

is true of half or more of the favored number whose careers he has traced, sustains the theory that fully nine-tenths of all fail.

That wealth does not, as a rule, long remain in the families of those who acquire it, is clearly shown by Mr. Walker's investigations. There were 30 prominent manufacturers in 1840—the "capitalists" of that day—of whom 14 either died or retired with property, but only 3 of the sons of the 30 now have any property or died leaving any. There were 75 manufacturers in 1850, of whom 30 either died or retired with property, but only 6 of the sons of the 75 now have any property or died leaving any. There were 107 manufacturers in 1860, of whom 60 died or retired with property, but only 8 of the sons of the 107 now have any property or died leaving any.

It naturally follows that the business men of the present generation in Worcester include but a very small number of men who are sons of the business men of a generation ago. In 1878 there were 176 individuals engaged in 10 of the leading manufacturing industries, and only 15 of these 176 were themselves sons of manufacturers. The proportion proved to be almost the same during the early portion of the period, but the fact was not so striking or significant when so many branches of manufacturing industry were new as it is now.

It is a corollary of this that the business men of to-day are the poor workingmen of a few years ago, who have pushed themselves to the front by their energy and industry. It will surprise nobody to learn that, of the 30 manufacturers of 1840, 28 began as journeymen. But it will surprise many people, who have been told that the poor man no longer has a chance, to find that the proportion was quite as great a generation later, no less than 161 of the 176 manufacturers of 1878 having begun as journeymen. Nearly half of them went into Worcester from farms, and most of the rest were the sons of machinists, carpenters, blacksmiths, etc.

It is much to be wished that the labor agitators, from Henry George down, would study and digest such figures as these, and then tell the workingmen what they signify. The labor agitator is constantly talking about the "bloated capitalists," and cultivating the idea among workingmen that employers constitute a caste of wealth. The truth is, that 90 or 95 per cent. of all capitalists—that is, men who carry on business upon their own account—fail; a large proportion of them after a long and melancholy struggle to keep their heads above water and pay the wages of the men whom they employ, and who never suffer one-tenth the frequent anxiety of the employer, wondering all the week where he is going to get the money to pay them Saturday night. The labor agitator—even so intelligent a man as Henry George—is constantly talking about the impossibility of the workingman's forcing his way among the capitalists. The truth is, that the capitalists of to-day are themselves the workingmen of twenty-five years ago, as the workingmen of to-day will be the capitalists of twenty-five years hence.

MR. ARNOLD'S DISCOMFORT.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD'S article on "Civilization in the United States," as it appeared in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Smalley, the London correspondent of the *Tribune*, introduced to the American public on Sunday week with a somewhat amusing wail of mingled sorrow and indignation. The subject as Mr. Arnold gives it out, "Civilization in the United States," or, as he explains it, "the success of the Americans in solving the human problem," is really a tremendous one, which one would hardly expect a man of Mr. Arnold's intellectual experience to attack in sixteen pages of a monthly review. If we might be allowed to amend the title, we should call the article, "Why I Was Uncomfortable in the United States." We are all the better pleased with this suggestion because he gives as his reason for writing, or rather as an incentive to writing, the article, the fact that Sir Lepel Griffin, "a very acute and distinguished Indian official," had also published the opinion "that there is no country calling itself civilized where one would not rather live than in America, except Russia," meaning by "one," of course, Sir Lepel himself.

This deliverance seems to have made such an impression on Mr. Arnold that he resolved to do now what he had thought of postponing—make an inquiry into the nature and defects of American civilization. And yet, a little further on, he reveals the fact that he saw very clearly what the cause of Sir Lepel's dissatisfaction with the civilization of the United States was. It was neither more nor less than the absence of those "comforts and conveniences of life" which "men of the professional and official class in England, who do the most part of her literature and journalism," have provided for them in England at very small expense, or, in other words, at prices suited to incomes of "from four to fifteen hundred [pounds] a year," and which in America can only be had by the very rich—such as clubs, bansom cabs, porters at railway stations, tailors, and mercers. When a man of Sir Lepel Griffin's class, Mr. Arnold naïvely adds, "is passing judgment on a country's civilization, points of this kind crowd to his memory and determine his sentence." So that really what Sir Lepel ought to have called his book was also, "Why I was Uncomfortable in America."

Nothing, however, but a lack of humor ever allows a man to present his own discomforts as a traveller to the world as his "judgment on a country's civilization." The judgment of a man who takes himself so seriously as this is, in fact, of little or no value on any subject but his special work. No one with a real capacity for generalization or a real sense of proportion would have ventured to lay Sir Lepel's book before the world as a contribution to political or social philosophy. That Mr. Arnold should have taken it as such, and charged himself with the duty of prosecuting the inquiry on which Sir Lepel entered, shows, we fear, that same deficiency of the humorous faculty which led "the acute and

distinguished Indian official" to print with much solemnity conclusions about American civilization drawn from the expensiveness of its clothes, clubs, and cabs.

We are far from denying, however, that such books as Sir Lepel Griffin's and such articles as Mr. Arnold's are interesting and instructive. Every sensible man likes to hear how a distinguished Indian official, or an Englishman of the professional class and official class, who "has been at the public schools and universities," if he writes or talks reasonably well, finds life and manners in this or any other country, and to hear him tell what he enjoyed or admired, what offended his taste or excited his reprobation; but he must do it without solemnity. He must not sell figs in the name of the Prophet. That Sir Lepel Griffin would not like to live in the United States is a fact; but it is not a great or pregnant fact. To get any sociological nutriment whatever out of it, one has to know Sir Lepel Griffin, for he may be a man who not only would be uncomfortable in the United States or in Russia, but is uncomfortable wherever he goes. We have known Anglo-Indian officials who never could be happy even in England.

Everybody who is in the habit of looking at Mr. Arnold as a social and political philosopher, as well as a brilliant literary critic, will regret that he should have attempted an examination of American civilization in a short article on the Griffin plan. He was, like Griffin, uncomfortable in the United States. The sources of his discomfort, it is true, were different from Griffin's, and for the most part more serious; but we really must not be asked in this brief and peremptory way to pronounce American civilization a failure because Mr. Arnold did not like the American landscape, or the climate, or the restlessness of the farmers, or the plainness of the cities, or the absence of "cathedrals, parish churches, and castles of the Catholic or feudal age," or the odious names of the new Western towns, or the absence of "distinction" among the men. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that such things should be, but a real philosopher does not make too much of them, or produce them with too much preface. Mr. Arnold's well-known picture of English society—"an upper class materialized, a middle class vulgarized, and a lower class brutalized"—shows under what extremely unfavorable social conditions a country may be great and happy and highly civilized. A foreign philosopher visiting England and witnessing the condition of these classes of the population as described by Mr. Arnold, might well feel justified in taking an extremely gloomy view of England as a place of residence for men of intellectual tastes, and yet we know that tens of thousands of them find great comfort in that island, and would not quit it though the cab fares and the tailors' bills went up 100 per cent.

Mr. Arnold, too, is very much troubled by the want of native criticism of American defects. He says there are "plenty of cultivated, judicious, and delightful individuals" here,

but they all keep silent about the national faults. Supposing this to be true, in the broad way in which Mr. Arnold states it, is this not also a defect to which a foreigner, and especially an Englishman, should be very indulgent? We do not think it is true as Mr. Arnold states it. There is a great deal of criticism by Americans of American morals and manners, but no native criticism ever satisfies a foreigner. He always wants it laid on stronger, and is displeased if it is tempered by any perception of countervailing virtues. The way the English press treats the conduct of Englishmen in dealing with other and especially weaker communities, for instance, is never what foreign critics think it ought to be. There are reserves and omissions and qualifications in it which make Americans and Frenchmen and Germans swear with indignation, and yet, in spite of it all, it is the general belief that English civilization improves. It is not every one, as human nature goes, who enjoys, as Mr. Arnold and Mr. Ruskin do, speaking their mind freely and incessantly to the people among whom they live about their faults and follies. Such men are doubtless a precious possession to any community, but they will always be scarce, and have to be amazingly clever not to become insufferable bores. There is probably not one of the thousand agencies of human culture which accomplishes so little as lectures from censorious sages.

Mr. Arnold's attack on the American press touches on what all foreigners of distinction find the greatest mystery and nuisance of American life. For the last fifty years the newspapers have been the first thing which attracts their attention when they land, and which during their stay here most distinctly represents to them the national taste and manners. "The absence of truth and soberness in them, the poverty in serious interest, the personality and sensation-mongering, are," he says, "beyond belief." This is undoubtedly what a very large body of the most intelligent and cultivated Americans say of the newspapers, and it is no wonder that a foreign critic, who suffered severely from their brutality when he was here, should say it also. But here again it does not do to generalize too sweepingly. It is not true of the American press as a whole, and when true of particular newspapers is almost always the result of the personal peculiarities of the editor. For reasons which we have not space to discuss here, journalism in the United States has until recently been one of the neglected callings, which made no serious drafts on the talents and cultivation of the country, and of which the pecuniary possibilities were first made plain by a man of very low character. He may be said to have created "the American newspaper" as the world knows it, and to have given it a stamp and tone from which it has not yet worked free; but to conclude that it will never become more sober-minded, more serious in its interests, and more careful about accuracy, and more closely allied to the intellectual life of the country, is to deny one of the plainest facts of American

history, and that is, that there is no department of human activity in which progress in the United States is not constant and steady, though at particular points not always very perceptible.

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main."

PARLIAMENT TILL EASTER.

LONDON, March 29, 1888.

THE Easter holidays have come, and the Government may look with complacency on the record of the last six weeks. The Conversion Bill has already been passed into an act, with an assured prospect of success for the great financial operation which is its object. The Local Government Bill, a measure of the first magnitude and importance, has made an unusually fair start, and, though the signs of reviving trade are still faint and uncertain, the Government have been able to come to Parliament with a budget showing a larger surplus than the Chancellor of the Exchequer has had at his disposal for a good many years. The position of all these measures is favorable, after making every allowance for the defects they contain and the dangers they may run.

The credit of the financial proposals, so far as they are ultimately successful, will belong, of course, to Mr. Goschen. Those who doubt the correctness of his published opinions as to the effect of the appreciation of gold upon trade and prices, may not regard him as a trustworthy guide in the more difficult problems of political economy; but all the world was prepared to find in him a capable Chancellor of the Exchequer. His name, moreover, may be justly associated with the reform of local government also, because, when he was the first President of the Local Government Board, created in 1871, he did much to elucidate the principles on which reform should proceed, and reform in this direction has ever since been a definite aim of the party to which he then belonged. I believe the Liberals as a body recognize with pleasure that the finances are in the hands of an able man who knows his business, and whose administrative powers were too long lost to the country, even though on most political questions they find in him, to say the least, a very determined opponent.

Whatever interest may attach to the measures I have mentioned, they have not, in the eyes of many critics, redeemed the session up to the present time from the imputation of dulness. To this charge I cannot subscribe. It is true that, with the exception of one or two nights during the debate on the address, there have been no heated and angry discussions. But this very change in the temper of the House is a matter of great importance and of good augury—I wish one could dare to assume that it will be permanent; and there are certain other aspects in which the proceedings of Parliament have been specially significant and interesting. The new Procedure Rules have hitherto been a great success. The two important rules are the Closure Rule which was passed last year, and the suspension of business at midnight. It is by the combination of these two rules that the improvement has been effected. The midnight rule presses somewhat hardly on private members' bills, which often found their only chance in the small hours of the morning. But if the difficult problem could be solved of mak-

ing some selection among these bills, which are now left to a most unsatisfactory system of ballot, more would be gained than has been lost by the new rule. The prudence of making the discussion of the new rules the first business of the session was questioned by the Opposition leaders, though they undertook that, so far as their authority extended, no factious opposition should be offered; but the event has justified the Government. The House was more generally eager than was counted upon to adopt reasonable hours. The rules now furnish very formidable and effective weapons against obstruction, but hitherto there is ground for the better hope that all sections of the House will concur in turning over a new leaf.

One test of the complete success of the rules will be when the closure is not regarded as penal, but an ordinary incident of procedure; and though an amendment to make it automatic met with little support, there is certainly an approach to this change of view on the subject. Another incidental improvement which must follow, if the rules are to work well, is a curtailment of the length of speeches. On this subject there was some plain speaking. A few speakers on the front bench and elsewhere have had too great a monopoly of the time of the House, and have not made a moderate use of it. The House is very patient of a speaker who by any means has once got its ear, and speakers have not realized how inexpressibly tedious their long and ill-digested harangues had become. In this respect there is a beginning of improvement. A very high authority is said to have been struck by the greater condensation of speeches in some recent debates. Then the withdrawal of the hours after midnight has improved the temper of the House, because it was generally after midnight that it lost its temper.

But the most remarkable feature of the proceedings of the present session is the advance which they disclose in the growth of liberal opinions. At the opening of the session, in 1880, Mr. Gladstone's Government, in the flush of victory, was embarrassed for weeks by the opposition offered to Mr. Bradlaugh's taking his seat. The other day, with a Tory Government in office, Mr. Bradlaugh carried the second reading of his Oaths Bill by a majority of 100. The question of the reform of the House of Lords has entered into a new phase. For the first time the regular Opposition in the House of Commons has declared it is now ripe for consideration, and the debate and division on Lord Rosebery's motion show how seriously the matter is now taken up by the House of Lords itself. Lord Salisbury, echoed by the Unionist organs in the press, says that the House of Commons will not tolerate any reform of the House of Lords which will make it a stronger power in the country—which is tantamount to saying that it will not tolerate any reform at all. These critics profess to know the mind of the House of Commons better than its own members. The majority of the present House, by their recent vote, declared their opposition to reform of the House of Lords. But the number who objected to reform on Lord Salisbury's ground is infinitesimally small. Any one who supposes that such a consideration is sufficient to secure acquiescence in the present constitution of the House of Lords, is blind to the signs of the times, the signs of the present session. The argument, if good for anything, is an argument for a single chamber. But to such a change, without discussing its merits, the public mind would, at least for the present, be averse. If any change is made within a reasonable time, and that is probable,