

lished, or imported, to sell or expose to sale any copy" of such engraving, upon penalty of the forfeiture to the proprietor of the copyright of all the plates on which the same shall have been copied, and every sheet, either copied or printed, and a fine of one dollar for every such copy found in his possession.

A bill is now pending in the House of Representatives (favorably reported) which increases the penalty to \$10 for every fraudulent copy of the engraving. These penalties would, no doubt, also afford complete protection against the abominable practice, becoming so prevalent in this country, of using the very finest designs for advertising purposes or for vulgar decoration—a barbarism against which Professor Ward complains bitterly. But while the Chace bill, if enacted, will so amend the present law as to enable the foreign proprietor of engravings to recover damages in case his works are pirated in this country, it is not calculated to encourage him in seeking an American market for his productions, for it practically prohibits his sending them to a dealer in the United States to be sold. Only persons purchasing "for use and not for sale" (according to the text of the bill) are allowed to import copyright engravings, and even then, only two copies at any one time, and after first having obtained, in each case, the written consent of the proprietor, signed in the presence of two witnesses. Furthermore, all such importations are subject to a tariff duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

RAILROAD EXTENSION IN THE EAST.

THE contrast between Russia and Turkey in their railroad policy is strongly marked. While Turkey controls fertile districts in which there seems to be a fair prospect of profitable traffic, no effort is made to develop them. Russia, on the contrary, is rapidly reaching out into Central Asia, and is coming dangerously near the Indian frontier of England. Both Russia and Turkey are equally bankrupt; but the former appreciates the importance of railroads enough to find some means of building them, while the latter opposes their construction with other obstacles besides financial ones.

The Trans-Caspian Railroad, which we described a few months ago, is now in successful operation. A little further to the south a line is being constructed into the heart of Persia. Starting at Resht, on the Caspian Sea, it runs to Teheran. Although on Persian territory, it is wholly under Russian influence. Many of the workmen are Russians, most of the others have been engaged in one way or another on the construction of the Trans-Caspian Railroad. The material is brought into the country by way of Russia, and the Government of that country seems to be making every effort to render the completion of the road as easy as possible. No definite arrangements have as yet been made for continuing it further than Teheran, but it is generally assumed that little time will elapse before it is pushed on to Meshed and Herat, in the

East, as well as southward to the Persian Gulf.

Nothing can contrast more painfully with this rapid development than the supineness of the Turkish Government. It is scarcely two months since Constantinople itself has been in direct rail communication with the west of Europe, and this communication was in a certain sense brought about by the Bulgarian Government in spite of Turkish opposition. As long ago as 1883 an agreement was made by Austria, Servia, Bulgaria, and Turkey for the opening of through communication in the summer of 1886. Austria did her part promptly, opening the section of line from Buda-Pesth to Belgrade in September, 1884. The Servian line from Belgrade to Nish was opened at about the same time. From this point the system, as agreed upon by the four Powers, branched off in two directions—one line, on which the Servian and Turkish frontiers came into direct contact, running towards Salonica; the other and longer line, towards Constantinople, passing through Bulgaria on the way.

The line to Salonica was open for traffic in the early part of the present year; but it was by no means an easy question to decide who should operate it. The Oriental Railroad Company, with Baron Hirsch at its head, seemed to have the best rights in the case. But, as not infrequently happens, the Turkish Government had quarrelled with the company on a question of payment, and was not disposed to accord it the chance to operate a profitable line of this kind. The whole was finally put provisionally into the hands of a company in which Servian influences were apparently predominant. About midsummer, the direct line to Constantinople via Bulgaria was also finally completed. It was not, however, at once put into operation. Baron Hirsch, according to the agreements, seemed to have the right to operate the Turkish section, but he was denied this right on the Constantinople line for the same reason as on the other. The Turkish Government would have been glad to have it operated by the Servian company; but to this the Bulgarians demurred, and in fact refused to transport the Servian rolling-stock necessary for the operation of the company. Had this company had any real rights in the matter, it could have compelled Bulgaria to recognize them; had they had any rolling-stock in that part of Turkey, they could have disregarded Bulgaria's protests; but in the absence of both rights and rolling-stock, there was little to be done.

While every one was wondering what turn affairs would next take, the Bulgarian Government, on the 15th of July, 1888, calmly sent down a train laden with railroad officials and the necessary guards for the stations, to the end of the line thus unused, and, after ascertaining that the coast was clear, on their return dropped at each station the necessary officials and time-tables, after which they sent the Ottoman Government a rather cool note, stating in general terms that a valuable property was in danger, and that they thought it necessary to take possession of it as a means of protecting it. The Porte, as may be imagined, was far from satisfied

with the turn which affairs had taken. It is by no means an unheard-of thing, even in America, to have a railroad stolen; but this particular manner of railroad stealing, and the cool way in which it was announced, was something of a surprise. The Porte attempted to persuade Hirsch, who had undoubted rights in the matter, to come and eject the Bulgarian Government; but he did not prove as willing an instrument as was hoped. As between the Governments of Turkey and Bulgaria, he felt quite as friendly to the latter as to the former. He, however, consented to operate the line on condition that he might also have given over into his hands the profitable line to Salonica, which was now run by the Servian company. But here again there was objection on the part of Servia, and it is difficult to see what will be the final outcome. At present a compromise has been reached by which the Constantinople line is provisionally operated by Hirsch; but it is by no means clear that we have as yet reached the end of the difficulty.

If such is the trouble involved in getting to Constantinople, it may be imagined that the difficulties in getting beyond it are even greater. It is some time since the system of railroads through Asia Minor and in the direction of Persia has been authoritatively surveyed; but it is still an open question how soon actual work will begin, or whether, when work is once begun, the Turkish Government may not place such difficulties in the way as to hinder its completion. At present it seems to be playing off one construction company against another in the bids for this enterprise, and shows a disposition not to deal straightforwardly with any of them. Under these circumstances, the policy of Europe in maintaining the Turkish power as a barrier to Russian expansion may react against itself. It prevents Russia, for the time being at any rate, from getting a foothold on the Mediterranean, but it insures her a clear field in railroad expansion towards the Persian Gulf. If half the accounts are true as to the natural resources of Asiatic Turkey, railroad communication with Persia should have developed in that country rather than across the deserts further to the north. But as long as Turkey is left in possession, any such result seems likely to be postponed indefinitely.

TINKERING THE FRENCH CONSTITUTION.

PARIS, October 15, 1888.

REVISION of the Constitution has become a universal cry. That this revision should be the cry of the Opposition, of all kinds, is no wonder: it is more difficult to understand why the Government also has formed a scheme of revision. The Constitution is, in a republic, the highest law, the law of laws, and it ought not to be constantly modified. It is not for me to tell with what difficulties and formalities the framers of the American Constitution surrounded the revision of a single article of that instrument: you remember well under what circumstances it became possible to revise the articles relative to slavery. With the exception of those articles, what has been changed

in the American Constitution within a century? It stands now as a firm pillar, round which States and Territories can be organized; it is an object of respect and veneration to all succeeding generations; it gives to your democracy the element of fixity, of duration, which is given to monarchies by a dynasty.

The French Constitution, in its last form, dates from 1875, and it has already been revised. The revision of it is as easy as the change of an ordinary law.

"The Chambers shall have the right, upon separate deliberations, determined in each by an absolute majority of votes, either spontaneously, or at the request of the President of the Republic, to declare that there is need of revising the constitutional laws.

"After each of the two Chambers has taken this resolution, they shall unite as a National Assembly, in order to proceed to the revision.

"The deliberations concerning the revision of the constitutional laws, either total or partial, shall be determined by an absolute majority of the members composing the National Assembly."

Mark in this last article the word *total*. In the intention of the framers of the Constitution, a total revision was a possibility, and it was clearly understood in the deliberations of the Assembly of Versailles that a new National Assembly could substitute, if it chose, a monarchy for the Republic.

Jules Ferry felt that this was a danger for the Republic. He was afraid that a time would come when the representatives of the people might legally and constitutionally put an end to the Republic; and when he was Prime Minister he proposed that the right of revision should be curtailed on this special point; that a special article should be inserted in the Constitution, forbidding any deliberation in the National Assembly on the subject of the form of government. He carried his point, and the Constitution was revised in this sense; an article was inserted which makes it impossible to put to vote the question of the form of government in a National Assembly. The precaution was unnecessary so long as the majority remained Republican in both Chambers, and it would become futile if both Chambers ceased to be Republican. The axe was laid to the tree by the man who wished to protect the tree; for it was seen how easy it was practically to revise the Constitution—that it could be done in a day, with no more difficulty than any small alteration in an ordinary law.

This first revision became a signal; ever since, all the parties in opposition have taken up the cry of revision—the Monarchists in order to abolish the article introduced in the Constitution by the influence of Jules Ferry; the Bonapartists for the same reason; the Radicals because they accuse the Constitution of impotence, and wish to suppress the Senate and even the Presidency. There are obvious reasons why those who desire to substitute a monarchy for the Republic should try to test constantly the fragility of the Republic and to undermine its Constitution; there are reasons also why the Radicals, the Socialists, the Communists, the men whom nothing can satisfy, who are ardent for any change, any commotion, should cry, "Revision, revision!" Still, the cry did not find much echo till it was adopted by General Boulanger and his party.

It is difficult to explain how this party was formed and what are its objects. So far, the programme of General Boulanger is purely negative—"Dissolution, revision!" Once he tried to explain what he meant by revision, and what modifications he would make, if he could, in the Constitution. He was not much listened to, and I suppose that, by this time, nobody remembers the long programme which

he read to the Chamber, and I should not be much surprised if he had forgotten it himself. The electors who vote by thousands for Boulanger, without ever having seen him or heard him, do not look upon him as a framer of constitutions, but as a destroyer of constitutions. Who are they, what are they? They are the discontented of all classes, of all ranks, of all opinions (if they have any fixed opinions); the men who follow instincts rather than ideas, who, for one reason or another, are tired of the present, and want something new, something different—they do not know exactly what. Imagination has more to do in the affairs of men than is commonly supposed, and, strangely enough, General Boulanger has caught the imagination of the people. I heard some time ago an old diplomat, a man who has had a great experience of the world and who has travelled in every part of it, say to some people who were criticizing Boulanger, and were trying to prove that some of his actions would ruin him: "You are mistaken. He is an idol. I have travelled in the East and seen many idols: I always found that the uglier they are, the more miracles they perform."

It would be a long and painful task to show how the Republicans have allowed the tide of discontent to rise to its present level; how the "République aimable" of M. Jules Simon, the "République athénienne" of Gambetta, made way by degrees for the present Republic. It would be even more difficult to analyze the process by which all the discontent crystallized, so to speak, round General Boulanger. He appeared first before the eyes of the people as a soldier on horseback, sword in hand. The people see him still as they saw him first, though he no longer wears his uniform, and has been thrust through in a duel by a lawyer. It was thought that after this duel he was a finished man; a short time afterwards three departments returned him by overwhelming votes. Next year there will be general elections, and committees are already formed in every department. I am told that everywhere the Monarchists are obliged to count with General Boulanger and his party: the popular tide is with him, and they dare not oppose it. We must expect to see in the provinces a coalition of Monarchists, Bonapartists, and Boulangists. They will probably vote together on a purely negative platform, without any definite conventions or arrangements, for the sake of victory.

It is needless to show the dangers of such a policy. Lord Palmerston once said that a man on horseback was in coalition with the horse; only, when you form coalitions, you must always be careful to be the horse. Who can tell who will be the horse in this extraordinary coalition of the monarchical forces and of the enigmatical and unnamed forces which go under the name of Boulangism? The real alliance to be feared is the old alliance between Caesarism and democracy, the alliance which placed Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. on the throne, and which has always ended in a deadly struggle between France and Europe. It seems as if, in the face of such dangers, the Republicans ought to learn some prudence and wisdom; they have still in their hands the keys of the house, but now they themselves propose to rebuild it. M. Floquet, who is our Prime Minister, is the new architect; he also cries, "Revision!" thinking that he can shout it louder than General Boulanger. The plan of the ministerial revision is, it must be confessed, most extraordinary. The rights of the Senate are curtailed with regard to the veto of the budget; yet the Chamber of Deputies has not made such a good use of the finances of the

country that a little advice from the Senate should be thought unnecessary. The July number of the *Bulletin de Statistique du Ministère des Finances* gives the amount of the expenses incurred since the war of 1870, outside of the ordinary budget. It is seven milliards, and seven hundred millions of francs. As has lately been said, "The State spends every year five or six hundred millions more than it receives from the regular taxes and sources of revenue."

Still, the prerogative of the Chamber in matters of taxation is a point which can be discussed; but what shall we say of the proposition made by the Government to deprive the President of the right of dissolution—a right which he can use only with the consent of the Senate? This is another diminution of the senatorial power, as well as a diminution of the Presidential power. The most extraordinary part of the scheme of revision, however, seems to me to be the gradual reflection of the Deputies—one-third going out every two years, so that there would never be a general election. The Ministers appointed by the Chamber would remain in office so long as a partial reflection of one-third should not have taken place, and could not be upset in the interval of two partial elections by a parliamentary vote. Two years of office would be thus assured to every Cabinet. I leave you to judge if this change can be recommended in a country where the ministerial responsibility is complete, and where the Ministers have to appear every day before Parliament. Everything can be tried in politics; but I can hardly imagine the coexistence of a Chamber and of a hostile Cabinet. This measure is proposed as a remedy for the instability of our cabinets; but the only true remedy is the election by the people of a large and united majority. The present House is cut up into groups and fractions, and cabinets are upset in turn by coalitions of groups. This may be a great evil, but I don't see how it can be remedied except by the electors.

Correspondence.

THE PARTY NOT A PERSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: One more word ought to be said to men like Dr. Storrs, who believe that the Republican party is entirely wrong in this campaign, but continue their support because it was right twenty-five and thirty years ago. Their sophistication comes from giving personality to the party. In their conception, the party is a personal existence, that can claim fealty. If this fealty is not given, the person failing to give it is a "traitor to the party." If the party is wrong, its errors are to be condoned, like the errors of an individual, in view of its previous good record, and in the hope that its general spirit of rectitude will speedily bring it back from its lapses from sound political virtue. There is not a greater error enslaving the minds of educated men than this conception of the nature of parties. The correct conception of a party is, not that of a personality which has rights over men, but that of an instrument for achieving political results, to be cast aside whenever it fails to answer one's purpose. It is only an aggregation of men who act together as a party because they have common purposes to achieve. As soon as there are divergent purposes, there should be new combinations of men.

This truth is brought out by a brief history of the Republican party—or rather Republican parties, as there have been a number of them.