TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The People's Money.

WHAT is the best kind of money for the people — using the latter word in the sense in which it is employed by the advocates of free silver coinage? These advocates, like the champions of all other forms of cheap money during the past three centuries, speak of gold as the money of the rich, of bankers and money-lenders, of capitalists and rich corporations, whom they denominate "gold-bugs," and whose center of activity is Wall street. All the remaining elements of the population are classed together as "the people," to whom, it is now claimed, free silver is the money which would bring the largest measure of prosperity and happiness. Is this claim well founded; or is it, like all other alleged cheap-money benefits, a delusion founded partly upon ignorance of economic laws and principles, and partly upon private and personal greed?

The silver dollar which the free-coinage advocates desire to have bestowed upon the people is one containing 371¼ grains of pure silver, worth in the markets of the world, at the present writing, about 70 cents. The proposition is that the United States government shall take this amount of silver, coin it free of charge, stamp it "one dollar," and make it a legal tender for all public and private debts. That means that the United States shall pay $1.29 an ounce for silver, in any and all amounts from any and every quarter, though the market price is only 90 cents an ounce, and shall make payment in legal-tender money interconvertible with gold at par.

What would be the first effect of the passage of this law? There is not an economist of any standing anywhere in the world who will not say that the first effect would be the disappearance of gold entirely from our circulation, and the descent of the country to the silver standard. The silver advocates claim that the mere passage of the law would force the price of silver from 90 cents up to $1.29 an ounce, but there is no possibility of such an effect. They claim that silver has fallen in value because of its demonetization by nearly all the nations of the world, whereas the real cause is an enormous increase in production, and great improvements in mining, by which the cost of production has been diminished. The yearly average product of silver from 1851 to 1875 was $51,000,000, and from 1876 to 1890 it was $116,000,000, an increase of 127 per cent. The yearly average product of gold between 1851 and 1875 was $127,000,000, and between 1876 and 1890 $108,000,000, a decrease of 15 per cent. That is why gold has more than maintained its value, while silver has depreciated. In 1873 silver was worth $1.30 an ounce, in 1874 it had dropped to $1.27, in 1875 to $1.24, and in 1876 to $1.15. In 1877 a free-coinage bill was introduced in Congress, and in 1878 it was amended so as to provide for the coinage of not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion per month into dollars to be full legal tender at their nominal value. This was passed, vetoed by President Hayes, and passed over his veto. It was claimed that this would raise the price of silver. Since it became a law 405,000,000 silver dollars have been coined, 348,000,000 of which are locked up in the Treasury vaults, never having passed into circulation. The price of silver dropped to $1.12 an ounce in 1879, reached $1.14 in 1880, $1.13 in 1881 and 1882, fell to $1.11 in 1883, to 99 cents in 1886, to 93½ cents in 1889, and to 90 cents in 1892. In 1890 Congress enacted a law which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase four and a half million ounces of silver bullion per month at the market price, and to give in return for it legal-tender notes redeemable in gold or silver at the option of the Government. Even this enforced purchase of 54,000,000 ounces of silver a year has not stayed the downward progress of the price.

A striking demonstration of the utter folly of the claim that free coinage would lift the price of silver from 90 cents to $1.29 an ounce is made by Mr. Louis R. Ehrich of Colorado Springs, to whose luminous and valuable publications upon the silver question we are indebted for much exact information. At the time he wrote silver was 95 cents an ounce, but his demonstration is none the less effective. He says:

> There is on our planet, in round figures, three billion nine hundred million dollars' worth of silver held as money or as a fund for money redemption. That is to-day all worth about 95 cents an ounce. Now these free-silver men tell us that the natural alchemy of free coinage by the United States all alone is going to raise these thirty-nine hundred millions from 95 cents to $1.29. That is, it is going to add a value of over a billion dollars to the world's silver stock. Astonishing proposition!

All authorities agree that the silver of the world would be dumped almost in a body upon us, at the advanced coinage price which our Government would have to pay till we abandoned the gold standard, or gold went to a premium, which would be in a very short time after the law went into operation. We should then have only one kind of money, a dollar worth 70 cents, which every man who had a debt the payment of which was not stipulated to be in gold, could use to pay off 100 cents' worth of debt, and which every man who earned money in any way would have to receive for a 100 cents' worth of work. All debts would therefore be scaled down 30 per cent., except those with a gold-payment stipulation, and all wages, pensions, salaries, life-insurance policies, and savings-bank deposits would be cut down in the same way. There would be no escape. The dear money, gold, would be driven out of circulation by the cheaper money, silver, by the working of a law as inexorable as the law of gravitation.

Attention was called to this effect upon the pensioners of the Government in a circular which Congressman Harter of Ohio sent to all the Grand Army Posts a few weeks ago. In that he said:

> If a *Free-Silver Bill* becomes law, a veteran who now gets a pension worth to him $4.00 per month would receive *actually* but $2.80, with the chance of it going down to an actual value of $2.40. Take the case of a soldier who is a total physical wreck and utterly unable to do for himself. Such a man gets $72.00 per month. If a Free-Silver Bill passes, while he would *nominally* get the same, he would really get but $50.40, with a strong probability that in the early future his $72.00 of monthly pension would be

worth not over $43.20. This coinage question should not be one of party politics. It rises above partizanship. The honor of the country is at stake. Its business interests from ocean to ocean and from lake to gulf are jeopardized. Its good faith not only to its living soldiers is brought in question, but if a so-called free-coinage bill becomes law, the widows and orphans of the nation's dead will be robbed by the laws of the land they died to save. The law would work a monstrous wrong, for from the moment it goes upon the statute book it represents over $45,000,000 per year taken from the ex-soldiers, their widows, and their orphans.

That would be the effect upon the pensioners, without a doubt. No man who has a rudimentary knowledge of economic laws can question that for a moment. Let us see what would be the effect upon savings-bank deposits and life-insurance policies.

There are deposited in our savings-banks sixteen hundred millions of dollars, a sum greater than the entire amount of money in active circulation in this country. These deposits are for the most part made up of small amounts, and represent the savings of the working-classes. Of these savings a thousand millions are invested in mortgages. Many of these mortgages are made payable in gold, but many others are not. Every one of them which has not a gold-paying clause can be paid off in silver; that is, the holder of it can be compelled to receive $700 as full payment for every $1000 of money lent. Is this honest or wise? Would a man who paid his honest debts in that way ever be able to secure another loan? Every mortgage in future would bear a gold-paying clause, and it would be very difficult to induce lenders who had been cheated once to trust the persons who had cheated them with a further loan on any terms.

Who are the lenders who would be cheated if mortgage indebtedness were to be paid in silver at 70 cents on a dollar? Are they "gold-bugs"? On the contrary, in many cases they are widows and orphans who are living on the hard earnings of industrious people, saved through many years of economy and toil. The "gold-bugs" have been merely the agents for the investment of this money, seeking for it a sure and safe return to the people who have put it in their care. The indispensable requisite for such return is the most sure and unvarying standard of value known to man — that is, the gold standard. The "gold-bug" who insists upon that is the truest possible friend and servant of the people, whether he be acting as their agent in lending them money, or investing and caring for it at the head of an insurance company, or in any other capacity. Rich men do not lend money; they borrow it — borrow it from the banks and insurance companies to invest it for their profit, and for the profit of its owners. They are the agents for all the money-savers of the land, seeking to win for them the best income possible upon their savings. They place the mortgages upon the western farms, and upon the buildings and other property in western cities, and the money which they use for that purpose is the money which the people, the workers and savers of the land, place in banks and insurance companies for their families and for use in their hour of need.

These are the people who would suffer by the swindle of making 70 cents do the work of a dollar by process of law. Every workingman in the land, every person drawing a salary, would suffer in the same way. He would receive the same number of dollars as before, but each dollar would buy only 70 cents' worth of commodities. He is in fact a creditor for every day's or every week's work, and he is cheated of more than a third of his earnings if, when pay-day comes around, he must take $7 in place of $10, or $14 in place of $20.

The true "people's money" is the best money; that is, the money which will buy the most of what every man needs, and which will be worth the same this week as it was last, the same next year as this year. There is no security for savings of any kind with any other standard of value, no safety for loans, no interest on bank deposits. The man who declares cheap money in any form to be the "people's money" is the worst possible enemy of the people, for his policy, if carried out by the Government, would rob the people of a large portion of their hard-earned savings; would cut down their wages, and would throw the whole business of the country into confusion and doubt, sending paralysis and disaster into every industry and into every branch of trade and commerce. The worst sufferers would be the toilers of all kinds, the people of moderate means, and the poor. If the advocates of free coinage were honest in their contention that the country's welfare would be enhanced by having both silver and gold as a basis for its currency, they would consent to the coinage of a silver dollar worth 100 cents; but this they refuse to do. They refuse to accept an honest dollar, and insist upon a dishonest dollar. They are not serving the people, but are serving the devil, and the issue which they raise, far from being a political one, is a moral one of the first magnitude.

No great party in the United States, in national convention assembled, will dare make itself responsible for the distress that would fall upon the masses of our population from free and unlimited silver coinage.

The Machine versus the People.

It has been our custom for many years to discuss in this department of THE CENTURY questions of political science, that is, of politics in the widest and truest sense of the word, which is the attainment of that method of administering public affairs which will best promote the safety, peace, and prosperity of the whole people. Into the wrangles of partizan politics this magazine cannot enter. It can concern itself only with general movements and tendencies which promise on the one hand to promote the cause of good government, or threaten, on the other, to retard or even to destroy it. If in criticizing and condemning bad political methods and schemes for dishonest government we seem to be condemning any particular politician or class of politicians, the fault will not be with us, but with him or them; for the politician whose champions hasten to say that he is assailed whenever dishonest political methods are attacked, has become so identified with those methods that the public instinctively thinks of him when they are mentioned. No man gets a reputation of this kind save by his own conduct.

The most dangerous tendency in this country during the past twenty-five years has been the steadily increasing power of the political machines. From being the necessary organizations through which the voters of the great political parties were enabled to express their will in an orderly and authoritative manner, they have been developed into compact and disciplined bod-

ies of political workers, blindly subservient to a few leaders, or to a single leader or boss. Instead of registering the will of the whole party, a machine of this character uses all its power to suppress that will, and to force upon the party the will of the leaders or boss. The party is forced to acquiesce or to overthrow its own recognized organization and to subject itself to the danger of defeat. Rather than incur this danger, both political parties have frequently rallied to the support of notoriously unfit candidates for State and minor offices, and not infrequently have elected them. By general consensus of opinion, the harm which has been caused to good government in States and cities by this abuse of the legitimate use of political organization is incalculable. It has given the believers in popular government in all parts of the world serious misgivings as to its capabilities and its perpetuity— misgivings which we do not share, but which cannot be ignored.

This abuse of machine power is bad enough, and disastrous enough, when applied to State and municipal politics. If now it shall be extended to National politics, and if it shall prove strong enough to secure a presidential nomination by suppressing the will of a great party, the issue made will be so serious as to rise at once above politics and to become purely a question of morals. From the nature of the case this must be the outcome, for machine power is never exerted to extreme ends save in the interest of the worst and most objectionable politics.

We cannot illustrate this contention better than by enumerating the long-continued series of steps by which a politician of the machine type has advanced to the point at which a presidential nomination is sought to be captured for him. He begins his political career in the ward politics of a small city. He receives his elementary instruction in political methods from a professional corruptionist, and under this tutelage soon becomes an expert in debauching and perverting the suffrage. He is able to get himself elected to the State legislature, and while in that body forms an alliance with the greatest corruptionist of the time. From the legislature he advances by successive stages till he reaches the highest office in the State — becomes its chief executive. He wishes to be reëlected, and needs money to help him to succeed in his purpose. He gives his personal notes for $15,000 to the chairman of his party committee or machine. He has these notes converted into cash by inducing certain political friends to indorse them. The chairman of his machine, who happens to be a large contractor on one of the State's public works, subsequently pays both notes, and charges them against himself upon the books of his contracting firm. He uses his influence to induce a majority of the commission controlling a public work to award to the firm of contractors of which the chairman is a member a contract for which that firm's bid is $54,000 higher than the lowest competing bid. When the contract has been awarded, it is immediately sold by the chairman to one of the lower competing bidders for $30,000 clear profit, the chairman never having done any work under it. Thus the city has been robbed of $54,000, and the machine chairman has obtained $30,000 of it with which to pay himself for $15,000 which he gave to the chief executive for the latter to use in his reëlection.

Let us follow this career a little further. The term of chief executive, lasting through a period of several years, is devoted to the most untiring and unscrupulous efforts for the building up and strengthening of his personal political machine. To this end the public service, all its offices and patronage, and all the power which the executive's veto-privilege confers over the members of the legislature, are used without scruple, and without regard to anything save the individual advantage of the executive. The most intimate relations are established by the executive with the liquor interests of the State, and with the most unruly and dishonest elements of the population in all the cities. No legislation restricting the spread of liquor-selling is permitted to become law, and all legislation in the interest of honest elections and a secret and untrammeled ballot is either vetoed or, through executive opposition, injuriously modified — as is demonstrated when finally put into practice. So successful are these years of machine-constructing, that when the term of the executive draws near its end he is able to order and secure his own election to a senatorship of the United States. As he wishes to make that a stepping-stone to a presidential nomination, he does not go to Washington, but retains possession of both senatorship and governorship at the same time, in order to maintain his control upon his machine. When the election of his successor has been held, and it is found that his party has a majority in one branch of the legislature but not in the other, he at once sets his machine in motion to capture control of the other by manipulating canvassing boards. He is overruled by the courts, and he denounces and defies them. Some of the legal returns are abstracted from the delivered mails in the State offices before they can reach the final canvassing officers, and thus it is made possible for those canvassing officers to count as legal a return which the highest court in the State had declared to be illegal, thereby getting full possession of the legislature. To the most shameless of the minor State officers who help in this theft is awarded, through a subservient successor in the governorship, a judgeship on the bench of the highest court in the State, whose decrees have been defied.

With this theft of a legislature as his crowning achievement he announces himself a candidate for the presidency, his champions pointing with pride to that as his strongest claim upon his party for its highest honor. He then sets his perfected machine in motion to commit his State to his candidacy; calls a convention at an unusual date; leaves his seat in the Senate and personally directs the machine in its work of packing and running his convention; and when all is done appears before the delegates and thanks them for the honor which he has bid them confer upon himself.

When the candidacy has been launched before the country on this record and in this manner, let us suppose that this aspirant for the presidency goes into every State, either personally or by means of his agents, and inspires the political elements in each which correspond to those behind him in his own State to go to work by similar methods to defeat the will of the whole party in the national convention, forming, as it were, a compact union of all the worst members of the party for the defeat of the wishes of all the other members.

Does not a manifestation of machine power like this call for serious attention from all honest men, no matter what their political faith may be? Can a presi-

dential nomination be sought by such a man and with such methods, and not raise an issue of morals in politics in which the whole country will take a vital interest? No American who has faith in his country and in its capacity for self-government believes it possible that, if such a candidate were to succeed in forcing his nomination upon a party, he could be elected. The moral sense of the country would be so aroused by the insult that it would sweep away all party lines, and unite all honest men in a grand committee of safety to defend the nation's honor from so base an assault. It would be a national disgrace for a great party to confer a nomination upon such a candidate, for its doing so would be a confession that half the voters of the country were in slavery to machine rule; but when the righteous indignation of the people made itself heard at the polls, the disgrace would be wiped out forever.

Regularity and Independence.

THE most useful word in the vocabulary of the man who makes a mere business of politics is "regularity." The "regular" politician, when he sincerely desires votes for his side, is eloquent in calling upon every man of character, principle, and independence to cease voting for the other party, and to come and vote for the politician's party. In fact the calls to national conventions of all parties are largely made up of such appeals,[1] and are based upon the idea that a human being not only can, but should, think independently and vote independently. It is only when this independence becomes troublesome that men of independence of character are covered with the politician's inelegant abuse.

And yet there is nobody more irregular than a regular politician of the unprincipled sort. He is essentially and brazenly irregular. His very rules are often constructed for entirely irregular purposes. While making certain apparent use of rules, his whole scheming is against rule; that is, he lends all his energies to falsify public opinion; he misrepresents majorities; he is autocratic, tyrannical, and purely self-seeking. The securing of fair dealing and just regularity is the very life and intent of rules; whereas this is exactly what the regular politician labors, through his use of regulations, to avoid. We say through his use of regulations; but it is notorious that nobody can break his own rules with more effrontery than the most pedantic of regulars.

As for independence, there is no one, in a sense, so independent as the regular politician. It is he (with the assistance, perhaps, of a little group of cronies) who decides—often with complete indifference to public opinion—what shall be the "principles" of a party, and who shall be its candidates at any given election. When the regular politician, therefore, denounces independence and irregularity, he does it with his tongue in his cheek; and yet there are good men who are innocently beguiled by this sort of talk at every election.

We are not of those who denounce the idea of party. Every good movement, every valuable idea in human progress, tends to the formation of a party and the breeding of partisans. Primarily a party is nothing other than the association of men to put into practice some principle of government to which they are attached. It is only when party names are degraded to mere pretexts for plunder and means of selfish aggrandizement that they become a menace to the public good; and that this is the tendency of all large political associations history proves.

It happens that in the career of every great party a moment arrives when the mere machine politician endeavors to use an organization sacred to a purpose and a cause for ends solely personal and corrupt. In other words, a moral crisis is sure to arrive in the course of every political association. Then comes throughout the length and breadth of the land a sure test of clear vision and integrity. One of the saddest sights at such an epoch is the pitiful and apologizing use of clean reputations for the bolstering of sordid causes; the alliance of fair and cherished fames with all that is sinister in the forces that influence the destinies of a people. Look around, and look back over the political history of America! It is always so. The weakly good, and the cynically and selfishly decent, just at the time when designing and corrupt manipulators should be opposed by all the strength of public opinion, lend their names and services to the cause of immorality, and conspire with evil men for the degradation of government. But discouraging as is this melancholy phenomenon, there is always deep encouragement in the spectacle presented in moral crises such as we have described of brave and cool-headed independence, of unselfish devotion to principle, of right feeling showing itself often in unexpected places, of wide-spread enthusiasm for moral ideals, and for sound and elevated views of public duty.

[1] See "Partisan Recognition of the Independent Voter," Topics of the Time for October, 1890.

OPEN LETTERS.

The German Emperor and the Russian Menace.

THE German Emperor shares with the best-informed men in his army the belief that Russia intends to attack him at the earliest convenient opportunity. It is not the Czar who is urging war. Those who know that monarch well scout the idea. He loves peace and quiet, and does not wish to be disturbed. How long he can make his personal wishes prevail we cannot say, for he may have to choose between war and disquieting agitation. His ministers, who see more clearly than their master, realize that the economic condition of Russia has been going from bad to worse under a system of protection and repression that has no parallel in modern times. Commercial enterprise is hampered by a swarm of police, who are able to levy blackmail upon any tradesman who is not "protected." Inquiry of every kind is carefully stifled, and even French newspapers are "blacked out" by the censor if they contain news contrary to police wishes. Popular discontent exists, and it is the object of the Government to divert attention from domestic affairs to the enemy beyond.

Russia's active hatred of Germany dates from 1878, and is one of the many legacies of the Bismarck era. Every one remembers that the Russian army was in sight of Constantinople, and was prepared to take pos-

session, when England interfered. The Russians returned from the war expecting to receive at the Berlin Congress, in a diplomatic way, all that they had given up on the battle-field. In this they were mistaken, and their ambassador returned from Berlin to tell his people that the fruits of the war of 1877 had been lost to them through German perfidy. From that day to this hatred of Germany has been preached as the national gospel of Russia, and in this hatred have been included Jews, Poles, Swedes, Finns — in short, all the unorthodox whose civilization draws inspiration from the western neighbor. "Russia for the Russians!" is now the cry, and the orthodox Russian Church shouts louder than any one in the congregation.

The famine which spread over part of Russia last year does not abate this cry of revenge. On the contrary, there is not a peasant who does not believe that in some mysterious way the heretic Jew or German is responsible for his misery, and for that matter German and Jew are one to him, for both are unorthodox, both un-Russian. With this aspect of the case in mind, it seems strange indeed that the government of Russia should be acting in a manner to alienate the sympathy of subjects on her western frontier. It is possible that the Czar's ministers disapprove of the extreme measures taken in the Baltic provinces to expunge the German language and the Lutheran faith, but they know the power of the orthodox clergy, and dare not resist the only expression of what has to pass for public opinion.

The famine in Russia is real, although it is equally true that there is always a failure of crops somewhere in a country so vast. I lost no opportunity during the height of the newspaper discussion of the subject to make inquiry in proper quarters regarding the nature and extent of the alleged distress. The Government seems incapable of giving friends of Russia any satisfactory idea of the situation, and, worst of all, does not inspire any great confidence in the breasts of sympathizers. One day a minister reports that the famine is of no serious character; soon afterward the press announces that twenty millions of people are perishing. In any event, the situation is not cheering, famine or no famine.

If, however, a famine really exists on a large scale, then is there all the more reason to expect war. The peasant suffers first; next suffers the storekeeper, who supplies the few things the peasant cannot make himself; next suffers the wholesale dealer, who gets no more orders; next suffer the merchant and the banker of the capital and the seaport; at last suffers the only one worth considering — the Government, which feels it finally in the confession of hundreds and thousands of police officials that the peasant has been taxed to his last copeck. At this point the news becomes serious, for the Government is a costly one, and only money can sustain it: money for the interest on a huge public debt; money for the huge military machine; money for the police; money for the imperial family; money for secret service; money to maintain political jails; money to guard prisoners on the way to the mines of Siberia. When the Government finds that money is wanting to sustain its prestige, and that empty stomachs are growling, it may choose war as the lesser evil.

Germany is not blind to the dangers that threaten her, particularly from France. She will have one army on the Rhine, another on the Vistula. Von Moltke clearly foresaw the intention of Russia to attack, and never failed to urge upon William I. the military necessity of forcing the war as soon as possible. His reasons, of course, were purely military. "Russia," he argued in 1875, "is arming against us; each year she becomes more formidable. We, on the contrary, remain stationary. Our duty is to fight now, while the heroes of 1870 are still fresh, and not wait until they are retired from active service." Von Moltke saw more clearly than Bismarck. William I. was old, and relied on his prime minister, who kept telling him that Russia was Germany's natural ally; that Russia must be humored at any cost. On the part of the venerable William I. there were strong family reasons dictating friendship for the Russian Czar; but this does not explain Bismarck's apparent indifference to the fact that, for the last fifteen years, Russia has been cultivating hatred of Germany, second only to that prevailing in France.

The present German Emperor foreshadowed Russia's attitude of to-day three years before he came to the throne. He has been nearly four years in power, and has not only not declared war, but has not made a single warlike demonstration of a practical kind. His military family, if I may use the expression, are ready to anticipate the blow of Russia; but Germany keeps the peace because her Emperor is too conscientious to precipitate the conflict. Personally he is deeply pained by the hostile attitude of the Russian government; his efforts in the direction of closer commercial intercourse have been met by sullen objection; he has been treated with personal discourtesy by the Czar; his own people are outraged by the daily account of persecution to which Germans in Russia are subjected; he knows that the line of the Narew, the Niemen, and the Vistula is fortified by a chain of strong forts, and that Kirghis Cossacks patrol all the roads crossing his frontier. He is perfectly well aware that France is ready to coöperate with Russia, and that her forces are better organized than ever before.

The German Emperor is not unpopular in Germany. This fact cannot be too strongly presented, because many important consequences flow from it. He has done many things to disquiet moderate Liberals; has done things indicating a disposition to assume responsibility which might better be shared with Parliament. He has made many impromptu speeches which a prime minister would cheerfully have recalled; he has written texts which a strictly constitutional ruler would wish relegated to privacy. Granted all this and much more, for the sake of argument, let us come to what he has positively done, in order to understand why, in spite of this, he is Emperor in the German heart as well as in the German army. He has shown himself accessible to complaints from all classes of the community, and has interested himself in remedies; he has abolished the special laws against socialism with most excellent results; he has removed much of the irritation on the French frontier; he has met the grievances of the Polish Prussians in the same spirit; he has shown a liberality in dealing with the press and platform agitators unknown in Bismarck's day; he has inaugurated a commercial policy which, if not free trade, is a complete denial of the principle that one class has a right to enrich itself at the expense of another; he has drawn together the trade relations of Germans so wisely that Vienna, Budapest, and Berlin seem now like sister cities

of a free federation, and has spread the blessing of commercial freedom more widely than was ever before known in Europe; he has instituted legislation for the benefit of wage-earners and wage-payers, not as a socialist, but in the spirit of arbitration and fair play. In all of this he has moved independently, fearlessly, moderately, and in opposition, not merely to the teachings of Bismarck, but to the school of politicians created for him by that master of medievalism. Not only this, but he has interfered energetically on behalf of the soldier in the ranks; has insisted upon his troops being treated with proper respect by officers, and particularly by corporals and sergeants. He has vigorously put down gambling and fast living among his officers; he has at last interfered on behalf of the overworked school-children, and is the first to say that a teacher shall not cram the pupil's brain at the expense of general health.

All this sounds as though a stroke of the pen could make such reforms real, but it is not so. All academic Germany sets its face against school-reform, and the utmost exercise of tact and persistence is necessary on the part of the Emperor to make his proposals bear fruit. These instances suggest some of the reasons why Germans respect their Emperor. There are others of a negative kind. For instance, we have yet to hear of anything he has done for the gratification of selfish tastes. He is a plain liver; he has never indulged in the vices sometimes associated with royalty; no officer in his army can say that the Emperor taught him to gamble; in his family he is exactly what a German would wish him to be; and the keenest sportsman could not wish a better companion. Finally, he is a thorough soldier: he has served from the ranks up; he can do sentry duty with a guardsman, and can also manœuver combined army corps according to the principles of strategy and modern tactics. He has his faults, and none sees them so well as the German general and the German parliamentarian. But he has elements of strength and popularity which vastly outbalance any faults so far discovered — and this is what outside critics are apt to ignore. He has sources of strength totally closed to the Czar. The Kaiser is a man of flesh and blood; he feels as a German; his work is in harmony with the spirit of German progress; his failings, such as he shows, are German. There is no German who does not admire him in his private relations, even though differing from him in matters official; and we all know that in times of political danger the people are drawn to the man of strong personal character rather than to the cautious and colorless figurehead.

The forces behind William II. are such as have never been cultivated in Russia, whose Czar lives in hourly dread of assassination, and whose people are so many items of an official budget, so many units in a military report. The German Emperor walks about the streets of his towns as fearlessly and naturally as any other man, although the life of his grandfather was twice attempted. One day, in November of 1891, he was walking with a guest through the narrow and crowded thoroughfare of a city not far from Berlin. The sidewalks were narrow, and, as the Emperor is a fast walker, he frequently had to step out into the street to pass other pedestrians, and especially clusters of people who stopped for a chat. His companion, who had been in Russia, was struck by the democratic manner in which the German Emperor rubbed in and out amongst porters, fish-wives, peasants, and the rest of the moving crowd, chatting the while, and acting as though this was his usual manner of getting about. He was struck still more by the fact that no precautions against a possible murderous fanatic appeared to have been taken, and ventured to speak of this. The Emperor laughed heartily, and said: "Oh, if I had to stop to think of such things, I should never get through with my day's work."

It is with this man that Russia will have to reckon when her Cossacks start for Berlin; and this man is strong, not merely because he represents a strong army and a strong political administration, but because in him center the feelings of unity and development, of pride of achievement, and of promise of a still greater future which lie dormant in the hearts of those who regard Germany as the bulwark of civilization against barbarism — Europe against Asia.

Poultney Bigelow.

IN LIGHTER VEIN.

The Sleeping-Car.

CŒLUM NON ANIMUM MUTANT.

WE lie with senses lulled and still
'Twixt dream and thought, 'twixt night and day,
While smoke and steam their office fill
To bear our prostrate forms away.

The stars, the clouds, the mountains, all
Glide by us through the midnight deep;
The names of slumbering cities fall
Like feathers from the wings of sleep.

Till at the last, in morning light,
Beneath an alien sky we stand;
Vast spaces traversed in a night;
Another clime, another land.

T. W. Higginson.

The Arbutus.

ARBUTE, blossom of the May,
Thou and the wind together
Make, whatever the almanacs say,
The spirit's brightest weather.
When youth is gone and fancy flown,
When thought doth little and dwells alone,
The blooming foot-paths open a way
To many a long-past holiday.
Though youth be flown and fancy gone,
The mind's sweet memories may live on.
Only let the south wind blow,
Thou and the South together;
For thou and the balmy south wind make
The spirit's brightest weather.

James Herbert Morse.

coln Hall. His next letter was in reference to that, and is as follows:

"NEW YORK, Nov. 29, '87.

"MY DEAR MR. DODGE: I have purchased from Mr. J. S. Hartley a bronze cast of the Lincoln head, duly framed, and suitable for hanging up indoors in Lincoln Hall. . . . I hope it will reach you before Christmas.

"Will you kindly thank Mr. E. H. Fairchild for his letter of Thanksgiving Day, and tell him that he is unduly alarmed as to my health? As Mr. Lowell said yesterday, in his address on Copyright, 'We are all of us, always, just beginning to live.'

"I am very sincerely yours,
"ROSWELL SMITH."

Besides the new building, we received from him four thousand dollars for current expenses. His last gift and last letter came after the exciting political campaign of four years ago.

"NEW YORK, Dec. 31, '88.

"MY DEAR FELLOW-WORKER FOR CHRIST: I wish you a Happy New Year, and I send you a thousand dollars for your work, which please use (after consulting Pres. Fairchild) 'where it will do the most good,' as the politicians say, and may the Divine Master's blessing go with and attend its use.

"I am yours sincerely,
"ROSWELL SMITH."

Our sympathies are with the family and friends of this good man.

Very truly yours,
P. D. Dodge,
Secretary and Treasurer.

BEREA COLLEGE, KY., April 21, 1892.

FROM THE REV. DR. EDWARD B. COE'S FUNERAL ADDRESS.

IT was a fortunate circumstance, but it was not an accident, that during a visit to Europe, twenty years ago, his thoughts were turned toward the literary project with which, in its subsequent development, his name will long be associated. I say it was not an accident, because, as one who knew him well has stated, "to be identified with a business which had to do with books and writers had always been his ambition." In other words, he was looking for a field of wider and more direct influence and usefulness than that which he had thus far found. Though he was not himself a practised writer, he had a quick sympathy with those who like himself were men of ideas and earnest desire to promote the intellectual as well as the moral life of the community.

The opportunity was precisely that which would best meet his genius and his tastes, and give free play to his peculiar talents. It brought him into intimate relations with intellectual and scholarly men, whom he needed and who needed him. With rare tact and discernment he left them free to do their work in their own way, making innumerable suggestions, but never giving orders, while he inspired them with his own confidence and enthusiasm, and placed at their service his extraordinary executive ability. He had the utmost possible faith in his associates, in himself, in the work which they were together doing, in the public on both sides of the Atlantic, and in the certainty of ultimate success. He never lost heart in the darkest times. He assumed immense responsibilities without hesitation. He worked his way steadily through difficult negotiations. His plans were often startling in their boldness, but his patience and perseverance were equal to his audacity, and the novelty of his methods was sometimes the secret of their success. In his dealings with other men he was high-minded and generous often beyond the strict demands of justice, giving more than he was compelled or asked to give, from a conviction that the Golden Rule may safely be applied to mercantile transactions. There was, if I may judge correctly, something statesmanlike in his conduct of the business interests of which he was at the head, while there was also something romantic in his feeling about them. To his mind The Century Co. was not a concern for making money, but an organization for the advancement of civilization.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Roswell Smith.

BEHIND every successful enterprise one may be sure there is somewhere at work, even if not always prominently in sight, a powerful personality. The personal force — alert, original, full of initiative, insistence, and enthusiasm — which has been from the beginning, in 1870, up to the past year or two of illness, behind the publishing corporation now known as The Century Co. was that of Roswell Smith. Others may express in these pages their impression of the man in the various phases of his aspiration and activity. It is, perhaps, only necessary for the present writer to record here the grief of all associated in business with our late President at his untimely departure, and to say a word regarding especially his relation to THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

We do believe that Roswell Smith came nearer realizing the strictest editorial idea of what the publisher and chief owner of a periodical should be to that periodical than has often been seen in the literary and publishing world. Trusting the persons chosen to take editorial charge in a manner to call out all the energies and abilities of those so generously confided in, he spent no part of his energy in thwarting or

diverting their control, but set all his great strength to the task of enthusiastically coöperating with the plans of the magazine,—making possible, by his appreciation, courage, and loyal and liberal support, enterprises in their way of unprecedented cost and importance.

It was always an idea—always the ideal—that, appealing to his imagination, drew forth his deepest and most active sympathies. It was especially ideas of usefulness, of patriotism, of humanity, which commanded his most practical and zealous activities. The famous War Series of THE CENTURY could not have been carried on with a publisher of a timid and time-serving disposition. The authorized Life of Lincoln was made available to the great mass of the people largely through the liberality and determination of Mr. Roswell Smith. When George Kennan was gathering in long and painful journeys the material for his great work on the Siberian Exile System, his most frequent and most sympathetic correspondent, outside of his own family, was the busy President of The Century Co.

He not only earnestly supported the most costly and wide-reaching plans, but from his direct suggestion came magazine enterprises of breadth and moment. Nor was it only in large matters that his mind was active and helpful. In many details connected with the appearance of the magazine he made improvements: for nothing to him was unimportant that tended in any way to the perfection and good repute of the publications with which The Century Co. was identified. More important than everything else,—in addition to his sympathetic attitude, his suggestiveness, his faculty of invention, the fertility of his resources,—there was for all near him a constant inspiration and spur to highest effort coming from his fervid faith in God and man; his unswerving confidence in the success of generous methods and lofty and beneficent ideas.

To its President The Century Co. was truly an individual, beloved as a favorite child. There was hardly a waking hour of his life, especially after the company entered upon a separate existence, in which he was not pondering on and planning for its enterprises present and to come. When physical infirmity weighed heavily upon him, in the last weeks of his long and heroically endured illness, his failing power was expressed by himself with manly and smiling pathos, when, sitting one day in his old chair in his own office, he said, "My only contribution to The Century Co. now is one of curiosity." He, and all of us, well knew that when such words could be truly spoken the end must indeed be near.

It seems hard that there should not have been for him an old age of rest and satisfaction in witnessing and enjoying the fruits of such devoted labors,—labors which were indeed essentially public in their scope and intention. But, after all, our friend and associate had in his life the reward of clean, congenial, and successful work. He took his pleasure in his labors as they went on; and he had so poured his individuality into the corporate life which was largely his creation that he seemed to see much of his own personal energy and individuality existing along the future in forms of usefulness to mankind.

Roswell Smith had somewhat of the reserve attributed to the New England character, and his mind was concentrated on the principal work of his life with peculiar intensity. Yet collectively and individually his business associates and employees have all and each at various times, and in many an hour of stress and trouble, found in him a kind, sympathetic, and generous friend. There are men of letters in this country whose lives have been made smoother and brighter for his faith in them, and his friendly and substantial encouragement, proffered in all respect and manliness. He has done a good work in many ways; in a sense no one can "take his place"; but the spirit in which he labored will not soon fail of inspiration for his survivors and successors.

It was part of the late President's prevision and care that his large interests should remain within the company, and that the business management should continue in the hands of his trained and chosen associates.

Growth and Change in College Education.

IN an extremely interesting and valuable paper which he published in the February number of "The Educational Review," Mr. Arthur M. Comey showed that the number of male students attending 282 colleges in various parts of the United States had nearly doubled in the decade between 1880 and 1890, though the increase in population during the same period had been only 25 per cent. He showed also in a series of clear and most carefully compiled tables that between 1850 and 1890 the number of male students in these colleges had increased from 8837 to 31,359; that while the increase in population during that period had been 165 per cent., the increase in the number of students had been 254 per cent.; and that the number of students per 100,000 of population had risen from 38.1 in 1850 to 50.3 in 1890.

In making up his tables, Mr. Comey omitted all students in the preparatory courses of many Southern and Western colleges, and all women in the coeducational institutions. He omitted also a few colleges on account of low standard, and all the scientific schools, though he included scientific students in colleges. Had he included the scientific schools, which have been organized almost wholly since 1860, the percentage of increase would have been far greater than appears from his tables. His conclusions are that the "colleges of the country are growing rapidly," that "there is at the same time a decided tendency to raise the standard both for admission and for the courses of study," and that these facts justify "even optimistic views of the future of higher education."

The figures are certainly encouraging, as showing a constantly increasing desire among the youth of the country to pursue their studies beyond the limits of the public schools and seminaries. But what does Mr. Comey mean by the term "higher education"? That there is a wide difference of opinion among professional educators themselves on this point is made evident by an article which President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University has in the same number of "The Educational Review," wherein he takes issue with General Francis A. Walker, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; David S. Jordan, President of the new Stanford University in California; and Professor Goodwin of Harvard, as to what should constitute a liberal education. General Walker had contended that the scientific schools were doing a work "not surpassed, if indeed equaled, by that of the classical colleges,"

and are turning out "better-educated men, in all that the term implies, than the average graduate of the ordinary college." Messrs. Jordan and Goodwin had contended that old ideas as to what constituted a liberal education had passed away, and new ideas, adapted to the demands of the time, had taken their place. The new ideas, briefly summarized, are: not to compel all students to take the same course of study, with Latin and Greek as the basis, but to permit each student to take the course which best suits his tastes and abilities, and to supply for each student the best facilities for pursuing the course of his choice.

It is not our purpose to follow the ramifications of this discussion, or to attempt to decide which method of education can more accurately be pronounced "higher" or "liberal." The great and encouraging facts which Mr. Comey's statistics and the discussion disclose are that the colleges of the country are attracting a steadily increasing number of students, and are making such changes in their methods of instruction as enable them to extend their influence to fields hitherto not occupied by them. Upon one point the disputants are agreed, and that is that the main object of education is to make good citizens. General Walker calls it adding to the "manhood and citizenship of the country," and President Gilman, in a passage which deserves to be put on record as a comprehensive and accurate definition, says of "liberal education":

> In every "liberal" course these elements should be combined: mathematics, ancient and modern languages and literature, science, history, and philosophy. The more one has of all these elements the better. It is obvious also that a "liberal" education is not to be limited by the period devoted to the college course or a course in technology. It begins in the nursery, it goes on in the domestic circle, it continues through school, college, and university, and ends only with life. All science, all knowledge, all culture, not essential to bread-winning, is "liberal," no matter whether it be acquired in the oldest or youngest university, in the old-fashioned college or the modern school of science. I may go further and say that "liberal" culture may be acquired without the aid of seminaries; scholars may appear in the walks of business, in the solitudes of rural life, on the boards of a theater, in politics, in philanthropy, in exploration; and they cannot be produced by narrow, cramping, or servile training.

All this amounts to saying that the best college course is only a beginning, and that its main purpose, its highest achievement, is to start the student in the right direction. "Culture," says Matthew Arnold, "is reading; but reading with a urpose to guide it, and with system. He does a good work who does anything to help this; indeed, it is the one essential service now to be rendered to education." That is what the college ought to teach first of all, and if the instruction be thoroughly imparted, the foundation of a liberal education is laid. Montaigne said he read books that from them he might learn "how to live and die well." Every student who is taught to read or study with a purpose finds in his books the secret of how to live and die well; that is, learns how to become a good citizen, that most valuable influence in a community. He carries into life a deference to acquired knowledge, a respect for the teachings of experience, which are of incalculable value among a people prone to think that they can solve all problems for themselves, and have no need to profit by the results of similar experiments by the generations that have preceded them.

Especially is this true of the study of political science, to which many of our colleges, following the excellent example of Harvard and Columbia, are devoting increasing attention. In this they are doing the whole country a most useful and greatly needed service: a subject which we shall soon discuss in its bearings on public life.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Pressing Need of Forest Reservation in the Sierra.

NONE too early comes the announcement that the Interior Department has under consideration the establishment of a very extensive forest reservation in California's Sierra Nevada, to the south of the Yosemite National Park, and including the wonderful King's River Cañon described by Mr. John Muir in the November CENTURY.

It will be remembered that by a recent enactment of Congress the President was authorized to withdraw from the offerings of public lands for sale those districts where the preservation of the forests might appear, in his discretion, to be necessary for the security of the supply of water for irrigation and other purposes. Under that act an important addition has been made to the Yellowstone National Park, and, more lately, a territory largely exceeding a million acres in extent has been designated as a reservation in the State of Colorado, the area thus set apart covering much of the higher watershed of the Colorado River. The projected new reservation in California would perhaps be the most notable of all these judicious undertakings, whether the extent of domain be considered, or attention be turned to the varied splendor of the scenery, or to the effect as insuring a permanent yield of lumber according to the efficiency of the system of forestry, or yet to the influence on agriculture in the lowlands. As contemplated, the proposed reservation would include the sources to which the upper San Joaquin Valley, comprising the great counties of Fresno, Tulare, and Kern, must forever look for a supply of water for that irrigation which is necessary to successful agriculture in this land of inadequate rainfall. It would also include those steep declivities on which, if denuded of their restraining vegetation, the melting snows and falling rains would unite to form torrents that would, a little later, take the form of such devastating floods as have but recently taught the Spaniards how Nature revenges herself on those who trifle with her forces.

At present the population of the whole valley region overlooked by the proposed reservation is probably not more than 70,000 in number. Under comprehensive irrigation the land would easily be able to support sev-

eral millions of inhabitants, and all in a high average of rural or urban comfort. Even a cursory inspection of the wealth of those irrigated oases which have been created at intervals along the line of the railway, during the last dozen of years, is enough to carry conviction that the head-gate of the irrigation ditch is the door to a future whose magnificence cannot easily be overdrawn by the liveliest fancy. In the county of Fresno alone there are now about 150,000 acres actually watered by means of canals, and thus brought into an admirable condition of prolific and highly remunerative husbandry. The canals existing would suffice for the irrigation of several times the acreage named, and the counties of Tulare and Kern are ambitious rivals of their neighbor in the matter of profitable agriculture through the vivifying influence of the ditch. Yet all that has been accomplished and the vastly greater results that may be accomplished in the proximate future are imperiled to satisfy the desire of a few men for gain, and by the supineness of the many in the face of dangers that promise disaster to the well-being of their children, if not of themselves.

That the hazards which have accumulated under the policy of indifference are not imaginary is perfectly well known to such persons as have considerable knowledge of the mountains. Not long ago one of the best-informed landed proprietors in the San Joaquin Valley related that he had traveled over about 700 square miles of the King's River watershed, and had rarely seen a tree under thirty years of age. The age of the youngest trees at all commonly noticeable would therefore nearly coincide with the invasion of the mountains by numerous bands of sheep, and with the attendant fires due to negligence or deliberate incendiarism. With no younger growth coming on and with the mature or maturing trees rapidly vanishing in flame, or by natural causes, it is easy to foresee what will soon be the fate of those forests (which are occasionally described as "inexhaustible") under the policy of public inaction. Add to the destructive agencies already at work the uncontrolled operations of lumbermen, who are only now beginning to push their industry on a formidable scale in the part of the Sierra in question, and the disappearance of the forests that stand guard over the welfare of the San Joaquin Valley becomes a supposition whose realization may well be witnessed by men now long past youth. "If the policy heretofore followed," says an unusually well-informed correspondent of the writer, "be much longer continued, we shall have so denuded the rock of our mountain ridges that within half a century all our streams will be torrents for a few brief weeks in spring and dry beds of sand all the rest of the year. Massive reservoirs of masonry will have to be built at vast expense to take the place of the beautiful reservoirs of pine and redwood which nature created."

With reference to the advisability of the projected reservation, the present writer was led of late to make some extended inquiry concerning the opinions held by men of acknowledged enlightenment, of large views, and whose interests in the San Joaquin Valley are of undoubted extent. The result of this inquiry was to disclose a uniform agreement in the idea that there should be an immediate abandonment of the old policy of *laisser-faire*. As fairly representative I quote, by permission, the substance of the reply made by Hon. C. C. Wright, a gentleman known to all Californians as the author of the Wright Irrigation Act, whereby the system of irrigation districts sustained by public taxation has been introduced as one of the most noteworthy parts of the order of the State. Mr. Wright's letter says:

> I think it would be universally admitted that the existing supply of water in the streams, if all conserved, is sufficient to meet present and, very likely, prospective uses, so far as the demands of irrigation go. The paramount importance of comprehensive irrigation is almost, if not quite, unanimously admitted. The interests to be served by the removal of the forests, as compared with those to be secured by comprehensive irrigation in the great valleys of California, are insignificant. So far as additional reservations will secure the use and deter the abuse of forest areas, they ought to be established. I consider Federal control and action as the only practicable means of affording the protection needed.

To the San Joaquin Valley the subject of transportation by water is second in importance only to that of irrigation. Such transportation will, however, soon be listed among the dim recollections of things that were, or that might have been, unless prompt measures shall be taken to restrain the flood-borne detritus from the hills, now laid bare by the hoof of the sheep and by fire. As a sufficient warning of the most practical description, one need only point to the ruined navigation of the Sacramento River, and to the buried farms lining the course of that stream, which were, not so many years ago, the pride of northern California. The whole of that melancholy and calamitous work is the result of causes strictly analogous to the denudation which has made such progress on the sierras that slope toward the valley of the San Joaquin, and which has already had the most injurious effects on the navigation of the river of that name. There is one stretch of thirteen miles where the detritus from the mountains has during the last few years formed bars that divert the water into sloughs leading off from the main channel. On this stretch boats drawing six feet of water had formerly no difficulty in navigating. I am informed by a letter of Mr. H. J. Corcoran, of Stockton (who represents the river navigation interests), that the channel has now a maximum depth of thirteen inches. It is perhaps needless to add that Mr. Corcoran "is in every case in favor of the preservation of the forests."

In the case of the Sacramento River the National Government has interfered to prevent further destruction; but before the interference the damage had reached such an extent that if a practicable remedy be at all applicable it will be attained only by the means of heavy pecuniary expenditure. It is not too late to save the San Joaquin. Little money will be needed for the undoing of the mischief already wrought. And for the future there need be no fear if the plain, common-sense method of precaution be adopted,— the method of maintaining at every point the only means — to wit, forest vegetation — by which the mountains can be prevented from becoming the worst foe, instead of the best friend, of the inhabitants of the valley.

After nearly six continuous years spent in the Sierra, the writer entertains not a shadow of doubt of the truth of what is said by Mr. Emil Newman, of Porterville, Tulare County:

> I, for one, believe that the reservation of forest lands in the mountains, and intelligent legislation in regard to the preservation of the forests, are absolutely necessary in order to prevent this valley from reverting to desert conditions.

George G. Mackenzie.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Responsibility for Political Corruption.

IT is the habit of many persons who deplore the existence of corruption in American politics to place the main responsibility for it upon the ignorant voters. "If we had not such a large ignorant vote, a great deal of it foreign," they say, "we should get along much better. We should not have so much money used corruptly in carrying elections, or in influencing the course of legislation." Is this an accurate diagnosis of the case? Let us consider the chief forms of corruption, and see whether it is.

To begin with national politics, the chief method of corruption is the use of large sums of money in carrying Presidential elections. A great deal of this money is used for legitimate purposes, but a great deal more of it has been used in the recent past for the direct purchase of votes. This was conceded to be the case in the campaign of 1888, when both political parties raised unprecedentedly large campaign funds, each making excuse that it must do so to counteract the other. The corrupt purpose of these rival funds was disclosed by the fact that they were raised during the final days of the campaign, when the legitimate work of electioneering had been finished. There were no more documents to be distributed, no more halls and headquarters to be hired, few or no more parades to be organized or mass meetings to be held.

Who supplied the money for those funds? Did it come from the ignorant and foreign portion of the electorate, or from its intelligent, native, and more respectable elements? It is unnecessary to answer these questions. Did not the contributors suspect that their money was to be used for corrupt purposes? If they did not, what other use did they think would be made of it? If they did suspect, why did they, as reputable citizens, upright and honorable members of society, contribute it? Simply because they had become so interested in the campaign, so desirous of partizan victory, that their moral sense was blunted to practical extinction. They shut their eyes and consciences at the same time; gave their money, asked no questions as to its use, and got ready to toss up their hats with joy at the victory which they hoped it would bring. Yet if their money went into the hands of a professional corruptionist, who distributed it among his agents, which agents went with it into the slums of great cities and bought with it the votes of ignorant and foreign-born electors, thus debauching the suffrage—upon whose head rested the responsibility? Which was the more guilty in the sight of God and man, the poor, ignorant wretch who yielded to the temptation of the man who went to him with the money in his hand, or the respectable, intelligent, honorable member of society who supplied the temptation?

Partizanship is not the only motive for such giving. Positions of honor and profit in the public service, legislation of great value to private business interests, are bought and sold in advance of election, the goods to be delivered in case of success at the polls. Here again the authors of the corruption are the men who supply the money, not the men who are tempted to take it at the sacrifice of their honor.

When we come to State and municipal politics, we find the same evil of corruption in elections traceable to the same sources, and we find an even greater one in the buying and selling of legislation in the legislative bodies. It is a matter of common knowledge that all the great railway and other corporations, all the banks and chartered institutions which have large vested rights and interests to protect, are obliged to keep close watch by means of hired agents upon the law-making bodies of the various States, to guard themselves against hostile legislation, or to promote the passage of favorable measures. In many instances large sums of money are devoted each year to this work in the legislatures. It is disguised under some such term as "legal expenses," but the managers of the corporations and institutions who authorize its expenditure know what its purposes are. It is admitted, indeed, by many of them that the money is used for corrupt purposes, but it is claimed that such use is an absolute necessity for the protection of the property which is in their charge. They argue that so long as legislative bodies are constituted as they are at present, with venal elements frequently holding the balance of power, direct bribery is the only method for warding off injurious legislation, or securing desirable legislation.

Before inquiring as to the responsibility for this kind of corruption, let us see to what it leads. It has brought into public life a class of men known as legislative "jobbers" or "strikers." Frequently, in order to get elected, these pay sums several times as large as the salary which the office affords, their object being to get into a position in which they can traffic in legislation. They introduce measures designed to injure corporate and vested rights, in order to be "bought off" from pressing them. They organize "cliques" and "combines," and require payment for the votes of this organized gang of plunderers for or against any measure in which they think there is "something for them." These men would never have thought of going into a legislature had not the business of paying for legislation been encouraged and built up by the corporations and other aggregations of capital.

Is there any doubt about the responsibility for this kind of corruption? Does it rest upon the miserable creatures who have been attracted, like flies to offal, by the bribes offered in the halls of legislation, or upon the men of character and standing in the community who as presidents, directors, and managers of corporations and institutions furnish the bribes? What would happen if these presidents, directors, and managers, from one end of the land to the other, were to come together and declare that henceforth not a cent would they authorize for use in influencing legislation of any kind? What would happen if they were to agree that in every instance in which a demand were made upon them by a legislator or his agent for money as a price of legislation, they would make public exposure of the same, and do their utmost to have the guilty person punished? Would not the whole nefarious and demor-

alizing business disappear, and with it the legislative "jobbers" and "strikers" it has bred and nourished until they have made popular government a mockery, and the halls of legislation, in more than one instance, a den of thieves?

There has never been any corruption in politics, in any nation that the world has ever seen, in which the responsibility did not rest upon the man who offered the bribe rather than upon the man who took it. It does not lessen this responsibility if there be one or a dozen middlemen between the bribe-giver and the bribe-taker. What is wanted is a moral sense which will be as keen in political matters as it is in private and commercial matters. No reputable man ought to give a dollar for political purposes unless he can have in return an accounting for its use. Every man who contributes to a large campaign fund, to be expended by a professional corruptionist without any public or private accounting of the uses to which it is put, is an accomplice in a gigantic scheme of bribery which he has helped to make possible. Every man who contributes a penny to the blackmail levied against him, either as an individual or as a member of a corporation, is an accomplice in the systematic debauching of popular government which is in progress in the legislative bodies of this country to-day.

Why is it that it is so difficult to secure a more honest administration of the government of a great city like New York? There are many reasons, but the chief of them is not the cupidity and ignorance of the lower class of voters. Why do men not only consent to pay "assessments" to the Tammany dictators as the price of nominations for office, but why do they also consent to contribute directly to its campaign funds under fear of hostile treatment in case they refuse? An instance is within our knowledge in which the members of a firm were as individuals deeply interested in the campaign of the People's Municipal League against Tammany Hall in 1890, and as individuals were contributors to the League's fund, yet as a firm they contributed also to the Tammany Hall fund in order to be on good terms with Tammany after election. The idea that their moral obligations as good citizens were greater than their business interests did not occur to them, or, if it did, was not powerful enough to control their conduct.

Instead of being the source of our political corruption, the ignorant voter is the victim of it. If he be foreign-born, almost the first lesson he receives in American politics is that elections are controlled by corrupt men for corrupt purposes, and that the rich and respectable members of American society supply money for this work of debauchery. Instead of educating him to a high and just conception of his duties and privileges as a citizen, we are teaching him the lowest one possible. The dangerous consequences of such teaching need not be pointed out. Every instinct of patriotism, as well as every moral obligation, ought to show to every man who loves his country what his duty is in the premises.

A New Movement in Municipal Reform.

A FEW public-spirited young men in New York City have set on foot a project which ought to find imitators in all other large cities of the land. They have founded a City Club, composed of men who are in favor of better municipal government, and who are sufficiently anxious to obtain it to work together for that end without regard to the considerations of national politics. It is proposed to have a club-house which, in addition to the usual accompaniments of such buildings, will have facilities for publishing and distributing documents and other educational literature. The minimum membership of 500, proposed as a beginning, was quickly reached, and the membership is approaching its first thousand. The idea is to organize ultimately the intelligence and morality of the community as thoroughly as the cupidity and ignorance of it have for years been organized by the political machines, and thus to make the former a power which shall drive the latter from the control of the government.

The alacrity with which eminent citizens of all political faiths have joined in the movement furnishes evidence, as encouraging as it is surprising, that there is an abundance of public spirit in the city which has generally been accused of having less of that quality than almost any other in the country.

But in how many other cities do the most intelligent elements of the population neglect entirely municipal affairs for the greater part of the time, taking only a brief and often misdirected interest in them for a few weeks preceding an election? The men who make politics their occupation and means of livelihood devote all their energies to the business every day in the year. They have their meeting-places, or halls, and their organization is in constant readiness for a contest. They would never make the blunder of allowing their organization to go to pieces after each election, trusting to luck to get it together again in time to carry the next election.

There is not a city in the land in which the respectable and intelligent citizens are not in an overwhelming majority. Bad municipal government in the United States, which is the almost universal rule, exists only because of the refusal of these citizens to take control of their own affairs. They allow themselves, in the first place, to be divided into two factions because of their national political affiliations. This gives the politicians who get their living out of bad municipal government their most important point of vantage: they have the enemy surely and permanently divided. Having given the politicians this advantage at the outset, the intelligent and respectable citizens give them the further advantage of refraining from all permanent organization. These are notorious facts, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon them, or upon the results which flow naturally from them.

The City Club idea is aimed directly at the two worst evils of our present system. It requires its disciples to say that they will leave national politics out of the problem, and that they will enroll themselves as members of a permanent organization, paying annual dues for its support and for the prosecution of its work, and holding themselves in readiness at all times to unite in a common movement for a common purpose. It is based on the belief that the intelligent citizen will find in civic pride an incentive to political work as powerful and absorbing as the ignorant and corrupt politician finds in the spoils of office. We do not believe that this is a misplaced confidence. There is no lack of civic pride in any city of America. It exists everywhere in constantly increasing volume, because of the shame which the scandals of municipal misgovernment are bringing upon us as a people. With proper organization it can be converted into a tremendous power for good, and

such organization the City Club idea seems surely to promise.

Every patriotic citizen, and every sympathizer with the hardships and sufferings of his fellow-creatures, ought to rejoice at an opportunity to join an organization of this character. Municipal misrule is a scandal and a shame, but its most deplorable aspect is the suffering which it causes to the most helpless portion of every city's population, the poor. It is upon them that the evil of dishonest and ignorant government bears most heavily in the end. In the model governments of cities like Glasgow, Berlin, Edinburgh, and Birmingham, it is the poor whose health, happiness, and security are most carefully provided for and protected. In many of our cities the government not merely ignores their needs, it brutally aggravates and multiplies their distresses. It does nothing to soften the hardness of their lives, but nearly everything possible to make their burdens heavier.

Another Word on "Cheap Money."

WITH the failure of the free-coinage bill in Congress, the danger that this country might be called upon to pass through the quagmire of a fresh cheap-money experiment seems to have been averted, for the present surely, and in all probability for a long time to come. It is apparent now that whatever of popular sentiment there may have been behind the free-silver movement at its beginning, there was very little behind it at the time of the free-coinage bill's failure, and even less at this moment than there was then. The American people have always shown great quickness in educating themselves on financial and economic questions, and the sudden subsidence of the free-silver "craze" shows that the work of education, so far as that form of cheap money is concerned, has been practically accomplished.

THE CENTURY rejoices sincerely in the assurances which have come to it from many sources that its efforts to assist in this work of education have not been unsuccessful. Now that the work is ended for the present, it may not be amiss, in taking leave of the subject in these columns, to quote a few striking passages, on the evils of cheap money, from the writings of two masters of vigorous English who studied different phases of those evils in former times. The truth of their forcible language will be all the more appreciated now, since we are coming more and more each day to a proper realization of the perils from which, as a nation, we have had so narrow an escape.

In 1722 one William Wood, a hardware merchant, obtained from the British crown a patent to coin copper money for Ireland to the amount of £108,000. He had no power to compel any one to take his halfpence, which he coined under this grant and sent to Ireland; and when a large batch of them arrived there the people refused to take and use them as money. They were made of such base metal, and were so much smaller than the English halfpence, that they were worth in gold or silver not more than a twelfth of their face-value. When the Irish people refused to accept them as money, there was talk of Wood's obtaining orders from the crown compelling the king's commissioners and collectors of customs in Ireland to take them as money, and thus force them into circulation. Upon this proposition Dean Swift, then in the full vigor of his wonderful powers as a controversialist, published a series of pamphlets or letters addressed to the tradesmen, shopkeepers, farmers, and common people in general, on the subject of the debased coin, which made a powerful impression in both England and Ireland, and hastened the repeal of Wood's patent. These letters were signed "Drapier," and are known in the collections of Swift's works under that title. We shall make a few quotations from them with a view to showing how perfectly his arguments against the folly of debased or cheap money, made 170 years ago, apply to the proposal to inflict upon the American people a debased silver dollar worth only 70 cents.

It was urged in defense of Wood's money that copper halfpence were scarce in Ireland; that the people needed more copper money for the transaction of their business; and that if the supply were greater everybody would be more prosperous. All that sounds very familiar. It was also said, in answer to a query as to whether Wood would keep his coinage within the £108,000 limit, that he would be guided in that respect by the "exigencies of trade." That phrase also sounds very familiar. Here is what Swift says on that point:

> Wood proposes that he will not coin above £40,000 unless the exigencies of trade require it: First, I observe that this sum of £40,000 is almost double to what I proved to be sufficient for the whole kingdom, although we had not one of our old halfpence left. Again I ask, who is to be judge when the exigencies of trade require it? Without doubt he means himself, for as to us of this poor kingdom, who must be utterly ruined if his project should succeed, we were never once consulted till the matter was over, and he will judge of our exigencies by his own; neither will these be ever at an end till he and his accomplices will think they have enough.

In reference to the effects of cheap halfpence on the people of Ireland, Swift said:

> Mr. Wood will never be at rest but coin on: so that in some years we shall have at least five times four score and ten thousand pounds of this lumber. Now the current money of this kingdom is not reckoned to be above four hundred thousand pounds in all; and while there is a silver sixpence, these blood-suckers will never be quiet. When once the kingdom is reduced to such a condition I will tell you what must be the end: The gentlemen of estates will all turn off their tenants for want of payment, because the tenants are obliged by their leases to pay sterling, which is lawful current money of England; then they will turn their own farmers, run all into sheep where they can, keeping only such other cattle as are necessary; then they will be their own merchants, and send their wool and butter and hides and linen beyond sea for ready money and wines and spices and silks. The farmers must rob or beg or leave the country. The shopkeepers in this and every other town must break and starve, for it is the landed man that maintains the merchant, and shopkeeper, and handicraftsman. I should never have done, if I were to tell you all the miseries that we shall undergo if we be so foolish and wicked as to take this cursed coin. . . . In short, those halfpence are like the accursed thing, which, as the Scripture tells us, the children of Israel were forbidden to touch; they will run about like the plague and destroy everyone who lays his hands upon them.

Carlyle, in his "French Revolution," uses scarcely less vigorous, and even more picturesque, language in regard to the *assignats* which were issued in France between 1789 and 1796. These were in the form of paper money, based at first upon the security of confiscated church lands, and afterward upon all the national domains and other property. They were issued to the amount of over forty-five billion francs, and be-

fore they were withdrawn depreciated to less than one three hundredth of their face-value. Carlyle records that a hackney-coachman in Paris demanded six thousand livres, about fifteen hundred dollars, as fare for a short ride, in the last days of the *assignats*. In regard to the first issue, he says in the first volume of the "French Revolution":

> Wherefore, on the 19th day of December, a paper-money of "*Assignats*," of Bonds secured, or *assigned*, on that Clerico-National Property, and unquestionably at least in payment of that,—is decreed: the first of a long series of like financial performances, which shall astonish mankind. So that now, while old rags last, there shall be no lack of circulating medium: whether of commodities to circulate thereon is another question. But, after all, does not this assignat business speak volumes for modern science? Bankruptcy, we may say, was come, as the *end* of all Delusions needs must come: yet how gently, in softening diffusion, in mild succession, was it hereby made to fall;—like no all-destroying avalanche; like gentle showers of a powdery impalpable snow, shower after shower, till all was indeed buried, and yet little was destroyed that could not be replaced, be dispensed with! To such length has modern machinery reached. Bankruptcy we said was great; but indeed Money itself is a standing miracle.

The miracle of the *assignats* consisted in creating what appeared to be something out of nothing; but it returned in due season to nothing, leaving ruin and desolation behind it.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Disputed Picture in Sparks's "Washington."

IN THE CENTURY for February, 1892, Mr. Charles Henry Hart undertakes to "refute" what is stated in my volume, "George Washington and Mount Vernon," concerning the error of Sparks in publishing a portrait of Washington's sister as that of his wife. But Mr. Hart, in his comparative study, deals with the wrong picture! He contrasts the Sparks engraving with a picture from Clarke County shown in our Centennial Loan Exhibition in 1889. Although to me it is plain that the exhibited picture was meant for the same person as the Sparks picture, it is a wretched daub, and looks like some local artist's attempt to paint Betty Lewis in advanced age with the dress of her early portraits. However this may be, it is aside from the issue. The portrait to be compared with the supposed Martha Washington is the unquestionable Betty Lewis at Marmion, of which an engraving appeared in THE CENTURY for April.

A satisfactory comparison cannot, however, be made between the two engravings. The Sparks engraver has made the lady much younger than she is in the original, and has slightly rearranged her beads, so far as I can judge from a blue photograph of the original now before me. On the other hand, the Marmion lady appears older in black and white than in the original, which is represented in New York by a full-sized copy, made many years ago by a competent artist for the late Captain Coleman Williams, one of the Lewis family. Since seeing the picture in the April CENTURY, I have closely compared the pictures again, and believe the only important difference between the undisputed Betty Lewis and the supposed Martha Washington is in a slight rearrangement of hair over the forehead. In the originals the two appear to be of the same age, and the portraits were probably taken successively, Colonel Fielding Lewis ordering one picture of his bride for himself, another for her brother. In order to show that they were not replicas, the artist has altered the hair slightly, and some few details; the flower held in the right hand is changed, and the figure, standing in one case, is seated in the other. If Mr. Hart will call on me, he shall be shown the copy of the Marmion portrait beside the Sparks picture, and a photograph from the original represented by the latter. I do not doubt that he will be convinced that, unless they be the same, no two unrelated ladies ever so miraculously resembled each other, or dressed so alike, even to the loops of the bow-knot at the breast, and ribbons floating out in the same way. I think, too, that Mr. Hart will admit that nothing less than a miracle could transform the lady of the Sparks picture, especially as seen in my photograph from the original, into the Mrs. Washington by Charles Willson Peale reproduced in his article in the February CENTURY.

It is not necessary for me to venture any theory as to the origin of the error in Sparks; but having some Virginia sentiment concerning the families connected by Mr. Hart with the matter, who are placed as I think in a false position, I must question the authenticity of his statement that G. W. P. Custis and Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Lewis are responsible for the publication in Sparks. If indeed they believed the portrait to be that of Martha Washington, they may have got the notion from the book of Sparks, who might have got it from a negro housekeeper. None of them could remember Betty Lewis or Mrs. Washington at so early an age as that of the portrait, and they might easily have been misled. But were they misled? Mr. Custis does seem to allude to this portrait as that of his grandmother, but evidently had no definite knowledge about it. He says it was painted in 1757—the terrible year in which Martha Custis, after the death of her two children, saw her husband sinking into the grave. Is it to be supposed that then, or in any of those years of affliction, this bereaved mother and widow was painted in *décolletée* costume, and gayest colors, as shown in the original of the Sparks picture?

In 1855 Colonel Lewis Washington, who pointed out the error in Sparks, made a careful investigation of all the family pictures, and corresponded with Mr. Custis on the subject. In a letter to Colonel Lewis Washington (August 4, 1855), Mr. Custis speaks of the "majestic" Betty Lewis, and adds, "There is a good portrait of her." To what portrait did he refer? Certainly not to the wretched daub with which alone Mr. Hart has compared the Sparks picture. No sane man could describe that as good, or its subject as majestic. Mr. Custis could hardly mean Colonel Lewis Washington's own picture of Betty Lewis. The "good portrait" may have been that at Marmion, whose characteristics he might

not remember. Or, finally, Mr. Custis may have been convinced in 1855, when Colonel Lewis Washington called his attention to the matter, that the portrait at Arlington, which Sparks had engraved, was that of Betty Lewis.

Moncure D. Conway.

A Word More on the Distribution of Ability.

IN the abundant comment upon the article about "The Distribution of Ability in the United States" which appeared in the September CENTURY, much criticism was mingled. To reply to this criticism in detail would be needless, and would occupy too much space. But all of it, I think, can be met by a few general statements, and the more easily as most of it proceeds from a misapprehension of the original inquiry and of the system upon which it was conducted.

In the first place, I did not create the statistics; I merely collected them, and they are as free from error as it is possible to be in tallying and classifying over fifteen thousand names. I should have been glad to give figures which would have gratified every one's local and race sensibilities; and if I had been making up the lists as a work of the imagination solely to please myself, I should not have reached the conclusion that Connecticut among the States and the Huguenot French among the race stocks showed the highest percentage of ability. I gave the results exactly as I found them, and had no idea what they would be until all the names had been tallied, classified, and finally counted.

Another criticism has come from a failure to recognize the plainly stated system upon which the work was done. I adopted, for instance, a certain race classification. It is perfectly fair to criticize that classification as such, but it is absurd to say that I have misrepresented facts because the results of a different classification are not the same as mine. For example, I classified the Irish and the Scotch-Irish as two distinct race stocks, and I believe the distinction to be a sound one historically and scientifically. It is possible, of course, to take another view of this arrangement of races, and perhaps to defend it. But to add a large part of the Scotch-Irish to the Irish, as one of my critics has done, and then to accuse me of misrepresentation because his result based on one classification differs from mine based on another and entirely different one, is unfair and meaningless, and does not touch my conclusions. The Scotch-Irish from the north of Ireland, Protestant in religion and chiefly Scotch and English in blood and name, came to this country in large numbers in the eighteenth century, while the people of pure Irish stock came scarcely at all during the colonial period, and did not immigrate here largely until the present century was well advanced. There seems no good reason why a people who were not here except in very small numbers should perform the impossible feat of producing more ability than races which were here and which outnumbered them many times. In the table of persons born in the United States the number of pure Irish stock is small because there was very little of it. On the other hand, in the emigrant table, which represents ability after the Irish movement began, the Irish stand high. The Scotch-Irish and Huguenots show the reverse. They stand very high in the tables of persons born here, and almost disappear in the emigrant table. In other words, the figures correspond, as they ought, with the facts of history and with the race movements.

The same principle holds true in regard to States. Communities cannot begin to produce native-born ability until they have been in existence as communities for at least the lifetime of one generation. For this reason the total amount of ability becomes less as we pass from the old thirteen States to those founded just after the Revolution, and thence through the different stages until the newest States are reached, where practically nothing is shown in the tables, simply because there has not been time for men and women to be born and to grow to maturity, and the active and able part of the population has of necessity come from outside. The criticism that birthplace should not be the test for the classification by communities seems hardly to require an answer, for a moment's reflection ought to convince any one that no other is practicable. Place of birth is no test of race, although it may be an indication, but it is a test for determining the community which produced a given man or woman. If we attempt to credit a person to the community in which he grew up or was educated, or in which he achieved his reputation, our only guide is discretion, and the classification could be disputed in every instance. The place of birth may sometimes be misleading as to the community which really produced a man or woman, but these errors are comparatively few; they balance, or tend to balance, one another, and the test itself is not open to dispute and is not a matter of personal discretion.

In addition to these general points, there is one specific objection which I wish to meet. Some of my critics said that it was not surprising that New England and New York showed such high figures, because "Appleton's Cyclopædia of National Biography" was a Northern and Eastern publication, and its editors were a New-Yorker and a New-Englander. It was intimated that if the "Cyclopædia" had been edited and published elsewhere, and by other persons, the result would have been different, and that the place of publication and the unconscious bias of the editors had given the States which showed the best results an undue advantage. This criticism was susceptible of a test which I have accordingly made. In regard to American ability the "Encyclopædia Britannica," whatever its merits or defects otherwise, is at least a disinterested witness, unswayed by either the State or race partialities of the United States. In the index of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" I find 317 names of Americans, who are not merely mentioned in lists, but of whom some account is given either under their own names or in connection with some general subject. Of these at least 250 would be placed without dispute among the 300 most distinguished Americans. Of the remaining 67 the right of some to be in the list would be disputed, while that of others would be rejected, by American judges. These last names, however, whether removed or left in, are so divided among races and States as to make no difference in the general result. These 317 names, therefore, selected by an entirely outside authority, I have classified and arranged just as I did those in the original article, and the results are given below. These tables explain themselves. It will be seen that they not only confirm the general trend and results of the Appleton tables, but accentuate the differences among the States shown by the latter, and fully sustain the conclusions of the original article.

TABLE A.

States.	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Literature.	Physicians.	Clergymen.	Lawyers.	Science.	Inventors.	Navy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Philanthropy and Business.	Art.	Educators.	Engineers.	
Massachusetts	25	3	31	..	10	2	7	4	..	4	3	2	2	..	93
New York	13	4	8	1	4	1	5	..	..	4	1	1	..	..	42
Pennsylvania	5	3	10	2	1	..	5	1	1	3	2	1	..	..	34
Connecticut	6	2	11	..	6	1	3	2	1	1	..	1	1	..	35
Virginia	15	8	..	..	1	1	2	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	29
Maryland	..	..	3	..	..	1	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	6
New Jersey	2	..	1	..	1	..	..	1	1	3	..	..	..	..	9
New Hampshire	6	..	1	..	1	..	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	11
Rhode Island	..	2	1	..	2	1	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	8
Vermont	3	..	1	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	7
Maine	2	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Tennessee	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	3
Delaware	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	2
North Carolina	3	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
South Carolina	6	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	10
Kentucky	3	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Ohio	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Indiana	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	3
Georgia	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	2
Louisiana	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Illinois	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
	97	30	69	3	28	7	26	9	8	21	7	8	3	1	317

TABLE B.

By Groups.

NEW ENGLAND.		
Maine	3	
New Hampshire	11	
Vermont	7	
Massachusetts	93	
Connecticut	35	
Rhode Island	8	
		157
MIDDLE STATES.		
New York	42	
New Jersey	9	
Pennsylvania	34	
Delaware	2	
		87
SOUTHERN STATES.		
Maryland	6	
Virginia	29	
North Carolina	5	
South Carolina	10	
Georgia	2	
Louisiana	2	
		54
WESTERN STATES.		
Tennessee	3	
Kentucky	6	
Ohio	6	
Indiana	3	
Illinois	1	
		19
		317

TABLE C.

Races.	Statesmen.	Soldiers.	Literature.	Physicians.	Clergymen.	Lawyers.	Science.	Inventors.	Navy.	Pioneers and Explorers.	Philanthropy and Business.	Art.	Educators.	Engineers.	
English	75	17	58	3	25	7	20	7	5	16	4	7	3	1	248
Scotch	5	6	3	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	16
Scotch-Irish	10	2	1	..	..	..	1	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	16
Irish	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Welsh	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Huguenot	2	2	4	..	2	..	2	..	1	1	1	..	..	..	15
French	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	3
German	1	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	6
Dutch	2	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	2	1	..	..	..	7
Swiss	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Spanish	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
	97	30	69	3	28	7	26	9	8	21	7	8	3	1	317

H. C. Lodge.

Note on "The Distribution of Ability."

THE writer of "The Distribution of Ability in the United States" has omitted to mention one circumstance which strikes me as a very material one. Be one's ability what it may, it is the pen alone that can confer upon him even the immortality of the biographical dictionary. Nearly all the writers and chroniclers of the country have been Northerners, and largely New-Englanders. As a consequence, local prominence, of whatever sort or degree, stood a much better chance there of falling in the way of the encyclopedia-maker, than if achieved among a people with whom literature was by far the most backward of all pursuits.

It has been said that a happy people have no history. It is self-consciousness and discontent, rather than naturalness and cheerfulness, that fill the libraries. Thus the Southerner, I opine, has come to be a maker of books.

But this is somewhat from the point. It is of course impossible even to estimate the effect of a State's backwardness in literature on the fame of her sons. That it must have some weight the author of the article mentioned will, I am sure, admit. Sallust said of the Athenians:

> The exploits of the Athenians doubtless were great; and yet I believe they were somewhat less than fame would have us conceive of them. But because Athens abounded in noble writers, the acts of that republic are celebrated throughout the whole world as most glorious; and the gallantry of those heroes who performed them has had the good fortune to be thought as transcendent as the eloquence of those who have described them.

David Dodge.

KITTRELL, NORTH CAROLINA.

By his own judgment, therefore, of what great poets are, he must be placed among them, and the office of genius, as he defined it, must be declared to be his. The millennium has not come, any more than it came in the first century. The cause Shelley served is still in its struggle; but those to whom social justice is a watchword, and the development of the individual everywhere in liberty, intelligence, and virtue is a cherished hope, must be thankful that Shelley lived, that the substance of his work is so vital, and his influence, inspiring as it is beyond that of any of our poets in these ways, was, and is, so completely on the side of the century's advance. His words are sung by marching thousands in the streets of London. No poet of our time has touched the cause of progress in the living breath and heart-throb of men so close as that. Yet, remote as the poet's dream always seems, it is rather that life-long singing of the golden age, in poem after poem, which most restores and inflames those who, whether they be rude or refined, are the choicer spirits of mankind, and bring, with revolutionary violence or ideal imagination, the times to come. They hate the things he hated; like him they love, above all things, justice; they share the passion of his faith in mankind. Thus, were his own life as dark as Shakspere's, and had he left unwritten those personal lyrics which some who conceive the poet's art less nobly would exalt above his grander poems, he would stand preëminent and almost solitary for his service to the struggling world, for what he did as a quickener of men's hearts by his passion for supreme and simple truths. If these have more hold in society now than when he died, and if his influence has contributed its share, however blended with the large forces of civilization, he has in this sense given law to the world and equaled the height of the loftiest conception of the poet's significance in the spiritual life of man. Such, taken in large lines and in its true relations, seems to me the work for which men should praise Shelley on this anniversary, leaving mere poetic enjoyment, however delightful, and personal charm, however winning, to other occasions.

George E. Woodberry.

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Popular Crazes.

NO portion of Professor James Bryce's "American Commonwealth" reveals more strikingly the author's remarkable insight into American methods and character than the twelve chapters on Public Opinion which constitute Part 4 of Vol. II. Every American who is interested in the efforts which his own country is making to work out successfully and completely the problem of popular government can read those chapters with profit, for he will find in them, clearly and forcibly set forth, many things that he has dimly conceived but has never been able to think out thoroughly for himself.

Professor Bryce holds that "in no country is public opinion so powerful as in the United States," and in the course of his searching and able discussion of why it is so he makes certain observations which we wish to cite at this time as having an especial bearing upon the subject that we wish to consider in the present article.

Remarking that one of the chief problems of free nations is "to devise means whereby the national will shall be most fully expressed, most quickly known, most unresistingly and cheerfully obeyed," he says:

> Towards this goal the Americans have marched with steady steps, unconsciously as well as consciously. No other people now stands so near it. . . . Towering over Presidents and State Governors, over Congress and State Legislatures, over conventions and the vast machinery of party, public opinion stands out in the United States as the great source of power, the master of servants who tremble before it.
>
> There is no one class or set of men whose special function it is to form and lead public opinion. The politicians certainly do not. Public opinion leads them.
>
> A sovereign is not less a sovereign because his commands are sometimes misheard or misreported. In America every one listens for them. Those who manage the affairs of this country obey to the best of their hearing. The people must not be hurried. A statesman is not expected to move ahead of them; he must rather seem to follow, though if he has the courage to tell the people that they are wrong, and refuse to be the instrument, he will be all the more respected.

Professor Bryce goes on to argue that one reason why public opinion is so powerful is the universal belief of the people in their star, a "confidence that the people are sure to decide right in the long run," that "truth and justice are sure to make their way into the minds and consciences of the majority." Every one who has studied the history of this country knows how true all this is. Whenever a new peril threatens us from any quarter, either in the form of some abuse in legislation or in administration, or in the form of some fresh financial or economic heresy, the final stronghold of hope to which every anxious observer clings is the conviction that the people will decide right in the end. Our national history is the record of a succession of perils of one kind or another, suddenly averted at the very moment when escape from them seemed most impossible.

The recent collapse of the Free Silver Coinage "craze" makes a review of similar popular delusions timely. We have had many of these since the war, and all of them have passed away as suddenly as they arose, after a uniformly brief and absorbing period of existence. No one can contemplate them after they have

passed and not doubt whether they were really as strong with the people as they appeared to be; whether they might not be, after all, mere instances of what Professor Bryce calls the "mishearing" of public opinion. There was the Granger movement, which appeared in 1873, and which seemed to carry everything before it in the Western States. It did elect a governor in one of those States and legislatures in a few others, but by 1876 not a trace of it remained. It was followed by the Greenback movement in 1878, which threatened the supremacy of political parties in all parts of the country, actually gaining the control in Maine, polling many thousands of votes in nearly every Western State, and making inroads upon the old parties even in New York State. By 1880 nearly every trace of this "craze" had vanished. Next came the Labor movement, which sprang from the great strikes of 1886. In the fall of that year Henry George polled 68,000 votes, nearly one third of the entire number cast, as Labor candidate for mayor of New York city, and shrewd politicians were convinced that the Labor vote would be the controlling force in the presidential election of 1888. Yet when 1888 arrived, scarcely a trace of the movement, as a separate force in politics, was visible.

Following close upon the Labor movement came that of the Farmers' Alliance, with the sub-treasury money plan as its chief issue. In 1890 this was so powerful that it carried two Western States, and seemed certain to threaten the dominion of the Democratic party in the South. Yet in the elections of 1891 it cut scarcely any figure, and has been fading rapidly from existence since that time. The Free Silver delusion, which accompanied it, and remained after its demise, seemed, when the new Congress assembled in December last, destined to overcome all opposition, and to plunge the country into the most direful cheap-money experiment of modern times. Yet at the critical moment this peril was averted, and at the present time the "craze" itself has so nearly disappeared that one wonders if it really ever was formidable.

In every instance public opinion was the sovereign under whose commands the "craze" was abandoned by the politicians. As soon as they discovered that the people did not favor the movement, they hastened to turn against it. It is, of course, impossible to say whether or not the people had ever been so strongly in favor of any of these various "crazes" as the politicians supposed. Undoubtedly more were in favor of them at their birth than at the moment of their abandonment, for in the intervening period the work of education had been in progress, and the American people are quick to discover an error and equally quick in correcting it. We are convinced, however, that in nearly or quite every instance the politicians had, to use an apt phrase of Professor Bryce, "mistaken eddies and cross currents for the main stream of opinion." They had been so fearful lest public opinion should get ahead of them that they hastened to stimulate the "craze" in order to benefit by it, rather than to point out to the people their mistake and trust to their intelligence and honesty to bring them around to the right side in the end. As Professor Bryce well says, the statesman who has the courage to tell the people that they are wrong "will be all the more respected," but this is a truth which the lower grade of politicians is slow to learn.

What is Patriotism?

It was suggested some months ago by some one who was impressed with the need of a keener sentiment of patriotism among the American people, that such a sentiment could be cultivated by certain observances in the public schools. The chief of these was to be the daily display of the American flag upon all school buildings, and the daily formal salute of it by the pupils. It is indeed a pleasant and inspiring sight, and not without a patriotic effect upon children and the general population — the flag flung to the breeze from the school-house in the city street, or on the country hillside or valley. But according to our observation young Americans draw in a love of the flag and of their country as the British general in the Revolutionary War said the boys of Boston did — "with the air they breathe." They think the American flag the most beautiful in the world, and the American nation the most powerful and glorious on the earth. This is the spontaneous and unreasoning patriotism of childhood, and the country which did not inspire it would be in a sad condition.

There are no signs of a lack of this childish patriotism in this country. Concerning the supply of reasoning patriotism, which ought to be developed from it as the youth advances to manhood and takes his place as a citizen, the case is less clear. It must be said that many men carry through life, without change or development, the unreasoning patriotism of childhood, and are thus the easy victims of the sham statesmen and politicians who make patriotism not merely the "*last* refuge of a scoundrel," but, as the Rev. J. W. Chadwick said recently, the *first*. Men who take "my country, right or wrong," as the complete epitome of patriotism, are the most useful, though unconscious, allies of those who do the most to injure their country's fame. Lowell, with his unerring touch, has put his finger on the crucial test of all patriotism, by saying in regard to doubts about his own love for his country,

> I loved her old renown, her stainless fame,—
> What better proof than that I loathed her shame?

That is the true kind of patriotism which no country can have too much of — a patriotism which loathes everything that brings shame to the nation's honor, or to its reputation before the world. A patriotism of that kind makes short shrift with political tricksters and time-servers, by condemning them as disgracing their country and dishonoring its name. No nation is so great that it can afford to be unjust, or to act the bully toward weaker nations, or to conduct its public affairs in violation of moral and economic laws. The highest conception of a country is expressed in the Scriptural phrase, "Righteousness exalteth a nation." The real patriot is the man who wishes to see his country glorious through the reign of intelligence, truth, honor, and justice in all its public affairs, and through the high value of its contributions to the civilization of the world. The only kind of patriotism worth having is that which holds up this model of a country, and rejects as unworthy all that stands in the way of its achievement.

There is no more persuasive teacher of patriotism than the true politician or statesman, as Lowell has described him.

He is not so much interested in the devices by which men *may* be influenced, as about how they *ought* to be influenced; not so much about how men's passions and prejudices may be utilized for a momentary advantage to himself or his party, as about how they may be hindered from doing a permanent harm to the commonwealth.

Under the guidance of statesmen of this type, politics becomes a very different pursuit from what it usually is in this country. Of politics, in the true sense of the word, the American people have a very inadequate conception. What they think of when they hear the word is something very unlike this definition, which stands first under the word in "The Century Dictionary":

The science or practice of government; the regulation and government of a nation or state for the preservation of its safety, peace, and prosperity. Politics, in its widest sense, is both the science and the art of government, or the science whose subject is the regulation of man in all his relations as the member of a state, and the application of this science. In other words, it is the theory and practice of obtaining the ends of civil society as perfectly as possible.

Nobody can deny that we need in all parts of the land politicians of this character, earnest, able, trained men, who are so thoroughly grounded in the science of politics, who have such complete knowledge of governmental laws and social and economic principles, such familiarity with the history of politics and political systems in all lands and times, that they will be able when occasion offers to stop the progress of "crazes" and delusions, simply by showing from the teachings of human experience and the working of established laws the impossibility of their success in practice. In no country in the world are liberally educated men, in the true sense of the word, more needed than they are in the United States, and in no country in the world are they more powerful, for of all peoples, Americans are the most eager to learn the truth and the quickest to grasp it when it is presented to them. The breeding of citizens of this character in our schools and colleges is the surest way by which to develop patriotism of the highest type.

Trade Schools.[1]

In giving a half-million dollars for the endowment of the New York Trade Schools, Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has set the millionaires of the country an example which, it is greatly to be hoped, many of them will imitate. It would be difficult to conceive a more beneficent use of wealth than this. The object of such schools is to furnish the young men of the country with the means of learning, quickly and thoroughly, useful trades; that is to say, to supply them with the best qualifications for leading upright, industrious, and useful lives. We have in this country abundant school privileges, and are constantly enlarging our facilities for the education of youth who desire to live by brain-work as distinguished from manual labor; but for the youth who would be glad to fit themselves for lives of manual labor we have, until within a few years, furnished no educational facilities whatever.

One of the first men to perceive the need of an educational system of this kind was Colonel Richard T. Auchmuty, of New York city. About eleven years ago he established the New York Trade Schools for the purpose of giving young men instruction in certain trades, and to enable those already working in such trades to improve themselves. At first instruction was given mainly in the evening to pupils who were engaged in workshops during the day, and who were dissatisfied with what they were learning in them. Gradually other young men who had finished their school-days, and had no definite occupation in view, became interested. They were unwilling to learn a trade by entering a shop as apprentices, but they were very glad to avail themselves of this method of not only learning it rapidly and thoroughly, but without unpleasant or humiliating surroundings. In their eagerness to learn many of these young men joined both day and evening classes.

From small beginnings the schools grew rapidly, until at the end of eleven years the attendance was nearly 600, instead of 30 as at the beginning. The trades chiefly taught are plumbing, plastering, stone-cutting, painting, bricklaying, carpentering, and tailoring. Instruction is given by master mechanics and other competent teachers, and practical work is accompanied when necessary by the study of technical books and diagrams. The pupil is not only taught how good work should be done, but the difference between good and improper work. The purpose of the instruction is "to enable young men to learn the science and practice of certain trades thoroughly, expeditiously, and economically, leaving speed of execution to be acquired at real work after leaving the schools." The prices charged for instruction are scarcely more than nominal, relieving the schools of the charitable aspect and giving the pupils a manly sense of paying their way.

The benefits of this system of education are obvious and great. The thoroughness of the instruction sends out workmen of the best type, scientific, thinking, progressive men, who become the master mechanics and inventors of the future. They are the kind of workmen who give dignity to labor, and who, in addition to elevating the condition and character of their fellow working-men, make good citizens in whatever community their lot may be cast. If every city in the land were to have its trade schools, modeled after those established by Colonel Auchmuty, and nobly endowed as his have been by Mr. Morgan, the work of reducing the mass of idleness and consequent viciousness which exists in our large cities would be begun in the most effective way.

When Colonel Auchmuty began his experiment, trade instruction in schools was little known in this country, though it had long been in existence in Europe. In this country, in addition to the trade schools of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, trades are now taught to beginners at the Pratt Institute in Brooklyn; at the Free Institute in Worcester, Massachusetts; at the Hampton Institute, Virginia; at Clark University, Georgia; at Central Tennessee College; to the Indians at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania; in some of the colleges endowed by the United States land grant act; and in many asylums and reformatories. The Carriage Makers' Association in New York has a school for young men in that trade, and the Master Plumbers' Association in some cities provides instruction for its "helpers." We have made a beginning in this country, but have done little more than that. Colonel

[1] See also "The Need of Trade Schools," THE CENTURY for November, 1886, and "An American Apprentice System," January, 1889; both by Colonel Auchmuty.

Auchmuty's schools are now assured of a future of large and constantly increasing usefulness, and ought to serve as a model for others in all the large cities of the land.

These schools, in fact, supply the only means by which American boys can become skilled workmen. The old apprentice system has gone, never to return. Both the spirit of the time and the changed conditions of trade are against it. Outside the large cities, in the so-called country districts, boys can still be taught a trade by the workers in it; but in the large cities, where skilled labor is in demand, this is no longer possible. The trade-unions in these cities are controlled by foreigners who seek to confine their industries to men of their own nationalities. They not only refuse to teach an American boy a trade, but they combine to prevent him from getting employment after he has succeeded in learning it in a trade school. This is a situation of affairs without parallel in any country in the world, and one which will not be tolerated in this country when once public opinion has been aroused to a full comprehension of it.

Colonel Auchmuty has shown from statistics that out of $23,000,000 paid annually to mechanics in the building trades in New York city, less than $6,000,000 goes to those born here. The number of new journeymen trained outside the cities in the trades themselves is not sufficient to fill vacancies, much less to supply the constantly increasing demand for larger forces. Thousands of foreign mechanics come here every year, some to remain, others to work through a busy season and return to Europe with their profits. These foreigners have no sympathy with Americans. They control the trade-unions, which in turn control the labor market, absolutely in their own interest. They seek to keep wages high by closing the doors of employment to all comers not of their own kind. The result is that in free America, sometimes called the paradise of working-men, the field of skilled labor is occupied almost exclusively by foreigners who declare that an American boy shall not enter, either to learn a trade, or to find employment if he shall have been able to learn his trade elsewhere.

We present to the civilized world the astounding spectacle of a great nation, which boasts itself the freest on the globe, throwing open its vast and lucrative fields of skilled labor to the mechanics of all other nations, while closing them to its own sons. Was there ever a more incredible act of national folly! We have in America material from which to make the best and quickest mechanics in the world — that is the testimony of all competent authorities; yet we refuse either to train them or to give them work if trained. We deplore the existence of increasing numbers of idle and unoccupied young men in all our cities, and then accept conditions which compel a multiplication of the numbers. It is useless to put the blame upon the foreign laborers: they are merely improving their opportunity. The American people are responsible, and they must supply the remedy.

The first step toward the remedy is the multiplication of trade schools, and the second is the insistence upon the free exercise of every man's right to earn his living in his own way. It is surely not too much for the American people to say that their own sons shall not only be permitted to learn trades, but shall be permitted also to work at them after they have learned them. We advise any one who is desirous of seeing the kind of skilled working-man that the American boy makes, to visit Colonel Auchmuty's schools and look over a set of photographs of his graduates. He will find there a body of clear-browed, straight-eyed young fellows who will compare well with the graduates of our colleges. This is the stuff from which laborers are made who honor and dignify and elevate labor, not by agitating, but by being masters of their craft, faithful in its performance, and willing to share its toil with all comers, fearing honest competition from no quarter. Such men are at once true American laborers and true American citizens of the highest type, and the educational system which evolves them is a national benefaction of incalculable value.

OPEN LETTERS.

Camping Out for the Poor.

NEARLY twenty years ago I left New York late one afternoon toward the end of June to take my fortnight's vacation in a little hamlet a mile east of Moriches, on the south or ocean shore of Long Island, seventy miles away from New York. The day had been a particularly hot and exhausting one. The city literally panted for breath. As I walked down to the ferry I had to pass through some of the most miserable of the tenement-house districts on the east side, and for a few blocks I went along Cherry street, a most wretched thoroughfare blessed with a pretty name in grotesque contrast to the street's character. The slums were alive with people.

The shades of night seemed to bring no comfort to such streets as these. It would be morning before the heated masses of brick and stone cooled off, ready for another day's sun, for there was not a breath of air. I could not help contrasting the scenes in which I should find myself twenty-four hours later with this squalid, heated misery, and it really seemed as if I had no right to run away while so much wretchedness remained behind, unable to escape. I suppose that most of my readers have experienced this feeling when about to get away from New York in summer, and then, as I have so often done, they have put the unpleasant thought away with the consoling reflection that what little they could do to alleviate such misery, even by the sacrifice of their own vacations, would be but a drop of honey in this ocean of gall. We have also the habit of saying to ourselves that the poor people who remain in town the year round do not suffer as we imagine they do — they are thicker-skinned, and they have never known anything better.

But upon this particular occasion, although I was not an over-sensitive young man, the scenes upon which I could not shut my eyes haunted me for days, and I

felt that I was running away from a problem which ought not to be put aside. I still remember one picture of an apparently motherless child, sitting on the lower step of a big double tenement — a little girl of ten or twelve years of age, who was trying to sing to sleep two younger children, one in her lap and the other pillowed against her arm. The child was pale and tired, but ready to sacrifice herself for the sick and peevish little brother and sister whom the noise and rattle of the street kept awake. The father was crouched on the same step, in a drunken stupor, but cared for by the child. As I stopped to look at the pitiful picture, too common for notice in all these tenement neighborhoods — the child mother — I again asked myself what right a strong fellow had to go in search of sea breezes and quiet while such weaklings as these remained behind? But I soothed my conscience by dropping some pennies in the child's lap, and hurried on to my boat.

It happened that about twenty-four hours later I had occasion to study another family group. We had been fishing all day, and were on our way back to Moriches when our boat grounded upon the flats which fill these bays; and, there being no moon, we decided to sleep on board. One of our party descried a light on the shore a few hundred feet from us, and we pushed our sharpie off in that direction, hoping to find some natives who would pilot us to deep water. On the south side of a giant rick of salt grass we discovered a camp-fire, around which were grouped a father, mother, and five children. The man told us that he was a New York shoemaker, and knew nothing of the channels. They were on an island on the south side of the bay, and their only means of communication with the mainland was an old row-boat for which the man paid one dollar a month.

They had a tent, which was used apparently only to sleep in, and when I made the party a call some days later, I found the man working at a box of shoes he had brought with him from New York, to finish. The whole family looked like gipsies, they were so browned and hearty. The man told me that he liked that sort of life in hot weather, and had camped out for several summers. He did enough work to earn the very few dollars their supplies cost them, and in September they would go back to New York — he to the shop he worked in, and the children to school.

While these two pictures, both met with at about the same hour in the evening,— the one in the squalid, reeking, murky Cherry street, in which figured those little prisoners of poverty, and the other of island life and cool air,— impressed me deeply at the time, it was long before I drew any particular lesson from them.

It was not until years later that I began to ask myself why the poor people who suffer every summer in New York, and whose children die from heat, do not join my shoemaker on his island in Moriches Bay. Now, however, it is one of my hobbies that the New York mechanic and clerk can afford a far better outing in summer than he dreams is possible.

In the case of clerks or assistants in small business houses, such a course as I have to propose would not be possible, and in some trades, such as those connected with building, the hot months are the busiest and the men cannot get away. But in a large number of shops and factories the dull season comes in the hot months. I have not the slightest doubt but that the proprietors of thousands of large retail shops in all our large cities would be only too glad to give their clerks a ten-weeks' vacation provided salaries stopped during those ten weeks; and the same is true of the thousands of factories which are kept open on half time and often at a loss to the proprietor, who wishes to keep his men together. The tendency of late years, especially since the shorter hours of labor have prevailed, is to pay all workmen by the piece in factories and wherever such a course is possible. In many trades, such as the making of cheap clothing, cigars, etc., in which the work is done at home, it may be done in one place as well as another, allowing a small amount for getting the bundles of goods in and out of New York. I suppose that if the taste prevailed for such a life as seems to me desirable for the poor city family during the ten hot weeks of the year, when the city bakes and the children die of heat and bad air, at least half of the workers who live in the tenements might escape.

I am well aware that something of the same kind, but upon a more permanent scale, has recently been attempted without success. One of the benevolent societies connected with Mr. Adler's Society for Ethical Culture subscribed enough money to build a dozen comfortable cottages in a pleasant spot some twenty miles out on Long Island, and induced some poor families of Polish Jews who worked on cheap clothing to make the experiment of living there, the society making the rent almost nominal and also paying the express charges upon the packages of clothing sent in and out from the large shops which gave these people employment. It was hoped that the advantages of a country life, of pure air for the children, of lower rents than in their dirty, miserable tenements, of the possibility of a garden, chickens, etc., would encourage others to join such a colony. The result was disappointment, and after a year the experiment was abandoned. The people, especially the women, wanted to get back to the city; they complained that it was lonely. They wanted society — the noise and squabbles, the fights, the dirt, and the crowds of the tenements. This result showed that if these people were to be taught the value of fresh air and quiet, the process must begin with the children. Their elders were like the life prisoners who, when released from the dark dungeons of the Bastille, begged to be taken back — they had lived so long in the dark as to dread the light.

In such an experiment as I now propose, I wish simply to get such people out of New York during the heat of summer, when the death-rate is largely made up of infants and small children. The system under which such people rent their small tenements makes it possible for them to give up their few rooms at a week's notice. They can store their goods at small expense, and save enough on the rent to pay for their food during the weeks they are away. The rents paid by even the most miserable of these workers average $10 a month for two or three rooms. The "boss" who employs them cares nothing as to where their work is done.

Take the typical family of slop-shop clothing-makers. The mother and father sew all day, and the children live or die according to their constitutions. What is to prevent such a family from pitching its tent on some of the beaches which stretch out for more than one hundred miles along the south shore of Long Island, or in the Jersey pines? The spots along the south

shore of Long Island which are inhabited and valuable are as nothing compared to the wastes of equally pleasant land upon which a poor family may "squat" during hot weather, either free of rent or for a trifling payment to the owner of the land. If all the poor of New York wanted to "squat" on the Long Island beach, there might be objections raised; but of that there is no danger. The man who can get out of town must have at least a few dollars in his pocket, and every one who has worked among our city poor knows that the majority of these people live from hand to mouth; they are chained by the hardest of poverty to the great city. Fortunately, the average sober mechanic needs but a very few dollars to make such an experiment possible.

In some figures I gave in the course of an article published on this question I estimated, judging by what such outings in the past have cost me, that a poor family of six persons — two adults and four children — would be able to spend ten weeks out of New York at an average weekly expense of not more than $5. A tent, an oil-stove, some cots, and a few boxes of bedding and stores would complete the whole outfit. Even the oil-stove would not be needed every day if the family "squatted" on the ocean beach, for the beach is strewn with kindling-wood. I leave out of the calculation the cost of getting from and back to New York, as that depends upon the distance. Our typical family could go fifty miles and back for $10. The cost of getting a big bundle of clothing from New York once a week by express would not be more than a dollar. In case steady work was carried on, there would also be a sewing-machine to take. The oil-stove, the cots, the sewing-machine, are already owned by most of these poor families. The tent would cost from $15 to $25, according to size, and would last for years. The food would certainly cost less than in New York, for in most places along the Long Island shore there are clams, oysters, crabs, and fish, which the children can get with little trouble.

Now consider the drawbacks and advantages of such a life. Upon one side we place the isolation which seems to have such terrors for the tenement-bred poor; but if two or three families made the experiment together, this would disappear. There would be rainy days and the various unpleasant features and hardships of camping out. There would be no corner liquor-store for the man, nor corner gossip for the woman. The daily toil might be even a trifle harder, owing to lack of conveniences. Meat would be difficult to get and to keep. But look at the other side of the picture. First of all, while New York baked night and day, there would be clear, cool air for the little ones, worth all the medicines in the world. The children could run barefoot on the beach, could bathe in the surf and play in the sand; and what more, after all, can the millionaire give his children during these hot weeks?

If the man and his wife are above the common herd and are able to appreciate the quiet and beauty of the ocean beach in summer, the glorious rising and setting of the sun, a series of pictures beyond the power of any artist to copy, they will find more than repayment for any personal sacrifice they may make for the children's sake. I should imagine that most men not wholly unfitted for decent things and depraved by the corner grogshop would find in the majesty, the quiet, and the beauty of a summer evening on the ocean beach a comfort beyond words. Think of smoking a pipe after a day's labor, and watching the flame of a driftwood fire rising against a background made up of ocean and bay!

I should like to see some society undertake to teach poor people the possibility and value of such an outing as I have in mind. It would virtually be camping out for the hot months, a pastime commonly considered as within the reach of the rich or the well-to-do only. The proprietors of many large shops and factories ought to be members of such a society, for they can arrange to do without half their force in summer and save money by so doing. Employer and employed ought to coöperate in such a scheme. The employer will not be afraid of losing good clerks and salesmen; the employed will not fear loss of position, and will return in September better fitted for ten months of work than if he had lounged the summer away behind a counter. The tremendous waste of time in summer is recognized by every business man. If work of every description could stop from the first of July to the first of September, our mechanics would certainly have more to do when they returned to their shops, and they would be in better trim to do it, provided their eight weeks of vacation had been wisely spent.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle in the way of a wholesale realization of a scheme upon this plan is the fact that so few poor people have even the small number of dollars necessary to it. A man cannot stop work or stop looking for work if there is no bread in the house. Upon the other hand, it may be said that persons and families likely to enjoy and appreciate camping out in July and August are usually fairly provident. What might be done by a Camping-out Society would be to tell poor people where and how they might camp out, the advantages and disadvantages of the life, its cost, its ways and means. I should like to hear camping-out lectures in which people who had camped out would give their experiences for and against the life.

I should like to say to such of my conservative friends as scent socialism and vicious idleness in this idea, that if one per cent. of the tenement-house population is induced by a vigorous advocacy of the camping-out idea to make the experiment, I shall be amazed. One poor man whom I urged to make the experiment and take his sickly children to a bit of beach I knew, told me that the noise of the "bloomin'" ocean made him "blasted" tired. There are too many people who cannot see the trees for the forest. They have been in the Bastille of vile air, dirt, and death too long to realize what a world of content lies beyond the grimy tenement. But even if one family in every thousand could be induced to camp out next summer, the experiment would be worth making. I have been accused of fanaticism in my detestation of city life,[1] especially in summer, and I have advised people to try the country even if at some sacrifice of dollars and personal comfort. But in this instance I merely advise a better use of time that is now nearly or wholly wasted.

Philip G. Hubert, Jr.

A Search for Shelley's American Ancestor.

THE tradition that the grandfather of the poet Shelley was born at Newark, in America, of an American mother, was the scent which led me off upon a two-

[1] "Liberty and a Living," Putnam's Sons, New York.

weeks' record hunt, in behalf of THE CENTURY, and apropos of the Shelley centennial.

Timothy Shelley, born April 19, 1700, third son of John Shelley, of Sussex, England, emigrated to America, and is said to have married here a widow named Johanna Plum, and to have had two children born here, and named respectively John and Bysshe. It is said that Bysshe Shelley was baptized August 1, 1731, at Christ Church, Newark. With this tradition comes the statement that the house at Guilford, Connecticut, in which the poet Fitz-Greene Halleck passed the closing years of his life, had once belonged to an ancestor of Shelley, the English poet. There are other statements — such as that Timothy Shelley had followed the trade of apothecary in the colonies; that he had practised as a quack; that he had deserted his American wife, and that he had run away to England to avoid his creditors. It seemed natural to me to seek information where the American land-holding was, so I turned my attention first toward Guilford.

The New Haven Colony came from Massachusetts early in the seventeenth century, and in 1666 sent a branch colony to the Passaic, so that there is close historic connection between Guilford and Newark. In the library of the Historical Society at New Haven there is a carefully written manuscript of Guilford births, marriages, and burials, in which I found several pages of Shelleys. Among the 162 individuals therein mentioned there are many who bear Old Testament baptismal names, such as Shubael, Ebenezer, Benjamin, and Reuben, and two or three known by that of Timothy. There is no record of any Shelley taking a wife named Plum, maid or widow, and the name of Bysshe does not appear at all. Guilford still keeps its old colonial records, and there I found in the vault of the office of the town clerk vellum-bound volumes containing notes of the original apportionment of lands, minutes of boundary settlements, copies of wills, deeds, and bonds from the earliest date of the settlement. In these books are names of many Shelleys, from the first Robert, who came over in the *Lion* in 1632, and married Judith Garnet of Boston in 1636, to another Robert who owned the land upon which the old-fashioned frame-house once occupied by Halleck now stands. From this Robert this portion of the "home lot," to follow the description considered sufficient in the simple old days, came to Nathaniel Elliott, who gave it to his daughter Mary, the wife of Isaac Halleck and mother of Fitz-Greene Halleck, the poet. From this, doubtless, grew the story which gave the Halleck house to an ancestor of Percy Bysshe Shelley.

The Shelleys of the seventeenth century were nearer to the common ancestor, and when Timothy came over early in the eighteenth it may be that he found his first welcome from kinsfolk in Guilford, and that the first American Timothy, who died at Branford in 1738, was named for him.

A close search amongst the archives of the New Jersey Historical Society in Newark revealed the existence of a Samuel Shelley who in 1776 was a soldier in the War of Independence. The family of Plum is here abundantly evidenced by both printed and manuscript references.

Samuel Plum was one of the original party who came from New England. From his stock, which continued prosperously in Newark for many generations, came most likely the American wife of Timothy Shelley, who became thus an ancestress of the English poet. The Newark records show that the family of Plum was large and widely connected, and might well have furnished a daughter or a widow to mate with the handsome young Englishman. There is indeed notice of a Johanna Plum who died March 9, 1760, at the age of fifty-two, but it is difficult to decide whether she was spinster, wife, or widow. It is curious and apt that in the story of these early days there is much mention of a certain Captain Giles Shelley of New York, master of the bark *Nassau,* who fell into trouble with the New Jersey authorities in 1699 by landing a cargo of contraband goods at Woodbridge, and who lived not free from suspicion of strange doings upon the far high seas, and association with Captain Kidd. The church records, which would tell us beyond question where and when the marriage of Timothy Shelley and the births of his two sons occurred, went to feed the bivouac fire of some Hessian contingent or British troop; for it is well established that when Newark was occupied by the King's forces in the Revolution, old Trinity was used as a stable for the horses of the troopers, and on their departure only the blackened stones of the old building remained to witness the work done both by the priest who came to the cure of souls at the beginning of the century, and by the soldiers who came at its end to dispose of the bodies of the colonists.

In the office of the clerk of Essex County at Newark there is a book of old colonial court records which contains the information that "at a Courte holden the 4th Tuesday of November, A. D. 1734," Timothy Shelley sued David Hayward for the sum of £15, and that the sheriff returned that he had attached the body of the defendant. It also contains the entry of an action for slander during the January term, 1738, wherein Timothy Shelley was plaintiff and John Nettle was defendant, and the sheriff's return of arrest of the latter. The original narration or statement of the cause of suit might give us much information, but though I made a thorough examination of the papers relating to early litigation which are preserved in the custody of the Essex county clerk, I found neither the narration in Shelley *vs.* Hayward, nor that in Shelley *vs.* Nettle. It appears from these papers that there was a Benjamin Shelley in Newark in 1732, and that on April 10, 1734, one "Cunney High, Shelley's godson," was indebted to Samuel Wheaton in the sum of one shilling and one penny.

The office of the Secretary of State at Newark contains the colonial probate and real-estate records of East New Jersey, and here I found the will of a Widow Shelley, but she was of New York; her name was Heelegand, she had been a Van Horne as a maiden, and she had died in 1716, all against the hope that she had been the widow of Timothy. I suspect she was the widow of the sea-rover Giles, for I find that after writing his owners in 1699 that he had brought back with him from "Macadagascar" to their account twelve thousand pieces of eight and three thousand "Lyon" dollars, he soon after loaned three hundred "Mexican pillar pieces of eight" on a mortgage of lands on the Raritan River and at Barnegat, which mortgage, as is indicated by a subsequent record, appears to have come to the executor of his will. Heelegand Shelley seems to have had some interest in East New Jersey lands

and this mortgage is the only record by which such an interest is traceable.

The last place of my search was the office of the Register of Deeds in New York city. Little thinking to find anything of importance there, I found the most definite and interesting of all the records. In Liber 32 of Conveyances, at page 368, is a copy of a document which is in form a post-obit, and is curious enough to be repeated here in words and letters as it stands upon the record-book:

RECORDED for Capt. William Bryant of the City of New York, Mariner, this 30th day of May Anno Dom. 1743.

KNOW ALL MEN by these presents that I Timo Shelley of Newark In America, Merchant, my heirs &c am held and firmly bound unto William Bryant of the City of New York in America, Marriner in the sum of Two hundred pounds of Sterling money of Great Brittain to be paid to the said William Bryant, his certain attorney, Executors, Administrators or assigns, to which payment well and truly to be made and Done I do bind my Self my heirs Executors and administrators and every of them firmly by these presents. Sealed with my seal dated the six day of December In the ninth year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord George the Second by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France and Ireland Defender of the faith and so forth and in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven hundred and thirty five.

THE CONDITION of this obligation is such that if the above bounden Timo Shelley his heirs Executors or administrators shall and do well and truly pay or cause to be paid unto the above named William Bryant his certain Attorney Executor administrators or assigns the full and just sum of One hundred pounds sterling money of Great Brittain aforesaid and that so soon as he the said Timo Shelley shall be possessed of an Estate of the value Two hundred pounds a year sterling which now belongs to his father John Shelley of Fenn place in the county of Sussex in Great Brittain Esq. and that without fraud or further Delay then this obligation to be void and of none effect otherwise to be and remaine in full force and virtue.

TIMO SHELLEY [Seal].

Sealed and delivered in the presence of JOHN SHURMUR and THO. NIBBLETT.

MEMORANDUM that on the Twenty-eighth day of May Anno Dom. 1743 personally appeared before me John Cruger Esqre Mayor of the City of New York Thomas Nibblett of the same city victualler and made oath upon the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God that he was present and saw the within named Timothy Shelley sign seal and deliver the within written Bond or obligation as his Voluntary Act and Deed and that he the Deponent together with John Shurmur Did at the same time subscribe their names as witnesses thereto.

JOHN CRUGER.

It will be observed that this bond was not recorded until more than seven years after its execution.

The father of Timothy had died in 1739, and, presumably, Timothy had returned to England, taking with him his children John and Bysshe, and had entered upon the enjoyment of the "Estate," at least as guardian of the interests of a lunatic elder brother. The prudent mariner, since he was careful to put it on record, probably as soon as he learned that Timothy had left the colonies, doubtless enforced his bond in England against the Newark merchant, "his heirs, executors, or administrators." It may have been the enforcing of this obligation which created the report that Timothy Shelley had absconded from his creditors on this side of the water, but, reasonably considered, that should not, and no other record does, reflect discredit on his honest dealing in America.

John Malone.

"Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War."

MY circumstances, before and since the war, have enabled me to judge clearly and impartially, I think, of the ability and fairness of the views and conclusions of Dr. Tillett in his important paper in the November CENTURY entitled "Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War." A Southern boy, educated in Pennsylvania, and when a man married to a New York woman, and subsequently the president of one of the most important of the Southern female colleges, I can confirm almost everything on the subject that has been said by the author of the article and the correspondents whom he so freely quotes.

But there is one thing I know, which Dr. Tillett could not know, because he is so much younger a man, and has had his observations almost entirely confined to the South. For instance, he cites the fact that before the war self-support was never thought of by young women of good social standing in the South, and that their male relatives would never have allowed it. Was not that just as true of the North? Since reading the article I have reviewed my recollection of the state of affairs in social life, and I cannot recall a single girl of all my college acquaintances of whom that was not just as true as of the girls I had known in my boyhood in the South. Fifty-three years ago I came to New York, and the same was true of all the young ladies with whom I became acquainted here. Not one pursued studies that had any reference to self-support. I can recall the names of a number of leading families in the city, which then terminated on the north at 14th street. There was not a father in any household I entered who ever expected his daughter to become self-supporting; not a young man who, if the idea had been suggested to him, would not have regarded his sister as forfeiting social position if she had sought to "make her own living." Thirty years ago I first saw England, and the same was to a large extent true of social life there. I am sure that at that time no titled lady would have dreamed of opening a large millinery establishment in Regent street, London.

But now that is all changed. The last quarter of a century has altered woman's relative social condition in all lands, and Southern women have shared the general progress; and it is more remarkable in the South because young women in high social life there occupied a position very nearly that of the daughters of the English aristocracy, though their circumstances were suddenly and startlingly changed by the results of the war.

I can confirm the opinion of the distinguished educator whom Dr. Tillett quotes and whom I think I know. While I was president of the college in North Carolina "I had no pupils preparing for their own support." In 1853 M. W. Dodd, then a publisher whose store was in "Brick Church Chapel," which stood where the "Times" building now stands, published a little book of mine entitled "What Now?" It was an address to my graduating class of that year, a class composed of young ladies, the daughters of wealthy or well-to-do planters and professional men. After the war the American Tract Society desired to republish it, and, in preparing it for the general public of young women just beginning life, the changes I was compelled to make to fit the book for its new mission show

very strikingly the changed condition of young womanhood even then.

Now, as one of Dr. Tillett's correspondents shows, and as I have learned from other sources, the standard of scholarship has been greatly advanced in Southern colleges for women. Now "twenty-five per cent. of the girls look to supporting themselves when they leave college." Of course "*they* are most earnest and diligent in the prosecution of their studies." It is to be pointed out that two things are resulting from this: (1) that large numbers are pursuing less the ornamental and more the useful studies; (2) that the effect of their better scholarship in both departments is to stimulate powerfully the other students. So while the present generation of Southern girls can never become lovelier than their charming grandmothers, the new order is producing a larger class of better-educated women.

Charles F. Deems.

The Steering of Yachts.

I. A SUGGESTION.

UNDER the heading, the "Evolution of the Modern Yacht," appeared in the "North American Review" for October, 1891, an article over the signature of Lewis Herreshoff, praising the model of the *Gloriana*. Of the form of that craft I have nothing to say either in praise or censure, because I have never seen her. If she can outsail yachts of a different shape, that fact conclusively proves that hers is the better. Only one of the author's points do I wish to criticize. In praising the steering qualities of the *Gloriana* he says:

> In vessels of the usual form, when driven by fresh winds the water is piled up against the lee bow, and, owing to the bluff part of the bilge being wholly or partially immersed, the water it displaces forces the bow of the boat strongly to the windward, giving the vessel a tendency to luff, or turn toward the wind. This "luffing" influence of the lee bow must be counteracted by the rudder, resulting in labor for the helmsman and loss of speed for a double reason, the obstruction caused by the piling up of the water of displacement under the lee bow, and the drag on the boat by the rudder, seeing that it must be carried at an abnormal angle to produce the required effect.

If a boat or vessel at any time, whether running free or close to the wind, carries a weather helm, no matter how slight, the tendency in this direction will be increased as the breeze freshens, causing her to careen more and more. It is not difficult to find the reason for this. The farther the vessel lies over on her side, the less becomes the steering-power of her rudder. If we could suppose her to move on after she lay upon her beam-ends, and still have a tendency to turn her bow to the wind, the helm might be placed hard up, but it would be powerless to counteract the luffing influence, because, when in a horizontal position, the rudder has lost all its steering-force, although it is still a drag on the boat.

The rule is the same whether the boat is sailing in rough or smooth water, and whether she has a bluff bow or a sharp one. The scow and the yacht are governed by the same principle; namely, when the rudder is in the nearest to a perpendicular position that it ever gets,—if the stern-post is raking, it will be always somewhat inclined,—it exerts the greatest steering-force; when it reaches a horizontal position, it loses its capacity to steer altogether; and as it leaves the perpendicular and approaches the horizontal, it steers with diminished power; and, consequently, "must be carried at an abnormal angle" to do its work.

It will be observed that I have been stating the effect of the increased careening of the boat, and the consequent change of the position of the rudder on its steering-power alone. I have not been accounting for the tendency of the boat to luff under certain circumstances, but only for her apparently increased disposition to turn her head to the wind as she lies over on her side more, when the wind freshens, owing to the diminished steering-power of her rudder as it approaches a horizontal position. The main cause of this tendency to luff is the action of the wind on her sails. When the boom of a sloop is swung out to leeward, the influence of the breeze on her mainsail is the same as the finger of the spinner on the spoke of the spinning-wheel, it turns her around toward the wind—gives her a tendency to luff. If, while the sail remains at this angle with the keel, the increase of the breeze causes the boat to careen more, then the rudder loses some of its steering-power, and "must be carried at an abnormal angle to produce the required effect."

A result reached in a "rather obscure but interesting manner" is not quite so profitable as one the causes of which are clearly seen, and hence the above suggestion.

Isaac Delano.

II. COMMENTS BY MR. HERRESHOFF.

MR. DELANO has made an excellent beginning in the science of steering by his study of the action of the rudder, but if it be his desire fully to perfect himself in that art, closer observation will be required. The proper office of the rudder, as a factor in steering a sailing-vessel, is to create an equilibrium amongst several opposing forces, so that the desired control may be maintained over the movement of the vessel.

The careful designer seeks so to adjust the various factors that go to make up the proper balance of a yacht that the action of the rudder will be sufficient to counteract any excess that one force may exert over another. The chief thing to be done is to place the center of effort of the sail-area in proper relation to the center of lateral resistance of the hull. This is about all the designer can do; he trusts to the good sense of the master of the vessel to trim his sails properly, and to keep them in as good condition as to fit and setting as possible, all of which has marked influence on steering qualities.

The general proportions of the hull have a direct bearing on facility of steering, and the form also exerts more or less influence in the circle of forces that enter into the problem. Now if these various forces would remain always in the same relation to each other, steering would be easily performed; but with every change in the force of the wind and in the angle of inclination of the hull, new combinations are formed, and even new forces may be set up, so that the problem of steering, which might seem simple when considered as the rudder's work alone, really becomes often difficult and complex. Yachts of the "English type" nearly always carry a lee helm, when sailing close-hauled or slightly free, in fresh breezes; yachts of the old Ameri-

can type, like *Mucillage*, require almost a horse's power to steer them under the same conditions, carrying the while an abnormal weather helm.

When *Gloriana* and *Mineola* were approaching the Spit in the New York Yacht Club regatta last June, the latter yacht became in a measure unmanageable, pushing herself under the lee bow of the former yacht in a troublesome and unusual manner, the *Gloriana* all the while being under absolute control although she carried a heavier press of sail than her opponent.

These and many more circumstances convince me that other influences than merely the action of the rudder enter into the problem of steering, and I must still adhere to my statement made in the "North American Review," in October, 1891, that the perfect steering qualities of *Gloriana* in a great measure are acquired by the peculiar form of her entrance and by her manner of disposing of the water of displacement under her lee bow.

Lewis Herreshoff.

The Battle of the "Wyoming" in Japan.

It was with much pleasure I read in the April number of The Century Magazine the account of the United States Steamship *Wyoming* in the Straits of Shimonoséki, but I regret that the article should be marred even by a single omission or inaccuracy.

If my memory serves me rightly, "Master William Barton" was at that time Lieutenant William H. Barton. Acting Master John C. Mills should read John C. Wells, of Greenport, Long Island. I regret that the name of our ward-room messmate, an able officer, stanch friend, and popular with all the ship's officers and crew, has been omitted entirely from the article: namely, Acting Master William Tallman, Jr., of New Bedford. He it was, I believe, who was in command of the "after 11-inch pivot-gun" (not Wells), and therefore, if I am right, to him should be given the credit. Mr. Wells was the navigating officer, and the undersigned at that time was assistant navigating officer and officer in charge of the powder and shell division. It was a hot fight, and every one on board entered into the engagement with a determination to conquer or die. From the nature of our surroundings there could be no skulking, no straggling, no retreat. To be defeated by the overwhelming numbers meant naught but death eventually by the hand of our enemies, a fate much more horrible to contemplate than to meet death amid the heat and smoke of battle.

Mr. Griffis compliments our late commander McDougal and Lieutenant-Commander and Executive Officer Young none too highly, for they truly were men of steel, modest and fearless; heroes in all the word implies.

Walter Pearce,
Late Acting Ensign, U. S. S. "Wyoming."

COMMENT.

I thank Mr. Pearce for calling attention to my unintentional omission of the name of Acting Master William Tallman, Jr., though I was informed by the other officers of the *Wyoming* that Acting Master John C. Wells (which a mistake of the copyist made Mills) was in charge of the after pivot-gun. Master William Barton was not, as he has written me, made lieutenant until some time after the action.

William Elliot Griffis.

IN LIGHTER VEIN.

Along in June.

A Summer Series of Prairie Farm Fancies, by Doane Robinson.

WITH PICTURES BY E. W. KEMBLE.

I. MISTER TAPLEY.

Along in June
Sech craps I never seen,
The wheat stud up above knee-high
So kind of rich and blue-black green,
"I ruther calkerlate," sez I,
"I 'll go to town this afternoon
And buy a bran new bind-machine."

Come night, when Jones sot on the rail
A-whinin' 'bout the 'tarnal hail
Thet give the craps a swashin',
I sez,— a-pickin' up a pail,
And scoopin' up a bar'l of hail
To melt fer washin', —
"Wall, I don't feel half-way so mean
Es ef I 'd bought thet bind-machine."

II. HERDING.

No end of rich green medder land
Spicked out with ever' kind of poseys.
Es fer es I kin understand
They 's nothin' else on earth so grand
Es just a field of prairy roseys,
Mixed up with blue, gold-beaded plumes
Of shoestring flowers and peavey blooms.
Take it a warm, sunshiny day

When prairys stretch so fer away
Ther lost at last in smokey gray, .
And hulkin' yoke-worn oxen browse
Aroun' the coteaus with the cows,—
The tipsey, stag'rin' day-old calf
Mumbles a bleat and slabbers a laugh,—
And yearlin' steers so round and slick

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

A New Edition of "The Century's" Cheap-Money Papers.

IN compliance with many requests for an edition in larger type and more enduring form, the articles on "Cheap-Money Experiments," which appeared originally in this department of THE CENTURY, and were afterward collected and republished in a pamphlet, have been again republished by The Century Co. in an attractive volume. It is printed in large, clear type, and neatly bound in cloth. Some additional chapters, which have appeared in THE CENTURY since the publication of the pamphlet, have been added. In its amended form the book is, even more than the pamphlet was, a compact and comprehensive handbook of the most notable attempts which have been made in past and present times to attain State or national prosperity by making money "cheap and plentiful." No similar compilation is to be found in the whole range of economic literature.

In calling attention to this new publication of the "Cheap-Money" articles, it is pleasant to record the fact that since their first publication a death-blow has been formally administered to the Free-Silver heresy, which, in many respects, was the most dangerous "cheap-money" delusion that ever confronted the American people.

In writing about the evils which free silver coinage would entail, in THE CENTURY for May last, we said:

> No great party in the United States, in national convention assembled, will dare make itself responsible for the distress that would fall upon the masses of our population from free and unlimited silver coinage.

The national conventions of the two great parties have verified this prediction by putting into their platforms such explicit declarations against free silver coinage as to eliminate the question completely from the campaign. After their action it is safe to say that the danger of the free and unlimited coinage of a debased silver dollar has passed away, probably forever. The question has been taken out of politics, and it would be well for the country if all other financial questions could be taken out with it. In a thoughtful, intelligent, and patriotic address which he made on "The Silver Question in its Relations to Legislation," before the Iroquois Club of Chicago, in March of last year, Mr. James Herron Eckels stated this point in words which we cannot do better than quote as summing up accurately and forcibly the only sound view to be taken:

> I am not unconscious of the fact that in and of itself this question has no place in politics. Under right and proper circumstances, its solution belongs to the professed financier, and not to the professed politician; but, unfortunately, those circumstances do not now surround it. Through an error that in the past has been costly, and in the future bids fair to be fraught with disaster, it has been taken out of the list of business issues and thrust among those of a political character; and with regard to its political bearing rather than with reference to its effect upon the material interests of our country, it is being presented to the people.

The French Assignats and Mandats.

IT would have been reasonable to suppose that the experience which France had with cheap money under John Law's guidance in the early part of the eighteenth century, as described lately in these columns, would have imparted a lesson not soon forgotten. But such was not the case. Before the end of the century a new and not dissimilar experiment was made in the same direction, ending, like its predecessor, in failure and almost boundless confusion and disaster.

One of the first and most serious troubles which confronted the republic established by the French Revolution of 1789 was the scarcity of money. This was due to many causes, but chiefly, says Thiers, to the "want of confidence occasioned by the disturbances." The same authority adds the following general truth about circulation, which is applicable to all countries and in all times: "Specie is apparent by the circulation. When confidence prevails, the activity of exchange is extreme; money moves about rapidly, is seen everywhere, and is believed to be more considerable because it is more serviceable: but when political commotions create alarm, capital languishes, specie moves slowly; it is frequently hoarded, and complaints are unjustly made of its absence." To increase the supply of circulating medium, it was proposed that the National Assembly issue paper money based on the Church lands which had been confiscated by the Government. These lands were yielding no revenue, but were a heavy burden. The money, to be called assignats, was really a form of titles to the confiscated lands; for it was receivable in payment for them, and was designed, in addition to furnishing revenue to the Government, to bring about a distribution of those lands among the people. The debates of the National Assembly upon the proposition showed that John Law's experiment had not been entirely forgotten. There was strong opposition, but it was overcome by arguments that bear a curious resemblance to some which are heard in our day in favor of various forms of cheap money which are advocated for the United States. "Paper money," said one of the advocates of the assignats, "under a despotism is dangerous; it favors corruption: but in a nation constitutionally governed, which takes care of its own notes, which determines their number and use, that danger no longer exists." How like that is to the argument heard here, and in the Argentine Republic as well, that a great and rich and prosperous and free nation could make its own economic laws, invent its own monetary systems, and even defy the teachings of all other nations with entire safety! These curious arguments carried the day in the National Assembly, and a first issue of assignats, to the value of 400,000,000 francs, was issued in December, 1789. They bore interest, and were made payable at sight, but no interest was ever paid, and subsequent issues had no interest provision. The first issue represented about one fifth of the total value of the confiscated lands.

Yet with this solid basis of value upon which to rest,

the assignats never circulated at par. A few months after the first issue, demands began to be made for a second issue, as is invariably the case in all experiments of this kind. Talleyrand opposed the second issue in a speech of great ability, many of whose passages have passed into economic literature as model statements of fundamental monetary principles. "The assignat," he said, "considered as a title of credit, has a positive and material value; this value of the assignat is precisely the same as that of the land which it represents: but still it must be admitted, above all, that never will any national paper be upon a par with the metals; never will the supplementary sign of the first representative sign of wealth have the exact value of its model; *the very title proves want, and want spreads alarm and distrust around it.*" And again: "You can arrange it so that people shall be forced to take a thousand francs in paper for a thousand francs in specie, but you never can arrange it so that the people shall be obliged to give a thousand francs in specie for a thousand francs in paper." Still again: "Assignat money, however safe, however solid, it may be, is an abstraction of paper money; it is consequently but the free or forced sign, not of wealth, but merely of credit." In answer to the arguments of Talleyrand, the most effective, because most "taking," argument, if argument it can be called, was the following by Mirabeau: "It is in vain to compare assignats, secured on the solid basis of these domains, to an ordinary paper currency possessing a forced circulation. They represent real property, the most secure of all possessions, the land on which we tread."

The advocates of money based on lands who are heard in our country to-day will recognize their own doctrine in this resounding phrase of Mirabeau. It carried the day in the National Assembly, and in September, 1790, a second issue of assignats, to the value of 800,000,000 francs, bearing no interest, was ordered.

The decree for this second issue contained a pledge that in no case should the amount of assignats exceed twelve hundred millions. But the nation was drunk with its own stimulant, and pledges were of no value. In June, 1791, a third issue of 600,000,000 was ordered. This was followed soon afterward by a fourth issue of 300,000,000, and by a new pledge that the total amount should never be allowed to exceed sixteen hundred millions. But this pledge, like two others that had been made before it, was broken as soon as a demand for more issues became irresistible. Fresh issues followed one another in rapid succession in 1792, and at the close of that year an official statement was put forth that a total of thirty-four hundred millions had been issued, of which six hundred millions had been destroyed, leaving twenty-eight hundred millions in circulation.

Specie had disappeared from circulation soon after the second issue, and the value of the assignats began to go steadily and rapidly downward. Business and industry soon felt the effects, and the inevitable collapse followed. Ex-President Andrew D. White, whose tract, "Paper Money Inflation in France," is the most admirable and complete statement of this experience which has been published, says of the situation at this stage:

> What the bigotry of Louis XIV., and the shiftlessness of Louis XV., could not do in nearly a century, was accomplished by this tampering with the currency in a few months. Everything that tariffs and custom-houses could do was done. Still the great manufactories of Normandy were closed; those of the rest of the kingdom speedily followed, and vast numbers of workmen, in all parts of the country, were thrown out of employment.
>
> In the spring of 1791 no one knew whether a piece of paper money, representing 100 francs, would, a month later, have a purchasing power of 100 francs, or 90 francs, or 80, or 60. The result was that capitalists declined to embark their means in business. Enterprise received a mortal blow. Demand for labor was still further diminished. The business of France dwindled into a mere living from hand to mouth. This state of things, too, while it bore heavily against the interests of the moneyed classes, was still more ruinous to those in more moderate, and most of all to those in straitened, circumstances. With the masses of the people the purchase of every article of supply became a speculation — a speculation in which the professional speculator had an immense advantage over the buyer. Says the most brilliant apologist for French Revolutionary statesmanship, "Commerce was dead; betting took its place."

In the early part of 1792 the assignat was 30 per cent. below par. In the following year it had fallen to 67 per cent. below par. A basis for further issues was secured by the confiscation of lands of emigrant nobles, and a flood of assignats poured forth upon the country in steadily increasing volume. Before the close of 1794 seven thousand millions had been issued, and the year 1796 opened with a total issue of forty-five thousand millions, of which thirty-six thousand millions were in actual circulation. By February of that year the total issue had advanced to 45,500,000,000, and the value had dropped to one two-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part of their nominal value. A note professing to be worth about $20 of our money was worth about six cents.

The Government now came forward with a new scheme, offering to redeem the assignats, on the basis of 30 to 1, for mandats, a new form of paper money, which entitled the holder to take immediate possession, at their estimated value, of any of the lands pledged by the assignats. Eight hundred millions in mandats were issued, to be exchanged for the assignats, and the plates for printing the latter were destroyed. Six hundred millions more of mandats were issued for the public service. At first the mandats circulated at as high as 80 per cent. of their nominal value, but additional issues sent them down in value even more rapidly than the assignats had fallen, and in a very short time they were worth only one thousandth part of their nominal value. It was evident that the end had come. Before the assignats were withdrawn, the Government resorted to various expedients to hold up their value by legislative decrees. The use of coin was prohibited; a maximum price in assignats was fixed for commodities by law; the purchase of specie was forbidden under penalty of imprisonment in irons for six years; and the sale of assignats below their nominal value was forbidden under penalty of imprisonment for twenty years in chains. Investment of capital in foreign countries was punishable with death. All these efforts were as futile as similar efforts had been in John Law's time. The value of the assignats went steadily down. Bread-riots broke out in Paris, and the Government was compelled to supply the capital with provisions. When the mandats fell, as the assignats had fallen before them, the Government was convinced that it was useless to try to give value to valueless paper by simply printing more paper and calling it by another name; and on July 1, 1796, it swept away the whole mass by issuing

a decree authorizing everybody to transact business in any money he chose. "No sooner," says Mr. McLeod, in his "Economical Philosophy," "was this great blow struck at the paper currency, of making it pass at its current value, than specie immediately reappeared in circulation." In commenting upon this second experience of France with paper money, which lasted for about six years, Prof. A. L. Perry, in his "Elements of Political Economy," thus graphically and truthfully sums up the consequences:

> The distress and consternation into which a country falls when its current measure of services is disturbed and destroyed, as it was in this case, is past all powers of description. The prisons and the guillotine did not compare with the assignats in causing suffering during those six years. This example is significant because it shows the powerlessness of even the strongest and most unscrupulous governments to regulate the value of anything. The assignats were depreciating during the very months in which Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety were wielding the power of life and death in France with terrific energy. They did their utmost to stop the sinking of the Revolutionary paper. But value knows its own laws, and follows them in spite of decrees and penalties.

Campaign Blackmailing of Government Clerks.

MR. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, speaking in the name of the National Civil Service Commission, issued a timely warning in the July "Atlantic" against all levying of assessments upon governmental employees during the presidential campaign. He wrote with characteristic plainness and force, and set forth both the law in the case and the attitude of the Commission toward offenders with such clearness that his utterance cannot fail to have a restraining influence upon all persons tempted to violate the statute.

As he pointed out, the law seeks to provide both for the protection of the office-holder and for the punishing of the politician who seeks to get from him a portion of his salary. It provides, under heavy penalties, that no office-holder shall in any way solicit or receive assessments or contributions for political purposes from any other office-holder; that no person, office-holder or otherwise, shall solicit such contribution in any federal building; that no office-holder shall in any way be jeopardized in his position for contributing or refusing to contribute, as he sees fit; and that no office-holder shall give any money to another office-holder for the promotion of any political object whatever.

It is well to give these provisions the widest possible publicity at this time, in order that all men may become familiar with them and act accordingly. Mr. Roosevelt gives emphatic assurance that the Commission will protect all office-holders whose positions are threatened because of refusal to contribute, and will ask the indictment and recommend the dismissal of all superiors in the service who attempt any intimidation of subordinates. He invites complaints of all instances in which contributions are solicited, promising to treat them as confidential and to endeavor to punish the guilty person without revealing the identity of the informant. He also declares that it is the intention of the Commission during the present campaign, whenever it finds an individual or an organization trying to assess Government office-holders, publicly, through the press, to call the attention of everybody to what is being done, and to invite any information which will enable the Commission to prosecute the offenders.

In regard to the practice which has prevailed in some recent campaigns, of sending circulars from State or National committees to the private residences of office-holders, instead of to the public buildings in which they are employed, thus evading the letter of the law, while violating its spirit, Mr. Roosevelt says the Commission will also call public attention to every case of this kind which it discovers, and will assure all Government employees that they can disregard all such appeals without fear of losing their places.

These are all public-spirited purposes, and no one familiar with Mr. Roosevelt will doubt that he will adhere to them with vigor and determination. The practice is an abominable injustice, and ought not to be allowed in a single instance. It does not prevail to anything like the extent to which it was carried before the present law was enacted, but the evil is by no means abolished. Fear of loss of place, or chance of promotion, impels many a clerk to give who would never contribute a penny could he feel assured that his refusal would have no effect upon his tenure or prospects. The hardship which such extortion entails is pictured vividly, but with entire truthfulness, by Mr. Roosevelt in the following passages:

> Government employees, as a whole, are hard-working, not overpaid men, with families to support, and there is no meaner species of swindling than to blackmail them for the sake of a political organization. The contribution, moreover, is extorted from them at a time when it is often peculiarly difficult for them to pay. To take away two per cent. of a man's salary just at the beginning of winter may mean that he will have to go without a winter overcoat, or his wife and children without the warm clothing which is almost a necessity.
>
> Moreover, it is the poorest and most helpless class who are most apt to be coerced into paying. In several investigations undertaken by the Commission, we found that it was women who were most certain to pay, and that the women opposed in political faith to the administration were even more apt to pay than the others.

Can any self-respecting person read that and not flush with indignation that such things are possible under a free, popular government? Could there be a meaner or more despicable business for a man or a party to be engaged in than this levying of political blackmail upon hard-working, deserving, and poorly paid men and women? Mr. Roosevelt is right in thinking that publicity will be a powerful weapon to use against all men caught in this business. The American people would be made of poor stuff indeed if they did not arise in wrath against such unworthy specimens of their race. The abuse has been tolerated only because the public attention has not been aroused to it. Let us have the names of the offenders, and specifications of their offenses, published to the world, no matter how high they may stand in official life, and the thorough extermination of the evil will be soon accomplished.

Mr. Roosevelt gives a valuable hint to the extortioners, at the close of his article, by reminding them that in case of a defeat of their party at the polls in November, it will be much easier to obtain evidence against them from their victims after election, than it would be were the party to succeed.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Crisis of the Civil War.

AT the celebration of the opening of the Northern Pacific Railroad, of which I was at that time the general manager, two of the guests present were President Chester A. Arthur and Secretary of War Robert Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln sent for me with a request for a brief interview, and stated that he desired information upon a subject that had elicited much discussion, and upon which a careful examination of the war records, both of telegrams and letters, failed to throw any light. He said that upon entering his father's room one morning, just after the battle of Gettysburg, he found him in great distress, and upon inquiring the cause, the President stated that information had just been received from General Haupt that General Meade had no intention immediately of following up his advantage; that he intended to rest for several days; that without an immediate movement of the army the enemy would be permitted to cross the Potomac and escape; that the fruits of victory would be lost and the war indefinitely prolonged. He asked if I had sent any letters, telegrams, or other communications in which this information had been given.

I replied that I had communicated such information either to the President or to General Halleck, but in what way I could not then remember.

Two years ago I commenced to write the memoirs of the operations of the Military Railroad Construction Corps, and in one of my letter-books found a full and satisfactory explanation. From this it appears that after spending the forenoon of Sunday, the day following Lee's retreat, with General Meade, I took an engine the same evening and repaired to Washington and as early as possible on Monday morning made personal report to General Halleck; informed him of the situation and the conclusions I had reached, that, unless General Meade could be induced to change his plans and move immediately, the enemy would certainly cross the river and escape. It was, no doubt, immediately after this interview that General Halleck called on the President and communicated the information that gave him so much distress.

The President and General Halleck have been severely criticized in some quarters for the words of censure sent to General Meade, which, it was claimed, did injustice to a gallant officer who had performed services of the highest value. Certain it is that the predictions in regard to the escape of Lee were verified: he was not disturbed for ten days; he crossed the Potomac July 14, 1863, and the war, which, in my opinion, might have been then substantially ended, was prolonged for two years with immense sacrifice of blood and treasure.

As the battle of Gettysburg was the turning-point in the great struggle, and as antecedent events with which no one now living is familiar except myself had apparently an important influence upon the result, my friends insist that it is a duty to place certain facts on record.

The position that I held in 1862 and 1863 was that of Chief of the Bureau of Military Railroads, charged with the duty of constructing, reconstructing, and operating all railroads used by the Government in the active operations of the war, but especially in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, where I directed operations personally. I reported directly to the Secretary of War and to General Halleck, but necessarily kept in constant communication with the general in command of the army in the field, that I might know his plans, his requirements in the way of transportation, and the lines to be operated upon.

When Lee was moving toward the Potomac for the invasion of Pennsylvania, I supposed as a matter of course that General Hooker would follow him up and that, as a necessary consequence, the base of supplies must be changed and the rolling-stock transferred from the line of the Orange and Alexandria to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. I went to the front to consult with General Hooker, and found him under a tree two miles from Fairfax Station.

In answer to my inquiries, he replied that he did not intend to move until he got orders, and that he would follow them literally and let the responsibility rest where it belonged. He said that he had made suggestions that were not approved, and if he could not carry out his own plans he could not be held accountable for failure if he literally carried out instructions of which he disapproved.

Regarding the situation as critical, I returned as soon as possible to Washington and made report to General Halleck in person. General Halleck opened his desk and took out a bundle of papers, from which he selected several which he read to me. They were communications which had passed between General Hooker and the President, of which copies were always sent to General Halleck.

From these papers it appeared that Hooker's plan was to capture Richmond while the army of Lee was absent from it, and that the President had replied, in substance, that it would be a poor exchange to give Washington for Richmond; that if, as stated, the enemy was spread out in a long thin line, with one flank resting on Fredericksburg and the other on the Potomac, it would be much better to break through his line and beat him in detail. This was about the substance of these letters, as I remember them.

After reading these papers, General Halleck put on his cap and left the office, no doubt to confer with the President. In half an hour he returned, and quietly remarked, "Hooker will get his orders." This was all he said, but a few days after General Hooker was relieved at his own request, and the command conferred upon General Meade.

General Meade and I had been classmates at West Point, graduating in 1835. I appreciated the difficulties of his position. Called unexpectedly to the command of an army the several corps of which were scattered, and with no plan of operation required to

form his own plans and prosecute a campaign with but little time for consideration, it was certainly a most trying situation.

The following special orders were issued:

HEADQUARTERS OF ARMY,
ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, June 27, 1863.

Special Orders, No. 286.
Brigadier-General H. Haupt, United States Volunteers, is hereby authorized and directed to do whatever he may deem expedient to facilitate the transportation of troops and supplies to aid the armies in the field in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.
By command of Major-General Halleck.
E. D. TOWNSEND,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

June 28, 1863, General Meade telegraphed General Halleck, acknowledging the receipt of the order placing him in command of the army, and stated that he was ignorant of the exact condition of the troops and the position of the enemy.

I repaired promptly to Harrisburg, as the best point at which to obtain reliable information as to the situation. I found Colonel Thomas A. Scott at the depot, showed him my orders, and asked for a full report. He informed me that Lee, who had occupied the opposite side of the river in full force, had that morning, June 30, begun to retreat precipitately, in some cases leaving provisions uncooked, and the artillery being on a trot. After hearing a full explanation, with many details unnecessary to repeat, I told Colonel Scott that he was entirely in error as to the cause of Lee's retirement. My explanation of the movement was that Lee had just received information that Hooker had been relieved and Meade placed in command; that Lee knew that our army corps were widely scattered, and that some days would be required before Meade could get them in hand; and that the movement of Lee was clearly not one of retreat but of concentration, with a view to fall upon the several corps and crush them in detail, in which case Washington, Baltimore, and Philadelphia would fall into his possession; and I added emphatically, "We are in the worst position that we have occupied since the commencement of the war, and nothing but the interposition of Providence can save us from destruction."

Colonel Scott replied: "I think you are right. What can be done?"

I immediately, at 10 P. M., sent this telegram:

HARRISBURG, PENN., June 30, 1863.
MAJOR-GENERAL HALLECK, General-in-Chief: Lee is falling back suddenly from the vicinity of Harrisburg and concentrating all his forces. York has been evacuated. Carlisle is being evacuated. The concentration appears to be at or near Chambersburg. The object, apparently, a sudden movement against Meade, of which he should be advised by courier immediately. A courier might reach Frederick by way of Western Maryland Railroad to Westminster. This information comes from T. A. Scott, and I think it reliable. H. HAUPT,
Brigadier-General.

Further information continued to be received, and at 12.45 A. M. I sent this second telegram:

HARRISBURG, PENN., July 1, 1863, 12.45 A.M.
MAJOR-GENERAL H. W. HALLECK, General-in-Chief.
Information just received, 12.45 A. M., leads to the belief that the concentration of the forces of the enemy will be at Gettysburg, rather than at Chambersburg. The movement on their part is very rapid and hurried. They returned from Carlisle in the direction of Gettysburg by way of the Petersburg Pike. Firing about Petersburg and Dillsburg this P. M. continued some hours. Meade should by all means be informed and be prepared for a sudden attack from Lee's whole army.
H. HAUPT, *Brigadier-General.*
(And repeat to General Meade and General Schenck.)

General Meade subsequently informed me that he received these telegrams by courier in his tent at about 3 A. M. on the morning of July 1.

On July 1, I returned to Baltimore via Philadelphia, as the Northern Central had been broken, and organized transportation over the Western Maryland Railroad. J. N. DuBarry, superintendent of the Northern Central Railroad, was relieved at his own request, and Adna Anderson placed in charge, under whose efficient management thirty trains per day were passed over this road under extraordinary difficulties; and, as General Ingalls, Chief Quartermaster, stated, so efficient was the service that at no time were the supplies insufficient for three days' rations in advance.

I then directed my attention to the reconstruction of the Northern Central Railroad, on which nineteen bridges had been destroyed, as also all the bridges on the branches between Hanover Junction and Gettysburg. Before midnight of July 5, all these bridges between Gettysburg and Baltimore had been reconstructed and the telegraph line restored, and on Monday morning, July 6, General Meade was in communication with Washington both by rail and telegraph.

On Sunday morning, the day of Lee's retreat, I rode to Gettysburg in a buggy, and repaired early to General Meade's headquarters, where I found Generals Meade and Pleasonton, and remained with them about three hours. The scene is vividly impressed upon my memory, as also the conversation. We were seated at a small table, upon which was a map of the country,— Meade and Pleasonton on one side, I on the opposite side. General Meade was much surprised to learn that the bridges and telegraph lines had nearly been reconstructed, and that in a few hours he could begin to send his wounded to the hospitals. He remarked that he had supposed that the destruction of the railroads had been so complete that three weeks would be required for their reconstruction. After many incidents connected with the battle had been related, General Pleasonton made the remark that if Longstreet had concentrated his fire more and had kept it up a little longer, we would have lost the day; to which Meade made no reply, and appeared to acquiesce in this opinion.

After other matters had been disposed of, I remarked to General Meade that I supposed he would at once follow up his advantages and capture the remains of Lee's army before he could cross the Potomac. The reply was, "Lee's pontoon-trains have been destroyed, and the river is not fordable. My army requires a few days' rest, and cannot move at present." I was greatly surprised, and said decidedly, "General, I have a construction-corps that could pass that army in less than forty-eight hours, if they had no material except such as could be procured from barns and houses and trees from the woods; and it is not safe to assume that the enemy cannot do what we can." All my arguments and remonstrances proved unavailing, and I left, when the interview ended, fully convinced

that Lee would be permitted to escape, and that the fruits of the glorious victory would be lost.

The situation can be briefly explained. The Federal army had been occupying the Cemetery Ridge for several days. They were not so foot-sore that a march of thirty-five miles would have been impossible; they had ample supplies for at least three days, as the chief quartermaster informed me; they would have moved toward, not from, their proper base of supplies, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; they had two good pontoon-trains with which to bridge the river at any desired point. I was quite familiar with the locations, having resided ten years at Gettysburg and made railroad surveys between it and the Potomac, and had walked over the same ground in one day ten miles further than it would have been necessary for the army to march.

The Confederates were depressed by defeat, short of ammunition, especially for artillery, they had a swollen stream not fordable in their front, no pontoon-bridges and no material immediately available for constructing others, no possibility of retracing their route up the Cumberland Valley, as that would have removed them further from their supplies on the south side of the Potomac, and, besides, the Cumberland Valley was occupied by the corps of General Couch, which had not been in action; they were apparently hemmed in a trap.

My opinion has always been that if Meade had moved at once to the Potomac, had occupied a defensible position below Lee's army, thrown bridges across and placed a moderate force with artillery on the south side, within supporting distance from the main army, it would have been impossible for Lee to receive supplies or reinforcements; the batteries, properly placed, would have prevented any attempts to construct bridges; and Lee would have been forced to capitulate. It would not have been necessary to risk an engagement; the enemy would have been checkmated.

I left Meade on Sunday, July 5, about noon, and the next morning, as I find from my records, I was in Washington and had a personal interview with General Halleck, in which the situation was fully explained; and this is the reason why no records were found of any letters or telegrams from me to General Halleck or the President referring to the Meade interview. I find, however, a letter to General Halleck, written from my office in Washington, Monday, July 6, referring to the interview with him in the morning, which throws light upon the subjects discussed at that interview. In this letter I assumed that Lee would escape, and suggested that, as a successful pursuit up the Shenandoah Valley would be hopeless, it was desirable at once to occupy the line of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad with a good cavalry force as far as Lynchburg, destroy telegraph lines and the bridges and tracks on both the roads leading from Richmond, occupy the passes of the Blue Ridge, isolate the army in the Shenandoah Valley, and attack when favorable opportunities offered. These were, of course, mere suggestions for the consideration of the General-in-Chief. The principal value of this letter at the present time is to show that as early as July 6 I had reached the conclusion that Lee would escape, and was occupied with plans of what should be done in that contingency.

The predictions were verified. Lee did escape, but not until July 14, on bridges constructed on the plans that I had indicated as possible. Meade's army, instead of occupying the line of road east of the Blue Ridge and cutting the communications of the enemy, followed him in a hopeless chase up the Shenandoah Valley, and, when too late to be of efficient service, I was telegraphed to bring all my forces from the line of the Cumberland Valley Railroad and reconstruct with all possible expedition the Orange and Alexandria Railway, which again became the base of supplies.

The records show that even before the interview with General Meade I wrote to General Halleck, expressing apprehension that the pursuit would be so tardy as to lose the fruits of victory. On page 523 of Part III of the Gettysburg records there is a letter to General Halleck, dated Oxford, Pennsylvania, July 4, "11 A. M." This date is an error in the printed records; it should have been P. M., as the letter commences—"Night has overtaken me at Oxford. . . . Persons just in from Gettysburg report the position of affairs. I fear that while Meade rests to refresh his men and collect supplies Lee will be off so far that he cannot intercept him. A good force on the line of the Potomac to prevent Lee from crossing would, I think, insure his destruction."

This letter, it will be perceived, was written from Oxford, seven miles east of Gettysburg, before my interview with General Meade at an early hour the next morning. The fear expressed was so greatly intensified by my personal interview with General Meade that I felt it to be my duty to take an engine and proceed to Washington the same night, to make a personal report to General Halleck, who was my immediate superior.

Although the President seems to have been much exercised over the probability of Lee's escape, the communications between Generals Halleck and Meade, as published in the records, do not indicate disapprobation on the part of the authorities at Washington until the escape had been actually effected, on July 14, when the telegrams were of such character as to induce General Meade to ask to be relieved from the command of the army.

I can readily understand the situation from my relations to General Halleck and familiarity with his policy. Contrary to the generally received opinion, he was unwilling to give any other than very general instructions to the generals in the field. A single illustration will make this clear. At the battle of Fredericksburg I was with Burnside nearly all day in an upper room of the Phillips House overlooking the battle-field. After the battle I took an engine, ran to Aquia Creek, twelve miles, then boarded a steamer and proceeded as rapidly as possible to Washington. I called on President Lincoln and explained the situation. He asked me to walk with him to General Halleck's quarters on I street, near the Arlington. On arrival we found General Halleck at about 11 P. M. in his drawing-room with several officers. These were requested to withdraw, and the President then asked me to repeat my report to General Halleck, which I did. The President then directed General Halleck to telegraph orders to Burnside to withdraw his forces from the south side of the river. General Halleck rose from his seat, paced the room for some time in meditation, and then, standing in front of the President, said emphatically, "*I will do no such thing. If such orders are issued, you must issue them yourself. If we were personally present we might assume such responsibility. I hold that a general*

in command of an army in the field is, or ought to be, better acquainted with all the conditions than parties at a distance, and by giving peremptory orders a serious error might be committed." The President made no reply, but seemed much dejected. I then ventured the remark that I did not consider the situation so serious as he supposed. I explained more in detail the topographical features of the locality and the relative positions of the two armies. Our troops could not be fired upon, nor our bridges enfiladed by the batteries on Marye's Heights, without destroying the city, and I had no doubt that Burnside would retire his army during the night. When I finished, the President, with a deep sigh, remarked, "What you have just told me gives me a great many grains of comfort."

There can be, I think, no doubt that the President from the first shared with me the apprehension that Lee would escape and the war be indefinitely prolonged, but was deterred from interfering with General Meade by the position taken by General Halleck, who would not, unless personally present, assume the responsibility of giving orders.

General M. C. Meigs, Quartermaster-General, had great influence with the President, Secretary of War, and General Halleck, and was often present at their councils. I find among my papers a telegram to General Meigs, dated Frederick, July 8, in which I endeavored to secure his coöperation to induce more prompt action, in which this language is used, "I could build trestle-bridges of round sticks and floor with fence-rails. It is too much to assume that the rebels cannot do the same." I had previously made a similar remark to General Meade.

On July 9, General Halleck telegraphed to General Meade that "the evidence that Lee's army will fight north of the Potomac seems reliable."

This seems to me, under the circumstances, a very remarkable opinion for an officer of so much intelligence as General Halleck; but he may have had reasons for the opinion of which I am not advised. Lee was of necessity short of ammunition. With nearly 300 pieces of artillery in action for three days, it would seem to have been an impossibility for Lee to have retained sufficient ammunition to renew the offensive, and he could get neither ammunition, supplies, nor reinforcements until he could establish communications with the south side of the Potomac. In fact, it was not until July 10 that Lee succeeded in getting some ammunition via Martinsburg, probably carried over the river in rowboats, and this could have been intercepted by a small force on the south side. To me it seems extremely probable, in fact almost certain, that if Lee could have been prevented from getting ammunition to renew an attack, or from constructing bridges on which to cross the river, he would have been forced to capitulate without another battle. If he had attempted to escape by moving up the river, the difficulties of the position would not have been relieved. Meade, having the great advantage of pontoon-bridges, could always safely have maintained a sufficient force on the south side to intercept supplies. Lee's forces were certainly in no condition to renew the contest when they reached the Potomac, and although it might not have been wise to attack them in a strong, defensive position, it is certain that, without supplies, such position could not have been long maintained, and the Federal army could never again hope for conditions more favorable for themselves. If no decisive move could be made north of the Potomac, it was vain to expect more favorable results on the south side, with the enemy reinforced, supplied, rested, and on their own territory, with communications intact and popular sympathy in their favor.

The records show that the opinions herein expressed are not afterthoughts, but were entertained at the time when the events occurred, and that no efforts were spared on my part to avert the great calamity of the escape of the Confederate army and the prolongation of the contest for two years, with the losses of life and treasure consequent thereon.

Soon after the battle of Gettysburg, for reasons not pertinent to this article, I ceased to be an active participant in the operations of the army; but the construction-corps that I had the privilege of organizing continued, under other officers, to perform most efficient service, and contributed greatly — perhaps it would not be too strong an expression to say was indispensable — to the success of General Sherman in his celebrated march to the sea. The facility with which bridges were reconstructed and broken communications restored enabled him to advance with confidence, leaving hundreds of miles of unprotected railroad communications in his rear.

Colonel Lazelle, formerly in charge of the publication of the records of the war, declared that the services of the Military Railroad Construction Corps had been of the greatest value to the Government, but that they had never been recognized or appreciated.

Herman Haupt.

Francis Davis Millet.

"BETWEEN TWO FIRES" is a good example of the work of one of the best-known of American painters. The story is well told, the painting is conscientious and unobtrusive, the figures are well drawn, and the composition is pleasing in color. It shows, perhaps, as well as any of Mr. Millet's pictures, what the qualities are that distinguish his work and have contributed to the painter's excellent position in contemporary art. He seems to have the same desire not to omit detail, and yet not to insist too much upon it, that appears in the work of the great Dutchmen. There is no dash or showy brush-work, though technically Mr. Millet's work is not tame; but the chief characteristic is a certain thoroughness, a straightforward earnestness of intention to be realistic, and the accomplishment of this purpose without making realism the only, or even the predominant, quality. There are charm of expression, healthy sentiment, very clever workmanship, and completeness in all that he does.

In a large picture of "Anthony Van Corlaer, the Trumpeter of New Amsterdam," a fine composition of six or seven figures; in "Rook and Pigeon," an excellent group of two men, with the scene in an English inn in the time of the Stuarts; in "A Waterloo Widow"; in "The Duet"; and in the picture of the traveler at the inn, which belongs to the Union League Club of New York, the painter's admirable qualities are well shown. The picture "Between Two Fires" has been purchased this year from the Royal Academy Exhibition by the Chantrey Fund.

In another line of subjects — those depicting scenes

of Greek and Roman life and single figures of women — Mr. Millet is as successful as in the treatment of English *genre*, and he has also won a reputation as a painter of portraits. Mr. Millet passes the winter season in New York, but lives the rest of the year in London and at his charming home at Broadway in Worcestershire, where he has for neighbors Alma-Tadema, Alfred Parsons, Sargent, and other Englishmen and Americans of note. He was born at Mattapoisett, Massachusetts, and was graduated at Harvard in the class of 1869. He is vice-president of the National Academy of Design, a member of the Society of American Artists, of the American Water Color Society, and of the Royal Institute of Painters of London. He obtained his art schooling at the Antwerp Academy, and received first-class medals at the Antwerp exhibitions in 1873 and 1874. A prize of $2500 was awarded to him at the American Art Association Exhibition in 1886 for the picture, mentioned above, which is in the Union League Club, and at the Paris Exhibition of 1889 he received a silver medal in the British section. Mr. Millet is widely known as the brilliant war-correspondent of the London "Daily News" in the Russo-Turkish war, and as a clever writer of fiction and descriptive articles. In the field of illustration he has contributed to the magazines a large number of excellent drawings, those of life and campaigns in the Balkans being particularly noticeable for freshness and vividness in transcription, and marked by great truth of observation and artistic feeling for the picturesque.

William A. Coffin.

Corrections with Regard to the Washington Family.

MR. THOMAS M. GREEN of Danville, Kentucky, writes to correct two errors in the article on "The Mother and Birthplace of Washington" in THE CENTURY for April, 1892. On page 833 it is stated that Augustine Washington died April 12, 1740, the writer having supplied the last figure, which is obliterated in the entry in the family Bible, with a cipher. Mr. Green quotes from General Washington's letter to Sir Isaac Heard to show that the correct date of Augustine Washington's death was April 12, 1743. Mr. Green also says:

> In a note at the bottom of page 832 referring to the godmother of General Washington, who held him in her arms at the baptismal font, the statement is made that "the godmother, Mrs. Mildred Gregory, was an aunt of the infant. She was the daughter of Lawrence Washington, brother of Augustine." The word "brother" in the note was evidently an inadvertence or a misprint. Lawrence Washington was the father of Augustine and of Mildred. EDITOR.

IN LIGHTER VEIN.

Lincoln's Goose Nest Home.

NEAR the graveyard where Lincoln's father and stepmother rest, seven miles south of Charleston, Illinois, in a place then known as Goose Nest, the Lincolns made their final settlement on removing from Indiana. Here Abraham Lincoln assisted his father in "getting settled," as they called it. He helped him build a log cabin, and cleared for him a patch of ground, and when he saw him "under headway" in the new country, bade him good-by and started north afoot. He found employment not far from Springfield, Illinois, where the active part of his early life was spent. Though he did not linger long in the Goose Nest cabin, he was there long enough to stamp his individuality on every heart for miles around, and many are the stories told of his sojourn among these people. It was my lot to be born and reared a few miles from the early home of the Lincolns, and the incidents I shall relate were picked up in conversation with the old settlers about our neighborhood, all of whom knew Lincoln well. I was shown a bridge he helped to build, and many other relics of his boyhood days.

One very old man told me that he once rode up to Thomas Lincoln's cabin and inquired if he could spend the night there. He was informed that the house afforded only two beds, and one of these belonged to a son who was then at home; but if he would get the consent of this boy to take him in as a bedfellow, he could stay. The stranger dismounted, and soon found the six-foot boy in the back yard lying on a board reading. The boy consented, and the man slept with him that night. The boy was Abraham Lincoln, and the other never tires of telling how he spent the night with the future President.

Tarlton Miles, a veterinary surgeon of Charleston, told me that he had seen Lincoln driving an ox-team into town with cord-wood to sell. One night Lincoln was detained till late selling his wood. It grew dark, and "Abe" thought best not to attempt to drive home. As the Miles homestead was just out of town toward the Lincoln cabin, Lincoln stopped there overnight. His entire outfit, in the way of wearing-apparel, consisted of homespun jeans trousers, knit "galluses," a linsey shirt, and a straw hat. Miles's father sat up till midnight talking with Lincoln, and was amazed at the wisdom he displayed.

I spent four years in Charleston, as salesman in a large dry-goods house there, and as most of the country folks traded at this store, I often enjoyed rare treats in the way of chats with the old settlers about "Abe," as they loved to call him. As I measured off calico for them they measured off "yarns" for me. I said to one old settler, "Did you ever have a hint of Lincoln's greatness while he lived near you?" "No," he said, as he took a chew of "Lincoln green," "I never did. I had six boys, an' any one of 'em seemed as peart to me as Tom's Abe did —'cept perhaps in book-readin'. He always did take to that, an' on that account we uns uset to think he