

sent. We thus reached, my friend M. Bertholon and I, the basin of Neptune, still followed by my colleagues.

The official tribune was almost supported against a wall, and behind it was a small gate, by which there was a narrow passage between the platform and the wall to the street. There were more than 10,000 persons present, and the soldiers on guard had great difficulty in maintaining order and preventing a "crush," letting people pass only very slowly. I decided that we must either ascend to the chateau straight against the crowd, or wait two hours to go out. Now it was ten o'clock, and the telegraph at Versailles closed before midnight, so that when we got out it would be too late to reach the Versailles office, and too late also to return to Paris or to telegraph. However, so much had been said of this fête that to be disarmed by the telegraph agencies was to be beaten.

We were now pushed against a wall on which rested a roof which rose above a court. On the other side I could see the top of a long ladder, by which people from without had climbed upon the roof in order to enter the park.

"Listen!" said I in a low voice to M. Bertholon. "Take one of the chairs by the side of the platform, and let us lean it against the wall; get up on the roof, and give me your hand." It was done. "Now I have thrown back the chair,

which they are about to replace, descend the ladder quickly, hold it and I will follow you, and when once I am down, you, who are big and strong, will help me, and we will upset it." Just as M. Bertholon came to my rescue, the others appeared on the roof, and tried to retain the ladder, which, however, escaped their hands, and fell into the court. The man to whom the ladder belonged ran forward, crying out. "Here are twenty francs," I said to him. "Throw the ladder into the street." The man hastened to execute the order. I heard some furious cries. I hastened towards the carriage which I had ordered to wait for me at a particular spot, and at breakneck speed we rushed to the telegraph office. I had the wire free, all to myself, and wrote my telegram, which was transmitted word by word. When I was just finishing, an employé came to me and begged me to make haste, as the office was about to close. I handed him my last page, and he gave the order to shut the doors.

In the street I met those who had remained in the park, and who were running with all their speed to despatch their telegrams, and I heard them striking their fists against the closed doors of the telegraph office.

This is the way that one manages to send telegrams before other people, and succeeds in making five enemies in one single well-employed evening.

## "AMERICA FOR THE AMERICANS."

BY EDWARD ANTHONY BRADFORD.

"CHINA for the Chinese," is the rallying cry of the Kolao Hui, and at the present moment diplomats and admirals representing the leading nations of Europe and the United States are engaged in officially remonstrating against the folly and barbarism of such a sentiment. Again, not all the divinity which hedges about the Russian autocrat can prevent some stray shaft of the world's universal scorn from telling him that his scutcheon is sullied by the misery of the Jews within his realm. These modern instances could, if it were necessary, readily be re-enforced by others, showing that jealousy of foreigners is characteristic of imperfect civilization, and, as a rule, that hospitality to aliens increases with a nation's strength and the wisdom of its people. But, al-

though the rule is so, there is one conspicuous exception—the United States. Until within a half-dozen years it merited Webster's glowing eulogium of it as the refuge of the oppressed of every clime; but within that period it has backslidden until the words now read almost like a reproach. Reference is not now made, except in passing, to the marked change in public sentiment regarding immigration. That is another story, although the motive is similar. Nor is it for a moment intended to compare our treatment of foreigners in degree with the persecutions of the Middle Kingdom and the Russian pale. But the fact remains, albeit unappreciated if not unsuspected, that the United States, and several separate States, have recently enacted laws

depriving aliens of property rights which other nations concede freely, but not more freely than did the United States until within a year or two. It is a singular commentary upon modern methods of legislation that this reversal of the custom of a century, carrying our strong, prosperous, intelligent nation back a long step toward the weak and ignorant customs of feudalism, was enacted without strong impulse from the people, and without any legislative deliberation worthy the name. In the House, for instance, a half-hour for debate was refused, and, under the operation of the previous question, it was made law that no foreigner should thereafter own real estate within the Territories of the United States. The cry, not of the people, but of the legislators, was "America for the Americans." Only six Representatives dared vote nay, and they were not permitted to explain why. The 210 who voted aye were content to do little more than vote. It would be simply reviving ancient history to recall these facts, were it not that this is only the starting-point of a story to which several little-known chapters have been added within a very few months.

The blessings of this reversion *pro tanto* to barbarism were necessarily limited to the jurisdiction of Congress, that is, to the Territories and the District of Columbia. But the residents of those regions sent up a unanimous shriek of pain. Within the next Congress seventeen amendments were introduced to relieve the hardships of the law, and just one was passed. It was enacted that foreign governments could own land enough for their embassies at the seat of our Federal government. To withhold such an ordinary and universal element of international intercourse was doubtless unintended *gaucherie*, about which no more need be said than that it supplies a touchstone by which to test the ripe consideration of which the law is the result. The sixteen other amendments were mostly designed to relieve the mining industry. But the non-resident majority so hardened their hearts that, instead of regarding the petition of the Territories, they actually proposed to extend the operation of the law beyond the Federal jurisdiction into the boundaries of every State in the Union. There is a constitutional point here which will not now be considered, but it can readily be apprehended

from the fact that several States (Iowa, Illinois, Texas, perhaps others) proceeded to legislate similarly for themselves.

In order to appreciate the singular change in American sentiment upon the subject, so far as acts of Legislatures express popular sentiment, it is necessary briefly to outline previous law and custom. One consequence of the victory of Norman William over English Harold at the battle of Hastings was that he portioned out conquered Britain among his followers, upon condition that they should fight for him when necessary. He did this rather out of selfishness than generosity, his motive being rather to strengthen himself than to enrich them with an unqualified gift. It was too early then for national loyalty as we understand it now. The retainer was patriotic, that is, loyal to his chief, because what the sword gave and held, the sword could take away. It scarcely needs elaboration to show how different was this relation from that between modern landlords and tenants. Not even indirectly nor by theory are lands held now by any obligation of military service, nor by any grant from ruler or nation. Even public lands, when sold to private persons, are sold absolutely for the price named, and for nothing else. Our patriotism bears no relation to the power or wealth of our citizens, and is equally regardless of whether a man lives in a rented house or in one which belongs to him. In the background there is, indeed, the right of obligatory military service upon conscription. But the drafted soldier cannot excuse himself on the plea that he does not own a farm; and when he fights, he fights for the nation, not for the owners of land, who, instead of being the most powerful class, are in a minority of either numbers or wealth. It thus appears both how necessary it was for feudal lords to restrict ownership of their lands to fighters, and how foolish it is for us to mould our policy according to a common law fetish, which, even in the land of our ancestral origin, lost its force centuries before it was formally and completely repealed by statute in the thirty-third and thirty-fourth years of Victoria. The unwisdom and injustice of excluding aliens from ownership of soil were seen by us much earlier, and over a score of States\* en-

\* The States which have removed the disabilities of alienage regarding real estate are, Alabama,

tirely removed this disability by statute. Six others enabled aliens to hold lands if they were residents; and four others added a condition that citizenship proceedings should have been at least begun, although not necessarily completed.

Many foreign treaties equally establish a similar policy for the nation. One of the most recent, that with Peru in 1887, gives aliens complete rights to own lands; and there are two earlier similar instances. Treaties with Italy and Servia place their citizens on the “most favored nation” basis. Citizens of Nicaragua and Switzerland are confirmed in coequal rights in the States where the property lies, and France and Salvador give and receive reciprocal privileges in this regard. A dozen other treaties modify the common law rigor variously, but chiefly by providing that when an alien owner of real estate dies, it need not escheat to the State, but the heirs may have a convenient period to sell it and remove the proceeds. One treaty specifically binds the United States to urge liberal legislation upon the various States.

The policy and practice of the United States and of the separate States being thus settled in accord with modern civilized usage, what was the excuse for returning to antique and discarded customs? So far as there was any popular impulse, it may be traced to bad harvests. In good years the current of legislation, and presumptively of popular thought, flowed placidly along the way above described. But when the pinch of bad years came, Congress was memorialized in favor of untold quack nostrums. Thus the Farmers' Alliance petitioned for agricultural sub-treasuries, and loans of public funds on pledge of farmers' produce, for free silver, for more money “per capita,” and, to a certain limited extent, for legislation against aliens. These frantic petitions were merely

Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, Vermont, Wisconsin, West Virginia. These States require aliens to be residents if they wish to own real estate: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, New Hampshire, Tennessee. These States further require aliens to declare intention of citizenship before owning realty: Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina. New York theoretically maintains its right to escheat aliens' realty, but, in fact, the escheat is seldom if ever enforced, and frequently waived by special statute.

symptoms, and have nearly disappeared as increasing prosperity has healed the aching pocket nerves. But vote-hungry Congressmen, taking the hint, preached sermons far beyond the text. Investigating committees set out to find abuses, and found no lack of them—on paper. It was officially reported that the public land system of the United States—*i. e.*, the policy of granting public land to actual settlers and cultivators—was being displaced by a system of immense aggregations of realty in the hands of non-residents, who either let the land lie idle, with a view to profiting by the “unearned increment,” or who rented the property and consumed the rents abroad. Thus a certain subject of the Queen, named Scully, was officially reported to annually receive rents of \$200,000 from hundreds of tenants, scattered over 90,000 acres in Illinois; and the Scheuler heirs, being also British subjects, were said to draw abroad \$100,000 annual rents from 2000 acres in the city of Pittsburg. The abuse of the homestead system was set out in even more glowing colors. Here is a partial list of the alleged—officially alleged—holdings by foreign landlords:

A Scotch Syndicate in Florida . . . . .	500,000 acres.
M. Ellerhausen, of Halifax . . . . .	600,000 “
B. A. Evans, of London . . . . .	700,000 “
Anglo-American Syndicate . . . . .	750,000 “
German Syndicate . . . . .	1,000,000 “
Phillips, Marshall, & Co., London . . . . .	1,300,000 “
Marquis of Tweeddale . . . . .	1,750,000 “
English Syndicate in Mississippi . . . . .	1,800,000 “
Sir Edward Reid . . . . .	2,000,000 “
English Syndicate No. 3, Texas . . . . .	3,000,000 “
Holland Company, New Mexico . . . . .	4,500,000 “

It must be said at once and explicitly that nothing will be urged here in favor of such a system. It is frankly conceded, or rather contended, that the system of small tenancies by actual residents is much the best foundation for personal and national prosperity. The gorge rises at reading of principalities reserved for deer forests while homeless human beings starve. Any effort to import and fasten such a system on us would be a grievous misfortune. No one anywhere has been heard to defend such a thing, least of all in these pages. But it is not necessary to abolish private property because millionaires exist, nor to place ourselves outside the comity of civilization because yarns are told about aliens. It is quite true that legislation was based on the official report above cited, but the

committee appears rashly to have adopted a floating story for which no adequate authority can be given, or at least was given. On the contrary, the report has been vigorously challenged and denied by ample authority. Senator Plumb, of Kansas, speaking in his place and in favor of the bill, declared that no owner of land in his State held half so much land as was attributed to one British corporation. And he told the history of another dreadful example, namely, Albert Grant. To use the Senator's words, Mr. Grant "brought over a colony of Englishmen and located them on the land, and laid out a town which he named Victoria. Finally, his holdings becoming unprofitable, . . . he sold out, mainly, I believe, to the colonists whom he had brought over, and that land is owned now in comparatively small tracts."

One other example will suffice. A certain alien corporation was reputed to own thirty square miles. But it appears on indisputable authority that the company did not own more than half a dozen quarter sections. The thirty square miles which they "owned" was simply public land cannily fenced in for private uses. It was an outrage, but it was at least in strict accord with native customs; and, whatever else it proved, it did not prove that our institutions were imperilled by these alien land-owners, who were simply cheating our jails. It is not wholly denied that there may be some authentic instances of excessive aggregation of lands in single ownerships, but it is urged that the harm done has been exaggerated, and that, after all, it is not necessary to burn down a house to roast a pig. If individual aliens or Americans hold too much land, the size of permissible holdings may be regulated, surely, in the manner that this same statute forbids corporations to acquire, hold, or own more than 5000 acres. And whoever trespasses on public lands, foreigner or native, may be punished, if our officers do their duty. There would be nothing sensational about such a policy, but it would be effectual; and obviously it possesses some advantages over placing ourselves out of joint with civilized usages, and that not to our profit, but to our positive disadvantage, in proof of which appeal may be made both to fact and reason.

Take, for instance, the Scully and Scheuler estates as typical of non-resident

alien landlords. They could not have stolen their broad acres; they must have paid for them; and they cannot take them away. Whatever they paid to previous owners is just that much added to our aggregate wealth, not so much taken from it. They may be born subjects of the Queen, but by buying American property which they cannot remove they are under bonds, as it were, both to be observers of our local laws and to promote good relations between England and the United States. Not being citizens, they could not be impressed for military duty, but their taxes will help support our armies, and, if necessary, confiscation would furnish ample substitutes for their personal allegiance. If it be true that they withdraw their rents out of the country, it must be remembered that the price which they paid they brought into the country, and it is engaged in increase here, as otherwise it would not be. Moreover, they sustained the price of real estate by their purchase, and being on the market as landlords their offerings tend to depress rents by competition, and increase the supply of improved property, our surplus being wild land. So if non-resident landlords are at all harmful, at least there is a credit side to the account. If the question be as to the exclusion of resident alien land-owners, it seems almost like wonderland, the paradise of topsy-turvydom, to argue seriously in the negative. Is there a nation in the world—Russia and China excepted—capable of rejecting a resident land-owner? Does not his wants and the wants of his family increase the aggregate of wants, the supply of which is the object of commerce and the source of trade and wealth? It is not now a question of alien paupers and criminals, but of alien land-owners. What civilized modern nation rejects them except the United States? Is there any conceivable reason why we should not conform to universal usage, except that we have public lands for sale? And what difference does that make? Until these latter days it has been thought that farms without farmers were as useless as unmined treasures, and that to bring wild land into bearing was to increase our national strength. So thought Daniel Webster, when the subject was mooted in his time. To quote his words on the pre-emption law: "My colleague [Davis] complains that the law holds out

great inducements to foreigners to come among us and settle on the public lands. A foreigner could always come here; he could always buy land at the minimum price; he stood always on an exact footing of equality in this particular with our own citizens. Would my worthy colleague now make a difference by this bill? If two settlers are found on the frontier, the one a citizen and the other a foreigner not yet naturalized, would my colleague make a difference? I am sure he would do no such thing. His sense of justice and his good feeling would revolt from such a course of action as quickly as those of any human being.” The approaching exhaustion of public lands is the only consideration possible to urge against views otherwise as sound now as when Webster spoke. But suppose the last public acre sold, would it still be a good or a bad thing that aliens should come with money in their hands to buy? If any American feared harm, could he not protect himself by refusing to sell? And if he sold, would he not profit? And, to paraphrase the cry of the Knights of Labor, is not the aggregate of individual profits one measure of national profit?

But this is mere theorizing and reasoning, against which it is equally open to argue contrariwise. It is, of course, possible to be “for the law and against its execution.” This seems to be the appropriate position of gentlemen running for election to Congress. A sounder test of the wisdom of a measure may be found in its actual operation, and this law having been “tried on a dog,” it is possible to speak positively regarding its practical effects. Its working in the mining regions has already been referred to, and what is added here is taken largely from the report of a committee of the United States Senate appointed to investigate the subject. The amount of foreign capital invested in mines in the Territories was put at \$20,503,750, upon which \$4,737,800 was paid in dividends. The aliens still had the mines, to be sure, but the people in the Territories had the balance of about \$15,000,000, and the sellers seemed to be better pleased with the bargain than the buyers. There were many arch allusions on the floor of the Senate to this view of the subject, the supporters of the anti-alien law, strangely enough, arguing in defence of the aliens’ pockets. But the Territorial Delegates pleaded that readiness to absorb

foreign cash was not their chief motive. On the average, only one-tenth of a mine’s earnings was profit to stockholders. The nine-tenths were spent in operation, in employing labor, in purchasing machinery, in paying freight, etc. American capital, the Delegates argued, was averse to such risks, and without capital their chief source of wealth was denied development. To quote the memorial of the Idaho Legislature: “The alien land act is unjust in discriminating against the Territories in favor [*sic*] of the States, denying rights and privileges to our people that are freely enjoyed by neighboring and adjoining States. Why should Congress, the guardian and protector of the Territories, pursue this injurious, shortsighted, crippling, senseless, and suicidal policy, and shut off from their needy wards this foreign stream of capital that is ready to pour in and bring prosperity to a long-suffering people?” In support of the memorial, in debate, a very clear distinction was drawn between mining and agricultural realty. But Congress, so far from thinking the point well taken, refused all relief, one member going so far as to advocate absolute prohibition of foreign capital entering this country.

It is also possible to point, but not with pride, to the operation of a State anti-alien law under conditions more representative of an agricultural community. In Texas mines are scarce, and cowboys and farmers are correspondingly more numerous than miners. Moreover, Texas was early and liberal in removing the disabilities of alienage, and reference to the table above will show how she suffered, on paper, from foreign landlordism. When Congress hesitated about overturning a remarkably consistent body of legislation in favor of aliens in the various States, Texas went ahead, and, no longer ago than last April, substituted for its earlier liberal statute one stringently forbidding alien ownership of realty. Already the law is execrated by the people and declared unconstitutional by the courts. In Mattison’s case, wherein it was sought to take from an alien land which he had paid for, the court ruled that it was null and void because its caption did not indicate the contents. And in a foreclosure suit by a British corporation—the Texas Land and Mortgage Company—another judge held similarly, adding that Texas, having taken from the company a ten-

year license fee, could not legislate to impair the obligation of the thus created and existing contract. Unfortunately, neither judge deemed it necessary to consider the contention of learned counsel that the United States could not constitutionally enter a field of legislation already covered by Federal treaties and by Federal legislation. But these are lawyers' pleadings, and the point here sought to be made is that the operation of the law is not popular, however "popular" the cry "America for the Americans" may appear. In proof might be cited editorial expressions in the *Dallas News*, the *Waco Day*, the *Fort Worth Gazette*, the only journals consulted being unanimously hostile to the law. A correspondent of the *Gazette*, October 3d, assumed as common knowledge that if the law were sustained the "immediate effect would be the serious embarrassment and probable ruin of thousands of our citizens, the reduction of the present inadequate monetary circulation in Texas, an increase in interest rates, a check to railroad building, and, in general, fifty years of retrogression." The writer admitted that, in compensation, the law would protect Texas against foreign landlordism, but that danger was, he argued, as remote as "invasion by the wild men of Borneo." The *Dallas News*, October 14th, trusted that the decisions mentioned above would tend to "give a lasting quietus to this ungainly monstrosity, which has produced such a tumult of confusion and mischief during its hobgoblin career."\*

There are two sides to every shield. It

\* Since this was written these decisions have been confirmed upon appeal. The local journals printed scores of jubilant interviews welcoming the return of prosperity, and not one word of dissent has met the eye of the writer. A San Antonio telegram reports that a public meeting of rejoicing was held there, and a display of fireworks made. Toward the

end of December a similar statute in Illinois was declared void upon the much broader ground that it was in conflict with a foreign treaty. The judge added *obiter* that the act was a piece of mad foolishness. In both States the legislators appear to have been singularly unfortunate in their views of what they could do, and of what the people wished.

may be a misfortune that "thousands" of Texas citizens and tens of thousands of Americans are living on lands and in houses mortgaged to foreigners. It is to be regretted, perhaps, that foreign wealth has the ability, the courage, the foresight, the belief in our future, to buy our land. But, on the other hand, the imagination shrinks appalled from the conception of the blow to our prosperity which would follow the withdrawal of this very real and very necessary help to our development. Would it not be wiser to legislate against the evils we feel and know rather than against those we imagine? Whatever may come in a distant future, it is certain that now there is no monopoly of land. If foreigners imitate a certain Senator of the United States, and build fifty miles of fence around public land to which they have no shadow of title, is it statesmanship to forbid another foreigner to buy land and pay for it? If Scotchmen buy \$10,000,000 worth of red wood forest, the title to which rests on acts repeatedly indicted, is it better to send the guilty to jail, or to hamper the development of a community by forbidding industrious, thriving men to borrow foreign money on terms satisfactory to borrower and lender? A law compelling a man to benefit himself by borrowing of an alien or selling to an alien would be a patent absurdity. There is equal error in forbidding a man to so sell or borrow. He knows his own business best, and the resultant of the aggregate operations of individuals for their respective benefits is the factor of national prosperity.

## THE WORLD OF CHANCE.

BY WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS.

### I.

THE dinner had run its course, or its courses, and had come to the cigars and coffee. Most of the small cups had been drained and the overflow which discolored them was mixed with ashes in the saucers; in some the stubs of cigarettes were slowly dying, and sending up an offensive smell; the whole place was

blue with smoke; at times you could hardly see the speaker; but everybody was eagerly listening. Certain of the listeners leaned forward over the table; others had pushed back their chairs and sat with their legs sprawled out under the board, or with their knees braced against it; here and there a couple of chairs faced each other with their occu-