. In 1884, presidential year, there was a slight increase in criminal expenses. In 1885 and 1886, years marked by the return of the outlawed saloon and a consequent reign of lawlessness, there was a large increase, the total in the year last named being \$421,024.31. In 1887, the year following the passage of the Clark (enforcement) law, the criminal expenses were reduced to \$282,877.66; and in 1888 they aggregated \$300,424.06 for ten months.

Compare the record of "leading crimes" in 1888 with the same in 1882. In 1888 there were 94 convictions for assault, 13 for breaking and entering, 47 for burglary, 13 for forgery, 13 for gambling, 42 for keeping a gambling-house, 148 for larceny, 9 for murder, 6 for manslaughter, 190 for keeping a nuisance, 59 for selling intoxicating liquors; total, 634. In 1882 there were 188 convictions for assault, 18 for breaking and entering, 78 for burglary, 30 for forgery, 14 for gambling, 41 for keeping a gambling-house, 215 for larceny, 14 for murder, 1 for manslaughter, 658 for keeping a nuisance, 25 for unlawfully selling intoxicants; total, 1282—more than double that of 1888.

A few weeks ago I met Warden Barr, of the Anamosa Penitentiary, on his way to Fort Madison with a carload of prisoners, under orders from Governor Larrabee to take these men from the State quarries to the State shops. I learned that the transfer was ordered in response to a loud call from Warden Crossley, of the Fort Madison Penitentiary, for more hands to enable him to comply with certain contracts for labor into which the State had entered with certain manufacturers. The circumstance led me to write Governor Larrabee for information as to the comparative number of prisoners in our penitentiaries this year and in previous years. From our chief executive I learn that the monthly average of prisoners in the two penitentiaries in 1886 was 696; in 1887 it was 667, and in 1888 it was 607. On the last day of September, 1888, the end of the fiscal year, there were but 535 prisoners in both penitentiaries. I am informed by those who have investigated the subject that no other State in the Union, unless it is Vermont, has as small a percentage of convicts as has Iowa at the present time.

But, going back to the counties, what say our judges? Here is a small pamphlet containing the answers of forty-one district and superior-court judges to a number of questions put to them by Governor Larrabee, one of the inquiries being as to the expediency of re-

pealing the prohibitory law. I find that of the forty-one, 4 favored repeal, 9 were non-committal, and 28 were of the opinion that the law should stay. Let me quote several specially significant passages from these letters.

Judge Traverse, Bloomfield: "My experience is that, wherever saloons are closed, crime is diminished."

Judge Harvey, Leon: "It has reduced crime at least one-half, and the criminal expenses in like ratio."

Judge Lewis, Sioux City: "The law is as well enforced as any other, and has decreased criminal expenses at least two-thirds."

Judge Deemer, Red Oak: "In many of the counties the jail is getting to be almost an unnecessary building, and in the last three counties I visited there was not an occupant."

Judge Carson, Council Bluffs: "When in the senate I favored local option, but I am now satisfied the statute should stand."

Judge Thornell, Sidney: "I should regard its repeal as a calamity."

Judge Bank, Keokuk: "This was the first and only term in my recollection that there was no criminal business transacted in court."

Judge Wilson, Creston: "I was not in favor of the law, thinking that high license would work better. I have carefully watched its workings and am convinced that I was wrong."

Judge Wakefield, Sioux City: "As the saloons were driven out, other business came in to occupy the vacant places."

Judge Wilkinson, Winterset: "Crime and criminal expenses have been lessened."

Judge Johnson, Oskaloosa: "The effect of the prohibitory law has been to reduce very materially crime and criminal expenses in this district."

Judge Kavanaugh, Des Moines: "It has decreased crime over 50 per cent. and added largely to individual happiness."

Judge Granger, Waukon (now of the Supreme Bench): "The closing of the front door of the saloon, whereby it is destroyed as a place of social resort, has canceled nine-tenths of the drunkenness. . . . Our grand juries have comparatively nothing to do. . . . Our criminal expenses since the closing of the saloons have been comparatively nominal."

But roving correspondents for journals in the large cities about us inform their readers that prohibition is killing, or has killed, Iowa. Let us see for ourselves.

The census of 1880 gave our State a population of 1,624,615. The State census of 1885 put the population at 1,753,980—an increase of 129,365. The fact that there has been a decided increase in population since the last census (in 1885) is shown by comparison of the vote of 1884 with that of 1888. The total vote of Iowa in 1884 was 377,153, while that of 1888 was 404,130; an increase of 26,977—an estimated increase of 134,885 in four years.

Iowa years ago won, and has never since lost, the honor of having less illiteracy in proportion to population than any other State in the Union. But note the educational progress she has made during these six years of prohibition. In 1883 there were 11,789 school-houses in Iowa; in 1884, 11,975; in 1885, 12,285; in 1886, 12,444. The value of these school-houses was, in 1883, \$10,473,147; in 1886, \$11,360,472. State Super-

intendent Sabin's report to the last Iowa legislature begins thus: "It is gratifying to be able to report a most satisfactory and prosperous condition of education throughout the State. The past two years have been years of increased interest, activity, and growth. . . . The number of school-houses has been increased by about 500, and their aggregate value by more than \$550,000. The number of teachers is increased by about 500, while our school population is 10,000 greater than the same as reported two years ago."

Another index of Iowa's increasing prosperity is the showing made by our savings-banks. The reports made to our Auditor of State show that the "total assets and liabilities" of Iowa's savings-banks were, in 1883, \$8,419,739.83; in 1885, \$9,618,866.97; in 1887, \$12,666,347.72. Auditor Lyons informs me that on June 30, 1888, the total assets, etc., of the savings-banks had increased to \$14,625,024.84. These figures show that since the adoption of prohibition the resources of these depositories of the poor man's surplus earnings have increased over six million dollars, or over 73 per cent.

*Johnson Brigham.*

#### A Tenor Farm.

WE are a conservative people in New England and there is plenty of idle money among us awaiting safe investment. Flaming prospectuses of riotously rich Western farm lands attract only after insistent iteration; even then, I fancy, they draw comparatively few of the hoarded dollars which have escaped the depression in "C. B. and Q." and "Atchison and Topeka." I have a plan for using these dollars on a Western farm. It is this. Let a company of capitalists buy the most fertile five hundred acres in Dakota, Kansas, or Southern California, anywhere thereabouts where land is good and the climate equable. Let them erect thereupon a set of dwellings and school-buildings, obeying in the process every sanitary law; also gymnasium, theater, and concert-hall. They should thoroughly fence their property with barbed wire. Now to people it. Let agents be sent throughout the United States in search of tenor voices, behind which are robust bodies and good average minds. Contract with the parents or guardians of these voices and bodies for their time and keep for a term of years, say six. After selecting competent agriculturists to run the farm, and a teacher of physical science,—for the farm and the gymnasium are to furnish the before-mentioned voices and bodies with healthy, normal, and discreet exercise,—get a good corps of teachers of the voice, who know their business (alas! alas! our scheme may fail at this point), another to teach music, and set them to the task of developing these voices and bodies into manly and beautiful singers. It can be done. It will pay a large dividend. Why? Because in this country there is a great cry for tenors. Twenty oratorio societies, ten societies giving high-class instrumental concerts, and scores of vocal clubs would keep the product of this tenor farm continually employed eight months out of every twelve, at from two hundred dollars to four hundred dollars per individual per engagement.

There is not one great American tenor singer. There is only one in England who is kindred to us on account of the language he speaks. Our concert audiences yearn to hear a good tenor. Look at a file of Boston Sym-

phony or New York Philharmonic programmes for the season of 1887-88; how many tenors are numbered thereon? One in Boston, where twenty-four concerts were given; none in New York. And the Boston singer was a *German!* Why is this? Because the right kind of tenors do not exist. Scores of puny, pretty, and weak voices arise to the parlor and church-quartet state of the vocal art, but for some reason go no further. The great need of the country to-day is tenors. Our tenor farm would easily pay twenty per cent.

G. H. Wilson.

#### Irish Estates.

IN the valuable and interesting article "The Temperance Question in India," published in the July

number of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE, on page 445 there is drawn a comparison between the tenants of "Out Stills" in India and an agent over an Irish estate which is calculated to convey a wrong impression of the management of properties in Ireland.

The author says:

He [viz., the highest bidder] has farmed the job, just as a man farms the rents of a landlord holding an Irish estate, and it is his interest to get all the money out of it he can.

Such an arrangement is certainly not the custom in Ireland; and even had it been, it would now be impossible to carry it out, since the tenants have the right to have their rents judicially fixed.

George W. Ruxton,  
J. P. County Louth, Ireland.

DUBLIN, IRELAND.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

### When Polly Goes By.

THIS but poorly I'm lodged in a little side-street,  
Which is seldom disturbed by the hurry of feet,  
For the flood-tide of life long ago ebbed away  
From its homely old houses, rain-beaten and gray;  
And I sit with my pipe in the window and sigh  
At the buffets of fortune — till Polly goes by.

There 's a flaunting of ribbons, a flurry of lace,  
And a rose in the bonnet above a bright face,  
A glance from two eyes so deliciously blue  
The midsummer seas scarcely rival their hue;  
And once in a while, if the wind 's blowing high,  
The sound of soft laughter as Polly goes by.

Then up jumps my heart and begins to beat fast.  
"She 's coming!" it whispers. "She 's here! She has passed!"

While I throw up the sash and lean breathlessly down  
To catch the last glimpse of her vanishing gown,  
Excited, delighted, yet wondering why  
My senses desert me if Polly goes by.

Ah! she must be a witch, and the magical spell  
She has woven about me has done its work well,  
For the morning grows brighter, and gayer the air  
That my landlady sings as she sweeps down the stair,  
And my poor lonely garret, up close to the sky,  
Seems something like heaven when Polly goes by!

M. E. W.

### The Elder Galvanism.

A PARABLE FOR NOVELISTS.

I, PAULUS, who love science more than money,  
Self, woman, fame, or art,  
Dissect a certain sleek, tame household bunny  
And galvanize its heart.

Comes Paula, liking science less than habit,  
Wit, beauty, youth, and flowers:  
Storms — calls me monster — wants her old live  
rabbit,  
Whose heart beats — beats — like ours!

Dora Read Goodale.



BY THE SEA.

OLD SALT. "I jes want ter give ye a pointer, young man. With that ther net sot as it is and them durned scoop nets you 're a-handlin' you 'll never catch a fish around yere in a thousand years."

### Reflections.

THE mischief of opinions formed under irritation is that men feel obliged to maintain them even after the irritation is gone.

VOTES should not be counted, but weighed.

THE small writer gives his readers what they wish, the great writer what they want.

TO be content with littleness is already a stride towards greatness.

MEN are equally misunderstood, from their speech as well as from their silence; but with this difference: their silence does not represent them; their speech misrepresents them.

J. A. Macon.