

haps even of the more refined but frivolous public of the Faubourg St.-Germain. Such shallow criticism, however, only expresses a sort of physical sensation, a sensation of fatigue, which may be shared by many people. But M. Sarcey goes a little too far when he speaks of the last scenes of the drama, and says: "If these inventions were not signed with the great name of Shakspeare, I should find them at the same time monstrous and infantine." "Hamlet" is not a common drama, it is one of the most profound and extraordinary psychological works. Dr. Charcot has said that it is even a deep physiological work, and that the alienists of the day cannot find the slightest fault with *Ophelia*. It will always be allowable to say to many:

"The Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of thy sphere."

But the dramatic element is still so strong and so powerful that, notwithstanding its obscurities and its lyrical parts, "Hamlet" will always carry the suffrages of the multitude.

## Correspondence.

### THE INDIANA CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* of October 21 I notice a letter from Mr. W. V. Stuart, charging that the Indiana Civil-Service Reform Association is being used for party purposes.

The letter does not correctly state the situation. The former Executive Committee consisted of six members—three Republicans, one Democrat, and two Independents. (I include as Independents only those who voted for Mr. Cleveland, and who have since been anxious for the success of his Administration.) Mr. Stuart says this number has been changed to four; on the contrary, it has been changed to ten. The places are not yet all filled, but so far three Independents and one Democrat have been appointed. Two members of the Executive Committee, a Republican and an Independent respectively, and the President—a Republican who did not vote for Blaine—investigated the Insane Hospital. They found a shameful and corrupt condition of affairs, and the facts reported by them have not been controverted by Mr. Stuart or by any one else. The investigation embraced only the present administration of the Asylum. The report was given to the press regardless of party. It was published by order of the Executive Committee, five members voting for it, and the sixth, a Democrat, not attending, although notified of the business to come before the meeting. Two of the signers of the report have been making Republican speeches in this campaign, both incessantly urging civil-service reform from the highest stand. The report contains the following recommendation:

"The mismanagement of the Asylum—a peculiarly great evil, considering the character of the institution—lies in that abominable system by which the welfare of the unfortunate beings for whom the benevolence was created, is made a secondary consideration to some supposed party advantage or political necessity; and no permanent improvement can be looked for while this continues to be the case.

"The obvious remedy for abuses connected with this institution is the enactment of a law by the General Assembly providing for competitive tests of fitness to be applied to all persons seeking employment in the Asylum, followed by a suitable probation, prohibiting appointments or removals for political reasons, and placing the administration of this Hospital, as well as the other benevolent institutions of this State, in the hands of non-partisan Boards of Trustees. We would also recommend that the position of Trustee of the Insane Hospital should not be accompanied with any salary. In most of the States such office is purely honorary, and is filled by a much better class of men than in Indiana."

Mr. Stuart came to the annual meeting stating that he had not read the report, but that "its only effect would be to transfer the abuses from Democratic to Republican hands," and he asked the Association to investigate former Republican management. Republican management ceased seven years ago. It was undisputed in the discussion that that management was partisan and defective, and the Association properly refused to investigate what had ceased to exist, to show a condition of things not denied.

Under the direction of the Association at that meeting the following circular has been sent to nearly all candidates for the coming General Assembly, and would have been sent to all had not the Democratic State Committee refused the names:

INDIANAPOLIS, October 16, 1886.

DEAR SIR: The Indiana Civil-Service Reform Association believes that it is important to take the civil service of the State, except the elective offices and possibly a limited number of other places, out of the domain of party politics. In pursuance of this object, the Association, at its recent meeting, directed that the following inquiries be sent to those who are now candidates for the General Assembly:

1. Are you in favor of placing the public institutions of the State under the control of non-partisan boards?

2. Are you in favor of extending the principles of the National Civil-Service Law, known as the "Pendleton Act," to the benevolent and penal institutions of the State and to other branches of the State civil service, where practicable?

It is to be hoped that the measures proposed will have the support of the members of the next General Assembly, without regard to party, and the Association asks that within the next ten days you will transmit to the Secretary your answers to the above questions for publication.

Respectfully,

JAMES B. BLACK, Sec'y.

To this circular a considerable portion of the Republican candidates have made favorable answers, and one Democrat has replied. A State civil-service law seems almost within grasp, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Stuart should, by his impulsive action, tend to oppose that much desired end.

LUCIUS B. SWIFT.

INDIANAPOLIS, October 23, 1886.

[We have received a letter, corroborating the above statements, from Mr. Wm. D. Foulke, President of the Indiana Association. The following extract is all that it seems useful to reproduce.—ED. NATION.]

It is true that civil-service reform in Indiana finds many more adherents among Republicans than among Democrats. This, I think, has always been the case; it has certainly been so since the Democratic party came into power. A bill for civil-service reform, based upon the New York law, was introduced into our last State Senate. Every Republican voted for it; it was defeated by Democratic votes. The sentiment among Democrats here is almost unanimous in favor of the spoils system. I think no one will deny, not even the President himself, that the present condition of the civil service in this State is unsatisfactory. The Democratic party had omitted to place in its platform any plank favoring civil-service reform. Its administration of State affairs is extremely partisan. The Republican party, on the other hand, has pledged itself to incorporate the provisions of the national Civil-Service Act into the legislation of this State, in order that the abuses which prevail in our benevolent and reformatory institutions may be suppressed. The parties have divided upon this issue. Individual members of the Indiana Civil-Service Reform Association, including members of its Executive Committee, have therefore felt entirely free to avail themselves of the assistance of any party that would pledge itself to reform the monstrous abuses which exist; and some of them have taken individually an active part in

the present canvass in behalf of the Republican party, which has promised a non-partisan administration of these institutions. These men believe that as individuals they would not be doing their whole duty to civil-service reform, if they did not do their best to bring these abuses before the people, even in a political campaign, and insist upon a reformation.

### GEN. WEAVER AND CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In writing this letter I do not desire to air any political grievances of the Democrats of this district. The public is not interested in them. I desire to illustrate, in a forcible manner, the viciousness of the system under which we live, for it is only by a recital of the facts in individual cases that the enormities perpetrated under the "spoils" system can be brought home to the people.

Gen. Weaver is not a civil-service reformer, but he has had much to say of the corruption of the Democratic and Republican parties, and two years ago he had a good deal to say, in a general way, of civil-service reform, it being an issue. Therefore, while we had no reason to expect more from him than from his predecessors, we had a right to expect as much. It is entirely safe to say that his distribution of patronage has been infinitely worse than anything we have ever known here. Indeed, men who are now supporting him frankly admit that the appointments he has had made are a disgrace to the community, to the party, and to the Administration. I do not mean to say they are all bad; some are good, but in a majority of cases, in fact, in nearly every case, a job or scandal has been disclosed. A history of all of them would fill a volume. I shall confine myself to three cases, but a similar story might be told of a score or more.

The Postmaster at Richland, in Keokuk County, Iowa, is one Stockman. In 1884 one Bassett held this office. After the election Bassett, believing his time short, offered to resign in favor of any Democrat who would buy his stock of goods kept in the same room or building. In said county lived Dr. Bartow and his three sons. They were all active, earnest Democrats, and had always been Democrats. One of the young Bartows bargained for Bassett's stock, conditioned on his appointment. He was appointed on a petition under the Arthur Administration. After Mr. Cleveland's inauguration Bartow, not doubting he should be retained, circulated a petition which received the signatures of seventy-six of the eighty-six Democratic voters in that township or precinct. But Gen. Weaver, it seems, had promised the office during the campaign of '84 to Stockman, and late in the summer of '85 Bartow, after long-continued efforts, was removed and Stockman was appointed. Bartow then got more signatures, affidavits and protests, and sent a friend to Washington to ascertain the cause of his removal. It was found that he had been removed for being an "offensive partisan."

Now, if the charge had been true, his removal would have been justified; but true or not true, Gen. Weaver used it only to accomplish his purpose, for he is not the man to remove one of his own followers for being an offensive partisan. The more offensive they are, the better they suit his purposes. Stockman, who is said to be a Greenbacker, at last secured his commission. During the controversy and the delay, the quarrel between the rival factions became very bitter. One Duke took up the quarrel for Stockman, and old Dr. Bartow for his son, and, two or three days after Stockman got possession of the office, the quarrel culminated in the death of old

Dr. Bartow, Duke burying the contents of a revolver in his body.

Montezuma and Grinnell, in this (Poweshiek) county, are Presidential offices. Mr. J. E. Latchem is Postmaster at Montezuma, and for a complete understanding of these cases it will be necessary to give details, at the risk of being tedious. During the campaign of '84 this Mr. Latchem and Mr. L. J. Anderson were the editors and proprietors of the *Poweshiek County Democrat*, a Weaver organ. The office had for years been under the control of the *Montezuma Republican*, a Republican organ. In consideration of the services of Messrs. Latchem and Anderson, Gen. Weaver agreed to transfer this office to the *Democrat*. After the election, it occurred to Mr. Anderson (who, by the way, is one of Gen. Weaver's most devoted henchmen) that he could do better than divide the spoils with his partner. He had a brother, recently released from the insane asylum, and he arranged with Gen. Weaver to secure the appointment of this brother, Mr. J. E. Anderson. When Mr. Latchem discovered that he had been "left," he raised a breeze, and, as the profits of the paper were small, he demanded of Mr. Anderson that he take his half off his hands. This Mr. Anderson did, giving his note, and securing the same, it is said, by a chattel mortgage on the whole. The note matured, or was about to mature, and Mr. Anderson had no funds with which to meet it. It was now Mr. Latchem's turn to squeeze, and the result was that Mr. Latchem took back his half-interest in the paper, Mr. J. E. Anderson resigned, and Gen. Weaver recommended Mr. Latchem. The *Democrat* is now able to live nicely on the proceeds of a Presidential post-office, and shouts lustily for Weaver; and thus doth true patriotism receive its just reward.

Mr. D. S. Beardsley is the Postmaster at Grinnell. He was, until the date of the receipt of his commission, editor of the *Grinnell Independent*, a Democratic paper. Mr. W. S. Leisuré had been for eighteen years Postmaster. He served as a private through the war, was wounded, and draws a small pension. He is a man of high character, quiet, of a retiring disposition, and never took any part in politics except to cast his vote. No man could be more faithful than Mr. Leisuré has been in the discharge of his duties, and consequently his office was one of the most carefully kept offices in Iowa. His commission expired in December, 1885. His patrons very much desired his retention—so much so that, without any request from him, they circulated a petition, and in a few days secured the signatures of over six hundred voters, a good many of them Democrats. But Gen. Weaver said, "He must go." Mr. C. E. Schoff was and is the editor of the *Grinnell Signal*, a Greenback paper, a Butler organ in 1884, and always a Weaver organ. In consideration of his services Gen. Weaver promised to secure for him the Grinnell office. The Democrats bitterly opposed the appointment of Mr. Schoff, or of any other Greenbacker, and, for personal reasons that I never fully understood, many Greenbackers opposed Mr. Schoff. Either because of this opposition or because he feared Mr. Schoff could not be confirmed, Gen. Weaver at last, but very reluctantly, abandoned his project, but resolved to recommend no Democrat to succeed Mr. Leisuré, unless he would consent to contribute to the support of Mr. Schoff and the *Signal*.

This proposition was made to Mr. J. W. Burroughs, a Democrat, who rejected it with contempt. Mr. A. J. Blakely, a Greenbacker, was also an applicant. The Burroughs and Blakely factions finally "pooled," and proposed Mr. Blakely's appointment, Mr. Burroughs to be his deputy. This proposition Gen. Weaver rejected because it made no provision for Mr. Schoff and the *Signal*,

and all applicants were given to understand that no arrangement short of a division with Mr. Schoff would be countenanced. These negotiations were conducted through Mr. Schoff, and principally through Mr. Anderson, the hero of the Montezuma episode. Mr. Anderson was at the time Chairman of the Democratic County Committee, and for a brief period the County "Boss."

At last Mr. Beardsley acceded to the demands of Gen. Weaver and Mr. Schoff, and consented to give Mr. Schoff a certain percentage of the net proceeds of the office, the amount being, I believe, thirty-three per cent., the blackmail to cease when Gen. Weaver secured for Mr. Schoff an appointment satisfactory to him. Mr. Beardsley's name was then sent to the Senate. These disgraceful facts were laid before the Senate Committee, but they decided that, Mr. Beardsley being a man of good character and entirely qualified, they could not go outside and investigate any bargain that he might have made. Mr. Beardsley obtained his commission in August, and soon thereafter took possession of the office. The *Independent* and *Signal* are now living on the proceeds of a Presidential office, and both are shouting lustily for Weaver; and thus hath true patriotism again received its just reward. Mr. Schoff does no work in the Post-office of any kind, and yet he draws part of the salary of a Federal office. He is a sort of pensioner upon the Government, and yet he never fought any of its battles.

In conclusion I will say that no one can complain of the manner in which Mr. Beardsley performs the duties of the office. Probably no man better qualified could have been found; but Mr. Beardsley's friends would be glad to see him released from this shameful agreement, and the friends of civil-service reform everywhere will be glad to see the end of a system that makes such things possible. DAVID W. NORRIS.

GRINNELL, October 4, 1886.

[We retain the date at which the above letter was written. For reasons personal to the author we have held his communication over (at his request of a later date) to avoid the suspicion of being intended to influence the approaching election.—ED. NATION.]

#### A "DISLOYAL" TEXT-BOOK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation*, No. 1111, commenting on the stir made about Barnes's 'History of United States,' you say the book has been in use fourteen years without a word of fault being found with regard to its loyalty. This may be true of Newark, but is not of Salem, Marblehead, and other towns of Essex County. This objection has been repeatedly raised for ten years. Are you not mistaken regarding the surrender of Lee at Appomattox when you say that the charge brought against this history of underrating the numbers of Lee's army at the final surrender "is untrue, since the author in a foot-note gave the official returns of both sides"? The author did nothing of the kind. See page 275, edition of 1880. The statement there that the number surrendered was "8,000 men, the remains of the Army of Virginia," is unqualified. In 1885 I made this charge against the book in the school board, and was told that it would be corrected. In the revised edition just issued—revised by Gen. Carrington—the foot-note has been added. In my opinion the paragraph is still very misleading.

But this is not the worst misstatement. On page 240 the book says of the Second Bull Run: "Pope, with 40,000 men, was compelled to fight the whole rebel army." On the first day of this battle,

August 28, commonly called the battle of Gainesville, Pope had his original army of 49,500 men (less 3,390 lost at Cedar Mountain), and a reinforcement of 23,000 from the Army of the Potomac, giving him 70,000 instead of 40,000. On that day Longstreet was not present, and Pope fought Jackson with 23,823 men.

On page 241 we read that the "shattered remnants" of Pope's army were "glad to take refuge within the fortifications of Washington." Out of his 70,000 men Pope lost less than 10,000. The night after the last day's fight, Franklin joined him with 10,000, and the next morning Sumner with 10,000, making his "shattered remnants" 80,000 strong. Barnes says that Pope lost 30,000 men. The "Official Records," 'War of the Rebellion,' page 262, vol. xii, part 2, give the losses to Pope's army as 8,105. The additional losses to the Army of the Potomac and Burnside's corps, from August 16 to September 2, make the total only 14,462.

On page 247, battle of Chickamauga, we read that "Longstreet pushed a brigade into the gap and swept the Federal right and centre from the field." Longstreet, who on this day commanded the rebel left, "pushed" Stewart's, Hood's, Kershaw's, Johnson's, and Hinderman's divisions supported by Preston's large division into this gap. My authority is Gen. Cist of Rosecrans's staff.

These are but a few of the glaring misstatements. Perhaps they are not vital to school history, but if worth stating at all worth stating correctly. They have not been corrected in the revision. WINFIELD S. NEVINS.

SALEM, MASS., October 18, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There are two topics in your paper of October 14 which suggest a few words that may be of interest.

In your editorial columns you refer to a "queer controversy" respecting the "loyalty" of a school-book, 'Brief History of the United States,' by the late Prof. J. Dorman Steele—which question had been decided, "in a qualified way, in the negative." It is a curious fact that, on this side of the line, the same book has been challenged as leaning the other way. I am myself a member of a school board in which, four years ago, the book was impeached on that ground. To a letter on the subject, the author replied in a spirit of admirable frankness; and, being convinced on investigation, he cheerfully removed the offending passage, and the book was afterwards adopted in the schools. It seems, therefore, strange to us now to read of the charge against his book of disloyalty to the North. Perhaps charge and countercharge may be taken together as proof of his effort to be perfectly fair. At any rate, they show how hard it is to write even a "brief history" of the war which shall be acceptable on all sides. Is it, indeed, as yet, even possible to do so?

My other topic is apropos of your appreciative notice of 'Addresses and Speeches on Various Occasions' by Robert C. Winthrop. It may be pleasing to the many friends and admirers of this eminent citizen to know that to him, by the same school board above referred to, has just been paid a signal honor in the naming after him of a training school for teachers—the first in this State—which, by the aid of the Peabody Fund, has recently been founded in this city. The board declare that this is done "in honor of the illustrious statesman and philanthropist who presides over the Peabody Board." The name was received with approbation by the people, and the *Columbia Register* expressed the hope that "the Winthrop Training School may unite with a perpetual public benefaction the undying memory of a great and good man." This incident, slight



in itself, is related to show that here in the far South, as well as in the North, the name of Mr. Winthrop is held in honor, and that we, too, are proud of such a life. When, on the one hand, one listens to the "fight among the book agents" over a school history, it seems as if the war were still raging; but when the people of the South look upon such a man as Mr. Winthrop, in his old age of "philanthropic labor" for North and South alike, they feel that it is indeed ended.

EDWARD S. JOYNES.

SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE, COLUMBIA, S. C.,  
October 18, 1886.

#### CONFISCATION OF THE HEPTAMERON.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To your readers who may not have seen the announcement in some of the daily papers, it will doubtless be of interest to learn that, by a recent decision of the Treasury Department, the 'Heptameron' of Margaret, Queen of Navarre, has been declared an "obscene" book, and that certain copies of an English translation imported by us have been seized and confiscated as such, under the section of the United States Revised Statutes prohibiting the importation of indecent publications.

Mr. Fairchild, the Acting Secretary, in an interview, is quoted as saying in substance that

"if any book is obscene, the confiscated edition of the 'Heptameron' in question is such a book. The illustrations are some of them insignificant, while some of them are decidedly unchaste. The language, while possibly not in itself obscene, is impure in all its suggestions, and the entire scope of the work is unwholesome. Certainly no one would be any better for reading the book, and it can be of no value except as an illustration of certain features of literature. The exceptions which might be made in behalf of such works as literary products might apply to the original Italian (*sic*). They certainly do not apply to English translations."

It is of course wise and necessary that there should be a law suppressing indecent books, and the difficulty of deciding just where to draw the line in regard to such is fully admitted; but that it should now be drawn at the 'Heptameron' will astonish the many persons of undoubted culture and refinement by whom it has heretofore been considered as a classic, not only in the original tongue, but also in the English translation. While without doubt it should not be allowed indiscriminate circulation in public libraries (not because it is at all obscene, but because it is not the best food for youthful minds), it will be generally conceded that the prohibition *in toto* is absurd. It is certain that thousands of copies have been brought into the country without question, and we believe we are not wrong in saying that it is in the collection of nearly every one of scholarly attainments who pretends to a library, and with few exceptions constitutes part of the stock of every bookseller. It would seem right that these facts, as expressing the opinions of those quite as competent as Mr. Fairchild to pronounce upon the merits of the book, should have been given more weight in estimating its character. Surely it cannot be so morally debasing and yet be thus received in our midst.

Now that proscription has begun, it will be decidedly interesting to learn the limit of its extent, and to know if some other long-regarded classics are also to come under the ban, the 'Decameron,' 'Gil Blas,' 'Tom Jones,' Rabelais, etc., and if exceptions are to be made in the case of more modern works, as, for instance, Balzac's 'Droll Stories,' and much of the current French fiction.

The illustrations which are especially complained of by Mr. Fairchild are those of Flameng, the celebrated French etcher, and while a few of them would probably have shocked the notions of our Puritan ancestors, they can hardly in this day be regarded as "unchaste." If prints of a

similar nature are to be prohibited, we apprehend that the customs officials will soon find their hands full. Perhaps they would do well to heed the caution given by the New York *Herald* in commenting on the case, and, while straining at a gnat, not swallow a camel.—Very truly,

W. H. LOWDERMILK & Co.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 25, 1886.

#### THE REPUBLIC IN FRANCE.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For the student of politics, as I have before had occasion to remark, there is no field more instructive than the modern history of France. A book has recently appeared with the title of 'Nos Fautes: Lettres de Province, 1879-1885,' which is deeply interesting, not merely as to France, but for the side-light which it throws on our own affairs. To show its full meaning, I must restate the theory which it illustrates. Popular representative government, in its short life of little more than a century, has everywhere been struggling with one problem—how to secure a working relation between legislature and executive, and how to bring public opinion to bear so as to keep each within its proper bounds. If the executive gets the upper hand, its modes of abuse of power are obvious and well known. If the legislature acquires supremacy—which it is quite as eager to do, and has even greater advantages for doing—the speedy results are loose and defective administration, the sacrifice of the national to local and private interests, a shifting and unstable policy, financial disorder, and, in a word, anarchy. The people are blamed for this state of things, though they may not approve of it at all, and, being without leaders, are perfectly helpless in the hands of the politicians of the legislature. They drift helplessly on, till in fear and despair they finally acquiesce in the rule of a strong man, who has the ability to send the legislature about its business, and thenceforward to substitute his will, at least in great measure, for law.

Passing over previous experiences, let us now see what the Third Republic, according to our author, has come to in its sixteen years. It seems that in the discussions on the revision of the Constitution, the word "Convention" was pronounced with a shudder by some speakers:

"But if we look at the matter squarely, have we not already a Convention? Stripped of the bloody memories of the Terror, a Convention is nothing else than a surrender to the deputies—who ought to have nothing but legislative power and a right of control of public affairs—of all administrative and governmental authority. Divided into two chambers or united in one, a Convention is in fact the government and direct administration of the country by members elected by popular suffrage. That is what we see to-day. The Deputies and the Senators impose their sovereign will upon the Ministers, who are only their instruments; they regulate all business, they deal with all questions of *personnel*."

"Certainly, to do this they must come to an understanding with the bureaucracy. But that is easy enough. The senators and the deputies go into the departments, cause the drawers to be opened and the dockets shown them. They adapt themselves readily to a system which, concentrating administrative life in Paris, gives them more prestige in the eyes of their electors. They begin with governing and administering in the sole interest of their respective departments. But, little by little, getting a taste for this mode of action, they have greatly extended it. We see the members of the budget commission introduce themselves into the ministries and there do the actual work of ministers. We have seen in recent debates the Chamber take even the direction of diplomacy. Is not that the régime of the Convention? At any rate, it is no longer the parliamentary system, as formerly understood—that is, by the side of the power of the legislature, a ministerial power. To-day the ministerial power is effaced in the direction of the internal policy of the country. There is only one sove-

reign in France, a being multiple and omnipotent, the deputy."

Is there not here a familiar sound in relation to the politics of this country?

What, in the next place, have been the effects of this dominant power of the legislature? France, as everybody knows, is governed by a strongly centralized administration, and its numerous agents have in the past performed their functions, such as they were, with a certain sense of official honor and with the general respect of the country. After the period known as the sixteenth of May, ending in the resignation of MacMahon and the election of Grévy, on the plea of replacing monarchical officials by republican, the "spoils system" has been put in force in a way, which, as described by our author, himself a Republican, is truly appalling. The details are most interesting, but I must pass them by.

Again, as no definite and continuous policy of government can be worked out by an anarchical Chamber, some comprehensive and demagogical "cry" must be got up to influence the country, and this has been found in the war upon the church and religion. Nothing could excite greater alarm and hostility through the country, but the moderates, or as they call themselves, the "opportunists," are steadily losing ground as against the radicals or what were once known as the Jacobins. Of exactly the same kind is the banishment of the members of the royal family. Allowing for the changed circumstances, things are following the same road as in the years after 1789.

The worst effect, however, is in the finances. The Finance Minister has no power at all. The "Budget Committee," corresponding to what we call the "Appropriations" and "Ways and Means," has taken the matter in hand and is perfectly helpless for any good purpose. The result is reckless expenditure and annual and increasing deficits. A large floating debt is rolling up, the Chamber will not listen to any funding scheme, is at its wits' end about taxation, and there seems no resource but that most dangerous of all expedients in unskilled hands, the income tax.

What is the attitude of the people in this state of affairs? So far from their being satisfied, our author describes an increasing uneasiness and discontent which was manifested in the unexpected success of monarchical candidates at the last election, and this although it seems to be admitted that the country is still strongly attached to the republic. The writer says: "Our people are so constituted that they attach themselves to persons quite as much as to ideas, or rather they love to embody their ideas in persons." This is no more true of the French than of any other people, as he admits in saying that there is nobody who holds in France the position which Bismarck does for the Germans, Gladstone for the English, Tisza for the Hungarians, and Depretis for the Italians. In fact, this is just what is impossible under the rule of a legislature. While Thiers still lived, his great services and commanding position insured him the support of the country, and after his death Gambetta held, though with a long interval, a somewhat similar position. Since he died, however, the Ministers are only a succession of puppets, set up and pulled down by the caprices of the Chamber. The people are unable to control that body, while they have not and apparently cannot have a leader. What this tends to is only too plain. In all probability France will continue to drift into more and more hopeless chaos, till some strong adventurer, some new Napoleon, modified, let us hope, by nineteenth-century influences, shall concentrate the energies of the country in a dictatorship based upon foreign war.

Is there not instruction and reproof for us in this lesson? We have greater wealth, a more in-

telligent population, freedom from foreign complications, and local self-government; but the political situation is the same. Not only Congress but the State Legislatures have absorbed nearly all the power of government, and the executive is, as regards positive action, a cipher in their hands. True, we have no state church or royal family for demagogues to ride upon, but Blaine with his "Protection," and Powderly and George with "Labor," furnish very fair substitutes. We have a large surplus revenue, and no army or colonial enterprises or state railroads to swallow up endless millions; but as far as scientific finance goes, we are hardly in a position to criticise the French. One element of superiority we certainly have, and it may well prove adequate to the solution of the problem. Once in four years the nation directly elects its President, and at shorter intervals the States their Governors. Backed by the people, these officials ought to be able to hold their own against the legislatures. But to do this they need to be provided with an adequate arena; to have, through their chosen agents, equally with members, a voice in legislation; to be able to defend the wants of administration, and to shape out and enforce a continuous policy in public debate.

G. B.

BOSTON, October 25, 1886.

## TWO MASSACHUSETTS OPINIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After reading your editorial review of Mr. McMurtrie's "Plea for the Supreme Court," I am tempted to send you a short extract from the Hazard State Papers, volume ii, page 110, which relates to an event possibly not familiar to the "expounders" of to-day, as it happened about 240 years ago in the time of the New England Confederation. It seems a fort had been built at Saybrook, and the commissioners from the colonies other than Massachusetts thought Springfield should contribute a part of the expense of its erection. Among other reasons for this demand, the Commissioners say that opposition to such payment "would reflect upon most of the Governments of Eurup." "Wee reply," say the men of Massachusetts, "it is no good argument to say most of the Governments of Euroup doe thus therefore it is Lawefull noe more than if wee should say most of the Gouvernements etc. oppress both Subjects and Strangers ergo oppression is Lawefull."

May I quote for easy reference and comparison in this connection the more familiar words of the Massachusetts member of the Supreme Court, delivered in 1884? "The Governments of Europe . . . have as sovereign a power of issuing paper money as of stamping coin." "Congress, the Legislature of a sovereign nation," has power "to make the notes of the Government a legal tender in payment of private debts, being one of the powers belonging to sovereignty in other civilized nations." (U. S. Reports, 110.)

Respectfully yours,

AUSTIN SCOTT.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., October 21.

## ARCHÆOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I see repeated in a note of the *Nation*, No. 1109, the recommendation of the Archæological Institute to make an expedition into the Cyrenaica. There is no doubt that it would be one of the most fruitful of fields for excavation, but surely the authorities of the Institute must know that an expedition there is absolutely impracticable unless protected by a considerable body of troops. Were it not for this, the Italians and the French would long ago have made ex-

plorations. The coast by Cyrene has long been examined, and is continually being searched for tombs, etc.; but to penetrate into the country is impracticable, from the suspicious and warlike character of the natives, who are under no rule and love no strangers.

As to Tarentum, the Institute must be prepared to buy real estate, for the new town is being built over the old, and some of the most interesting sections of old Tarentum are already covered by the new Taranto. There are parts of Tunis which are well worth the attention of the Institute, and the French administration is most liberal in regard to research, while any funds to be spent in Magna Græcia would be well employed if the advice of the Ministry of Public Instruction as to site, etc., were taken and followed. A search for Sybaris would, if successful, be a splendid triumph for the Institute, and need not cost much. The Italian Government is most cordially disposed to any researches in archæology, and would no doubt materially aid the Institute in its work.

An additional difficulty in Cyrenaica would be the jealousy of the Porte, which holds suzerainty, and would stop any work undertaken without a firman, and probably would not give one. Where the Porte's authority extends, this would prevent; and where the Porte cannot go, the explorers cannot.—Yours truly,

W. J. STILLMAN.

ROME, October 13, 1886.

## THE CRISIS AT COLD HARBOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At the end of your criticism of the Comte de Paris's 'Gettysburg' occurs this phrase: "This same Confederate army . . . at Cold Harbor . . . probably came nearer conquering a peace than at any other time in its history."

The fight at Cold Harbor was an ill-judged assault and a bloody repulse; but the Confederates made no counter attacks. Indeed, they were too weak to risk an offensive-defensive movement. Had they done so, they would have found the Army of the Potomac and a corps of the Army of the James strongly intrenched and with batteries in position—a bad field for conquering a peace.

T. L.

BROOKLINE, MASS., October 22, 1886.

## TRANSFORMATION OF SURNAMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In addition to what was said on this subject in last week's *Nation*, it is interesting to note the transformation of Scottish names into French, resulting from the large immigration of Scotsmen to France during the existence of the ancient league between those two countries in the Middle Ages:

Scottish.	French.
Williamson	became D'Vallançon.
Sutherland	" Sidrelant.
Menzies	" Miniez.
Cunningham	" Coninglant.
Gowrie	" Gohory.
Crawford	" Crafort.
Drummond	" Dromont.
Turnbull	" Tourneboulli.

Etc.—Yours truly, A WISCONSIN SCOT.

MILWAUKEE, October 18, 1886.

## DREAMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The writer on "Dreams," in a recent number of the *Nation*, might have added to the illustrious names who may be quoted as having recognized the mysterious authority of dreams, that of Hawthorne, who says (in his tale of 'The

Birthmark'): "Truth often finds its way to the mind close-muffled in robes of sleep, and then speaks with uncompromising directness of matters in regard to which we practise an unconscious self-deception during our waking moments." \* \*

## WOMEN AS COMPOSERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The "women in music" question, discussed in late numbers of the *Nation*, calls to my mind a very interesting lecture on "Die Frau als Künstlerin," which Prof. W. H. Riehl, the celebrated German "Kulturhistoriker," delivered in Elberfeld, Germany, ten years ago, and which I wrote down in shorthand. I am able to give his own words, which I shall translate as literally as possible. In the first place, Riehl treats of women in poetry, then he passes to music; and, after having given an historical synopsis of the employment of female singers and players of musical instruments, he continues as follows:

"But the women I am speaking of, *i. e.*, pianists and songstresses, are reproducing artists. They execute, though in a really artistic spirit and in a revivifying way, what other people have produced. Experience in this respect has been very peculiar. Since the end of the last century there have been schools of music in Europe for both sexes, the oldest of which was the Paris Conservatory, founded at the time of the Republic on principles which still prevail, and which have been adopted in most other states. In this conservatory, students of both sexes have the opportunity of receiving the highest musical education. Girls as well as young men have to study harmony, but it is a general experience that the schools of music turn out excellent singers of both sexes and excellent women pianists as well as men pianists, but no female composers along with the male composers. The instruction is the same, the effect is different. Not that women could not learn the technical part: girls generally are more diligent and more attentive and comprehend more quickly and easily than young men do; but although young men do not comprehend so well, they feel called upon to make another use of their technical attainments than women, who, in the main, are only reproducing. There is no partiality, no trace of sexual restraint, as regards instruction; and there are a great many women possessed of all the technical acquirements for composing. Women, thus far, have not yet composed a great poetical work, a great drama or epic, nor any great musical work such as a symphony, an oratory, or a grand opera of any lasting effect. They have, indeed, composed sweet songs, but even those are but exceptional. This fact seems to prove that women's capacity does not lie in this direction."

Respectfully,

RUDOLF TOMBO, PH.D.

116 E. 110TH ST., NEW YORK,  
October 18, 1886.

## ANOTHER WORD OF APPROVAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Among the multitude of young men who will come forward to witness to the truth of what "A Boston Subscriber" asserts in the communication entitled "Some Belated Praise," allow me, although but a three-years' reader of the *Nation*, to testify to the very apparent effects of its teachings in helping me to form a political method—this irrespective of any substantive faith it may have led me to embrace.

Too much cannot be said in praise of the contents, the timely information with which each number of this journal is filled to the brim; but my greatest debt of gratitude to the *Nation* is for the training it has afforded my political conscience in the matter of going to the principle of right in public questions.

Commend me to a journal that is ever on the alert to discover whatsoever things are pure and of good repute, and, when found, is a relentless advocate in their support.

A ST. LOUIS SUBSCRIBER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., October 23, 1886.



## Notes.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE, redivivus in name, but otherwise a brand-new creation, will appear on December 15 with a January number. Succeeding issues will follow the *Century's* good example of appearing on the first of the month whose name they bear. It is to be "in the widest sense a magazine of American literature," and its pictorial illustrations will be made quite subordinate to this purpose, while in themselves representing "the most spirited, sincere, and original work done in this field."

Charles Scribner's Sons have in press a translation of Mommsen's 'History of the Roman Provinces, from the Time of Cæsar to that of Diocletian,' by Dr. W. P. Dickson; 'The Second Army Corps,' by Gen. Francis A. Walker, illustrated with portraits; 'Our Arctic Province, Alaska, and the Seal Islands,' by Henry W. Elliott, illustrated; 'Down the Islands,' a cruise to the Caribbees, by William Agnew Paton, illustrated; 'The Sentimental Calendar,' by "J. S., of Dale"; 'Talks with Socrates about Life,' by the author of 'A Day in Athens with Socrates'; 'Among the Law-makers,' a child's book, by Edmund Alton, formerly a Senatorial page; and 'Prince Peerless,' a fairy book, by Margaret Collier.

'Mexico of To-Day' is the title of a work by S. B. Griffon which Harper & Bros. will shortly bring out, with maps and illustrations.

Ticknor & Co. publish on October 28 'Persia and the Persians,' by S. G. W. Benjamin, late United States Minister to that country; 'Recollections of Eminent Men, and Other Papers,' by the late E. P. Whipple; 'Confessions and Criticisms,' by Julian Hawthorne; and 'The Evolution of the Snob,' by Thos. Sergeant Perry.

D. Appleton & Co. have issued Mr. Dobson's 'Richard Steele,' in the "English Worthies" series, already noticed by us in the English edition. They will be the American publishers also of 'Reminiscences and Opinions,' by Sir Francis Hastings Doyle, formerly Professor of Poetry at Oxford; and of 'Sketches from My Life,' by the late Admiral Hobart Pasha, edited by his widow. Finally, they announce a new American novel by George Alfred Townsend, 'Katy of Catoctin; or, the Chain-Breakers,' the significance of the secondary title lying in the fact that the story opens with John Brown at Harper's Ferry, and closes with the death of Lincoln.

'The Volcano under the City,' by a Volunteer Special (Fords, Howard & Hulbert), is said to be a graphic history of the New York draft riots of 1863. It will appear on October 20.

Thomas Whittaker is publishing a "Half-hour Library of Travel, Nature, and Science," illustrated, and especially intended for young people.

Roberts Bros. have added 'Rhoda Fleming' to their uniform edition, now in progress, of George Meredith's works; and Balzac's 'Cousin Pons' to their translations from this writer.

'Humorous Masterpieces from American Literature,' edited by Edward T. Mason (G. P. Putnam's Sons), in three handy volumes, is a pleasing collection of light literature from Irving's day. Nearly three-score authors are represented, and the work may fairly be pronounced successful, since in a case where nearly all the material to be selected from is covered by copyright, it is not to be expected that the best of each writer has been put at the editor's disposal. The aim to include so many littérateurs forbids the highest degree of excellence on the one hand, and on the other we cannot think the effort to take in so eminent a name as Longfellow's has a happy result. The whole is agreeable reading, mostly in the minor variety. By no means do the volumes contain our "masterpieces," or represent at their

best our "masters," of humor, but rather they exemplify our average product.

Mr. George Alfred Stringer has collected, under the title 'Leisure Moments in Gough Square; or, The Beauties and Quaint Conceits of Johnson's Dictionary' (Buffalo, N. Y.: Ulbrich & Kingsley, 1886), the more interesting definitions and illustrations of that monument of English literature. The selections are confined to words which are "obsolete, curious, or rarely used," and little is attempted in the way of supplementing or correcting the Doctor's learning by the results of later scholarship. The volume is thus a library curiosity, with some historic literary value. It is a convenient quarto, handsomely printed, and the edition is limited to 300 copies.

Another "leisure moment" volume is a reprint, with additions, of a hitherto privately circulated collection of anecdotes illustrating the 'Self-Consciousness of Noted Persons' (Boston: Ticknor & Co., 1887), compiled by Justin S. Morrill in his unoccupied hours. "Self-consciousness" is euphuistic for "Vanity" or "Proper Pride," as the reader pleases; but, after reading this volume, he may still hold the opinion that the belief that eminent men are vainer than other people is a popular superstition. Mediocrity is really much more concealed than genius is, and where a great nation has one Victor Hugo, every village has its *Bottom*. In the present amiable publication, half the instances are mere truth-telling, or proofs of modesty even, when measured by the man who speaks. There are some slips which indicate second-hand authorities, and others which show carelessness. Of the latter, for example, is the statement that Xenophon, (d. B. C. 350) "is the best historian of Alexander," and "tells his readers that he himself is as eminent among the Greeks for eloquence as Alexander was for arms"! This is not a solitary blunder. The citations cover a wide field of reading, and all the professions in which men achieve greatness.

It is a growing fashion for medical authors to prepare books for the immediate use of intelligent laymen, setting forth the physiology and hygiene of various organs, but wisely refraining from direct advice to the ill. Secondarily these diffuse a mild solution of knowledge, and primarily they draw attention to undiluted reservoirs of the same. Such a group is the following. 'The Hygiene of the Vocal Organs' (Macmillan & Co.) has been prepared by Dr. Morell Mackenzie, a well-known London physician, as a handbook for singers and speakers. To give advice intelligently to those not students of such subjects, complicated as it must be with much physiological and anatomical information, is a very difficult matter; and it is given more easily than it is digested. 'The Management of the Eye, Ear, and Throat' (Cassell & Co.), by Drs. Power, Field, and Bristowe, is an excellent type of this new literature. The triple authors are competent, and, as far as it goes, the work is accurate. The information it gives is useful, but as a domestic guide it will probably not be appreciated in anything approaching entirety, while for a medical student it is too verbose and it stops short of treatment. Mr. Malcom Morris's 'Management of the Skin and Hair' (Cassell & Co.) is a companion to the last named. It contains interesting information, such as all persons should know; but the most of those who should profit by it will wait until prevention of trouble must be replaced by cure.

Time was when a book bearing the title, 'Blood is Thicker than Water: A Few Days among Our Southern Brethren,' and written by a Northern doctor of divinity, would have meant one more immoral apology for the national sin of slavery. The letters, however, bound together under the above caption by the Rev. Henry M. Field, D.D. (New York: George Munroe), are a very proper

contribution to sectional good feeling, to which there is no longer any obstacle in the institutions of the country. Dr. Field's narrative also shows, as far as his observation extended, that the South has no animosity to cherish on account of the war. He was the spokesman of the party of capitalists who travelled in a parlor car to Atlanta, Chattanooga, Nashville, Birmingham, Montgomery, New Orleans, Vicksburg, Memphis, and Louisville, and had many occasions to contrast the present with the past without eliciting any dissent. There is not much that is new in what he wrote home to the *Evangelist*: perhaps the Louisiana salt-mine on the Gulf at Avery's Island, where Mr. Armour (of the party) found "three of his refrigerator cars waiting to be loaded for their great cattle-yards in Kansas City," is as novel and as interesting as anything. Dr. Field heard and relates many stories of the war by prominent participants, and visited several battle-fields. On page 118 he transfers to the Old South Church in Boston the cannon-ball that lodged in the tower of the Brattle Street Church.

Latham, Alexander & Co., on issuing the thirteenth annual edition of their 'Cotton Movement and Fluctuations, 1881 to 1886,' have put it on the market for sale. Besides the cotton reports of the several States and the customary statistical tables, there is a chapter on the cotton trade of Egypt. A photographic view of the Sub-Treasury in this city, with its Washington statue, and a portrait of the Swiss cotton statistician, Otto Trumpler, embellish the volume.

Part ii of the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for 1884 is wholly given up to the National Museum, whose history is set forth, and its current operations in great detail. A number of ethnological illustrations accompany the text.

We have received the volume of 'United States Naval Uniform Regulations' for 1886. One looks almost in vain among the plates of officers and men for a distinctly American face—a fact attributable rather to the artist than to the well-known heterogeneity of our sailors.

Mr. Charles H. Levermore's 'Town and City Government of New Haven' forms the tenth issue of the fourth series of the Johns Hopkins University Studies, edited by Dr. H. B. Adams. The subject of dual municipal governments is a curious one, and New Haven furnishes but one example out of many. Mr. Levermore does not treat it abstractly, but historically, tracing the action of the two powers step by step—for example, giving the town's resolutions against the admission of Missouri, and noting the city's silence on that burning question.

The consideration due to the "first number" of any new literary enterprise may well be accorded to *American Art* (Boston).

None such is needed by the *American Book-maker* (New York: Howard Lockwood), now in its third volume, and a very readable and instructive monthly.

The double number, 8-9, of the eleventh volume of the *Library Journal* contains the papers and other proceedings of the Librarians' Conference at Milwaukee in August and September last. Any cultivated mind will be interested in them. The variety of topics is remarkable.

With the November number *Lippincott's Magazine* apparently returns to the old practice of appearing two weeks in advance of its nominal time of publication. The present number, which is the first of the new volume, has the usual assortment of fiction, experience-papers, and notes, with a rambling article on the recent earthquake, by Felix L. Oswald, or, more properly, on some general features of earthquakes, with especial reference to prognostications of them by signs of nature, the instincts of animals, etc. He does not add anything, that is at once certain and of interest, to the record of phenomena. The num-