NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.
No. CCCXCI.

JUNE, 1889.

WEALTH.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are to-day where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was just like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization.

This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Mæcenas. The "good old times" were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and therefore to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticise the inevitable.

It is easy to see how the change has come. One illustration will serve for almost every phase of the cause. In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly articles were manufactured at the domestic hearth or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions. When these apprentices rose to be masters, there was little or no change in their mode of life, and they, in turn, educated in the same routine succeeding apprentices. There was, substantially, social equality, and even political equality, for those engaged in industrial pursuits had then little or no political voice in the State.

But the inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. To-day the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the generation preceding this would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the farmer had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer, and appointments more artistic, than the King could then obtain.

The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, in the mine, and in the counting-house, of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom the employer is little better than a myth. All intercourse between them is at an end. Rigid Castes are formed, and, as usual, mutual ignorance breeds mutual distrust. Each Caste is without sympathy for the other, and ready to credit anything disparaging in regard to it. Under the law of competition, the employer of thousands is forced into the strictest economies, among which the rates paid to labor figure prominently, and often there is friction between the employer and the employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor. Human society loses homogeneity.

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race. Having accepted these, it follows that there must be great scope for the exercise of special ability in the merchant and in the manufacturer who has to conduct affairs upon a great scale. That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures for its possessor enormous rewards, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. The experienced in affairs always rate the MAN whose services can be obtained as a partner as not only the first consideration, but such as to render the question of his capital scarcely worth considering, for such men soon create capital; while, without the special talent required, capital soon takes wings. Such men become interested in firms or corporations using millions; and estimating only simple interest to be made upon the capital invested, it is inevitable that their income must exceed their expenditures, and that they must accumulate wealth. Nor is there any middle ground which such men can occupy, because the great manufacturing or commercial concern which does not earn at least interest upon its capital soon becomes bankrupt. It must either go forward or fall behind: to stand still is impossible. It is a condition essential for its successful operation that it should be thus far profitable, and even that, in addition to interest on capital, it should make profit. It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affairs, under the free play of economic forces, must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be judiciously expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any others which have been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day that the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, "If thou dost not sow, thou shalt not reap," and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends—the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally the legal right of the millionaire to his millions. To those who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism the answer, therefore, is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it. But even if we admit for a moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, Individualism,—that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing Swedenborg's idea of Heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not from laboring for self, but for each other,—even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, This is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself—a work of æons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know. It is not practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now; with the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in endeavoring to uproot, when all we can profitably or possibly accomplish is to bend the universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as to favor the destruction of Individualism Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest results of human experience, the soil in which society so far has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished.

We start, then, with a condition of affairs under which the best interests of the race are promoted, but which inevitably gives wealth to the few. Thus far, accepting conditions as they exist, the situation can be surveyed and pronounced good. The question then arises,—and, if the foregoing be correct, it is the only question with which we have to deal,—What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few? And it is of this great question that I believe I offer the true solution. It will be understood that *fortunes* are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by many years of effort, the returns from which are required for the comfortable maintenance and education of families. This is not *wealth*, but only *competence*, which it should be the aim of all to acquire.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth can be disposed of. It can be left to the families of the decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered during their lives by its possessors. Under the first and second modes most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each of these modes. The first is the most injudicious. In monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest portion of the wealth are left to the first son, that the vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that his name and title are to descend to succeeding generations unimpaired. The condition of this class in Europe to-day teaches the futility of such hopes or ambitions. The successors have become impoverished through their follies or from the fall in the value of land. Even in Great Britain the strict law of entail has been found inadequate to maintain the status of an hereditary class. Its soil is rapidly passing into the hands of the stranger. Under republican institutions the division of property among the children is much fairer, but the question which forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is: Why should men leave great fortunes to their children? If this is done from affection, is it not misguided affection? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it is not well for the children that they should be so burdened. Neither is it well for the state. Beyond providing for the wife and daughters moderate sources of income, and very moderate allowances indeed, if any, for the sons, men may well hesitate, for it is no longer questionable that great sums bequeathed oftener work more for the injury than for the good of the recipients. Wise men will soon conclude that, for the best interests of the members of their families and of the state, such bequests are an improper use of their means.

It is not suggested that men who have failed to educate their sons to earn a livelihood shall cast them adrift in poverty. If any man has seen fit to rear his sons with a view to their living idle lives, or, what is highly commendable, has instilled in them the sentiment that they are in a position to labor for public ends without reference to pecuniary considerations, then, of course, the duty of the parent is to see that such are provided for *in moderation*. There are instances of millionaires' sons unspoiled by wealth, who, being rich, still perform great services in the community. Such are the very salt of the earth, as valuable as, unfortunately, they are rare; still it is not the exception, but the rule, that men must regard, and, looking at the usual result of enormous sums conferred upon legatees, the thoughtful man must shortly say, "I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar," and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires these enormous legacies.

As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before it becomes of much good in the world. Knowledge of the results of legacies bequeathed is not calculated to inspire the brightest hopes of much posthumous good being accomplished. The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted. In many cases the bequests are so used as to become only monuments of his folly. It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquired the wealth to use it so as to be really beneficial to the community. Besides this, it may fairly be said that no man is to be extolled for doing what he cannot help doing, nor is he to be thanked by the community to which he only leaves wealth at death. Men who leave vast sums in this way may fairly be thought men who would not have left it at all, had they been able to take it with them. The memories of such cannot be held in grateful remembrance, for there is no grace in their gifts. It is not to be wondered at that such bequests seem so generally to lack the blessing.

The growing disposition to tax more and more heavily large estates left at death is a cheering indication of the growth of a salutary change in public opinion. The State of Pennsylvania now takes—subject to some exceptions—one-tenth of the property left by its citizens. The budget presented in the British Parliament the other day proposes to increase the death-duties; and, most significant of all, the new tax is to be a graduated one. Of all forms of taxation, this seems the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great sums all their lives, the proper use of which for public ends would work good to the community, should be made to feel that the community, in the form of the state, cannot thus be deprived of its proper share. By taxing estates heavily at death the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire's unworthy life.

It is desirable that nations should go much further in this direction. Indeed, it is difficult to set bounds to the share of a rich man's estate which should go at his death to the public through the agency of the state, and by all means such taxes should be graduated, beginning at nothing upon moderate sums to dependents, and increasing rapidly as the amounts swell, until of the millionaire's hoard, as of Shylock's, at least

> "—— The other half
> Comes to the privy coffer of the state."

This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to attend to the administration of wealth during his life, which is the end that society should always have in view, as being that by far most fruitful for the people. Nor need it be feared that this policy would sap the root of enterprise and render men less anxious to accumulate, for to the class whose ambition it is to leave great fortunes and be talked about after their death, it will attract even more attention, and, indeed, be a somewhat nobler ambition to have enormous sums paid over to the state from their fortunes.

There remains, then, only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor —a reign of harmony—another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense individualism, and the race is prepared to put it in practice by degrees whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal state, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense, the property of the many, because administered for the common good, and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if it had been distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among them through the course of many years in trifling amounts.

If we consider what results flow from the Cooper Institute, for instance, to the best portion of the race in New York not possessed of means, and compare these with those which would have arisen for the good of the masses from an equal sum distributed by Mr. Cooper in his lifetime in the form of wages, which is the highest form of distribution, being for work done and not for charity, we can form some estimate of the possibilities for the improvement of the race which lie embedded in the present law of the accumulation of wealth. Much of this sum, if distributed in small quantities among the people, would have been wasted in the indulgence of appetite, some of it in excess, and it may be doubted whether even the part put to the best use, that of adding to the comforts of the home, would have yielded results for the race, as a race, at all comparable to those which are flowing and are to flow from the Cooper Institute from generation to generation. Let the advocate of violent or radical change ponder well this thought.

We might even go so far as to take another instance, that of Mr. Tilden's bequest of five millions of dollars for a free library in the city of New York, but in referring to this one cannot help saying involuntarily, How much better if Mr. Tilden had devoted the last years of his own life to the proper administration of this immense sum; in which case neither legal contest nor any other cause of delay could have interfered with his aims. But let us assume that Mr. Tilden's millions finally become the means of giving to this city a noble public library, where the treasures of the world contained in books will be open to all forever, without money and without price. Considering the good of that part of the race which congregates in and around Manhattan Island, would its permanent benefit have been better promoted had these millions been allowed to circulate in small sums through the hands of the masses? Even the most strenuous advocate of Communism must entertain a doubt upon this subject. Most of those who think will probably entertain no doubt whatever.

Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as Count Tolstoï gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live; still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

We are met here with the difficulty of determining what are moderate sums to leave to members of the family; what is modest, unostentatious living; what is the test of extravagance. There must be different standards for different conditions. The answer is that it is as impossible to name exact amounts or actions as it is to define good manners, good taste, or the rules of propriety; but, nevertheless, these are verities, well known although undefinable. Public sentiment is quick to know and to feel what offends these. So in the case of wealth. The rule in regard to good taste in the dress of men or women applies here. Whatever makes one conspicuous offends the canon. If any family be chiefly known for display, for extravagance in home, table, equipage, for enormous sums ostentatiously spent in any form upon itself,—if these be its chief distinctions, we have no difficulty in estimating its nature or culture. So likewise in regard to the use or abuse of its surplus wealth, or to generous, free-handed coöperation in good public uses, or to unabated efforts to accumulate and hoard to the last, whether they administer or bequeath. The verdict rests with the best and most enlightened public sentiment. The community will surely judge, and its judgments will not often be wrong.

The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. Those who would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise, for one of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so called charity to-day, it is probable that $950 is unwisely spent; so spent, indeed, as to produce the very evils which it proposes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of this beggar; knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work more injury than all the money which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true charity will do good. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance,—and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by alms-giving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in cases of accident or sudden change. Every one has, of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of knowledge of the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even more so, for in alms-giving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.

The rich man is thus almost restricted to following the examples of Peter Cooper, Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise—parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste, and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people;—in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of Rich and Poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free; the laws of distribution free.

Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor; intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of the race in which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows save by using it year by year for the general good. This day already dawns. But a little while, and although, without incurring the pity of their fellows, men may die sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and is left chiefly at death for public uses, yet the man who dies leaving behind him millions of available wealth, which was his to administer during life, will pass away "unwept, unhonored, and unsung," no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

Such, in my opinion, is the true Gospel concerning Wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the Rich and the Poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men Good-Will."

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

WHAT IS THE DESTINY OF CANADA?

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

EIGHT men of every ten in this country, who have thought upon the subject, have reached the conclusion that Canada ought to belong to the United States. This decision has not been reached by an elaborate process of reasoning, nor by a mature consideration of the consequences of such an event. The general belief that the United States comprises nearly all that is worth having on the continent makes it easy for the average American to jump to the conclusion that what remains ought to be included within the Union. Without realizing the magnitude of the country to the north, or making any estimate of its possibilities, the general conclusion is that its addition to the United States would not disturb or imperil the existing system. A more careful study of the matter might lead to a different conclusion; but, in view of the feeling which now prevails, the eventual acquisition of Canada as a National policy would be approved by an immense majority.

While the opinion that Canada should belong to the United States is general, no one proposes to achieve it by other than peaceable means. In the event of war with England, public sentiment would entirely change, and Canada would then be the battle-ground. It might even happen that a persistence by the Canadian Government in a nagging and unfriendly policy, as shown in the harsh and antiquated interpretation of the Fishery Treaty, the constant invitation to retaliation by acts of bad neighborhood, by hostile tariffs and other irritating influences, might work up a sentiment in the United States that would demand and justify the military capture of Canada. If, indeed, the anti-British vote in the United States had any real influence upon the policy of the country (which it has not), some military advantage might be taken of Canada's weakness, by reason of its remoteness from Great Britain and the enormous preponderance of the United States. But up to the present hour there is not the slightest sign, in any class or in any direction, of a desire to acquire Canada other than by the free and unbiassed consent of her own people.

While it may be said, in truth, that eight of every ten men in the United States would like to see Canada a part of the Union, it could, until recently, with equal truth be alleged that, in Canada, eight of every ten Canadians preferred to preserve existing political conditions and to remain part and parcel of the British Empire. An agitation for closer commercial relations, which have been denied to them; a persistence in a restrictive and offensive policy toward the United States, and an attempt to divert public opinion in favor of some form of Imperial Federation with other colonies, have, it is true, created a sentiment in favor of annexation nearly as pronounced as the Tory manifesto of 1849. This tendency has recently been quickened by the encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church and its evident hold upon legislation, as evinced in large grants of public money to Jesuits in Quebec, which were afterwards confirmed by a preponderating vote of the Dominion Parliament. It is true that this growth of the annexation sentiment is denied by super-loyalists and subsidized supporters of the present administration, and its existence for any present political purpose is ignored. Yet it is claimed by some observers that, if a secret ballot were taken in Canada today on the question, a majority of the voters would be found to favor a political union. But the fact that a *secret* ballot would have to be taken in order to evoke any pronounced opinion in its behalf is the significant circumstance by which the force of the movement is to be judged. No man, however favorable he may be to a political union between the two countries, can believe that such a revolution in public sentiment is possible as would elect within a period of twenty years a Parliament whose main plank should be annexation to the United States. True, now and then there are indications of a growing party in favor of political union; but their rarity and inconsequent character show that, while the sentiment may be a growing one, many years will pass before it is sufficiently effective to become a force in practical politics.

The great body of thinking Canadians are quite content with their present political condition. In the absence of universal suffrage, and wanting the constant additions of a foreign vote which threatens the political extinction of the American; in the absence also of an elective judiciary; with a system of government less dependent upon the corner saloon, the professional politician, and the ward boss; with an admirable code of election laws, under which bribery is difficult, if not impossible; and with many other improvements upon the American system, the political contentment of the Canadian is assured. Aside from this, there is a sincere and ardent attachment to British institutions, and especially to the person of Her Majesty, Queen Victoria. It could hardly fail to be otherwise. England has treated Canada with the utmost liberality, and it has often been said that if, prior to the Revolution, Great Britain had treated the colonies with the same consideration and coöperation, there would have been no Declaration of Independence. Made up as Canada largely is of descendants of United Empire Loyalists, and of former residents of Great Britain or their immediate descendants, between whom and the mother-country there is a close business and social connection, how is it possible that an allegiance so constant and beneficial should be suddenly and without justification severed? This is all the more unlikely when it is recalled that there is now a steady stream of immigration into the great Northwest, made up of English people who deliberately prefer to live under British rule.

Perhaps the most serious barrier, however, to the vital change in the political condition of Canada which would follow annexation to the United States is the French Canadian element, under the dominant influence of the Roman Catholic Church. It may be doubted if anywhere else in the world this great clerical institution rules more absolutely than in Quebec. Elsewhere its power and influence diminish; its wealth is stationary or decreases; but here in free North America, in the Nineteenth Century, the Roman Catholic Church is becoming so dominant, so successful in a business point of view, and so generally aggressive, as to create serious alarm for the future in the minds of the Protestants of Canada. The marvellous fecundity of the French race, their thrift, industry, and contentment, are elements of vital strength in this religious propaganda; and already considerable areas, formerly jointly occupied by Protestant and Catholic communities, are given up to French domination. Special privileges, the right to levy tithes, protection, and other important advantages are assured to the French church under existing political conditions. These, it is feared, would be materially lessened should annexation to the United States ever occur. The complete control of education, the possession of vast estates for religious purposes, freedom from taxation, and public grants could hardly be tolerated in a free State of the Union; while, above and beyond all, would be feared the danger of an influx into Quebec of intelligent Protestants, owing to the development of natural resources and the increase of foreign capital. The influences of a progressive spirit, greater intelligence, higher forms of education, and freedom of inquiry into the power and influence of the church, would be more feared than even a change in the political conditions.

It will thus be seen that great impediments stand in the way of annexation in Quebec. On the other hand, it is a fact that recent events have so alarmed a large body of thinking Canadians that no other escape seems possible from the despotism of the church than that which a complete revolution in political conditions would afford by annexation with the United States. While this consideration may have weight with the more intelligent and independent, as a means of lessening the undue influence of the church, the very fact that it is urged with that end in view alarms the devout and arrays both priest and people against political union.

Meantime an influence adverse to annexation prevails in Canada, the force and universality of which very few in the United States apprehend. It is a Protestant force, and its reason for existence is opposition to the encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church; and yet, so pronounced is its loyalty, so prejudiced and ignorant is it in regard to the United States, that it would unite with its bitterest enemy to maintain British supremacy. This force is the secret society known as the Orange order, which, owing to recent events in the progress of Jesuitism, is likely to become, in conjunction with various sectarian bodies, the most powerful organization in Protestant Canada. It is impossible to conceive of a body of men more vociferously loyal to the Crown; and in view of the antecedents of its members, their prejudices and peculiar rites,—in which an oath to maintain the British rule is the chief obligation assumed,—it is difficult to see how political union can be attained while such an organization exercises an influence so powerful. It would, therefore, seem that two great organized forces—to wit, Protestant and Catholic Canada—are arrayed against any political change whatever.

In considering the obstacles to a political union with the United States, nothing has been said as to the feeling of Great Britain on this question. It would seem almost incredible that the official and aristocratic class, which is so powerful in England, will favor the loss of nearly half of the British Empire. The colonial policy of Great Britain has been largely stimulated by the expectation that trade would follow the flag, and that, if the English flag ceased to be emblematic of governmental control, English trade would languish and cease. Republican sentiment in Great Britain would, it is presumed, receive an enormous impulse should these principles of government, by a single act, be extended over so large a part of the British Empire as is included within the greater half of the continent of North America. If Great Britain has spent millions of money and sacrificed hundreds of thousands of lives to make conquests in distant parts of the world, it would be a complete reversal of policy to abandon or cede so great a country as Canada cheerfully and without a murmur. When one recalls how essential to her political and military supremacy is the possession of outlying posts, such as Gibraltar, Malta, Bermuda, and other strongholds, it seems incredible that she would willingly relinquish Halifax on the Atlantic or Vancouver on the Pacific. The new-born hopes of an alternative route, within British territory, to her vast eastern possessions, and the expectations that have been raised in the minds of English capitalists as to the development of a great eastern trade through English channels, are all opposed to the assumption that England would for a moment consider favorably a proposition that her great colony of Canada should become part and parcel of the United States.

In all this enumeration, difficulties in the way of the annexation of Canada to the United States which for the moment seem insurmountable present themselves. How many years must elapse before these difficulties will disappear so as to permit the election of a Parliament in Canada that will demand separation from the mother-country? How many will elapse before it puts an end to its own existence, and, filtering into a requisite number of State legislatures, merges itself into the Congress at Washington? The possibility of such a catastrophe to the Senate of Canada, who are all selected for life and whose animating sentiment is loyalty to the British crown, it is impossible to contemplate with any expectation that its remnant would survive to tell the tale. Certainly not within the present generation does such a consummation as the extinction of Parliament seem possible to the average Canadian, who is familiar with the feeling of loyalty to the British crown on the one hand, and, on the other, the political cowardice and mock sentimentality that exist throughout Canada, which, even in the presence of a marked change favorable to open trade relations with the United States, and while one-fourth of its adult population is already in this country, shrieks hysterically, "Treason!" "Rebellion!" Under these circumstances a political union seems too remote to justify its present consideration from a business point of view.

The peculiarities of the Canadians—their sturdy Anglo-Saxon nature—make the task a hopeless one, either to drive or force them into submission. Moreover, the great mass of the American people would disapprove such a policy. Those who might favor it would soon find that the people at large, especially the great mass of business men, would much prefer a more natural and a more profitable course. If a union of nations on this continent is to be brought about except by conquest, it must be brought about by a union of interests. Unless a political union can be achieved by a perfect acquiescence in the advantages and superiority of the institutions of the United States, a political union would be a serious and fatal mistake.

It remains, therefore, to consider whether a Commercial Policy cannot be inaugurated by both countries which will materially benefit both nations, without political union, and which might have the eventual effect of removing the obstacles to political union. There are those who think that a policy of retaliation—for which Canada has afforded abundant justification—would starve the Dominion into submission; there are others who believe that a steady persistence in the policy of rigid and, perhaps, offensive indifference will result in Canada dropping like a ripe plum into the ever-open mouth of the United States. But life is too short for either of these policies to work out a union of the English-speaking people on this continent in our day.

With this conception in view, a movement in favor of a Commercial Union between the two countries has been for some time making steady progress on both sides of the border. It has met with surprising favor in the United States among merchants, bankers, and manufacturers, and especially among the intelligent class of artisans in New England industrial centres, who see in it a hopeful sign for cheapened food and a supply of raw material, on the one hand, and an enlarged market for the product of their industry, on the other. Nova Scotia to the New England States is a new Alabama, within easy reach, with resources equally important, especially to the regeneration of her iron industries. Without some such advantage these are doomed to extinction, in view of the competition of the Southern and Western States. With, however, sources of supply of iron and coal and coke from Nova Scotia, New England iron industries, with a slight reduction of taxation, should compete in all the markets of the world, owing to their advantageous position on the sea-board. In New Brunswick and Quebec (the latter comprising five times the area of New York State) there would be found supplies of raw material of the most useful character; from the great Province of Ontario—the most favored spot on the continent—there would be derived an infinite variety of products, from the mine, the forest, and the field; while in the enormous wheat-producing areas of the Canadian northwestern territories there would be found a receptacle for immigration from all the world, thus affording a field for western trade and for western transportation of the greatest possible consequence. As for the Pacific coast, no boon could be afforded to California and Oregon greater than is implied in the essential supplies from British Columbia of the finest coal, the largest timber, and the enormous fishing wealth which the coast of that province affords —a coast the extent of which the reader will realize when he is told that it covers a mileage as great as from Florida in the south to the boundary of Maine on the north.

In furtherance of the pronounced sentiment in behalf of a commercial policy that would make all these palpable advantages almost immediately available, a most significant event was the passage at the close of the last session of Congress, by the House of Representatives, of a resolution which, had it been assented to by the Senate, would have proved a great stride towards a permanent and most beneficent settlement of all difficulties between the two nations. This resolution, the movement towards which originated in the fertile mind of the Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, but was eventually promoted by that sagacious statesman, the Hon. R. R. Hitt, of Illinois, is in the following words·

> ***Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, etc.*,** **That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish Commercial Union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed, on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three Commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal-revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts, in a Commercial Union; and said Commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress.**

The effect in the United States of the passage of this resolution would simply be to give shape and form to a desire for an enlarged relation with the greater half of the continent, on terms of a mutuality of interest as perfect as is possible to be created, and to disclose, as the result of inquiry, for the subsequent action of Congress, the advantages to both countries which would flow from the adoption of this policy. The effect in Canada of the adoption of such a policy by the United States would be, at the proper time, an acquiescence in it of a most marked character. The vast majority of the population of Canada is made up of men whose interests would be enormously advanced by an open market in the United States and a cheapened supply of manufactured goods,—composed largely as that people is of farmers, lumbermen, miners, and fishermen. These number three to one the class who would be adversely affected, such as manufacturers, artisans, and professional men. But even among these latter it is certain that a very large contingent are favorable to improved relations with this country. It is believed by those who watch the trend of affairs that a general parliamentary election, which occurs within three years, will result in a triumph for Commercial Union, should the United States continue to offer terms similar to those set forth in the above resolution. The election of a Parliament having a Commercial-Union complexion would result in the passage of a bill giving practical shape to the proposition above set forth. Such an event may have most momentous consequences, not only in Canada and in the United States, but upon the relations that will thereafter exist between Canada and England. It is to the very critical conditions that would thus be created between Great Britain and her greatest colony that the attention of the people of the United States is now most earnestly asked. Heretofore the Dominion has shaped her own fiscal policy and has been permitted, in her freedom of action, to create a customs barrier against English goods in common with those from the United States and from other countries.

But it is pushing this freedom of action to an extreme to ask Great Britain to consent to let one part of the British Empire charge a high rate of duty against the goods of another part of that Empire, while admitting free of duty the manufactures of the United States, her great commercial rival. It is even going a step further than this, because if the tariff under the proposed continental Commercial Union is to be regulated anywhere, it must be at Washington; so that in the event of the Canadian Parliament passing a bill for Commercial Union with the United States, the spectacle would be presented of Congress fixing the rate of duty which shall prevail thereafter in nearly one-half of the British Empire, as against the goods manufactured in another portion of that Empire. It will be seen, therefore, that, if the people of Canada were in earnest in their desire for open and unrestricted trade with the United States, and made such an expression of their views through Parliament,—as they certainly would,—the dilemma of the Imperial Government would be extreme. That Government would either have to renounce the principles of free trade which her people have preached with such force for so many years, or she would have to give perfect liberty to Canada to trade with whom she chose. The Imperial Government, on the one hand, would be compelled to refuse Canada that liberty which she has hitherto enjoyed, and thus afford a justification for a severance of the tie which has bound her with silken cords and with such affectionate regard that to talk of severing it now is considered as the highest form of treason. If Her Majesty should refuse to advance the interests of five millions of her Canadian agricultural subjects, and sacrifice them for the benefit of half a million English manufacturers, a serious shock would be given to the relations that now exist, and the annexation sentiment would then be justifiable. If, on the other hand, Imperial consent were given for a Commercial Union with the United States, as in the end it no doubt would be, the effect upon Canada and its future would be decisive and remarkable. An open market for her minerals, her vast fishing possibilities, and enormous timber resources, with other stores of wealth, would soon beget an immigration into Canada of Americans and their followers that might so change the political complexion of the country that within two or three Parliaments she might find an outcome in an altered destiny. If, in the meantime, the great problem of self-government had been successfully worked out in the United States,—if a right solution had been achieved of many troublesome questions now impending, and the attractiveness of American institutions were such as to induce an annexation propaganda,—it could then, with far greater probability of success, be promoted. So that through Commercial Union some will see a short cut to annexation, while to others this indefinitely postpones it.

The destiny that awaits the greater half of the continent, now included within the British possessions in North America, is a subject of the most profound interest. If, as resulting from a Commercial Union with the United States, and the political consequences that would follow from an enormous increase in population, with a dissatisfaction with colonialism and the development of a real national life, a movement should set in for the Independence of Canada, it would take but a few years to achieve it. Already there is a tendency in this direction in the Canadian mind, especially among the young men of Canada; and there would be less disinclination on the part of English statesmen to favor a movement of that character in preference to absorption by the United States. The Independence of Canada could result only in the creation of a great Republic, founded upon very much the same principles as those that now pervade the United States. The area, comprising now eleven provinces and territories, could be divided advantageously into thirty States; and if the movement towards a Republic should have the hearty cōoperation and all the commercial advantages of a close union with the United States, no greater achievement could be imagined than to build up a great nation, composed of people of the same lineage, the same language, the same laws, and the same literature, governed by the same principles, and having the same destiny in the advancement of civilization. England would be benefited, the United States would have a constant contribution to its greatness without increased responsibility, and the new Canadian Republic would occupy a place before the world such as her magnificent proportions, her vast wealth, and the genius of her people would entitle her to.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

UNHAPPY MARRIAGES IN FICTION.

BY ANDREW LANG.

Poscimur. The Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW asks for a study of married misery in fiction. Whence are we to begin? *A Jove principium,* we might say, for the poets fable that the King of Gods and Men was most unluckily married. This, no doubt, is a mystery, and implies a prehistoric belief that not even a god can secure a happy wedlock. But more modern students may start from a letter of Mr. Thackeray's to Alexandre Dumas. "Why don't you take possession of other people's heroes," asks the Englishman (I translate his French), and "show us the secret of their wedded lives?" The Master of Ravenswood, Thackeray thinks, did not really perish in the Kelpie's Flow. He was picked up by a passing smuggler (perhaps the skipper was Dirck Hatteraick the elder), and it was the Master's bonnet and plume, floating on the tide, that caused the myth of his decease. Why not continue his annals? Quentin Durward, too, had adventures manifold after he married the heiress of a castle in most debatable land. Let us pursue the fortunes of our favorites beyond the altar. So Thackeray said, and himself shows us how. Wilfred of Ivanhoe bore the yoke. But marriage is the trite finish of romance. Neither in poetry nor novels has married life been duly studied. Authors "avert their ken from half of human fate," like Wordsworth in Mr. Arnold's poem.

"They lived happy ever after." We all adopt that formula of the fairy tale. There are, to be sure, fairy tales more daring than most, which prolong the narrative beyond the nuptial hour, behind the nuptial veil; show us what a wicked mother-in-law can inflict and a pretty princess may endure. But human nature is impatient of such researches. If you will consult "La Belle au Bois Dormant," of M. Charles Perrault, you shall find that the Sleeping Beauty's troubles only begin after she has been married and made a mother. But our English nursery versions, except in the old original rendering of Mr. Pote (1729), leave all that out. Is this not a clear proof, in its way, that novel-readers and story-hearers do not want to know the truth about marriage? Poets and romancers say they are "critics of life." But there is a part of it which very few of them criticise. It has been asked whether any poet has ever yet sung the sorrows of being "henpecked"? Not one, unless we count a dramatic rendering in Mr. Browning's "Andrea del Sarto." Yet many poets, and novelists too, must have been in Socrates's case. The wisest of men found the bay mare (Xanthippe) the better horse. But Socrates wrote little verse, still less fiction, and the world waits for the daring lyrist who is to touch this saddest and sweetest of minor chords.

Marriage, on the whole, is avoided as a topic, except where the "love interest," as they call it, is to begin *after* marriage. In an English or American story, the union of hearts occasionally follows tardily after the union of hands and fortunes. The girl is made to fall in love with her husband, or he with her, when both have passed through a period of slight aversion. This is not a very agreeable topic, and one may doubt whether any of the great novelists have handled a situation that tempts lady authors. Out of England and America the opposite rule prevails: love comes after marriage punctually enough, but it is love for Another. At the risk of seeming flippant, one is obliged to say a word on this view of marriage—of marriage when it is needlessly and improperly complicated; a situation with which the English mind has little sympathy. Marriage of this kind is criticised from a dozen points of view by the romancers of France, of Russia, of Finland, I dare say. Is this or that marriage of alien fiction happy? we are asked, but then the difficulties begin to arise. Happy for *whom?* Say there are only three persons interested,—the usual three,—and, thinking of M. Paul Bourget, I wonder at the moderation of the allowance. Is it a happy marriage? What does the heroine think, who likes her husband very well, and finds him unsuspicious and affectionate? That depends on the heroine's character and sense of honor. Sometimes she is perfectly happy; so is her lord, and so is the Third Person. Sometimes she is unhappy,—a little grain of conscience makes her sour,—and then it is unnecessary to assure the experienced reader that neither of the others is allowed to be jolly. The lady takes care of *that*, and a duel, or suicides, one, two, or even three, may illustrate her lack of felicity.

Then we have the marriage (I am still speaking of Continental romance) where the Third Person learns to prefer the husband, to think him a good fellow, while, as to the lady, "he is passing weary of her love." I do not think we can call *that* a happy marriage; nor is it happy when the lady begins to prefer her lord, in the long run. Take, again, the case of the husband. He may believe in his wife and his friend, and then he is "happy as mortals count happiness," to render Aristotle's expression, and, as far as *he* goes, there is no reason why the marriage should not be happy also. Now and then the sympathetic man commits suicide to oblige the others, as in George Sand's "Jacques." But with so many possible situations, it is clear that wedded happiness is not easy to win in foreign fiction. French novels of married life are usually either humorous—when the whole sacred institution is made a joke of; or they are serious—and pessimistic. Indiana, that daring creation of George Sand, was not happy, nor was the wife in "Le Recherche de l'Absolu," nor that much-tried spouse of the Baron in "La Cousine Bette." On the other hand, the married lady in "Mensonges" was almost ideally happy, for she liked *all* of them, in their way, till things went wrong, and several of them found her out. But even then she displayed a stoicism and a power of making the best of things, which are very unlike the conduct of Brynhild in the "Völsunga Saga," that old and heroic novel of thwarted love.

Our Anglo-Saxon fiction is rather shy of these complications, or used to be rather shy. Among the gallant gentlemen and ladies who now throw off our old-fashioned scruples, one notices an air of "who's afraid?" Like a warrior mentioned by Thackeray, "they are not only brave, but they know it," and are in a kind of emancipated flutter at their own audacity.

When we think of unhappy marriages in fiction, then, we mean English and American fiction, and we mean marriages which are *not* complicated by the errant affections of either party or of both. Then what *is* a happy marriage?—for only by establishing the type can one estimate divergencies from the type and analyze marriages which are unhappy. Now, the essence of a happy marriage is put into few words by the first and greatest writer of romance—by the author of the "Odyssey." His hero, shipwrecked on the coast of Phæacia, is rescued by the Sea-King's daughter, and he addresses her thus: "May the gods give thee all thy heart's desire, a husband, and a home, and a mind at one with his may they give, for there is nothing nobler nor stronger than this, when a man and wife are of one heart and mind in a house, a grief to their foes and to their friends great joy, but their own hearts know it best." This is the definition of wedded happiness, and there is an irony in the words, for Nausicaa loved Odysseus, who went home to his own wife, and it may be that she never came to her heart's desire.

However that fell out, there are moderns who will tell us that the marriage Homer had in his mind is impossible. In a recent dialogue, Mr. Henry James introduces a character who remarks that the great war of the world and of the future is the strife between the women and the men. And another modern novelist, at the opposite pole of fiction from Mr. James, chanced casually to say the same thing lately. Men and women, he said, are, indeed, more absolutely divided in their estimate of life, its value, its conduct, its pleasures, its duties, than Aryans from Australians, or Jews from Chinese. Our idea of honor is not their idea, nor our notions of justice or of humor, nor can we at all discover a common calculus of the relative importance of things. Matters that are trivial to us fill women's thoughts in sleeping and waking; affairs that we consider momentous leave them quite indifferent, quite unmoved. There is only one thing in the world better than a good woman; namely, a good man, and his excellence lacks the charm of hers, and the bloom on it. But a very indifferent man will, in some matters, have a juster estimate of life than the best of women. Children of the same mothers, we are born more different than if we were of alien race, and color, and speech. Yet nature compels us to try to be one, and to be wretched when we fail.

I do not speak cynically or lightly: the wisest of the ancients were of this mind. Aristotle will not allow that "happiness" can be predicated of a woman, a child, or a slave. Marcus Aurelius learned from his mother "piety, and beneficence, and abstinence not only from evil deeds, but even from evil thoughts, and simplicity in his way of living, far removed from the habits of the rich." And yet it is Marcus Aurelius who, when sketching the absolute evil, says "a black character, *a womanish character,* a stubborn character, bestial, childish, animal, stupid, counterfeit, scurrilous, fraudulent, tyrannical." We know what Montaigne said of women, and Montaigne has a renown for being wise. It is not meant, of course, that women deserve what Montaigne says, and what Aristotle and the great Emperor say, but their words, and the male tradition of the world, are proofs of the eternal conflict and strife between the sexes.

Look at mythology—that is, at man's earliest theories of the world. Man always comes first and alone into the world. Woman follows to bring a curse, in Greece, among the Hebrews, among the Minitarees. The very gods are unhappily married in the Aztec, as well as in the Greek, mythology. Men and women are made to thwart and to misunderstand each other, no less than each is made to be, and may be, the help-meet of the other. But the way of evil is easy, and the way of good is steep and hard to climb. And so it happens, in the words of Rochefoucauld, that "there are excellent marriages, but there is scarce such a thing as a delightful marriage." St. Paul is of the same mind as the wise Duke: they speak the voice of humanity and of experience, not of stupid scorn and silly pessimism. Life is hard, and marriage is harder; we cannot mend the matter by effusive twaddle.

If this be true, we might expect the majority of marriages in fiction to be, not unhappy, but far from "delicious." The novelists who end their story at the altar, of course leave the opposite impression, and with perfect fairness and honesty. The hero and heroine come, in Homer's words, "to their heart's desire," and the gods give no better gift. Why should we go further, and show how often the heart's desire is deceived, or fades, or is thwarted? But the novelists who deal with married life might be expected, on a reasonable calculation, to describe unhappy marriages. Happy are the couples, as well as the countries, whose history is uninteresting, and as the novelist is compelled to interest, he may seem almost compelled to make his married people more or less miserable.

On the whole, speaking only of "Anglo-Saxon" fiction, it is wonderful how often the novelist escapes what seems inevitable.

Let us think first of the dead masters; of Richardson, Fielding, Miss Austen, Sir Walter Scott, Thackeray, Dickens, George Eliot; of those who wrote for our great-grandfathers and our fathers. No doubt they all described marriage as they saw it, when they chanced to make married people prominent characters, which was not very often. Now, Sir Walter did not marry the woman of his heart; he never "came to his heart's desire"; his poems and his letters—at least, his unpublished letters—and his diary frankly confess it. One can hardly remember one example of married hero and heroine in his works. He writes of the love of young folk, and he once admitted that his lovers were "automata," mere uninteresting puppets. It is not, therefore, to Scott that we can look for studies of marriage. He takes it for granted that Rowena and Ivanhoe will "ca' through it," as the Scotch say, well enough, after the ceremony, and that the memory of Rebecca will not be too importunate. Perhaps their life will be as humdrum as that of the laird in "Guy Mannering," while his worthy wife endured—a more good-natured Mrs. Bennet. Lady Ashton and her subservient lord, in "The Bride of Lammermoor," may be pronounced moderately happy. The lady has her will and her way, and the husband has stoicism enough, and not too much heart, for the situation. He can see his daughter's heart broken, his honor stained, his house disgraced, by his wife's masterfulness, and he can bear it very tolerably. The study is true enough, but it was not Sir Walter's way to dwell on the dismal commonplace of miserable marriages.

Nor is Richardson fond of this topic. "Clarissa" scarcely gives him an opportunity, and to wed Sir Charles Grandison was, in itself, bliss beyond the dreams of maidenhood. Fielding is such a believer in marriage, and in good women, that he probably expects wedlock to convert Tom Jones, that volatile foundling, or Sophia to be happy with him even while he remains unconverted. Nor could any man fail to be happy with Sophia. Fielding's wife, whether she had "a broken nose" or not, must have been an angel. It is she who sat for Sophia Western, and for Amelia Booth, the kindest, the dearest, the most charming and lenient of women. The author does not linger over the sorrows of the men who led Lady Booby and Lady Bellarton to the altar. He furnishes a rugged tavern-keeper with a shrew for a wife, in "Joseph Andrews," and the shrill shrew is drawn with masterly success—the Lady Ashton of lowly life. But, on the whole, looking at the three greatest of our elder novelists, we see them making matrimony a goal, and a fortunate goal; but the beginning of evils.

If any novelist might have been expected to sketch married miseries, it is Mr. Thackeray. In a recent criticism by a modern English writer of one or two obscure tales, Thackeray is spoken of as the artist of "the odd and the ugly." This kind of estimate simply amazes, however narrow the education and the intellect of the person who ventures on it may be. Unhappy married life abounds in the odd and the ugly, but it is not these qualities—not these, but the mortal pain of the wretchedness—that meet us in Mr. Thackeray's miserable marriages. We think of Clive and Rosey, of Clive with his heart otherwhere:

> "There she sits; the same, but changed: as gone from him as if she were dead, departed indeed into another sphere, and entered into a kind of death. . . . . Do you suppose you are the only man who has had to attend such a funeral? You will find some men smiling and at work the day after. Some come to the grave now and again out of the world, and say a brief prayer, and a 'God bless her!' . . . . Shall we go visit the lodge gates of Newcome Park with the moon shining on their carving? Is there any pleasure in walking by miles of gray paling, and endless palisades of firs? O, you fool, what do you hope to see behind that curtain? Absurd fugitive, whither would you run? Can you burst the tether of fate: and is not poor dear little Rosey Mackenzie sitting yonder waiting for you by the stake?"

That is the man's part in the entertainment—and the lady's.

> "'Who is it, Pen?' says Clive. I said, in a low voice, 'Ethel'; and starting up and crying 'Ethel! Ethel!' he ran from the room.
>
> "Little Mrs. Rosey started up too on her sofa, clutching hold of the table-cover with her lean hand, and the two red spots on her cheeks burning more fiercely than ever. I could see what passion was beating in that poor little heart. Heaven help us! What a resting-place have friends and parents prepared for it!"

Even without the Campaigner (who is "ugly," but not "odd,") here is a memorable marriage, here are two excellent people in a very evil way. They have more desperate companions in Barnes Newcome and his wife, and there the Third Person, Mr. Jack Belsize, is very much more importunate and obtrusive than the prematurely-buried love of Ethel. Thence comes another hopeless wedding, that of Jack and Lady Clara; a mere example of what follows when the rules of the game are broken. For in England, at least, it can be said that, however unhappy a marriage may be, it is less unhappy than whatever may be won by breaking the rules.

In Thackeray's opinion, as far as it can be gathered from his novels, marriages are usually spoiled either by having been arranged in the beginning by relations, or by the intrusion of the mother-in-law. It is the mother-in-law who makes Clive's marriage an inferno,—it need have been no more than an endurable state of probation,—and the mother in-law appears in such sketches as "A Little Dinner at Timmins's," and in "Lovel the Widower." This wicked cynic, by the way, this dabbler in the odd and the ugly, is almost as fond as Henry Fielding of happy marriages. Who were ever happier than General Lambert and Mrs. Lambert, in "The Virginians," and who ever deserved happiness better, for their tenderness and humor? Did Theo and George Warrington not reach the haven where they would be, even their heart's desire, after many a tempest? We are to understand that Pen's wedlock proved happier than was likely, and that Laura did not trouble him about Blanche. The new occupant did *not* say, "Are *these* the letters you thought so charming? Well, upon my word, I never read anything more commonplace in my life," and so forth.

But, somehow, we don't much envy the happiness of Mr. Pendennis, nor, indeed, are we allowed to envy Rawdon Crawley. He had, to be sure, the most delightful wife in the world. Becky would have made any man happy, till he found her out, and for my own part I believe that Mrs. Wenham *had* one of her headaches, that Becky was cruelly used, that she was not unkind to little Rawdon. The author does not agree with us; he seems to credit all that unkind tongues have said of Mrs. Rawdon Crawley, just as George Eliot invents dreadful, spiteful calumnies about fair Rosamond Vincy. Miss Rosamond made a mistake; she married Dr. Lydgate, who was what the young men call "an ideal bounder." He may not have made her happy, but her friends remain true to her, as they are true to Becky, through good report and evil report. Mr. Thackeray's genius was too strong for him; his own creation mastered him and masters us; and which would you rather have wedded, the bride of Rawdon or of his brother, Sir Pitt? Was Becky ever *jealous?* Her green eyes were not lit by that flame which shone behind poor Rosey's and Lade Jane's, and even Emmy's when George flirted with Becky on the balcony. Had we known Mrs. Rawdon Crawley, she would have made us all her slaves, and was it her fault that she had not £3,000 a year? It was all she asked as a condition of goodness. Her fall, her failure, move one like Napoleon's at Moscow, like Charles Edward's when they made him ride northward from Derby. Why had Mrs. Wenham that unlucky headache ?

Dickens was more or less bound to make his married people happy. There is no better-assorted union than that of Mr. and Mrs. Squeers. Sir Leicester Dedlock was a Baronet, and had to be punished somehow; so his nuptial fortunes were cloudy. The old schoolmaster's wife in "David Copperfield" comes to prefer her husband to her cousin. David himself had all the chances of unhappiness, but Dora conveniently died, and Agnes came to the front. Another woman might not have been wholly blessed in such a lord, but Mrs. Micawber would never desert Mr. Micawber. Mr. Weller the elder was rendered unhappy by the intrusion of the clergy, in the shape of Mr. Stiggins—a not infrequent cause of matrimonial wretchedness.

For it is to be observed that the saints are always, or almost always, unmarried. If either husband or wife is filled with the ambition to be a saint, misery is assured. Christian deserted Mrs. Christian and the children. It was a mean act, but what was he to do ? What is any one to do, who feels a vocation for perfection, after marrying, in another mood, as one who plays tipcat, drinks beer, and dances with the girls. This is a fruitful source of unhappiness in married life; it matters not whether you take the case of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary, or of the second wife of the elder Weller. Where one partner is a saint and the other a "wessel," happiness flies out of the door. We are usually invited to sympathize with the "wessel," but I am not certain that the saint does not as much deserve our compassion. In other cases, the saintliness is common to both partners, but the pattern of excellence differs. Then we have the woful predicament of Mrs. Elsmere, who was good, but on the old lines, while the Rev. Elsmere was good too, but "advanced"—a reader of Strauss and Renan and Baur.

> "Better had he been plodding
> Among his clods that day ! "

George Eliot made but little use of speculative differences in her unhappy marriages. Romola's was unhappy, because, being a High Soul, she married for the delight of the eye ; she married a handsome, agreeable person, with no more conscience than a kitten. One is sorry for poor Tito when Romola sits up late for him. That marriage could not end well. As to Dorothea, she married also from some wrong, and, indeed, quite inscrutable motive ; she married an elderly and deeply mistaken mythologist. As a rule, mythologists make the *best* husbands ; their studies incline them to tolerance, and when out of temper they can wreak it on the other mythologists. Mr. Casaubon was a person who would never have married at all if Dorothea would only have let him alone. She, not he, is to blame for an unfortunate union. Mr. Grandcourt would have made Griselda Grantley happy enough ; Gwendolen would have been happy with nobody. There are persons of both sexes who cannot be happy, whether wedded or single, and Gwendolen was one of them. We should not be too hard on Mr. Grandcourt, though he was not amiable. George Eliot's ideal of a happy marriage was that of Caleb Garth. He had humor, which is almost indispensable to a Benedick—witness the case of Mr. Bennet, in "Pride and Prejudice." Only a humorist could have extracted content and enjoyment out of Mrs. Bennet and the girls. A High Soul would not have been happy with Mrs. Bennet : suppose, for example, that Robert Elsmere had married Mrs. Bennet or Lydia ! It would have been dreadful, and yet the mind lingers with fondness on this idea. Indeed, the possible combinations of Venus, when, glad in her cruel business, she delights to yoke unequal mates, are full of ideas for novelists. Let some one take such a lofty moralist, full of noble aspirations and soul-conflict, let him marry this hero to a lady like Becky, or one of Miss Broughton's girls,—say, Sara, in "Belinda,"—and what would happen ? The experimental novelist may use the notion, and work it out. There will be laughter and tears on the way—tears and laughter which make up our lives—above all, wedded lives—and render us a spectacle for gods.

The unhappy marriages of later novelists are not easy to remember. Either the characters they draw are much less marked and memorable than those of Scott, Thackeray, Miss Austen, or we forget them more easily because we studied them in later life. Mr. Stevenson has two unhappy marriages—first, that of Prince Otto, which I confess I could never make head or tail of ; and next, in his romance, unfinished as I write, "The Master of Ballantrae." That is a study of gloomy power. Mr. Henry James's marriages one does not expect to be happy, because they are at the mercy of "international complications"; indeed, they are international complications themselves. They add a new element of misery, and an element quite superfluous. Mr. Howells has a most unhappy marriage in "A Modern Instance," but who can be sorry for such a pair—a jealous shrew, and a beery journalist? Elsewhere—I have hopelessly mislaid the reference—one of a jangling pair in a novel of Mr. Howells's says the best and most touching thing about such a union—about husband and wife being like two children together—that one remembers to have read. Can the story be "Dr. Breen's Practice"?

Mr. George Meredith has treated this matter fully in the singular poem, "Modern Love," but less in his prose. Mr. Besant's marriages are always what Rochefoucauld says *no* marriages can be. The ideas of Mr. Norris are not so radiant. There is a most complicated miserable marriage in Mrs. Burnett's "Through One Administration," but it is easy to see that the author has been in more than one mind about her sentimental heroine; nor can one believe that the poor married man was *repente turpissimus*. The man is usually treated but badly in this kind of romance, just as in real life the husbands of the prettiest ladies are commonly, but perhaps inaccurately, reported to be "brutes." Concerning an early marriage of She, (1340 B. C.) it may be enough to observe, on private information, that the union was far from happy. Perhaps the best advice on marriage is given by the miserably-mated Uncle John, in a story of Whyte Melville's. The counsel ends with the words: "And, whatever you do, never try to reason with her as if she were a man." By remembering this, much unhappiness will be avoided in the marriages of real life.

Nay, let us end with a wiser word and a kinder picture out of Thackeray,—the picture of George Warrington in his old age. "An old man, sitting in this room, with my wife's work-box opposite, and she but five minutes away, my eyes grow so dim and full that I can't see the book before me. 'But five minutes' away, and some time he or she will go away, and will not come back again, and the other will know that this trouble and that, all the little jars and sorrows of their lives, endured but for a moment, and are burned up in love, which is one and is immortal. For if we love so much those whom we have lost, can we quite lose those whom we have loved?"

ANDREW LANG.

HOW TO RESTORE AMERICAN SHIPPING.

BY NELSON DINGLEY, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM MAINE.

THE inquiry suggested by the caption of this article has reference solely to American shipping in the foreign trade. This is the only branch of our merchant marine which has declined.

Our shipping in the domestic trade is prosperous and steadily increasing in effective tonnage, notwithstanding the unexampled development of railroad competition in the last forty years. To obtain an adequate idea of the growth of this branch of our merchant marine, it is necessary to take into account not only the increase of its tonnage, but also the increased efficiency of this tonnage arising from the substitution of steamers for sailing vessels. Computing on the rule that one ton of steam vessels is equal in carrying power to only three tons of sailing vessels, the tonnage of our shipping in the domestic trade has increased from a sail equivalent of 1,639,314 tons in 1840, and 4,300,392 tons in 1869, to 6,177,475 tons on the 30th of June, 1888. This gives the United States a home fleet which has increased more rapidly than the similar fleet of any other nation, and with a tonnage more than three times that of the coastwise shipping of the United Kingdom, and five times that of any other nation.

In striking contrast with the growth and prosperity of our shipping in the domestic trade stands out the humiliating decline since 1855 of the tonnage of the United States in the foreign trade. From 1807 to 1840 our shipping in the foreign trade made almost no permanent growth, notwithstanding the increase of population. The most prosperous period of our merchant marine in this trade was from 1840 to 1855, during which time the discovery of gold in California and the Crimean War caused an exceptional demand for American sailing vessels. In 1840 our shipping in the foreign trade registered only 899,765 tons. In

1855 it had increased to 2,535,136 tons, of which all but 115,045 tons were sailing vessels.

The decadence of our shipping in the foreign trade began immediately after 1855, although for several years thereafter this decline was shown by a slow, but steady, reduction of the percentage of our exports and imports carried by American vessels, rather than by the aggregate tonnage employed in this trade. In 1855, 75½ per cent. in value of our exports and imports was carried by American vessels. This percentage decreased from year to year, until in 1861 it was only 66½ per cent.—a decline of nine per cent. in six years, or one and a half per cent. per annum. During the four years of the Civil War we lost one-third of our tonnage in this trade through capture by the Confederate cruisers and sale to foreigners to escape capture. In 1865 only 28 per cent. of our exports and imports was carried by American vessels. Since the close of the War the decline of our foreign carrying trade has continued at an annual rate slightly less than that experienced between 1855 and 1861, until in the last fiscal year a little less than 14 per cent. in value of our foreign commerce was borne by American vessels.

The falling-off in ship-building for the foreign trade in the six years before the War was still more marked than the decline of our foreign carrying trade. In 1854, 507 square-rigged vessels, presumably for the foreign trade, were built in the United States, but in 1857 the number declined to 309, and in 1859 to only 117. Since the close of the Civil War the decline has gone on, until in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, there was not one ship, and but few other vessels, built in this country for the foreign trade.

There is a disposition among a class of public men who look at everything through partisan glasses, to divert attention from the real causes of this decline of our shipping in the foreign trade, and to discredit adequate remedies, by ascribing the decline to the change in our tariff policy in 1861, which (they allege) has crippled our foreign commerce and increased the cost of materials for ship-building. The conclusive answer to this oft-repeated, but entirely unfounded, assumption is found in these facts :

First. Our foreign commerce, which furnishes the cargoes for ocean transportation between the United States and foreign countries, has increased more rapidly since the close of the War, under the alleged "crippling" tariff policy, than ever before in the history of the country, and was 50 per cent. larger per inhabitant in the decade ending with 1880 than in the decade ending with 1861. Cargoes have multiplied as never before; but these cargoes have been seized by foreign vessels.

Second. The present tariff is as favorable, on the whole, in its duties on imported materials for the construction of American vessels for the foreign trade as was the tariff of 1846. The tariff of 1846 levied duties on all materials for the construction, repair, and supplies of such vessels. Under the act of 1872, as embodied and extended by the Tariff Act of 1883, all imported lumber, timber, hemp, manilla, iron and steel rods, bars, spikes, nails, bolts, copper and composition metal, and wire rope for the construction and equipment of American vessels for the foreign trade, and all materials for their repair, are admitted with a rebate of the entire duty. And under the Shipping Act of 1884 all supplies for such vessels come in free of duty. The difference in cost of materials for an iron steamship in this country and in England was as great before the War as now, so that if we had then been called upon to build and sail such vessels, we should have had the same difficulty as at present.

Third. The decline of the American foreign-carrying trade began immediately after 1855, when the revenue tariff of 1846 had been in operation for eight years, and continued under the same tariff policy between 1855 and 1861 at as rapid a rate as in any similar period since the War under a protective tariff; while under both tariff policies our shipping in the domestic trade prospered.

These facts demonstrate that changes of tariff policy have had nothing to do with the decadence of American shipping in the foreign trade.

Coupled with the fact that, while our unprotected shipping in the foreign trade has declined, our shipping in the domestic trade, absolutely protected against foreign competition by our navigation laws, which restrict this business to American vessels, has prospered, they further demonstrate that the decline of the former is due to unequal foreign competition, and the growth and prosperity of the latter to protection against such competition.

It was not till 1850 that British vessels were admitted to participate in the business of transporting our exports and imports on the same terms as American vessels, and maritime reciprocity became the accepted policy of the United States. At that time natural conditions gave the United States such an advantage in the competition for the ocean transportation of the world's commerce that our statesmen of that period failed to discern a revolution, then already inaugurated, which in a few years would deprive us of this natural protection and place American vessels at a great disadvantage in competition with British steamships.

Up to about 1855 the world's ocean carrying trade was done by wooden sailing vessels. Inasmuch as we had cheaper and more abundant timber than any foreign nation, and the labor required to construct a wooden vessel from the timber in the forest was comparatively small, we could build our vessels cheaper than our maritime rivals; and in consequence of the small crews required for sailing vessels, this advantage offset the slightly-increased cost of sailing them after they were built. But about this period iron steamships began to seize upon the ocean carrying trade, and Great Britain, as the possessor of rich mines of coal and iron near the sea-shore, with much cheaper labor to transform the ore into the completed steamship, and especially to officer and man her after construction, obtained a far greater advantage than we ever had.

The natural advantages gained by Great Britain through this revolution from wood to iron and steel, and from sail to steam, were greatly strengthened by direct and indirect Government aid extended to her shipping. Among the methods adopted by England with this object in view were the tender of liberal contracts for the construction of war-ships and transports, to encourage the establishment and extension of private ship-yards; direct subsidies to ship-builders and ship-owners who would construct iron steamships after plans prepared by the Admiralty; and enormous indirect subsidies for carrying the mails, to encourage the establishment and maintenance of British steamship lines.

This policy of Great Britain was all the more effective for the reason that at the time it was most liberally employed to build up great ship-building plants and obtain possession of the ocean routes of commerce, our shipping in the foreign trade was being driven from the ocean by Confederate cruisers built in British ship-yards, and the hands of our own people and Government were tied first by the Civil War and subsequently by the seriousness of the problem of Reconstruction and the engrossment of our citizens in the development of the new West.

In this situation, it is evident that it is far more difficult now to devise a policy which will enable our shipping in the foreign trade to compete successfully with British and other foreign vessels, especially steamships, in the transportation of our exports and imports, than it would have been thirty-four years ago, when the revolution from wood to iron and from sails to steam first began to place our vessels at a disadvantage.

If we could return to the policy of imposing discriminating dues and duties on foreign vessels and their cargoes, which was inaugurated by the founders of our Government and finally discarded in 1850, this protection against foreign competition would be ample to restore our shipping in the foreign trade. But after the policy of maritime reciprocity has been adopted by nearly all commercial nations on our own invitation, it would probably lead to reprisals if we should now attempt to return to the old policy.

All that remains to us, if we desire to revive our shipping in the foreign trade, is to adopt some other policy that will neutralize the advantages which foreign vessels have over American vessels, and thus overcome the disastrous open foreign competition which is driving our vessels from the ocean. The character and extent of some of the advantages possessed by our foreign rivals will be appreciated when it is borne in mind that the laborers employed in mining the ore, smelting the iron, and transforming it into the completed steamship, and the officers and men required to run her after she is built, according to the official report of United States Consul Russell, receive 38 per cent. higher wages, and demand 27 per cent. better fare, on an American vessel than on a British vessel.

The measure which has been most strenuously advocated to place our vessels in the foreign trade in a position where they can compete successfully with foreign vessels, is what is known as the "free ship" policy—*i. e.*, the repeal of the provision of the navigation laws of 1792 which restricts American registry to vessels built in the United States, so far as it applies to vessels in the foreign trade, and the enactment of a law allowing the free importation and registry of foreign-built vessels for this trade. It is this provision of the navigation laws of 1792, and not the tariff laws, to which a certain class of critics refer when they assert that "our shipping in the foreign trade has been protected to death." If cross-examined, these critics would explain that they do not question the wisdom of this legislation when originally enacted in 1792 on the recommendation of Washington and with the approval of Madison, but that, when British vessels were admitted to participate in the business of transporting our exports and imports on equal terms with our own vessels in 1850, then this provision of our navigation laws should have been repealed, as the logical complement of maritime reciprocity.

It cannot be denied that, in theory, this position seems sound; but the fact that not a single statesman of that day advocated "free ships," notwithstanding the prevalence of free-trade ideas, shows that there was a general concurrence in the view that there were National interests involved which demanded that American ships should be built in American ship-yards.

"Free ships" before the War might have materially aided ship-owners in meeting the British competition of that day; and very likely that policy might have been then adopted, if the statesmen of that day had not regarded it as dangerous to rely on British ship-yards for the construction of our vessels. But "free ships" now would do almost nothing to restore our shipping in the foreign trade. Some years ago there were ship-owners who favored "free ships" as a partial remedy for the disadvantages under which we labored; but to-day it is doubtful if half a dozen could be found to risk their reputation as business men by pronouncing "free ships" at this time an adequate remedy in that direction.

At the present time, partly on account of the fact that higher wages are paid mechanics in this country than in England, and partly on account of the fact that Great Britain has numerous large iron and steel ship-yards well established through Government encouragement, the cost of constructing an iron steamship is about 15 per cent. more in this country than on the Clyde. This difference in cost, however, is steadily diminishing, and if our iron ship-yards could be encouraged by the Government as those of Great Britain have been, in ten years most of this difference would disappear.

But it is not this difference in the first cost of an American iron steamship which causes the serious difficulty in competing with British steamships. The chief difficulty lies in the increased expense of running an American steamship after construction. The slightly-increased cost of construction of an iron steamship here is spread over the thirty to fifty years of her life, and is of comparatively little consequence. But the increased cost of running an American steamship, mainly in consequence of the higher wages paid the large number of officers and men, is a constant burden which renders competition with British steamships difficult, and which the "free ship" remedy does not reach.

The most serious objection, however, to the policy of having our vessels for the foreign trade built on the Clyde and the Tyne, instead of at home,—for that is what the "free ship" policy means,—relates to our commercial independence and National security. The Nation cannot afford to have the vessels of our merchant marine built in foreign ship-yards. They must be built at home at whatever cost. If we should adopt the policy of relying upon the Clyde and the Tyne to build our vessels, what would be our situation if Great Britain should become involved in a war with a great naval power? Our commercial independence requires that we should build our ships at home.

More important still, our National safety demands this. Jefferson well said that numerous ship-yards, to which we can resort for the construction of cruisers and transports in time of war, are as essential to National safety as forts.

On the assumption that the people and Congress regard an American merchant marine in the foreign trade, constructed in American ship-yards, as indispensable to commercial independence and National security, there ought to be no serious difficulty in reaching an agreement on the more essential features of a policy which will secure this great National object.

First. The Government, in constructing vessels for a new navy, should give contracts for building such vessels not only to iron and steel ship-yards already in existence, with the view of enlarging and improving these plants, but also to such responsible citizens as will undertake the establishment of new ship-yards at suitable points on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and on the Great Lakes. Great Britain has built 80 per cent. of her war-vessels and transports in private ship-yards, in order to build up great iron and steel ship-building plants, to which she can resort in time of war. We should do the same.

Second. Our Government should imitate Great Britain in offering a liberal construction bounty to encourage the building of iron or steel steamships for the foreign trade, to be constructed on plans approved by the Secretary of the Navy, such steamships to be subject to be taken by the Government at an appraised value whenever required for naval uses. Nearly all the great steamships in the leading British lines have received a Government bounty, and are subject to be taken by the Admiralty for war purposes. By this policy British merchants are aided in controlling the routes of foreign trade, and the British Government is provided with a large naval reserve at a lower cost than it could be secured otherwise.

Third. The act of 1872, admitting free of duty certain materials for the construction, equipment, and repairs of American vessels for the foreign trade, which was incorporated in the tariff of 1883, should be extended so as to cover whatever may be classed as materials for the construction of the hulls and machinery of vessels for this trade. This act rests on the same principle as the familiar drawback laws which have existed on our statute-book for ninety years, under which 90 per cent., and in some cases 99 per cent., of the duty paid on imported materials used in the manufacture of articles for export is reimbursed ; and there ought to be no objection to its extension as suggested.

Fourth. American steamship lines should receive such liberal pay for transportation of the United States mails as will increase the frequency and celerity of the trips of existing lines and induce the establishment of new lines, especially to South and Central American countries and to the East. Thus far, with the exception of two or three spasmodic movements in this direction, Congress has declined to adopt the policy by which foreign countries, particularly Great Britain, have secured the establishment and maintenance of great steamship lines, which have enlarged their merchant marine, increased their naval power, controlled routes of commerce, and largely developed foreign trade. The recent action of Great Britain and Canada in granting a subsidy of $300,000 per annum to secure the establishment of a British steamship line between Vancouver and China and Japan, with the object of driving off the American line between San Francisco and those countries, ought to arouse Congress to the importance of encouraging the establishment and maintenance of American steamship lines between the United States and the countries of South America and of the East.

But something more than aid to lines of steamships carrying

United States mails is necessary, if American vessels generally are to be placed in a position where they can compete successfully with foreign vessels in the over-ocean trade, and if the American merchant marine in this trade is to be started on a career of prosperity. Our shipping in the foreign trade has been so long subjected to the unequal competition of foreign rivals that the latter are now strongly intrenched on all the routes of commerce ; and nothing but the encouragement and assistance of our Government for a sufficient period to enable American vessels to obtain a similar position is adequate to revive this branch of our merchant marine.

What this encouragement and assistance should be must be measured by the extent of the disadvantages under which an American vessel enters into free competition with a foreign vessel for the transportation of our exports and imports. This business cannot be protected against foreign competition by duties on imports, as are all other industries in this country which are not thus protected by natural conditions; but justice and the public interests demand that some other method of equalizing the conditions under which this business encounters foreign competition should be devised, so long as the general policy of protection prevails, as it has prevailed to a greater or less extent in all tariff legislation, whatever may have been the theories of its framers.

The most feasible method of equalizing the conditions under which American vessels compete with foreign rivals in the over-ocean carrying trade, is by a system of navigation bounties similar to those given by France and Italy. The French system offers a bounty of thirty cents per registered ton for every thousand miles sailed by a French vessel actually engaged in the foreign trade. The bill approved by the American Shipping League and introduced at the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress by General Negley, of Pennsylvania, and referred, is substantially the same as the French law. A bill based on the same idea, but perhaps providing for a smaller bounty, not to exceed a specified sum per ton per annum, and embodying additional provisions to guard against possible abuses, will undoubtedly be introduced at the next session of Congress, with the indorsement of all the Shipping Leagues and many Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the country.

In the judgment of gentlemen well acquainted with shipping interests, such a navigation bounty to American vessels in the foreign trade, gradually reduced after five years, and terminating at the end of fifteen years, would give our foreign carrying trade such an impetus as to lead to the permanent revival of this branch of our merchant marine. The amount needed to make such a system effective has been estimated by experts at three millions the first year, rising to five millions the fifth year, and after the eighth year gradually diminishing. When it is remembered that the Government has received since the close of the War over twenty-eight millions of dollars from the tonnage-tax on vessels in the foreign trade, and that this tax now yields nearly half a million annually, it will be seen that this fund alone would pay a large part of the expense of carrying out this policy.

The objections to such a measure are based on the theory that the Government should not extend aid or bounty to any enterprise of a private nature.

While this theory is just and proper as applied to private enterprises that are not so related to the public welfare as to have a public as well as a private character, yet in private enterprises of a *quasi*-public character, especially such as are not likely to be successfully carried out by private resources alone, the policy of this and every other commercial country is based on the theory that the public ends to be subserved justify public encouragement and aid. The records of both State and National legislation are filled with examples which amply sustain this statement. The grants of land to aid in the construction of western and trans-continental railroads are illustrations of the applications of this policy on a gigantic scale.

Now, the restoration of the American merchant marine in the foreign trade is an object of at least equal National importance with any of those objects which have received National aid by general consent. Indeed, from the stand-point of commercial independence and National defence this interest should be considered as having practically the same National importance as the establishment and maintenance of a navy. For unless Congress speedily comes to the rescue of our imperilled shipping in the foreign trade, the day is not far distant when this branch of our merchant marine will practically disappear from the ocean, and our flag will rarely be seen in foreign seas or ports flying from the peak of an American vessel.

NELSON DINGLEY, JR.

THE LAST DAYS OF THE STEAM-ENGINE.

BY R. H. THURSTON, DIRECTOR OF SIBLEY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

> "The introduction of new Inventions seemeth to be the very chief of all human Actions. The Benefits of new Inventions may extend to all Mankind universally; but the Good of political Achievements can respect but some particular Cantons of Men; these latter do not endure above a few Ages, the former forever. Inventions make all Men happy, without either Injury or Damage to any one single Person. Furthermore, new Inventions are, as it were, new Erections and Imitations of God's own Works."—LORD BACON.

> ". . . Was I wrong in predicting that the heat-engine of the future will probably be one independent of the vapor of water?"—SIR FREDERICK BRAMWELL.

RECENT advances in the improvement of the various forms of heat-engines other than the steam-engine, and the assumed or apparent slow progress of the latter prime motor during recent years, have led many men of science, no less than many a charlatan or other less well-informed ordinary mortal, to question whether the last days of the steam-engine are not approaching; whether the grand invention of James Watt, his predecessors, his successors, and his joint inheritors of fame among inventors, may not be on the eve of passing away with the countless other antiquated inventions of the past centuries. This anticipation of an early disappearance of the grandest power that man has yet subdued to his own use has even gained ground in later years among engineers, and we find Sir Frederick Bramwell, as long ago as at the York meeting of the British Association (1881), predicting that, unless some great improvement were made in the steam-engine, its days, for small powers at least, were numbered, and that another fifty years would see this wonderful agent and servant of mankind only in the museums, preserved as merely of antiquarian interest. Seven years later, at the Bath meeting, the same distinguished engineer signalizes his election to the presidency of the association by reiterating the same conviction.

In a recent article in the *Forum*, treating of "Steam and its Rivals," I have shown what are the principles involved in the transformation and conversion of energy from the form of heat to that of mechanical energy in this class of motors, and have given my reasons for doubting the probability that any one of the numerous other available working fluids proposed as substitutes for steam will ever successfully displace that cheap, convenient, and efficient motor. What are the probabilities of the steam-engine soon seeing its "last days" may, perhaps, be best judged by tracing the development of that motor from its inception to its latest form, observing the method, extent, and direction of improvement in the past and at present, and comparing it in these respects with its anticipated rival, the gas-engine.

Before making this comparison it should be stated that the three essential conditions of economical operation of a heat-motor of whatever kind are: First, the possibility of securing so high a pressure in the working cylinder that the resistance of the machine itself shall become comparatively small and unimportant; secondly, that the working fluid shall have a power of expansion with sustained pressure in a maximum degree; and, thirdly, that it shall be competent to convert a maximum proportion of heat into mechanical energy, and thus to supply the demanded power at a minimum cost for fuel and operating expenses. Further than this, the machine must be reasonably safe, convenient of operation, and durable. It should, for many purposes, as for navigation, be compact, simple, powerful, and light of weight, and in many, in most, cases it should be of minimum cost per horse-power, as well as economical of operation.

It is now over a century since Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of the great naturalist, published his "Botanic Garden," in which he wrote:

> "Soon shall thy arm, unconquered Steam, afar
> Drag the slow barge, or drive the rapid car;
> Or, on wide-waving wings expanded, bear
> The flying chariot through the fields of air."

This was at a time (1781) when the earliest of the great inventions of James Watt had hardly been conceived, and long before they were made generally known. The prediction was but little less remarkable than the famous stanzas of Homer:

> "We use nor Helm nor Helms-man. Our tall ships
> Have Souls, and plow with Reason up the deeps;
> All cities, Countries know, and where they list,
> Through billows glide, veiled in obscuring Mist;
> Nor fear they Rocks, nor Dangers on the way."

Pope's translation* furnishes the following rendering of Homer's prophecy:

> "So shalt thou instant reach the realm assigned,
> In wondrous ships, self-moved, instinct with mind;
>
> * * * * *
>
> Though clouds and darkness veil the encumbered sky,
> Fearless, through darkness and through clouds they fly.
> Though tempest rage, though rolls the swelling main,
> The seas may roll, the tempest swell in vain;
> E'en the stern god that o'er the waves presides,
> Safe as they pass and safe repass the tides,
> With fury burns; while, careless, they convey
> Promiscuous every guest to every bay."

The minds of the prophets, from the earliest times, were evidently fully prepared to look with confidence and faith to the appearance of the wonderful motor that first received its form from the genius of Watt.

The real inventor of the modern steam-engine, however, was, more correctly, Thomas Newcomen. It was he who first converted the old, wasteful, dangerous contrivances of Savery and his predecessors into a comparatively safe, and, even for the time, economical machine. Watt found this machine of Newcomen already in successful operation, and it continued in operation until after the death of Smeaton, the greatest of contemporary engineers. Watt made use of the Newcomen machine as the base of his own invention, and adding to the crude engine his separate condenser, introducing the steam-jacket, adopting better valve gearing, and making other improvements, he converted that engine into the modern steam-engine. The purpose of these more important changes was, as Watt himself expressed it, "to keep the cylinder as hot as the steam which entered it." The older engines wasted heat and steam enormously. As the piston moved backward and forward in the cylinder, under the alternate impulsion of the steam and the atmosphere, the motor fluid was first introduced to follow the piston and, displacing the air, to exert its pressure upon it, then to be condensed, forming a vacuum behind the piston, allowing the pressure of the air or of the steam, as the case might be, to act in turn. The condensation was effected in the Newcomen engine by the introduction of a jet of water into the cylinder, in the midst of the steam, thus at once condensing the steam and cooling the cylinder down to the temperature of the water of condensation. The result of this operation was that, when the next charge of steam was introduced, the first action was the heating-up of the cylinder to the temperature of the steam itself by the condensation and waste of a corresponding amount of steam which otherwise might have been applied to the impulsion of the machine. This enormous waste was first observed and ameliorated by Watt, and the work of all great inventors improving the steam-engine, from his time to ours, has been mainly the reduction of wastes, partly by modifications of construction and partly by that gradual progress in the elevation of steam-pressures, in increasing the speed of the engine, and in making available a more complete expansion, which has attracted the attention of every intelligent observer of its advancement from that day to this.

---

* "Odyssey," Book VIII., p. 175.

The machine of Watt, in its most perfect state at the commencement of this century, was, at its best, a slowly-moving, cumbersome, wasteful, and feeble machine, as compared with the modern forms of engine familiar to us as the motors of our steamships, our railway trains, our factories, and our mills. To-day it represents the noblest product of the inventive genius of man. We may to-day say, more unreservedly than could Belidor:

> **"VOILÀ LA PLUS MERVEILLEUSE DE TOUTES LES MACHINES; le Mécanisme ressemble à celui des animaux. La chaleur est le principe de son mouvement; il se fait dans ses différens tuyaux une circulation, comme celle du sang dans les veines, ayant des valvules qui s'ouvrent et se ferment à propos; elles se nourrit, s'évacue d'elle même dans les temps réglés, et tire de son travail tout ce qu'il lui faut pour subsister."**

Before we can judge with confidence whether this most wonderful of all the marvellous inventions of the mechanic is approaching its last days, it will be necessary to consider what is the nature of this energy-transforming machine; what are its powers; whence derived; what its advantages and disadvantages, its merits and its defects; what it has done, is doing, can do; to what extent further growth and improvement seem to be possible; what seem to be the limits which are being approached; where further improvement may probably cease; when may we reasonably expect to see it reach those limits, and what may we anticipate to be the powers and characteristics of the finally perfected machine, when man's genius can no further go. We must also inquire what are the characteristics of its presumed rival and in what respect are we to look for superiority, or a higher limit of perfection, as the end of the contest for superiority approaches.

Buried in the depths of the earth, distributed all over the globe, and in total quantity beyond the ability of the human mind to conceive, and almost beyond its power of computation, lie the skeletons of forests which covered the earth for, perhaps, millions of years during that early period called by the geologist the carboniferous. During a long interval of time the globe was covered with a warm, moist, misty atmosphere, rich in carbonic acid, the food of the vegetable kingdom, and its soil was kept warm and productive by the conjunction of the heat of its internal fires with the caloric received from the sun and held encaged by this atmosphere, which is known to have the property of permitting easy transmission of the rays of the sun to the earth, while strongly resisting their return into space. Under such circumstances, the growth of vegetation took place with a rapidity unknown even in the tropics to-day; the earth became covered with forests; forests grew on the relics of earlier vegetation; millions of square miles of soil were composed of the trunks, the branches, the leaves of tropical plants, the stems of gigantic ferns, the masses of enormous mosses; while the sea was clogged with marine vegetation the growth of which was stimulated by a steady and uniform warmth extending from the equator to the poles. Higher animal life could not exist amidst this atmosphere of mixed air and carbonic gases; but the lower forms swarmed throughout the world. Thus heat, moisture, and carbon-supplying compounds conspired to provide a wonderfully gigantic and rankly-growing vegetation, and the progress of ages saw the rise and the fall of measureless quantities of woody material, which was finally spread over the earth, to form, by later consolidation and by the elimination of volatile constitutents, those apparently inexhaustible stores of fuel now an essential element of human life and civilization. The partial decomposition of the animal and vegetable juices and fibre produced the petroleums and the unimagined quantities of compressed gases which are just coming into use for fuel and light in many parts of the country—a hitherto unsuspected reserve.

This process of production and storage of fuels of such strange variety of condition and composition is now known to have been a system of reception and storage of a minute part of the energy, the work-power, that the sun and the subterraneous fires of the earth were lavishly and wastefully distributing in all directions into space. Every pound of the carbon thus stored away for the use of the human race in the millions of years succeeding the millions that should elapse before its appearance on the globe, is now known to hold in "potential" form, as the man of science puts it, 14,500 thermal units of heat, once active and kinetic in the sun or in the earth. Of this heat every 2,500 thermal units, or a trifle over, will measure the equivalent, each hour, of a horse-power; every pound of pure coal contains the equivalent, if burned in one hour, of about six horse-power; every ton of carbon burned per hour is the measure of over 13,000 horse-power. The coal-producing area of the world, so far as known, is about 400,000 square miles, of which about three-fourths is in the United States and one-fortieth in Great Britain. But Great Britain is estimated to possess 200,000,000,000 tons of fossil fuels. At the same rate, the United States possesses 4,000,000,000,000, and the world, we may presume, about 6,000,000,000,000 tons, allowing for as yet undiscovered deposits. This will last the human race, if we assume a rate of expenditure twice as great as to-day,—500,000,000 tons per annum,—for 12,000 years. At this rate of expenditure, it is the equivalent of about 15,000,000,000 horse-power for the world.

Measured by the periods of the geologist, obviously the human race is very rapidly using up its essential material of sustenance; quite as much so as if it had its food stored in a similar manner in the depths of the earth. Measured even by the time-gauge of the historian of civilization, or by the chronologies of the Egyptians and the Hindoos, the race has but little time to live on this earth, unless it can find, and promptly, means of economizing its stock of heat and available power, or unless some other resource, as yet unknown, is discovered by the man of science or by the inventor.

Most unfortunately, the facts of the case, as revealed by science, are that the best methods of utilization yet known to the world are enormously wasteful. Fortunately, if looked upon from the other side, there remains a margin for improvement and economy of very considerable magnitude, of which, it is believed, human genius will soon find ways of greatly availing itself. The best heating apparatus of the day ordinarily wastes at least one-fourth of all the heat developed by the combustion of fuel; the best heat-engines of the day, whether steam or other, waste over four-fifths. Ordinary forms of heating apparatus and of heat-engine probably waste, on the average, not less than one-half and *nine-tenths*, respectively. Could these wastes be reduced to insignificant figures, the life of the race would be more than doubled; every ton of coal would heat, on the average, twice as long, or twice as much space; every steam-engine, on the average, would use but one-eighth as much coal, or less, or the fuel used for power would last eight times as long as now. But science shows that, if we must adhere to known methods of utilization, a sensible loss of heat must be submitted to, and a large waste of fuel in heat-engines, in whatever form, is inevitable. We are thus forced to the conclusion that either existing types must be improved much more effectively than now seems possible; or a new type of engine must be invented; or a new system of transformation of heat-energy into mechanical energy must be discovered, which shall not involve the now necessary and unavoidable thermodynamic loss, by converting the latent energy of fuels into some other form of natural energy, perhaps into electricity.

This latter is one of those obvious and seemingly possible improvements which the scientific men of the time are beginning to search for; it has been effected by nature, ages ago, in the firefly and the glow-worm, in the production of light, and in the whole animal economy in the production of heat and power. There seems no reason to assume that its discovery is always to remain beyond the reach of men of science.* But until that much-to-be-desired point is reached in the scientific progress of the race, it seems probable that we must depend upon the so-called heat-engines for the utilization of that inconceivable store of potential energy which lies dormant in our coal-beds, in our oil-fields, and in those ungauged reservoirs of "natural gas" upon which we are now drawing so prodigally and wastefully. Latent energy must be converted into the active form by chemical forces, causing combination of oxygen with hydrogen and carbon and resulting in combustion; and the heat so produced must be transformed into mechanical energy and work by the, at best, wasteful operation of heat-engines.

---

* The writer publicly called attention to this evident, but apparently previously unnoted, yet vitally important, matter as early as 1881. See his second President's Address to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, November, 1881: Trans Am. Soc. M. E., 1881.

"Heat-engines" are the machines devised by the engineer and the mechanic for the purpose of the conversion of all this stored energy of past ages, and of the once kinetic heat-energy of the universe, into mechanical power. All known forms—steam-engines, gas-engines, hot-air engines, æther-engines, whatever their class—exhibit certain common essential features: they depend for their power upon the production of heat by the combustion of a fuel, and transform the energy of molecular movement thus evolved into mechanical power and mass motion, through changes of pressure and volume effected in a "working fluid," as the steam, the gas, or the air which gives a name to the engine employed. In all of them, a mass of gas or vapor, or of a mixture of both, is caused to absorb a quantity of heat, and thus to take an accession of pressure, of temperature, or of both pressure and temperature, and of volume, expanding behind a piston which it drives by the excess of its pressure above that of the air, or the vapor in a condenser, on the opposite side, until, the stroke being completed, the unutilized stock of heat and of fluid is expelled.

Science shows that, in all such operations, it is impossible to transform a proportion of the heat stored in the working fluid, or communicated to it during this cycle of operations, greater than the proportion borne by the range of temperature worked through to the total absolute temperature of the working fluid at its maximum, measured down to the perfect zero of heat-motion, nearly four hundred degrees below the zero of Fahrenheit. In the best steam-engines this, to-day, represents the proportion of about two hundred to eight hundred; in the gas-engines something like twice this proportion. In other words, it is known, by scientific processes of unquestionable accuracy, that in the best of ordinary practice in steam-engineering, if it were possible to conduct the proposed operations in a perfect machine, incapable of wasting any portion of the heat or power by conduction, radiation, or friction, but one-fourth of all the heat-energy stored in the coal used in its furnace could be converted to useful purposes by transformation into mechanical power; and, similarly, the gas-engine has a maximum possible efficiency, as it is called, of about one-third. These figures may be increased indefinitely by increasing the initial temperature of the fluid actuating the engine.

The actual performance of heat-engines falls short of these ideal efficiencies in proportion as they are subject to wastes of heat and of power due to their imperfections as structures or in operation. Perfect utilization of the heat from the fuel would give us a horse-power, in the steam-engine, through the consumption of about two and a half pounds of steam, or a quarter of a pound of good coal, per hour. Very few engines could, "theoretically," work on less than ten pounds of steam or one pound of fuel; the wastes usually bring the actual performance far short of this, and in the very best type of engine, these wastes often amount to about as much as the quantity actually required "theoretically." A gas-engine which should use but ten cubic feet of gas per hour and per horse-power actually demands, at best, twenty—ten for use thermodynamically, ten to supply wastes due to the fact that the machine has a working cylinder composed of metal, a substance capable of storage and of conduction of heat. That form of heat-engine which most completely reduces these wastes, other things being equal, will constitute the fittest, the surviving, form of heat-engine. That which permits the highest ideal efficiency and is least subject to such losses will ultimately outlive all competitors. It is asserted that it will be the gas-engine, not the steam-engine, which must be expected to do the work of the world in the end; since, as is thought, it is capable of working through the widest range of temperature, and offers the most promising outlook for reduction of internal wastes. That it must be one or the other of these forms of engine—or possibly the hot-air engine—is generally believed by scientific men and by engineers to be certain; since it is only these classes of machine which use as working fluids those which are at once readily available, of no cost, free from liability to special accident or to produce serious annoyance or injury to life, if liberated, and each, in its way, peculiarly well fitted for the storage and utilization of energy. Steam stores the most heat; air or the products of combustion of the gas-engine, which are essentially similar to air and largely composed of the elements of the atmosphere, permit the adoption of a wide range of temperature; steam gives high pressures, and wastes but little power in driving its own mechanism; air or the gas, through the adoption of a wide range of temperature, gives high efficiency of thermodynamic transportation, but is loaded in larger proportion by the resistances of its machinery. That which ultimately can be made to work up at once to high temperature and to high pressures, and can be, at the same time, made to develop its powers in the smallest and lightest engine, will be the survivor in the competition, the winner in the race.

The whole history of the steam-engine has been a history of progressive amelioration of the wastes of the earlier and cruder machines, and of gradual increase in temperatures and pressures at which it has been worked. Watt's engines demanded one cubic foot (62½ pounds) of water and ten pounds of fuel, per horse-power and per hour; the best engines of the next generation required about five pounds of coal and forty pounds of steam; those of the period signalized by the successful introduction of the Sickels "cut-off" and of the Corliss engine, three pounds of coal and thirty pounds of feed-water, and the best engines of our time are claimed to work on one and a half pounds of fuel and fifteen pounds of steam, or less, per horse-power per hour; and even now we are expending 50 per cent. in what are judged to be avoidable wastes, and are consuming six times the mechanical equivalent of the heat-energy stored in our coal, in the process of transformation into power. The principles of its operation are, however, only now becoming generally and thoroughly understood by men of science and by engineers, and we may anticipate the approach, soon, to the practical limit of its improvement in the direction of reduced wastes of heat by conduction and by transfer without transformation. The limit of gain in range of working temperature remains an uncertain and conjectural matter.

The history of the hot-air and of the gas-engine is a similar story. Both have a history extending over about a century, as has the steam-engine of modern type. The gas-engine, taken as the more important of the two, required, in its earlier forms, about one hundred cubic feet of gas per horse-power per hour; by the middle of the century, it had come down to from fifty to seventy feet; ten years ago, to about thirty feet; and the best engines of our day consume about twenty feet, or a little less, of the best gas, when of moderate size and power. As in the steam-engine, these improvements have been effected by changes which have resulted in the reduction of the wastes of the machine; the ideal thermodynamic requirements remaining substantially unchanged. The heat called for for thermodynamic transformation is as at first, nearly; but the losses by internal conduction and by external transmission through the thus far essential "water-jacket," required to prevent injury to the machine by its own internal fires, have been to this extent reduced. When, in both engines, if ever, these losses can be substantially evaded, the two machines will stand, so far as can now be seen, in about the relations above stated as those of the ideal machines.

The two machines have had, thus, pretty nearly the same length of life and opportunity to exhibit their capacities for useful work. What have they accomplished? Which has thus far been the more efficient servant of mankind? Which has done more and which is doing more for the world? Finally, which gives to-day the better evidence of capacity to do effectively and satisfactorily the work of the coming centuries, to utilize the more thoroughly the stored energies of those millions of millions of tons of coal still remaining in the depths of the earth?

The gas-engine, after years of struggle against natural and artificial obstacles, to-day successfully drives a few thousand small factories and does the work of an insignificant portion of the world's industries; it competes with steam here and there, where work of small magnitude is demanded; it is now and then effective for powers exceeding fifty horse-power. Its fuel is costly; its weight and bulk are considerable; it is sold in the market at high prices. The promise is that it may, if in time supplied with cheaper fuel, give higher efficiency and correspondingly extend its range of competition with steam; there is no reason, as yet, to believe that it can ever be expected to operate at a higher maximum or much lower minimum temperature, or to have a much wider range of working temperature; the reduction of its wastes to *nil*, hardly to be hoped for, would double its economy of fuel. Any great extension of its powers for unity of its weight is very uncertain. If we assume that it may, in time, double its efficiency and may have its weight reduced to one-half or one-third that now common, it may, perhaps, be taken as a fair estimate. This would give us a gas-engine using about a half-pound of gas, or ten cubic feet, per horse-power per hour, and weighing, exclusive of the gas-generating apparatus, about two hundred and fifty pounds per horse-power. It is not anticipated that the steam-engine, as at present constituted, can ever consume as little as ten pounds of steam, or about one pound of coal, per horse-power per hour. It weighs, as a minimum, about fifty pounds per horse-power, including boiler. The cost of gas is to-day many times that of coal, weight for weight; it is not anticipated that it can ever be brought down to as little as twice the cost of the coal from which gas is necessarily made. It is not likely, apparently, that we can ever hope, therefore, to have a gas-engine that shall compete in cost of fuel with the steam-engine, where of equal powers; nor can we hope that it will ever, gas-producer included, nearly approach the small weight for equal powers that has already been attained by its rival—a weight which, it is expected, will in time be still further and greatly reduced in the steam-engine. The use of the gas-engine at sea or on the rail, the grandest and most extensive of the uses of the heat-engine, seems thus quite beyond reasonable expectation, even if competing with the steam-engine of to-day. Should ways of increasing the economy of working of the steam-engine be devised,—and we have no reason to presume that the days of invention and of scientific progress in that direction are past,—the gas-engine has still less chance in the competition.

The steam-engine, on the other hand, with but little longer period of actual growth, instead of being confined in its operation to the pigmy tasks measured by ten, twenty, or fifty horse-power, drives ten thousand tons of ship and freight, living and inanimate, across three thousand miles of sea, in face of the heaviest gales, indifferent to wave or storm or current; crossing the Atlantic in six days; attaining twenty miles an hour, the whole week through; exerting fifteen thousand horse-power continuously; doing the work that, if done by horses, would require a stable of 60,000 horses, weighing three times as much as the great ship and cargo altogether and demanding more space than could be found in fifty such ships. It does its work so cheaply that the burning of a copy of this magazine in its furnaces would afford sufficient power to transport a ton of freight five or eight miles, consuming, as it does, in the very best of recent ships, less than a pound and a half of fuel per horse-power per hour. Its weight is but two hundred pounds per horse-power, and this is brought down in torpedo-boats and fast yachts to one-fourth that figure, but at the sacrifice of economy. On land, it draws a thousand tons of freight at a cost of a half-cent per ton per mile, bringing the wheat-fields of Dakota nearer the consumer in Boston, New York, or Philadelphia than were those of the Genesee valley at the date of its application to this task, but little more than a half-century ago. It spins across the continent in four days ; it transports the traveller, with his bed, his table, his library, his stores, his wardrobe, a thousand miles, from New York to Chicago, in a single day ; it alone still does the work about which it was first set by Watt a century ago, the raising of water from the depths of the earth that mines may continue to supply us with coal, with ores, with the precious metals ; it drives all the spindles ; it actuates every loom ; it does the work of the world.

And who shall say that the steady progress of a century has reached its limit ? Are we to presume that we may set a period to the victories of the mechanic, or assert that the genius of the inventor shall cease to be the main-spring of advance in our material civilization, the foundation of that prosperity on which culture must lay its most solid foundations ? Can we see a limit to the improvement of the steam-engine more definitely than could the generation preceding Watt ? It may well be doubted if the growth of this wonderful and indispensable servant of the race, more powerful than Aladdin's genius, has reached its end. On the contrary, every step made in the further advancement of the philosophy of the subject, every new discovery in science or in art, indicates that the limits of the development of this mightiest of the products of human constructive talent, this noblest work of the engineer, are set far ahead. By reducing the visible wastes of the contemporary machine, we can see that its efficiency may be nearly doubled ; by increasing the range of temperatures through which it may be worked, its gain in economy may be indefinitely greater; by finding ways of utilizing its rejected—its necessarily rejected—heat, the engine being thermodynamically perfected, we may again make an enormous advance ; by the steady increase of the speed of its piston, up to a limit quite beyond our present outlook, and far beyond our experience, we may gain in lightness and cost of production and of transportation, and thus in extent of application, possibly even, in time, to the point of meeting the prediction of Darwin or of old Mother Shipton.

The engineer and the man of science see no reason to set a limit to the extent to which the wastes may be reduced ; none to the extension of the working range of temperatures—even to the point of superheating to temperatures limited only as those of the gas-engine are limited, by the resisting power of the materials of construction. They see no natural limit, in the near future, to the decrease of weight or of lost work in the machine itself. No one can yet say when or where the limit of improvement of the steam-engine is to be reached. Were a guess to be hazarded, it might, perhaps, be that we may see the steam-engine of the next generation consuming one pound of fuel per horse-power per hour; weighing twenty-five pounds per horse-power; driving ships of twenty thousand tons or more at the rate of thirty or even forty miles an hour; crossing the Atlantic in three or four days; spanning the continent by flying trains in two days; transporting machinery and cotton and woollen goods to San Francisco at a cost of three or four dollars a ton, and returning the grain and the fruits of the Pacific coast and of Mexico to feed and to comfort the poorest of our workers at prices that they may all afford to pay; doing the work of the world far more cheaply and more universally than to-day; continually, and with still invisible limit, developing in power, applicability, and economy. It seems far more likely that the life of the race will ultimately be conserved, through those thousands of added years, by the steam-engine, improved by a hundred coming inventors, than by any other form of heat-engine.

But a time must come, nevertheless, when, the coals and the oil and the gas being substantially exhausted, the race must depend upon the steadily decreasing heat of the sun for its life and support. Then, perhaps, humanity may remember gratefully John Ericsson, the inventor of the "Sun Motor."

R. H. THURSTON.

THE INEVITABLE SURRENDER OF ORTHODOXY.

BY THE REV. MINOT J. SAVAGE, OF THE CHURCH OF THE UNITY, BOSTON.

HUMANITY is an army on the march. Where the van-guard is to-day, there the main body will be to-morrow. Find out what the few best thinkers of any age are dreaming, and you have what will be the common thought of the next age. With the exception of what has been scientifically demonstrated, the thought which is popular is that which is about to pass away. This only means that the world grows and is gradually learning.

In the ordinary departments of secular life and thought, so far are these ideas from being startling that they are regarded as even commonplace. But, strangely enough, in religion they are looked on as even shocking and profane. Everywhere else the past is known to have been the world's childhood, and maturity is expected to bear riper fruits of thought as well as action. But in religion it is wicked to grow to manhood and to "put away childish things." The religious leader can learn nothing, because he already knows it all. He is bound, hand and foot, brain and heart, by a theory that locates all divine wisdom in the past, and that threatens with infinite penalties the man who is daring enough to test it in the light of new discoveries and to declare that it does not fit the facts.

As anomalous, however, as this condition of things may seem at first sight, it is neither strange nor unnatural. It is but the inevitable result of a system of thought that starts with the ruin of the race and postulates a supernatural revelation, which man is just rational enough to accept, but not rational enough to criticise or reject. How inevitable this state of mind is, and, at the same time, how indefensible, will appear as we go on with our discussion.

There was a time, during the middle ages, when the church was practically synonymous with civilization. She matched and satisfied the brain, the heart, the conscience, and the spiritual aspirations of the world. Such science as there was, devoted itself to constructing a theory of the universe into which her dogmas would fit as a picture fits into its frame. Philosophy clipped its own wings and bounded its flight by the limits which she had determined. Art found no other patron, and so brought the creations of its genius and laid them on her altars. Music sought only to give wordless voice to the pathos of her penitence, to wing her aspiration, or catch some echoes of the rapture of her triumph. Either the world's heart was not tender enough to be shocked by the cruelty of her doctrine and practice, or else it took refuge in, and hushed its cry in the presence of, an infinite mystery it dared not attempt to understand. The world's conscience abdicated its right to judge what set itself above all human judgment, and humbly compelled its decision to square with an authority that arbitrarily imposed itself from without. And its dreams of the future were apparently satisfied with such conceptions as the "Paradiso" of Dante and the later visions of the blind Protestant singer. And the church was established on secure foundations so long as the world was thus content.

But the church forgot that this is a growing world. And, unfortunately for her future, she committed herself to a hard-and-fast theory of infallibility, which made it impossible for her to change without abdicating those claims which were the very source of her life and power. Perhaps these claims were the steps of her ascent to her throne of world-wide dominion. But certain it is that they had in them the prophecy of their overthrow. For though she forgot that this is a world that grows, the world did not, for that reason, conclude to stand still. The muttered assertion of the humiliated Galileo, though in a sense different from that in which even he meant it, was the sentence that decreed her downfall.

The church taught certain things about the world, about God, about man, about destiny, as having been revealed from heaven once for all, and as being, therefore, infallibly and unchangeably true. It staked its authority and rested its claims on the verity or falsity of these teachings. So much of these teachings as is an essential part of what is well known as "the plan of salvation," is properly called *orthodoxy*.

What, then, are these? Or, what *is* orthodoxy? This question must be definitely and explicitly answered at the outset.

Nor must those who like to be considered as still orthodox be allowed to make a private dictionary of their own. Such a course is confusion of all discussion, an abuse of the dictionary, and practical infidelity to the very first principles of morals. He who tampers with the meaning of words not only debases the intellectual coin of the world, but he becomes false to the realities of which words are only symbols, and so a dishonest juggler with the supreme interests of men. The word orthodoxy for some hundreds of years has stood for a something perfectly definite and clear. This something, it has always been claimed, was supernaturally and infallibly revealed. And now to play with the word and (to escape a difficulty) to attempt to substitute for its very soul a something else that the ages of faith would have indignantly repudiated,—this is not only "to palter with us in a double sense"; it is to be guilty of what any honest business man on the street would bluntly call *lying.*

The Romish branch of the church still teaches with sufficient clearness the main points of orthodoxy. But in the Protestant churches of both hemispheres there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of ministers who are not orthodox in any true sense of that word. Yet they still claim the name and enjoy its advantages, trying to justify their course by such pseudo-reasoning as reveals either an amazing mental confusion or such a moral indifference to the means by which they prosper as stultifies their claim to be moral teachers at all. Their beliefs have suffered "a sea-change into something"—"strange," if not "rich." They have become a series of dissolving views; and yet these men still claim to hold "the faith once delivered to the saints." They are as pliable courtiers as *Polonius;* the theological cloud is "camel," or "weasel," or "whale"; and yet they still claim to speak for him "with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

It is needful, therefore, that the candid mind—there is no use in discussing with any other—should be brought back to clear and calm recognition of what "orthodoxy" really is. Then one can rationally note its present conditions and its prospects.

As I am writing now chiefly for Protestants,—though the main line of my argument will apply equally well to the Romish position,—I must begin with the one claim which is the basis of the whole orthodox system. This, of course, is that they have received an infallible revelation from God, which revelation consists of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The orthodox scheme of doctrine is alone derived from these scriptures. No one claims that this scheme would ever have come into existence but for these scriptures. For, on any other supposition, the supposed revelation would not have been necessary.

What, now, are the essential points of the scheme, as thence derived? I shall deal with *only* the essential points, the absence of any one of which constitutes so radical a change as to turn orthodoxy into something which is not orthodoxy. For when *either one* of the following points is surrendered, what is left may be either false or true, but *it is not orthodoxy.*

The first point, then, is *the Fall of Man,* and the consequent condition of the entire race as under the wrath and curse of God. Every man, woman, and child are "alienated from God," naturally incapable of being partakers of his life, and so, unless "saved," naturally and necessarily separated from him forever. So necessary is this point that, but for it, the rest of the scheme would be entirely *uncalled for, and would never have been thought of.*

The remaining essential points together constitute a plan for delivering the race from the supposed effects of the supposed fall. The chief feature of this plan is, of course, *the Atonement.* The work of this atonement centres in the supposed *Incarnation, Life, Teachings, Suffering, Death, Resurrection, Ascension,* and continued *Intercession* of the *Second Person* of the *Trinity;* this second person in the Trinity being identified with the historical man Jesus of Nazareth. The precise method of this atonement is taught with so little clearness and consistency in the scriptures that several widely-differing theories of it have been held and taught in the church. It will be well to note the chief of these.

At first, and for a long time, it was supposed that man, by his rebellion against God, had become the veritable subject of the hostile kingdom of Satan, the arch-enemy of God. God was supposed to have entered into a bargain with Satan, by the terms of which the second person of the Trinity was to be delivered into his hands in exchange for mankind, or such portion of it as should not accept the conditions of the proposed ransom. But Satan was deceived; for, after he had bound himself to the agreement, he discovered—what he had not known before—the divine nature of his victim. And as the victim "could not be holden of death," he escaped, "leading captivity captive." That is, at his resurrection, he broke down the gates of hell, and escaped with a multitude who, up to that time, had been in the power of Satan. So far were many of the church fathers from seeing any culpable "sharp practice" in this, that they held and taught it as worthy of the divine ingenuity.

A later theory of the atonement taught that the justice of God demanded satisfaction, so that somebody must suffer what might be taken as an equivalent for the penalty of the world's sin. So God, in his great love for men, took it upon himself in the second person of the Trinity, Jesus offering himself as a "substitute." Thus "God could be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." This appears to have been the doctrine of Paul. It is also the ordinary Presbyterian doctrine of Great Britain and America.

What is commonly known as the "New England" theology has held to the "governmental theory." It was not any personal quality of justice in God that needed to be "appeased," so much as it was a governmental necessity that had to be met. In order to be a divine government at all, its subjects must see that the law could not be broken with impunity. So somebody must suffer; and "without the shedding of blood" there could be no "remission" of sin.

One more theory needs to be mentioned. This is the one that takes its name from its famous exponent and advocate, Dr. Horace Bushnell, of Hartford. According to this, the Christ was only a manifestation to the world of the eternal love of God. It was intended solely to influence the sinner and make him willing to be saved. This doctrine has always been rightly regarded as verging dangerously near to Unitarianism. For if all that God needed to do was to let the world know that he loved men and was willing to save them, it hardly seems necessary that he should resort to so stupendous a series of miracles as those which constitute the older theory.

These, then, are the chief forms that the doctrine of the atonement has assumed. The remaining essential points of the orthodox scheme are only two—*Heaven* and *Hell*. These follow of necessity. If all are "lost," then only those who are "saved" go to heaven; and the rest simply stay lost and go to their own place. It needs no additional condemnation, for "they are condemned already," as the word of scripture declares.

Of course, there are many other points contained in the generally-accepted creeds of the orthodox churches. But as I wish to make this paper as clear and simple as possible, so that there may be no confusion of thought as to the issue, they are purposely left out of this discussion. These constitute the citadel that must be defended at all hazards. Unless they can be defended, all of them, then surrender of all is inevitable.

It will be well, right here, to group and number them. They stand as follows :

1. The fall of man.
2. Atonement through the Christ.
3. Heaven for those who accept the atonement.
4. Hell for those who, for whatever reason, do not accept it.
5. The infallible Bible, which has revealed these things, and by means of which only are they known.

Here is the real *heart of the creeds*, the *kernel in the husk*. If the truth of these can be maintained, orthodoxy is secure. If any one of them be not true, then any most ordinary thinker, if he be at all clear-headed, must see that the whole system must be surrendered. For each of these points is vital to the whole scheme. Let any one of them be taken away, and the reason for maintaining the rest is gone. If there has been no fall, then there is no need of any such atonement. If there has been no such atonement, then either man has not fallen or else he can be saved in some other way. The old heaven implies the fall, the atonement, and the lost. Take away the old hell, and there is no reason for all this stupendous scheme for saving people from it. And if scripture be not infallible, then the whole scheme becomes the fancy of an ignorant and barbaric age, of no more authority than the dreams of Mohammed or Gautama. All this is perfectly clear,—as simple and as inevitable as the "multiplication table."

Let us now address ourselves to the question as to whether these central and essential points of the orthodox faith are true, and, so, defensible. This is not a difficult task, in the light of modern knowledge. It is within the reach of any fairly-intelligent man or woman. The issue is perfectly simple and plain. The world already possesses knowledge enough to settle it beyond any reasonable doubt. If the orthodox faith, as set forth above, is true, then every honest man must be orthodox. If not, no honest man can be. It only needs that people face the matter. Were it not that prejudice, self-interest, and fear were involved, it might be settled in six months. People know enough, and the facts are sufficiently accessible. It only needs candor and courage. To those possessing these I speak. It is of no use to speak to others.

Let us first consider the question which is at the foundation of all—as to whether the books of the *Old and New Testaments* are infallible. The claim that they are is absolutely without any basis whatever, except that of an utterly baseless ecclesiastical tradition. These books make no such claim on their own behalf. The only appearance of such a claim—and it is only carelessness or dishonesty that could even for one moment urge it—is in a passage that occurs in II. Tim., iii., 16. This reads, in the revised version: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching." It does not say *what* scripture is "inspired of God." Even if it did, it would express only the opinion of the writer, unless it could be otherwise proved that he was infallibly inspired. And, furthermore, since we do not know who the writer was, we have no way of estimating the value of even his opinion. And, in any case, the passage could have had no reference to the New Testament as we now have it, for its books were not then gathered; *i. e.*, there was then no New Testament

In the next place, what *certainty* have we of the verbal accuracy of any single text on which, as we are told, hangs the tremendous issue of heaven or hell? The oldest manuscript of any part of the New Testament takes us no nearer the real words of Jesus and his disciples than some time in the fourth century. Hundreds of manuscripts, of all or a part of the Testament, are in existence. But they contain *thousands* of differences in their readings. Generally these differences are not important; that is, they do not materially change the sense. But in some cases they are very important. They amount to a difference as to whole verses; and, in a few instances, to whole paragraphs or parts of chapters. Some of these differences mean more than carelessness; they indicate a deliberate tampering with the text, under the influence of doctrinal bias.

It is sometimes urged, in reply to this point, that we are as sure of the general accuracy of the New-Testament text, as we are of that of the best classics, such as Cicero's orations. Suppose we are : the fact is still entirely beside the point. When some one claims that the salvation of the soul depends on the reading of a text in Cicero, then the comparison will have some relevancy. Until then, however, it is only a flippant evasion of the difficulty even to raise such a comparison. Whatever be the condition of any or all the classic texts, the plain and serious fact remains that we are not sure of the verbal accuracy of any single New-Testament text, on which we are told depends the destiny of the soul. And this would still be true although the Bible had been infallible in the first place. For the blunders of copyists are proof enough that the work of handing it down has had no infallible superintendence.

And though there were a reasonable certainty—as there is not—that *some* books were infallibly inspired, the question would still remain as to *which* ones. The canon has never been settled by any infallible authority. The Romish Church came to no final decision until the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, and included a whole list of books—the Apocrypha—which the Protestants rejected. Which was right ? No voice from heaven has answered. And no generally recognized authority, except a sort of blind drifting or common consent of the incompetent, has ever settled the Protestant canon. Doctrinal bias was clearly apparent during the early centuries. As one illustration, the apocalypse of John was very popular so long as the immediate second coming of Jesus was looked for. But when it was found that he did not come, it fell into disrepute on account of its pronounced Millenarianism, and for a long time recognition was refused to it. It is well known that, so late as the Reformation, there was no general agreement as to what was "Scripture" and what was not. Luther even contemptuously rejected the Epistle of James, the very brother of Jesus, calling it "an epistle of straw." And no voice of authority has spoken since his day.

In general, it can be said of nearly all the books of both the Old Testament and the New, that nobody knows when or where or by whom they were written. It is true that this does not at all affect their general religious value, any-more than critical disputes over the authorship of Homer or Shakespeare touch the poetic worth of the "Iliad" or "Hamlet." But it does have a most serious bearing on the question as to whether these books are of such authority that they must be taken as settling all the great problems of human origin, character, and destiny.

More than this, it has been proved, over and over again, beyond all honest and intelligent question, that these books are full of errors as to matters of natural science, of history, and of morals. To deal with this point adequately would require a book. The story of creation, both as to method and the order of appearance of the forms of life on earth, has been demonstrated to be untrue. The Genesis account of the origin of languages is childish in its absurdity. The history of the Exodus is so full of impossibilities and contradictions that it would require a long article, all by itself, even to point them out. Indeed, the whole of the five books of "Moses" is one mass of incongruities, absurdities, and impossibilities, if we try to treat it as history. As tradition, of great interest and value, of course no one would have anything to say against it. In itself, it is just what we might expect it to be. But the foolish and unfounded claims, not its own, but which others put forth for it, on behalf of a theory, compel these things to be said. What shall be said of a "revelation" that does not reveal things until, thousands of years after it is supposed to have been written, the truth is tortured and twisted *into* a text in which the wholly unknown author plainly supposed he was saying something else?

Were there time for it, similar points might be made good against the accuracy of the New-Testament writers. I will stop for only one case, but one so remarkable that I have often wondered that it is not oftener referred to. If the Bible be an infallible revelation, then the *Epistle of Jude* is a part of it. In the three verses of its one chapter (14–16) is one of the most curious and palpable blunders. The writer quotes what he declares to be the words of the old Patriarch, "Enoch, *the seventh from Adam.*" Whom is he actually quoting? The wholly anonymous and irresponsible writer of a wildly apocryphal book, written within a century or so of the time of Jesus, and full of absurdities worthy of the author of Baron Munchausen. The "Book of Enoch" is easily accessible; and a merely superficial perusal of it will incline any reverent mind to relieve the Holy Spirit from all responsibility for any such palpable blunder as Jude is here guilty of. But if one of "the inspired writers" is capable of such a mistake, who can vouch for the rest? And if the church has been mistaken in accepting Jude as canonical, who can vouch for its judgment as to all the others?

In their attempts to defend, not the Bible, but their own theories about the Bible, from the assaults of critical scholarship, orthodox theologians have several times shifted their ground. For a time *verbal inspiration* was held. When that was found untenable, the theory of *plenary inspiration* was adopted. This claimed that, though not verbally accurate, the Bible writers had been so inspired as to teach only truth with no admixture of error. Now, in many quarters, they take refuge from scientific and historical errors in saying that the Bible was not intended to teach science or history, but only spiritual truth. And, at last, some are claiming only that the Bible *contains* a revelation, not *is* one. In other words, the claim is virtually abandoned, except as to such points as cannot be brought to any decisive test. Where it can be tested, it is fallible; where it cannot be, there it is infallible: so stand the admission and the claim. But what reasonable man will take as authority in the unseen a book that is full of errors as to the realm of the seen? No, it may as well be frankly confessed that this sort of talk is surrender of the only claim that here concerns us. *Whatever else we have, it is certain that we do not have any divine or infallible authority for accepting as true the essential points of the orthodox creed.*

This claim, then, is an affront to human reason. But not only this; it is also an outrage on the human heart. In justification of this statement, let us examine a little the morality of the orthodox creed. I pass by the Biblical indorsement of slavery, polygamy, and other like barbarisms, because they are well known and have been often dwelt on. But, before coming to the main point I wish to make, I will briefly touch on one or two actions that the Old Testament attributes to Jehovah himself. What shall be said of a god who sends forth a prophet divinely commissioned to lie, in order to entice a king on to his destruction? (I. Kings, xxii., 22, 23.) What shall we say of a god who sends Moses forth with the command, "Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites"?—a part of the vengeance being expressed in the following terms: "Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children that have not known man by lying with him, *keep alive for yourselves*". (Judges, xxxi., 17, 18.) Moses is instructed to lie to Pharaoh, telling him at first that all the Israelites desired was to go into the wilderness to sacrifice. And when the time comes for actual departure, the people are instructed to "borrow" of the Egyptians —plainly with no intention of returning it—everything they could easily lay hands on. It is an ungracious task to dwell on such illustrations of a barbaric age. But what shall be said of men who, in this nineteenth century, attempt to defend such barbarities in support of a theory?

Many are willing to admit that the Old Testament does thus "accommodate" itself, as they say, to the conditions and cruelties of the times, while they still claim that the ethics of the New Testament is perfect. Were there time, much might be said as to the practical morality of the *Sermon on the Mount*, as well as of the teachings of some of the disciples. I must, however, call attention to only one point. It has been the custom of the Protestants to condemn severely the Romish doctrine and practice as to the celibacy of the clergy. But the teaching of the New Testament is explicit and clear as to the superior holiness of the single as contrasted with the married state. This would seem also to apply to the laity as well as the clergy, so that the Shakers are doubtless right in their contention. Paul's doctrine concerning women is, to say the least, not a lofty one. The Apostle John assigned to the unmarried the very highest place in heaven. See Rev. xiv., 1–4. And Jesus himself teaches plainly, not only by example, but by precept, their superior sanctity. See Mat. xix., 10–12. And there is no intimation that he had any reference to a temporary condition of affairs.

But the chief thing I wish to emphasize, in this connection, is that the whole "plan of salvation" is distinctly and definitely an immoral scheme from beginning to end.

Here let it be kept clearly in mind that an Infinite Being must be held as ultimately and solely responsible for whatsoever he either ordains or permits. Keep also clearly in mind the distinction between an evil that is temporary and one that is eternal. Any kind or amount of suffering and evil that are temporary, that are only experiences in the development of a soul, may conceivably be justified by the outcome. But, in the very nature of the case, eternal evil and suffering have no outcome except more evil and suffering, and so cannot be justified. Now look at the orthodox scheme.

God creates a man. He has had no experience of either good or evil, and so cannot possibly comprehend the results of his action. He is a man-sized child. He has no way of knowing that he is under any obligations to obey him who, "for his own pleasure," has created him. Neither can any one else, even now, see how he was under any obligation to obey a mere arbitrary command. This child-man God allows to be tempted, and punishes him because he falls. This is bad enough, and outrages all common-sense and justice. But there is worse to come. He has so related this child-man to all the unborn millions that every man, woman, and child that have since come into the world have come weighted with the curse and wrath of God, and doomed to endless pain. Tested by the standard of any justice that the human mind is capable of conceiving, such an act as this is an unspeakable crime. All the cruelty of all the bloody characters of all the world, its Tamerlanes, Neros, Caligulas, Borgias, and Torquemadas rolled into one, would show white and merciful against such a background of blackness and cruelty. For all earthly tortures, however prolonged, must have an end. But, according to orthodoxy, the immense majority of all that have ever lived are now in hell, and "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *forever and ever.*"

But, it is said, it is the fault of the lost if they be not saved, for salvation has been offered freely to all. In the first place, this is not true. What of the countless millions before Christ, who did not even know that a little obscure people in Palestine were being "prepared," as they say, for his coming ?. What of the countless millions who have been born and have died since, and who have never heard anything about it ? And, by the way, is it not a little strange that the *Almighty* God has been at work for nearly two thousand years and has not been able to get the news of his own incarnation, sufferings, and death before even the superficial attention of more than a third part of the inhabitants of this little earth ?

But, leaving all this one side, the orthodox representation of the "infinite love and mercy" of God is only mockery and cruelty. Let us see how it looks in the light of an illustration. Suppose a great merchant should send a ship to sea. It is loaded with merchandise and crowded with passengers. He knows before it leaves port that it is unseaworthy and will not get half way across before it will spring a fatal leak. Still he sends it. After it is well on its way, he, knowing what will occur, fits out and sends after it a relief-ship. This arrives, as he knew it would, just in time to save a few of the passengers, while the great majority sink into the waves, "unknelled, uncoffined, and unknown." But the illustration has one merciful feature that the orthodox theory has not; these poor victims will get through being drowned some time. The strangling and struggle for breath are not endless. But what would any fair man say of such a merchant? Would he sing hymns to him for "the few that he saved," or execrate him for his cruelty? On this orthodox theory, I cannot find any voice with which to praise God for the saved, for my words are drowned in tears of pity for those he did not choose to number with the few "elect."

Not only, then, does the educated and unbiassed head cry out against orthodoxy, but the civilized heart and conscience reject it as a relic of those barbarous ages when might was right and man was only clay in the hands of a potter who shaped his vessels to honor or dishonor as suited his whim. There is not one single feature of the orthodox "plan of salvation," starting with the fall and ending with heaven and hell, that does not outrage the sense of justice of any intelligent and unbiassed mind. Speaking of the Ptolemaic system of the universe, Alfonso of Castile said that, "if he had been present at creation, he could have suggested a better ordering of the heavenly bodies." So any intelligent and honorable man might say that, had he been present at creation, he could have suggested a better ordering of the course of human destiny than that set forth in the orthodox scheme.

Either the critical or the moral argument, as already set forth, is fatal to the orthodox claim. But one other consideration remains, which alone is sufficient, not merely to cast doubt upon it, but to demonstrate its falsity. I purpose now to set that forth as clearly as the limits of this article will allow.

Every religion presupposes, runs back to, roots itself in, and springs out of, a cosmology or theory of things. The Bible begins with science. So orthodoxy has its theory of the world, of God, of man, of destiny. The crucial point of this, so far as our present discussion is concerned, is the doctrine of the fall of man. Had it not been for this, no such thing as "the plan of salvation" would ever have been heard of. It came into being and it exists simply and solely as a means for delivering the race from the supposed effects of the supposed fall. Now, modern science has demonstrated the antiquity of man and his derivation from lower forms of life. These facts are demonstrated as conclusively, and in precisely the same way, as is the rotation of the earth on its axis or its revolution about the sun. It is perfectly safe to say that, but for theological bias, no competent intelligence on earth to-day would think of disputing it. And what of it? Why, plainly this: It means a belief in the *ascent of man*, instead of the *fall of man*. It means that man began at the lowest point, and, however slowly, has been ascending from the first. And since there has been no fall, it requires no great leap of logic to reach the conclusion that the elaborate, unsupported, and unjust scheme of orthodoxy is not needed. The human race is needy enough, but it does not need this. It has called for "bread," and has received this consecrated "stone." It does not need an imaginary cure for an imaginary evil. Man's great want calls for rational treatment in the light of the discovered facts as to his origin, nature, and course of development.

Though no necessary part of this argument, which is quite able to stand alone, it is well worth while for Bible-readers to note two points which are generally overlooked. In the first place, every scholar knows that the Jews themselves had not heard of any fall of man until they obtained the Eden story from the Persians during their captivity. Not a little strange is this, after all the talks that Abraham and Moses are reported to have had with Jehovah.

And, in the next place, it is not a little curious that Jesus should never have referred to it. On the supposition that Jesus was the second person in the Trinity, and that he had come to earth for no other purpose than to rescue the race from the effects of this fall, it seems to me nothing less than remarkable.

The belief in the fall, then, being given up,—and it must be soon surrendered by every intelligent and honest man,—the whole orthodox scheme crumbles and falls. The critical argument, the moral argument, the scientific argument—either one of these is fatal to the orthodox claim.

But, in spite of these incontrovertible facts, thousands still cling to it because, busied with other things, they do not investigate these matters; and so the force of tradition drifts them on. Other thousands cling for reasons of interest, social or business. Still other thousands cling because they are afraid of consequences; ethical motives seem bound up with the old beliefs, or they do not see clearly what is coming in place of them. Other thousands more cling to them under the impression that only some slight modification of views is necessary, and that they can hold the property, the places, and the name, while the thing itself is being changed.

It would be ludicrous, were it not pathetic, to notice the desperate make-shifts of some of these latter. The Rev. Dr. E. A. Abbott, of England, in his book, "The Kernel and the Husk," strips off the husk with a vengeance. He accepts the evolution of man, surrenders the infallibility of the Bible, the miracles, the deity of Jesus, and everlasting punishment. What is left he may call "the kernel," if he pleases; but what is left is certainly *not* the kernel of the orthodox "plan of salvation." And a business man, accustomed to inviolable "trade-marks," would hardly call it honest to keep the old label. But the most astonishing thing in this direction that I have come across is a note in Eaton's "Heart of the Creeds," a work by an Episcopal clergyman. This note is as follows: "When we say of Jesus, 'Conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, and went into the place of departed spirits,' we simply *mean* to declare our belief in *the facts of history, whatever they are.*" The italics are mine. *Can* the language of mental confusion go further than this? Compared with this, the wisdom and clear-headedness of the boy who claimed to have the same jack-knife after both blade and handle had been renewed, were profound. In the "funny" column of a newspaper, a remark like this would be entitled to rank high among the best of those of Josh Billings or Artemus Ward. But when put forth as the serious work of a "reconciling" theologian—well, perhaps in these days it is in place. Trinities that are no trinity, falls that are not the fall, resurrections of the body that are only ascensions of the soul, hells that are only a temporary regret—these are to be found on every hand. All these were well enough, if only we could have them along with words that were meant to tell the plain truth, and not to conceal ideas.

But this is the age of *theological fiction*, in a sense that does *not* refer to any of the popular novels of the time. But perhaps it is so that the change must come. It took three centuries for the transition from paganism to Christianity. It took two centuries for the popular mind to become habituated to the new ideas of the Copernican system. And even then the ideas and phrases of both paganism and Ptolemy still lingered. Though thought moves faster to-day, it may yet take many years to work out the greatest revolution of human thought that the world has ever seen. For what we are now going through is no less than that. It means nothing less than a new universe, a new God, a new man, a new destiny. It is as certain to come as sunrise. And when the sun is up, the cruelties, crudities, monstrosities, injustices of the long night of orthodoxy will have fled away with the shadows. From the " new heaven " will smile down a grander God, and on the " new earth " will live and labor and hope a grander man.

M. J. SAVAGE.

HOW A CENSUS IS TAKEN.

BY THE HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

THE interest in census-taking increases with each recurrence of the Federal enumeration. The census answers for the Nation to the stock-taking time of business men; so now, as the year 1890 approaches, the interest in the decennial account of stock increases, and especially as the period is the centennial of the first constitutional enumeration. One hundred years will have elapsed since the first constitutional enumeration took place.

The American census finds its germ in the colonial period of our history, but all colonial enumerations, or nearly all of them, were exceedingly faulty. They related simply to the counting of the people. The census as such, with all the proportions known to the modern enumeration, was not known until within recent years. The colonial enumerations were carried on under the immediate direction of the colonial governments, through the agency of sheriffs and their deputies; but it is evident from the results that, so far from a census having been achieved under their direction, there was not even a thorough enumeration of the population.

It was the province of the Constitution to secure to the country, first, a full enumeration, and afterward what is now known as the census. The following is the constitutional provision, and was the result of much deliberation on the part of the Constitutional Convention:

> **"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers. . . . The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."**

Under this provision, the United States has had at each decennial period, commencing with 1790, an enumeration of the population, and for each decade since and including 1850 what may well be called a National census; that of 1880, the tenth, comprehending a vast collection of information other than that which is ordinarily secured through the machinery of an enumeration. The growth from the first to the last has been uniform and steady. Without attempting an analysis of the various steps as presented at each decade, this growth may be shown by reciting the facts sought at the first enumeration, in 1790, and indicating the scope of the inquiries in 1880. The following shows the schedule, and the only schedule, used in 1790 :

SCHEDULE OF THE WHOLE NUMBER OF PERSONS WITHIN THE DIVISION ALLOTTED TO A. B.

Names of heads of families.	Free white males of sixteen years and upward, including heads of families.	Free white males under sixteen.	Free white families, including heads of familes.	All other free persons.	Slaves.

Instead of one simple schedule, having but six heads, there were used in the Tenth Census five regular schedules and a large number of special schedules.

Schedule No. 1 in the Tenth Census related to population and the condition of the people, and contained twenty-six separate inquiries. These comprehended the relation of each person enumerated to the head of the family—that is, whether wife, son, daughter, boarder, or other ; the civil conditions of each person enumerated —whether married, widowed, or single ; the place of birth of each person and of the parents of each person enumerated ; the physical and mental health of each—whether active or disabled, maimed, crippled, bed-ridden, deaf, dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic ; and whether employed or unemployed, and if unemployed, during what portion of the year.

Schedule No. 2 comprehended all necessary inquiries relative to the agriculture of the country.

Schedule No. 3 related to the products of mechanical industries.

Schedule No. 4 related to the indebtedness of cities, counties, towns, etc.; the ownership of the public debt of the United States, and inquiries respecting public paupers, criminals, and all kindred matters.

Schedule No. 5 contained inquiries as to the birth-place of the father and mother of each person reported as having died during the year, and as to the usual occupation of decedents.

In addition to these, there were schedules relating to railroad, express, and telegraph companies ; to shipping and all the various interests of the country; and many special investigations were made, covering a wide range of topics.

This general statement shows the proportions reached by the Federal census as compared with the attempts of 1790.

Congress has now provided by law for taking the eleventh and subsequent censuses, and the purpose of this paper is to show how the census so provided for is to be taken. The new act follows the lines laid down in a bill which General Garfield, as chairman of the House Committee on the Census, undertook to pass for taking the Ninth Census. The bill passed the House, but failed in the Senate; so the Ninth Census, that of 1870, was taken in accordance with the old law of 1850, which provided that it should be done, as previous censuses had been conducted, by United States marshals and their deputies. In 1879, however, the Garfield bill, with such modifications as experience had taught were necessary, became a law, and under it the Tenth Census, that of 1880, was taken. The law recently enacted, and approved March 1, 1889, being an act to provide for the taking of the eleventh and subsequent censuses, contains all that was good in the Garfield bill and the law of 1879, with such provisions as the wide experience of the Tenth Census has indicated. The act of 1879 was carried through Congress by the Hon. Eugene Hale, chairman of the Census Committee, on the part of the Senate, and the Hon. S. S. Cox, chairman of the House Committee. In shaping the measure they had the experience of General Walker to aid them. The new legislation has been carried through by the same veteran legislators in census matters, who have again been chairmen of the committees of their respective houses. Their experience in all the legislation pertaining to the Tenth Census has been of great practical value in shaping the measure for 1890.

The Eleventh Census, that of 1890, is to be taken under the supervision of a Superintendent of Census, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who has charge of the Census Office, a bureau in the Department of the Interior. The present act gives the Superintendent a competent organization, consisting of a chief clerk, a disbursing officer, ten chiefs of division, stenographers, statistical experts, and a sufficient number of clerks of the various classes, without number, to enable him to carry out the provisions of the act. The probability is that the whole organization of the Census Office at Washington, at its highest, will consist of at least fifteen hundred persons. This force, which, of course, will be a gradual growth during the first year and a half of the census, must in its inception make all the preparatory provisions for the census—the preparation of schedules, blanks of all kinds, methods of account, preparation of portfolios, and all the paraphernalia of the material side of the census work; but this force, even at its largest, is small compared with the total army necessary to complete the work.

Before field operations begin, which must be on the first Monday of June, 1890, the whole country is to be divided into not exceeding one hundred and seventy-five great districts, called supervisors' districts, and a supervisor selected for each district, such supervisor being appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These supervisors constitute the field-generals of the force. They should be selected with great care, and from among men who have good business capacity and who will put something more than mere service into the work intrusted to them. Each supervisor is to receive the fixed sum of $125, in addition to which he is to receive $1 in thickly-settled districts for each thousand of the population enumerated, and $1.40 in sparsely-settled districts for each thousand. This gives a sliding scale of compensation, with a fixed amount for the initiative; but no supervisor is to receive a sum less than $500. These supervisors take the place of the United States marshals under the old order of census-taking as it existed up to 1880, when the change took place. Their duties are to divide their supervisors' districts into enumeration districts, and report such division to the Superintendent of the Census for his approval.

The enumeration districts must not exceed 4,000 population, estimated on the basis of the census of 1880. As a rule, in great cities and in thickly-settled communities, they should not exceed 2,000 or 2,500 at the outside, the object of the small district being to enable the enumerators in cities to complete their work in two weeks, while in more sparsely-settled localities, country districts, etc., thirty days are allowed by law. The supervisor, having made his division into enumeration districts, and his division being approved by the Superintendent, must then select an enumerator for each enumeration district. These enumerators constitute the great census army,—an army equal in size to that with which Sheridan fought Early in the Shenandoah Valley, —consisting of about 35,000 men. Each enumerator is to be a resident of his enumeration district, and he must, by law, be selected solely with reference to fitness and without reference to political party affiliations ; but it is provided that, in the appointment of enumerators, preference shall in all cases be given to properly qualified persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States residing in their respective districts. Of course, as a matter of safety, the law provides that, if it shall occur in any enumeration district that no person qualified to perform and willing to undertake the duties of enumerator resides in such district, then the supervisor may appoint any fit person resident in the county as enumerator. These enumerators are regularly commissioned by the Superintendent of Census, such commission being countersigned by the supervisor of the district in which the enumerator is to be appointed.

The enumerators, as well as the supervisors, take a rigid oath, binding themselves to perform and discharge the duties intrusted to them, according to law, honestly and correctly and to the best of their ability, and no enumerator can be allowed to enter upon his duties until such oath has been taken.

The chief burden of enumeration, or the work of collecting the wide range of facts called for by the Census Law, falls upon the enumerator. It is difficult to secure men for the short service required of them for this work. Their duties are arduous in the extreme. Each enumerator is equipped with a portfolio of schedules relating to the population, as indicated, and with the schedules calling for information relating to manufactures, agriculture, etc., although the Superintendent is allowed by law to withhold from the enumerator all schedules except those pertaining to the population. Before starting upon his tour of duty, the enumerator is supposed to be thoroughly instructed by the supervisor on every point in such manner that he can accurately collect the information desired. To do this he must visit personally each dwelling-house in his sub-division, and each family therein, and each individual living out of a family in any place of abode. In cities he must inquire at great mercantile houses if families are living in the upper part of such buildings. In fact, he must search out and find every inhabitant living in his district on the first day of June, 1890, and by inquiry, to be made of the head of such family or of the member thereof deemed most credible and worthy of trust, or, if an individual be living out of a family, of him in person, obtain each and every item of information and all the particulars required by the law pertaining to each individual in the whole population as of date June 1, 1890 ; and he may, if no person shall be found at the usual place of abode of a family, or of an individual living out of a family and alone, competent to answer the inquiries made in compliance with the requirements of law, obtain the required information, as nearly as may be practicable, from the family or families or person living nearest to such place of abode. If, however, such information cannot be obtained by any ordinary efforts, then, of course, the enumerator must report the omission to his immediate chief—that is, the supervisor of his district.

In this way the enumerator travels over the whole of his district; and if he is intrusted with the schedules relating to manufactures and agriculture, he must obtain the required information as to products, wages, capital, material, and persons employed, and other information sought, from each individual concern, and the quantity and kind of products, and the value of each product, for every farm in his district. After he has collected all the information required by law, he must forward the original schedules, filled out by him and duly certified as to their accuracy, to the supervisor of his district. The supervisor, in turn, must carefully examine all such schedules as come from the enumerators of his district, and if there are omissions to be filled or corrections to be made, he must see to it that such omissions are filled and corrections made, and then forward the original returns to the Superintendent of Census at Washington.

The enumerator is also obliged by the new law to collect information as to the service and organization in which service was rendered, as well as the length thereof, of each surviving soldier of the War of the Rebellion, and also certain facts relative to the widows of soldiers who served in the Rebellion. These facts, as well as the facts relating to persons who have died during the census year, are collected on separate schedules—that is, independent of the great population schedule.

The compensation of the enumerator is, in ordinary localities, two cents per capita for the population schedule ; that is, he receives two cents for each name entered on his schedule, but the entry of the name includes all the facts called for. In sparsely-settled localities he may receive two cents and a half per name. Under this compensation the enumerator of ordinary capacity can make from $2 to $6 per day. He also receives five cents a name for all names entered on the schedule relating to soldiers and soldiers' widows, and for the facts regarding each death he receives two cents. He receives for enumerating the facts for each farm fifteen cents, and for each establishment of productive industry twenty cents. In districts where the difficulties of enumeration are very great—as, for instance, island districts—the Secretary of the Interior, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Census, may designate special rates, but to no enumerator in any such district can there be paid less than $3 or more than $6 per day of ten hours' actual labor, if a *per-diem* compensation is established, or more than three cents for each living inhabitant, twenty cents for each farm, and thirty cents for each establishment of productive industry, when the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that a *per-capita* compensation is deemed advisable in such difficult districts.

After all the schedules have been filled by the enumerator, as may be required of him, he must make up his account as to the number of people enumerated, and the number of farms and manufacturing establishments, deaths, soldiers, etc., for which information has been gathered, such account being sent to the supervisor for the purpose of being audited by him; if found correct, the supervisor must approve the same and forward it to the Superintendent, when, if the number of persons or farms (or whatever the account is for) in the account accords with the returns of the enumerator, his payment is at once made, by draft on a sub-treasurer, and he is practically discharged from the service.

In addition to the work of the enumerators under the direction of the supervisors, the Superintendent of Census employs special agents for special purposes. He is obliged by law to collect information relative to the Indians, and also for the Territory of Alaska—undertakings surrounded by great difficulty and in the prosecution of which many obstacles are to be met. Special agents also collect information relative to railroading, fishing, mining, cattle, and other great industries, as has been stated.

All the vast quantities of information provided for under the act will be poured in upon the Census Office at Washington between the middle of June, 1890, and the end of the year, and must be properly classified and compiled and brought into tabular form. At this point the heaviest clerical force is employed. The difficulties attending this branch of census-taking are great indeed. Many original errors are found, and must be corrected by correspondence. Thousands and thousands of letters must be written to manufacturers, farmers, and others who have given information, in order that harmony may prevail in all parts. An expert must detect all the various errors that naturally occur. An enumerator may carelessly enter the wrong figure; as, for instance, in taking the facts relating to a farm, the farmer may say that he harvested so many acres of potatoes and that the yield was 20 bushels per acre. The enumerator, in his haste, may use one too many ciphers and leave it 200 bushels per acre, and this error reaches Washington. The expert in charge of such matters must be able to determine from the statements whether they are reasonably correct or not; that is, in the instance cited, he must know, of his own knowledge, that, if an enumerator said the yield was 200 bushels of potatoes an acre, a mistake has been made. So in all other matters of farm-products, a man skilled in the business knows whether the statements of the enumerator are probably correct or not.

But these cases are quite simple compared with the difficulty of ascertaining the accuracy of statements relative to the products of manufacturing concerns. Experience shows, however, that in any given branch of production, with one or two factors of production stated, the other factors can be ascertained with reasonable accuracy. If the manufacturer of a certain line of goods is willing to state the number of people employed and the gross wages paid, and then shrinks when it comes to capital invested or value of products, the expert can determine whether or not an attempt to deceive has been made by the manufacturer, and if such an attempt is apparent, correspondence must be entered into in order to harmonize the results. The population schedules, after they are received, with all the efforts of the enumerators and supervisors, in turn, to make them correct, need a great deal of attention before they are ready for tabulation. Many errors will unavoidably creep into them, and errors that are exceedingly amusing sometimes; as, for instance, a child one year old will be entered as "married." Of course, such an error occurs in the transposition of the answer, it belonging to the person whose name has been given just before that of the child. So, too, it has been found that children have died of old age and old men of the diseases common to infants. All such errors require careful attention on the part of the examiners and tabulators, although they are, as a rule, easily corrected on the face of the schedules; but correspondence must be had many times in order to straighten out inconsistencies and glaring defects. And so, through the whole process of assimilation, the expert work becomes a necessity.

It is this that causes the delay in the publication of census returns. In the census of 1880 all the essential features of the census were published with remarkable rapidity. The public impression that these were much delayed has been gained through the appearance of volume after volume for eight or nine years after the census began; but these later volumes were the results of the work of special agents upon special topics, and not the publications of the census returns proper. Of course, the greatest value to be obtained from census returns, after accuracy is secured, is in their prompt publication, but the difficulties of prompt publication are great, as already shown. The public always requires the results first, and through its representatives, seeking information in the Census Office, usually states that it does not care for detail, but only wants the totals; but the Census Office is obliged to consider each and every detail and see to it that each is accurate before it can arrive at totals,—the total being the last figure, of course, to be reached, and not the first. All the vast machinery referred to is necessary before the Superintendent can name the figure which can be stated in half a line of text, representing the total population of the country; and the expenditure before this simple statement can be made must reach the vicinity of $3,000,000, and probably more.

The new law makes a wise and radical departure in respect to copies of schedules for the use of local governments; and while this does not come under the title of this paper, it seems to me well to state to the public what it can receive for its own immediate benefit. Under the old census methods, the United States marshals who conducted the enumeration made copies of their schedules and forwarded them to the Census Office at Washington, retaining the originals in their respective districts; but these originals were of little value, after all, because a marshal's district covered such a wide territory. Now the originals are sent to Washington; but under the law providing for the Tenth Census, copies were made, giving the name, age, sex, birthplace, and color of the persons enumerated within each enumeration district, and such copies were deposited with the clerk of the court of the county in which the district was situated. It has been found that these copies are of little or no value, and simply lumber up the offices of the clerks of court. The chief value which can come from the copies is in having them in the custody of municipal governments; so the new law provides that, upon the request of any municipal government, meaning thereby the incorporated government of any village, town, or city, or kindred municipality, the Superintendent of Census shall furnish such government with a copy of the names, with the age, sex, birthplace, color, and race, of all persons enumerated within the territory in the jurisdiction of such municipality, but such copies must be paid for by the municipal government requesting them. This provision relieves the Census Office of the labor of making copies whether wanted or not, but imposes upon it the labor of making them when municipal governments call for them. These copies, placed in the hands of city or town clerks, will be of great value.

The question is often asked, Why cannot the United States census be taken in one day, as is done in England and many Continental countries? The reasons are obvious on reflection. In the first place, England, which we will take for an example, is a compact nation, all the functions of government being concentrated at the national capital. The constabulary is national, and the census is taken through it. The skeleton of the body of enumerators always exists. The enlargement occurs through the appointment of temporary constables, working with the permanent constabulary force. This gives England—and like conditions exist in other countries—a force always in existence, or easily brought into existence, for census purposes. Each constable is supplied with a proper quantity of blanks for a very small district. These he distributes one day and collects the next. They are to be filled out by the head of the household, and are to contain the names and facts relating to each person living under the roof at midnight. The United States Government has no force which can be enlarged to a proper extent for a one-day census. This fact alone would prevent our Government from following the methods adopted in Europe. But there is another reason which would entirely prevent the adoption of the European method. The schedule for the English and Continental censuses is a very small affair, comprehending but few inquiries relating to the name, relation to head of family, condition (whether single, married, etc.), sex, age at the last birthday, the profession or occupation, place of birth, and whether deaf, dumb, or blind. This constitutes the whole English census. The United States census comprehends, as we have seen, a very great number of inquiries, relating to numerous topics.

To distribute the United States schedules among the people and ask them to fill them out would simply result in total failure. The method adopted in 1880, and which will be carried out in 1890, of making small districts and appointing an enumerator for each district,—the districts being so small and the enumerators so numerous that the census of the people can be taken in cities in two weeks and in the whole country in substantially one month,—is much the best, when all the conditions, the vast territory, and the wide extent of inquiries of our Federal census, are considered. It is even argued by many that a more accurate census would be obtained by having fewer enumerators and allowing them to work from district to district in a progressive way, so that the experience acquired in the first week or two of the canvass would be utilized during succeeding weeks in other districts; but this would be returning to the old system of taking the census under United States marshals, by giving the person performing the duties of enumerator a large territory. In all probability, the modern method is superior to the one which has been laid aside. The difficulty of the modern system of small districts and a vast army of enumerators lies, as has been intimated, in securing competent men for so short and so poorly-paid a service; but with proper precautions on the part of the Superintendent, with proper instructions to the supervisors, and by them again to the enumerators, all of which instructions should be communicated a sufficient length of time prior to the enumeration to enable all concerned to comprehend them fully, there would seem to be a sufficient guarantee of a fairly-accurate enumeration.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

THE MISCHIEVOUS ICE-PITCHER.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, SURGEON-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED.

"THERE is death in the pot," said Mr. Accum to the people of England, in his diatribe against dram-drinking. The words fell with startling force upon those in high and low places, and set up a train of inquiry which nothing but some short and terrible invective like his could have excited. Artists and manufacturers took up his idea and reproduced it on canvas and in almost every plastic material used for decoration or domestic purposes. Preachers announced it from their pulpits and drew fearful pictures of its appositeness ; and, if we are to believe the assertions made at the time, many habitual drunkards were saved from a wretched life and a still more wretched death by being frightened into sobriety. Arguments would have been useless with such people, but a grinning skull looking over the edge of a wine-glass, or a skeleton clasping a decanter in his bony hands, or a snake coiled around the stem of a goblet, caused them to pause as they grasped the poisoned chalice, and to shrink back in terror as they dashed the death-giving vessel to the ground. Many Englishmen renounced their gin and took to tea instead, being further told that it was the "cup that cheers, but not inebriates."

The notion seems to be prevalent that, in order more effectually to reform a drunkard, his stomach must be drenched with water, and especially ice-water. This idea originated in the United States, and has gradually spread to Great Britain and Ireland and their dependencies. The result is that "cold-water brigades" and "ice-water brigades" have been formed in almost every country where the English language is spoken. Tea-drinking, which received so great an impetus from Mr. Accum's expressive words, is rapidly giving way before ice-water drinking. Philanthropic individuals combine and raise money to establish ice-water fountains in the most populous parts of our large cities, and the people are told to shun the liquor-saloon and the beer-cellar and to quaff the refreshing liquid that nature supplies. These good people forget that the ice they put into the water, to make it, as they suppose, more fit for the wants of the human system, is their act and not nature's. I have heard of one repentant distiller who on his death-bed, thinking thereby to atone for the destruction to those who had imbibed his whiskey, appended a codicil to his will by which a considerable sum of money was set apart, the income of which was to be forever devoted to supplying ice-water to all who should apply at the tail of a cart that was to be especially fitted up for the purpose and to be driven through the streets. Probably more were killed by his whiskey than by his ice-water, but that the latter had its victims there can be no doubt.

It is certainly true that more ice-water is drunk in the United States in one year than in all the rest of the world in ten. This fact is in part due to the facility with which ice can be obtained, and the comparatively low price at which it is sold; but our National craving for ice-water cannot be altogether the result of its cheapness, for we find that in Norway and Sweden, and in the high regions of India, South America, and Switzerland, ice-water as a beverage is almost unknown. Certainly, so far as the appetite is concerned, it is the result of education. Young children, or adults not accustomed to drinking ice-water, find it at first not only unpleasant, but positively painful. Infants shudder when it is first put into their mouths, and I have seen American Indians spit and squirm for several minutes after they had been induced to drink a tumbler of ice-cold water; but persistency in this, as in most other matters of food or drink, almost invariably conquers, just as it does with tobacco or alcohol and many other things, which, originally being repulsive, finally become almost indispensable to the comfort or the factitious demands of the system. There must be something inherent in the American organism which prompts to the formation of the habit, just as there is an inborn tendency in us to indulge in the use of "chewing-gum," hot sodden bread, and indigestible pies. If the proclivity were an innocent one, there would not be much to say against it: that it is extremely harmful is not a matter for doubt.

In the first place, it may cause sudden death, especially if indulged in when the body is overheated. A very important part of the nervous system, called the solar plexus, is situated immediately behind the stomach. A severe blow inflicted on the body just over this part of the sympathetic system of nerves will cause death with as great rapidity as will a stab in the heart. Many a so-called man has killed his wife by kicking her in the stomach. It is not the injury to this organ of digestion that produces instantaneous death, but the shock which is given to the solar plexus, and through it to the heart. A big drink of ice-water reduces the temperature of the solar plexus so suddenly that the action of the heart is greatly lessened; sometimes to so great an extent as to cause instant death. It is quite common for persons to feel faint and to become pale immediately after drinking a glass of ice-water. They attribute these effects to heat or over-exertion, or to some other cause which has nothing to do with the result, not knowing that they have so weakened the heart as to prevent its sending a due amount of blood to the lungs and brain, and that, had the water been a little colder, life would possibly have been extinguished altogether. Direct experiment with instruments especially devised for the purpose of measuring the force of the heart's pulsations establish the fact that there is no agent of the materia medica more powerful with some persons as a depressant of this organ than a large draught of ice-water. Under certain circumstances it acts with all the force and rapidity of prussic acid.

The people who do the most harm in this direction, in this age and country of ice-water drinking, are the keepers of the so-called mineral-water fountains. Most of them, I am sorry to say, are druggists and chemists who ought to know better. It seems to be the chief object of these vendors of frigid drinks to cool them down to the lowest possible point consistent with fluidity. As these waters generally contain some saline ingredients, they can be reduced below the freezing-point of ordinary water without congealing. It appears from the signs that they display in front of their places of business that the colder they can make these mixtures the more pride they take in themselves and the more customers flock to their shops. Many deaths of persons have occurred while in the very act of drinking these more than ice-cold liquids, and I am, myself, conversant with numerous cases in which great mental and physical prostration was the result, and from which recovery did not take place for several days. In two of these instances obstinate facial neuralgia, lasting over a year and only yielding to energetic medical treatment and complete change of climate, was induced.

Besides being one of the most prolific causes of neuralgic affections, very cold drinks injure the teeth. They crack the enamel, and therefore increase their liability to decay. Americans as a nation have worse teeth than any other people in the world, and this fact is due more to the excessive use of ice-water than to any other cause. In the old days of slavery the negroes of the South were remarkable for their good teeth, for ice-water was a drink unknown to them. But with freedom, and more money at their disposal than they formerly had, they have taken to tippling the icy liquid, and as a consequence bad teeth are now frequently seen among them.

A person who drinks a great deal of ice-water at meals very materially lessens his ability to enjoy the good things of the table, for the sense of taste is greatly impaired when the temperature of the inside of the mouth is reduced many degrees below the normal standard. Indeed, a very excellent method of counteracting the offensive taste of certain medicines is for the one who is about to swallow them to hold a little ice-water in the mouth for a few moments. The nauseous dose can then be gulped down without a tenth part of its offensiveness being experienced. On the other hand, the delicate flavors of the finest wines are entirely lost to the person who has before drinking them taken a glass of ice-water.

The effect upon the stomach of ice-water drinking is no less marked. As soon as the cold liquid reaches this organ, the blood vessels which are enlarged during the process of digestion, in order that a due amount of gastric juice may be secreted, are at once contracted, and the function is accordingly more or less completely arrested. Confirmed dyspepsia is a necessary consequence, and this frequently assumes the form of gastric catarrh, than which few disorders are more intractable. Nor does the morbid action cease here. Many a case of obstinate diarrhœa owes its origin to the refrigeration of the sympathetic ganglia of the abdomen induced by ice-water. There is some reason to believe that cancer of the stomach, a disease certainly more frequent among Americans than other people, is likewise one of its consequences.

It has been asserted by some medical writers that excessive ice-water drinking is a prolific cause of Bright's disease of the kidneys. There does not seem, however, as yet, to be sufficient evidence to support this view, but it is, nevertheless, quite possible that it is not altogether unfounded. Judging by analogy, and by what we know of the effects of ice-water upon other internal organs, I see no reason to doubt that the kidneys may also be brought under its morbid influence. So long as there is a reasonable doubt upon the subject, it would seem to be prudent for those who are predisposed to kidney disease to drink water considerably above the temperature of thirty-two degrees.

Water for drinking purposes should never be below fifty degrees. We can almost always get it even in the hottest weather as cool as this by letting it run for a minute or two from any household faucet, or drawing it from any country well. If not, there is no objection to cooling it to the point mentioned. The East India "monkey," which can now be had almost any where in this country, and by means of which the contained water is cooled by its own evaporation, answers the purpose admirably. I am quite sure that, if ice-water should be generally discarded as a drink, the average duration of life would be lengthened and existence rendered more tolerable.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF ENTHUSIASM.

BY GENERAL WILLIAM BOOTH, COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE SALVATION ARMY.

IN ORDER to be understood, I must first of all disclaim acquaintance with any religion but that which consists in following Jesus Christ. Learned and unlearned persons in many lands have taken opportunity to remind me that texts can be found in the New Testament which seem to advocate a hidden religion of the heart which commends itself to them because it can be lived in the midst of a godless world without offending anybody. But with the so-called "Old" Testament, which was the Bible of the Saviour and his apostles, in my hand, I really cannot accept any version of his life or teachings that will not harmonize with the glorious enthusiasm of the Psalms or the conduct of the men who "turned the world upside down." Enthusiasm for Christ is, in fact, first of all valuable in my eyes as a proof that a man really knows him and the power of his resurrection, and possesses some of his spirit of devotion to the salvation of men.

But in writing, as I presume, to practical men,—to men who know how to turn villages into cities, territories into states, and states into stepping-stones to power,—I shall just dwell upon a few of the practical results of enthusiasm as contrasted with ease in connection with religion, which I have myself observed during forty-five years of public labor in the cause of Christ.

Enthusiasm is good for the enthusiast. In endeavoring to promote that most difficult of all objects, the subjection of men to the will of God, one must needs encounter the most chilling and wearying influences at every turn. Merely to aspire to the realization of any considerable results in the religious world is to be the butt of all manner of criticisms and objections, the most painful being the suggestion that some base, selfish motive must be the main-spring of your action. The world has become so sadly unaccustomed to the sight of men leaving all to follow Christ, or putting themselves to any serious trouble on his account, that they are naturally incredulous when they meet with any one who professes to have commenced so extraordinary a life.

Therefore the man who attempts it with a weak and trembling spirit is not likely to persevere. The same man filled with the joy of the Lord, and rushing upon the world with the ardor of a soldier eager for battle, will be far more likely to endure the cross, despising the shame.

How often do we see men and women who have, all their lives, been indifferent or even opposed to religion suddenly reverse their course, declare themselves sorry for the past, and resolve to be godly in the future. If we sent such people out with multiplied cautions, with doubtful looks, and exhortations to be very careful not to be too loud in their professions of devotion to their new master, I venture to say that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if they did not relapse immediately into their former life, they would, at any rate, become timid, reserved, ineffective servants of God. But we welcome them into his kingdom with a shout as hearty as if they were members of the minority elected to some legislative body. We help them to sing as if they really did believe in Jesus Christ and meant to follow him. We make them understand that we fully rely upon their daring to stand up as public witnesses for him the very next day, and consequently we find the Swede and the German capable of becoming as flaming zealots in his cause as the Hindoo or the Irishman.

On the other hand, what do we see? We are anxious to avoid saying any word that may reflect upon any other followers of the same King. But do not the sermons and speeches of the leading ministers of most churches tell us plainly enough that where the motto, expressed or understood, is "No enthusiasm allowed here," the whole body sinks to a level of indifference that no person is capable of stirring? In one of the leading churches of Scotland, the other day, the chief speaker in one of the discussions now so common about the indifference of the masses to religion, summed up with the remark that the church was perishing through the selfishness and indifference of her own children.

Enthusiasm is valuable in its influence upon the crowd. This will, I think, be so universally admitted that there can be no need to argue it. But, unfortunately, the last thing that many able teachers of religion desire to see is any crowd. They have a notion that, in some way, the excitement of the multitude on the subject of religion must bring with it a profane and irreverent result; as though, in fact, there were a danger of crowding Jesus

Christ himself. Now, the whole story of his three years' ministry shows he had no such dread of the multitude; and it would surely do much to disabuse the gospel of the halo of sanctimonious uselessness that so largely obscures it in our day, if we could only realize the clouds of dust and the buzz of oriental chatter that doubtless proclaimed in his own day the coming of the Son of Man.

It will, I think, be admitted on all hands, that no candidate for the Presidency would stand the faintest chance of election if his foremost advocates contented themselves with the quiet and dignified sort of propaganda that is thought the correct thing by those whose business it is to make the nations awake to the claims of Jesus Christ to universal sovereignty. To win the million, there must be the putting-forth at every turn of such efforts as can only spring from the most enthusiastic partisanship. This is a principle that one would have expected any common-sense nineteenth-century being to be wide awake to. But, alas! alas! Jesus Christ is most sacredly guarded from success by the unaccountable prejudices of the bulk of his own party. Consequently we see the little handfuls resorting weekly to the church, and the huge majority crushing daily into the theatre and the saloon.

The enlightened newspaper of a Christian people and the polished inhabitant of the suburb may sneer at the "cranks" who wear glaring uniforms to show their devotion to the cause of a heavenly candidate, and kneel in snow or mud at the street-corner to pray; but the crowd find an irresistible something about men and women who are manifestly in earnest, and from the saloon, and worse places still, they come in ever-increasing numbers to see what all the racket can be about. We shall yet, by God's help, turn the millions right about face.

Need I say that I regard what has been called the enthusiasm of humanity as one of the most invariably distinctive marks of the true follower of Jesus Christ? When once a man has found in him the one grand source of light and happiness, love to his neighbor must above all demand supreme effort to lead that neighbor to Christ; and this principle, in view of a world determined to forget Christ as much as possible, must needs imply a life-long struggle to lead the crowd to the cross.

As for the theory that those who labor in the world-field for God are not responsible for results, it always seems to me one of the most laughable follies of the age. What would any of the gentlemen who are so eloquent about "sowing the seed and leaving the results with God" say to a gardener who wished to be kept in their employment upon such terms, and who after, say, three years' patient sowing, complained that it was unreasonable to judge of his work by the absence of any apparent result, and endeavored to persuade his master that the quantity of valuable seed deposited in the ground, though not a sprout had appeared from it, should be considered in itself a matter for congratulation and a guarantee of coming fruitfulness? The coolness with which church after church officially admits its failure and its incompetence to deal with the masses, whilst claiming to be none the less in the divine order, is to me simply astounding.

Not to stir the whole multitude, not to make the name of Jesus Christ in sober reality "high over all," seems to me to mean ruinous failure, and I am more and more confident, the longer I live, that the majority in any land can be thoroughly awakened on the subject of religion wherever there are laborers sufficiently enthusiastic in their devotion to the cause.

The masses are never likely to take particular interest in a religion whose meeting-places remain closed most days of the year and most hours of the exceptional days on which they are utilized. Practical men judge, naturally enough, that the professors of such a religion do not, after all, attach very much importance to it, and that they by no means believe the tremendous things they are accustomed in creeds and songs and prayers to declare.

Enthusiasm is necessary to perseverance in hard work. To overcome the disastrous results of so much religion without enthusiasm; to drive out the strange gods that to-day command the honor and devotion which are due to the one Almighty Saviour, and to disciple all nations for him, demand an amount of self-denying and painstaking effort such as enthusiasts alone can put forth. We have to turn one of the smallest and most insignificant of minorities into a majority, and for such a purpose anything short of desperate activity is absurdly inadequate. But I have proved that an enthusiastic love of Christ is sufficient to constrain persons of every class to take upon themselves the form of servants to mankind and to labor without hope of earthly reward up to the limit of, and too often beyond, their strength.

In an age devoted above all to gain, I have seen many thousands of men and women give up home, friends, situations, and prospects to become the despised officers of the Salvation Army; to toil in all seasons and climes day by day for the good of strangers, who have too often been led to return hatred or contempt for their love. More than 8,000 of these are serving with the colors to-day. I have seen ladies nurtured in the lap of comfort perform the most menial services for the vilest of the poor, and delight to go on with such work year after year, because they felt their smallest effort was helping to bring about the triumph of Christ's cause. Enemies of the Salvation Army, no longer able to deny the self-sacrificing and laborious character of our officers' lives, have actually represented them as slaves to myself and my children, as though it were possible for the members of one family to secure and maintain the daily, faithful obedience of thousands of servants recruited from every quarter of the globe, and employed amidst every variety of circumstance from the Hooghly to the Oregon. How is it that, with all the prizes of the world before their eyes, young men can be relied upon amid the snows of Canada or Sweden, the jungles of India and Ceylon, to carry out the same system of daily toil for others, enduring want and suffering only too uncomplainingly rather than even trouble with the story of their perplexities the leaders who are supposed to be so cruel to them? I say that such lives would be impossible but for the reproduction by the spirit of God in our own day of the very enthusiasm which brought the Saviour from his throne to a manger and from the Mount of Transfiguration to Calvary. If those who sneer at any suggestion of unearthly motive or unearthly power can discover a method of enlisting human activities in the service of the race to a larger extent than has been done in any age by the enthusiasm of the Crucified, I for one would be ready to give their representations every attention. But without enthusiasm one can only expect, in connection with religion, the cold perfunctory service which gains nobody, and sooner or later disgusts and wearies everybody.

Enthusiasm is good for the wretched. How is it that so great a gap generally exists between the representatives of Christianity and those who are in outward or inward misery? The horrible barrier of caste which separates so widely between the rich and the poor in most countries of Europe will surely not be allowed to extend beyond a few large cities of the United States; but without this I think it will be admitted that there is a serious gulf between those who are surrounded with every comfort and the really poor; between the professors of religion and those who see no good in it. How is this gulf to be bridged? It appears to me impassable except by enthusiasts.

To a poor fellow who feels himself friendless, whether with regard to this life or to that which is to come, the mere "God bless you" of an ignorant Salvationist, who evidently cares about him, is more valuable than a whole course of lectures from some patronizing friend whose style and manner say: "I would like to assist you, if you will be good enough to keep your distance." Human hearts are marvellously alike, wherever they may be found, and the mere discovery of some one wildly eager to do him good is enough to help many a despairing one into a new world, where there are light and hope.

But enthusiasm is, above all, of value to the rich. We have it upon the highest authority that no class has, after all, so great difficulty in becoming or remaining truly religious as those who have plenty of this world's goods. Surrounded and almost overwhelmed by circumstances calculated to divert the mind from every spiritual consideration, and opposed, whenever they attempt anything like hearty adhesion to the cause of Christ, by their whole circle, it is, indeed, "hard for them that have riches to enter into the kingdom of God." I must honestly confess that I have never known an instance of a rich man who was successful in the attempt, without having first sold all that he had, if not in the literal sense, at least in that of absolutely and completely coming out from his circle to be an avowed and enthusiastic follower of Christ. From John Wesley downwards I believe every great leader in the religious world would agree with me that the wealthy "patron of the society," who expects to wield influence at least in proportion to the extent of his liberality, is one of the greatest hindrances to the church's success. How common is it to find ministers and even churches who confess themselves powerless to carry out the work as they believe they ought, because "it would never do" to offend Squire So-and-So. For the scruples of the Squire I have only discovered one effectual cure; namely, to get him fired with the very same spirit which made apostolic farmers sell up and go out to die.

How often have we seen wealthy persons approach us with every sign of interest and sympathy only to draw back to a greater distance than ever ; and the secrets of the process have not been far to seek. These ladies and gentlemen came to a meeting loaded with all the prejudices that multiplied misrepresentation could create. The first half-hour in the presence of a people whose every look and word demonstrated a furious sincerity scattered these prejudices to the winds, and the astonished visitors left the place thoroughly satisfied that we had God's blessing and deserved theirs as well. But the next morning some friend put before them the newspaper rendering of the very meeting they had themselves witnessed, and a few well-directed sneers were sufficient to cause them to withdraw from all appearance of sympathy, or, at best, to write me letters of remonstrance and complaint with regard to matters of mere taste to which, when present, they made no objection. How can such persons ever be emancipated from the chains of custom and the terrors of criticism in any other way than by becoming absorbed with a passionate love for the Great Master and the souls he died to save?

I must confess that I always have looked, and I continue to look, to the American continent and to the colonies for examples of this chivalrous devotion which has become so rare in modern times in the old world. Surely the energies and abilities of the new nations that are growing up across the Atlantic are not going to be absorbed altogether in the construction of railroads, canals, and palaces. Surely in this enlightened age we shall yet see the spectacle of men, possessed of resources of every kind, throwing themselves into the service of God with something like the completeness of devotion common in what are called the dark ages.

Of one thing, at least, I am certain: religious enthusiasm will be indispensable to the endurance of heaven. How I have been puzzled to imagine the meaning that many persons attach to the authorized descriptions of the country in which they hope to spend their eternity ! Multitudes beyond number, bursts of enraptured song, shouts of gladness, and all this forever, for the enjoyment of persons who are ready to grumble if they are asked to remain at ever so quiet a meeting for more than an hour or two ! I really cannot help thinking that heaven will be simply unendurable for those who detest religious enthusiasm. Perhaps they really hope to see the whole race end in the mud. I prefer to live forever, and while I live, to live.

WILLIAM BOOTH.

SIR ARTHUR SULLIVAN AND PIRACY.

BY ALEXANDER P. BROWNE.

" 'PINAFORE'—now being performed simultaneously in over one hundred theatres in America!"

Such was the announcement that, in 1879, covered the billboards and dead-walls of London. Brief as it was, it was full of suggestion. It marked the opening of a new field for the foreign author, the American dramatic pirate, and the legal profession, irrespective of nationality.

In it English, French, and German authors and composers hailed the tidings of a new market for their wares—a new and brilliant prospect of exchanging the work of their brain for the proverbially plentiful American dollar. The dramatic pirate chuckled to himself at the chance of capturing and looting many a richly-laden bark, tossed and baffled on the troubled seas of international non-copyright. The lawyers began to rummage among their books for points and precedents, not without a comfortable premonition of long and lucrative battles to come.

The success of "Pinafore" made the names of its authors a household word on both sides of the Atlantic. More than that, it produced the dramatic trade-mark "Gilbert and Sullivan," which to-day stands for actual millions of profit to its owner, Richard D'Oyly Carte, of London. As people there used to say, "Carte invented Gilbert and Sullivan." Having made the invention, he patented it to himself by an exclusive contract with the author and composer, and from the profits of "Pinafore" he bought outright a piece of land in perhaps the highest-priced quarter of London and built on it his own theatre, the Savoy. His English establishment being thus put in order, he turned his attention to the American market. He had already shown himself a good business man and a hard fighter for his rights, and Gilbert and Sullivan, knowing this, intrusted to his management their future battles for Yankee dollars.

When the "Pirates of Penzance," the successor of "Pinafore," appeared, the outlook for it in "America," as Englishmen call the United States, was not encouraging. "Pinafore's" success had developed in this country a horde of men for whom that opera had made a considerable sum of money. With the taste of blood in their mouths, they pricked up their ears at the news of further prey ; they even quarrelled among themselves, in advance, as to the distribution of the booty. Some of these men were, and long had been, the managers of well-known theatres and in good and regular standing in the profession ; but the majority belonged to that class of penniless theatrical speculators who, in the expressive slang of the trade, are now known as "fly-by-nights" or "snides." This union of classes, the worthy and the worthless, showed well the lamentable state of public opinion then existing as to the propriety of appropriating other people's ideas without paying for them. In those days even the newspapers laughed at our efforts to protect such property in the courts, and in this way did much to salve the consciences of those managers who appeared to possess any.

Appeals to "public opinion," "the self-respect of the American art-loving community," and similar phantasms having been tried in vain with "Pinafore," Carte decided to adopt different methods with the "Pirates." It so happened that, whatever the defects of our statutes, our common and unwritten law recognized fully the exclusive right of a foreign author to do everything he might like with his manuscript, except to publish copies of it. The latter privilege would seem a reasonable one, too; but, as a matter of fact, it did not exist. However, the half-loaf of dramatic bread thus promised appeared better than no bread at all. It was decided to keep both the words and music of the "Pirates" scrupulously in manuscript until the piece had been thoroughly run in New York, Boston, and other large cities, thus insuring at least the cream of the business to those to whom the whole of it morally belonged. This plan worked well enough financially, but it was very distasteful both to the author and the composer. Naturally enough, Gilbert, having written his book, wanted people to read it, and Sullivan had the same reasonable wish for his music

—that the lovers of it should have it at home to play over and enjoy. But under our laws it could not be; a foreign author could hold his right of unlimited performance indefinitely until he published either at home or here, but when that day came, good-bye to any further American income for him.

The right of controlling the performance of a manuscript piece I have spoken of as settled in the law, and so it undoubtedly is now, but in the "Pirates" days our courts were very wabbly and uncertain about it. In a case in Massachusetts in 1861, Laura Keene was the fair plaintiff and the stolen goods consisted of "Our American Cousin." The Supreme Court held that you or I might perform for profit as much of anybody's else dramatic property as we could remember, although we would not be allowed to eke out our memory by taking notes. But if we did not have a good memory ourselves, we might employ some one who did, which was actually done in the Keene case. Of course, this was not a sound view of the law. Various writers promptly pointed out the absurdity of the distinction between purloining with the mind and with a lead-pencil, and the case as authority was generally derided. Nevertheless, when the new opera came, in 1880, *Keene v. Kimball* was still available as a sort of cave or refuge for the pirates of the drama, and they hastened to avail themselves of its shelter.

My first dramatic fight was with a pirate of this variety. A certain music-publishing house of high standing put upon the Boston market a *pot-pourri* entitled "Recollections of the Pirates of Penzance." As no music from the opera had before been published, the "Recollections" sold at a great rate. To the general public, the first part of the title probably conveyed no particular idea; they paid more attention to the "Pirates of Penzance" part. To us, however, it was a shout of defiance from the Cave of Memory before mentioned—in other words, the Keene case. "Ha ! ha !" cried the pirates from their legal fastnesses, "capture us if you can!" Meanwhile they were busy filling their own pockets with the money which rightfully belonged to the despised foreigners. Human nature naturally could not stand this ; so an injunction was asked for, albeit with great misgivings as to the result. They proved to be unfounded. Judge Lowell at that time was the United States Circuit Judge. When the defendant's counsel expressed his reliance on *Keene v. Kimball* as authority, the Court expressed without reservation its dissent from the doctrine of that case, and granted us our injunction.

Judge Lowell's decision as to "memorizing" had now become pretty widely spread among the would-be robbers of the Northern States, but the Southern managers were still unenlightened and unterrified. Carte next produced "Billee Taylor," over which we had a hand-to-hand encounter in Baltimore before the United States Judge there. Our opponent was Ford, a well-known local manager. His version of the play, so he testified, had been taken from our own by memory. We admitted the taking, for the two were almost identical, but denied the memory part of it. We were morally certain, in our own minds, that a more reliable agent had been employed, viz., a little money judiciously administered to some of our under people, and, in return, the surreptitious loaning of our prompt-book to the agents of the enemy. But the proofs of this were defective. Furthermore, *Keene v. Kimball* had not then been publicly overruled, for Judge Lowell had not published any formal opinion in our "Recollections" case. So the main part of our injunction was denied by the Maryland Judge, who treated *Keene v. Kimball* as authoritative. All that we saved from the wreck, so to speak, was a vast amount of free newspaper advertising—for the case was widely discussed—and an order that our "printing," or illustrated posters, should not be too closely imitated by our competitors.

The gloom of defeat in the "Billee Taylor" case, which was tried in 1881, lasted until May, 1882, when the decision in "The World" case appeared and the memorizing ghost was laid. This was the case where one Byron, the so-called "Boy Tragedian," had been expressly employed, on account of his wonderful memory, to steal the play of "The World," and had accomplished the feat of committing the whole of a long melodrama to memory in only two attendances. The performance of the version so stolen was enjoined by the Supreme Court of the State, and in the course of their opinion the "memorizing doctrine," as it was called, was completely and finally disposed of.

Not long after this, another ray of light broke through the cloudy sky of copyright litigation. Gounod's "Redemption" had recently been produced in England and was attracting considerable attention. Its English owners, the well-known house of Novello & Co., sold the American rights of producing the work to Theodore Thomas, and performances of it by the celebrated Thomas orchestra were duly announced in all the great cities. Works of this magnitude and character had not before suffered at the hands of the American spoiler; so no one, at least among those most interested, was at all prepared for the following announcement, which suddenly made its appearance in the Boston papers:

BOSTON THEATRE.
SUNDAY EVENING, JANUARY 21, 1883.
First Performance in Boston of
GOUNOD'S REDEMPTION,
WITH NEW ORCHESTRATION ARRANGED
from Indications in
THE PUBLISHED PIANO-FORTE SCORE.

It was once more the shout of the pirate. The Cave of Memory having been knocked to pieces, he had found another shelter, and the announcement showed just what it was.

It so happened that the "piano-forte arrangement" of the "Redemption" was made by an English composer of reputation, Mr. Berthold Tours. With a laudable desire to add to the completeness of his work, he has printed in here and there, above the musical staff, such expressions as "Fag," "Wind and Strings," "Timp," etc.—cryptogrammatic to the general public, but conveying to the musically-instructed person, in a very general way, the kind of effect which Gounod had produced at the place indicated, in his original work.

Such were the "indications" so pointedly referred to in the newspaper announcement, by the aid of which the "new orchestration" had been, or was to be, constructed. Of course, they were not in any reasonable sense indicative of anything, nor were they intended to be, but they offered a toe-hold for the attacking party who were striving to drive out Mr. Thomas, and the fight began.

Like most copyright fights, it took the form of a motion for a preliminary injunction, that being the speediest way of obtaining redress, if redress was to be obtained at all. The first question presented to Judge Lowell for decision was whether the "indications" were, in fact, of any importance or value as suggestive or indicative of the orchestral composition. As the experts on both sides agreed that they were not, this question was easily disposed of. The second question was one of law, and much more important. The piano-forte arrangement was the work of a foreigner. It was already published both in England and this country. Of course it could have no American copyright protection. The second question then was: "Did the publication of the piano-forte arrangement—the version for that instrument—deprive the original orchestral work of the protection which it, remaining wholly in manuscript, would naturally enjoy?"

The industry of counsel on both sides had found prior decisions more or less analogous, but nothing which was in any way controlling or decisive. The point was one of new impression. In a written opinion, showing great care and ability, Judge Lowell held that the injunction should issue; that the exclusive right of performing the unpublished orchestral work had not been lost by the unprotected publication of the piano-forte book. The opinion held, as we had from the first admitted, that a performance of the music of the piano-forte version, entirely without orchestra, would be permitted; and, to the eternal disgrace of musical art, the "Redemption" was, in fact, afterward produced by Lennon in the Boston Theatre to the accompaniment of two pianos and a parlor organ!

This decision in the "Redemption" case was hailed with joy by our foreign friends. Of course, what was law for Gounod was law for Sullivan. "Iolanthe" was just then about to be produced, and we looked eagerly forward to the full enjoyment of the American market and the easy discomfiture of all our foes.

We did not have long to wait. Once more Mr. Ford, of Baltimore, was the purloiner; once more we advanced to give them battle,—and, alas for the glorious uncertainty of the law, once more we were completely routed. Judge Morris, also of the United States Court, was the instrument of our discomfiture. He fully recognized Judge Lowell's premises, but from them reached a diametrically opposite conclusion. The injunction was denied.

At this juncture there occurred to the writer a plan by which to avoid some of the uncertainties of the disputed "Redemption" doctrine, and to obtain, what we had never before had, a valid American copyright on a part, at least, of the work. The plan in question was so simple and obvious that the wonder is it had not been hit upon before. It was merely to employ an American to make our next piano-forte arrangement for us. The opera of "Princess Ida" was then under way, and it was determined to try upon it the new scheme. Accordingly a competent Boston musician, Mr. George Lowell Tracy, was engaged and despatched to London. As soon as he arrived there, he was set to work, and the arrangement for the piano-forte was, before long, completed. Now to protect it by copyright in both countries. We knew that such work had already been declared by the courts sufficiently original in character to be the subject of copyright. We knew, too, that England, with a liberality that should be to our own law-makers a constant shame, gives to any alien author full copyright protection, provided only that he be, upon the day of first publication, bodily present within the borders of her realm. Furthermore, and fortunately for our scheme, our law does not insist upon any particular place of residence for the American author at the time of publication. Finally, by publishing the arrangement on the same day in London and New York, the law of each country would be complied with, so far as that matter was concerned.

So, with a free use of the cable, and not without several narrow escapes from disaster through a slip here and there, we succeeded in getting the "piano-forte book" of "Princess Ida" duly copyrighted to Mr. Tracy in both England and the United States. Now once more to the fray! Give us only a foe to fight, and the outlook for having victory perch on our banner would be bright indeed. For the first time we were disappointed through having no one to give us battle. The public here did not want "Princess Ida" enough to induce any one to steal it. However, we had not long to wait.

The marvellous popularity of the "Mikado," which next appeared, brought forth at once a host of would-be pirates. Our "piano-forte book," as in the case of "Princess Ida," was the work of Mr. Tracy and was duly copyrighted by him. The reader will understand that, save for this piano-forte book, no publication whatever of the music of the "Mikado" had been made. It was necessary, therefore, that whoever sought to produce the opera without license must do one of three things. He must either play it with piano-forte accompaniment alone, or if with orchestra, then his orchestral score must be either stolen from Sullivan's unpublished score or prepared by amplifying our published and copyrighted piano-forte arrangement. As to the production with piano-forte alone we had no fears, for we knew that the public would not tolerate such a wretched substitute for the original. Theft from the unpublished orchestral score was also an unlikely event. The parts were kept with most jealous care, a trusty man being employed, whose sole duty it was to see that they were never out of his sight. He was, furthermore, instructed to report to us instantly the slightest indication of any attempt at copying or otherwise appropriating any part of the precious manuscript. The third and greatest danger was that some American manager of piratical tendencies would have an orchestration made from the copyrighted Tracy book, and use that orchestration in producing the opera.

We had not long to wait before this very thing was done, and by several different managers at once, in New York city itself. Mr. John Duff had gotten an illicit "Mikado" well under way at the Standard Theatre. We decided to make this our next object of attack, and straightway began a suit in equity for an injunction.

Our position was this: As I have said, our piano-forte arrangement was the work of an American citizen, and had been duly copyrighted as such. The airs in it were Sullivan's, and, as he was a foreigner, could not be protected; but the rest of the book, the accompaniment, was the work of our arranger and covered by his copyright, which, of course, we controlled. Now, our American statute says that, when a person copyrights a *dramatic* composition, he and his licensees shall have "the exclusive right of publicly performing the same." Mr. Duff admitted that his orchestral score was simply an expansion of the piano-forte book ; a mere reärrangement of our copyrighted arrangement. Therefore, we argued, when Mr. Duff performs his opera with orchestra, he is performing what confessedly contains our copyrighted thing; and therefore he is performing that thing itself. The only question then that remained to be demonstrated to the court was this: "Is an arrangement for piano-forte of the music of an opera originally written for an orchestra, a *dramatic composition* within the meaning of our American copyright statute ?"

Judge Wallace decided against us. At the outset of the published opinion, his Honor says, by way of gilding the pill he was about to administer to the unhappy foreigner : "No one questions the justice of the claim of the author of an intellectual production to reap the fruits of his labor in every field where he has contributed to the enlightenment or the rational enjoyment of mankind. It was, therefore, entirely legitimate for the authors of this opera to avail themselves of any provision they could find in the laws of the United States, which might protect them in the right to control its dramatic representation in this country, and . . . the plan adopted was an ingenious one."

The opinion then proceeds to knock the plan on the head as follows:

"It does not seem open to fair doubt, that the literary part of an opera, together with the music of the voice parts, comprises all there is of the dramatic essence that lies in the action of the performers. The instrumental parts serve to emphasize the sentiments and intensify the emotions excited by the words and melodies. . . . . . But the instrumental parts alone are inadequate to convey intelligently to the hearer the dramatic effect communicated by the language and movements of the actors.

"If the orchestration of an opera is not a dramatic composition, certainly the piano-forte arrangement cannot be, ... and the complainant falls short of a case for the relief asked, because representing the arrangement on the stage is not the representation of a dramatic composition, but of a musical composition, as to which the complainant's statutory title consists in the sole right of printing, copying, etc., and not of public representation.

"*While it is much to be regretted that our statutes do not, like the English statutes, protect the author or proprietor in all the uses to which literary property may be legitimately applied, it is not the judicial function to supply the defect.*"

From the last paragraph, the foundation cause of our defeat will be clearly perceived. It was a defect, a "hole," in our own copyright law, and one which concerns directly all my American fellow-citizens of musico-literary tendencies. Bear in mind that Judge Wallace says, in substance, this: "The orchestral part of an opera is not a dramatic composition, and the unlicensed performance of that part of the opera violates no provision of our copyright law."

Now let us suppose that an American composer, say John K. Paine, should collaborate with a foreign librettist, for example J. R. Planché, in the production of an international opera; can they, or either of them, hold the American performing rights in the piece ?

This raises a serious question of musical copyright law, and one upon which there is little, if anything, in the way of legal precedent in this country. Judge Wallace, as we have seen, was inclined to discriminate in this respect between the melody and the accompaniment, and he held that, while the former might be considered a dramatic composition, the latter certainly was not. While criticism is ungracious that comes from the defeated party, I may be pardoned for suggesting here a question as to the soundness of the distinction, from which, when applied to such a subject as operatic music, it follows that so much of that music as is vocal is also dramatic, and so much as is instrumental is not. If the later works of Richard Wagner were to be judged by this standard, it is certain that the result would fail to commend itself to the musically-educated intellect. In the Duff case, Judge Wallace quoted with approval this statement from a text-book of authority: "Music designed to be interpreted by instruments alone can hardly be considered a dramatic work within the meaning of the law." Yet I venture, with great respect, to doubt very much if the lamented author of "Die Walküre," for example, would admit for a moment that those portions of his work "designed to be interpreted by instruments alone" were not as fully and entirely an essential part of his "music drama" as the rest, in which another instrument, namely, the human voice, was also called into play.

It seems to me that the question whether a musical composition is or is not also a "dramatic composition" within the meaning of our law depends upon the use for which it is primarily intended and adapted ; and that if the air of such a composition is held to be dramatic, the accompaniment should be similarly regarded. However, the gods have decreed otherwise, and up to this writing there has been no reversal of that decree.

The validity of the copyright upon our American-made pianoforte book, so far as concerned its being reprinted by others, was not passed upon by Judge Wallace. The point has, however, been since decided by Judge Nelson, now a United States Judge for the Massachusetts District, and the validity of the copyright sustained, the case being *Carte v. Evans*.

Judge Nelson's opinion contains a full and instructive consideration of the questions presented, and the temptation to quote at length from it is difficult to resist. I may be excused if I yield to this temptation so far as to reprint here a few remarks of the Court in reply to the claim of the defendant's counsel that our plan of employing an American manager was "a mere evasion of the copyright act."

"I am unable," says Judge Nelson, "to perceive how it can properly be called an evasion, if by that is meant a proceeding by which the letter or the spirit of the law is directly or indirectly violated. The thing copyrighted was an original work by an American composer, and therefore the lawful subject of copyright. All the steps taken to secure the copyright, and vest it in the plaintiff, were authorized by our statute. Undoubtedly the plan adopted displayed great ingenuity, and the effect is to vest in these foreign authors valuable American rights in their work; but there is nothing of evasion or violation of the law."

With the Evans case ends the history of our dramatic battles down to the present time. The legal result has been to increase considerably the protection which foreigners, in the absence of an international-copyright law, are entitled to enjoy in the United States. From the point of view of financial value to American managers of the privilege of playing the Gilbert and Sullivan operas with authority, the situation has greatly changed for the better. Nowadays, there is nearly as much of competition among our American friends for the privilege of production and payment of license-fees, as there was ten years ago to see which one could be the first to despoil us. Moreover, that the long and bitter litigation has not been without other pecuniary fruit is shown by the fact that the profits to the foreign proprietors upon the performances in the United States of the "Mikado" alone are said to have amounted to upwards of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Of course, there is a remedy for all the turmoil and confusion that I have described. Men ought not to have to battle for the preservation of their property. To those who have read this story of the fight, the thought must, before this, have come, "Why not have international copyright?" And in reply the writer can only say with Echo, "Why not?"

ALEXANDER P. BROWNE.

WHY AM I A QUAKER?

To ONE who before all else would be a Christian, the reasons for adhesion to any given denomination must lie in the circumstances of his education, and in his preference for that form of Christianity, in doctrine and practice, which distinguishes the body to which he adheres. I am a Friend, then, because for two centuries my ancestors have as Friends served their generations; and yet more from a conviction that in Quakerism is to be found "what Christianity is in itself," divested of non-essentials and relieved of the accretions it had gathered since the apostolic times.

The Society of Friends grew out of a vivid apprehension of the spiritual presence of Christ made perceptible to men, especially to those who welcomed that presence; of an intense faith in God's universal love to mankind, and an honest endeavor to carry the reformation of Christianity to completeness by a return to the tenets and to the life, moral and religious, of the first Christians. Christ the eternal Word, Christ incarnate, and Christ ascended, yet ever enlightening and teaching men, was their foundation. Without reference to the historic fact, they resumed many of the views held by the orthodox Greek fathers as to God's nearness to man, man's affinity to God, and the universality of the Father's love to those who even the heathen knew were "his offspring." Quaker Christianity commends itself to me by these traits, and especially by its universal spirit. Assured of the operation of the Spirit of God upon the mind and the conscience, the Friends accept without reserve the testimony of the Scriptures to themselves, that "holy men of old spoke as they were moved of the Holy Ghost," and regard the Bible as the only divinely-authorized record of the doctrines they are bound to believe. They hold that the Bible is to be understood and applied by spiritual aid, and have based their Christianity upon its truths and facts, under the illumination of the Spirit. But they have adopted no special theory of inspiration, and have expressed their belief chiefly in Scripture terms, whereby they have escaped serious theological difficulties.

The Friends accept in their fullest import the words that God loves "the world," while he hates sin. Many who have been lovers of their kind and have looked beneath the surface of things, have found themselves face to face with the sin and misery of their race, and have emerged from that dark shadow giving varying answers to the problems it suggests. Of such an experience George Fox wrote: "I saw that there was an ocean of darkness and death; but an infinite ocean of light and love which flowed over the ocean of darkness, and in that I saw the infinite love of God." Nevertheless, he did not weakly fly to any superficial view of the dread reality and fruits of sin. He and his associates had felt too profoundly "the immeasurable nature of the compunction awakened by wrong-doing—the total inability to forgive one's self—the sense of an evil that is irreparable and sin beyond all gauge,"* to deal lightly with either redemption or retribution. Their conviction was that through and by Christ an offer of salvation was made to all, and that the ultimate fate of each soul is determined by the acceptance or rejection of divine light and love. Believing in God as Creator and King, and recognizing his omnipresence in all the processes whereby the universe has become what it is, they prized above all his relation to men as a Father, to Jew and Gentile, Christian and heathen, who, though marred by the effects of sin, hereditary and personal, still have a child-likeness to him and are the objects of his paternal love and care. This love, ever outflowing, found highest expression in the coming of Christ, who, as the Word that was with God and was God, became flesh, bringing God and man into closest union. As one with the Father and with us he revealed him, by his words, his life, his spirit, his death, in which he was "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." Yet Christ is ever the Word, who touches the moral and religious nature of man, imparting to all some knowledge of God, some discernment of the right, some recoil from the evil, some aspiration after the good, some power of grace over sinful tendencies, and, if received, some quickening of the sluggish or dead soul into spiritual life and communion with God. In this the Friends have kept the distinction between human faculties and the divine Spirit, between conscience and Christ, have maintained individual responsibility, the necessity of Christ's death and life to recovery from sin, and have met the demand of the moral consciousness for a concurrence of supreme love with holiness in the removal of personal guilt. To my apprehension they have thus offered the truest order of Scripture teaching, and to the utmost have justified the ways of God to men. In thus recognizing a universal offer of salvation from sin, there is no undervaluing of the duty to spread abroad the facts and truths of the Bible, for the spirit of Quaker Christianity, as shown in its first period and again in the present, is an earnestly evangelizing one. Assured of finding in every conscience a witness for the truth, the obligation to carry the noontide of Christian knowledge to those sitting in the glimmer that lies beyond it is felt to be imperative.

---

* James Martineau, "Types of Ethical Theory," Vol. II., p. 66.

The same inclusive spirit is shown in the conception of the invisible church as consisting of all those who have been saved, or are being saved, from sin through Christ; and of a visible church as an association of like persons, who, having conscious faith in him, are joined together for worship, work, and witnessing. Though hitherto a small body, the Friends have the most large-hearted views of the church; and as to membership in it, with John Woolman they know no narrowness concerning sects and opinions, provided there are evidences of the reign of Christ in men's souls. Though thus inclusive, their standard of Christian experience is not a low one, but as Christ overcame all evil, so they believe that through his grace and the Spirit's aid victory over all wilful and conscious sin may be known, so that we may really love God and man in the full measure of our individual capacity. It seems to me that this is the true thought as to salvation, not an impracticable one, but worthy of God's offer and man's acceptance.

The mode of worship of the Friends is as simple as its ideal is true and its experience delightful to those that enter into it. It looks upon the few or the many met in Christ's name as permitted to know the "real presence" and headship of Christ, with access, individual and united, through him unto the Father in spiritual communion, without the necessary intervention of any minister or priest. The "liberty of prophecy" accorded in this manner of worship admits of edifying one another, of heart-felt, united prayer and praise, and the preaching of the Word. If its ideal is high, it is the more exacting that worshippers shall habitually walk in the light, following the master in close companionship. But as it depends so little on preärrangement, it is empty indeed unless there be real life in the congregation. In this simple worship there is a unique feature—the privileges given to women. Christianity is the only religion that has placed women in a true position. The sacred friendship of our Lord for the sisters at Bethany and for the group of noble women that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, with his hallowed love for his mother, prepared the way for this result and for the saying of Paul, "There is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus." The Friends apprehend that devout believers of either sex may receive spiritual gifts for the profit of all, and that among these is that gift of prophecy which fits the recipient for speaking to others unto edification, exhortation, and comfort. They have, therefore, made room in their organization for the exercise of such gifts by women, and have proved that the use of this liberty is consonant with all that is best in womanhood. They have found inestimable benefits from acting out with quiet confidence what they believe to be the teaching of the Bible in this respect.

It is a like comprehensive view of Christianity that has led the Friends to regard the "one baptism" as that whereby all members of the church are, through repentance, faith, and consecration to Christ, baptized by the one Spirit into the one body. They conceive that to the church the risen Christ in his last commission intrusted "the word of the truth of the Gospel" in the power of the imparted Spirit, and that the means the church was to use in baptism is "the ministry of the word and prayer," whereby others are brought into vital union with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and all drink into one spiritual life. The true "communion" they find not in the reverent use of outward symbols, which they omit, but in welcoming the presence and pure reign of their Lord in the heart, so that in private devotion and in public worship the feast is kept, and they partake by faith of the body that was broken and of the blood that was shed for the many. "Believe and thou hast eaten," wrote St. Augustine, and the Friend responds, "Amen."

All Christians seek for guidance in duty from the Bible, providential circumstances, the counsel of friends, and the best use of their knowledge and judgment. To these the Friends add confidence in impressions of right made directly upon mind and heart. To walk in the light, and up to the light that Christ gives, is their ideal of a religious life. It leads to a strong sense of personal responsibility and of the sacredness of conscientious convictions. Perhaps it has been this more than anything else that has made them the van-guard in the struggle to secure freedom to every man to serve God according to his conscience, and to repudiate, from their origin, all persecution for religious opinions. I cannot but honor them for the victory won in this field through much suffering and some martyrdom, patiently borne, and for their share in handing down the heritage of religious liberty now enjoyed throughout the English-speaking world. Their love of liberty and of equal justice to all has given them "a genius for humanity," a sympathy with whatever has been best in free governments; and their principles, as expressed in the declaration of rights and laws of the Province of Pennsylvania, have had no inconsiderable influence in shaping the free institutions of America.

Intentness to act in harmony with the spirit of Christ has led them to anticipate or quickly to side with legal or moral reforms, and to have sympathy with the races subjected to oppression or looked upon as inferior. The reduction of capital punishment for crimes (once frightfully common in Great Britain), the reform of prisons, the abolition of the slave-trade and of slavery, the removal of the evils of intemperance, social purity, and the placing of all classes on an equality before the law, are among the movements in which they were pioneers or with which they were early and efficiently associated. As early as 1688 a written protest against slavery as unfit to be practised by Christians, was sent by some Friends from Germantown, Pennsylvania, to their superior meetings; and during the intervening period, until the abandonment of the system, they were among the most faithful in pleading for its suppression and the most Christian in the spirit of their protest against it. From its rise the Society of Freinds has advocated great caution in the use of intoxicants, and it was the first Christian body to make the disuse of them a subject of disciplinary advice. It was a Friend who started "Father Matthew" on his beneficent crusade against "the drink," and up to the present time its influence has been persistent and active against the unspeakable miseries caused by the abuse of alcoholic beverages.

War has brought into exercise many heroic virtues, among them self-sacrificing courage in defence of the honor, the property, and the corporate existence of peoples. It has, doubtless, been the expression oftentimes of a lofty patriotism, and has been providentially used or overruled to the advancement of the world. But human history has been largely written in blood: too generally war has been carried on in disregard of the sentiment of humanity, as well as of every other moral principle. To-day millions of men, forming the standing armies of Christendom, in the very prime of manhood, are withdrawn from productive industry and are supported by the toil of others. The severe labors they should perform are thrown to a degrading extent upon women ; they are in a large measure debarred from the elevating influences of family life, are subjected to the idle vices of the barracks, debasing the populations around them and being debased by bestial passions.

The industries of Europe groan under the burdens these armies impose, until in Italy—the one Continental state from whose reports accurate information upon this subject can be had—the income-tax is 14 per cent. and the combined taxes upon the farmer equal 40 per cent. of the product of his land. Great nations, like France and Germany, armed with every device for slaughter that ingenuity can devise, and moved by ambition or revenge, stand ready to be hurled against each other. In the middle ages the Popes sometimes commanded a " truce of God," to arrest such fratricidal strife. But to-day no European church but the Society of Friends lifts its voice in entreaty and protest, in Christ's name, against such iniquity. When even philosophers like Spencer and Comte see that the military stage is a temporary one, through which peoples pass from barbarism to a true civilization, I cannot but rejoice to belong to a body that has confidence in the Prince of Peace, from whose teachings such philosophers have drawn their moral conceptions ; that believes he is calling upon the church to condemn all war and to lead men, not into a cowardly devotion to money-making, but into labor in self-forgetting love to set each member of the body politic in his best estate, physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. Be it that the time is far till this day comes, it is still well to labor and to wait with patient courage through the decades or the centuries till the end is gained.

The Bishop of Peterborough, in the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1886, vigorously defends the use of oaths by witnesses in courts and in other legal proceedings involving grave consequences; yet he desires that they should be abandoned. Moreover, with faintest hope, he looks forward to a time when men's words shall be as good as their oaths and the latter may be laid aside. The movement in this direction in Great Britain and America was begun by the Society of Friends, who believe that, although Christ recognized the rightfulness of legal oaths under the old dispensation, he distinctly forbade them in the kingdom of God he came to set up. During the last two and a half centuries the progress towards the end which the Bishop seems to regard as desirable has been a most hopeful one, and confirms a confidence that Christ's law of truth-speaking, "Swear not at all," was founded on a sure insight into our moral nature, and was intended to promote entire truthfulness, individual and national. To accept this view, and to be released from calling down a curse upon one's self in case, through infirmity, one should fail to speak the exact truth, wears to me the aspect of a privilege.

Doubtless the reaction of the Puritans against the license of their times was pressed to an extreme—a course sometimes necessary in righting great departures from the true standard of living; but they had intense moral earnestness, and a love of righteousness that made them lightly esteem a right eye if it stood in the way of its realization. While sharing in the wider view that it is safe to follow him who came, not as an ascetic, but as reverently enjoying his Father's bounties, there are some who still think that this means taking up the cross daily and maintaining simplicity in dress, manners, and modes of living. They judge that amid the abandonment to material success which marks our time it is well to keep the body under, and the soul's eye clear, by wholesome self-denial—a tradition among the Friends that some of us would not willingly let die.

For a long time the Friends have done garrison duty in defence, as they apprehend, of some truths overlooked by others; simply "holding the fort"; but within the last quarter of a century a spiritual awakening and power have come to them, and in all parts aggressive action is taking the place of quietism. In education, preliminary and collegiate, in authorship, in home and foreign missions, they have assumed an activity unknown since their early days, and their most thoughtful members are looking forward with the hope that they will continue to take part with their brethren of all the churches in extending the benign sway of the kingdom of God.

J. A. R.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

ICONOCLASM NECESSARY TO PROGRESS.

THE American is by nature and education an iconoclast. To this fact we owe nearly all our moral and material progress. Had we set out with the idea that the past is sacred, because it is the past, and that its relics and institutions must, therefore, be cherished and preserved, we would still be what we were just before the Revolution—a little cluster of provinces reflecting the ideas of feudal Europe. But, by cutting loose from the past and, when the need arose, destroying its institutions, we became what we are to-day, the most progressive nation on the face of the earth. The Revolution itself was a gigantic act of iconoclasm, which stamped us as barbarians in the estimation of Europe. The organization of a state without a religion was another act of iconoclasm, which surely ought to have called down upon us the vengeance of heaven, if the men who believed in the old order of things were right. So, too, the refusal to perpetuate many of the social customs and traditions of the past was an act of iconoclasm of which, in the opinion of Europeans, only vandals could be guilty. Nevertheless, we have gone right along prospering until at last many of those who began by denouncing us on this score are now beginning to think that iconoclasm may not be such a bad thing, after all.

Such being the case, it is hardly necessary for an American to apologize for this National idiosyncrasy. It is justifying itself even in the eyes of our critics. But it is quite proper to call attention to the good that our iconoclasm has accomplished, in order to reassure the doubters. Many of us, in whom there is but small reverence for the past, are, it may be, secretly ashamed of the fact. We would not, of course, acknowledge it. But in our hearts we confess that we are really very terrible people; and although we go on being iconoclastic, we are oppressed with a sense of guilt. It is to remove that sense of guilt, made heavier, perhaps, by the recently-observed centennial of Washington's inauguration, that I write these lines. It is well, of course, to remember the good that has come to us from the past, and to venerate the names of its heroes, martyrs, and saints. But as for its traditions, usages, institutions, and material remains, the only question with us should be, What use are they to us? If they serve any good purpose in the world of to-day, retain them; if not, destroy them, no matter how closely they are linked with some great name or some mighty epoch. The world of to-day is for the men and women of to-day, and not for the pallid ghosts of the past. Destruction and revision are the two most potent weapons of progress. By destroying what is useless and bad, and by revising what is capable of improvement, we clear the way for the newer thought of our own age, which is capable of adding to and enriching the heritage of the past. Only thus does material and moral progress become possible.

As may easily be inferred, I have, personally, very little veneration for relics of the past. I can see no use in them except the gratification of a morbid sentimentality. I would not give a nickel for the most authentic relic of the most famous saint that ever lived. And the false teeth of Washington, which, I believe, some one treasures as a precious relic, would excite in me nothing more than a feeling of disgust. Still, the lover and collector of such relics is comparatively harmless; his folly affects nobody but himself and his friends; and so we may leave him to his fad, only regretting that so much intelligence is wasted in amassing and gloating over a lot of trumpery stuff of no intrinsic value whatever.

But society at large is injured by the preservation of old institutions and traditions merely because they are old. The man who tries to hold his generation to a belief in and love for an outworn idea, on the plea that it was once vital, is a public enemy and should be so regarded. The man who stands up in this age of marvellous progress and laments the glories of the past is unworthy to bear a hand in the work of the modern world. He is either a dreamer, a sciolist, or a crank. I believe in burying what is old and surrounding ourselves with what is new. If it could be proved that the ground occupied by the Pyramids was needed for the development of the race, I should be in favor of tearing down the meaningless old heaps of stones within twenty-four hours. And in place of the picturesque old dwelling-houses of so many European cities, saturated as many of them are with the disease-germs of half a score of generations, I would like to see newly-built houses, with modern improvements and modern conveniences. Interesting as may be the old house of your grandfather, from an archæological point of view, it cannot compare in comfort and luxury with the house that you can build to-day. The lovers of the past are constantly mourning over the obliteration of old landmarks, especially in our great cities. They actually seem to think that the growth of a great metropolis like New York is a crime because, forsooth, it demands the demolition of some old colonial building whose usefulness has long ago departed. They do not understand that constant and continuous change is the mark of true progress, and that to stand still is to go backward. Let us, if we will, hoard the heirlooms and relics of the past in our museums, where we can look at them when we have nothing better to do. They will, at least, teach us how far we have advanced since the days when these things were considered the master-pieces of human skill. But do not let us, out of a morbid reverence for the past, cumber the earth with useless monuments and buildings whose only value is their age. Do not let us perpetuate laws and customs and traditions in our social and political life, whose only excuse for being is that, a hundred years ago, or two hundred years ago, they were the very efflorescence of human wisdom.

The application of my little homily is this : Do not feel any secret pangs of guilt because you share in the iconoclastic spirit of the American people. Rather rejoice because that spirit has been so largely manifested in the destruction of old institutions, in the abrogation of old laws, in the suspension of old customs, in the breaking-down of old lines of caste, in the death of old superstitions, and in the cutting-loose of the American Republic from so many of the outworn ideas and ideals of the old world. There is still a great work for the American iconoclast to do in politics, art, science, commerce, sociology, and religion. I hope he will do it so fearlessly, so effectively, and so wisely, that in the great American Republic of the future not a vestige of the old abuses and the old falsehoods will remain.

PERCY DOUGLAS.

II.

ILLUSTRIOUS SECONDS.

WHEN a new writer appears and succeeds in attracting attention, the public, having read, praised, criticised, busies itself with his (or her) classification. What is this? Have we a new George Eliot? an American George Sand? an Anglicized Gautier? a reëmbodied Milton? The public, when thus rummaging among the crowded store-rooms of its brain, let it be understood, intends to be friendly and complimentary. If any one advanced the idea that it was heaping insult upon the new and would-be original author, and giving him a seat in the school-room where he aspired to be a master, it would flout the idea with scorn. And as the public will inevitably go on comparing and classifying, the author must look out for himself and not give it the opportunity. As a matter of fact, however, nine out of ten authors can be classified very readily ; it is the tenth's inability to be filed that gives him the position of master instead of pupil, and a chance to live.

Every woman who has written a striking novel in England during the past ten years has been hailed as a second George Eliot. These women have doubtless been flattered, and have not realized that in resembling George Eliot they must ever remain Number 2, if for no other reason than because George Eliot had won her immortality before they were heard of. Lucas Mallet, Vernon Lee, Mrs. Ward, have all been relegated to the ranks of illustrious seconds, with the banner of George Eliot waving above them. Olive Schreiner alone refuses to be classified, and judging by this significant fact, as well as by the inherent qualities of her work, one may venture to assert that of the four she alone will live.

Over here we have our—so-called—American Eliots, Zolas, Balzacs, Gautiers, Shakespeares, Thackerays, and even Swinburnes, Ouidas, Rhoda Broughtons, and Blackmores. They all bear that superficial and fascinating resemblance to the originals which a wax apple bears to a real apple, and at least have the satisfaction of being the fads of a day. For this quality of reproduction has a certain temporary value. The great reading world is not creative; consequently not particular about absolute originality. It knows what it likes from habit and is slow to make up its mind to like anything radically new. Naturally, therefore, when a new writer, who has modelled himself upon a great master or a familiar favorite, bursts into being, the public recognizes the flavor at once and is eager to enjoy and appreciate. That the old dish is made by a new cook is a recommendation in its favor, for the world does not object to that light rate of originality which exists in the average author's personality. It is perfectly willing to prophesy a great future for the novice; but always reasoning from the same premise—the meteor resembles an acknowledged and fixed star. And what is the result? The meteors shoot forth and drop, shoot forth and drop, and we all go back to the fixed stars.

Ten thousand dramas have been written on Shakespearean lines since Shakespeare laid down his pen. Many won praise and shekels for the authors. Where are they now? What are the authors' names? Does any one remember? What does the world want of imitations of Shakespeare when it can get Shakespeare himself? Some day a greater man than Shakespeare will be born—but he will in no wise resemble Shakespeare.

All great writers have imitated here and there, but always consciously and for their own amusement solely. Many of these reproductions have been very brilliant, but upon no one of them has the fame of an author ever rested. When Coleridge wrote his remarkable paraphrase of the Bible, "The Wanderings of Cain," it was undoubtedly an event in the literary world, and brought him much praise; but if Coleridge had never written "Christabel," or "The Ancient Mariner," or "Kubla Khan," what niche in literature's temple would Coleridge occupy to-day? Byron, in his "Heaven and Earth," wrote a description of the flood which for dramatic power, vivid portrayal, and stupendous strength, far exceeds the Bible's picture; but because the flood had been the Bible's pecular property for hundreds of years before Byron was born, so it will continue to hold its rights to the end of time. To come down in the scale, "St. Elmo" and "Rutledge" owed their great vogue to the popularity of "Jane Eyre" and the inspiration their authors drew from that famous novel. The Duchess and Helen Mathers pressed their lips to the fever-stricken mouth of Rhoda Broughton and took the disease in a milder form. Rita and Amélie Rives have snatched the falling mantle of Ouida, divided it in half, and wound it so closely about themselves that it has become an extra cuticle and could only be removed by a surgical operation.

Great original genius is only recognized and admitted after a desperate fight, because there is no greater coward than the intellectual public. The well-furnished and critical brain has every shelf of its cells fitted up with the lore upon which centuries or generations of public approval have set their seal. It knows that to admire that choice library is both safe and proper; it gives one dignity and it gives one pleasure. Anything, therefore, which is radically different from the inhabitants of those precious shelves must perforce be worthless. People do not stop to compare or even to remember the difference between the succeeding literatures of past generations. Think of the monotony of the world's letters if no original minds had ever come to break loose from traditions, inaugurate new schools, and plant new ideas! Suppose the glorious galaxy now illuminating our Past had succumbed to the inevitable fire of public protestation,—what sort of a literature would we have to-day?

Unquestionably the literature of one generation, even of one decade, is the natural result of the literature immediately preceding it: evolution is inexorable. But upon this force of heredity operate the great and complex forces of the times, and the man who is thrust head and shoulders above the mass, as the target of his generation and a landmark for posterity, is he in whom both forces have met and been ignited by the divine spark that shot in his unborn brain, whence no man can tell.

GERTRUDE FRANKLIN ATHERTON.

III.

THE POLITICS NEAREST HOME.

IS THERE not something beyond mere accident, or coincidence, in the widespread interest suddenly manifested in America in the question of the government of cities? There seems to be the action of a sociological law in this; for it may be observed that when the time is ripe for a political or social advance the movement begins to assert itself, not at one point alone, but with a sort of spontaneity in various portions of the National mass. It cannot be denied that in the practical government of cities some of the leading European countries are now far in advance of us. This acknowledgment strikes something of a blow at our National pride—or vanity; for we have been so accustomed to regard ourselves as the political models for the world that it seems humiliating to have to concede the superiority of others in any respect. Therefore, while allowing the fact, many of us have been disposed to ascribe it to the fundamental difference between European and American theories of government, and to say that, while great European cities were undoubtedly better governed than ours, the free spirit of the American people would never tolerate the application of such methods here. But if this were true, would it not be a very unfortunate confession of American incapacity? Would it not give the lie to our professed ability to surpass the rest of the world under an equality of opportunities? Fortunately for us, this excuse is not valid. It is not owing to monarchical institutions that European cities are better governed than ours. Those cities are old democracies and the parents of our modern republicanism; self-government maintained itself in them while despotism ruled the land, and it is because of their methods of responsible self-government that their affairs are now so well administered.

It is a healthful sign that this sense of our defects has aroused an active interest in the question of municipal government. If the body politic be diseased, its ills will show themselves most keenly in the parts most immediately concerning the public; and if the very foundation be defective, we can hardly hope for a sound National structure. It is well, therefore, that we are becoming aroused from our self-complacency and made to see plainly that, of all the countries calling themselves enlightened, our own free land has the distinction of possessing the worst-governed cities.

Two important courses of lectures on municipal government, given in Boston and Providence, have commanded exceptional attention far beyond the public to whom they were directly addressed, and the subject has otherwise been widely discussed and studied throughout the country. In the comparisons between European and American methods, made by several of the lecturers, data have been made prominent that plainly show the reasons for the excellencies on the one hand and the defects on the other. The differences lie both in system and in functions. In the chief cities of Great Britain and Germany—the countries furnishing the best examples of model municipal government—the business-like organization is notable. While our system of frequent elections and short terms of both officials and popular representatives puts a premium on inexperience and incapacity, the purpose of theirs is to secure men of experience and capacity at the head of affairs. Their city councils are permanent bodies, only a certain proportion of the members retiring periodically, so that even should none of them be reëlected, there always remain a majority of men familiar with the public business. The other features of their governments are likewise arranged with a view to the best efficiency, and we see the fruits in the economy and thoroughness with which affairs are administered, as against the extravagance and neglect that are the rule in nearly all our large cities. They are likewise in advance of us in the municipal exercise of functions that are usually here handed over to private corporations with substantially free license to ride rough-shod over the public. Therefore, while we have to pay the highest rates for services of necessity and convenience, rendered as poorly as the public will bear, they get the cheapest and best possible services of the same kind.

When we Americans fully realize the wastefulness and corruption attendant upon municipal methods, we may be expected to make practical application of the lessons imparted by foreign examples, regardless of prejudice. We have taught the old world much of the highest value, and in return we can afford to receive good instruction from that quarter. One of the most profitable things that we can learn is to administer municipal government so efficiently as to make it the instrument for all the services that can be better performed collectively than by individual effort.

SYLVESTER BAXTER.

IV.

AMERICA FOR THE AMERICANS.

"BECAUSE of its size and the heterogeneity of its components, the American Nation," says Herbert Spencer, "will be a long time in evolving its ultimate form, but its ultimate form will be high. From biological truths it is to be inferred that the eventual mixture of the allied varieties of the Aryan race forming the population will produce a finer type of man than has hitherto existed."

It is with this question of the heterogeneity of its components that the American Nation has now to deal. Will not this finer type of man, which is evolving from the "allied varieties of the Aryan race"—will not this type, I ask, be slightly impaired by the yearly absorption of masses of criminal, slothful, imbecile humanity from other lands? Will not the yearly dissemination of hundreds of thousands of paupers, criminals, and idiots among us retard, in some measure, the evolution of this "finer type," to which the biologist bids us aspire? I am of the opinion that it will, whether we view the question morally or politically.

When Augustus of Poland remonstrated with France for affording refuge to the fugitive Stanislas, the Duke of Orleans, then Regent, replied to the ambassador in what Voltaire calls these remarkable words: "*Monsieur, mandez au roi votre maître que la France a toujours été l'asile des rois malheureux.*" America has given asylum to all; has hospitably welcomed to her shores the high-born and the low. But when foreign powers persist in flagrantly and shamelessly abusing this open hospitality, then is the time for this hospitality to cease. Then is the time to view clearly the question whether we are to continue to receive yearly, with outstretched arms, the refuse and filth of European governments. From the very nature of the circumstances America is, and ever will be, a hospitable nation, but, as Mr. Depew remarked, "We refuse to act as the dumping-ground of Europe."

When Young America was embarking on its voyage through life, it welcomed all new-comers to its shores, in the very joyousness of youth, demanding no pedigrees, asking no questions. But now that the youth has developed into a full-fledged man, Liberty's Goddess, under whose fostering care this youth was transformed into the man, pauses and views with wrathful eyes her gracious rights of hospitality trampled in the dust and the annual arrival of criminals, idiots, paupers, and diseased upon her shores. We have, indeed, hitherto, cordially received all "varieties of the Aryan race," but there are certain varieties at which we choose to draw the line—a very decided and emphatic line. We are now a nation complete in ourselves, and we ask no foreign assistance in the shape of exotic criminals, imbeciles, and ex-inmates of the poor-house. We refuse to allow that rank weed, anarchism, uprooted from its native land, Germany, and spurned by England, to embed itself in American soil. We may, in accordance with the biological truths previously stated, be evolving "a finer type of man than has hitherto existed"; in some rare, sunny moments we hope that such may be the case; but we have already evolved a nation—a nation fathered by a Revolution, purged by the fire of Civil War—a nation the purity and well-being of which we refuse to endanger by pollution from the offscourings of Europe.

As a nation, we have been kind and generous. Our kindness has been abused; our laws of hospitality violated. This abuse of our hospitality calls for immediate redress. This question of the restriction of immigration admits of no delay. Already the lump of corrupt leaven is at work, as we learn from the daily records. It is always unwelcome—the awakening to the fact that one has been imposed upon; that the world stands ever ready to take advantage of another's adolescence. But the awakening, however unwelcome, has come; the experience, though dear, has been purchased; and now it remains for us to demonstrate to the world that our adolescent period has passed, that we are now a nation mature enough to be conscious of imposition and with vitality enough to cause a speedy cessation thereof.

Mathew Arnold has said: "Politically and socially, the United States are a community living in a natural condition and conscious of doing so. And being in this healthy case, and having this healthy consciousness, the community there uses its understanding with the soundness of health; it, in general, sees its political concerns straight, and sees them clear." Let us gracefully accept this meed of praise, and by our subsequent conduct prove that, in this case, at least, it was well merited. Does America, the land of the free and home of the brave, desire the acquisition from other lands of bondsmen weighed down by the shackles of sin, of dastardly, bomb-throwing Anarchists? America's gracious and far-reaching hospitality has been abused most mercilessly, and America's Goddess, justly incensed and indignant, withdraws the once freely-extended hand of welcome, and with frowning brow writes over her portals: "Not at home to idiots, beggars, felons, murderers, and so forth, of foreign extraction!"

M. A. WESTCOTT.

V.

AN IGNOMINIOUS DESTINY.

"TO WHAT base uses we may return, Horatio!" exclaims *Hamlet;* and he proceeds to suggest that Alexander's noble dust might be found, if traced, stopping a bunghole, and that

> "Imperial Cæsar, dead and turn'd to clay,
> Might stop a hole to keep the wind away."

But these base uses of great men's dust, imaginary though they are, hardly surpass the ignominy to which one of the monarchs of Egypt was actually subjected a few years ago. Think of the "father of the mighty line of Pharaohs" figuring as dried fish in the customs entries in his own land! Such, however, was the description under which the founder of the Pharaonic dynasty was suffered to pass through the land over which he once swayed the kingly sceptre. M. Maspero, leaving the Booklah Museum in view of the contingencies that might arise during the British campaign in Egypt, determined to take with him the mummy of Merenra, the most ancient of the Pharaohs. At the railway station the booking-clerk refused to pass the preserved monarch, unless his value was declared and a corresponding payment made. This was not easy to do, and so it was arranged that first-class fare should be paid for his defunct majesty. But then there were the *octroi*, or city duties, to be paid at Alexandria; so, looking over the lists, M. Maspero found that salt-fish paid but a mere trifle upon entry; and accordingly, we are told, the first Pharaoh of Egypt entered the last city of his empire as dried fish, paying the corresponding tax! What a vivid illustration of the well-known saying of Sir Thomas Browne: "Mummy is become merchandise, Misraim heals wounds, and Pharaoh is sold for balsams!" Merenra's descendants are no longer in their narrow sepulchres, or they would turn in them on learning that their great progenitor had been disgracefully smuggled through his own dominions as a package of dried and salted fish.

Ignominious as was the fate of the Egyptian monarch, it was hardly more so than that of the Egyptians whose mummies, as Gibbon tells us, were deposited by their sons, as securities for loans, with money-lenders. Merenra's destiny has been paralleled in modern times by that of Richelieu,—the virtual monarch of France,—whose body, in 1793, was torn from the grave in the church of the Sorbonne and rudely trampled under foot, after the head had been cut off and exhibited to the by-standers. Passing into the possession of a grocer, the head was sold to M. Armez *père*, and transferred successively to several persons, till at last attempts were made, but made in vain, in 1846 and 1855, by the Historical Committee of Arts and Monuments, to repair the profanation. "We accuse no one," says Feuillet de Conches, who relates these incidents in his "Variétés d'Histoire et d'Art"; "still the fact is undeniable that this terrible head, the personification of the absolute monarchy killing the aristocratic mŏnarchy, is wandering upon the earth like a spectre that has straggled out of the domain of the dead." In the same year the fine marble statue of the great Cardinal at the Château de Melraye was decapitated and the head used by an ultra-republican of the district as a balance-weight for a roasting-jack!

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

VI.

A PLEA FOR THE DIALECT STORY.

IN A RECENT number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Mr. Norton V. Johnson strongly condemns the dialects and dialect stories of this country. His remarks are very much prejudiced; he can see nothing at all to commend in dialects; and altogether he gives his side of the case with great frankness.

Do we want dialect stories in this country? Yes; most emphatically, yes. A dialect itself may be a sign of ignorance, and may also show a lack of education, but there is no denying that there is a certain picturesqueness, a certain fascination, about it that makes it very taking. It is impossible to have the representatives of the different nations and classes in this country speak one universal language with the same accent and enunciation, and as long as the different dialects are spoken, just so long will dialect stories be written. Mr. Johnson states that dialect stories have *irritated* thousands of readers and hundreds of compositors. It is true that a class of readers find it a little difficult at first to get accustomed to the dialect, but a majority of the intelligent readers in this country have no difficulty at all in understanding it. Those who find dialect stories *irritating* have no right to attempt to read them. As for compositors, no doubt dialects are difficult to put into type; but a compositor's business is to follow the copy set before him and make no complaints. One of the best examples of the dialect story is Thomas Nelson Page's "Meh Lady." What can be more simple, more touching, than the way the old negro tells of the death of "Marse Phil"? What can be more delicate, more eloquent than the charming manner in which he describes the love scenes? Would Mr. Johnson like to see "Meh Lady" put into cold, matter-of-fact, grammatical English? What would be the effect if it were done? The story would be utterly ruined. "Meh Lady" is one of the master-pieces of its class, and is also one of the most beautiful short stories that has ever been published. Before condemning the dialects of this country, one should read not only the stories of Thomas Nelson Page, but also those of George W. Cable. The dialect of the Creoles is most musical, pleasing to the ear, poetical, and altogether charming.

In the literature of this country, we always want the Yankee to speak like the Yankee, the Creole to speak like the Creole, and the negro to speak like the negro.

WILLIAM EARLE BALDWIN.

INDEX
TO THE
ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH VOLUME
OF THE
North American Review.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. Christianity versus Socialism, 447.
Adaptiveness of Nature, The, 355.
Aërostation, Feasibility of, 417.
Agnosticism and Huxley, 403.
ALLEN, GRANT. A Persistent Nationality, 602. The Adaptiveness of Nature, 355.
ALLISON, WILLIAM B. An Extra Session—When? 397.
America for the Americans, 772.
American Boy, The, 217.
American Farming, Does it Pay? 360.
American Marriages Abroad, 424.
American Shipping, How to Restore, 687.
ANDERSON, MARY. The Stage and Society, 16.
Annexation of Mexico, The, 525.
Arbor Day and Tree-Planting, 650.
Artemus Ward, How he Became a Lecturer, 521.
Assassination as a Political Argument, 280.
ATHERTON, GERTRUDE F. Illustrious Seconds, 769.
Atlantic, Peril on the, 572.
AUSTEN, JAMES R. Tree-Planting and Arbor Day, 650.
Bacon's, Delia, Unhappy Story, 307.
BALDWIN, WILLIAM E. A Plea for the Dialect Story, 774.
BALLOU, WILLIAM HOSEA. Unconscious Suicide, 261.
BARR, AMELIA E. Are Women to Blame? 638.
BAXTER, SYLVESTER. The Politics Nearest Home, 771.
BAYARD, SECRETARY. *See* Letters to Prominent Persons.
BEALL, MARION E. Why am I a Missionary? 263.
BLIND, KARL. Feasibility of Aërostation, 417.
BOOTH, WILLIAM. The Religious Value of Enthusiasm, 743.
BOUCICAULT, DION. Shakspere Interviewed, 266. At the Goethe Society, 335. The Debut of a Dramatist, 454. Early Days of a Dramatist, 584.
BOUTWELL, GEORGE S. Common-Sense and Copyrights, 327.
Boy, The American, 217.
BOYER, A. Fog-Signals at Sea, 513.
BOYESEN, H. H. The Hero in Fiction, 594.
BRADLAUGH, CHARLES. Humanity's Gain from Unbelief, 294.
BROOKS, SAMUEL. Fog-Signals at Sea, 512.
BROWNE, ALEXANDER P. Sir Arthur Sullivan and Piracy, 750.
Bryce's "Commonweath," Errors in, 344.
BRYCE, LLOYD S. Misrepresentation in Congress, 184. Errors in Prof. Bryce's "Commonwealth," 344.
Bugaboo of Trusts, The, 141.
BURTON, GEORGE. Fog-Signals at Sea, 513.
California, Old Times in, 269.
Canada, What is the Destiny of? 665.
Captain's Work, A, 73.
CARNEGIE, ANDREW. The Bugaboo of Trusts, 141. Wealth, 653.
Census, How one is Taken, 727.
CHACE, JONATHAN. Inadequate Congressional Salaries, 503.
Chinese Must Stay, The, 476.
Christianity Becoming Materialized, 645.
Christianity versus Socialism, 447.
Churches, Our, Can They be Made More Useful? 372.
Civil-Service Reform, Use and Abuse of, 607.
Civil War, An English View of the, 538.
Clayton's Murder, Was it a Political Crime? 287.
CLEWS, HENRY. Legislative Injustice to Railways, 319.
Coffee-Drinking in Eastern Europe, 643.
Common-Sense and Copyrights, 327.
"Commonwealth," Errors in Professor Bryce's, 344.
Congress, An Extra Session of, 397.
Congress, Misrepresentation in, 184.
Congressional Salaries, Inadequate, 503.
Conspiracy, Behind the Curtain of a, 484.
Continent, The Greater Half of the, 54.
COOK, JOSEPH. Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles, 106.

COOKE, ROSE TERRY. Is Housekeeping a Failure? 246. Are Women to Blame? 626.
Copyrights and Common-Sense, 327.
Count Tolstoï and his Critics, 524.
Culprits, Are Workingmen? 134.

CURRENT AMERICAN LITERATURE.

Social Struggles, John Philip Phillips, 137.
History of the Christian Church, Philip Schaff, Vol. VI., The German Reformation, 138.
Lands of Exile, Pierre Loti, 139.
Dogmatic Theology, William G. T. Shedd, D. D., 2 Vols., 392.
Memoirs of P. H. Sheridan, Autobiography, 2 Vols., 393.
Dissolving Views in the History of Judaism, Rabbi Solomon Schindler, 393.
Hints About Men's Dress, 394.
Religious Duty, Frances Power Cobbe, 394.
The Lover, Richard Steele, 394.
Fireside Saints, Douglas Jerrold, 395.
The Wishing-Cap Papers, Leigh Hunt, 395.
Dreamthorp, Alexander Smith, 395.
Rome or Reason, Nathaniel Ramsay Waters, 395.
A Code of Morals, John S. Hittell, 395.
Show Us the Father, M. J. Savage, S. R. Calthrop, H. M. Simmons, J. W. Chadwick, W. C. Gannett, J. L. Jones, 395.

DANA, JOHN COTTON. Dipsomania and Original Sin, 646.
DARE, SHIRLEY. Is Housekeeping a Failure? 243.
DAVIS, REBECCA HARDING. Are Women to Blame? 622.
Decadence of Song, 388.
Delusions, Geographical, 523.
Destiny, An Ignominious, 773.
Dialect Story, A Plea for the, 774.
DINGLEY, NELSON, JR. How to Restore American Shipping, 687.
Dipsomania and Original Sin, 646.
DOBLIN, BENJ. Siberia and Land-Tenure, 265.
DONNELLY, IGNATIUS. Delia Bacon's Unhappy Story, 307.
DOUGLAS, PERCY. Iconoclasm Necessary to Progress, 768.
Dramatist, Early Days of a, 584.
Dramatist, The Debut of a, 454.
English View of the Civil War, An, 538.
Enthusiam, The Religious Value of, 743.
Expedition, The Next Polar, 151.
Extra Session of Congress, 397.
False Modesty in Readers, 180.
Farming, Does it Pay in America? 360.
Feasibility of Aërostation, 417.
FERRIS, G T. A Possible War, 132.
Fiction, The Hero in, 594.
Fiction, Unhappy Marriages in, 676.
FISHBACK, W. M. Statehood for the Indians, 648.
Fog-Signals at Sea, 509.
FORD, JOHN T. Behind the Curtain of a Conspiracy, 484.
FORSYTHE, S. Some Newly-Discovered Heroes, 520.
FRANCIS, A. L. Turkish Freethinkers, 523.
FREMONT, F. L. Zoölogical Game-Preserves, 262.
F. W. H. Fog-Signals at Sea, 509.
Garden, In Josephine's, 435.
Geographical Delusions, 523.
GLADDEN, WASHINGTON. Can Our Churches be Made More Useful? 381.
Gladstone's Over-Estimate, 649.
GLADSTONE, W. E. Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles (Republished), 116.
Goethe Society, At the, 335.
GRANT, FREDERICK JAMES. Naming the New States, 389.
HALE, EDWARD EVERETT. Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles, 97. Can Our Churches Be Made More Useful? 377. The Tree of Political Knowledge, 564.
HAMILTON, GAIL. In Josephine's Garden, 435. In Josephine's House, 613.
HAMILTON, JOHN B. Is Yellow Fever Contagious? 47.
HAMMOND, WILLIAM A. The Mischievous Ice-Pitcher, 738.
HARLAND, MARION. Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles, 102. Is Housekeeping a Failure? 250. Are Women to Blame? 630.
HENDERSON, W. J. Decadence of Song, 388.
Hero in Fiction, The, 594.
Heroes, Some Newly-Discovered, 520.
HOUGHTON, LOUISE S. Women and War Policies, 652.
House, In Josephine's, 613.
Housekeeping, Is it a Failure? 243.
HOWE, JULIA WARD. Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles, 109.
Humanity's Gain from Unbelief, 294.
Humor and Wit—Old and New, 33.
Huxley and Agnosticism, 403.
Ice-Pitcher, The Mischievous, 738.
Iconoclasm Necessary to Progress, 768.
Idiosyncrasies of Alcohol, 495.
Illustrious Seconds, 769.
Impossible Presidents, 391.
Inebriety as a Disease, 135.
INGERSOLL, R. G. Professor Huxley and Agnosticism, 403.
Interviewing as a Factor in Journalism, 522.
J. A. R. Why Am I a Quaker? 761.
JONES, JAMES K. Was Clayton's Murder a Political Crime? 287.
Josephine's Garden, In, 435.
Josephine's House, In, 613.
Journalism, Interviewing as a Factor in, 522.
KENNEDY, CHARLES WM. A Captain's Work, 73. Fog-Signals at Sea, 510. Peril on the Atlantic, 572.
KIRKE, EDMUND. Wit and Humor—Old and New, 33.
Land-Tenure and Siberia, 265.
LANG, ANDREW. Unhappy Marriages in Fiction, 676.
LATHROP, GEORGE PARSONS. False Modesty in Readers, 180
LEE, YAN PHOU. The Chinese Must Stay, 476.
Legislative Injustice to Railways, 319.
Letters to Prominent Persons, 21.
LORING, GEORGE B. Does American Farming Pay? 360.
MANN, EDWARD C. Inebriety as a Disease, 135.
Marriages Abroad, American, 424.
Marriages in Fiction, Unhappy, 676.

MATHEWS, WILLIAM. An Ignominious Destiny, 773.

MCMAHON, R. R. Use and Abuse of Civil-Service Reform, 607.

Mexico, The Annexation of, 525.

Misrepresentation in Congress, 184.

Missionary, Why am I a? 263.

Modesty in Readers, False, 180.

Naming the New States, 389.

National Reform, The Next, 82.

Nationality, A Persistent, 602.

Nature, The Adaptiveness of, 355.

Naval Wars of the Future, 1, 196.

Old Times in California, 269.

OSWALD, FELIX L. Our Rodent Rivals, 262. Geographical Delusions, 523. Mr. Gladstone's Over-estimate, 649.

Orthodoxy. The Inevitable Surrender of, 711.

OWEN, CATHERINE. Is Housekeeping a Failure? 254. Are Women to Blame? 633.

PARLOA, MARIA. Is Housekeeping a Failure? 257.

Peril on the Atlantic, 572.

Persistent Nationality, A, 602.

PETERS, ALFRED H. Count Tolstoï and his Critics, 524.

PIERREPONT, EDWARDS. Shall we Banish Silver Coin? 226.

Pleas for Copyright, 464.

Polar Expedition, The Next, 151.

Political Crime, Was Clayton's Murder a? 287.

Politics Nearest Home, The, 771.

PORTER, DAVID D. Naval Wars of the Future, 1, 196.

POST, SARAH E. Thought-Transferrence, 518.

Presidents, Impossible, 391.

Progress, Iconoclasm Necessary to, 768.

Prohibition or Restriction, 133.

Prominent Persons, Letters to, 21.

PUTNAM, GEORGE HAVEN. Pleas for Copyright, 464.

Quaker, Why am I a? 761.

Railways, Legislative Injustice to, 319.

Realism, The Claim of, 386.

Reform, The Next National, 82.

Religious Value of Enthusiasm, The, 743.

Restriction or Prohibition 133.

RICE, ALLEN THORNDIKE. The Next National Reform, 82.

RICHMOND, ARTHUR. Letters to Prominent Persons, 21.

Rivals, Our Rodent, 262.

Robert Elsmere's Mental Struggles, 97

ROMERO, M. The Annexation of Mexico, 525.

ROOTS, LOGAN H. Assassination as a Political Argument, 280.

RUSSELL, OLIVER H. Spite in Text-Books, 651.

Salaries, Inadequate Congressional, 503.

SANIAL, LUCIEN. Two New York States, 86.

SAVAGE, MINOT J. Can Our Churches be Made More Useful? 372. The Inevitable Surrender of Orthodoxy, 711.

SEARLE, W. S. Idiosyncracies of Alcohol, 494.

Session, An Extra—When? 397.

SCHUYLER, EUGENE. American Marriages Abroad, 424.

SCHWATKA, FREDERICK. The Next Polar Expedition, 151.

Shakspere Interviewed, 266.

SHERMAN, W. T. Old Times in California, 269.

Shipping, How to Restore American, 687.

Siberia and Land-Tenure, 265.

Silver Coin, Shall We Banish it? 226.

Sin and Unbelief, 161.

Socialism and Christianity, 447.

Society and the Stage, 16.

Song, Decadence of, 388.

Spite in Text-Books, 651.

Stage and Society, The, 16.

Statehood for the Indians, 648.

States, Naming the New, 389.

States, Two New York, 86.

Steam-Engine, The Last Days of the, 697.

STOCKBRIDGE, HENRY. Restriction or Prohibition, 133.

Suicide, Unconscious, 261.

Sullivan, Sir Arthur, and Piracy, 750.

Surrender of Orthodoxy, The Inevitable, 711.

SYLVESTER, PHILO H. Two Needed New Words, 647.

Thought-Transferrence, 518.

THURSTON, R. H. The Last Days of the Steam-Engine, 697.

Tolstoï and his Critics, 524.

TOURGEE, ALBION W. The Claim of Realism, 386.

TOWNSEND, HORACE. Interviewing as a Factor in Journalism, 522.

Tree of Political Knowledge, The, 564.

Tree-Planting and Arbor Day, 650.

TROWBRIDGE, J. T. The American Boy, 217.

Trusts, The Bugaboo of, 141.

TUCKERMAN, C. K. Coffee-Drinking in Eastern Europe, 643.

Turkish Freethinkers, 523.

Two Needed New Words, 647.

Unbelief and Sin, 161.

Unbelief, Humanity's Gain from, 294.

Unconscious Suicide, 261.

Usefulness of the Churches, 372.

War, A Possible. G. T. Ferris, 132.

WARD, MRS. HUMPHRY. Sin and Unbelief, 161.

Wars of the Future, Naval, 1, 196.

WASSON, J. B. Christianity Becoming Materialized, 645.

WATSON, J. W. How Artemus Ward Became a Lecturer, 521.

Wealth, 653.

WEBB, LINUS S. Are Workingmen Culprits? 134.

WESTCOTT, M. A. America for the Amercans, 772.

Why am I a Missionary? 263.

Why am I a Quaker? 761.

WILKES, S. J. Impossible Presidents, 391.

WIMAN, ERASTUS. The Greater Half of the Continent, 54. What is the Destiny of Canada? 665.

Wit and Humor—Old and New, 33.

WOLSELEY, VISCOUNT. An English View of the Civil War, 538.

Women and War-Policies, 652.

Women, Are They to Blame? 622.

Words, Two Needed New, 647.

Work, A Captain's, 73.

Workingmen, Are they Culprits? 134.

WRIGHT, CARROLL D. How a Census is Taken, 727.

Yellow Fever, Is it Contagious? 47.

Zoölogical Game-Preserves, 262.