

no honest unbiased work can ever be hoped for when such a confession of faith is made a *sine qua non* of fitness for teaching or writing history. To illustrate this, I have but to cite the case of a fine old gentleman of ante-bellum antecedents, a member of a good family, whose knowledge of history consists in having memorized the standard texts of some twenty years ago. This gentleman is professor of history in one of the largest State universities in the South. On a vacation ramble about a year ago the writer happened into his lecture-room, and learned from a well-worn copy of Oman's 'History of England,' and from some students who still lingered about the classic walls, that this single text constituted the whole work of the senior history class in that college! On the margins of the pages were recorded in very small characters the stock stories and jokes doled out to patient students from year to year. The text was repeatedly marked, "Tell joke No. 1, or No. 2, at this point."

What is it that keeps scores of such good old gentlemen at the heads of the most important departments of study in Southern schools? Clearly, a public sentiment which taboos the most vital subject in American history, a sentiment which demands from every one a full justification of the South in all its past history. Behind these men is the individual influence of the Confederate veterans, who, having once had a share in making history, now demand that their views of its teaching and writing shall be everywhere accepted. They meet together in great assemblies, and, without critical knowledge or even careful examination of the books used in schools and colleges, make out a list of authors whose works may be used. It is not difficult to say what class of writers are commended.

Next to the Confederate soldier's influence in retarding the advance of true historical studies is that of the Southern publisher, who makes capital of the so-called patriotic sentiment. He feels the pulse of the Confederate veteran and takes the measure of the reviewer, who is usually of the accepted type, and then publishes his *Southern* text-books. The representative of the largest publishing-house in the South recently refused so much as to read the manuscript of a piece of investigation in Southern history, though posing all the while as the champion of Southern history-writing, its very Mæcenas.

It will be seen that, under such conditions, no healthy criticism can exist. The results of investigation are fixed for an author before his work begins. The sentence of the reviewer is likewise dictated by an uncompromising public dogmatism. These, then, are some of the conditions which check the development of scholarship, which prevent the higher institutions of learning from taking their rightful stand, and which seriously retard the educational and intellectual advance of the South. They are natural conditions, to be sure—conditions which, until recent years, prevailed at the North, but which, as is indicated by the discussion of the recent proposition of Charles Francis Adams to erect a monument in Washington to R. E. Lee, are fast disappearing, and it is to be hoped they are also passing away in our section.

In truth, healthy beginnings are being made at many points. In every Southern State there are honest and able young stu-

dents who are beginning to address themselves to the task of writing in true characters the history of their sections—students who are becoming authors of books which require no recommendation, and which find publishers in any part of the country. In South Carolina a great scholar is giving to the public a history of that State in the Revolution which compares favorably with any similar work ever produced by an American writer; in Alabama there has arisen a small coterie of competent critics who, by the aid which the State is freely giving, promise much for that part of the country; in Texas, at its great University, in North Carolina and Tennessee, magazines of history and biography are doing pioneer, almost missionary, work in their fields. So it is not altogether an unpromising future which we face. And there are at present two movements of quite recent origin which brighten still more the promise of the future. These are the educational revolution of which the Ogden Association is a part, and the campaign, best illustrated in North Carolina, for the establishment of rural and town libraries. In North Carolina alone about five hundred small libraries were established last year. An educated public may be influenced and a reading public may be convinced. May not these beginnings be the harbingers of intellectual emancipation, of independent literary production?

WM. E. DODD.

Correspondence.

THE ATLANTIC FISHERY AND PROTECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is one of the most remarkable anomalies of the twentieth century that the two leading republics of the world, France and the United States, the two countries that boast the loudest of their freedom, should be each distinguished for their adherence to an absurd antiquated system of protection, which utterly disregards the true interests of the people, and is dictated solely by a ring of monopolists for their own selfish ends. Take, for instance, the question of a drawback on Cuban sugar. Every motive of national honor and sound policy demanded liberal treatment for the southern island by her great republican neighbor and protector, yet, as we have seen, notwithstanding President Roosevelt's stirring words, American good faith, the reputation and character of a great country, was to be trampled in the dust and brought into contempt before the whole world simply to protect the beet-sugar monopolists.

When we come to look into the workings of protection in both France and the United States, the plain man finds absurdities and monstrosities worthy of the grotesque politics of Laputa. France easily leads the van. Here in North America the national Government, in order to keep up a fishery in Newfoundland, gives (1) a bounty exceeding the intrinsic value of the fish; (2) a drawback quite equal to the bounty; (3) 50 francs a head for every one engaged in the transatlantic fishery, plus 50 francs more per fisherman given by the Municipal Council of St. Pierre for every Frenchman engaged on the Newfoundland coast; (4) a bounty of 4,000 francs distributed among her

shore fishermen. Outside the cost of three expensive war-ships, France pays \$240 per man for every one of her subjects engaged in this trade.

The follies and utter absurdities of protection could hardly go further. But when we come to examine the American policy of excluding foreign fish, and preventing the public from obtaining this most necessary and valuable food at reasonable rates, we can perceive that their system is just as illogical, as absurd, and as mischievous to the nation as the ridiculous methods of France. A high tax on a necessary article of food which amounts to an actual prohibition of its free consumption by the public, is a burden which no free people should suffer. The English people would not bear it for a moment. The Americans are a patient people; they suffer the monopolists gladly who plunder them on fuel and light. Only the odious Meat Trust seems to have stirred them up. This outrageous attempt to raise the price of food touched their stomachs, a tender point with the great republic. Has it ever occurred to the citizens of this great nation that, for a century, they have been burdened with a tyrannical monopoly in their food supply as grievous as the attempted Meat Trust? There is not a shred of an argument of any kind in favor of the fish monopoly. It used to be claimed that it manned the national navy. The official naval experts have completely exploded this idea. The men protected are not even Americans; by far the greater portion of the deep-sea fishermen are provincials and foreigners. To aid this motley alien crew and the fish rings, all Americans have to eat dear fish.

The toiling millions of Europe could not exist without eating cheap fish food. Take such a common product of the sea as the herring; all over England and the Continent its cost is two cents, or three for five cents. In the States a single herring costs five cents, or three times the price at which the English workman enjoys his bloater. What makes all this so monstrous and absurd is the ridiculously small number of people, a few hundred, who benefit by this protection to their petty trade, in comparison with the seventy millions who have to pay for the monopoly. The American deep-sea fishery to-day is a poor decaying industry. It is not even American, and a considerable portion of its product is not even caught by Americans. It does not furnish one-fourth of the supply of sea fish which should be consumed in the same proportion as in Europe.

The policy of the American Government in dealing with this vital question of the Atlantic fishery, for a great nation, has been contemptible in the extreme. They ask in the meanest way every favor from their smaller British neighbors, but they will give nothing in return. It is thoroughly well known that, without free access to the Newfoundland bait, the Bank fishery could not be carried on by the American fishermen. It is also officially reported to the revenue officers that the so-called "American industry," the winter frozen-herring business, is a gigantic fraud. Brought in free as "American products," there is not one thing American about the whole business except the Yankee gold that pays for the fish. All are caught and frozen by the English residents. What I have pointed out in former papers on this

subject is not only the cruel absurdity of a tax on food in the twentieth century; in this special case the monopoly acts as an actual barrier to the public supply of most valuable sustenance. If these barriers were thrown down, British North America could furnish the States with an abundance and variety of cheap fish, as full and ample as England now enjoys.

Sir John A. McDonald always maintained that there was nothing to expect from the liberality or enlightenment of the American Government. Their dealings with British America were always a compound of arrogance and selfish meanness, as shortsighted as contemptible. It is now certain that this peddling policy in regard to the fisheries will be checkmated in a thoroughly effective way. The union of Canada with Newfoundland is a foregone conclusion. The island colony is even now making the American fishermen pay a fixed price for his bait, besides a big fee for his license. When the Dominion obtains control of all the British fisheries, the Americans will be simply at their mercy. The Newfoundland bait supply, on which they depend, will either be prohibited altogether, or else made too dear to be purchased. Gloucester has already sounded the note of alarm, and sees a reciprocity treaty looming in the distance. What will the American Government do in these circumstances? Will it wait until free trade is forced upon them, or gracefully accept the inevitable?

D. W. PROWSE.

ST. JOHNS, NEWFOUNDLAND, July 28, 1902.

CONGRESSIONAL ENCOUNTERS, NEW AND OLD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In looking through some old numbers of Charles Dickens's magazine, *Household Words*, I chanced upon a paragraph or two that might well be republished—without comment—to-day. In No. 330, under the title, "The Congressional Prize Ring," comment is made upon the then recent assault of Preston S. Brooks of South Carolina upon Charles Sumner of Massachusetts in the Senate on the 22d of May, 1856. As certain events and casualties of the session of 1902 are fresh in interest, it may be edifying to print the following quotation:

"The forcible mode in which debates are conducted in the parliament of the United States, and the personal encounters which sometimes follow them, are believed by the present generation to be novelties and only recently brought to a culminating point by the Hon. Preston S. Brooks's life-preserver upon the head, face, eyes, and body of Senator Charles Sumner. This is a mistake. Fifty years ago, exciting debates often ended in a regular stand-up fight in the lobby of the House of Representatives. The combatants stripped, a ring was formed, bottle-holders appointed, and the latter fought and reported quite in the style of Moulsey Hurst and Bell's *Life in London*.

"In corroboration of this statement, we present to our readers the following paragraph copied from the New York *Evening Post* of December the thirteenth, eighteen hundred and five, into the Annual Register for eighteen hundred and six:

"On Friday last, the well-known Leib, one of the Representatives of Pennsylvania and leader of the Duane party, and Joseph H. Nicholson, one of the Representatives of Maryland, met in the Congress lobby about one o'clock, when Leib immediately called Nicholson a liar; and thereupon commenced one of

the best-fought battles recorded in the annals of Congressional pugilism. The fight continued till the sixty-fourth round, when Leib had received such blows as deterred him from again facing his man. He protracted the fight, falling after making a feeble hit. In the round which ended the fight, those who backed him advised him to resign; which he did after a combat of one hour and seventeen minutes. The combatants were both very much beaten."

ALBERT C. PHELPS.

NEW ORLEANS, July 22, 1902.

NICE DISTINCTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The War Department acknowledges receipt of a report relative to the action taken by Gen. Chaffee in the case of Lieut. Lytle Brown of the Engineer Corps, U. S. A., who was recently tried for assault and battery on Charles O. Ziegenfuss, a citizen of Manila. It appears from the testimony that Lieut. Brown took offence at an article in the paper conducted by Ziegenfuss, and, in consequence thereof, proceeded to the latter's house one night, and "did then and there unlawfully, wilfully, and maliciously assault said Ziegenfuss by striking him with his, the said Brown's, clinched fist, and the said Brown did then and there otherwise beat, bruise, wound, and illtreat the said Ziegenfuss, knocking out two teeth of him the said Ziegenfuss. Said Brown did kick and jump upon the said Ziegenfuss with the feet of him, the said Brown, and did cause him, the said Ziegenfuss, to suffer great bodily pain and anguish." So the charges and specifications read.

That which seems incomprehensible, to the ordinary mind, at this distance, is the principle upon which army officers base their code of honor. Lieut. Brown was found guilty of the charge of assault and battery and sentenced to be "reprimanded." Of the second charge, of "conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman," in connection with the same offence, he was found not guilty. It is presumed from the finding of the court that nothing less than the killing of the said citizen would be regarded by it as unbecoming an officer, and such killing, in truth, would not—in the section of the country south of here from which Lieut. Brown undoubtedly hails—be regarded as unbecoming a gentleman.

On the other hand, suppose it had been a private soldier who, smarting under adverse criticism, had at night entered the house of a citizen and comported himself in the same manner as that of his superior officer; would the court-martial have been satisfied with imposing the farce of a "reprimand"? We are of the opinion that, under the circumstances narrated, the law-breaker would have been turned over to the civil authorities and would have had to expiate his offence by a goodly number of months in jail, suffer the loss of pay and emoluments, and thereafter dishonorably be discharged the service.

Privileges and distinctions of this nature can hardly be regarded as conducive to good order and military discipline. VETERAN.

THE WASHINGTON-JEFFERSON LETTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It has been known that, after Washington's death, Tobias Lear permitted Al-

exander Hamilton to withdraw from his papers certain letters and documents. It was also rumored that Jefferson enjoyed the same privilege and used it to destroy all evidence of an interchange of caustic letters between Washington and himself. At intervals this rumor reappears, with variations and embroideries, and has almost attained the dignity of an historical fact. It is always difficult to treat such elusive matter, for the evidence supporting it is, as a rule, mere hearsay evidence, and yet is attributed to such sources as give it every semblance of truth. It was with pleasure that I found what is perhaps the earliest evidence in writing upon this Jefferson-Washington correspondence. Whatever Custis may have been, he was not a reliable witness on any question concerning his guardian. Weak of will, and possessed of an inordinate vanity, without real ability in any one line, and depending for his position and reputation on his connection with Washington, he babbled and romanced to any one who would listen to him. The solemn assertions in this letter, written to a kinsman, are ludicrous when examined according to the simplest rules of evidence. His promise of a more definite account in his volume on Washington was not kept, for that work is even less full and satisfactory on this point than the letter. In 1854, the chapter as it appears in the memoirs was printed in the *National Intelligencer*. The editor published a short note from Custis, in which he said:

"The story of the Lost Letters of the Rawlins Book I have put off to the last. It is a painful subject to me, but it was a bounden duty upon me, as Washington's Biographer and the last of his domestic family, to place this matter in the only light in which it can ever appear to the world."

The famous letter of Jefferson to Mazzei was first published in Italy, at Florence; a translation into French appeared in the *Moniteur*, and from that paper it was translated into English for the *Minerva*, the Federalist paper at New York, in which it was printed May 14, 1797. So far as is known, no letter passed between Washington and Jefferson after that date. There was too much to be explained on Jefferson's side, and too great sensitiveness and dignity on the part of Washington to make even an inquiry or explanation likely. I was unable to find any evidence in Washington's letter-books of mutilation, and am quite familiar with the books in Rawlins's writing. Now that we have what is intended to be the solemn testimony of one who always claimed to be in possession of the facts of the matter, it is safe to reject the whole story. The narrative of Custis is almost childish in its simplicity, but that is the least of its many weaknesses. He believed his own story, but his own evidence is against him.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

Boston, July 24, 1902.

Arlington House, Oct 8th 1832.

My Dr Sir

Your very interesting Letter of the 25th ult^o came duly to hand. Cholera among my people, and myself much indisposed, must plead my excuse for the too long delayed answer.

I have a most vivid recollection of all that happened at Mount Vernon, touching certain Letters supposed to have passed between General Washington, & Mr. Jefferson, subsequent to the famed Letter to Mazzei. All the details

you have given of the conversations in the sitting Room, &c., are correct. As relates to myself, over & above my share in the general conversation, I have to observe that Colo. Lear called me into the Hall, and pressing my hand affectionately, remarked with emphasis—The gentlemen are mistaken, I tell you my Dear Washington. THERE WERE LETTERS. He then retired, without entering into explanations respecting the character or tendency of the letters he had thus solemnly declared to have passed between the parties.

Some time afterwards Colo. Lear visited me at Arlington House, previous to his journey to Boston, for embarkation to Algiers. I renewed the subject of the Letters, and pressed the Colo. to enter into the necessary explanations as a mean of healing the breach which had occurred between himself, Dr. Craik, & other of the friends & relatives of Washington. He complained sorely of the coolness, which he had experienced from those with whom he had been in long years of friendship & intimacy, prior to the conversation at Mt. Vernon; declined saying further on the subject of the Letters, but promised that he would write to me on his arrival at Boston. He wrote, but it was simply a most kind & affectionate adieu, and thus the character of the Letters, so far as Colo. Lear was concerned in developing the same, partake of the silence of his untimely grave.

To one who feels the devotional enthusiasm that I do for both men & things of the Revolution, it is with painful regret that I disturb the ashes of the author of the Declaration of Independence, or of my old Master and early friend, who whatever may have been his faults (if any he had) towards others, was ever most kind to me. But truth my Dear Sir, "is mighty," and should always prevail. The Lives & actions of distinguished men belong to their countries, and to History. No action in the long & meritorious life of the Great Washington, shuns the light, and the light and truth of History shall still beam upon the long hidden & mysterious affair of *The Letters* if I can dispel the darkness, so help me God, amen.

I am happy that you are about to anticipate my *Private Memoirs of the Life & Character of Washington*. The Public should be put in possession of the facts touching the Letters, & no one can doubt that there were Letters after the repeated & solemn declarations of Colo. Lear to that effect, to whose sole care was entrusted all the precious deposits of the Chief, for History. The volumes of his public & private correspondence. Of the character of the Letters we have the evidence of Rawlins, who copied the same under the orders of the Chief, and here it may be proper to be known, that Albin Rawlins was of respectable birth & connections, in the County of Caroline, State of Virginia, an intelligent, & amiable young man, whose correct moral deportment, pleasing manners, and attention to business, won for him the esteem of the whole Family of Mount Vernon, where he resided several years. Rawlins when questioned, declared that there were three Letters on the part of Washington, the first courteous, & a mere letter of enquiry. To this was returned an answer in the usually elegant style of Mr. Jefferson, who was assuredly the most finished epistolary writer of the age in which he flourished. In the second, the old Chief pressed the Philosopher home, bringing him to the point of guilty or not guilty. The answer was said to be couched in terms of conciliation, spoke much of ancient friendship, and of the long and happy intercourse & kindly reminiscences of by gone days. The last letter of Washington, to use the words of Rawlins, was awfull, so that R declared, my hand trembled as I wrote it down.

The subject of the Letters will be found at large & treated from facts only, in my *Recollections & Private Memoirs*, of the Life & Character of Washington, a work too long delayed from the American public, which has most kindly received various extracts from it, as published in the papers. My "poverty not

my will" has heretofore prevented my visiting Europe, a mission indispensable to the completion of the work, & which I hope at no distant period to be able to accomplish. Enough is now elicited by Mr. Dr. Sir, to convince the American Public, & the World, that *Letters did pass between Genl Washington & Mr Jefferson subsequent to the Letter to Mazzei*. And that the said *Letters of Washington were of no friendly character*.

Ever yrs

George W. P. Custis

P. S. Copy this badly written scrawl.

Addressed: Majr Lawrence Lewis, Audley, near Battle Town, Frederic County, Virginia.

Endorsed: "1832. G. W. P. Custis respecting correspondence between Genl Washington & Thos. Jefferson, confirming what I have stated on several occasions."

Notes.

A uniform series of reprints of standard historical novels is to be undertaken by Henry Holt & Co., and, "so far as practicable, the series will present a somewhat systematic general view of history"; always with regard to "high literary quality" as well as interest and (the most dubious item of the three) "trustworthiness." Some account of the author and his work will be given.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. promise for the coming autumn an *édition de luxe* of John Fiske's works; two compilations of Masterpieces of Greek and Latin Literature, respectively, chosen from the most famous English translations; a "Cambridge Edition" of the late Professor Child's 'English and Scotch Popular Ballads,' edited by his daughter, Miss Helen Child, with an introduction by Prof. George L. Kittredge; and 'A Study of Prose Fiction,' by Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

The late W. E. Channing's 'Thoreau, the Poet-Naturalist,' published by Roberts Brothers in 1873, and long since out of print, is to appear in a new and enlarged edition, edited by his literary executor, Mr. F. B. Sanborn. It will be brought out handsomely in October by Charles E. Goodspeed, Park Street, Boston, in two editions—the more expensive with extra illustrations.

'The Career and Conversation of John Swinton,' a sketch by his friend Robert Waters, will be published next month by the author in West Hoboken, N. J. (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.).

'De la Formation des Maitres de l'Enseignement Secondaire à l'Étranger et en France,' par M. Dugard (Paris: Armand Colin), is one of the numerous publications which show how widespread, in all civilized countries, is the feeling of a need of better secondary schools. The author states the problem clearly and treats it in a systematic way. The book may be consulted with interest and profit.

The decline of Spain as a political Power and the loss of its prestige among modern nations in art and literature are now leading many thoughtful and patriotic Spaniards to inquire into the causes of this lamentable decay, and to suggest means of resuscitation and regeneration. Such is the purpose of a work of 207 pages, entitled 'Psicología del Pueblo Español,' by Professor Altamira, the second volume of the 'Biblioteca Moderna de Ciencias Sociales,' a series of treatises on sociology now be-

ing published in Madrid. The author maintains that this national degeneracy is due not to any defects or incapacities inherent in the race, but to the imperfect development and systematic suppression of the superior qualities with which it is naturally endowed, and that a remedy must be sought in a more careful and general cultivation of the intellectual faculties. The state, under the influence of the Church, has grossly neglected popular education, and in many provinces, in which the public money is lavishly expended for bull-fights, the school-teachers are not paid even their meagre salaries, and are thus reduced to the ignominious choice between starvation and beggary.

The first volume of Dr. Ernst Steinmann's 'Die Sixtinische Kapelle,' just published by Bruckmann in Munich, describes the construction and decoration of this unique specimen of ecclesiastical architecture under Sixtus IV., and is an exceedingly valuable contribution to the history of the Renaissance in the latter half of the fifteenth century from a political as well as from an artistic point of view. The author is a German scholar residing in Rome, who has made a thorough study of the subject, and presents the results of his researches with remarkable completeness and (what is rare in German works of this kind) in a very attractive style. The text is profusely illustrated with excellent reproductions of the architectural details of the edifice and of the paintings of Perugino, Pinturicchio, Botticelli, Ghirlandajo, and other artists. The second and concluding volume will be devoted chiefly to Michelangelo.

"Municipal Socialism," the first title of the Consular Reports for July, is an interesting array of facts relating to the ownership by municipalities in England of public or semi-public enterprises, as street-railways, waterworks, etc., and to the housing of the poor who are dispossessed for sanitary reasons. This is the absorbing problem in Liverpool, which, "it is said, owns more revenue-producing real estate than any other municipality in the world; its income from this source being about half a million dollars a year." The report closes with two observations: "Speaking generally, municipal government in Great Britain is honest, intelligent, and energetic; and, as a rule, politics has but little to do with the engagement or retention of civic employees." The Antwerp Labor Exchange, whose recent opening is chronicled, is an outcome of the great dock strike two years ago. At that time a federation of employers and workmen was formed to protect and develop the interests of the shipping trade. The members, numbering now over 5,000, are "guaranteed an indemnity in case of lack of work, and mutual-benefit associations among the dockers are encouraged. . . . Never has there existed a more complete understanding between masters and men than under these conditions. Day work has now proved so efficacious that the necessity for overtime work has greatly diminished." The Exchange, a workman's club in fact, with lavatories and a dispensary, "furnishes at cost excellent beer, coffee, and tea, but no gin." The lack of forests in China leads our consul at Niu-chwang to believe that there will be a permanent and extensive demand in that country for our Pacific Coast lumber. He states