

Nobody ever denied this fact. From this marriage came two children, one of whom, Claire Clémence de Maillé-Brézé, married the Great Condé (February 7, 1641). Condé had in vain striven against his father, who was anxious to secure the good will of the great Cardinal, and obliged his son to contract this marriage. Condé never ceased to protest that he had never given his consent to this union except under fear of the violence of the Cardinal and out of deference to the absolute wish of his father. The Princess of Condé was only thirteen years old when she was married, and still played with her dolls; she became in time a lively brunette. A child was born a little while after the battle of Rocroy; two others were born afterwards, but died young. Condé, however, neglected his wife. He was convinced that his marriage was a blot on his character; he could not reconcile himself to it. The Princess was much affected by his desertion, and she became a monomaniac. The secret was well kept and her mania remained unknown. M. Allaire cites, however, a report of an English political agent, taken from the State Paper Office (published in an 'Essay on the Life of the Great Condé,' by Lord Mahon, 1842), which tells of an incident that allowed Condé to shut up his wife with the consent of the King. "La Bruyère," says M. Allaire, "speaks of this affair as one of those curious cases which he does not understand: 'Is it on account of the secret or from an hypochondriac taste, that one woman loves a servant; another woman a monk, and Dorinne her doctor?' La Bruyère adds: 'For a woman of the world, a gardener is a gardener, a mason is a mason; for some women who live in great retirement, a gardener is a man, a mason is a man. Everything is temptation for those who fear temptation.'" I ask here, By what right does M. Allaire apply this passage to the case of the Princess of Condé? It is enough for him that such an application could be made, but was it really made by the author of the 'Characters'?

The Princess became incurable; she was kept in a park at Châteauroux in Berri, where she was treated with care, and was surrounded with devoted servants. Her son, Henri Jules de Bourbon, called M. le Duc, was never shut up, but he was very eccentric, very irrational; for a moment he excited great hopes in his father, but he was a failure. He never could learn the first elements of the art of war; he had no equilibrium, no balance; he was light, irrational, full of caprices; he was incoherent, dissipated. As long as Condé lived, he was kept within bounds; after his father's death M. le Duc became uncontrollable, and he had frequently terrible fits of anger, which, says Saint-Simon, resembled at the same time epilepsy and apoplexy. He died in one of these fits, at the age of forty-two, in full carnival, making horrible grimaces.

Condé had always had great fears of his son, seeing in him the temper of his mother, and it was for this reason that he took such great care of the education of his grandson, the Duc de Bourbon, and placed near him such men as La Bruyère. It was also to please his son, and to keep him contented, that he consented to the marriage of the Duc de Bourbon with Mlle. de Nantes, the daughter *légitimée* of Louis XIV. and of Mme. de Montespan, though he saw the vice of such an alliance; he hoped, also, to bring fresh blood into his family, and to counteract the influence of the blood of the Brézés. He showed great affection for the young Duchess, who was amiable, sensible, who led a regular life, and who protected her husband against the evil influences of the little court of the Dauphin.

After the death of Condé, La Bruyère remained attached to the Duke and Duchess of Bourbon, with the functions of gentleman in waiting. The

leisure of his new life gave him time to finish his 'Characters.' He read his work to a few friends, and among them to Boileau, and, after some hesitation, took it to the printer. The book had immediately a great success, especially in the ranks of the high clergy. The pious Catholics understood at once the scheme of the work, which only shows what is false and ridiculous in the world in order to bring the mind of man into the higher atmosphere of truth. Bussy-Rabutin, who was a pure *mondain*, wrote, however, a charming letter on the book, praised it, and expressed a great desire to make the acquaintance of the author. M. le Prince (since the death of Condé M. le Duc had assumed this name) did not much admire the 'Caractères,' and simply approved of them. The success of the first three editions added a little lustre to the House of Condé. La Bruyère was one of his gentlemen; he was proud but unselfish, unambitious; perhaps the Prince could make some use of his talents and of his good will.

The success of his 'Caractères' was a great encouragement to La Bruyère; and it may be said that the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh editions form altogether a new work, and the most important. In these editions La Bruyère touched boldly some of the most important questions, he passed in review all classes of society, he spoke of the people, he deplored war, he showed the advantages of good government, he prophesied revolution, he described the follies of the court and of the world, he entered into the highest philosophical problems, he gave the history of his own soul, his illusions in regard to life, love, glory. His work had come to its present state of perfection (the word perfection is not too strong) when he died on the 11th of May, 1696, at Versailles, at the moment when he was preparing a ninth edition, which had no additions, but only a few corrections.

Correspondence.

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To any one who has had experience, as a scribe of a local conference, in gathering the religious statistics from the individual churches, your recent article on "Religious Statistics" is calculated to provoke a smile. You object to the simple denials of your assertions by the *Independent*, and call for specific proofs, though it is hard to see why the denials of a paper familiar with religious matters are not all that is called for in reply to the assertions of a paper not familiar with them, till those assertions are supported by some specific proof. In my own denomination (Congregational), and I suppose in others, it is customary to apportion the amount to be raised for benevolences and the expenses of our denominational machinery among the churches in proportion to their membership; and the pressure which is felt by the churches is toward reporting the membership as small as possible. But this is a point on which minute investigation is necessary to reach any results which can be put into figures. When, however, you say, "The lists of membership given in denominational year-books are notoriously inflated, as are also the returns of church benevolences," you in the latter clause get into the range of figures ready to hand; and a slight examination of the last (or any other) Congregational Year-Book will show how wide of the truth your statement is, at least so far as the Congregational churches are concerned.

Thus, according to our last Year-Book (*cf.* p. 210 with pp. 43-53), the amount which the churches

report as given the preceding year to foreign missions is \$302,395.19, while our Board of Foreign Missions actually received in donations from the living \$428,769.98. The donations to the American Missionary Association were \$191,698.35, of which only \$114,283.36 got into the church reports. The cash receipts of our Home Missionary Society and New West Education Commission were \$500,237.81 besides over \$50,000 in supplies; but the church reports include only \$279,433.40. In this last case, but not in the others, legacies are included in the receipts; but legacies, as well as supplies not in cash, are often included in church reports, and may correctly be so included.

These figures certainly do not show that "the returns of church benevolences are inflated," and would seem sufficient till you have something besides assertions to offer on the other side. As sometimes the total is reported without specifying the separate causes, the column of "Total Benevolences" is more nearly complete; though this column (which includes all gifts to local and undenominational causes) is far below the facts.

Respectfully yours, E. W. MILLER.
BIG RAPIDS, MICH., December 25, 1886.

[The trouble with Mr. Miller seems to be the same as is the case with the *Independent*, not seeing that ignorance, however extensive, must always be of less value than knowledge even if limited. What he has to urge against the main contention of our article, he admits to be of little consequence. We do not know why the conference to which he refers did not follow the usual practice of going on the basis of the last reported membership of the churches. But the Congregationalists are especially weak in the matter of statistics, as we shall see. At any rate, we presume that Mr. Miller would assign no more weight to his exceptional experience, probably among missionary churches, than to the remarkable argument of the *Independent*—the only one it has thus far made use of—to the effect that there can be no inflation of the statistics of church membership, because the one denomination that investigated its rolls found that its figures had been decidedly inflated.]

Our correspondent contents himself with combating an incidental and entirely subordinate remark of ours—a single clause, in fact, of the whole article. Now we make no boast of being "familiar with religious matters," but it would be a very slight familiarity which could not show that Mr. Miller's figures are misleading and worthless. Why did he not read, or, if he read, why did he not believe, the statements of the editors of the Congregational Year-Book appended to their summaries of church benevolences? They say (p. 211, Notes 3 and 4): "The amounts reported above for the specific objects of benevolence are such as are reported by the State organizations and are below facts. They are inserted as indicating proportions, but are not worth adding up. It will be seen that the reports are very imperfect. Many churches make no report." Mr. Miller seems to have thought that such confessedly untrustworthy figures were not only "worth adding up" (they are not added up in the Year-Book, it should be understood), but also worth basing a serious argument upon. We see but one possible excuse for him. If he meant to argue that the benevolent returns of Congregational churches are not inflated because there are no returns at all deserving the

name, that his denomination is so loosely organized that it cannot secure the facts from the local churches, we are willing to admit that he has made his point, though he has most ingeniously concealed it; but we wonder that he went at it in such a roundabout way. In any other aspect of the case, we see nothing for it but to accuse him of presenting figures that are either ridiculous or intended to deceive. Furthermore, the Year Book itself makes it clear that gifts of \$387,000, not \$302,000, as he says, were credited to the churches, since p. 43 states that the former sum has been "acknowledged in the *Missionary Herald*."

Now, if Mr. Miller is really willing to rest the case upon an argument of the kind he advances as "sufficient," we commend to his attention the corresponding statistics of the Presbyterian Church, whose polity admits of a very near approach to accuracy in such matters. In the minutes of the General Assembly of this year, gifts by the churches to home missions are returned aggregating \$760,947. But the financial report of the Home Mission Board shows that of this amount no more than \$498,662 reached its treasury. We understand perfectly that a part of this discrepancy of \$262,285 is to be accounted for on the score of "supplies" sent directly to needy ministers, but, to account for it all in this way, the gifts would have to be at the rate of \$191 to each of the men commissioned by the Board, or rather at the rate of \$400, inasmuch as not half of them are favored with "boxes"; and we leave it to Mr. Miller if any of the home missionaries of his acquaintance would not surrender his "supplies" for two or three years in lieu of such a sum in cash. The facts are similar in the case of Presbyterian foreign missions. The minutes report contributions of \$651,160, while the Foreign Mission Board acknowledges but \$539,638. In this case "supplies" cannot be invoked to any appreciable extent, to account for the deficiency of \$112,522. Part of it, no doubt, goes to such non-Presbyterian missions as the McAll in France, or the Van Meter in Rome, which survives to prey upon the churches, even after its frequent exposures; a fraction, we suppose, finds its way to the pockets of irresponsible Armenians and Hindus who are for years "on the point of returning to preach the Gospel to their countrymen," and meanwhile pick up a comfortable living among American Christians; as to the rest, we confess we are as curious as the missionary secretaries to know what becomes of it.

These are some of the facts we had in mind at the time of penning the clause so much objected to. Another one like them is the practice of some city pastors who, when the time comes to make the yearly returns, gather together the reports of public charities—hospitals, asylums, orphanages, etc.—and put down, under the head of "miscellaneous benevolences" of their churches, all gifts which they find credited to any member of their churches or congregations. We suppose we ought to add, to prevent, if possible, the charge that we accuse ministers and churches of intentional dishonesty, a denial of intending any such thing. We simply maintain our former position, that the statistics of church benevolence,

like those of church membership, need to be sifted before they can be used with such positiveness as that with which they are often cited. That is, Christian apologists who are working the statistical argument so hard nowadays, ought to be a little less dogmatic in proving that Christian faith is not waning from the fact that it "lays upon the altar" such and such sums in "hard cash." This would be true, even if the discrepancies pointed out above were to be fully explained.—ED. NATION.]

HISTORY AND THE GROUP SYSTEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The statement from Prof. Palmer's article which you quote in your issue of December 23, has left upon some minds a false impression with respect to the limitation of our undergraduate courses in English and American history to law students and students of modern languages. As a matter of fact, there is no obstacle in the group-system to any student electing three hours a week of French and English history for one year, and the same amount of English and American constitutional history. While absolving the requirements of a particular group of studies, say the classical, students are not only allowed, but are sometimes encouraged, to elect historical courses in addition. To say, therefore, that "One does not feel quite easy in allowing nobody but a lawyer or a devotee of modern languages to read a page of English or American history" is expressing a discontent which is hardly warranted by the elasticity of the group-system.

I may perhaps be allowed to add that all undergraduate applicants for admission to the university are first examined orally in American history; if successful, they are then admitted to the written examination for matriculation, which, in history, requires a text-book knowledge of either (1) England and the United States, or (2) Greece and Rome, as the candidate may elect. The history of England and of the United States is usually offered for matriculation, even by classical students. Every undergraduate is further required to elect a class course in either ancient history or general European history. Classical and historical students elect the former; scientific students, the latter. Upon such historical foundations, which, with other English studies, underlie the entire group-system, our own special group of historical and political studies is founded. Each of these two main subjects occupies two years, with five hours each week. Upon this general and special undergraduate work is based the graduate curriculum of three years in history and political science. Graduates from other colleges frequently elect undergraduate courses in our group, but our own undergraduates are not allowed to elect graduate work.

Very respectfully, HERBERT B. ADAMS.
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, December 23, 1886.

DOMESTIC SERVICE FROM A WESTERN POINT OF VIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In response to the question asked in the *Nation* of the 23d inst., "Why do not intelligent and refined women more frequently choose house service as a support?" it might be answered, For the same reason that intelligent and refined men do not pursue the humbler callings in life. Capable and refined women can do better for themselves; more limitedly than men, it is true, but better every year and with more hope. A few years ago some six or seven employments only were open to women. There are now in the neighborhood of 100. In our own city one facto-

ry alone employed during the last season some 200 women, between the ages of fourteen and sixty. These earned from fifty cents to one dollar and a half per day, and in the evening passed out to their homes their own mistresses until the next morning. All these changing and widening influences must bring confusion to housekeepers, if for no other reason than that the demand exceeds the supply.

More than forty years ago, De Tocqueville noticed, in connection with our democratic institutions, the social inquietude and helplessness arising out of the domestic-service problem. He decided that in our country, where nothing is hereditary, not even money, it is impossible for a working class to exist. One whom you employ to-day may be your equal to-morrow. The men and women who for the time being work for you "rebel in their hearts against a subordination to which they have subjected themselves and from which they derive actual profit. In every household, secret and intestine warfare is going on between powers ever rivals and suspicious of one another." The forty years between then and now have but increased the difficulty. The colored people, in this section at least, and the native whites have almost entirely abandoned any kind of work which keeps them from home at night, and the whole business is given over to foreigners who, catching the spirit of unrest which governs all classes in the United States, yield but a temporary and a capricious service.

With regard to the conditions named, it would be well to ask if in factories, schools, and businesses generally the employees frame the rules. If not advisable in business, it is less so in domestic life, where each household is necessarily a law unto itself, and where the object is not to have some one whom you may kindly instruct or carefully advise, but to secure a faithful and a capable girl. Were school committees to provide for the welfare of the teachers rather than the pupils, hoping in this way to obtain more favorable and judicious teaching, it would be deemed the most farcical of means to secure the desired end. The rigor of the school law is such that teachers dare not do other than their duty. In Cincinnati, for instance, a few minutes' tardiness on the part of a teacher is mulcted as a quarter of a day's absence; but who ever heard of a deduction from wages appearing as a factor in the economy of a household for tardy meals, or absences, or comings home late?

Were social life better organized, it would be more powerful. Many rough issues which men prevent by combination, women are subjected to by isolation. In their case there is no majesty of the law to offend, but in every instance it is the personal, intimate relation of "you and me." If then, as a class, women were more dignified, if cases of disobedience were met with prompt dismissal, girls would discover their zeal and their interests united, and learn to prize the sense of honor more than they do now. Every lady would gladly give to a girl that sympathy and assistance which she extends to a friend, could she, in return, receive the same sympathy and assistance. The unfortunate point is, that in the transitional state in which we live, the girl uses her position for her own ends, and counts it no disgrace to be whirled from place to place, while the oftentimes dishonorable expedients to which ladies resort to secure help would cause a philanthropist interested in feminine advancement to shudder.

Life has many cares, but one of its heaviest to an educated woman is the necessarily constant intercourse with the "stranger within her gates," a relationship demanding continual forbearance, and returning, at its best, but a melancholy satisfaction. One may be "baptized into the sense of all conditions," but no state will prove secur-

ty against a family of little children or their necessary wants. The training of little children and the active supervision of everything within her borders constitute at times, it would seem, a complex and an unequal share of life's duties for a woman. But with kind and efficient servants, she could retain in a measure her accomplishments, and find, through all discouragements, "some sparkles of a better hope which elder days would happily bring forth." But it is to be feared that until this new-world society outgrows its primitive conditions, and makes for itself a condition of things stable and conservative, or protects itself by coöperative schemes successfully carried out, it will remain in its present chaotic state, and burden the world with its jeremiads upon domestic service. E. B.

KEOKUK, IA., December 28, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The communication in your last issue relating to "Domestic Service" and signed "A. S.," gives one a fair idea of the circumstances under which the "refined, intelligent girl" would engage to do housework for a woman. To express it more plainly, this superior young person would consent to perform the duties which in modest households are assigned by the mistress to her daughters, and in consideration for this noble act of self-abnegation she demands—the use of a suite of rooms, board, and money in amount from two to four dollars per week.

Now it seems to me the great demand is, not for "intelligent, refined girls," who are barely willing under impossible conditions to enter domestic service, but for strong, honest girls, who are not ashamed to wash, iron, scrub, or cook. I repeat, the general demand is for servants; and as servants "imported" young women are superior to the Americans, and will continue to be preferred until our own countrywomen are in condition to replace them; and this will not be until the present supply of American workingwomen is furnished with an amount of common sense exceeding its degree of "refinement." Good "help" we must have, and if we cannot find it at home we must get a larger supply from abroad. These despised foreigners seem to appreciate their opportunity, and so, to express it vulgarly, will their "sisters and their cousins and their aunts."

Despite all this talk of abuse received by workingwomen at the hands of the mistress, it in fact amounts to little more than the complaints of some vain, silly domestics, who have perhaps been frustrated in a desire to "lord it" over an employer possibly ignorant in household affairs; chagrined because unnoticed by father or son; angered because the impropriety of entertaining many "followers" has been suggested. Each woman of this class is anxious to appear to the world as a "lady," and, because of her ignorant attraction for the word, seeks at all costs to assume the finery of a woman of wealth, and, in time, forgets even that originally her aim was to win for herself respect and esteem.

My circle of acquaintances is large, and I know not one woman who does not gladly allow her servants at least the following privileges: the use of a comfortable bed and decent room; appointed hours for meals; for entertaining friends, the use of a warm, well lighted kitchen, that can be made as attractive as desired; one afternoon and evening of each week for leaving home; any time as their own at home when the work has been properly done; the part of Sunday that can be conveniently given up to them; money, in acknowledgment for services, from two to five dollars per week.

The women who wish to monopolize all the light work, and leave all the hard work for

some one else to perform, are not deserving of sympathy. E. H.

MICHIGAN, December 29, 1886.

BISHOP COXE'S HALF-KNOWLEDGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As your correspondent, "E. M. D.," has recalled attention to Bishop Coxe's singular manifesto in the *October Forum*, it seems worth while to point out more directly some of the errors of his article, illustrating the well-worn fact that eminence in one department of knowledge does not necessarily constitute authority in another. The "illogical and vulgar" use of the adverb *to* and the infinitive, which he finds in Mr. Gladstone's speech, he has also noted in two or three other writers, even twice in *Temple Bar*, and, suggesting that Dickens may have introduced this locution into England from American "tap-rooms," asks: "Is there a reputable authority for this treatment of the verb before the days of Dickens?"

Now Dickens has been made to answer for many sins of his pen, but he should not be charged with this attempt to "debase his mother tongue." This treatment of the verb is as old as Wyclif, and is found in the works of such writers as Bishop Doane, Sir Thomas Browne, Dr. Johnson, Burke, Southey, Coleridge, Lamb, and De Quincey. These certainly are "reputable authorities," and (since the days of Dickens) Ruskin, Spencer, Browning, Matthew Arnold, and Leslie Stephen have thought the form reputable enough for their writings.

Bishop Coxe expresses great surprise at finding that "such a scholar as Liddon does not disdain to use" that "abominable barbarism" *reliable*. Has he never found it in the works of Cardinal Newman, Dean Mansel, J. S. Mill, Leslie Stephen, and Mr. Gladstone, who use it without scruple? Certainly he cannot have read Dr. Hall's volume, "On Able and Reliable," which thoroughly vindicates the reputation of this word. He is also very severe upon the use of such "vulgarisms" as *talented*, *lengthy*, *being built*, etc., as evidence of the "rapid defilement and deterioration" of the language. It may shock him to know that the grammars in most extended use in the schools to-day have added a Progressive Passive Form to the regular conjugation to accommodate just such "improper" phrases as *is being built*.

But it is especially surprising that the Bishop, while appealing to his readers "to stand up for the purity of our noble language," should be very careless with his own purity. He cannot endure the established coinage *talented*, but gives us "Angliloquent," coined "on my own theory." He abominates *reliable*, but uses "rationale" where he means simply *reason*. He says that Canning "confessed," on a certain memorable occasion, when, as a matter of fact, he only *acknowledged*. He objects to the "vulgar use" of the word *influential*, but, on the same page, uses the very illogical provincialism "in this connection"—a New England phrase which, says Bartlett, "has become quite shocking to nervous people." Many other infelicities might be noticed, since (to borrow the writer's own language) "I have thrown out these examples from a somewhat extensive collection of specimens." Enough has been said to show that the verbal habits of Bishop Coxe, though perhaps not as "vulgar" as Mr. Gladstone's, are certainly as "illogical," so far as illustrated in this article. However effective the intuitive method of propounding truth may be in the realm of morals and theology, it ought not to be rashly applied to the facts of linguistic usage. And as to matters of opinion and taste, one is inclined to believe that Bishop Coxe

would have been less peremptory in his charges of vulgarity, had he fully perceived the wisdom of his own remark: "No individual has any right to engraft his personal peculiarities upon the common tongue."—Respectfully yours,

J. W. A.

BROOKLYN, December 29, 1886.

TOLSTOY'S "AUTOBIOGRAPHY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of your remarks on page 545 of this week's *Nation* on Tolstoi, permit me to say that the French titles 'Mémoires' and 'Souvenirs' were publishers' inventions, for purposes best known to themselves. I have before me the fifth edition of the complete works of Tolstoi, in Russian (excepting, of course, 'My Religion,' which circulates in Russia only secretly), printed in Moscow in twelve volumes, dated 1886. The whole of the first volume is taken up with *three distinct works, apparently independent of one another*. They are entitled as follows: (1) *Childhood. A Story. Written in 1852.* (2) *Boyhood. A Story. Written in 1854.* (3) *Youth. A Story. Written in 1855-57.* The Russian word is *povest*, which is properly a *narrative*, as distinguished from *razskaz*, which might be translated *A Tale*; if, indeed, there really is any difference between the two. Whoever sees in these titles anything more than what they indicate—such as an autobiography of Tolstoi, for which this work erroneously passes—has indeed a valuable faculty, but it is scarcely one compatible with a clear perception of facts as they are. Many, perhaps very many, scenes have undoubtedly a *basis* in Tolstoi's own life; but this is far from making the work an autobiography. Would it be right to omit the title from 'David Copperfield,' and, without further qualification or explanation, print it as an autobiography of Dickens? Of late, especially, whenever Tolstoi has had anything to say about himself, he has not been in the habit of concealing himself behind fictitious names and titles of "stories." It must, further, be remembered that as an artist Tolstoi is the exact counterpart of Turgeneff; if the latter's art was eminently objective, the former's is eminently subjective. Hence Turgeneff's first great work was a series of sketches of things and men without him—the 'Memoirs of a Sportsman'; Tolstoi's first great work was a series of sketches of things principally within him—for the three stories form together a continued subjective analysis of the growth of a human soul on Russian soil.

As you see from the above, the proper dates for these sketches are not 1851, but 1852-57; nor can these years be called "the years immediately following the Crimean war." If my memory serves me well, the Crimean war began in 1853 and ended early in 1856. The work, moreover, bears no traces of being "abruptly dropped." The work ends with the first half of the hero's youth; the narrator was seized with a sudden moral impulse, and says, "How long that impulse lasted, what was its nature, and how much it contributed to my further moral development, I shall relate in the following happier half of my youth." This promise of more may have been made *bona fide*, or may have been designed as part of the "plot." Be that as it may, on the face of it this is by no means an "abrupt" ending.

These points may seem trivial. But when one constantly hears of details of Tolstoi's life which on closer inspection prove fictitious, it is interesting to trace them back to loose statements of faithful but untrained students of their favorite author.—Respectfully,

IVAN PANIN.

WELLESLEY, MASS., December 30, 1886.

THE INTER-STATE COMMERCE BILL. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your number for December 23 it seems to us that Mr. Ashley made several errors in his letter on the Inter-State Commerce Bill.

He tells us "that if the short-haul principle is adhered to, not a grain of Dakota wheat will reach the mechanics of New York." Now, on the contrary, granting that it cannot be carried quite as cheaply, perhaps, under this bill, we claim (and the facts and figures will bear us out in the statement) that, in case of the passage of the bill, Dakota wheat would reach Duluth by paying much less freight than it now does, and from there it would be carried to the "mechanics of New York" for less money than now. The wheat receipts at Duluth are almost as large as those at Chicago, and, for the week ending November 13, were 543,000 bushels, as opposed to 634,000 at Chicago. The passage of this bill would make Duluth the great depot for Dakota wheat, and right then would commence the only real competition—that between carrying by water and by railroads.

We cannot show more clearly the futility and uselessness of pooling and competition in the matter of reducing railroad rates than by quoting a part of an open letter from the "Mankato Jobbers' Union" to the Railroad Commissioners of this State:

"We claim that no point in southern Minnesota is by nature or geography tributary to any city north of a direct line to the foot of Lake Michigan except possibly it be to a point at the head of Lake Superior, and that any adjustment of traffic rates which would force us to pay such tribute is contrary to public interest, is based on unsound business principles, and is illegal and unjust discrimination; and furthermore we allege that the C., St. P., M. and O., the C. and N. W., and the C., M. and St. P. Railroad Companies and other roads are to-day, and have been in all their past, so adjusting their tariffs from lake points as to enforce this unjust discrimination.

"We allege that the C., M. and St. P. R. R. crossing the Mississippi at La Crescent carries its Chicago freight, of all classes, north to Minneapolis, 139 miles, for a lower rate than it will the same freight to Mound Prairie, 16 miles west, or to any point on its lines west of this last-named place. We allege that the C. and N. W. R. R. carries freight from the same point to Minneapolis, 420 miles, at a lower rate than it will carry the same freight to Utica, 319 miles, or to any other point on its western line."

Respectfully, J. A. NOWELL.
MANKATO, MINN., December 27, 1886.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Friends of civil-service reform are scarce in these parts, and somewhat timid in making known their existence; but there is a time when patience ceases to be a virtue, and silence causes suspicion of imbecility. At present there seems to be a proper occasion to break that silence and give vent to one's dissatisfaction.

The subject of this complaint is the course of the Administration in regard to the Federal offices in this district, which has been such as to give the lie to its promises of reform and to the claims of its stanch friends, the Mugwumps. The latter looked upon President Cleveland's election as a triumph of sound political principles over the old spoils doctrine; they hoped to benefit their cause thereby, to be able to point to the practical application of their teachings, and thus to make converts. In this they have been most grievously disappointed, as will appear from a short statement of facts.

The district in which Detroit is situated has four principal Federal offices, viz.: the Pension Office, Post-office, Internal-Revenue Office, and the Custom-house—all of which were formerly held by Republicans. The latter have all been removed from office, and Democrats have been

appointed in their places; and the reason for and manner of doing it have, in three cases out of the four, been in accordance with the old approved principles of the spoils system. The former Postmaster was an exemplary officer, as acknowledged by everybody, irrespective of party, excepting the Republican campaign managers, who were mad at him because he refused to employ the influence of his office in their interests. But off came his head, and an old Democratic war-horse, who knew nothing about the business of the office, received his place. The Mugwumps felt hurt, but did not complain.

The Collector of Internal Revenue was the type of an old-time politician, who used his office for two purposes only, one to draw a fat salary with great diligence, and the other to fight the battles of the grand old party. His attacks on Cleveland during the Presidential campaign were worthy of a denizen of Five Points, and he was most deservedly kicked out of his office. But the man who received his place was one of the most active wire-pullers in the Democratic ranks, and notorious for having used his position as Clerk of the Superior Court of this city for the purpose of transforming fresh immigrants into full-fledged Democratic citizens, to the detriment of the other business of the office; and his appointment could only be considered as a reward for most offensive partisanship. This, again, was a sad illustration of the application of reform.

There remained the Collector of Customs. He, too, had been an active and offensive partisan during the campaign of '84, and his removal from office on that score would have been justifiable. As special protégé of the Senator from this city he was not molested until recently, when his office was given to a Mr. Campau, a young man of large fortune and social prominence, one of those who might have been expected to entertain higher views of politics than the pot-house orators. The friends of reform were inclined to consider his appointment a good one, and offset it against the former bad ones; but alas! they were doomed to be disappointed again, as will appear from the following, taken from the *Detroit Free Press*, the Democratic and Administration organ of this city:

COLLECTOR CAMPAU'S PLANS.

He Will Fill the Sixty Positions Under Him with Competent Democratic Officials.

D. J. Campau last night received notification from Washington of the confirmation by the Senate of his appointment as Collector of the Port of Detroit. Mr. Campau said to a representative of the *Free Press*, who called upon him to learn what steps he would take towards the reconstruction of the force of deputies under him, that he felt exceedingly gratified that the confirmation was made so soon after the opening of the session, and wholly without effort on his part. Further, Mr. Campau said that as a Democrat he should consider it a duty, both to his party and the office, to supply every position under him with a good Democratic official, and that it would only be a question of time when such changes would be made. He now has on file just 600 applications, mostly from Detroit, each of which are from Democrats qualified to fill the positions sought for. The Collector has sixty appointments in his gift, and says that as he is responsible for the work done in the various departments, he would much rather have men of his own political complexion to deal with. The entire matter of selecting men as to their respective qualifications is left to him, the name of each being sent to the Secretary of the Treasury at Washington for approval. There is no reason to fear that Mr. Campau's administration will not be satisfactory to all Democrats.

One could possibly overlook one or even two mistakes in disposing of four important offices, but such a complete disregard of principles and promises in three cases out of four makes it imperative to call attention to them, in order to avert from Independents the suspicion of dense obtuseness or of blind and slavish admiration of their successful candidate. Undoubtedly the

President has been misled by his advisers from this State, and we still are justified in attributing his errors to no bad intention. Mugwumps still believe in his honesty of purpose, but they may well begin to doubt his ability to carry out his intentions.—Yours respectfully, WM. E. H.

DETROIT, MICH., December 27, 1886.

SECRET SYMPATHY WITH CRIME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have a psychological question to propose. What is the exact state of mind, under analysis, of the small newspaper writer who always speaks of crime jocosely? Everybody must have observed it as one of the many ways in which the vulgar newspaper tends to vulgarize the public. For example, why "boodle" Aldermen? Certainly nothing is gained by slang terms for criminal offences; and it is noticeable that well-bred people are not in the habit of using them. The humorous or jocular view of any occurrence commonly implies a kind of careless, good-natured sympathy with the actor. What does this habit of jocular and slangy reference to criminals indicate in the third-rate newspaper writer, if not a secret and constitutional sympathy with crime? E. R. S.

THE EFFECT OF OIL ON STORMY WATERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: An account of Prof. Thurston's discussion of this subject in the *Nation*, November 25, 1886, page 437, ends, after mentioning Prof. Thurston's hope that the sea may thus lose many of its terrors, with the curious statement that "it would do much to undermine one of the chief arguments against thought-transference, namely, that it is impossible that it should be true, for it is impossible that if it were true it should not have been discovered before."

A belief in such an action is, however, of ancient date, and towards the end of last century special attention was attracted to the subject. There is a long memoir in the *Transactions of the Brussels Academy* (about 1780), in which the subject is treated both historically and experimentally. The author traces the history back through the Dutch and Norwegian whalers, if I remember rightly—I have not the volume at hand—to Pliny.

Among others, B. Franklin wrote "of the stilling of waves by means of oil" (*Phil. Trans. Abr.* xiii. p. 568, 1774).

THOMAS WINDSOR.

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

Notes.

THE Century Co.'s war book, to be called 'Battles and Leaders of the Civil War,' will be published early in the spring, by subscription. In addition to all the war papers by Gens. Grant, McClellan, Pope, Buell, Beauregard, Longstreet, and other prominent leaders on both sides which have appeared in the *Century*, the book will contain many papers heretofore unprinted, and will form a continuous illustrated history of the civil war, written by the chief participants. The Century Co. will endeavor to make it one of the handsomest subscription books ever published.

Ginn & Co., Boston, have decided not to import the sheets of Minto's 'Manual of English Prose Literature,' but to manufacture it themselves and to publish it at a reduced price.

Cupples, Upham & Co. will publish at once 'The Creed of Andover Theological Seminary,' by Rev. D. T. Fiske, D.D.—a pamphlet which has been more than once printed.

Miss Kate Hillard, who has for some years been making a special study of Dante, and who is