

TOPICS OF THE TIME

The Country for the Gold Standard.

THERE was only one interpretation to put upon the wonderful success of the new government loan which was offered in February last. It meant that the people of this country were determined to preserve its credit against all assaults. They were asked to pay gold for a loan of one hundred million dollars, the object of the loan being to enable the Government to maintain the gold standard. They responded by offering nearly six hundred million dollars of gold for that purpose, and at far better rates for the Government than previous loans had commanded. The offers to do this were confined to no section, but came from all parts of the country, mainly from banks and other institutions which represent the hoarded earnings of the people. All these said to the National government: «We believe in your policy of maintaining the gold standard, and we will give you five and six times the amount of gold you want for that purpose. We are determined that this country shall not pass to the silver standard, for that would mean illimitable disaster to its credit, its commerce, its business, and its industry, and to all its people.» So eager were the people to sustain the country's credit that they not only paid in the twenty per cent. required for a first instalment, but nearly or quite three times that amount; and when the date for the second instalment arrived over ninety per cent. of the entire amount was paid in, although there were two periods, of ten days each, which might pass before the final two instalments of twenty per cent. each needed to be paid.

In view of this inspiring demonstration of patriotic spirit, it is needless to pay further attention to the claims of the free-silver champions that they have the people behind them. They received the news of the loan's success in silence, realizing fully what it meant. Nobody knew better than they did that failure to place the loan on a popular basis would have given a powerful stimulus to the free-silver cause. They would have construed it as a verdict by the country against the gold standard. They cannot successfully dispute the meaning of the verdict because it went against them. We do not believe that the verdict represented any sudden change of opinion on this subject. The people have always been sound on the money question, far more so than the politicians who have pretended to be their leaders. The controlling class in this country is the business class, the men who are engaged in affairs which require the constant use of money. They know that there is only one kind of money that is worth having for their purposes, and that is the best money. Every man who buys or sells, borrows or lends, enters into contracts or bargains, or ventures into enterprises of any kind involving the use of money, knows that unless the value of that money is so stable that it will be worth as much next month or next year or ten years hence as it is to-day, it is virtually useless for his purposes. Doubt

about it paralyzes all transactions with it save those which are the absolute necessity of a hand-to-mouth existence. This being the case, how preposterous it is for our politicians to imagine for a moment that the people of the country are going to permit their own business, to say nothing of their country's credit, to be ruined!

A distinguished financier called his fellow-financiers and business acquaintances together when the last loan was proposed, and said to them: «We must unite to save the credit of the Government and the gold standard, or go to smash with them.» The business interests of the whole country took the same view, and served notice upon the enemies of the country's credit and financial stability that they would not permit them to succeed in their plans. We believe there has been no time since the silver delusion began its disturbing and harmful career in which the country would not have given a similar response had the question been placed squarely before the people. The moral to Presidential candidates and President-makers is: stop underrating the intelligence and morality and patriotism of the people, and appeal to those qualities rather than to their ignorance. The votes which decide National elections in this country come from the men who represent its commercial, financial, and business interests. When they come to make up their minds about candidates, they will not give their support to any man whose position on the financial question is doubtful. They must have in the President's chair a man whom they know will not give his consent to any measure which impairs the standard of value. Self-preservation, if nothing else, compels them to this course. The clamor of politicians, and the claptrap noises of a campaign, do not dull their senses on this point. More than ever will that be the case this year, since there is really no pressing issue before the country except that of a sound currency and sound financial system. Every business man in the land is looking eagerly for a candidate who can be trusted on this point; and in the looseness of party ties which everywhere exists, he will give his vote to the party which has the wisdom and patriotism to place such a candidate in the field. We are not a nation of idlers, but workers—a people with homes and vested interests and hard-earned savings. The business interests of such a country comprise a large majority of the population, and woe to the Presidential candidate who thinks he can safely ignore them.

The Growing Impudence of the Bosses.

It would be a great gain for good politics in this country if we could separate our bosses completely from our political parties, and keep them in a separate political rogues' gallery of their own. They have no right to the party names under which they conduct their operations, for they have no sympathy for or interest in the principles of government which lie at the foundation of great

parties; and they would work in one party as readily as in another, their affiliation being determined by the amount of personal advantage to themselves. They are really political freebooters, using party names as cloaks for their reprehensible practices. They are usually self-constituted, and are merely tolerated by the parties to which they ally themselves because of their following and their supposed power. If the parties were to repudiate them, and refuse them admission to their conventions and councils, they could not exist. Deprived of the sheltering name of a great party, they would have to carry on their business openly, to avow the methods and purposes which they practise, and this would ruin them.

No boss could retain his power by declaring to the world that he purposed to build up a great political machine by selling offices to the highest bidder, by collecting blackmail from corporations and individuals as the price of immunity from hostile legislation, and by passing laws which would rob the public for the benefit of himself and his followers. Yet this has been and is the occupation of some of our most powerful bosses. Several of them have acquired great wealth by means of it, and have flaunted their riches in the faces of the very people whom they have robbed. Not content with that, they have, from time to time, issued addresses through the press to the same people, informing them that they should be grateful for the excellent government which their robbers have given them. Other bosses, taking the blackmail which they have collected, use it, in the primaries and nominating conventions, to secure the selection for office of men whom they can control; and when these have been chosen by the people to legislative and other positions, the bosses turn about, and say to the people: «You are our servants, not we yours. We will give you the kind of laws and the kind of public service which suit us best. As for those of you who are reformers and think it your business to draft reform legislation, you are wasting your time. We shall not pay the slightest attention either to your measures or to your protests. We possess the government, and we intend to run it to suit ourselves.» Still other bosses, who have succeeded in advancing themselves to high office by corrupt and dishonest methods which have been so notorious as to constitute national scandals, have not hesitated to offer themselves as candidates for the highest office in the gift of the people—the Presidency of the United States.

Impudence of these colossal proportions, we repeat, would not be possible were not the bosses able to shield themselves behind party names. They are the most damaging members any party can have, for the scandals which their doings bring upon it are the most frequent causes of its defeats. The people are compelled to defeat the party in order to overthrow the boss, and they do this whenever his conduct becomes particularly offensive. He works at all times for the injury of his party, for he fights desperately against every attempt of its reputable members to reform it; and when he cannot defeat them in any other way, he unites forces with the boss of the opposite party, and the two together carry the day. In fact, the bosses of all parties reveal their common piratical character by uniting for the defeat of every reform movement which shows signs of succeeding. Any boss will always help the rival boss to win

when he sees there is danger of his own party winning a reform victory, for he knows that the success of reform men and reform principles means the end of his power.

A boss is, in fact, the most expensive attachment a great party can have. The more impudent he is the more does he detract from the moral force of his party, and weaken the public confidence in it. When he forces himself into a position of controlling absolutely all branches of a State government, because the party to which he belongs has possession of them, issuing quite openly his orders about legislation, and making no secret of the fact that he is really assuming to be the dictator of the State, he invites for his party the popular indignation and odium which his performances are certain to arouse. When, in the name of his party, he defies the moral sentiment of the country by offering himself as a candidate for the office of President, he does his utmost to bring that party into contempt. There is not a particle of doubt that the people despise bosses, and will condemn and repudiate them whenever they can get the opportunity to do so. Time and again they have defeated boss-named candidates, and they can be depended upon to do so in future. So well aware of this are the delegates to our State and National conventions, that they are usually very unwilling to nominate for important office men who are known to be the favorites of a boss.

There is ample reason for this popular distrust. The boss is the worst enemy of popular government, for the chief object of his labors is to steal away from the people their right to govern themselves. He poisons popular government at its fountainhead, in the primaries and nominating conventions, by foisting his tools into public offices. Having got possession of the offices, he uses them for barter and sale, for extortion and blackmail, taking into his own hands all the functions of government for his own enrichment and that of his corrupt and corrupting machine. Formerly our bosses carried on their operations mainly in secret. We knew who they were, and what their business was, but they allowed us to see very little of their methods. Now they give their orders to their tools in office more or less openly, declare through the press what their plans and purposes are, and without concealment summon their official servants to come to them for direction and counsel. They declare openly what their plans are in regard to presidential nominations, «pack» the State delegations to National conventions in accordance with those plans, and even offer themselves as candidates. The greatness of their success has turned their heads, and they reason that a public which has tolerated so much from them will revolt at nothing which audacity and impudence may suggest.

That they are inviting disaster, complete and overwhelming, we do not for a moment doubt. Every boss that we have had has run his career in a very brief time. The American people are not fools. They are slow to anger, but when their wrath is aroused there is no escape for those against whom it is directed. Tweed said, when his bossdom tumbled about his head and the penitentiary doors yawned before him, «There are some elections in which money has no influence.» So will it be with Tweed's successors, all of whom have his dull moral sense, and all of whom, with certain modern im-

provements, use his methods for filching power from the people. Their impudence is hastening the day of wrath, and the political party which wishes to escape all share in that wrath had best have as little to do with them as possible, and needs, above all, to avoid even the appearance of following their counsel.

The Mischief of the A. P. A.

THE bigot is generally devoid of that saving sense of humor which greatly helps to make life worth living. If it were not so those secret societies, like the so-called American Protective Association, which are engaged in a deadly warfare against all that is most significant and precious in American institutions, would not insist on parading themselves as «the patriotic orders.» Strange patriotism is this, which begins by denying the first tenet of American liberty,—freedom to worship God,—and proposes to punish religious beliefs which it does not share by depriving those who hold them, not only of their political rights, but, if possible, of the means of livelihood. The very enormity of the sworn purposes of these orders seems to be what gives them their opportunity; for the majority of honorable men find themselves incapable of believing that such purposes can be cherished by civilized human beings, and therefore fail to make any effective resistance to them. Thus they have the field to themselves; and with scarcely a protest, they creep in and entrench themselves in one community after another, gathering together a large mass of the ignorant and intolerant, and by their secret methods and their compact military organization making themselves a power in the local elections. Many communities have awakened when it was too late to find the grip of these secret orders firmly fastened upon their municipal machinery. There should be no need of warning intelligent citizens against the dangers of such organizations. They are the deadly enemies of democratic institutions. There may be business which can be legitimately carried on behind closed doors, but the public business is not of this nature. The attempt to control our politics in this way is an amazing usurpation of power; yet the subversion of republican government which has thus been accomplished in many localities has excited but little comment. On this question the great majority of newspapers are dumb, while thousands of Protestant ministers are helping on the fatal work. Some resistance, indeed, has been made to this domination in a few instances: Massachusetts, in the persons of Senator Hoar and the late Governor Greenhalge, has furnished a commendable example, but very few conspicuous politicians have ventured to challenge the secret power.

The political success of this conspiracy is due, of course, to the machine politicians. A secret organization whose vote can be controlled almost absolutely, whose official head can promise to throw it bodily into either side of the scale, does not need to have a very large membership in order that it may dictate nearly all the nominations of one or the other of the two parties. If twenty or even ten per cent. of the voters of a community can be handled in this way, one of the parties will be sure to give their leaders nearly everything they ask for. Ambitious minor politicians will make haste to join the society, there will be candidates enough in its member-

ship to fill all the offices, and for a time the party which secures its alliance is sure to elect its candidates. In this way, in many communities, the control of one or the other of the parties has passed almost entirely into the hands of the «patriotic» orders.

The mischief of this movement has lately begun to reveal itself at the National capital. The defeat of the appropriation for Indian schools, because most of these schools are under the care of Roman Catholics, is due to these societies, and it is to their hostility that we owe the shameful proposal to exclude from the National gallery of statuary the effigy of the great pioneer and discoverer Father Marquette. With respect to the schools, they avail themselves of a sentiment which widely prevails, and which is reasonable enough, but which, in this case, is greatly overstrained, with the result of depriving the Indian pupils of educational privileges. The spirit of the organization is exhibited also in the semi-official announcement that Senator Hawley of Connecticut is to be denied a reelection because of the part he took in securing the promotion to a generalship of Colonel Coppinger, whose fault is that he is a Roman Catholic. Not only are Roman Catholics to be refused permission to take part in the defense of their country, but those who decline to ostracize them must themselves be ostracized.

The Père Marquette incident is such an illustration of bigotry as ought to bring a blush to the cheek of every American. That the great French priest was a brave and noble man can be disputed by nobody; that his work among the Indians was one of beautiful devotion is not a matter of controversy; that to him was largely due the discovery of the upper Mississippi River, and the opening of the great Northwest to civilization, is the testimony of history. Yet simply because he was a Roman Catholic priest the «patriotic» orders would deny the State which is most closely associated with his beneficent activity the right of celebrating his services to the nation.

The inopportuneness of this recrudescence of bigotry is not the least of its mischievous features. At the very time when all the truly conservative forces of the country are needed to fight for its life against the civic treason of its politicians and the greed of its spoilers, these organizations are raising false issues to befog the ignorant and mislead the unthinking. But this is not all. No intelligent observer of events in the United States within the last five years can fail to be aware of the contest for supremacy that has been going on between the progressive and the reactionary elements of the Roman Catholic communion, or to note what a signal advance has been made thereby in the liberalizing and Americanizing of that historic institution. We do not share its creed, but it would be wickedly provincial not to wish that it may contribute its greatest influence toward the uplifting of mankind and toward the support of the free institutions of the country, rejecting all political alliances as fatal to its highest usefulness. It is remarkable that, just as its wisest leaders have apparently succeeded in cutting it loose from certain degrading political affiliations in the State of New York, its opponents have entered upon the very course they denounce.

To the student of current politics the operations of this new political force present an interesting problem.

To what extent will it be able to dictate the Presidential nominations? Will its adhesion to either party prove a gain or a loss? Will the party managers court it or shun it? Will its influence be offset by the open, unpartizan, and patriotic political activity of the Christian Endeavor movement? The exigencies of the next election always press upon the mind of the partizan leader, and the hope of securing the solid support of such a formidable contingent will powerfully affect his imagination. But it should not require any exceptional far-sightedness to discern the ruin which must overtake any party, in a free government, that identifies its fortunes with these «patriotic» orders. Such principles and purposes as their oaths reveal cannot be harbored by any political organization without forfeiting the confidence of the people.

A Model Forestry Commission.

THE readers of THE CENTURY are familiar with the various efforts that from time to time have been made during the last seven years to arouse members of Congress and the public to the peril of neglecting the National forests.¹ The indifference of our lawmakers to the preservation of our largest and most valuable agricultural crop has been phenomenal—the only bright spot in the dark record being the system of forest reservation advocated in these pages, and authorized by act of Congress, March 3, 1891. Under this law 17,000,000 acres of forest land of high altitude have been set aside by Presidents Harrison and Cleveland as reservoirs of timber and of water; but the enemies of the reservation policy have succeeded in defeating all measures looking to the proper defense and use of these lands, while the sheep-herders of the West go on in their depredations, unawed by the «paper bullets of the brain» fulminated against them by the Secretary of the Interior, who is powerless to call to his support a single soldier of the United States army. Even as we write a vigorous organization of the sheep-herders of Oregon is besieging the Secretary to consent to give up three fourths of the great Cascade Forest Reserve in that State. To yield to them would not only be against the immediate interests of Oregon, but would be a reversal of the beneficent policy of two administrations for which there would be no adequate reason, and would be a positive enactment of the principle, «After us the deluge», heretofore negatively shown in our legislative inaction.

But at last the whole policy of the Government has been turned in the right direction. By the official initiative of the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Hoke Smith, a National investigation has just been set on foot, which, by the sheer force of its authoritativeness, must compel legislative attention. By the constitution of the National Academy of Science it becomes the duty of this body to undertake the investigation of any scientific problem upon the request of the head of a department of the Gov-

ernment, and such a request for the study of the subject of forestry Secretary Smith has made of the president of the academy, Professor Wolcott Gibbs, who has responded in a spirit commensurate with the importance of the Secretary's wise and patriotic action. In his acceptance of the task President Gibbs says:

It is needless to remind you that the matter you refer to the Academy is important and difficult. No subject upon which the Academy has been asked before by the Government for advice compares with it in scope, and it is the opinion of thoughtful men that no other economic problem confronting the Government of the United States equals in importance that offered by the present condition and future fate of the forests of western North America.

The forests in the Public Domain extend through 18 degrees of longitude and 20 degrees of latitude; they vary in density, composition, and sylvicultural condition from the most prolific in the world, outside the tropics, to the most meager. In some parts of the country they are valuable as sources of timber-supply which can be made permanent; in others, while producing no timber of importance, they are not less valuable for their influence upon the supply of water available for the inhabitants of regions dependent on irrigation for their means of subsistence. The character of the topography, and the climate of most of the region now embraced in the Public Domain, increase the difficulty of the problem. Scanty and unequally distributed rainfall checks the growth of forests, while high mountain-ranges make them essential to regulate the flow of mountain streams.

You have done the Academy the honor of asking it to recommend a plan for the general treatment of the forest-covered portions of the Public Domain. That its report may be valuable as a basis for future legislation, it must consider:

1. The question of the ultimate ownership of the forests now belonging to the Government; that is, what portions of the forest on the Public Domain shall be allowed to pass, either in part or entirely, from Government control into private hands.

2. How shall the Government forests be administered so that the inhabitants of adjacent regions may draw their necessary forest supplies from them without affecting their permanency.

3. What provision is possible and necessary to secure for the Government a continuous, intelligent, and honest management of the forests of the Public Domain, including those in the reservations already made, or which may be made in the future.

This admirable statement of the scope of the work is accompanied by the appointment of a commission of experts to undertake the investigation which, in character and in range of scientific knowledge of the sort that qualifies for a given task, has seldom, if ever, been equaled in the record of governmental work. The members are: Professor Charles S. Sargent of Harvard, chairman; Professor Wolcott Gibbs, ex-officio; Alexander Agassiz; Professor W. H. Brewer of Yale; General Henry L. Abbott, U. S. A. (retired); Arnold Hague of the Geological Survey; and Gifford Pinchot, practical forester.

These gentlemen, serving without pay, will proceed to make a scientific and practical study of the public forests from every point of view, and on the ground, and

¹ Among the articles on this subject printed in THE CENTURY during the last seven years, are these: «How to Preserve the Forests,» June, 1889; «The Treasures of the Yosemite,» August, 1890; «Features of the Proposed Yosemite National Park,» September, 1890; «Amateur Management of the Yosemite Scenery,» October, 1890; «Forestry in America,» November, 1890; «Trees in America,» December, 1890; «The Pressing Need of Forest Reservation in the Sierra,» June, 1892; «A Memorable Advance in Forest Preservation,» April, 1893; «Our New National Forest Reserves,» September, 1893; «The Forest Reserves and the

Army,» January, 1894; «Forestry Legislation in Europe,» April, 1894; «The Depletion of American Forests,» May, 1894; «Congress and the Forestry Question,» November, 1894; «A Plan to Save the Forests,» February, 1895; «The Need of a National Forest Commission,» February, 1895; «The West and her Vanishing Forests,» May, 1895; «Reforestation Michigan Lands,» July, 1895; «Hope for the Forests,» September, 1895; «The Plight of the Arid West,» February, 1896; «Plain Words to Californians,» April, 1896.

their report and their recommendations, whatever they may be in detail, cannot fail to carry such weight with the press and the public that it will be as impossible to go back to the old policy of neglect as to reenact literary piracy, or the toleration of lotteries, or any other outworn system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

We regard the establishment of this commission as a landmark of national progress. While of extraordinary value to the whole country, it will prove, particularly, the salvation of the West from those who would sacrifice its entire future to the greed of the immediate moment.



OPEN LETTERS

Recent American Sculpture:

DANIEL CHESTER FRENCH'S O'REILLY GROUP. (SEE PAGE 89.)

HISTORY does not become ancient so fast but that many people will remember the coming and the going of John Boyle O'Reilly. He has been dead only half a dozen years, and it was so late as 1869 that he first landed in America. He came as an escaped Fenian after three years of confinement in English prisons and a final transportation to Australia. On his arrival here he took out naturalization papers, began lecturing, and soon became a reporter for the «Pilot.» In 1876 he became the editor and manager of the «Pilot,» and remained so until the time of his death. In addition to his political writings he addressed himself to the Muse. The Irish Americans of New England accepted him as a leader, and when he died a memorial committee was appointed for the purpose of erecting «a statue or other monument to John Boyle O'Reilly.» The sculptor chosen for the work was Daniel Chester French, and the group for the base of the monument shown in the illustration is the first result of Mr. French's labor.

The monument (to be erected in a small triangular park in the Back Bay district of Boston) is to take the form of a granite monolith of Celtic design. There will be a bronze bust of O'Reilly on the front of the shaft and this group of three figures in bronze at the back. It was fitting that the monument should show the features of the man in the bust, and symbolize the dominant qualities of the man's life in the group. As was abundantly shown in his verse, O'Reilly had his tender and sympathetic side. He had a love for the shepherd's pipe and the arts of peace; and this Mr. French has effectively represented by the figure of the genius of Poetry. He had also his sterner side, a nature quick to passion and resentful of wrong; and this Mr. French has represented by the strong figure of the soldier—the genius of Patriotism. Between the two sits the figure of Erin, the mother for whom he fought and sang. The two natures seem to support and console her: each has offered something to the leaves that lie in her lap; and as she sits sadly tranquil, forming the wreath of glory from shamrock, laurel, and oak, she seems to be thinking with pride of the deeds he has done in her name, and of the love that he in common with other sons has borne her.

The figures are types, not portraits, and they lean toward an expression of the Irish type in the Erin and in the Patriotism; but in other respects they are classic, yet with something too much of individualism and modern

spirit about them to be called either Greek or Italian. The Poetry, modestly offering a laurel leaf for the wreath, has a face of tender sadness which the light and shade seem to emphasize, and in pose is restfully relaxed, slightly leaning against the mother as though in sympathy. The lines of the figure, and the sweep of the wing which repeats the outer curve of the body and leg, are exceedingly graceful, and the lyre of Apollo, held in the left hand, relieves while it accents the rhythm of the lines. The figure of Patriotism is something of a contrast. The costume is that of a Roman or a Celtic warrior, the left hand clutches the flag, and slung at the back by a strap is the shield. The whole figure is heroic, strongly muscled, iron-like of frame, and stern of visage, as befits the soldier. The lines are shorter, rougher, more angular than in the Poetry, and instead of the soft relaxation of the gentler genius we have the half-strung rigidity of the guardsman ready to spring into action at a moment's notice. It is not a restless, but an alert figure—one that holds the oak leaf in the right hand easily enough but has something suggestive of nervous strength in the grasp of the left hand upon the flag. The Patriotism seems expressive of restraint; the Poetry indicates repose.

The entire group forms a pyramidal, balanced composition, and while the figures at the sides relieve each other, they also form the diagonal lines, and help support the pyramid of which the Erin is the center and the apex. She is seated erect upon a raised platform, and has a footstool or bench under her feet. The figure is massive, and is clad in a robe of heavy woven stuff that emphasizes the strength of the body by its breadth of treatment. The arms, bust, shoulders, and head are of corresponding proportions, and in their modeling give the feeling of structure and substance. The very largeness of the figure is impressive, and helps the dignity and majesty of the pose. The head is covered and the face is partly shadowed by a gracefully turned head-cloth, which not only lends to the evenness of the composition by sustaining the large proportions of the body, but produces an admirable effect of light and shade upon the face. Little of the Greek is to be seen in the features: the cheek-bones are too high, the jaw is too square, the mouth too large, the nose too heavy, for the ideal classic proportions; but the ruggedness and boldness of the features create the heroic type. It is a face of great nobility, tinged by sadness, it is true, and yet with something of pride in the sorrow. Sorrow is shown, but

rather by suggestion than demonstration. It is present but restrained, held in check by fortitude. The result is that essential quality in all good sculpture—repose, restfulness, quiescent unity.

Mr. French won his spurs as a sculptor some years ago. His «Minute Man» at Boston and his «Death and the Sculptor»¹ gave him artistic rank; and the thousands who visited the Columbian Exposition cannot fail to remember his colossal statue of the «Republic» in

the Court of Honor.² Like many another artist, his American education has been broadened by years of residence and study in Europe. He has served his apprenticeship and had his day of foreign travel; to-day he is among us living in his age of production. He is well equipped, and, in company with several other sculptors of note, he is giving forth work that is not only creditable to his native land, but would be distinguished in any land.

John C. Van Dyke.

¹ See THE CENTURY for April, 1893.

² See THE CENTURY for May, 1892.



The Protégé.

«THERE was a right curious case in this neighborhood,» my visitor said. I was sinking into something like a state of hypnotism, and the long-continued flow of words and click of knitting-needles were beginning to produce a faintly pleasurable sensation.

«I don't know whether you might call it curious either, but there was right much talk about it at the time, and a heap of people were down on Miss Delia and Miss Lidy. And it *did* look foolish the way they did; but I reckon people next door to starvation have their feelings, like the rest of us.

«I reckon you 've seen that little miserable-looking house that sets right in the edge of the woods by Drake's Branch, with the stained-glass windows, and the little cupelo on top? That's where they lived, Miss Delia and Miss Lidy, and I never did see a house that favored the people inside it like that did, somehow.

«Many's the time I 've been there with waiters of things for them—bread and butter, and bacon and tea, and I don't know what all. People in the neighborhood certainly were good to them; but they were real nice old ladies, if they were sorter thin and fidgety and fly-up-the-creek. Nobody ever took 'em things but in a waiter, no matter what it was, not wanting to hurt their feelings. They were mightily outdone with Mrs. Wilkins once for sending 'em a basket. 'T was just about Christmas time, and she sent them a turkey, and a bucket of sausage, and cake, and mince-pie, and everything. But it certainly did hurt their feelings—being in a basket. It 'most spoilt that Christmas for them, having things sent them like she 'd send them to a beggar; because they certainly were nice old ladies. But Mrs. Wilkins did n't mean a bit of harm.

«I reckon it was right lonesome there in the edge of the woods, with the owls and the whippoorwills, and nothing much to occupy them, on account of their eyes. Both their eyesights had given out long before my time. I reckon it is 'most always that way with twins—they fail along together.

«Well, they were so exactly like each other I expect they did n't find each other any company at all. It was

like sitting up all day and looking in the looking-glass. And there war n't any use in talking, any more than in talking out loud to yourself, when you knew beforehand just exactly what the other one was going to say to you. And so that Christmas Mrs. Wilkins insulted 'em with that basket it came over me that I had n't sent 'em a thing for going on a fortnight. Jemmy had had the measles, and Mr. Tompkins's sister, Emma Jane, had been staying with me, with five children that I thought sure were going to catch it, and I 'd been so worried that Miss Delia and Miss Lidy had clean slipped out of my mind. And so I fixed up a real nice waiter of everything good I had, and a box of meat and flour and things like that (they did n't mind boxes like they did baskets), and I got Jack to drive me over in the spring-wagon, though 't was a mighty cold winter, and I thought I 'd have frozen solid before I got there.»

She paused a moment to count her stitches.

«Thirty-one, thirty-two— They always were sort of finicky about their house. On each side of the walk they kept nice white rocks fixed in rows, and everything just as nice as they could make it; but 't was a mighty forlorn, tumbledown-looking little house—real pitiful looking.

«Well, I drove over there in the spring-wagon, and I certainly was glad when I saw a sorter flickering on the windows like fire. I never did see the place look so cheerful and lit up before.

«Miss Delia and Miss Lidy made a heap of fuss over me, like they always did, but there was something real funny and excited about them. They always *did* do like they were a heap gladder to see me than to see the things I 'd brought them. The more they needed bread and meat to keep them from starving, the more they looked like they did n't care much about anything but the compliment of being thought of.

«Well, they hurried me in to the fire, and, if you 'll believe me, sitting there as comfortable as you please was a great strong-looking young fellow about as old as my Jack.

««We have a guest,» Miss Delia whispered in one ear and Miss Lidy in the other. You might have knocked me down with a *feather*!

«He was a mighty ordinary-looking young man, I

TOPICS OF THE TIME

Gold the Money of Civilization.

THE most conspicuous fact in the financial history of the world for the last hundred years is the coming, one after another, of all the great nations to the single gold standard of value. Why have they done this? Extreme advocates of free silver say it is due to a conspiracy against silver; but even they do not believe that. It is due rather to a natural process of evolution. Gold has been found by practical experience to be many times superior to any other metal for the purpose in hand. For many years its superiority to silver was formally recognized as about sixteen to one; that is, it was sixteen times as useful as a medium of exchange, sixteen times as stable in value, sixteen times as convenient in weight, sixteen times as valuable in the eyes of the people. At the present time it is regarded as thirty-two times as desirable for all these reasons.

Every nation is merely a collection of individuals. It is the individual who decides this question of a standard of value. Who ever heard of an individual who wished to hoard money who did not select gold for that purpose? Who ever heard of an individual who had money to lend who did not wish to have payment guaranteed in gold? Who ever heard of an individual who had something to sell who did not wish to have payment made to him in the best money known—that is, gold? All trade is conducted through individuals, and the kind of money which individuals prefer is the kind of money which is used in trade. Edward Atkinson has pointed out that all international trade, from its very beginning, has been carried on without any legal tender money, but simply in gold. He contends that if gold were to cease to be coined as money, international trade would still be carried on with it by means of bills of exchange drawn for so many ounces and grains of gold. This would be done, not through hatred of silver, or in accordance with a «gold-bug» conspiracy, but simply as a necessity; for gold, more than any other metal known to man, contains the qualities absolutely essential for a medium of exchange.

We accept the results of human experience extending over many years in other matters; why not accept them in this? Why is all value, even that of silver, estimated or measured in gold? Is that the result of a conspiracy? One by one all the objections against a single gold standard have been refuted by the progress of events. It was said that we must have a double standard, or bimetallism, because there was a scarcity of gold in the world, due to a diminishing supply; that this scarcity had caused an appreciation in the value of gold, and hence a fall in prices; and that, since there was not enough gold in the world to do the business of the world, silver must be called in to help us out. All these assertions fell with a crash when it was shown that, instead of a diminution in the supply of gold,

there has been during the last few years a very large increase. The fall in prices could not have been due, therefore, to an appreciation in the value of gold caused by a scarcity of that metal; for the supply has been made, by the increasing annual product, far greater than ever before in the world's history.

What, then, is the matter with the gold standard? Why should gold be made an object of hatred, and silver an object of adoration? To come down to individuals again, what man who has something to sell, either goods or labor, objects to gold in payment, or prefers silver to it? What man who has money to lend prefers payment in silver rather than in gold? If there be any such, why does he hate gold, since he can always be paid in silver if he prefers it? We doubt if there be any such; but if there be, he is a rare exception. An overwhelming majority of the people, not only of this country, but of all civilized countries, not only prefer gold or its equivalent, but insist upon having it. So determined are they about this that if the world were to discard the gold standard to-morrow, its business would still be carried forward on a gold basis; for in that way alone could it be continued. International trade would be conducted upon it, and that would set the standard for all other trade; but aside from that, the necessity for a fixed and stable measure of value would make recourse to gold an absolute necessity. Any man who ever had any dealings with money knows these to be the very rudimental principles of trade, and it seems almost childish to state them here.

But, as a matter of fact, our whole treatment of the money question in this country during the last twenty years has been a reflection upon the national intelligence. We have shut our eyes, or our Congresses have, to the results of human experience throughout the world,—to the results of our own experience even,—and have said, «We will try this matter all over again for ourselves.» We have made a fetish of silver, and a devil of gold, personifying both in a manner worthy of a nation of heathen. But in all this we have not affected one iota the great facts of the case. Silver has not been helped, and gold has not been injured. Our opinions and our Congressional decrees have been powerless in the face of one great fact—the bullion price of the two metals in the markets of the world. So will it be till the end of the chapter. We have rolled up for ourselves many millions of dollars of debt, have done incalculable harm to our business and industrial interests, and have made American intelligence and capacity for government the jest of the world; but gold and silver remain as unaffected as if we had never given them a thought.

Has not this folly gone on long enough? There are many signs that the turning-point has been reached; that the people are realizing the fact that they have been deluded in this matter. For the first time in many

years several of our State conventions have not been afraid to say «gold standard» in their platforms, and to speak of «gold» instead of «coin» or «sound money» merely. This shows an awakening of courage, and the time may soon come when some of our public men can hear themselves called «gold-bugs» without shying or shivering. What is a gold-bug? Simply a man who insists that the people of the country shall have the best possible kind of money in which to transact their business; that the laborer shall be paid in the best money only; that the widow and the orphan who live on the interest of the money which has been left to them shall not be cheated of half their principal and interest by having a fifty-cent silver dollar substituted for a one-hundred-cent gold one. There is not a truer benefactor of all the people in this country to-day than the gold-bug; for he is contending for the maintenance of trade and commerce and industry, for the just dealings of man with his fellow-men—in short, for civilization itself.

The Unavailability of Trimmers.

A FEW months ago the editor of a Western newspaper addressed a request to something like a dozen well-known aspirants for a Presidential nomination, asking each to define the position which he holds on the currency question. As this was then, as it is now, the most important of all issues before the country, it was not unreasonable to suppose that the candidates addressed would be glad of the opportunity to make public their views upon it; but this was not the case. Only two responded at all, and they failed to define their attitude. One said he was in favor of «sound money», and the other that, «if possible, the unity of the party must be preserved.» All the others kept silent, thus maintaining that attitude of trimmers, which, at the time of this writing, they persist in holding, in spite of all importunities to abandon it.

It is a curious fact that we are on the eve of Presidential nominating conventions with a larger number of candidates whose views upon the leading question of the day are absolutely unknown than we have ever had before in our history. This is all the more surprising since the whole country is looking eagerly for a man who will take a decisive position upon the money question. There has not been a time during the last six months when a Presidential candidate, by placing himself squarely upon the gold standard as his platform, could not virtually have secured a nomination in advance of the meeting of the conventions. In fact, it would be easy to mention several candidates who apparently have lost all chance of a nomination by their persistent trimming or studied silence upon this question. To all appeals of friends and admirers that they should come out boldly and say gold if they mean gold, they have turned a deaf ear, either making no response at all, or so meaningless a one as to create disappointment and even disgust. Conduct of this kind is specially fatal with one great class of voters—the industrial and business men. These are so well aware of the absolute necessity of a sound financial system that they will take no chances about a President. They will not elect him and run the risk of his being a safe man on the money question after election.

Undoubtedly many of the trimmers who are hoping for a nomination think that they can take a position safely after the nomination shall have been won. The campaign is pretty certain to force them to take one side or the other. It will certainly be difficult this year for any candidate to go through the campaign without letting the people know where he stands, for such knowledge is of the first importance to them. They know from experience that Congress cannot be trusted on this question. For the last quarter of a century we have had to depend for the safety of our financial system upon our Presidents. It was President Grant who saved us from the Inflation Bill of 1874; it was President Hayes who vetoed the Bland Silver Bill in 1877, and whose known opposition prevented the contemplated repeal of the Resumption Act in the same year; it was President Cleveland who secured for us the repeal of the Sherman Silver Act, and whose firm stand against all efforts to force this country off the gold standard has preserved the national credit and prevented the wide-spread confusion and industrial and commercial disaster which a descent to the silver standard would have caused. Two Congresses in succession, one Democratic and the other Republican, have refused to sustain the National credit by saying that when we promise to pay all our obligations in «coin» we mean that they will be paid in gold. That refusal would have caused incalculable harm to us had not the whole civilized world known that so long as Mr. Cleveland shall remain President we shall pay our debts in gold.

In view of these facts, it is well-nigh incredible that a National convention should venture to take the risk of nominating for the Presidency a man who is a trimmer upon this subject. Can a man who has not the courage to say before a nomination and election where he stands upon the most vital issue of the day be trusted to develop sufficient courage after election to oppose the wishes of a possible silver Congress which may refuse him all support in case he ventures to antagonize it? Nothing is more insidiously destructive of character than a lifelong habit of trimming. A man who loses the courage of defining his opinions loses also the power of forming definite convictions, and can never be trusted to act decisively and bravely in a great emergency. Then, too, nearly every man who becomes President is susceptible to the desire for reëlection; and to secure that he will inevitably employ the same methods that he employed successfully in getting his first nomination and election. If he succeeded as a trimmer he will be a trimmer throughout his term, and the country can place no sure reliance upon him.

This is preëminently a year when the people demand courage in their candidates. They are anxious about their business affairs, and suspicious also of the great power which the political bosses are wielding. They wish to see in the Presidency some man whose personal character and known views will be a guarantee that he will be a bulwark there against all possible Congressional folly, and against all efforts to deprive the people of their right to self-government. They want a courageous, able, and patriotic man in the White House, and not one who is afraid to define his views lest it may deprive him of a few hundred or a few thousand votes. All the Presidents best loved of the

people have been men who not only had clear convictions, but had also the courage to avow them. At no time have the people been more alive than now to the need of such qualities in a President. They see with alarm the steady deterioration in character and ability of both houses of Congress, and realize that, unless the standard for the Executive be kept high, the public interests may be seriously imperiled. Every man who talks with his fellows knows this to be the case. The National conventions will but poorly represent the feeling of the people if they are not impressed by this view. If one of them shall take the risk of putting forth as a candidate a man whose views, not only upon the currency, but upon all the great questions of the day, are unknown because of his cowardice in failing to reveal them, its members may find long before election day arrives that a serious blunder has been committed. The country cannot afford to take any chances this year; the possibilities of harm are too many and too great. The politicians will be wise to make up their minds to this fact; for, unless they do so, and act accordingly, a great surprise may come to them on the day after election.

A Duty of Englishmen to America.

THAT was a high day in James Boswell's calendar on which he at last succeeded in bringing Dr. Johnson and Jack Wilkes together around Mr. Dilly's catholic dinner-table in the «Poultry.» But another than Jack Wilkes was there, whose meeting with the redoubtable doctor bade fair to prove explosive. «I observed him,» says Boswell, «whispering to Mr. Dilly, (Who is that gentleman, sir?)»

«DILLY: (Mr. Arthur Lee.)»

«JOHNSON: (Too too too) (under his breath), which was one of his habitual mutterings.

«Mr. Arthur Lee,» adds Boswell, «could not but be very obnoxious to Johnson, for he was not only a patriot, but an American.»

If any reciprocal feeling toward the great lexicographer ever animated Americans, the lapse of years must long since have assuaged it. We love him none the less that he was so high a Tory, and we can afford to forgive the blindness of his prejudice. There is a fine last-century flavor about it all that appeals to us. But when the presumably educated Englishman of to-day is content with Dr. Johnson's political point of view, and shows an equally indiscriminate prejudice, he seriously compromises either his intelligence, his honesty, or his loyalty to that love of fair play which we like to think our common Anglo-Saxon heritage.

The fact is that the English public men who have understood America, or who have seemed to care to understand her, have, at least until recently, always represented a small minority. During the first century of our national life scarcely an Englishman of eminence was clear-sighted enough to perceive America's real devotion to great ideals. Our British kinsmen thought us a horde of Gradgrinds and nothing else; whereas, in spite of a seeming absorption in material things, the national life was grappling with mighty ethical and political ideas, which the selfishness and irresponsibility of politicians might sometimes distort, but could never stifle. Leigh Hunt, as Lowell used to remind us, could

never think of America without seeing in imagination a gigantic counter stretched all along our seaboard: and we bore Hunt's ridicule with a complacency that was the more cheerful because his caliber and weight of metal were scarcely great enough to do much execution over sea. Carlyle sneered: we remembered his dyspepsia, and forgave. Ruskin emptied the vials of his eloquent contempt upon our sacrifice to America's freedom and integrity: we abated no jot or tittle of our veneration for his prophet's message, while we strove to make just allowance for the vagaries of the hyperesthetic temperament. These things it was easy to condone.

But we found it more difficult to excuse the attitude of statesmen whose business it should have been to know us better. Mr. Gladstone's unwillingness or inability to grasp the true issues at stake in our great war has long since been forgiven, if not forgotten. The noble candor and the keen insight of Tom Taylor's tribute to Lincoln were ample apology for «Punch's» sarcasm and misapprehension. But scarce anything could better illustrate the profound ignorance of even eminent Englishmen concerning the elementary problems of our national life than the fact that so liberal and philosophic a statesman as Sir George Cornwall Lewis made bitterly contemptuous reference to our great President as he entered upon his stupendous task in 1861; and that, even three years later, so high-minded and generous a critic as Walter Bagehot repeated and emphasized the gibe.

If we recall these things to-day, it is in no sense to revive any bitterness of feeling which they may once have provoked. Though the Jingo rage and the demagogue imagine a vain thing, the great mass of self-restrained and sober Americans remember them with sorrow rather than with anger. They furnish us, however, with a sufficient pretext for a word of kindly admonition to honest Englishmen.

It has been remarked in America that almost every Englishman one meets seems vastly more intelligent about India, Burma, or Central Africa than about the United States. This prevailing ignorance is unfortunate at all times; in a period of international stress it may prove calamitous. It breeds a factitious contempt on both sides, and contempt, when it is finished, bringeth forth hate. The Englishmen who have understood American life have judged it by something besides the froth of the irresponsible press and the antics of provincial «statesmen.» Cobden's fatal exposure of his life to do us service, and John Bright's brave words in the hour of our distress, can never be forgotten. The memory of Thomas Hughes—alas! that we must write «memory» now—will always remain a rich and fragrant legacy, to which, in a peculiar sense, we are co-heirs with Englishmen; while the work of Mr. Bryce has not only won our respect and gratitude, but is bound to leave deep impress on our life. None of these men was blind to the evident foibles, defects, and crudities of the strenuous life of an earnest and virile people. On the other hand, none invited distrust by silly attempts to flatter or cajole. But all were quick to recognize in American aspiration, achievement, and representative character something other and better than mere bigness. They even ventured now and then to speak of

these things as great; but the word sits better on their lips than on ours.

We have heard not a little during the last half-year of England's essential friendliness toward America and pride in her. Is it too much to ask that this good will be put to the simple test of a thoughtful reading of Mr. Bryce's «American Commonwealth» and a candid study of the life of Lincoln? Or if this seem too plain and prosaic fare for palates long tickled by the high-spiced dainties of Captain Basil Hall and Mrs. Trollope, we may at least suggest that our English friends make better acquaintance with Lowell. In the world of letters he is as typical an American as Lincoln was in the world of politics. Neither sacrificed his sturdy and consistent Americanism to the demands of personal or party policy. Each was quick to discern the distinction between accident and essence in American life. Both represented a great multitude of their most influential countrymen in the depth and earnestness of their convictions, and in the possession of that kindly humor which purges conviction of fanaticism and moroseness. When Lowell made Jonathan say to John in reference to the «Trent» affair,

We give the critters back, John,
Cos Abram thought 'twas right,

he felt that the reason assigned was quite sufficient to justify the act, not merely to the world at large, but to the mass of his excited and sorely tried countrymen. And when the voices of wise and sober men in our colleges and churches were raised in the difficult juncture of last winter, demanding a careful and dispassionate consideration of a perplexing question in order that the right might be discovered and done, it was a characteristic assertion of the will of law-abiding and self-respecting America. No one can hope to understand American life who shuts his eyes to the controlling influence of this conservative element, and keeps them open, as too many of our English visitors do, merely to the grotesque, the crude, and the bizarre among us.

A Plea for the Poets.

THE poets have always had a hard time of it, not only because they often beg their bread, and always learn in suffering what they teach in song, but because they receive treatment so unequal, being abused until they conquer recognition, and then worshiped as gods. Perhaps there is a good reason for this. There is an instinctive feeling that the poet is divine; if he is a pretender he should be put down, if he is genuine he is to be adored. But he would, upon the whole, be happier, and perhaps more productive, if at the outset he had somewhat kinder treatment, even if the later recognition were less emphatic. It seems to be regarded as a main function of current criticism to trample poets under foot, and to sweep them out of the way, with utter disregard, not only of generosity, but of economy; for poets come about as do other choice products: there must be many in order to produce one; the whole choir of birds must be suffered to warble in order to secure the nightingale and the lark. It makes one tremble to reflect how narrow an escape from extinction Keats and Wordsworth and Tennyson underwent at the hands of the critics; and

there is no telling how many Miltons have been kept mute by unwise repression of their noble rage.

Just now the process is very active. By an unusual conjunction of events there is hardly a great living English-speaking poet, and we are taking our revenge for this spiritual orphanage by abusing the fledglings and young birds of song (some of whom already pipe melodiously) as though they were to blame for the lack of Shelleys and Brownings. The magazines come in for a full share of this unreasoning censure, because they do not give us monthly an «Each and All» or an «Ode to a Water-fowl» or a «Locksley Hall.» To sneer at «magazine poetry,» as it is called in the cant of the day, is virtually to sneer at American poetry in general, which always has found its channel largely through the monthly periodicals and their congeners. To take this magazine as a familiar example,—and THE CENTURY gives more space to verse than any other similar publication,—a careful estimate covering two years shows that five sixths of our contributors have been sufficiently serious in the pursuit of the art to have collected their metrical work into volumes. A review of current American magazine poetry will show, if not great qualities, at least a fine sense of rhythm, and much delicacy, subtlety, intensity, and range. These are qualities to be encouraged, and it is only to be regretted that in these pages the limitations of space do not make practicable a larger hospitality. In no other way can the great poet be brought forward; all the birds must be heard in order to reveal the one supreme singer. Moreover, there is much cheer in the full chorus, and if the single clear note of the robin were hushed we should feel a loss.

We are not entering a protest against criticism, nor asking that it shall abate its high function of intelligent judgment; but we deprecate the discouragement which is cast upon poets and publishers of poetry by the tone of contempt with which the poetry of the day is received. The general attitude is destructive; it should be fostering. The critics and the public do not know what they are doing by discouraging the production of poetry: it is not only like opposing the cultivation of flowers; it is like trampling down wheat, for poetry is the bread of intellectual and spiritual life.

Hardly a better service could be rendered to literature at present than to revive a knowledge of Shelley's «Defense of Poetry,» a work that has been undertaken by Professor A. S. Cook of Yale University, in a thin volume well packed with judicious comment. There are, perhaps, better defenses of poetry than this of Shelley's, but it has an indefinable charm as well as cogency of statement. It is a plea for the value of poetry. As with all other values, the condition of its production and the measure of its worth should be thoroughly understood.

There are many things that we profess to value which are in reality poetry, or draw their charm or power from poetry. We are now redeeming religion from dogma to ethics; but we must learn that religion is also poetry, because it is truer than dogma, and is the soul of ethics, and holds them both, as it were, in a solution of moral beauty. Dr. Bushnell put the matter in a nutshell, and also into a dozen stout volumes, in the title of one of his essays, «Our Gospel a Gift to the Imagination.» And Shelley is on the track of the same thought in his remark that «a man, to be greatly good, must imagine

greatly and comprehensively; he must put himself in the place of another, and of many others; the pains and pleasures of his species must become his own." It is to the poets we must go for our rendering of religion. They are the true theologians, from Dante down to Tennyson and Browning and Whittier, and when the poets cease to sing, religion will perish—if it does not live in the echoes of their songs.

In the same way education and culture lean on poetry. Here also Shelley says a good word: "Poetry enlarges the circumference of the imagination by replenishing it with thoughts of ever new delight, which have the power of attracting and assimilating to their own nature all other thoughts, and which form new intervals and interstices, whose void forever craves fresh food,"—a remark which puts the poetic function at the root of all growth in knowledge, and falls in with his sayings, that "all high poetry is infinite. Veil after veil may be withdrawn, and the inmost naked beauty of the meaning never be exposed," and that "it is the very image of life expressed in its eternal truth."

In like manner poetry underlies history and government. No one has said a truer or profounder thing of Homer than Shelley in his remark that "he embodied the ideal perfection of his age in human character," the very office and highest achievement of history. And as for government, Shelley translates the saying of Andrew Fletcher, that "if a man were permitted to make all the ballads, he need not care who should make the laws of a nation," into the assertion that "poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world, because they measure the circumference and sound the depths of human nature with a comprehensive and all-penetrating spirit," and are thus the very "spirit of the age," which dominates society and issues in laws.

The part that poetry has played in public events is indeed a matter of familiar knowledge. Aside from the distinctive song-writing which animates all patriotic hearts, one recalls, to cite but a single instance, the glowing work of that band of poets who gave life and power to the anti-slavery cause. Lowell's philippic against the spurious statesmanship of the spoils system have not yet lost their occasion nor their animating force. Such "large utterance" realizes what Milton had in mind in the concluding lines of his sonnet, "To the Lord General Fairfax":

O yet a nobler task awaits thy hand
 (For what can war but endless war still breed?)
 Till truth and right from violence be freed,
 And public faith clear'd from the shameful brand
 Of public fraud. In vain doth valor bleed,
 While avarice and rapine share the land.

It is time to take to heart these suggestions, and to open our minds a little more widely to these candidates and aspirants for the highest place the world can offer and the greatest service it can require. They can forego their hopes and miss possible fame, but society cannot go without what the poets can give, and must give, to save it from the slough of misconceived utility.

"Four Lincoln Conspiracies." A Correction.

In the article with the above title, printed in the April CENTURY, reference was made to Mr. Louis J. Weichmann as having escaped punishment for supposed know-

ledge of the plot against President Lincoln, through his services as "the most important government witness at the trial of the assassin conspirators."

In refutation of the imputation contained in that statement, Mr. Weichmann has referred us to General H. L. Burnett, who was Special Judge Advocate of the commission which tried the conspirators. General Burnett says that Mr. Weichmann at the time was a clerk in the War Department, and, as a college-mate of three years' standing and friend of John H. Surratt, became a boarder in Mrs. Surratt's house nearly three months before Booth's advent there. Mr. Weichmann voluntarily explained his connection with the Surratt household, was at once sent by Secretary Stanton to Canada with the party searching for John H. Surratt, and on his return and during the trial conducted himself like a person innocent of wrong-doing, and willing to state the facts within his knowledge. Also, in a letter dated January 27, 1867, General Burnett said to Mr. Weichmann: "I have always believed that in that trial of Mr. Lincoln's assassins you enacted an honorable and truthful part, and did our struggling country great service."

In a letter inclosing copies of other letters from officers connected with the trial, Mr. Weichmann says: "I was appointed to an honorable position in the government service at Philadelphia on April 15, 1869, which I retained until the first day of October, 1886, when I resigned. During the early part of 1886 I was President of the Civil Service Board in the Philadelphia custom-house. My position was given me not as a reward, but as a measure of justice for what I had been compelled to suffer by reason of my testimony in the conspiracy trials."

To quote from a few of these letters, Judge Advocate General Joseph Holt wrote to Congressman W. D. Kelley on March 30, 1869: "Referring to our conversation this evening in regard to Mr. Louis J. Weichmann, a constituent of yours, I write to say that ever since this young man gave his testimony on the trial of the assassins of the President, he has been subjected to the most malignant proscription and persecution. . . . In giving his testimony on that occasion, which I verily believe he did with entire truthfulness, he performed a public duty imposed upon him with a conscientious faithfulness which entitles him to the support of the government, and to the commendation of all loyal and honorable men. . . . He has fine intelligence and culture, and sustains an irreproachable character."

General Lew Wallace, a member of the commission which tried the conspirators, wrote November 8, 1865: "Friend Weichmann: Please accept my regards and consider me your friend." General James A. Ekin, another member, wrote, June 7, 1876: "It affords me pleasure to bear testimony to your integrity of character. It was never questioned by me, and you were on several occasions favorably mentioned in conversation both by the late Secretary Stanton and General Joseph Holt. During the memorable trial of the conspirators your testimony was considered by the court as conclusive and clear, and your evidence was regarded as truthful in every particular. It stood the test of cross-examination, and remained unshaken on the record." General R. S. Foster, another member, wrote, July 30,

1885: «Your evidence was of great value to us in determining the guilt of those parties. You were unimpeached, and came off the cross-examination leaving the conviction in our minds that you had told the truth.» Judge George P. Fisher, who presided in the trial of John H. Surratt, wrote, under date of February 3, 1892: «Your letter of the 12th ult. was duly received, in which you request from me an opinion as to your testimony

and conduct in the trial of John H. Surratt for the murder of Abraham Lincoln. I have no hesitation in saying that your conduct on the witness-stand all through on that occasion was that of a perfectly honest and truthful witness.»

We take pleasure in printing these extracts, which show the estimation in which Mr. Weichmann was held by officers and members of the trial commission.

OPEN LETTERS

President Lincoln and the Widow of General Helm.

THE following appeared in THE CENTURY for December, 1895, under «Appeals to Lincoln's Clemency»:

Mr. Lincoln's absolute impartiality when dealing with affairs wherein he was personally interested is well illustrated in the following despatch to a Union general:

«WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
August 8, 1864.

MAJOR-GENERAL BURBRIDGE, Lexington, Ky.:

Last December Mrs. Emily T. Helm, half-sister of Mrs. L., and widow of the rebel general Ben. Hardin Helm, stopped here on her way from Georgia to Kentucky, and I gave her a paper, as I remember, to protect her against the mere fact of her being General Helm's widow. I hear a rumor to-day that you recently sought to arrest her, but was prevented by her presenting the paper from me. I do not intend to protect her against the consequences of disloyal words or acts spoken or done by her since her return to Kentucky, and if the paper given her by me can be construed to give her protection for such words or acts, it is hereby revoked *pro tanto*. Deal with her for current conduct just as you would with any other. A. LINCOLN.»

This despatch is a surprise to me, since I was never arrested and never had any trouble with the United States authorities. The circumstances of the protection paper given to me by President Lincoln were these: I had lost two of my brothers: one was killed at Corinth, the other died at Vicksburg from a wound received at Baton Rouge; at the battle of Chickamauga my husband had fallen. I had accompanied my husband South, and after his death I received from Mr. Lincoln a permit to return to Kentucky under flag of truce. Upon reaching Fort Monroe, a United States officer came on the boat and told me he had orders to require an oath of allegiance to the United States from every one who landed. I asked for permission to proceed to Washington on parole, stating that I would return in case I was called upon to take the oath. I had just left the friends in arms of my husband and brothers, with tears in their eyes and hearts for me in my great bereavement, and they would have felt, if I had taken the oath, that I had deserted them and had not been true to the cause for which my husband had given up his life. My refusal was therefore not bravado.

Soon after my conversation with the officer I was allowed to go on to Washington, and I immediately called on President Lincoln. Both Mr. and Mrs. Lincoln (who

was my half-sister) received me with every sign of affection and kindness. Since I had last seen them they had buried from the White House a little son who had loved me very much; on each side we had had overwhelming sorrow, which caused our meeting to be painful and agitating.

I told Mr. Lincoln my object in coming, explained my position, and stated that I did not intend to embarrass him or make myself conspicuous in any way, in case he allowed me to proceed to my home in Kentucky. I was his guest for several days; when I left he gave me a paper worded to protect me in person and property (except as to slaves), and as I thanked him he said, «I have known you all your life, and I never knew you to do a mean thing.»

After I arrived in Kentucky I was careful that no act or word of mine should make him regret being so considerate of me. Every one was kind to me in Kentucky, irrespective of opinions; and I do not think I made any enemies on account of my opinions. I had no occasion to use the paper except once, when asking a Federal officer to keep his soldiers, who were camped near me, from trespassing upon the grounds and taking our meals as they were cooked from our kitchen, which he did in the kindest manner. It is possible that he reported the fact of the protection paper to General Burbridge, who was his superior officer; and the latter, perhaps, desired orders from President Lincoln as to what he ought to do in case I made myself conspicuous. I was not arrested; I gave no cause; I could never have been so lost to my sense of obligation to President Lincoln. That he did not believe that I had been imprudent is shown by the fact that in March, 1865, under the escort of his son (my nephew), with Mrs. Bernard Pratt, a relative of General Zachary Taylor and General Singleton of Illinois, I was allowed to go South on some private business of my own; but finding it impossible to go farther than Richmond, Virginia, and being advised by friends, I returned to Baltimore, where I had been only a short time when Richmond fell.

Emily Todd Helm.

Remington's «Bronco Buster.»

«THE CENTURY'S» AMERICAN ARTISTS SERIES. (SEE PAGE 265.)

A GOOD deal has been said and written about American subjects for American artists, and some fault has been found with such of our painters and sculptors as prefer

to live in foreign lands or to visit them in search of the picturesque when there is so much at home that ought to attract them. While the artist's choice of subject concerns nobody but the artist himself, and all that we may ask of him is that whatever he chooses to interpret shall be well rendered, we may agree with the contention that there is no lack of material to inspire the artist in our native land. To those who delight in things purely American, not as trees, fields, and skies are American, but as scenes of life and manners are, Mr. Remington's «Bronco Buster» will give much satisfaction.

The cow-man is an American product. He is neither a «greaser» nor a peasant. He is not a planter, a mountaineer, a trapper, or a shepherd. When the cowboy undertakes to break in a bucking bronco, he takes upon himself a task that will amply satisfy his desire for excitement, and provide an interesting spectacle for bystanders. In the spirited group modeled by Mr. Remington, the horse, rearing on his hind legs, his body arched, and with his fore legs bent inward from the knees in a fashion that suggests the power of a tightly coiled spring, appears ready to snap forward. The rider, with the bridle-rein in his left hand, one foot out of the stirrup, and his right hand high in the air with the whip in it, is at the crisis of the action. The movement and force of both horse and rider are given with a strength and grasp that impress by their truth at first glance. The group is so good, and its aspect so attractive, that it deserves praise not only for its technical qualities, but also for its power to please those who care as much for subject as for treatment.

Frederic Remington, who before bringing out this excellent piece of character sculpture was most widely known as an illustrator and painter, was born in St. Lawrence County New York, in 1861. He studied drawing for a year in the Yale School of Fine Arts at New

Haven, and went West in 1880. With the exception of this single year of instruction, he has derived all his knowledge from constant observation and study. He has written entertainingly and cleverly of life in the West, as well as illustrated it in his drawings and pictures. Of «The Bronco Buster» he speaks in characteristic fashion: «I have always had a feeling for (mud,) and I did that—a long work attended with great difficulties on my part. I propose to do some more, to put the wild life of our West into something that burglar won't have, moth eat, or time blacken. It is a great art and satisfying to me, for my whole feeling is for form.»

William A. Coffin.

The Berthon Napoleon.

THE Berthon portrait of Napoleon I, which appears on page 285 of this number of THE CENTURY, is now published for the first time. It was painted from sittings given to Berthon in 1809, and represents the Emperor at the summit of his career. Although no mention is made of it in any published list of Berthon's works, its authenticity is beyond question. It was given by the artist to his son, George-Théodore Berthon, on the latter's departure from France in 1841, and was by him brought to Canada.

René-Théodore Berthon was a pupil (Lady Morgan says the «favorite pupil») of David, and the influence of that master is perceptible in his works. He exhibited in all the Salons from 1806 to 1842, and many of his works, notably those painted to commemorate the victories of Napoleon, were executed at the command of the Emperor or of the state. The portrait of Napoleon as emperor is still in the possession of his granddaughters at Toronto. He also painted the portrait of Pauline Bonaparte. He died at Paris in 1859. His son, also an artist, died at Toronto in 1892.

H. F. Mackintosh.

IN LIGHTER VEIN

A Secret.

YOU will not tell it? Nay, what need?
Like timid bird, whose soft nest, made
Low beneath grass and bending weed,
Is by her watchful care betrayed,
You do but make your secret clear,
Trying so hard to hide it, dear.

Madeline S. Bridges.


Discovered.

SEEN you down at chu'ch las' night—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy.
What I mean? Oh, dat's all right—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy.
Oh, you's sma't ez sma't kin be,
But you could n't hide f'om me;
Ain't I got two eyes to see?
Nevah min', Miss Lucy.

Guess you thought you's awful keen—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy;
Evaht'ing you done I seen—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy;
Seen him tek yo' ahm jes so,
When you got outside de do'—
Ah, I know dat man's yo' beau,—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy.

Say now, honey, wha'd he say?
Nevah min', Miss Lucy;
Keep yo' sec'uts—dat's yo' way—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy;
Won't tell me, an' I'm yo' pal!
I'm gwine tell his othah gal—
Know huh, too—huh name is Sal—
Nevah min', Miss Lucy.

Paul Laurence Dunbar.



TOPICS OF THE TIME

The Folly of Bimetallism.

NOTHING could be of more service to the country in the forthcoming Presidential campaign than to have both great National parties declare unequivocally in their platforms in favor of the gold standard of value. That would go a long way toward settling the policy of the next National administration in advance. It would take the question out of the campaign as a subject of discussion between the two parties, and would give the country the assurance that, no matter which party should win in the election, there would be no danger of free-silver legislation. Thus this threatened obstacle to the return of prosperity would be removed.

Of course such a desirable effect as this can be produced only in case both parties are unequivocal in their declarations. If one be more explicit than the other, then this issue is certain to take and hold first place in the campaign. On that point there can be no doubt. We have referred in former articles in this place to the many signs that have been revealed during the last few months which indicate the sentiment of the people upon this subject. They showed their determination to uphold the gold standard when they oversubscribed the last issue of bonds, and they showed it subsequently in the way in which they induced so many of the State political conventions to put the word «gold» into their platforms. By far the greater majority of the conventions held by both parties, up to the date of this writing, have declared emphatically, and without evasion or equivocation, in favor of the gold standard and against free-silver coinage. To realize the full significance of this it should be borne in mind that the phrase «gold standard» has not appeared in any political platform for many years—not since the worship of silver as a National fetish became popular. The people have recovered from that delusion, and are forcing the politicians to take note of their recovery.

This being the case, it is obvious that the party which fails to commit itself squarely to the gold standard will be certain to encounter formidable popular opposition in the campaign. The shrewdest politicians in both parties take this view, saying that not only the industrial and commercial interests of the country, but the wage-earners and the farmers are now so keenly alive to the merits of the gold standard that they are determined to have no further trifling with the subject. They are weary beyond endurance of the long-continued doubt about our currency system, and are resolved to put an end to it now. Other questions can wait, but this must be settled without further delay.

Profession of faith in bimetallism, «whenever this can be accomplished by international agreement,» is no longer regarded as satisfactory evidence of sound-money views. This is one of the most significant developments

of the last few months. The politicians and platform-makers have felt the necessity of adding to such profession a pledge of belief in the gold standard as the only safe currency basis pending the advent of bimetallism. This foreshadows the early withdrawal of bimetallism as a panacea for our financial ills, and that will be a long step forward. It is folly to talk about international agreement upon it as possible, for there is not the slightest hope of such a thing. England would never consent to it, if other countries should, and without her consent agreement is impossible. Her financial condition to-day, which is justly the admiration of the world, offers a most convincing demonstration of the supreme wisdom of the gold standard. She has stood inflexibly upon it, through all financial storms, and the consequence is that she does the banking business of the world, and exhibits a degree of national prosperity that cannot be equaled in any other country. Her treasury was never so full, her savings and other bank deposits were never so large, her securities never commanded so high a price, her revenue receipts far exceed expenditures. To say that, under such conditions as these, she will consent to change her standard of value is a manifest absurdity. The talk about international bimetallism as a possibility is, therefore, no less an absurdity, and must soon be abandoned.

With bimetallism out of the case, the only question is whether we shall have the gold or the silver standard. We must have one or the other, and nobody who has followed the course of public sentiment during the last year can believe that the people will consent to accept silver. Neither will they consent to have any doubt about it. There are certain great facts about the two standards which have become firmly lodged in the public mind. One is that gold is the best money known to man, and that every man who does business, or works for wages, or has anything to sell, wants none but the best money with which to transact his business or in which to receive his payment. Another fact is that if you have the gold standard you have silver in use also, but if you have the silver standard gold will not remain with you; for there is not a free-silver coinage country in the world to-day which is not on an exclusive silver basis. Another fact is that, if you have the silver standard, all values—savings bank deposits, life insurance policies, pensions, rents, annuities, wages, railway earnings—all will drop from a dollar to fifty cents at one stroke. In the face of facts like these it is a libel on the national intelligence to say that the American people will consent to depart from the gold standard. Nobody who possesses anything wishes for such a departure. The bankrupts and paupers of the country may wish it, but did anybody ever hear of a nation adapting its financial system to the wishes of those elements of its population? This country to-day is the paradise of

the laboring man. He receives higher wages than are paid in any other country, higher than are paid in silver-standard countries. Does he wish to receive them in silver rather than in gold? Ask him, and see what response he makes. He stands with the merchant, the manufacturer, and the prosperous farmer in saying that the best money is not too good for him. It is only the man who has nothing and who earns nothing who is in favor of second-rate money; for he thinks that he may possibly be able to get some of that, though, as a matter of fact, it will be as far beyond his reach as the best money, for unless he has something to give in exchange for it none of it will flow into his pockets. The common sense of the American people has asserted itself on this question, and the party or candidate that ventures to ignore this fact will regret the mistake before the present campaign is ended.

President Cleveland's Emancipation Proclamation.

THE President's order of May last, bringing within civil-service regulations virtually all the Federal employees before excluded from their operation, was really a new emancipation proclamation. It completed the work of freeing the political slaves, whose serfdom had been begun by Andrew Jackson over sixty years before. Thus one Democratic President has undone the evil wrought by another Democratic President. Jackson placed the Federal service in politics, making all its positions the perquisites of politicians—the bribes which were paid for political activity and support. What President Cleveland has done has been to put the service back where it was when Jackson looted it; that is, make its employees once more the servants of the people rather than the creatures and servants of the politicians. The American people owe the President a debt of gratitude for this act, which will be more and more appreciated as time advances. He has been the unswerving friend of the reform, and has done more for it than all other Presidents combined.

Henceforth the 85,200 employees in the Federal service are as absolutely removed from the control of the politicians as are the employees of a bank or a great commercial house. They are certain to hold their positions as long as they perform their duties acceptably. When vacancies occur, every citizen of the United States will have equal chance with every other to get one of them. The examinations will be free to everybody, and the fittest applicants are sure to win; nobody's influence or «pull» will be of the slightest value to an applicant. Republicans and Democrats will have equally good chances for succeeding, no matter what the politics of the administration in power may be. This is one of the most thoroughly American aspects of civil-service reform. When political influences decided the matter, only the candidates of one political party could hope to get into the government service. If one party were in power for a long period, all the young men of the opposite party were excluded from the service. Henceforth the best man is sure to win, no matter what his politics may be. Surely there could be nothing more thoroughly American in spirit than that—nothing more democratic.

In every way the change is in the interest of the people. Not only do all the young men and women of

the country have equal chance to obtain positions, but the Government is assured of far better service than was possible under the old system, and consequently the people have the benefit of a more economical administration. The business of the Government will be carried on now in precisely the same way as private business is. No private business could live in the way in which our public business was conducted under the old spoils system; that is, with a complete change of employees every four years, the new ones, like the old, being all more or less incompetent; for they were recruited from the professional political class, which was made up largely of persons who had been either too idle or too shiftless or too unprincipled to fit themselves for regular business or professional life. Instead of drawing from all the people for the best material, the old system drew from a small class composed largely of men notoriously unfit.

Next to the people, the chief beneficiaries of the new order of things will be Senators and Representatives and members of the Cabinet. These will no longer be compelled to sacrifice the greater part of their time to hearing applications for office and getting places for political workers. They can say to all comers that they have no power whatever in the premises any more than an ordinary private citizen has, and the result will be that they will be able to devote more time to the public business. We have no doubt that at heart the great majority of Senators and Representatives will rejoice over the new situation, for it was one of the most annoying delusions of the old system that any, even the most astute politician could use it in such a way as to give satisfaction to his followers. It was impossible to give all applicants what they desired, and the result in most cases was that the number of enemies made exceeded the number of friends.

But the best effect of all is that it brings us back to a proper conception of what public office is. This was well expressed in a recent decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, wherein it was said, «Public offices are created for the purpose of effecting the ends for which government has been instituted, which are the common good, and not the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men.» The boss or spoils view is precisely the opposite of this. That treats public office as part of the available campaign funds of a boss, to be used for the purchase of votes, as bribes for support in the campaign and at the polls. A worse and more debasing form of slavery than a public office, won and held on such terms, could not be conceived. The incumbent knows that just as soon as his boss goes out of power, out he must go from his office. As the manner in which he performs his duties has nothing whatever to do with his retention in office, he pays slight attention to his work, and seeks only to retain the favor of the boss while the latter continues in power. To call such a system as this American, and to say, as the spoilsmen do, that the new system is un-American because it creates an office-holding class, is perhaps the supreme instance of boss impudence; yet for a long time many persons were deceived by it.

We are certain, however, that President Cleveland's act is thoroughly in accord with public sentiment at present. Nothing has been clearer for the last few years than that the people have been disgusted with the

scramble for office that has followed the advent of a new President in Washington. They have been longing for Presidential action which should put an end to this National disgrace forever. In March, 1897, when the next President shall take office, there will be nothing for the spoils men to collect about and scramble for except the fourth-class post-offices, the consulships, and foreign missions, mainly only those offices which are filled by the President with the consent of the Senate. It will not be many years, we are confident, before all the post-offices and the consular service will be brought within the same regulations, for this reform is certain to go forward. Its chief advancing influence is the improved service which it secures for the people. That makes converts wherever it is seen. It used to be said that if the offices were not treated as spoils for the victors, nobody would do the necessary political work to carry elections, and there would be danger that these would go by default. Nobody seems to anticipate any peril of this kind at present, and certainly no one familiar with our professional working politicians will deny that if they, with their bosses at their head, were to leave politics in disgust, their departure would be a cause for National thanksgiving.

The chief work of reformers now ought to be to extend the national system to state officers, so that throughout the union all public servants shall become the servants of the people. That is the surest way to break down the power of the bosses, for without spoils they will find it impossible to perpetuate their machines.

Fears for Democracy.

EVERY great change in the political and social order of the world is closely followed by a revulsion of feeling and of opinion. Hope has hardly turned to elation when it begins to give place to despondency; the era of enthusiasm is succeeded by a period of criticism. The reform for which men have been longing is, in their belief, to undo all the evils of the older world; and in the list of those evils they comprehend not only such as are caused by the existing system, but other ills for which imperfect human nature is really responsible. When the new system is fairly established, it is discovered that most of the political and social vices of the former age have reappeared, more or less modified in their form, but substantially unchanged in character. In the period of disillusion that ensues, the old order seems fairer than it was, and what has been gained is underrated. Then comes the critic who, with injustice as great as that of the reformers, holds the new order responsible for all that is amiss—not only for its own peculiar sins of commission or omission, but for all the hereditary sins of the race.

The political fact which gives its stamp to the nineteenth century is the triumph of democracy. Now democracy signifies nothing in itself but the equal distribution, without regard to class, of the power to make laws and to control their enforcement. It is the most effective safeguard yet discovered against the oppression of an unorganized majority of the weak by an organized minority of the strong. Ideal monarchy *may* discharge this duty; by basing the throne on the whole people, it may prevent class rule; but historical mon-

archy has usually meant class rule. It meant this in the France of the Bourbons; it means this to-day in the Russia of the Romanoffs. Democracy is historically a reaction against class rule rather than against kingly rule. Its first demand and its dearest desire is political and legal equality. But from the beginning of the democratic movement the leaders have promised, and their followers have expected, other things. Democracy was to put an end to governmental extravagance and corruption. The monarch, reaping where he had not sown, might fling the treasures of the nation to courtiers and courtizans; his officers, accountable to him alone, might divert millions from the national treasury; but the plain people, who paid the taxes, would exercise another sort of thrift and watchfulness. Democracy, it was sometimes maintained, would put an end to governmental paternalism. The king, regarding his kingdom as his patrimony, might seek to develop its resources by constant surveillance and interference; the plain people would see to it that governmental functions were restricted to the most necessary common ends, and that the freest play was given to individual energy and intelligence. Democracy, finally, was everywhere to assure liberty—not merely political liberty, which means the right of every man to a share of governmental power; nor merely economic liberty, which means the right of every man to seek his fortune in any honest way; but civil, religious, and social liberty as well, since no man will desire to coerce his fellow as long as his fellow minds his own business. Such unjustifiable coercion could suggest itself only to a *jure divino* despot.

With the establishment of democratic government has come the recognition that democracy alone does not secure all these ends. It does not make men unselfish or reasonable or even honest. It secures the realization, in the long run, of the will of the majority, but it does not insure the wisdom of that will. It does not protect the minority against the majority; an unchecked majority may exercise a degree of tyranny over a dissentient minority from which a czar would shrink. For a number of years European writers have been calling attention to these and other defects of democratic government. A French deputy, M. Frary, declared, some twenty years ago, in his «Manuel du Demagogue,» that democracy does not care for liberty, but only for equality. Sir Henry Maine made the same assertion in his «Popular Government.» Mr. Lecky repeats it in his recent work on «Democracy and Liberty.» Maine declared that the tendency of democracy is socialistic; it facilitates the plundering of the rich by the poor. Lecky, too, views with some alarm the tendency of democratic communities toward progressive taxation of incomes and inheritances. Both Maine and Lecky lay much stress upon the corruptness of the French and the American governmental service. Lecky distrusts the impartiality of our elective judiciary. Both of these critics recognize abstractly that monarchic and oligarchic governments have been corrupt, and that monarchic governments, at least, have shown strong tendencies toward state socialism; but neither seems to realize that oligarchic government has often been a system of legalized plunder, or that the most highly developed socialism in history was that of the Roman empire in the fourth century; and each of them lapses into forms of

expression that seem to imply a peculiar responsibility on the part of democracy for the corruptness of some of its officials, for the desire of some of its citizens to make other citizens pay disproportionate taxes, and for the tendency of many citizens to regulate other men's business instead of minding their own. Both critics seem at times to forget that these weaknesses are not peculiar to any single age or form of government. Frary is more discriminating. He maintains that the modern demagogue, who wins by flattery the favor of the sovereign people and abuses their confidence for his selfish ends, is simply the seventeenth-century courtier in nineteenth-century costume; and while he recognizes the inclination of French democracy to state socialism, he rightly attributes it to a faith in «l'état providence» inherited from the Bourbon régime.

Mr. Lecky, like most conservative Englishmen of the present time, has a great admiration for our written constitutions, and especially for the protection they afford to personal liberty and to property. But neither he nor any other Englishman, unless it be Mr. Bryce, has fully grasped the peculiarity which chiefly distinguishes our system of government from that of Europe—from that of republican France as well as from that of monarchic Prussia. The difference lies in the extent to which we are accustomed to look to private initiative and private association for work that in Europe is commonly done by government. Society attains its ends in all countries partly by government and partly through liberty, but in no other country is the field of governmental action so closely circumscribed and the field of liberty so little limited as in the United States. This is still true in spite of the tendency of some of our latter-day legislators to exalt their office, and in spite of the tendency of our courts to give undue extension to the conception of «the police power.» It behooves us to see that it remains true. Democracy does not entail, as some of our foreign critics seem to think, a special risk of over-government; but we must not delude ourselves into thinking that democracy alone gives any safeguard against it.

The Attempt to Revive Intellectual Piracy.

ONE would have thought that any prudent man, with the slightest regard for his reputation, might have detected in the long agitation for international copyright which culminated in the act of 1891, the existence, among the classes that direct American public opinion, of a widespread impatience with the form of robbery known as intellectual piracy. Whatever extenuation there may have been for such offenses, the offenders as a body are doubtless ashamed of the old record. But there seem to be a few persons, chiefly among the publishers of music and of engravings, who betray a rash willingness to stand once more in the public pillory. This willingness is likely to be gratified, for we much mistake the temper of the cultivated people of the country if, five years after a new and honorable record has been made on this subject, they will be content to go back in any detail to the old disgraceful state of affairs. Indeed, the passage of the Treloar bill would be a greater disgrace, since it would involve actually taking away property rights that exist, instead of refusing to confer those which ought to exist.

The main proposition of the copyright bill of Mr. Treloar, a representative from Missouri, and himself recently, if not still, a publisher of music, is to rewrite the law of 1891, so that the condition of manufacture in the United States, which, in order to obtain from Congress any copyright reform whatever, was made to apply to books, chromos, lithographs, and photographs, shall now, when no such emergency exists, be extended to music, engravings, cuts, prints, etc. This is advocated ostensibly in the interest of the American workman, who, in all the years of agitation before 1891, did not raise a voice to demand it, and who in this matter is so nearly non-existent as to be, even in the matter of votes, a negligible quantity. It is really advocated in the interest of publishers of music and engravings, who hope, by making an impossible or onerous condition, to prevent composers, both American and foreign, from taking out copyrights, and thus to throw into the «public domain,» which now contains every note of music published before July 1, 1891, the further reinforcement of a large body of contemporary work. The obvious result would be the enrichment of such publishers, some of whom have already made fortunes on the unremunerated product of other men's brains. These, and these alone, are to be the beneficiaries of the proposed class legislation.

Now at whose expense is this bounty to be bestowed? First, of all foreign composers and artists; secondly, of all American composers and artists; thirdly, of the American public; and fourthly, of the entire system of international copyright, which under the present act has been laboriously built up with nine countries of Europe, to wit: Great Britain and her colonies, France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Against the proposal protests have been sent to Congress by the Manuscript Society of New York, representing the musical profession, and by over two hundred individual composers and musicians; by the Fine Arts Federation, representing ten societies of artists, of which six are of a National character in distribution of membership, and by the American Copyright League, representing the writers of the country. Why are not these protests conclusive? If any American industry is to be built up, why not that of producing music and art, instead of that of distributing them? Are not these civilizing influences more valuable to the country than the building up of a few colossal fortunes? The producers, moreover, are not asking special privileges; only the continued freedom of the present law to get the return which they may for their work.

But suppose that Congress, for a false idea of consistency, were willing to sacrifice the producer to the distributor, will it also sacrifice the privileges which the present law gives to Americans in the nine countries of Europe above enumerated? Or is anybody so foolish as to suppose that the passage of the Treloar Bill would not cause prompt reprisals by foreign countries? Will they be shrewd about pork and wool, and not about art and music? Are they not already restive under the inequality of what they give as compared with what they get through our present law? Excellent as it is in most respects, it is in some undeniably a source of hardship, and in the case of countries of a different tongue it is chiefly useful to their citizens by reason of the ideal

security which it affords to music and art. Shall all that has thus been gained for an honorable understanding with the world be thrown away by subjecting these two items to restrictions which will well-nigh nullify its benefits? To do all this would be to turn back the wheels of progress; and to do it for the sordid reasons which support it would be a most ridiculous and unpatriotic form of that materialism which is being continually nourished in Congress, and against which all the forces of our civilization have perpetually to contend.

At the notable conference in favor of international arbitration, held in Washington in April, our copyright

relations with other countries were cited by one of the speakers as being the most successful approach that we have yet made to a practicable international institution, forming as they do a system of agreement on the part of widely divided countries mutually to do justice. In the face of the great demonstration of human friendliness and respect for law which that conference represented, it would seem to be a bad year to interrupt the continuity of a system of reciprocal fair-dealing which, whatever its defects, has brought us, as a nation, so far as this question is concerned, from barbarism into civilization.



**American Musical Authorities against the
Treloar Bill.**

THE contributions which follow, from the professors of music in Harvard, Yale, and Columbia Universities, who, moreover, stand in the front rank of American composers, were written in response to the following questions, which accurately set forth certain provisions of the Treloar Copyright Bill, now pending in Congress:

1. Are you in favor of amending our present international copyright law by providing that copies of the musical compositions of American composers can be copyrighted only when the type is set up, or the plates made, or the copies manufactured, in the United States, and prohibiting the owner of the copyright from having the composition printed in England, Germany, or elsewhere and importing the copies for sale in the United States upon payment of duties?

2. Are you in favor of a copyright law which will compel the foreign composer to have his works printed in the United States in order to obtain copyright here; although the country of such foreign composer permits copyright there, without any such restrictions, of the composition of an American.

3. Are you in favor of a copyright law which will compel a foreign publisher, who arranges with an American composer to publish the latter's work, to print the work in the United States and sell here only such copies as are printed here?

4. In your opinion will it promote the progress of the art of music, will it promote the quality of music, and the use and enjoyment of music by the public, to require, as a condition of copyright in the United States, that the copies must be printed and manufactured in the United States?

5. Is such a requirement, in your opinion, beneficial or injurious to the interests of the composer?

From the Professor of Music in Harvard University.

I AM utterly opposed to any attempt to make the copyright of musical compositions conditional on their being printed in the United States. I believe that such a law would defeat its own object, for eventually it would restrict both the musical market and production of musical compositions; it would work injustice to our composers, publishers, printers, and the public alike.

The requirement that the works of foreign composers must be printed in the United States in order to be copyrighted is lacking in the *reciprocal* element which should be prominent in an international copyright law. Neither England, nor Germany, nor any other country so far as I am aware, requires as a condition of the copyright of the work of an American author or composer that such work be printed in England or Germany, etc. In European countries there is international copyright without reference to place or manner of printing. I am informed that, wherever there is free trade, copyright publications, with the consent of the owner of the copyright, may be imported free of duty. Where there is protection, copyright composition, with consent of the owner of the copyright, may be imported on payment of duties. Reciprocity requires similar provisions in the United States international copyright laws. Anything less would tend to develop, sooner or later, retaliation against Americans, and would be inimical to the growth of the art of music in America.

The proposed amendment would work grave injury to our rising American composers, who are beginning to find European recognition a very important factor in the development of native music in a young country. Our general public is not yet sufficiently advanced in musical taste and intelligence to appreciate independently the native talent now struggling to attain a higher ideal. The passage of the proposed amendment would retard half a century the time when America can take rank with European nations in creative music.

Within the last few years certain American composers have had orchestral scores and parts printed in Germany and England, either under the auspices of an American or a foreign publisher. Such publication has led to performances of these works abroad, where they have found recognition. This wide extension of the American composer's field of appreciation from *local* to *international* reacts favorably on the American public by procuring here readier performance and higher estimation. It should be understood that Germany, and particularly

Leipsic, is the center of the musical world so far as regards the publication of works involving orchestral scores. Such works issued at Leipsic have a far better chance of becoming known throughout the musical world than if published only in the United States. In fact, so far as my knowledge goes, not a single orchestral score of an American composer has yet been engraved in the United States. The only published orchestral scores and parts of native composers have been engraved and printed in Germany. To engrave a double set of plates for such scores and parts would be quite out of the question. Orchestral scores and parts have a limited sale, but without their publication *somewhere* the works cannot be made known to the musical world. If this law were passed, the future orchestral works of American composers would probably remain in manuscript, and have a most limited performance and appreciation.

In the case of short compositions of foreign composers, it is generally understood, I believe, that the necessity for printing them over again in the United States would prevent a great majority of such compositions from being copyrighted in the United States. Whenever any such composition becomes popular it will be printed, reprinted, and sold in the United States as a matter of course, and neither the foreign publisher nor the foreign composer will obtain the fruits of the composition. This is an obvious injustice arising from a lack of proper reciprocity in an international copyright act. Even if the foreign composer is not to be considered, the effect on the American composer is equally unjust and injurious; for such piracy of uncopyrighted foreign musical compositions produces an unfair competition with the works of the American composers, especially when the European composers have already established world-wide reputations. The rising talent here has great difficulty in getting a hearing or market on account of these unfavorable conditions.

It is obvious that music cannot justly be classed under literature. In the development of the refinements of civilization it should be recognized as a distinct and separate art, and should be encouraged in this country by a reciprocal international copyright, free from mechanical restrictions which would legalize injustice to both the American and foreign composer, and retard or destroy the international recognition of American compositions. Music is more international than literature, for the latter has natural circumscribed territorial limits. There is as yet no universal spoken language. Literature is English, French, German, Italian, Russian, etc., according to the country in the language of which such literature is written. Music has no territorial limits. The musical composition of an American composer may be performed and understood alike by German, French, Italian, or Russian musicians without translation; for its symbols are not words addressed to the verbal reason, but tones addressed to the esthetic sense of beauty and to the emotions.

If copyrighted musical compositions are accorded by Congress the same international freedom which exists in respect to *patented* mechanical inventions, it may well be that in another century America may acquire a rank in the musical world as high as she has attained in the mechanical world under our patent laws.

John K. Paine.

From the Professor of Music in Yale University.

I BEG to answer, «No,» to the first three of your questions.

As to the fourth: I think the proposed requirement will act distinctly against the progress of musical art in this country, by doubling the expense necessary to protect expensive, and therefore important, works.

It will also encourage the stealing of short works from European publishers, which practice has already done great harm to composers here and elsewhere.

I call it stealing, since it is taking that which belongs to some one else. That the law does not protect the composer's or the publisher's property does not change the character of the act of acquisition morally.

The above remarks apply also to question 5. I think the simplest possible legislation, securing to every composer, of whatever nationality, the fruits of his labor, will be that most beneficial to the entire country, composers and others. If we are at liberty to steal other nations' property, they can hardly be expected to frame laws to protect ours. If the question is, «Who has the most stealable property?» I admit we have less than most European nations, and a consequent slight advantage.

There is no doubt in my mind that the highest possible standard of international honesty in copyright matters will be our best policy.

Nor do I see how, in a question of copyright pure and simple, the interests of laborers or mechanics can in honesty be considered at all.

Horatio W. Parker.

From the Professor of Music in Columbia University.

In my opinion, any legislation compelling publishers and writers of music to have their works printed in the United States, under penalty of forfeiting their copyright, would be a very serious blow to the advancement of music in this country. Such legislation would increase the expenses of publication (owing to the necessity for several editions), and narrow the market, besides being both unjust and eminently un-American. Why should an American's work belong to him only when he prints it in America? Why should a law be passed to protect his property only when it is manufactured in the United States? If an idea, musical or otherwise, is not palpable property, then the Patent Office is an absurdity. If engravers and printers are to be given such a monopoly, why should not other trades—say, for instance, watch-makers—demand that the theft of any watch not made in the United States be unpunishable in law. I understand that most of the music engravers in the United States are foreigners. If the proposed amendment to the copyright law of 1891 be seriously considered, I would propose that none but either American-born citizens, or at least citizens of, say, twenty years' standing, be allowed to engage in the printing of music in the United States. Also that all tools used in printing be made in America from metal mined or material produced here. If there is to be a monopoly in the engraving of music, let it be given to Americans working with American tools made of American materials.

The tools of the writer of music are his compositions.

If he is to be compelled to have these manufactured in the United States, let the rule hold good for other professions also. Instead of putting a duty on foreign manufactures, let us prohibit them altogether by withdrawing from such property all protection of the law.

To your list of questions I say emphatically, «No» to 1, 2, 3, 4; to No. 5 I have answered at length above.

E. A. McDowell.

The Failure of the Hampton Conference.

WITH UNPUBLISHED LETTERS FROM JEFFERSON DAVIS AND R. M. T. HUNTER.

ON the third of February, 1865, upon the waves of Hampton Roads, near Fort Monroe, Virginia, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States; William H. Seward of New York, his secretary of state; Alexander Hamilton Stephens of Georgia; R. M. T. Hunter of Virginia; and Judge J. A. Campbell, then of Alabama, met for informal conference on the United States transport steamer *River Queen* in a conference looking toward a cessation of hostilities in the civil war.

They were not «warriors old, with ordered spear and shield,» but men from whose faces the war-paint had been temporarily washed, and whose war-clubs had been temporarily buried. Their objective point was peace, but by predetermined paths, which could not, like «mountains, converge in a single ridge.» For four hours these great men debated great questions. Messrs. Lincoln and Seward supported one side, the remaining three gentlemen pleaded for the other. The actors in this important drama of the war are dead. It was agreed that their conversations should be confidential, and many of their utterances have been closely guarded.

Six months prior to this council of peace, Horace Greeley induced Mr. Lincoln to write a letter stating the terms upon which his soldiers would lay down their arms. In a communication dated July 18, 1864, addressed «To whom it may concern,» President Lincoln proclaimed that the «integrity of the whole Union, and the abandonment of slavery,» were the corner-stones upon which to construct the temple of peace; that liberal terms would be granted on collateral points; and that any person who was armed with authority to talk on such a basis should have safe conduct inside his lines «both ways.» The South was not fighting for slavery, but to make two republics grow in this country where only one grew before. «The integrity of the whole Union,» and not «the abandonment of slavery,» was the condition which prevented a response to that communication.

Lincoln was preëminently in disposition and character kind-hearted and benevolent. War disturbed him. He recognized that though the progress of military events was slow, that of his armies was steady, and that the chances at that time of a restoration of peace upon his terms were favorable. He deeply desired what he prayed when about to take the oath of office for his second Presidential term, «that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away.»

Horace Greeley's failure to bring about negotiations between the belligerents did not deter another eminent citizen from making a similar attempt. Mr. Francis Preston Blair conceived the idea that possibly commis-

sioners might meet representing their respective sides, and the armies *ad interim* stack arms; that the peace feeling would then spread, and terms of settlement be reached. Greeley had tried Mr. Lincoln; Blair sought Mr. Davis. In February, 1865, Seward wrote to Mr. Adams, minister to England: «A few days ago Francis P. Blair, Esq., of Maryland, obtained from the President a simple leave to pass through our military lines without definite views known to the Government.» However that may be, Mr. Blair made his appearance in Richmond, and persuaded Mr. Davis to write him a letter which he could show to Mr. Lincoln, in which he should state that he was willing to send commissioners to confer with the Union President, if he could be assured they would be received; or, he would receive any that might be sent to him. With this letter Blair retraced his steps to Washington, showed Lincoln Davis's note, and induced the former to write him a letter which in turn he could show Davis, in which he should say that he had read Davis's note to Blair, and that he would receive any commissioners Mr. Davis might send to confer informally with him, «with a view to the restoration of peace to the people of our one common country.»

Again Blair went to Richmond and showed Davis what Lincoln had written, whereupon Messrs. Stephens, Hunter, and Campbell were appointed the commissioners on the part of the South. Observe the diplomacy exercised. Lincoln would not write to Davis, or Davis to Lincoln, but both wrote letters to Blair, each to read that of the other. So far everything was progressing favorably. Blair was doubtless delighted, while many others had an indefinite idea that those accomplished Northern and Southern statesmen would find some means to stop a war between people who «read the same Bible and prayed to the same God.»

Lincoln's companion and colleague in the Peace Conference was an enthusiast on the slavery question. A quarter of a century before, when governor of New York, Seward had proposed to extend suffrage to the negroes of that State, and had appealed to a «higher law.» He was balanced between the integrity of the Union and the abolition of slavery, but would not have objected if the scales had tipped toward the latter. At one time, as a Whig, he was a great friend of President Taylor; afterward he became a Republican and supported Frémont. He named the coming war «an irrepressible conflict,» and was willing to let it rage if its results were the abolition of slavery. He served eleven years in the United States Senate and became the logical candidate for secretary of state, because he was Mr. Lincoln's strongest opponent for the nomination for President in 1860, securing more votes on the first ballot. Seward was in advance of his party, in 1861, in the effort to secure a peaceful solution of the questions at issue, and for policy's sake advocated the evacuation of Fort Sumter. His great knowledge of public affairs, and his commanding intellectual ability, made him a capable adviser to his President.

Mr. Davis's selection of commissioners was probably as good as could be made under the circumstances. Not one of the three was a «die-in-the-last-ditch» man; all had great public experience, and required no introduction to the Union secretary of state or to his President. Stephens was born, and was buried, in Georgia. He

had been a member of several of his State's legislatures, and was equally full of pluck and infirmities. He opposed the secession movement, and helped to construct the Georgia platform of 1850, upon a plank of which was inscribed: «We hold the American Union secondary in importance only to the rights and principles it was designed to perpetuate.» He also was a member of the Georgia peace party of 1864. Later he was in the front rank of those who advised peaceable acquiescence in Hayes's election. He was the vice-president of a confederacy of States which the armies of the South were seeking to establish, but was never wholly in touch with the revolution necessary to secure their independence.

Robert M. T. Hunter died in Essex County, Virginia, seventy-eight years after he was born there; he served in the legislature of his State and in the Federal Congress, and was Speaker of the House, and for fifteen years a United States senator from Virginia, serving with great distinction as chairman of the Finance Committee. In 1860 he was a candidate for President of the United States. At the time of the secession of the Southern States there was a plan to make him President of the Confederacy, and Mr. Davis the commander-in-chief of its armies. He became instead Davis's secretary of state.

Judge John A. Campbell, a Georgian by birth, removed to Alabama, where he practised law. In 1853 President Pierce appointed him an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, where for eighteen years he dispensed justice with an even hand. He exerted his influence against secession, though he did not believe in its unconstitutionality. After the war he resided in New Orleans.

Thus the composition of the Southern members of the conference was supposed to be acceptable to the North; but the selection of its members by the South, had such choice rested with the people's representatives, might have been different. The gentlemen were strong in intellect, but weak in war; were as honorable and able as any of the Southern crew, but not adapted to tread the deck of the ship of state when the cordage was rent and the ocean's rip broken by the hurricane.

Mr. Davis put his confidence more in Mr. Hunter than in the other two, and trusted more fully to him. Notwithstanding General Lee's army surrendered but two months afterward, no commissioners could have negotiated peace even then, except on terms which should embrace the independence of the South. Had Mr. Davis agreed with the commissioners that peace should be restored upon any other basis, the soldiers in the field would have marched over him and them to battle.

One man, and only one, could have drawn the shots from the Southern guns, and, furling the Southern flags, restored peace on the conditions demanded by the Federal authorities. But Robert E. Lee was in accord with his civil chief on that question, and was determined to fight and risk the last defiance of fortune. «I say,» exclaimed Demosthenes, «that if the event had been manifested to the whole world beforehand, not even then ought Athens to have forsaken this course, if she had any regard for her glory, or for her past, or for the ages to come.»

Five years after the war, Mr. Davis wrote to Mr. J. M. Mason of Virginia very freely on this subject. He admired Mason's sturdy qualities, his courage, force,

frankness, and dignified character, and they became firm friends. James M. Mason inherited many of the great characteristics of his distinguished grandfather George Mason. He had served his State in her legislative halls, was sent to Congress as a Jackson Democrat, and later was a United States senator for sixteen years. In that body he had been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when Davis was chairman of Military Affairs; and it was owing to this fact, perhaps, that he was appointed in 1861 agent of the Southern States in England. Mr. Davis wrote him as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., June 11, 1870.

HON. J. M. MASON.

MY DEAR FRIEND: It has been long since I have received a letter from you. Perhaps you will reply, it has been long since I wrote to you; but it is of the first only I think, because therein consists the loss. It is probable that it may be in my power to visit you this summer, and it is possible that about the end of July I may start to England. Will you go with me, in that event, for a trip, say, of sixty days? Your many friends there would be rejoiced to see you, and I would endeavor to be as little disagreeable on the way as is possible for me.

My journeys through the Southwest have given me much to remember gratefully, and not a little to make me feel as one sorrowing without hope.

Mr. Hunter promised me that he would write a full account of the sayings and doings of the commission which met Lincoln and Seward at Hampton Roads. I have not thought it well to write to him while he was subject to Military and Underwood authority;¹ now I do not know his address. Having got into the subject, I will give you a brief account of the matter. The commission had no instructions beyond their authority to negotiate for a settlement between the two governments. They agreed with Lincoln and Seward that they would regard their conversations as confidential. Their report, when they came back, was therefore, to a great extent, oral; the written report so meager as not to furnish, as it seemed to me, what was needful to a fair comprehension of their failure, and the reasons for it. I urged seriously that a fuller report should be made. Mr. Stephens tenaciously insisted that the mere statement would be more effective to rouse and convince the country.

Hunter told me he urged Lincoln to enter into some form of agreement, and endeavored to overcome his refusal by pointing out to him the example of Charles I.; and that Lincoln said he did not know much of history, but he did know that Charles I. lost his head. They reported to me that Lincoln said if we would lay down our arms and go home that he would promise all the clemency within the executive power, and that he refused to make or entertain any proposition while we retained our position as States confederated and having a government of their own. It was a demand for a surrender at discretion, so viewed at the time, and so treated by the orators who addressed the public meeting held in Richmond soon after the return of the commission and the promulgation of their views. If you see Hunter I wish you would talk to him on this subject. May God defend the right.

Present me affectionately to Mrs. Mason and the young ladies, and accept the sincere regard of your friend,

JEFFERSON DAVIS.

This letter Mason sent to his former colleague in the United States Senate, R. M. T. Hunter, and from that gentleman came the following reply:

¹ Underwood was the United States District Judge who had Hunter, General Lee, and others indicted for treason.

LLOYD, ESSEX COUNTY, VA.,
September 19, 1870.

MY DEAR MASON: I have been waiting until I supposed you had returned from the Springs to answer your letter, which, indeed, I ought to have answered before, but I have been so harassed by many things that my mind was hardly free for anything but the cares which absorbed it. I have read Davis's letter which you inclosed, and regret that I did not write out minutely my recollections of what passed at the Hampton Roads Conference whilst they were fresh in my mind. But I was imprisoned soon after the war, and my papers were either seized or dispersed, and since my release I have been engaged in hard work for a livelihood. As soon as I received this letter I sent for Stephens's account of the conference published in the «*Eclectic Review*,» which really seemed to me to be very fair (August, 1870, Vol. VII, No. 2), and from which I do not much differ except as to the report of Seward's conversation on slavery. You will see from that report I did not assent to the scheme for invading Mexico: not, I confess, from any affection for the emperor, whose whole course in regard to that matter, and toward us, seemed to me to be very weak. I was moved by considerations affecting ourselves. The whole scheme originated with F. Blair, Sr., who, as you know, visited Richmond to persuade the Confederate government to settle the controversy. Stephens was much taken with the proposition, and enforced it very warmly upon Lincoln and Seward: not as a proposition from the Confederate government, but as something to be considered. Campbell and I said nothing for a good while, to see how the other party would like it. Toward the close I disclaimed the whole thing, as Stephens reports in his published account of the conference. We all reported to Mr. Davis. I know that in our opinion no settlement was possible except upon the condition of abolishing slavery and returning to the Union. But there was a question beyond that.

Supposing these things to be inevitable, as they then seemed to be, was it not worth the effort to save as much as possible from the wreck? Upon this Mr. Davis and I differed. I thought the effort ought to be made, but I saw then, and see it still more plainly now, that there might be two sides to that question. Although I retain my first opinion, I do not censure him for thinking differently. When the concessions believed to be inevitable were made, one might well have supposed that the Federal Government would have sought to have made them as tolerable as possible to us, and to conciliate us as far as was consistent with these objects. This was only to attribute to them an ordinary stock of good sense and good feeling. But I feared the bitterness of feeling engendered by the contest, and although far from appreciating the full extent, I was not mistaken as to its existence.

Whilst I expressed this opinion both to Davis and Lee, I told them that if they thought there was hope from war I would do my best to aid them. They were to be the judges of that matter. Under these circumstances I made a speech at the African Church, which some of my friends thought was a mistake. But if the contest was to be kept up, it was necessary to animate the spirit which could alone sustain it.

We were all agreed in the government as to the policy of an armistice; we should then have obtained time either to get some settlement of the question, which

would have saved us much life and suffering, as also to recruit our armies, which were then suffering much from desertion and the want of all necessary supplies.

But it was not to be had, which I think we all regretted. I hope, however, that we may meet some of these days, when I can explain these and other matters by word of mouth, and far more fully than upon paper. The difficulties which the Confederacy encountered are not generally known. The sacrifices and gallantry of the struggle on the part of the South, and especially of Virginia, have never been surpassed, and hardly equaled, in history. The Southern side of this history ought to be written. If I owned my time it would be a labor of love to endeavor to do it.

Most truly and faithfully your friend,

R. M. T. HUNTER.

HON. JAS. M. MASON.

Mr. Hunter, it seems, did not assent to the plan, warmly urged on Messrs. Lincoln and Seward, that both the Northern and the Southern armies should invade Mexico, expel the French, and enforce the Monroe doctrine.

Generals Grant and Lee riding side by side, with the heads of their respective columns turned toward old Mexico, would have been a most extraordinary exhibition. History has never recorded anything similar to such display of temporary forgiveness on the part of two armies which for nearly four years had sought to tear each other to pieces. Foes would have been changed to comrades, who might have remained so after both North and South had vindicated the principles of the Monroe doctrine.

The conception was wild, extravagant, and delirious, whether originating with Blair or Stephens. It was conceived and urged because there was nothing else in sight. Mr. Lincoln would accept nothing but the Union, and Mr. Davis nothing but the independence of the Southern Confederacy. There could be no peace until one side became the victor, the other the vanquished. Such conditions developed numberless schemes, and from the difficulties of the situation the Mexican plan was evolved. Undoubtedly an armistice between the contending forces would have been welcomed by the men whose bodies were targets for each other's rifles, and as many from both armies as were necessary for the purpose might have been marched across the Rio Grande, bringing results which might have changed the unhappy fate of Maximilian, Mejia, and Miramon. But what then? When the last French soldier had departed from Mexican soil, who could foretell what would have been the relations between the authorities at Washington and Richmond—whether war would have been again declared, or, the passions of the contestants having abated, peace would have been enthroned on some basis?

Mr. Lincoln was well satisfied then that peace would be dictated on his own terms, and did not intend to be diverted; while Mr. Davis would have entertained such a proposition only because it was a straw that a drowning man is always authorized to seize.

Fitzhugh Lee.



TOPICS OF THE TIME

The Portrait of a Public Enemy.

POPULAR government has no more deadly foe to-day than the party boss. He is, in fact, the destroyer of popular government, for he subverts it, and concentrates all its powers in himself. He controls all primaries and nominating conventions, either by the power of his machine, or by dishonest methods known as «packing» or «stuffing» the voting lists. All the candidates that go before the people for election are his men. He gets control of them by pledging them to his personal service before nomination, and by paying the expenses of their election, on condition that they shall do his bidding on taking office. He gets the money for these election expenses by «striking» or «assessing» corporations, which are at the mercy of State legislatures, promising in return to sell them only the kind of legislation that they desire. The people are cheated in both instances—in the nominations and elections, and in the legislation. The first beneficiary of this form of government is the boss, who takes possession of the governmental machinery and runs it as his private establishment.

Let us suppose for a moment that a boss should go before the people of the State openly with a proposition to elect him to the position which he holds now without an election. Suppose he were to say frankly: «You, the people, either through indifference or absorption in your private affairs, find the business of running your government a great burden—so great that you have about given up attempting to bear it. I propose that you change the form of it utterly. Make it an absolute monarchy, and vest all its powers in me, with the understanding that I shall run it for my personal advantage and that of my political machine, and that I shall render no accounting to anybody for my actions. I may levy blackmail, sell offices and legislation, and make such laws as please me without paying the slightest attention to the needs or wishes of the people.» How many votes would the boss who should make such a proposition receive at the polls? Would any boss venture to make the experiment? The dullest and most ignorant of them knows too much for that.

Why do the people submit quietly when the bosses do without permission what they would never be allowed to do were they to ask for the people's consent? There is no longer any doubt about what they do. It is so notorious that when it is spoken of everybody admits knowledge of it, but few express indignation about it. Occasionally some one confesses that he thinks it is very bad, but he supposes that so long as we have universal suffrage, and such a large ignorant vote, we must have bosses to attend to the business of organizing and directing our political forces; that somebody must do it for us, since we really have not time to do it for ourselves. As Lowell says, «We should not tolerate a packed jury

which is to decide on the fate of a single man; yet we are content to leave the life of the nation at the mercy of a packed convention.» That is precisely what we are doing when we turn our government over to the bosses. They are, what Lowell calls them, the «flesh-flies that fatten on the sores of the body politic, and plant there the eggs of their disgusting and infectious progeny.» They seek to put the business of government into the hands of the least fit, and to administer it against the interests of the people by making it incompetent, extravagant, and corrupt. Nothing but the written constitutions of our States is able to obstruct their subverting progress. But for such a barrier in New York during the past year, the entire public service of the State would have been looted, in defiance of existing laws, to make additional spoils for a boss. The legislature, owned by him, was willing to override the laws, but it could not override the constitution. Yet the people had adopted that constitution only a few months before by a very large majority, thus expressing directly their wish in the matter. The boss paid not the slightest heed to that wish, but defied it in every way, seeking to break down the constitution, and ordering his legislature not to pass laws designed to carry into effect its provisions.

So long as bosses are tolerated there is little use in considering plans for municipal and other kinds of political reform. These are all based upon the assumption that we are living under a system of popular government, which is not the case. We are living under boss government, and the same results would be attained, in many instances, were we to dispense with legislatures and governors and mayors and other officials, and concentrate all the powers of these officials and bodies in the boss. It is really he who exercises them now. The State would save money in salaries by abolishing all other executive and legislative offices, and allowing him to carry on the government directly through his personal edicts. If this were to be done, the evils of the system would be so apparent that the people would make short work of it. They would see that the only pressing reform is the annihilation of the boss, and they would waste no time in talking about other reforms. That is what they must be aroused to do now. Until the boss is overthrown there is little use in trying to improve our forms of government. The best governmental machinery in the world, lodged in his hands, will accomplish little for the people. He it is who has lowered the standard of our legislative bodies, State and National, and made political life so unattractive to men of intelligence and character that few of them care to enter it.

We need throughout the country something like an anti-boss league, which shall consolidate all the reform forces of the land against this public enemy. Every moral and educational influence should join in this work. The colleges and schools should instruct their youth

against him, and the pulpit and press should attack him without ceasing. He is a thief and a robber, who comes, not in the night, but in broad daylight, and filches away our rights and liberties, our national good name, and our reputation as a people capable of self-government. If we have not the courage and patriotism necessary to enable us to cope successfully with an enemy of this character, then our condition is sad indeed.

A Little Rift within the Lute.

EVERY patriotic American must deprecate the growing feeling of irritation which is perceptible between the East and the West. That it is anything more than a temporary difference of view in matters of taste and opinion we do not believe. It is very like a quarrel or tiff between brothers, which, instead of indicating a lack of affection, really furnishes evidence of it. If they loved each other less they would agree much more easily. The appearance of a common enemy would unite them in closer union than ever.

Whatever discord there may be is due to a natural rivalry in power and strength. The young, vigorous, indomitable West resents the assumption of superiority which the older East is somewhat in the habit of wearing quite as a matter of course. The East, while heartily admiring the tremendous energy of the West, is sincerely alarmed by its disposition to defy the results of human experience in matters of great moment, and to say that its own strength is so abounding and inexhaustible that it can settle all questions for itself without regard to the rules and limitations which weaker states and nations have found to be necessary. From this it has come about that the West accuses the East of underestimating both its material and its intellectual strength, while the East suspects the West of giving itself over more and more each year to financial delusions which, if allowed to dominate our national policy, will bring us as a people to bankruptcy and ruin. The West, joined by the South, charges the East with intellectual arrogance, and with the intolerance of vast hoarded wealth, seeking only to perpetuate and magnify its power. The East declares that the West refuses even to listen to reason, and is bent upon having its own way without regard to consequences; that it opposes many things simply because the East favors them, there being an increasing desire in the West to do something to punish and humiliate the arrogant East.

There is nothing in this situation which is irremediable, but there is in it much that may lead to serious consequences unless something be done to bring the two sections to a better understanding of each other. At bottom each thoroughly appreciates the other. What is most needed is a full comprehension of the fact that the highest good of one is always the highest good of the other; that neither can suffer or prosper alone, but each must share its fortune with the other. The West cannot injure the East without injuring itself in equal measure. The enormous development and power of the West are the common glory of the whole country, and contribute to the strength and prosperity of the East. We are convinced that the more thoughtful minds in both sections comprehend these facts perfectly, and re-

gret the irritation which a less clear perception of them causes in other minds.

Probably nothing ever did more to bring the East and the West together in national sentiment than the Columbian Exposition at Chicago. The whole country was justly proud of that, and no section was more ungrudging in its praise of it than the East. It was conceded frankly and heartily that Chicago had done what would not have been possible in New York or any other Eastern city, making not merely a world's fair, but a world's wonder. Western energy and dauntless daring were combined with a loftiness and breadth of artistic purpose to produce results which would have been impossible in an older civilization. As an experienced English observer said, «Not only was it the most wonderfully beautiful thing of the kind the world had ever seen, but it was likely to be the most wonderfully beautiful that ever would be seen; for no other nation would ever have the audacious courage to do again what Chicago did.» Yet this fair was merely the sublime outcome of one of the chief elements, if not the chief element, of Western progress—the public spirit of the people. They believe in their country, are proud of its wonderful growth and unbounded resources, and are determined to do everything in their power to add to its fame. This spirit is particularly strong in Western cities, and appeals to it are never made in vain. It makes possible the establishment on a firm and enduring basis of educational and artistic enterprises which find little cordial support in Eastern cities, and which lead there only a struggling and precarious existence. They are supported in Western cities because they will be a credit to the communities and will add to their fame. It would be an unspeakable boon to Eastern cities if this public spirit could be aroused in them.

But while the East ought to be, and in many respects is, willing to follow the more impulsive and progressive leadership of the West, it cannot consent to acquiesce in the financial folly which, with the notable exception of certain localities, has overspread that section of the country. There can be no greater folly than to think that the East can be injured by changing the money standard and destroying the national credit, while the West will not only escape unharmed, but will be benefited. This is not a matter of opinion, but of demonstrated experience. If the Western advocates of the free coinage of silver are right in their view, and the gold-standard men of the East are wrong in theirs, then all human experience since the dawn of civilization is wrong also. It must all be set aside, and the world begin anew, so far as economic principles and practice are concerned. To say that America is so great a country, so rich, so powerful, so capable of existing separate and distinct from the rest of the world, that she can make the world all over again on her own plan, is surely a folly if ever there was one. However it may be in other matters, it is not arrogance in the East to say there is only one side to this question, and that the people in the West and the South who take the other side are unenlightened or misguided; it is merely the statement of an incontestable truth. In every Western and Southern community, as a rule, the men who have to do with business and financial affairs know that the Eastern position is the only one that is safe, and

they are using their influence unceasingly to spread light among the people. That the people are misguided is not strange. In the first place, the subject is a difficult one to understand for all except a few minds with special bent for it, and, in the second place, unscrupulous politicians, seeking only present power, go about constantly disseminating error and prejudice. In the end the honest common sense of the people will assert itself, and this element of discord between the East and the West will pass away.

We believe firmly that all others will also pass away, and leave in their place a union all the stronger and more enduring because of their former existence. The East and the West are immeasurably more powerful together than either could ever be separately. The great qualities of both united in a common growth and development will make a far grander nation than those of either expanded to their utmost limit could produce. We want the energy and vigor and boundless enthusiasm of the West, we want its public spirit and its unshakable faith in the national glory and destiny; but we want with these elements the stability and conservatism of the East, and its respect for and determination to abide by the experience of mankind as the safest guide in human conduct. These elements united, as they must and will be, in a common and harmonious nationality will make us, what Mr. Bryce predicts in his latest edition of "The American Commonwealth" that we are destined to be, not only a nation that is powerful, and the wealth of whose citizens is prodigious, but a nation that is one in government, in speech, in character, and in ideas.

The Workingman's Support of International Arbitration.

THE movement in behalf of peace between nations appears to spring from something that looks like economic war, for among those who most stoutly demand the arbitration of international disputes are the societies of "organized labor." Is this attitude of workingmen new? Does organization merely afford an opportunity for expressing what they have always desired, or have their actual views and wishes undergone a change? If a real difference has been made in their attitude on the question of war and peace, has organization caused it?

The demand for arbitration has been made with most emphasis where the workingmen are most thoroughly united for other purposes. In England, where trades' unions are at their best, the peace movement among workingmen is strongest; and in our own Eastern States it is very strong. The strength of the demand itself grows in proportion as the contest over wages, for which trades' unions are primarily formed, becomes active. There is clearly a connection between these phenomena.

There are other possible causes of the increase of the peace sentiment. Precedents for arbitration have multiplied in recent years. Our people are now more familiar than were their predecessors with the process that makes fighting unnecessary. Already there is available, in the dealings of nations with each other, the germ of a judicial system. It is about in the stage of advancement that tribunals for private cases had reached when in minor disputes between neighbors it

had become customary to call in friends to mediate. The graver issues had still to be fought out in the old way. In the proposals now pending for a permanent tribunal of arbitration between America and one or more other countries, the impression prevails that certain important questions may have to be reserved from the express and formal jurisdiction of the new court. If, for instance, America and England are to agree in advance to abide by the decisions of a tribunal, they can at first be expected to make over to it only minor questions of interest. While the right to fight for a claim of vital importance will probably not be definitely surrendered, the hope is that the court will soon come to decide questions both small and great. Without promising to abide by the decisions, the nations may, in practice, ask for decisions and abide by them. The reservation of a right to take up arms will merely signify a jealous assertion of sovereignty. It will not mean war, provided there shall exist a strong moral pressure in favor of peace. It is for the sources of such a pressure that we are now looking. Will trades' unions create it? Will they aid decisively in the establishment of the court, in the extension of its work, and in making its decisions effective?

The action of trades' unions on both sides of the Atlantic is more than a new expression of an old demand. It expresses what is largely a new demand. The interest of nearly all men engaged in industry has long been opposed to war. Capital is wasted at an appalling rate by the modern method of fighting, and this waste reduces the wage-paying capacity of employers. War, as it were, sterilizes the earth. The workingman finds himself in a less fruitful environment, because of the reduction in the outfit of working appliances that war occasions. You cannot beat the pruning hooks of the world into swords and still gather as much wheat as before. Wealth-creating power shrinks and wages fall by reason of such wastes. Debts that have to be paid by indirect taxation press disproportionately on workingmen. It is always laborers more than others who have to face muskets; they are the rank and file of armies. Even if they keep out of the field they suffer by inflated prices. Goods are dear in time of war; measured in commodities, wages in America were at their lowest in 1865.

These motives for peace are old. What is new is described by the word "solidarity." It is, first, an alliance between workingmen in various occupations. Here and there an industry thrives during a war. Some one must build ships and engines and make cannon. There are contracts to be expected for clothing and feeding armies. The employer who gets a contract may make a profit. How far the chance of this may figure among the meaner motives for war it would be hard to say; but the men to whom such motives appeal are very few. What is of consequence is that the present solidarity of labor prevents workingmen from feeling the contagion of this desire for gain. To them, as they know, there is no share of it accruing. Their pay depends, not on the profits of the few men who have army contracts, but on the productivity of labor in the general industrial field. Wages are fixed in a universal market. There is a level toward which the pay of workingmen of a given grade is everywhere tending. Only when general or social labor is productive can the wages in a particular shop be high. The labor movement cuts across all lines that separate different

occupations. Its aim is high general wages. These are not secured by giving fat contracts to a few employers. A disastrous lowering of wages as a whole results from war. The new solidarity of labor makes it seek the good of workmen in every employment.

There is a further, an international, solidarity that works even more powerfully in this direction. The modern market for many things is world-wide. Labor has its pay adjusted in no one country alone. It may get more in some countries than in others; but its pay anywhere is an influence in determining its pay everywhere. There is a growing affiliation among wage-earners of all lands, in their efforts to get higher pay from employers of all lands. There is a line that separates the industrial classes, and it pays small attention to political boundaries. The quasi-battle that is waging across this line is not national. It creates comradeship among the workers of all countries, and this means far more than

a feeling. It is an affiliation in a practical cause in which success is endangered by international breaks.

Socialism, also, is hostile to international warfare. Its aim also is international. It wants all states to become employers, and to make of the world, ultimately, a co-operative commonwealth. Scientific anarchism wants all governments abolished, and the world made into a commonwealth of little industrial communes. It would thus become a brotherhood of local brotherhoods, without the capacity for national war. Anarchism of the meaner sort has its own reasons for objecting to armies.

Thus, out of the issue that chiefly disquiets the world, — the wage contest, — there is growing an influence that makes powerfully for international peace. The motives back of it are mainly noble, though with some inferior admixture. Ultimately its power may be counted on at the polls. Certainly it gives to the present peace movement its most substantial basis.



OPEN LETTERS

Church Architecture in America.

LEADING characteristics of modern American architecture are disregard of historic traditions, and a readiness to strike out into new paths under the impulsion of changing conditions or the pressure of practical considerations. In secular design, and specially at its opposite poles in the rural house and the lofty office building, these traits have led to results full of artistic interest and of promise for the future. In recent church-building the prospect appears more doubtful. A vast amount of money has been expended in the United States during the last twenty years upon elaborate and costly ecclesiastical edifices, some of them sumptuous to the verge of extravagance in their appointments and decoration. Yet to how few of them can we point as monuments of really noble or impressive architecture! With all their richness of design, and the striking originality of conception which sometimes characterizes them, they rarely possess the monumental quality, the repose and dignity, which the history and traditions of architecture have taught us to associate with buildings designed for worship. They display great cleverness of arrangement, convenience of planning, luxury of appointment and decoration, and, externally, picturesqueness of mass. They serve well the purpose for which they appear to have been solely designed — that of housing luxuriously the congregation, choir, clergy, Sunday-school, and social activities of the parish. Seldom do they manifest the existence of any higher aim than this, or any adequate recognition of the value of simple dignity, sober decoration, and solid and durable construction, in place of singularity and picturesqueness of design. The division of the religious communities of the United States into so many

denominations and sects, and of these into small parishes, has multiplied the churches, but has reduced their size. They lack in consequence, for the most part, the important element of large dimensions and ample scale. Other things equal, a large church offers better opportunity for impressive effect than a small one. Half a dozen churches seating a few hundred each cannot equal in majesty and importance a single edifice of commanding and imposing size. This predominance of small churches is largely due to the modern Protestant conception of the church as chiefly a place for preaching. This demands congregational units no larger than can be easily gathered within the range of an ordinary voice. The main concern of the designer is, then, to produce a good audience-room. Loftiness, amplitude, grandeur of scale, under these conditions, are apt to appear unnecessary and extravagant. Unhappily, the want of these qualities is seldom atoned for by those artistic excellencies which make many of the parish churches of European countries appear stately and worshipful in spite of their smallness. Our national disregard of architectural traditions, the desire for originality and the picturesque, have operated to prevent the crystallization of specific types of church design which might limit the caprices of individual conception.

In this respect the Episcopal churches of the United States are very apt to be superior to those of the non-liturgical denominations. Their designers have generally kept within limits imposed by ecclesiastical tradition, and have adhered more or less closely to well-defined historic types. A predilection for Gothic forms is a part of this tradition; but the comparative excellence of our Episcopal churches is something quite apart from their prevalent Gothic style, which is often only indifferently treated. Some of the finest among them —

Trinity Church in Boston, for example—are not Gothic at all. But the adherence to established types has left the architect free to bestow upon the proportions and detail of his design an amount of study quite out of the question where one has to invent a new type with each design.

Reasoning *a fortiori*, one would expect to find the noblest and worthiest examples of our church architecture among those erected by the Roman Catholics. It was the Church of Rome which, in the middle ages, evolved the unrivaled splendors of Gothic ecclesiastical architecture. As compared with the Protestant denominations, the Catholics of the United States have in general the signal advantage of much larger parishes, requiring churches of correspondingly increased dimensions. In small towns as well as great the Catholic churches are almost without exception the largest in the place. It is a regrettable fact that their architectural quality should so seldom correspond with their dimensions. They are frequently pretentious and showy buildings, but deplorably deficient in architectural character. They are badly and ignorantly designed, and in their internal treatment tawdriness and sham, both of construction and decoration, are often offensively conspicuous. They have neither the sobriety and dignity of the Episcopal churches, nor the straightforward utilitarianism and picturesque originality of the non-liturgical churches. Apparently the evil influence of the depraved taste of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which, under the lead of the Italian Jesuits, perpetrated such atrocities in plaster and sham marble throughout Europe, is not yet exhausted among us. Here in New York the only Catholic church of really conspicuous architectural merit is St. Patrick's Cathedral. This cathedral, undeniably the finest Catholic church in the United States, was the work of a Protestant architect, the late James Renwick.¹ All Saints', at 129th street and Madison Avenue, one of the most artistic of the more recently erected Catholic churches, was designed by his successors, the firm of Renwick, Aspinwall & Russell. Among the other Catholic churches in this city there is not one which one would care to visit a second time for the sake of its architectural beauty. The Paulist church at 59th street and Columbus Avenue is impressive by its size and the unusual severity and simplicity of its design, but this is a wholly negative merit, though a very unusual one.

It is not easy to determine how far this general inferiority of modern American Catholic churches is due to an actual dearth of architectural talent among the Romanists of the United States, how far to favoritism in the selection of architects, and how far to a general artistic insensibility. Whether the fault lies with the clergy or the people, I am not prepared to say. There is evidently somewhere a woful lack of artistic training. Yet the Catholic authorities seldom go outside of the ranks of their church for their architects, and men of very inferior training are intrusted with the designing of the most important and costly churches, which by their very size and costliness become the more objectionable as lasting monuments of wasted opportunity and artistic ignorance.

¹ It is a somewhat significant fact that very few among our leading architects are Catholics.

A reform in the architectural practice of the ancient Church would be a welcome consummation, and should be desired and promoted alike by those within and without «the pale.» A «campaign of education» in art, and especially in architecture, among the clergy and the more influential laity might in time rescue their church architecture from the *banalité* and unworthiness of its present condition. There are signs here and there of an artistic awakening in that Church. Will not its adherents rise to their opportunities and responsibilities toward the community in the matter?

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

A. D. F. Hamlin.

A Shock to General Sheridan.

SECRETARY STANTON always held a taut official rein over the military commanders in the field during the war. Any manifestation of mere militarism, so repugnant to the spirit of a pure democracy like ours, was peculiarly distasteful to him, and at times he appears to have taken a savage pleasure in curbing the self-assertion of his generals. Intoxicated with the power of command and the popularity of success, some of the generals at times put themselves very much in evidence, and easily fell into a domineering manner bordering on insolence toward their inferiors in rank, and specially toward civilians having to do with military affairs. Occasionally one so far forgot himself as to treat the lion of the War Office with a flippant levity akin to contempt, but he never repeated the indiscretion. Anything like this instantly occasioned a reproof which was not soon forgotten. Military success always won Mr. Stanton's unalloyed good-will and cordial official support; but woe to the officer, high or low, who presumed upon this to overstep certain lines of respect and subordination which the Secretary thought due in their official relations. There was no hesitation on his part in «calling down» the greatest of them when the dignity of his office was to be maintained. There is no doubt that his influence was a wholesome one in this regard, though it is probable that he too sometimes abused the arbitrary power of his great office.

An illustration of this fierce characteristic of the War Secretary is found in a short and pithy correspondence, which the public has never seen, between General Sheridan and him in the winter of 1864. Sheridan, by his series of brilliant victories over the Confederate General Early in the Shenandoah Valley at Winchester, Fisher's Hill, and Cedar Creek, had immediately become a great military figure, a necessity and a tower of strength to the Union cause. He was exceedingly popular throughout the country, and enjoyed the entire confidence as well as the personal admiration of both Lincoln and Stanton. That he somewhat presumed upon this state of affairs is probable; for though he did not lose his head in this sudden rise to greatness, there is certainly observable for a time in his correspondence an «I-own-the-earth» air not found in it previously, nor, indeed, subsequent to the collision with Mr. Stanton of which I am about to give an account. But General Sheridan was young, and acutely appreciated the harvest of personal popularity and consequence that inevitably followed his well-earned military success. If, for the moment, as I suspect, he somewhat exaggerated his importance, he may well be forgiven under the circumstances.

From the time he entered upon the command in the valley, like his long line of predecessors, General Sheridan had been greatly annoyed and his plans sometimes disconcerted by senseless alarms of Confederate invasions in West Virginia, coupled with frantic appeals for instant aid. The official archives are fairly sandwiched with these alarmist telegrams addressed to the War Department from both the civil and the military authorities of that region. They came with such perennial regularity, and were so generally unfounded, that very little attention was paid to them by the Government, especially in the last year of the war, unless there was corroborative intelligence from other quarters.

On December 22, 1864, Governor A. I. Boreman telegraphed from Wheeling to Mr. Stanton that the Confederate General Rosser, with some 3000 cavalry, was supposed to be advancing upon Grafton and the western part of the State. This information was without the shadow of a foundation: in view of the military situation and the season, the supposititious movement of Rosser would have been absurd. But however inconsequential such a despatch appeared to be, Mr. Stanton followed his wise and invariable rule of promptly forwarding it to the commander of the department in the field, without suggestion or comment. In regular course Governor Boreman's telegram reached General Sheridan at Winchester.

This last West Virginia canard, closely following a number of preceding annoyances of a similar nature, exhausted the hot-headed Sheridan's small stock of Irish patience, and on its receipt in the dead hours of the night the general telegraphed to Mr. Stanton the following impromptu comments on the information:

WINCHESTER, VA., December 22, 1864. 11:30 P. M.
HON. E. M. STANTON, *Secretary of War*:

Governor Boreman's telegram received. If I were to make disposition of the troops of my command in accordance with the information received from the commanders in the Department of Western Virginia, whom I have found, as a general thing, always alarming in their reports and stupid in their duties and actions, I certainly would have my hands full. I believe many of them to be more interested in coal-oil than in the public service. It was only yesterday that Rosser was at Crab Bottom, according to their reports; on which, at the suggestion of General Crook, I sent a regiment to Beverly. It was only two or three days previous that Rosser was at Romney, etc. They have annoyed me until, with your sanction, I would take great pleasure in bringing some of them to grief.

P. H. SHERIDAN, *Major-General*.

Under whatever circumstances and to whomsoever addressed, such a despatch as the foregoing was unwarranted. In both substance and spirit it was not only in bad taste from a man of Sheridan's intelligence and altitude, but very indiscreet. Addressed to such another as Edwin M. Stanton, it was positively grotesque. Prior to Cedar Creek, Sheridan, bold and independent as he undoubtedly was, would have meekly borne a far greater infliction than Governor Boreman's telegram before being dragged into penning such a despatch to the redoubtable head of the War Department.

The next morning, when this flippant epistle was placed in the Secretary's hand, he appears to have been deeply incensed, and immediately sent to General Sheridan the following stinging rejoinder:

WAR DEPARTMENT, December 23, 1864.

MAJOR-GENERAL SHERIDAN, Winchester:

No one, that I am aware of, has asked you to make disposition of your troops in accordance with the information received from the commanders in the Department of Western Virginia. Governor Boreman's despatch was received in the night, and sent by the operator in accordance with general instructions to give military commanders every report that comes here in respect to the movements of the enemy in their commands. They are expected to form their own judgment of its value. It has been supposed that such information might be useful, and desired by you, as it is by other commanders who are your seniors in the service, without provoking improper insinuations against the State authorities or disrespectful reply. With your subordinate commanders you will take such action as you please, but such reports as come to this department in relation to the movements of the enemy will be forwarded as heretofore, and will be expected to be received with the respect due the department of which you are a subordinate.

EDWIN M. STANTON, *Secretary of War*.

I am told by one of the staff-officers that on the morning of December 23, 1864, the cold mountain air about military headquarters at Winchester was made blue by the sulphurous ebullitions of the major-general commanding. The annoyance caused by Governor Boreman's ridiculous news that Rosser was making a winter raid with cavalry into the mountains of West Virginia was slight compared to the bewildering shock experienced at that headquarters upon the receipt of Secretary Stanton's telegram. No doubt the successful little general raged and fumed for proper effect upon his admiring camp-followers at Winchester, but no evidence of his wrath was forthcoming at Washington. No reply to Stanton's telegram can be found in the War Department archives. General Sheridan at the moment was probably too full for utterance, and a little calm reflection afterward likely had the effect of cooling whatever resentment he felt.

I will venture the opinion that this decided check, delivered so coldly and suddenly, and coming so unexpectedly from a quarter in which he imagined himself safely entrenched, was of actual benefit to General Sheridan in toning down an element of devil-may-care recklessness in his character which made itself apparent only after his brilliant successes in the field. At all events, an immediate and significant change in the general tone of his official utterances is easily detected after this incident, particularly in his correspondence with the Washington authorities. But I do not perceive that it caused any change in the friendly relations of Stanton and Sheridan. It certainly cannot be gathered from the records that Sheridan bore any ill-will toward Mr. Stanton.

WAR RECORDS OFFICE, WASHINGTON. *Leslie J. Perry.*

Mr. Jett and the Capture of Booth.

In the article published in the April CENTURY giving a detailed account of the assassination of President Lincoln, the writer states that «Jett, for his connection with the affair, was jilted by his sweetheart, ostracized by his friends, and outlawed by his family.» Being a near relative of Mr. Jett, and our homes being only a mile apart at the time of these deplorable occurrences, I am able to say that while Mr. Jett did not marry the young lady designated by the writer as his «sweet-

heart," she and her family continued his fast friends. He was never ostracized by his friends or outlawed by his family. No person of sense blamed him in the slightest degree for his action in piloting the Federal cavalry to where he had left the lame man (Booth) rather than have his "brains blown out."

Mr. Jett was in his spirits and demeanor in no way affected by the unfortunate circumstances with which he was innocently connected. He went to Baltimore a year after, engaged in business, traveling constantly in Virginia, and married the daughter of a prominent physician of Baltimore. Some sixteen years afterward he was attacked with paresis, and died at the hospital of

Williamsburg, Virginia, respected by every one who knew him.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

John L. Marye.

«Sargent and his Painting»—A Correction.

TWO errors occurred in the biographical part of the article in the June CENTURY on «Sargent and his Painting.» The maiden name of Mr. John S. Sargent's mother was Singer, not Newbold. His father's name was Fitz-William Sargent, not Fitz-Hugh. Dr. Fitz-William Sargent was born at Gloucester, Massachusetts, was a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and practised medicine in Philadelphia.—EDITOR.



IN LIGHTER VEIN

Mrs. Thompson's Ten.

MRS. THOMPSON softly closed her front door, and went on, through the two lines of dusty box, with her friend Mrs. Drivers.

Her small, faded face wore a slight flush, and she smiled before she spoke.

«He 's such a tease,» she said; «he all but worries my life out; but all the Thompsons are just that way. They are bound to have their joke.»

She gave an affected little laugh, drawing her glove, with jaunty pulls and pats, over her small, rough hand.

Mrs. Drivers stalked on with uplifted chin, in ostentatious forbearance, and said nothing; but her lips were very thin.

«Mr. Thompson's mightily set against all those new-fangled clubs and societies and things that you read about nowadays in the newspapers, and I reckon he thought I was going to join something like that. Men are mighty foolish about their wives: they don't want them to do anything that don't look just right.»

Mrs. Drivers said nothing. Her glance was traveling over the shabby black dress and bonnet of the other. She was a large, slow woman, who rustled richly as she walked.

«He could n't really have anything against the King's Daughters,» Mrs. Thompson went on; «and I think it will be real nice to belong to a Ten, and go to meetings and things—»

«You ought to go about some,» Mrs. Drivers said. «I could n't live cooped up as you do.»

The little woman flushed and trembled with an indignation which seemed to have no adequate cause, and found no expression in words.

«Some people don't find any pleasures as sweet as the pleasures of home,» she said. «I always was a stay-at-home, and that just suits Mr. Thompson. He 's the kind of man that 's all but lost without a woman around.»

«Yes—I reckon so.»

Mrs. Drivers seemed to stop herself forcibly.

Mrs. Thompson looked nettled.

«It certainly would hurt me,» she remarked, «to have

a husband that wa' n't dependent on me,—like some you see.»

They walked on a little way in silence, each with a slightly offended look.

«There go the Smith girls into Emeline's,» Mrs. Thompson exclaimed, with some excitement of manner.

She glanced down furtively at her rusty dress, but her eyes sparkled with anticipation.

ABOUT half a dozen of the Bakersville ladies were seated about on the haircloth sofas and chairs, talking together, while they waited for the tardy members. A little crooked, black-eyed woman came and sat down by Mrs. Thompson as the hostess, a pleasant-faced old maid, flitted from her to greet a new arrival.

«Well, I certainly am glad to see you, Mrs. Thompson,» she said. «But I told Emeline, when I heard you'd joined, that the skies were surely going to fall. How 's Mr. Thompson?»

A shade came over Mrs. Thompson's face.

«His health is mighty bad, Mrs. King,» she said; «and he 's one of that kind that won't ever say they're sick, and so I 'm uneasy about him all the time.»

«He looks mighty well,» the other suggested. «I've never seen the man yet that would n't make a fuss if he had a finger-ache. Don't you bother about his being sick if he don't say he 's sick.»

Mrs. Thompson flushed. «People that have dyspepsia,» she said, with a touch of dignity, «don't know what 's the matter with them half the time.»

She sat rapt and enthralled during the reading and praying, her voice rose high in the hymns, and a faint color glowed in her cheeks, as if from pure enjoyment.

«It certainly does do a person a heap of good to get away from home sometimes,» she confessed, at the close of the meeting, «even if there ain't any place like home. And there ain't, of course. I certainly am glad I joined.»

She stood laughing and chatting with her friends in a way that surprised herself.

«Mr. Thompson wants to monopolize me so; I believe he 's real jealous of my Ten; but he 'll be bound to see it 's a mighty good thing.»



TOPICS OF THE TIME

The Services of Art to the Public.

NO one in touch with the progress of art in the United States can fail to note the evidences of a new and widespread movement of late, which recognizes the good influence of art as an offset to the materializing tendencies of the age. When Mr. Millet, as chief of decoration at the World's Fair, in 1893, obtained from the board of directors commissions for pictorial decoration in some of the principal buildings at the great exhibition, and visitors saw how capable our painters are in this field when an opportunity is given them, the plainest proof of the ability of native talent was afforded. Taken together with the excellent sculptural work and the architectural triumphs at the exhibition, it was seen that, unknown to the general public, certain American artists had attained to a high degree of proficiency in decorative work, and only required such a chance as was offered at Chicago to convince the layman of the expediency of spending money for purely esthetic purposes. Private enterprise quickly recognized it, and various hotels and residences recently erected in New York and elsewhere exhibit on their walls and ceilings further evidences of the merit and capability of the American artist as a decorator in the true sense of the word. The organization of the Municipal Art Society of New York, in the spring of 1893, the object of which is to provide adequate sculptural and pictorial decoration for the public buildings and parks of the city, by devoting the funds obtained from its membership fees to the execution of artistic projects determined by competition or direct commission, owes its origin in part to the «revelation» at Chicago. This society has already presented to the city, as custodian for the State, the beautiful decorations by Edward Simmons, in the room occupied by the criminal branch of the Supreme Court, and has other work in hand. The architects of the Boston Public Library, acting with the public-spirited trustees of that institution, have succeeded in obtaining for their noble building mural decoration by such artists as Puvis de Chavannes, John S. Sargent, and Edwin A. Abbey, and sculpture by Augustus and Louis St. Gaudens. Finally, as the most conspicuous instance, the United States government has given commissions to two score or more of our best-known artists, both painters and sculptors, to decorate the new Congressional Library at Washington. These works are now well under way, and at the present time there is a feeling which amounts to conviction that we are not far from such general recognition of the value of art as a factor in our civilization as has existed for centuries in Europe, and finds its best expression in our day in the liberal provisions made by the French governmental authorities, not only for the artistic embellishment of France's splendid capital, but for all its historic towns and industrial centers.

The bill recently introduced in Congress, under the auspices of the Public Art League of the United States, creating a United States Commission, which shall pass upon the artistic merits of all plans for important public buildings and of all works of art that the government may propose to purchase or order, marks another step in the right direction. How far the good intentions of the bill, if it becomes a law, may be thwarted by the machinations of «practical politics» remains to be seen.

The conclusion must not be drawn that it is all plain sailing ahead for those who wish to see art occupy its proper place among us, and none but capable men intrusted with the duty of giving it in its best forms to the world. One has to note in New York City alone the contest between its citizens and the then Board of Park Commissioners over the Harlem River speedway; the indefensible decision of a better board, who succeeded them, in the matter of a site for the Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument, directly contrary to the recommendations contained in an excellent and thoughtfully considered report on the question submitted by the Fine Arts Federation, which spoke for all the societies of painters, sculptors, and architects of the city; and the determination of certain excellent citizens, through the Board of Aldermen, to force upon the city an unsatisfactory work in the shape of the Heine Memorial Fountain. However, the obstinate procedure in the last instance brought forth the enactment of a law providing for a competent commission, the approval of which is necessary before a work of art can be accepted for the city by the Board of Aldermen, or anybody else. The evils of the apparently fair, open-competition system meantime are still with us.

In the National domain an obstacle to artistic progress has been found in the results of the Sherman Statue competition. But such mistakes are merely obstacles on the upward path. The good influences will ultimately outweigh the bad, and the American people may be congratulated on the prospect before them in the near future, when public taste, and the standard of public criticism, will be lifted by the presence of good art in public places.

The Defacement of Natural Scenery.

CARLYLE'S famous explosion, in «Sartor Resartus,» against what he called «view-hunting,» meaning the delight in nature for its own sake, like a good many more of his utterances, represented nothing but a temporary irritation. At Craigenputtoch he had plenty of «scenery,» but he lacked other things that he seemed to require more. Having nothing but the «mountain solitudes» and the state of his digestion to take the place of society, it is no wonder that he should have issued his «Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous

Regiment» of the Picturesque. It is satisfactory to remark that, later in life, even he attained a saner view. The pages of the «Reminiscences» that may be read with the least mixed pleasure are those in which he paints the scenery of which, in his early days, he became so impatient.

Whether Carlyle was right or not in attributing the revival of «view-hunting» to the influence of Goethe in particular, there can be no question that it was contemporaneous with the Romantic movement in literature, to which Walter Scott and Wordsworth, in their several ways, so powerfully contributed. The Romantic movement was in itself a return to nature, and it was inevitable that there should attend it an increase of interest in the external aspects of nature.

At any rate, there is no need now of arguing in favor of the love of nature. We all know that it is one of the greatest helps, if not to what used to be called «grace,» to what is now called culture, denoting spirituality as well as refinement. An indifference to natural scenery all cultivated persons look upon as a pitiable or blamable insensibility, and the wanton defacement of it as a misdemeanor. Our urban parks, simulating wild or cultivated nature, are the most cherished of our municipal possessions, and show that a democracy may be trusted to supply itself with this kind of public possession, as well as the aristocracy, the maintenance of whose own «seats,» in part for the public benefit, is in older countries justly regarded as one of its most valuable functions.

With respect to rural scenery, it must be owned that the case is somewhat different. Scarcely any American can fail to recall some rural scene which he might desire to see under the control of a benevolent despot, or, in less majestic language, owned by some rich and refined person, who should have the power and the will to bring out its latent beauty, or at least to protect its patent beauty from defacement. In fact, we, too, have instances to show of the private acquisition for the public benefit of scenes that need to have their natural advantages either developed or protected. There is one fashionable seaside resort at which it is brought to the attention of the visitor, that the smaller cottagers hold that the largest and richest cottager «ought» to acquire an island of manifest picturesque possibilities, and even that there is «feeling» because he does not both literally and figuratively «meet the views» of the smaller cottagers and the more numerous boarders. This is, perhaps, an extreme instance of a tendency of which everybody has observed instances less striking.

The sentiment has been embodied in the establishment by law of the reservations at Niagara and in the Adirondacks, great as may be the need of an extension of the law in the latter case, and there is a movement to save the Palisades through the intervention of the general government. To preserve all that we have in the way of natural beauty or sublimity from destruction or defacement is a worthy work for legislators, whether the preservation requires an absolute prohibition of the advertisements which now disfigure so many noble landmarks, or whether it can be attained, as has been suggested, by a tax on such advertisements in such places. The defacements that are still allowed to vulgarize sublime or beautiful scenes are, however,

more and more the result of an open and conscious defiance of public sentiment. To extend and intensify this sentiment, and to apply it to the cases that come under one's own observation, is a worthy and humanizing work. It is a work in which every farmer, and every farmer's family, and every villager, and every summer sojourner among the rural beauties of our country can be a useful missionary.

In his «Democracy and Liberty,» vol. i, p. 167, Mr. Lecky has a suggestive passage which, though addressed primarily to English readers, applies, also, to our own country:

The State cannot undertake to guarantee the morals of its citizens, but it ought at least to enable them to pass through the streets without being scandalised, tempted, or molested. The same rule . . . applies also to some things which have no connection with morals: to unnecessary street noises which are the occasion of acute annoyance to numbers; to buildings which destroy the symmetry and deface the beauty of a quarter or darken the atmosphere by floods of unconsumed smoke; to the gigantic advertisements by which private firms and vendors of quack remedies are now suffered to disfigure our public buildings, to destroy the beauty both of town and country, and to pursue the traveller with a hideous eyesore for hundreds of miles from the metropolis. This great evil has vastly increased in our day, and it urgently requires the interposition of the Legislature.

«The Crime of 1873.»

No assertion in regard to silver has been made more persistently during the past few years than that a «crime» of some kind was committed in 1873 when Congress passed the act discontinuing the coinage of the silver dollar piece as a unit of value, and establishing the gold dollar as the sole unit of value. When first made the charge was that the passage of the act was the work of a «conspiracy» by some English and other foreign bankers, who sent an agent to this country with half a million dollars with which to bribe members of Congress. This was soon abandoned, and in its place was started the charge that the act of 1873 had been passed «by stealth.» One silver writer said it went through Congress «like the stealthy tread of a cat.» Another said it was passed «surreptitiously,» and a hundred silver advocates echoed the charge. One silver advocate, who is a writer of history, put it into one of his books as a historical fact, that the silver dollar was «silently demonetized.» Others added «secretly» to «silently,» or «surreptitiously,» and all accompanied the charge with the assertions that the passage of the act took one half of our money out of circulation, and that remonetization would restore the lost half.

One would think, from reading this charge, that the act in question was before Congress for a very brief time, and that it passed without its meaning and effect being known to more than a few members. That is the only way in which a bill can pass «silently» or «by stealth.» Now, what are the facts? The bill was first introduced in April, 1870; was urged upon Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury in a special communication recommending its passage; was subsequently urged by the Secretary in three annual reports—those of 1871, 1872, and 1873; was before Congress for nearly three years, and for five successive sessions; was printed by order thirteen different times; the debates upon it in the

Senate fill sixty-six closely printed columns of the «*Congressional Globe*,» and those in the House seventy-eight columns. If that be «*secrecy*» and «*stealth*,» what would constitute publicity?

There is abundant testimony also that the meaning of the bill was at no time concealed, or sought to be concealed. Mr. John J. Knox, who was then deputy-comptroller of the currency, prepared the bill and accompanied it with a communication, which stated distinctly three times that its provisions discontinued the coinage of the silver dollar piece. He had previously submitted the bill to boards of trade, chambers of commerce, professors in colleges, mint officials, and other experts, and persons best competent to pass judgment upon it, and the replies of these authorities were included in the communication to Congress. Mr. Knox said subsequently, in regard to the charge of «*stealth*,» that it «*has no foundation in fact*,» that «*it is not probable that any act passed by any Congress ever received more care in its preparation, or was ever submitted to the criticism of a greater number of practical and scientific experts.*» Ex-Senator Edmunds, who was a member of the Senate during the three years in question, said many years later, when asked if it was generally understood at the time that the bill put the country upon the single gold standard:

Certainly. All the nations with which we did business—or the most of them—were going to the gold standard alone; and the tendency of all trade pointed to that as the inevitable basis of values.

But the strongest evidence against the stealth charge is to be found in the speeches made in both Houses while the bill was under consideration. In January, 1872, the bill was before the House, and was debated for nearly two whole days. Congressman Kelley, of Pennsylvania, made a long speech in explanation of its provisions, giving a detailed account of the authorities to whom it had been submitted for opinion, saying that its only object was to provide for the «*integrity of the coinage*,» and adding:

I would like to follow the example of England and make a wide difference between our gold and silver coins, and make the gold dollar uniform with the French system of weights, taking the grain as the unit.

Congressman Hooper, of Massachusetts, when the bill was again before the House in February, 1872, explained the coinage and other sections of the bill in a speech which fills ten columns of the «*Globe*,» and in the course of which he said of the silver dollar which the bill discontinued:

The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silverware.

Congressman Potter, of New York, who opposed the bill, said:

This bill provides for the making of changes in the legal tender coin of the country, and for substituting as legal tender coin of only one metal, instead, as heretofore, of two.

Mr. Potter opposed the bill, not because he objected to its effect, but because, as the country had not at that time resumed specie payment, it was premature legislation. In replying to him, Mr. Kelley spoke of the bill in terms which leave no doubt that its meaning was per-

fectly well known by those who were considering it. Speaking of the «*impossibility of retaining the double standard*,» he said:

The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You cannot determine this year what will be the relative value of gold and silver next year. Hence all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver which shall circulate as legal tender for a limited amount, and be redeemable at its face value by the government.

The bill passed the House in May, 1872, and was sent back to the Senate, which had passed it in 1871, with certain amendments. It came up again for final passage, or concurrence in the amendments, in the Senate in January, 1873, and was passed without a division. In his speech explaining its provisions, Senator Sherman said:

The bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar (two half dollars) provided for in this bill is the precise equivalent of a 5-franc piece.

The final debate in the Senate on the bill filled nineteen columns of the «*Globe*.»

At the time the law was passed, the silver dollar was an obsolete coin. Senator Edmunds said, in a published interview from which we have quoted above:

For many years silver, save as a subsidiary currency, had been practically unknown, when the act of 1873 was passed. After 1845, or thereabouts, the silver dollar disappeared, and was an unknown quantity.

The reason was that it was worth three or four cents more than the gold dollar, and hence refused to circulate. Instead of being demonetized by the act of 1873, it had demonetized itself about 1845, or a quarter of a century earlier. Instead of the passage of that act taking half of our currency out of circulation, it actually increased the volume of it very largely. The total silver coinage for the first five years after the passage of the act was over \$31,751,000 against \$7,600,000 for the previous ten years. In 1873 began the enormous increase in the product of silver, which has been going on ever since. In 1870 this product was \$51,575,000. It increased gradually till in 1873 it reached \$81,800,000, a gain of 60 per cent. within three years. It fluctuated a little during the next few years, but at no time fell below \$81,000,000, and in 1881 it reached \$102,000,000. From that time it advanced several millions every year till in 1893 it exceeded \$209,000,000, a gain of 145 per cent. within twenty years.

It is very clear from these facts and figures that it was not the passage of the act of 1873 which either demonetized silver or reduced it one half in value. In both cases, the moving forces have been the eternal laws of nature, and if any «*crime*» has been committed against silver, nature is the culprit.

The Wage-earner's Interest in Improved Housing.

ONE day a wandering cynic chanced to visit a humble tenement lodging, and found the bath-tub full of coal. He did not stop to inquire what he himself would do if

he lived in quarters so restricted that there was no other means of storage, but straightway formed the opinion that improving the homes of working people was a fruitless task because of their misuse of such improvements.

Though the tale may represent reality in isolated instances, as a generalization it is absolutely untrue. Even the dullest and lowest intelligence will, in time, respond to an ameliorated environment.

This is not a mere thesis. There is plenty of evidence to sustain it. Lord Shaftsbury, who practically interested himself for more than sixty years in improving the homes of the masses, said time and again that many of the people who were in a filthy and deplorable condition had been made so by their surroundings, and that where their homes had been improved, they had been rescued from such conditions. Human nature is imitative; the force of good example is catching. Lack of opportunity to lead a more civilized existence, not the inclination to remain as they are, largely explains the situation of the poorer elements amongst city dwellers. Sir Sydney Waterlow cites the punctuality with which the rents are paid to his corporation as evidence that people having good rooms are anxious to keep them. He believes that there is a growing desire for comfortable homes.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony to the desire of wage-earners for a decent living environment is the prosperity attending model housing enterprises wherever they have been established. An exhaustive study made by Prof. E. R. L. Gould, covering all model enterprises in existence in the larger cities of Europe and the United States, shows that eighty-eight per cent. of them are earning dividends equal to or in excess of normal commercial rates. Upwards of 160,000 people find shelter in the improved tenements of London. The owners reap solid financial returns.

Prof. Gould's experience, based on more than three years' study and investigation of this matter, has established the firm conviction that wage-earners feel a positive interest in improved housing, and will cheerfully take advantage of it whenever it is provided.

What are the wage-earner's special interests in improved housing? In the first place, this class is vitally interested in the conservation of health. Good health means earning power, and as working-men lead more or less of a hand-to-mouth existence, any loss of earning power is a serious matter. Lord Beaconsfield aptly voiced this truth in an address delivered at the opening of some new blocks of improved tenements in London. He said «the health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and their power depends.» Few realize the loss of productive energy through sickness brought about by bad living environments. Sir James Paget, the distinguished English physician, estimates that the whole population of England between fifteen and sixty-five years old works in each year twenty millions of weeks less than they might if it were not for sickness. He puts down the loss inflicted on wage-earners at nearly fifteen millions of dollars annually. He refers simply to a purely preventable loss. Some years ago, the London health authorities instituted inquiries in certain low neighborhoods to estimate the value of labor lost in a year, not by sick-

ness, but from sheer exhaustion induced by unfavorable surroundings. It was found that, upon the lowest average, every worker lost about twenty days in the year from this cause. One might go on multiplying such instances, but it is not necessary to enforce the argument by cumulative citation.

Wage-earners are vitally interested in the passage and enforcement of wise sanitary laws. Bad sanitation entails proportionally worse economic consequences to them than to the more highly favored. They are also more often the victims of sickness and epidemics, fostered by insanitary neighborhoods. The working-man has a positive interest in using whatever political power he possesses to secure legal remedies against uninhabitable houses through expropriation laws such as those current in England, and the measure recently put into operation by the Board of Health of New York City under the Tenement House law of 1895. Who, if not wage-earners, are interested in the obliteration of rookeries where the death rate equals seventy-three in a thousand? Whatever promotes better living conditions, no matter whether it comes from legal enactment or private effort, will find support from wage-earners who appreciate their true interests.

Important as are the physical and economic aspects of this question, they are not the sole, perhaps they are not even the chief, considerations. Ethical issues have greater ultimate significance. Many of our moral and social ills are more nearly connected with bad housing than appears upon the surface. Take for example drunkenness. How absurd to suppose that immoderate liquor-drinking can be suppressed so long as people are left to live in houses where lack of elementary sanitation saps vitality, while noisomeness and unattractiveness impel a search for outside relief. It is entirely unjust to suppose that only a low impulse to debauch or a reckless disregard of family duties leads wage-earners to contract the «saloon habit.» The utter dullness, the lack of individuality in tenement-house existence, often lie back of the fatal temptation.

Promiscuity in human bee-hives, rendering independence and isolation impossible to the family, is a serious drawback. What may we legitimately expect from such conditions? Not only can there be no development of domestic life, which in the words of Cardinal Manning «creates a nation,» but every member from earliest childhood is a prey to those forces which drag down,—a stranger to those which uplift. Unwholesome sights and sounds fix themselves in the memories of children ere infancy is really past. The exuberance of youth, finding no possibility of expression inside the home, is poisoned by the philosophy of the streets. Boys, while yet of tender age, are introduced to viciousness and petty crime. Young girls from their earliest teens engage in a struggle for moral preservation. Mothers, instead of finding wifehood and motherhood the sweetest of all human relations, are oppressed to hopelessness, soured into ill-feeling or brutalized into a state of callous indifference. There is everywhere a distinct lowering, if not an entire loss, of moral tone.

With prospects of this sort, varying of course in degree according to circumstances, can one say that wage-earners, even of the lowest class, regard the out-

come with equanimity? Are these fathers and mothers so entirely different from the heads of more fortunately circumstanced homes?

It is a most gratifying fact that along with the destruction of the worst tenements in New York by the opening of the new small parks, and by the condemnation proceedings above referred to, an extensive movement has been started looking to the building of model tenements. Under the new tenement-house laws every new tenement must be better built than formerly,—with more light and air and safety from fire,—but the building on the voluntary principle (and not as in England by the local government) of additional model tene-

ments will help to make a new and better city; better, we believe, both in health, morals, and the enjoyment of life. The principal agency now at work in this direction is the City and Suburban Homes Company, of which Prof. Gould, of Johns Hopkins, is the President, and Mr. A. W. Milbury the Secretary, Mr. R. Fulton Cutting being the Chairman of the Board of Builders. This Company proposes to accomplish its philanthropy in a business-like way, which is, we believe, the best way for the permanent success—the permanent good influence—of the enterprise. The example will surely be followed not only in New York, but in other crowded cities of America.



OPEN LETTERS

Training Schools for Domestic Servants.

IT is too late in the day to discuss the need of better domestic service in the United States. It is the one crying evil that besets society, and makes life a series of makeshifts from the effects of which even the rich are not exempt, while at some time or other, and in most families continually, every man, woman and child suffers more or less. Some day the American people will realize what an intimate bearing this question has upon the national character as well as upon domestic happiness. Systematic study of the subject will follow, and some of the vast energy that now goes into remedial charities will be directed to the solution of this fundamental problem. For the present there seems to be only one remedy for the general situation, the Training School for Domestic Servants. It is the purpose of this article to make suggestions as to its range and character.

Such a school should be well organized and equipped for the thorough training of servants in all branches of household work. In the first place it should have facilities for teaching pupils how to bathe properly, to care for their own bodies and for their own clothes. It should have different departments of training, one for laundresses, another for chambermaids, another for waitresses, another for cooks, and another for general housework servants, the last, of course, requiring a special condensed course. On entrance, young women or girls should be classified as far as possible, according to their general intelligence and ability as well as the employment for which they wish to be fitted. The first work given should be the washing of the kitchen-ware, the sweeping of the kitchen, and the scrubbing of the floor and tables—in short, every pupil should be taught the work of a kitchen-maid. After that, even though she intends to fit herself for a special department, she should be taught to sweep and dust carpeted rooms, and next to do plain washing and ironing, these being among the things which every domestic should know how to do well.

An ordinary dwelling-house might be utilized for the school. The basement, which should be well lighted, could be fitted up as a laundry, capable of accommodating a large number of women, to be classified as they advance in skill in the department. There must be a head laundress to look after those under her, and inspectors to decide when a woman is capable of promotion. In a city of 5000 inhabitants, such a laundry might easily be made self-supporting.

The first floor of the Training School could be devoted to the cooking department. It should have several kitchens where the women in different stages of advancement could work, under an expert leader. The different departments in cookery could be made self-supporting by having lunch-counters where men could go in with their dinner pails and have served to them from the kitchens of the less skilled pupils hot soup, tea, coffee, and other plain food, while a restaurant of a better class might be sustained from the work of those who were more thoroughly trained. Another source of income might be secured by filling orders for special dishes, or for whole meals. Setting a table, waiting, washing fine china and glass, and polishing silver, could be taught in connection with the restaurant.

The upper floors should consist of a parlor, and various apartments, where servants could be trained in cleaning, dusting, window-washing, care of lamps, and all kinds of second work. From this department servants could be sent out by the hour or day to sweep, dust, or act as housemaids.

With the training given in this way a thoroughly competent laundress, if she were a fairly industrious and intelligent worker, should be graduated in perhaps six months. After the first month she might be paid a small sum for her services. The cooks might also begin to have small wages after the first month. At least two years would probably be required for a cook to be thoroughly trained in every branch of her work, from caring for her range to doing fine cookery. Those who show special capacity should be trained to take the whole responsibility of planning and cooking elabo-

rate luncheons and dinners, as well as in the mastery of economical and healthful cookery for every-day life. Wages should increase with gain in skill. The cook would find compensation for the longer course in the high wages which her certificate would enable her to demand. The time required for training in any department would depend upon intelligence and adaptability.

The certificates given by the Training School should be proof of skill, competence, and integrity; they should state exactly what the servant is fitted to do, and they should be so conscientiously given that a housekeeper might rest assured that she knew exactly the capabilities of the servant. Throughout the course earnest effort should be made to impress upon the pupils the idea of moral obligation. Servants should be made to realize the dignity of their work, and the important part its faithful performance plays in the happiness and health of the home, and so of the nation. They should be taught that their work is as essential to the moral and physical well-being of humanity as that of the teacher, the doctor, or the minister, and that it demands just as much unselfishness and conscientiousness. In this connection it might be well to establish a training school for mistresses and other members of the family, that the idea of moral obligation might not be all on one side.

The cooking schools and classes have done a great deal of good, but they do not seem to have reached the root of the trouble. They have not perceptibly improved servants as a class. We need not simply schools of cookery, but schools where everything a servant ought to know is taught.

Doubtless it would take several years for such a school to become self-supporting, but there is no doubt it would be so in time. This may perhaps seem a visionary scheme, but the Training Schools for Nurses were regarded in the same light. The wages of these nurses are from twelve to twenty-five dollars a week, and yet the demand is steadily increasing, and the result is that intelligent girls are constantly fitting themselves for this profession. Shall we not have trained servants when their work demands a like degree of excellence, and they are offered the same inducements? The prevalent opinion is that the work of trained nurses and of trained servants is not to be compared, but the more one thinks about the matter, the more it is seen that there is but little, if any, difference in their importance. There is no doubt, if more attention were paid to the proper preparation of our food, there would be less need of doctors and drugs. Of course with these higher wages many could not afford to employ trained servants, but neither can they afford trained nurses or dressmakers, yet this is never used as an argument against the training of nurses and dressmakers. When the era of the trained servant arrives, a great advantage will be gained for people who cannot afford to pay even the wages now demanded, because untrained servants will have to work more cheaply when they find that a certificate from a Domestic Training School is necessary to procure high wages. The increase of wages will probably not greatly add to the expense of living, as the intelligence of the trained servant will teach her economy of materials and labor, and in many cases one well-trained domestic will be able to do the

work of two who are untrained. It is doubtful whether middle-aged women, with their fixed habits, could be made into trained servants. We must depend upon the younger girls, and even they will probably respond slowly to the demand, so that it will be the rising generation that will reap the benefit of the purposed Training School.

One of the greatest difficulties in this matter is created by the great mass of raw material which is daily dumped upon our shores. Each one of these ignorant, stupid women expects to find a «place» with good wages. To meet this difficulty the coöperation of mistresses is absolutely necessary; they must combine and positively refuse to pay high wages to ignorant servants. If these girls cannot afford to fit themselves for service in the Training School, they should not receive wages for at least three months, or possibly the slight remuneration of one dollar a week might be offered. Housekeepers must make these untrained ignorant women understand that they are receiving a favor in thus being taught. The line should be as closely drawn in domestic service as in other departments of skilled labor. Until mistresses have such a sense of moral obligation as will make them refuse recommendations to undeserving and untrained servants there will be difficulty in carrying out this system. In short, this business of hiring servants must be managed like any other business, and the scale of prices must be arranged according to merit. In this result the Training School will be an important factor.

In one other important particular mistresses must mend their ways before a system of trained servants can be made successful. Every woman should inform herself sufficiently to be able to know when every kind of housework is properly done, and then she should insist that it shall be properly done. It may be suggested that this training, education, and granting of certificates, would make a class already difficult to deal with still more difficult, and that servants would assume such airs that the house would not contain them. Even if this were true, would a disagreeable trained servant be any harder to contend with than a disagreeable untrained servant? A writer who has given the matter a great deal of thought says that the effect would be just the reverse. A sensible and liberal education would teach women not only what is due to themselves, but what is due to others, and the feeling of independence which the thorough knowledge of her business gives to every worker in every craft would make servants invaluable. When we show the daughters of the less favored American families that brains are required in the kitchen, that ability in that department will be as well rewarded as in the positions of stenographer, bookkeeper, or trained nurse, and that, in short, servants will be as much respected for excellence as those who excel in other departments we shall find that the Domestic Servant Problem will solve itself.

Carrie Niles Whitcomb.

United States History in Secondary Schools.

A COMMENT in the January number of *THE CENTURY*, to the effect that «a Yale or Harvard freshman may know

the history of Greece superficially, but he knows it better than the history of England or the United States,» leads me to believe that the decided revolution in the relative position of English and United States history to Greek and Roman history is not appreciated by the large majority of people. In the last ten years the history of the United States has changed its place in the curricula of colleges and secondary schools. It occupied formerly an unimportant position, while such studies as Greek and Roman history, algebra, geometry, etc., held undisputed sway. But now these studies no longer exclude English and American history from their proper place. Somehow the interest, unity, inspiration, and economic teachings of United States history have been recognized. The vast field of economic and historic problems and solutions depicted in the career of this country has not appealed in vain to teachers. Even in the graded schools more attention has been given to the subject than ever before. So that, taken all in all, the young man or woman who enters our colleges in the next five years will know something about the history of this country, and know it well.

There has been a marked advance in the method of study and manner of presentation. History, especially that of the United States, used to be presented as a series of wars, with periodical elections of presidents; but now it is regarded as the development of a society, not as a mere political organization, but as an advancing industrial organization, the social pressure of which demands constantly increasing discipline and more and more limitations of liberty. It is, in fact, the history of a people developing in a way never known before; not, as in Europe, from non-liberty to greater freedom and democracy, but from liberty to greater and greater limitations on that liberty.

This change of view in regard to the presentation and importance of the subject is due chiefly to the influence of a few of the colleges in this country. Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Cornell, and a few others offer courses in United States history which go to the bottom of the material. On the results of their investigation new views of our history have made themselves manifest. At the present time the undergraduate at Yale is drilled in Bryce's «American Commonwealth» and the history of the United States. In the graduate department of the same university a two years' course in United States history is offered. The subject-matter is taken from the original sources, so that a student pursuing it gets a thorough knowledge of the subject. Many students in the universities doing this kind of work have gone out to schools and colleges as instructors and professors.

The candidates for admission to the various colleges and universities in the near future will be prepared to take up in an appreciative spirit the economic studies now offered. The ultimate meaning is better citizenship.

TEACHERS' COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY.

Frank L. McVey.

Who was the Man?

On April 14, 1865, three young ladies in the employ of the United States Christian Commission stopped

overnight at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. They were Miss Libbie Cunningham of Cleveland, Ohio, Miss Mary Shelton (now Mrs. Huston) of Burlington, Iowa, and the writer of this note. We were on our way from the hospitals in Nashville, Tennessee, to Wilmington, North Carolina, in answer to a call for volunteers who were willing to take their lives in their hands, and, braving the perils of swamp fevers, help to care for the Andersonville prisoners who had been, or were about to be, transferred to that place.

We had taken a train that stopped at Harrisburg rather than the through train, so that we might cross the mountains in the day-time. The train for Washington passed through Harrisburg at three o'clock in the morning. A few minutes before that hour we entered the hotel parlor and were greeted in a most excited manner by a lady who had traveled in the same car with us the day before. She had not taken a room, but, with her little boy, had remained in the parlor all night.

«I have had a frightful night!» she whispered. «There is a crazy man lying on the sofa behind the door, and he has acted so strangely and talked so wildly that I have been in terror!»

Our inquiries brought out the fact that in the early part of the night he had kept running to the telegraph office every few minutes, saying that he expected great news. Finally he had come in, saying that it had come. Lincoln and all his cabinet had been assassinated, and he was rejoiced. Observing that the man was awake and looked sane enough, we inquired of him concerning the shocking report he had made to our fellow-traveler, «Yes, it is all true! Lincoln and his cabinet have been assassinated, and I am glad of it!» he replied.

Unspeakably shocked at the man's insanity or depravity, yet entirely unbelieving, we all left the hotel at the same time. We observed that he climbed upon the platform of the coach in the rear of the one which we entered. The cars were very much crowded, but our Christian Commission badges secured for us everywhere courteous recognition. We made inquiry as to whether any hint of the great calamity had been communicated to the people on the train at any station on the road. Not a word of such import had met them anywhere, and we were laughingly told not to be frightened, that such absurd rumors could not possibly be true.

Lest we might have some lingering fears, one of the gentlemen kindly proposed to make inquiries at the telegraph office in York, Pennsylvania. His ghastly face and tearful eyes told a part at least of his dreadful story before his trembling lips could utter a word. Passengers gathered about us in the wildest excitement. Every car was searched in vain for the man who had been waiting impatiently in Harrisburg for news of the tragedy which he evidently knew was to be enacted in Washington.

Whether he had stepped again from the car at Harrisburg or had left at some other point we shall never know; but after the lapse of thirty years the remembrance of his fierce joy at the sad tidings, and the glad ring of his voice as he gave to us the first information of that which proved to be the nation's sorrow, are as clear as though it took place only last year.

Mrs. S. F. Stewart.

«LET FALL THE RUIN PROPPED BY EUROPE'S HANDS.»

(THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.)

LET fall the ruin propped by Europe's hands!
L Its tottering walls are but a nest of crime;
Slayers and ravishers in licensed bands
Swarm darkly forth to shame the face of Time.

False, imbecile, and cruel; kept in place
Not by its natural force, but by the fears
Of foes, with hand on hilt; even by the grace
Of rivals—not blood-guiltless all these years!

Aye, let the ruin fall, and from its stones
Rebuild a civic temple pure and fair,
Where freedom is not alien; where the groans
Of dying and ravished burden not the air.

July, 1896.

R. W. G.



TOPICS OF THE TIME

Government by Hysteria.

IN all the history of the Republic there has never been a time when it was more necessary that men and women who are capable of sane thinking and self-restraint should do their utmost to cultivate sanity and moderation, each in his or her own community and in the community at large. If mental violence and hysteria are catching, so also, fortunately, are calmness of mind and common sense.

Since the eve of the war of secession there has been no such public excitement and private anxiety. It is not worth while to take too seriously the isolated threats of disunion; it is well understood that separation would be of no practical use as a cure for any alleged grievance; and besides, the question of secession has been well settled by events that are not yet forgotten. Neither is it profitable to impugn the motives or to attack the character of sincere and well-meaning individual believers in this or that political, financial, or social program or panacea. It is, however, highly desirable to deprecate and denounce the hysterical mood of approaching problems of finance, political economy, and civil government.

Political nominating conventions in America have not always been the grave and orderly assemblies which they should be, having to make, as they must, such tremendous decisions in the name and for the welfare of the people. But recent conventions have surpassed all others

in the paroxysmal character of their conduct. Sacred images have not only been used in speech in a way calculated to create frenzy rather than reflection, but religious emblems have been bodily introduced and paraded about amid scenes of turbulent and insane emotion. Women—sad to say, painfully prominent in other convention years—have this year been encouraged to add the emotionalism of their temperaments to «demonstrations» which have outdone anything of the kind heretofore witnessed in the United States.

Not only in conventions has this ungoverned emotionalism shown itself. In much of the current political discussion there is the distinct note of hysteria. One expects intense political feeling to find expression in isolated instances of intemperate phraseology. But in this campaign,—when there is greater danger than for thirty-six years past of even good men being dangerously swayed by blind and unreasoned prejudice; when some phases of the debate are purely technical and require expert knowledge and a cool head; and when the decision of every voter is momentous,—in this campaign the evidences are wide-spread of a state of mind in which calm judgment, and wise and deliberate action, are simply not possible.

Is a man who is in a condition of complete or semi-hysteria capable of deciding, for instance, the question as to whether a certain radical financial expedient, condemned by the body of opinion of the conservative business world at home and abroad, is really going to

work the miracle he is assured by politicians and even by certain «experts» it will work? A citizen who is about to cast a ballot ought to be able to reason with himself and to listen to reason from his neighbor; but if he is subject to political hysteria he is no more open to intellectual considerations than a horse running away from a locomotive. History is full of frightening examples of mental epidemics, where argument was out of the question, and where all human experience was disregarded; indeed, a distinguished historian has truly declared that «experience counts for nothing in great fanatical movements.» Students of mental phenomena are devoting more and more attention to what is called «the law of imitation.» It is a vast subject, and can be studied in connection with all mental and moral epidemics. The article on «Mental Epidemics,» in this number of THE CENTURY, will be found, by the way, to be as startlingly suggestive as it is timely.) To the law of imitation we owe very largely the development of conscience; on the one hand it fosters fashions, on the other religions; it works for good in matters of education, from the home and the kindergarten up and out; it keeps the world moving forward, and sometimes it gives it a backward twist. One of its individual developments is hysteria, for, as Maudsley says: «It is impossible to conceive hysteria attacking one who was not a social being, or one, again, who, Robinson Crusoe-like, was planted alone on an uninhabited island.»

When hysteria shows itself in the processes of self-government, it is time for well-balanced minds to bring to bear the always efficacious physics of sanity and self-control.

It is declared by American orators of all parties and all beliefs that America is a great country, the greatest of all countries. But no amount of protestation or display of statistics on the part of the people of a country, on platforms, in corner groceries, or in college lecture-rooms, can make a country «great.» The extent of its population cannot do it, nor its «infinite resources»; its geography cannot do it, even its hereditary institutions cannot do it, no matter how free and admirable these may be—and surely in this regard America is dowered above all the nations of the earth. The greatness of a country depends upon the ability of its people to govern themselves with dignity and in such a way as to develop character in the individual, and to make the national name a pledge of good faith throughout the world. Something more is at stake in the coming election than the success of candidates or of policies. The Republic itself is on trial, and the ability of our people to conduct the affairs of the country calmly, honorably, wisely, and as they should be conducted in a sane and exemplary member of the sisterhood of civilized nations.

The Workingman's Interest in the Gold Standard.

THE workingman has more reason to be a «gold bug» than any other member of our population. He is a creditor every day of his life, and he wishes to have his debt paid in the best money possible. No man who has done a day's work is willing to receive for it any except the best money; that is, money with the largest purchasing power. If you were to say to a laborer who had spent

a day in your service, and to whom you had agreed to pay his regular day's wage: «Here are two kinds of money between which you may choose. One is called gold-bug money because it is based on gold. The other is called the people's money because it is based on silver, which is said to be dearly cherished by the people. The gold-bug money will buy for you about twice as much as the silver or people's money will, but you are assured by the advocates of the exclusive use of silver money that if the country only gets it in free and unlimited amount, everybody will be more prosperous, including yourself.» What response would a workingman make to that proposition? He would insist upon knowing how it was to come about that by giving up half his wage he would add to his welfare. The satisfactory answering of this inquiry would be extremely difficult.

In the first place, the workingman of this country is to-day receiving, on the gold basis, the highest average wages ever paid for labor in the history of the world. At the same time, prices of commodities, food, clothing, fuel, and other necessities and comforts of life, were never lower in price than they are now. The silver advocates claim that these prices have been reduced through the appreciation in the value of gold and its exclusive use as the monetary standard of value. Their claim is demonstrably false, but in making it they admit the existence of unprecedentedly low prices. They are also forced to admit the existence of unprecedentedly high wages paid in gold or its equivalent. It comes about, therefore, that the workingman can buy more for his money than he ever could before in the world. What inducement can be offered to him to make him desire to change from gold to silver? The silver advocates wish to change to silver in order to force up the prices of commodities; they can give the workingman no assurance that his wages will be raised. If he were to receive wages that would have only half the purchasing power that those which he receives now have, and if at the same time the price of what he buys were to be doubled, what would be his condition?

He would be in the situation thus outlined were this country to pass to a silver basis. That transition might be made in a night. Prices of commodities would be doubled instantly, for they would still be reckoned in gold, and would be fixed in the markets of the world. Indeed, the chief reason why the advocates of silver desire to have it for our standard is that it will effect this doubling of prices. They do not promise a doubling of wages. The farmers who are told that if we have a silver standard they will get twice as much per bushel for their wheat and corn and oats as they get now, are not told that they would also have to pay double wages for labor. If they were compelled to do this, in addition to paying double prices for whatever they had to buy, in what respect would they be benefited by silver?

Let us look for a moment at the different classes of laborers in the country. According to the last census, the largest single body of laborers are those in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. There are over four million of these, a large part of whom are of voting age. Their wages, at present paid on the gold basis, are from 50 to 68 per cent. higher than they were in 1860. Is it supposable that these will be doubled if we have the silver standard? Can their employers,

forced to pay double prices for their material, and confronted with the confusion and uncertainty which an unstable and depreciated standard of value always brings, pay double wages also? The idea is preposterous; yet, unless wages be doubled, these four million laboring men will really have their wages cut down one half. They can buy only half as much with them as they bought before silver's advent. The next largest class of laborers are those in agriculture. There are over two and a half million of these, nearly all of voting age. As we have said, the farmers, who are their employers, do not expect to double their wages when the prices of farm products are doubled. Are these laborers ready to vote to give up half their wages?

The third largest class of workingmen is that of employees on steam railways. There are nearly half a million of these. There is not the remotest possibility of an increase in their wages under a silver standard, but there is a strong probability of either a reduction or a total loss, for the railways would be the severest sufferers, next to the workingmen, from a descent to silver. Railway fares and rates could not be doubled. The receipts of the companies would be cut in half, while at the same time the interest on their bonded debt would have to be paid in gold. Every railway in the country would have its profits wiped out at a stroke by the change, and many of them would be driven into confusion and bankruptcy. This has been the fate of Mexican railways under like conditions, and would be inevitable here. Nothing could prevent it except a doubling of all charges, and this would simply put the burden back upon the people, and still further raise the prices of commodities. In any event, the railways would be seriously crippled, and would be in no condition to pay higher wages.

We have not included the farm owners in the agricultural laboring class. The census classifies these separately, and shows over five million of them. They are told by the silver advocates that with a 16 to 1 dollar they will get double present prices for their products. But they will get, in payment, money which will buy only half as much as gold-standard money buys now. The Southern farmer at the close of the war was able to get a wagon-load of money for a barrel of flour, but was he prosperous in consequence? If a farmer could get a silver dollar that was worth 50 cents when he sold, and 100 cents when he bought, he would gain by the 16 to 1 standard; but that would be a system of currency which has never yet prevailed in any community.

It is impossible to find any aspect of the silver question which can make it attractive to the workingman. He would suffer most severely of all persons, and his sufferings would begin soonest and last longest. Even if his wages were doubled, which might be effected after a long time, what would he gain if everything he bought cost double? If he had any savings, they would be cut down one half; if he had a life-insurance policy, that would be reduced one half; while his rent would be doubled, and his prospects for steady employment would be impaired by all the additional risks which a shifting standard of value would bring to his employer. The American workingman cannot possess the superior intelligence with which he has always been credited if he

fails to see that free silver coinage is his most destructive enemy.

Silver's Worst Victims.

THERE are three large classes of people in this country who have special reason to dread the substitution of silver for gold as our standard of value. We mean, of course, silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; that is, 16 ounces of silver equivalent to 1 ounce of gold. This is an artificial ratio, for in the markets of the world at this time of writing 1 ounce of gold sells for as much as 30 ounces of silver, so that the real ratio is 30 to 1. To declare by law that a silver dollar on this basis shall be equivalent to a gold dollar is to seek by legislative fiat to make 53 cents worth 100 cents. Repeated efforts during the past four hundred years to effect miracles of this kind justify the unequivocal assertion that this attempt, if made, will be a failure. The certain results will be the disappearance of gold from circulation, its rise to a premium of nearly 200 per cent., the doubling in price of nearly all commodities and of rents, a slight but tardy rise in wages, and the practical destruction of one half of all savings-bank deposits, life-insurance policies, and pensions.

Let us see what the extent of the loss in these three last-named directions would be. There are in the United States about 5,000,000 depositors in savings-banks. Their aggregate deposits are estimated by the best authorities at \$1,800,000,000, a sum fully equal to the entire stock of money in the country. These deposits are not made payable only in gold. If we were to pass to a silver standard, to a dollar worth only 53 cents which would be legal tender for all debts, these \$1,800,000,000 would shrink in a night to \$954,000,000. Who would lose the other \$846,000,000? Would they be capitalists, money-lenders, rich bankers, and millionaires? Not a bit of it. They would be the hard-working heads of families, devoted fathers and mothers saving for their children and their old age, widows and orphans, and deserving and ambitious youth seeking to lay the foundation for active and useful lives. There would be no escape for them from this deprivation, which in many instances would turn a life of simple comfort into one of want and misery. We have here a single class of 5,000,000 persons who have the best of reasons for looking upon gold as the true money of the people.

Yet these do not greatly exceed the holders and beneficiaries of life-insurance policies. There are in this country no less than 3,382,000 holders of life-insurance policies and certificates, amounting in gross to \$9,463,000,000, a sum nearly six times the entire amount of money in the country. These holders have been paying their premiums for years in gold or its equivalent, expecting to have it paid back to their families after their death, or on their policies becoming claims. The policies are not payable in gold alone. The companies and associations did not agree to pay them in that coin only. The average annual payment for claims is \$120,000,000, so that if we pass to a 53-cent dollar this will be cut down to \$63,600,000, and the annual loss to the widows and orphans of the land through this source will be \$56,400,000. In this case, also, the loss will not fall upon the rich. It will fall upon the most helpless, and will be robbery of the most deserving of all our citi-

zens, for the man who insures his life for the benefit of those who are dependent upon him must be a worthy citizen. This is another class who have excellent reason for looking upon gold as the true money of the people.

Finally, there is our army of 970,000 pensioners, drawing annually from the national treasury \$140,000,000. Their pensions are not payable in gold alone, and would be paid in silver. Their annual receipt would drop from \$140,000,000 to \$74,200,000, and the other \$65,800,000 would not come out of the pockets of the rich, but of the poor veterans of the war, who have been given this aid because they are supposed to have deserved well of the nation and are not able to support themselves. As a greater part of the persons affected in this case are voters, it is interesting to see how they are distributed in the country, and how the loss will fall upon the different States. In Ohio there are 105,160 of them, and their total loss would be over \$7,779,000. In Illinois there are 68,678 of them, and their loss would be nearly \$5,000,000. In Indiana there are 69,850 of them, and their loss would be over \$6,000,000. Surely this is an aspect of free coinage which rises above partizanship; for, as the late Congressman Harter of Ohio said of it, the nation's good faith to its living soldiers is not only called in question by it, but if it becomes a law the widows and orphans of the nation's dead will be robbed by the laws of the land they died to save. This is a third class, then, who have excellent reasons for looking upon gold as the true money of the people.

And what is to be said of the great body of American people outside these three classes? Are they prepared to say that they think such robbery as this would be is a desirable thing for a great and rich and free people to decree? We do not believe for a moment that they are capable of such inhumanity and injustice. They have only to comprehend fully the nature of the proposition to condemn it under overwhelming defeat.

An American Statesman.

EVERY country has numerous types characteristic of different phases of its life, and of different sections of its territory. The variety in our national geography, and the diversity in our local origins and histories, give America many such types. But, also, each nation produces certain men who are peculiarly significant of its general conditions and temperament. The late William E. Russell, ex-Governor of Massachusetts, was not only a representative of the culture and manhood of New England, but he was a representative American. In the freedom and dignity of his mind, in the self-respecting democracy of his manner, in the purity and earnestness of his character, and in his "saving common sense," he was recognized throughout the Union, both by political allies and adversaries, as one of those statesmen whom our soil and institutions are well fitted to breed.

A nation that produces such a man, that discovers him early in his career, and marks him out for present and future distinction, may take some honest credit to itself. Here was no trimmer, and no sensationalist; his appeal was always to reason, to the mood of judgment, not to that of prejudice or moonstruck madness. He would have cut off his right arm rather than utter a phrase that might array class against class, or section against section. He loved honor more than success. He

died a soldier, fighting, as he believed, for the life of the party that was his choice, and the honor and welfare of the country that he passionately loved.

Lifting the Lid from Central Africa.

WITH the third paper, printed in this number of THE CENTURY, our readers have been offered glimpses of the most arduous half of the late E. J. Glave's remarkable journey from the mouth of the Zambesi diagonally northwest across Central Africa to the mouth of the Congo. That he died on the threshold of home lends emphasis to the self-sacrificing character of his motive, which was to uncover the haunts and methods of the Arab slave-raiders of the interior. It was his privilege to witness the destruction by force of arms of the chief organized bands of man-hunters in the region of the great lakes; in the first paper (in the August CENTURY) was described the war waged by the English on the Arab raiders of the Nyassa region; and in this number the Belgian forces from the Congo Free State are shown in the act of completing their conquest of the disturbers of native peacefulness west of Tanganyika. In the second paper (in the September CENTURY) an account was given of Glave's discovery of the tree under which was buried the heart of Dr. Livingstone, and which still bears the inscription cut by the great missionary's followers.

These vivid extracts from Glave's journals seem to lift the lid from benighted Africa. They reveal the natives as generally peaceful tillers of the soil, as engaged in rude arts, and occupied with intertribal trade; they show that vast districts of the interior are adapted to planting, and point to a not distant day when the great rivers will be the highways of organized commerce. Other travelers have emerged from the interior of Africa as from a land of war and famine; Glave's intimate notes are of a world of primitive human life, and wherever he goes he shows a peaceful path wide open behind him.

A Little "Rift within the Lute."¹

IN order to close the "rift within the lute," we must first understand one more feature of its cause. That feature is the financial distress in the West.

Two years ago that distress was due to crop failure so great that food, seed, and clothing had to be sent to "the Western sufferers."

The years of plenty since have been years of such low prices that the distress is hardly less. There is food, but the surplus cannot be sold at a remunerative price, so as to pay taxes and interest and buy clothing.

A study of prices will show this; but to realize the actual condition, personal inspection alone can suffice. If part of the travel tide to Europe might be diverted to flow over our "uninteresting" prairie States, the money it would drop would help where help is most needed. And, more than money, there ought to result a more perfect understanding of and particular interest in the condition and needs of our own land.

This year let the word be, "Go West, traveler, and yourself become one of the bonds that shall unite all sections and heal the rift."

William Jones Gregory.

THERE has been financial distress in more than one quarter of the country lately; in some sections that have shown a good deal of free-silver sentiment, conditions

¹ See "Topics of the Time" for August, 1896.

have been, however, not unfavorable. Statistics demonstrate that in some parts of the West «farm lands are selling for much more than they brought half a dozen years ago,» and mortgages are being paid up. Uncertain climatic conditions have had to do with the distress in certain sections, also competition, over-production, and other causes not allied to currency conditions. The questions for inquiry are as to the true causes of discontent and as to practicable and genuine cures.

It has always been a desire of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE to make each section of the country known to all

other sections. Hence the «Great South» and the «Great West» papers; the papers on farming in different localities and by different methods, and on great features of natural scenery; the recent papers on forestry, irrigation, etc. The magazine expects to continue in this line. For while actual travel cannot be forced, as the writer of the open letter generously wishes to force it, it is possible, and it is a public duty, to cultivate mutual understanding and good will by means of those «fire-side travels» on which the illustrated magazine can conduct its immense company of tourists.



OPEN LETTERS

Sloane's Napoleon.

(SEE PORTRAIT ON PAGE 912.)

YOU are to be congratulated upon the publication of the most satisfactory life of Bonaparte which has yet been presented to the public. Professor Sloane deserves the highest praise for his recent contribution, in the pages of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE, to the verities of history. He will receive it not only from the lovers of a vivid and picturesque style of historical writing, but also from the scholar who searches the historic record with an impartial spirit, that the very truth of motive and of character may be ascertained. A still higher aim of the true historian is the interpretation of the underlying providential order of cause and effect which science finds in nature, and which the historian should find in the progress of humanity.

I have never read a story of Napoleon Bonaparte's life or career which so nearly attains this sum of attractions as does the work of Professor Sloane. While escaping the influence of the blinding hostility of English criticisms of the Corsican adventurer, he equally refuses to subordinate his judgment to the adoring enthusiasms with which the French surrounded their military emperor. He never loses sight of the *man*, whether his ambition is limited to the partizan seizure of a fortress on his native island, or contemplates the partition of the world between himself and the Emperor of Russia. The *man* is always revealed, within the lieutenant's uniform, or behind the embroidered robe of this ruler of kings. Nearly all previous writers upon this brilliant theme—the twenty-five dramatic years of France—have been thrown off their mental balance by the scenic glories of the stage as the curtain was lifted and revealed the greatest actor of modern centuries. This author, on the contrary, keeps his feet on the ground, and his eye steadily fixed upon the central figure, and the studied effects which he produces, from his first entrance to his final exit. And so he has been able to tell us the true life-story of the most astonishing international actor in all history.

Such a book is needed in all our libraries. The author has evidently put his material under great pressure of condensation. I could have wished to read his more com-

plete portraiture of other great characters of the time associated with or against Napoleon, and drawn with equal candor and accuracy. But within its constrained limits the book is a treasure, is almost the only life of Napoleon to be safely submitted to the youth of the country as a part of its culture in history. Its characteristic portraits add a charm to the text.

John A. Kasson.

«The Century's» American Artists Series.

FRANK W. BENSON. (SEE PAGE 917.)

FRANK W. BENSON, the painter of «Summer,» was born in Salem, Massachusetts, thirty-four years ago. When eighteen he entered the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, where he studied four years. In 1883 he went to Paris, and became a pupil of the Academy Julien. There he had the benefit of two years' study under the eminent masters Boulanger and Lefebvre.

In 1889 he was chosen instructor in his former school, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, a position he now holds.

Mr. Benson is a member of the Society of American Artists; a winner of the Shaw, Hallgarten, and Clarke prizes, National Academy of Design, New York; Jordan and Art Club prizes, Boston; and the third prize in the recent competition for the decoration of the Philadelphia City Hall. He is one of the artists at present engaged in the decoration of the new Congressional Library, Washington.

If what the distinguished French critic Albert Wolf said is true, «What gives value to a work of art is the artist's own sentiment added to his science,» Mr. Benson's works are precious. His sentiment seldom rises into poetry, but it is often akin to it. His science is excellent (by science I understand mastery over paints and brushes, and knowing how to *make* a picture). He composes with taste and rare decorative perception, and executes with charming freshness and delicacy of color.

W. Lewis Fraser.

Some Results of the Higher Education of Women.

MOST readers of THE CENTURY are familiar with the work of Toynbee Hall, in the east end of London, where

a number of Oxford graduates live for various periods of time, following their own personal business or study, yet taking part as neighbors in the life of the people of that neglected region. They are probably not as familiar with an enterprise of English college women on somewhat similar lines, whose modest beginnings antedate our American women's college settlements. In the spring of 1887 certain members of the Oxford and Cambridge women's colleges organized the community known as «The Women's University Association for Work in the Poorer Districts of London.»

The germ out of which grew this organized work of college women—individual workers having for years filled the positions which the University Association recommends to its members—was the conviction of Miss Grüner, the gifted first head worker of the association, and her chief assistant, Miss Elder, that they could do better work if they lived, for a time at least, among the people they wished to aid. An organization was consequently effected, and a house was taken at 44 Nelson Square, Blackfriars Road, Southwark, where the founders felt they could be most useful, while at the same time it would be near enough to other parts of London to serve the convenience of resident workers and those who might wish to help in special evening entertainments.

The chief object of the community is the promotion of the welfare of the people of the poorer districts of London, more especially of the women and children, and the lines along which the association works tend more particularly to the giving of better opportunities for education and recreation. An executive committee is formed exclusively of university women, and consists of seven members: two representatives of Girton College, two of Newnham, one of Somerville Hall, one of Lady Margaret Hall, and the head worker, the resident worker appointed as mistress of the house and director of all work. The committee has full power to arrange and control the work of the association, to appoint or remove the head worker, to admit or dismiss the resident workers, and to administer the funds of the community. The weekly expenses of the house—about \$3.50 for each person—are divided among the «residents,» and each one, if able, is invited to help pay the rent of the house, etc. Each one must make to the head worker a daily report of all work done by her, and no one can undertake, without permission from the executive committee, work not already organized. Private almsgiving is not allowed.

The head worker is assisted by four or five residents in the settlement, who remain there for not less than two weeks, and in some cases indefinitely, as the good these women hope to do as members of various local committees and in direct work among the people must

depend largely upon the personal influence that only time and knowledge can give. There are also non-resident workers, who either help occasionally in special work, or regularly on one or two evenings in the week, when there are meetings of library club, part-singing club, art-needlework club, or sewing, reading, and writing classes, lectures, etc. Most of the young women entering into the scheme have occupations of their own aside from their work in the settlement, as the committee think it an advantage for workers to have such occupations, partly because a variety of interests helps to keep the minds fresher, and partly because workers are more likely to be in sympathy with other workers.

The duties assumed by these social missionaries are numerous. As managers on the local committees of board schools, which correspond to our public schools, they have an important influence upon educational work, and as associates of the girls' division of the London Pupil-teachers' Association, they take parties of pupil-teachers to the National Gallery on Saturdays, and give evening receptions to the teachers of board schools, for the purpose of introducing a higher element and a broader interest into preparatory educational work. Also, as members of the Education Reform League and the Recreative Evening Classes Association, they aim to give a more general use of school buildings and grounds to the whole population, and to encourage boys and girls who have left the board schools to join evening classes in studies in which physical and technical elements are prominent. As active members of charity organizations and local sanitary aid committees, and as zealous workers for the spread of the coöperative movement among women, and the undertaking of fresh-air funds for the benefit of children, they are doing a work of incalculable value. The latest development of this London Settlement's work is an arrangement for several scholarships in social science, open to students of the several women's colleges at Oxford and Cambridge; they entitle the holders to two years' instruction and work at the settlement, and offer valuable preparation to women who wish to fill posts in charity organization societies, reformatories, and other philanthropic and governmental institutions.

One of the most pronounced features of social development in modern society is an increased sensitiveness on the part of educated men and women to the claims of their wide outside duties toward humanity; and must not the most conservative admit that the growth of the movement for the higher education of women is reassuring, when the association of graduates and students of the women's colleges at Oxford and Cambridge presents among its first fruits the University Settlement in Southwark?

Catherine Baldwin.