

Correspondence.

THE SALOON IN KANSAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your paper of January 12 you refer to Kansas in your article on "Successful Anti-Liquor Laws" as no more successful than Iowa and Vermont "in keeping saloons closed." If by saloons you mean the usual open saloon where liquor is sold, you are mistaken as to Kansas in general. There may be on the frontier, in new and lawless neighborhoods, and in one or two of the largest places in the State—like Wichita or Leavenworth, places of 30,000 and 25,000 respectively—and possibly in Kansas City, Kansas, open saloons; but not elsewhere in the State, or my information and observation are at fault. Indeed, I think the success here in closing the saloons is wonderful, and it is owing, it seems to me, to several causes—not the least of which, probably, is the fact that there is no city of more than 30,000 population, and only three of more than 15,000. Then the foreign-born population is small, and the people are agricultural, and the mining population is small, only a few hundred in any locality.

This does not mean that liquor is not to be had by those seeking it; the fact is, that one can probably purchase it in nearly every place in the State of any size, and it is constantly shipped into the State by the dealers in Kansas City and St. Joseph, and many drug stores supply it. But the use of it has greatly fallen off, and public sentiment has grown more and more favorable to prohibition, or at least to having saloons closed.

I am not a prohibitionist in the ordinary sense, though a temperance man, and I was not in favor of the experiment in Kansas; nor would I favor the same experiment in any State upon the basis of merely a majority of the votes in favor of it. But I think the prohibitionist may properly claim the movement in Kansas as thus far a great success. This fact, as I think it is, does not militate against the soundness of your reasoning in your article referred to. With a few cities of 50,000 or more in our midst, the situation in Kansas would be, probably, very decidedly changed.

EDWARD RUSSELL.

LAWRENCE, KAS., January 20, 1888.

THE OTHER SIDE OF HIGH LICENSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article on high license in No. 1176, by giving only one side of the matter, gives too favorable a view. There is another side of a very different sort, and it is one that gives very serious concern to many even of those who think that the general results of high license, in great cities and some States, are better than prohibition has thus far secured on the same ground. The principal sources of evil are two:

(1.) There are some villages, and even large towns and counties, in which prohibition is perfectly feasible, and has been successfully worked in the past, but in which the greed for large license fees, with the resulting reduction of taxation, has broken down the majority for exclusion and caused the licensing of a saloon or two or more. But saloons are peculiarly mischievous when first opened in a place in which the young have not grown up face to face with their evils; during the time that is necessary to educate and array public sentiment against them, they do a deadly work.

(2.) In many places the sudden discovery of the possibilities of revenue from high license has produced a craze for the reduction of taxation in this way. Hence has arisen the desire to license as many saloons as possible, that the annual question, "What is the tax rate this year?" may be answered in a gratifying manner. But there is a limit to the profits even of the liquor business, especially when the first act of the year is the payment of \$500 or \$1,000 into the city treasury, and the second is the payment of a heavy Government tax. There has been under high license very generally a falling off in the number of applications for license in the second and even in the third year, the old set being slow to give up. But fewer licenses means more taxation or a stopping of the public improvements that the flood of license-money permitted. Out of this state of things naturally grows a disposition to give the saloon-keeper more range, more sources and opportunities of trade, than the law allows; that is, to wink at the sale of liquor to minors and habitual drunkards, to try not to see the people sneaking in at the back door at midnight or on Sunday, to tolerate gambling in or in connection with saloons, and even to refuse point-blank to take away the licenses of those who have been convicted in the courts of violating the restrictions of the license. In some towns, and in all towns by some people, it is freely said that "the fine is punishment enough," and that "we must not be too strict with them or they will throw up their license." The goose lays a golden egg, and must under no provocation be killed.

How great the demoralization is that is thus produced, only those can realize who have tried, while participating in government, to persuade their fellow-officials to be strict. Perhaps the evil will grow less with time; that is what we are waiting to find out. Until things begin to better and have bettered very much, we cannot share very heartily the satisfaction that you feel. The thing that grows upon us is the conviction that the saloon is an intolerable pest.

H. M. WHITNEY.

BELOIT, WIS., January 24, 1888.

THE TOBACCO TAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am glad to see journals like the *Nation* advocating a repeal of the revenue taxes on tobacco. The question must now be respected by all fair-minded men, and the Congressman who shall become the champion of a measure for the repeal of these taxes will earn the lasting gratitude of the people of this country from one end to the other. The amount of money actually collected by the Government as taxes on tobacco, though objectionable, is less ruinous than the iron-clad regulations necessarily thrown around the tobacco business. The complications of the law are so many; the bonds required are so heavy, and the penalties for violation of the law so severe—ranging in fines of from \$100 to \$20,000, and always accompanied with imprisonment for from six months to five years—that both the production and manufacture have been driven into comparatively few hands. The few manufacturers, especially, who have thus been placed in the position of monopolists have almost all grown immensely rich, and will now fight to have the law retained, not for the pleasure of paying the taxes, but for the advantage of the monopoly which it guarantees them. There are thus no licensed dealers in the small towns, and the farmer must raise sufficient to make up the regulation case or hogshead, so as not to be classed as a retail dealer, and ship a long distance to the city.

Here only the large producers stand any show at all, the small shipments being little better than confiscated.

Thus, as above stated, all but comparatively few producers have been driven from the field, and the area of production is greatly restricted geographically. In the meantime, consumption has not materially decreased, and the erstwhile producer is still a consumer; and not only he, but all those whom his surplus crop would naturally have supplied, must buy from the aforesaid monopolists.

The law has fallen with peculiar hardship upon a very numerous class of small farmers, who are the most helpless of any class of men in the world under such circumstances. Not only do they submit, but their voices seem never or but feebly to be heard. A farm which will not support a family by raising grain once maintained them in comfort and gave honest employment to all its members by raising tobacco. Their old barns may be seen abandoned and rotting down in some parts of the country to-day. Land which would be valuable is worthless. Homes which might be united and happy are early scattered in poverty and ignorance. Thus have I myself seen prosperity depart from a community, and I have only sacrificed details to brevity in this letter.

Perhaps tobacco is a luxury. Anything better than corn-bread and bacon would be considered as such by many of these farmers. But what a delightful luxury must be the piling up of millions of dollars through the advantages of a close monopoly, even though we know that those who have a natural right to share in those millions are shivering and hungry in another part of the country.

W. M. H.

ST. LOUIS, January 18, 1888.

COEDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Everybody knows that extraordinary conclusions can be deduced from statistics if one sets about it with that intent, but your correspondent on the subject of coeducation has certainly surpassed all former records in that line. Let us examine his argument. He concludes:

(1.) *That women prefer colleges open only to women.* The New England colleges open to both sexes, from which this conclusion is drawn, are Bates, Boston, Colby, and Wesleyan. They are all either very small, or very denominational, or both. That they have fewer women students than the colleges open to women only may be accounted for by the fact that women prefer the best and most richly endowed of the colleges that are accessible to them. It is impossible to find out what Eastern women think about coeducation until the great Eastern colleges are open to them on the same terms as to men.

(2.) *That the necessity does not exist of admitting female students to colleges heretofore reserved for men.* What necessity ever existed for admitting women to any colleges? It was not pretended that they would commit harakiri if they continued to be denied the higher education, but it was maintained that it would be wholly to the advantage both of the whole race and of their half of it if they were to be made free of the best education attainable. So long as Harvard and the Johns Hopkins University offer better facilities for getting at the heights and depths of learning than the smaller colleges do, women cannot give themselves up to the contented enjoyment of what they have

got, although they like what they have got very much better than nothing at all.

(3.) *That in the eastern section of the country collegiate coeducation will not be extended.* It is impossible to see what ground your correspondent's figures give for this conclusion. The data are not sufficient to enable one to lay down the curve of rapidity of extension, and to show that it has already reached its asymptotic form; they have, in fact, no bearing whatever upon the question.

(4.) *That colleges limited to one sex enjoy a remarkable degree of prosperity.* This conclusion is the most interesting of all, and I have therefore reserved it for the last. Its ground is, that the five large New England colleges have not yet admitted women, and that they have not on that account *been reduced to small colleges.* The aggregate number of students at Yale, Amherst, Harvard, Williams, and Dartmouth for 1874 and 1884 were 2,418 and 2,948 respectively—that is, they showed an increase of 22 per cent. At the four small colleges named above which admit women, the increase was from 343 to 621, or 81 per cent.—that is, nearly four times as much. These figures would show, if they showed anything, that to admit women is to cause a *nearly four-fold more rapid increase in the number of students of a college than would otherwise take place*—a very satisfactory result for the friends of coeducation. That the women's colleges have been prosperous does not show, as we have pointed out before, that separateness is a cause of prosperity, for there are no mixed colleges of the same rank and character with which to compare them. In spite of that fact, however, the rate of increase of women at mixed colleges has been 221 per cent., and at separate colleges only 296 per cent.

The colleges of the West, your correspondent states, are overwhelmingly coeducational, and he says that it is hard to draw conclusions from them. It is true that it would be a little harder to draw from them the *same* conclusions which he draws from the statistics of Eastern colleges, but *some* conclusions it would not be difficult to draw, and, in fact, President Angell of Michigan University draws some highly interesting ones on the very next page of the *Nation* to that on which your correspondent's letter occurs.

We proceed to show that these same tables of statistics, if skillfully handled, may be made to yield another conclusion, more interesting and quite as sound as those to which your correspondent has been led. Counting Vassar as a New England college (this is necessary, because otherwise no comparison is possible, and it is admissible on account of the large number of non-New England men who go to the great New England colleges), the rate of increase in the women's colleges per decade has been 296 per cent., and in the men's colleges, taking the five great ones as a standard, it has been 22 per cent. If this state of things continues ("And how," said a workingman to me the other day, "do you judge of the future, if not by the past?"), then in another decade the large colleges will contain more women than men, and in another twenty years there will be, roughly speaking, four times as many New England women as men who are receiving a college education. This conclusion, reckless as it is, need not appear so very startling, for there are already, in the whole country, four times as many girls as boys who finish the high-school course.

CHRISTINE LADD FRANKLIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

Sir: Being "interested in the progress of coeducation"—at least in all advanced post-

graduate lines of work and study—I have followed the advice given by Mr. William A. Merrill of College Hill, Ohio, in his letter to the *Nation*, in its issue of January 19, and have examined the tables referred to "from the reports of the Commissioner of Education for 1874 and 1884-'85," and also the last published report of the Education Bureau, that of 1885-'86.

Without intending to accuse Mr. Merrill of special pleading, it seems to me that some of his "conclusions," as summarized in the letter, are hardly supported by the more detailed tables from which he made up his abridged ones, or by the statistics of "secondary education," to which educational strata, by the by, many of the institutions entered under the head of "Universities and Colleges" really belong. Personally, my prejudices are opposed to coeducation except in kindergartens and universities; but the people of the United States seem inclined to steadily extend its field in spite of such prejudices.

In an article on "Secondary Instruction" (page 359, Report of Commissioner of Education, 1885-'86), the Commissioner says:

"In eighteen States and three Territories reported in 1884-'85, coeducation was a feature of three-quarters or more of the schools under consideration; in nine States and four Territories it was a feature of one-half the schools, or less than one-half; and in eleven States the coeducation schools numbered between one-half and three-quarters of the whole. It is therefore evident that there is no settled prejudice against coeducation among those classes in the United States who are able and willing to prolong the education of their children beyond the elementary stage."

In 1876, of the 356 institutions classed as "Universities and Colleges," 140 report women students; in 1885-'86, of the 346 reporting under this head, 190 admitted women. Of the 26 new institutions of this character established in the 10 years between 1876 and 1886, 19 were coeducational. In 1876, about 6,000 women were "reported" as attending coeducational "colleges and universities"; in 1886 this number had increased to nearly 8,000, and is really considerably greater, as a number of institutions which had reported their male and female students separately in 1876, in 1886 merely reported the total number.

The tables and reports are all imperfect, one college leaving this question unanswered, another that; but the general trend of their evidence leads me to somewhat different conclusions from those suggested by your correspondent.

(I.) That *all* colleges, either limited to one sex or coeducational, where well-equipped and well-officered, "show a remarkable degree of prosperity," and that this increase is *not proportionately* greater in "colleges limited to one sex," for "a consideration of the several classes under which colleges and universities of the United States may be presented will, it is hoped, suffice to show that superior instruction in this country is rapidly assuming definite character as regards both its instruments and its purposes. As the process goes on, pretentious institutions are naturally overborne and finally disappear, while those that 'have a name to endure' strike their roots deeper and deeper into the community" (see Report, 1885-'86, p. 461).

(II.) That women, like men, prefer those colleges which supply with least expense their special needs most agreeably. To thousands of women this is done acceptably by coeducational institutions. Others prefer colleges exclusively for women, and these latter seem to be patronized by two classes of students: (1.) the daughters of parents who prefer to send, dur-

ing undergraduate years of study, young and inexperienced girls to colleges *under the direction of women*; (2) students who, being financially able to choose, pass by second-rate coeducational institutions for first-class women's colleges. The most thriving women's colleges are at the East, where coeducational ones equally good are rare.

In this connection, mention may be made of a recent statistical statement in a report to the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, in regard to the occupations of women college graduates. Of the twelve colleges from which those so classified had graduated, nine were coeducational, and of these nine seven had admitted women since 1870.

(III.) That, throughout the country, the coeducational colleges under denominational control, such as Oberlin, Hillsdale, Milton, Leland University, etc., have steadily thriven, showing no change of opinion among a large body of conservative people in regard to coeducation.

(IV.) "That the necessity" *does* "exist of admitting female students to the higher institutions of learning heretofore reserved for men," because only in these universities can post-graduate, professional, or "special" female students secure the advantages they crave and are preparing for. Furthermore, that the growth of liberal opinion favors the extension of the advantages of our great universities to women, and that "in the eastern section of the country collegiate coeducation will be extended."

Mr. Merrill mentions Harvard Annex as though it were a protest against coeducation; it certainly cannot be so regarded—although it may be a foreshadowing of one of the forms which coeducation is to take. The Harvard Annex is not a college for women in the sense in which Wellesley and Bryn Mawr are women's colleges. "The original object was not to build up a college for women, . . . but . . . simply to repeat for women the collegiate instruction that was already provided for men by Harvard College. Its instruction is given exclusively by professors and other instructors of Harvard." (Report for 1887.) The steady increase in the number of its students (this year ninety) is the best reply to those who assert that it is "unnecessary" to offer women the advantages of our older universities. The very increase in the number of women collegiate students, and of "institutions for the higher instruction of women," is a reason for opening to women the best equipped and endowed universities, so that they may as women continue most advantageously the studies begun as girls in high schools and colleges, coeducational or otherwise, or under private tuition.

Within the past year, several cases have come to the writer's knowledge where young women of ability and professional position have been refused admission to special courses at Johns Hopkins, only because they were women. "We are very sorry, but the trustees have so voted." One of these applicants was a teacher who wished to increase her usefulness by attending Prof. Hall's lectures on Psychology, specially designed for teachers; another was a young physician, anxious to carry on her pathological studies under Prof. Welch. Such applications are only heard of accidentally, but there is a steadily increasing sympathy with them when known.

When Columbia College grudgingly offered fairly generous opportunities for study and a conservative "certificate" for women, the entering wedge was driven which assures for women finally university training. The change may come slowly, but figures (Columbia has

thirteen women students this year, and a much larger number in the School of Library Economy), reason, generosity, justice, all urge that women shall be permitted to train their minds under the same august supervision which polishes and moulds those of their fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons.

Public opinion in educational matters is shown most surely in private and individual action. Therefore it may fairly be assumed that as long as the number of students in the average coeducational high school and college steadily increases, so the pressure will increase against the doors of our highest institutions of learning, until they too are opened, under limitations if you please, to the female graduates of any school or college, coeducational or otherwise, which properly prepares them to enter the more learned precincts of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, etc.

C. B.

BALTIMORE, January 20, 1888.

CRIMINAL POSING AMONG THE GERMANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your note in the last number of the *Nation* upon the career and trial of the thieving postman, Zalewski, which was related in the November number of *Nord und Süd*, you refer to the reason Mr. Gross assigns for the offence, *i. e.*, an ambition "to be the hero of what we call a 'dime novel.'" This assumption by Germans of a trite explanation of the most notorious and hideous criminal offences among their people is one singularly weak and unreasoning, it has struck me, and, moreover, reflective of an inherent, silly vanity and moral obtuseness which other nations, I feel sure, would hesitate to ascribe to them. And the desire "to be a hero," a hero in crime, seems to be the constantly recurring reason assigned by individuals of every class for most heinous offences.

A maid subserving in the household of the Prince of Lippe-Deimold threw herself into a mill-pond. I asked her friend Louisa, who waited upon me, the cause: "*Ach!* she would like to have people talk about her." A young man who regularly walked the opposite pavement, and smoked his after-breakfast pipe, disappeared. After a day or two, we heard he had made away with himself in Hanover, and willed his body to the dissectors. "He wanted people to talk him over," said the grandmother of one household; "and he had debts, too." In turning over an album I met the pictures of two fine-looking boys of about twelve and fourteen years of age. Their young lady cousin, a schoolmistress, explained that they were dead, having planned together an awful taking-off. After watching for weeks for an opportunity to accomplish their plan, they were left alone one summer night in a country-house. The older made away with the younger, and then with himself. When I asked the reason, there came the unflinching reply: "They would be heroes and have the world talk of them." A kinsman of a Westphalian went to Paris, hired a box at the opera, and in the midst of the gayest scene shot himself through the head. "But why?" I questioned. "*Ach!* he would be talked about," was the reply. In the autumn of 1882 a postman in Berlin murdered a man, and concealed his tracks with utmost cunning. "What was the cause of the act?" I asked a Berlin professor. "He wanted to be a hero," the professor answered; "he was thinking of the fellow (Kerl) down in Vienna who did the same thing last year for the same reason." I

remember that certain Berlin papers assigned a like cause for the act.

Can this morbid desire of posing, ascribed by the Germans themselves in the instances above cited—this wish of being in the mouths of people—be at the root of many crimes in Germany? With the Germans, we sometimes attribute the tendency to suicide in their country to a selfish over-sentimentalism, a mania of egoism. Shall we also follow them in lightly reasoning that many other unexplained crimes against life and property in their country are to be referred to the same cause?—Respectfully,

K. S.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 23, 1888.

"GALEOTTO."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is a very clear analysis and a very trenchant criticism which "B. P." gives of Echegaray's 'Galeotto.' Incontestably, whatever may be its other literary and dramatic merits, its epilogue is miserably lame and impotent—what is more, is as far from realism as idealism ever dare be. Why, then, are not common sense and artistic sense at once revolted? What is there in this passionate cry of the South to catch the cold, critical ear of the North? On what strong wings is the poet's fame uplifted in its flight "past the Pyrenean pines"?

Surely, the strength of the play must not be sought in the nerveless commonplace that it is very wicked to gossip; nor can it be found in the questionable doctrine that you can make white dark by calling it black. The one is true, but not new; the other new, but not true. But has not the poet after all "built better than he knew"? Is not the intense human interest of the play, which alone can make it "strong" or popular with the cultured, in fact rooted in our irresistible sympathy with two lovers? Was not Galeotto, was not the "book," really right? Assuredly, in the old tales, the luckless pairs were all along the intensest lovers. Perfectly innocent, perfectly unconscious, they might have been, until the touch of a hand, the glance of an eye, closed the electric circuit, and their quivering natures leaped together in flame. The poet, strive as he may, cannot wrest man away from nature. Gossip, after all, was right. At least, the human heart supplies the defects of the poet's imagination, and rejoices all the more in the love of *Ernst* and *Julie* because the weight of nobility in their souls suppressed it into unconsciousness.

The ultimate motive of this tragedy is, then, it would seem, not different from that of the early Greek drama: it is the strife of man with destiny; or, rather, it is the battle in and around man of the powers above. Here it is the god of love quelled by the god of hospitality. Gossip is at best but an armor-bearer in the fray.

WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, January 22, 1888.

THE TRAINING OF THE HUMAN MIND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Let us settle our facts first and draw our conclusions afterwards. My facts are, first, that Charles Darwin received a strict, rigid, or, if you please, narrow classical education extending through school and college; second, that his working mind evinced the keenest observation, the deepest reasoning, the most patient research, the most careful deduction. Who is the correspondent that will controvert either the one or the other of these facts? If any would, I respectfully tell him that the only

effective way for him to overthrow my facts will be for him to produce a naturalist, philosopher, or scientist who, having been trained in early life by means of a scientific or optional system of education, developed in after life a better working mind than Mr. Darwin's. Who is that naturalist, philosopher, or scientist, and where was he educated?

Your correspondent "X." (*Nation*, January 20, 1888, p. 73) says, in substance, that nothing could have been worse for *his*, Mr. Darwin's, mind than this narrow classical education. I respectfully deny the asserted fact. We are now dealing with the reasoning and observing faculties of the human mind; and, in the endeavor to get at the facts, I call upon "X." to produce instances where the observing faculty of Darwin brought him false information, or where his reasoning power dwindled away in shallow inferences. In the law it is necessary to establish the *corpus delicti* first—to show that somebody was killed before you can try somebody else for killing him. For the same logical reason, I want it first established wherein the working mind of Darwin was defective—instances where his observation was not wide enough or close enough—instances where his reasoning was illogical or inconclusive—instances where another mind, educated in another way, has, under like conditions and dealing with like material, done better. When we have such facts before us, we can intelligently inquire as to their causes.

In the meantime, I shall reiterate that the evidence now before us indicates that a strict, rigid, or even narrow classical education furnishes the best possible training for the working mind of the future naturalist.—Respectfully, etc., etc.,

C. C. N.

WASHINGTON, January 27, 1888.

Notes.

'UNCLE SAM AT HOME,' by an English resident in the United States, whose humorous views of our social, political, and financial being will be seasoned with pictorial illustrations, is shortly to be published by Henry Holt & Co.

Ticknor & Co., Boston, will make a volume of the Mendelssohn-Moscheles correspondence exemplified in the February *Scribner's*. They announce also 'The Ethics of Boxing and Manly Sport,' by John Boyle O'Reilly; and 'Harvard Reminiscences,' by the Rev. A. P. Peabody, with a portrait of the author.

Chas. Scribner's Sons have in press 'Society in Rome under the Cæsars,' by William Ralph Inge, M.A.

'American Fishes,' a popular treatise on the Game and Food Fishes of America, with special reference to habits and modes of capture, by Prof. C. Brown Goode, U. S. Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, will be brought out in March as a subscription work by the Standard Book Co. of this city.

The next publication of the Dunlap Society—the second of the Society's second year—is a 'Life of Thomas A. Cooper,' by Mr. Joseph N. Ireland, now printing at the De Vinne Press. It will have for a frontispiece a reproduction of a rare portrait of the actor who stood at the head of the American stage for many years.

To the "Knickerbocker Nuggets" series (Putnam's) have been added Lord Chesterfield's 'Letters, Sentences, and Maxims,' with Sainte-Beuve's critical essay on this writer prefixed in an English form; and 'The Adventures of Baron Munchausen,' compiled from the original English edition (taken over bodily), the near-