

in time, but it was accelerated by the McKinley tariff, whose declared purpose was "to reduce the revenue," and which accomplished its aims to such an extent that the outgoing Harrison Administration barely escaped a deficit, while the incoming Cleveland Administration had to face one immediately. These two measures made the panic of 1893 inevitable. Everybody could see that the gold reserve in the Treasury must be used to meet the current expenses of the Government; and how could the greenbacks and the Sherman notes be redeemed when the gold reserve was drained off for other purposes? Everybody knows, moreover, that the Wilson tariff bill was not passed till August 15, 1894. The last Democratic Administration simply fell heir to the mischievous legislation of the preceding Republican Administration, of which Mr. Henderson himself was no inconsiderable factor in the House.

The most probable explanation of Mr. Henderson's withdrawal is, that he feared that he would be beaten in the coming election. He must have known the state of feeling among his constituents, and he would hardly have yielded to the opposing forces in his own party if he had believed that he could be elected in spite of them. At all events, his withdrawal is the most striking demonstration possible of the strength of the tariff-reform sentiment among the Republicans of the Middle West. It must have tremendous influence in stiffening the purpose of the young and progressive element to burst the bonds of the high tariff. Hundreds of thousands of plain people—farmers in the West, and small shopkeepers, clerks, and laborers in the East—have felt with growing unrest the pressure of the tariff. They have seen the cost of living rise far faster than their earnings, and they have laid the blame largely at the door of the Dingley Act and of the Trusts that have flourished under it. When Senator Hanna and Speaker Henderson join in the sentiment that not "a single schedule of the Dingley Act can be so amended as to relieve the people from the oppression of the Trusts," then the Western farmer, who sells in an open market and buys in a protected one, who is therefore convinced that he pays toll both going and coming, begins to think of electing as Senator or Congressman some one who has the courage and independence to amend the preposterous Dingley Act.

This desire for revision is not a sudden outburst. Any one who is familiar with the temper of the West, as revealed in the newspapers or in common talk, knows that the fire has long been smouldering. Congressman Babcock knew it last winter, when he proposed to strike protection from every commodity controlled by a monopoly. The flames have been fanned, not merely by Democrats and Populists, but by the

most conservative Republicans. The time has come, then, for the protected interests to stop playing about this volcano; to make timely concessions; to grant at least a little in order to save much. It has not been for the sake of providing entertaining reading that Republican conventions in Oregon, Idaho, Wisconsin, and Iowa have recently declared for revision. The Republicans are in such dead earnest about the matter that Speaker Henderson says their bitterness in his own district can hardly be imagined. They want reform, and sooner or later they will get it. If President Roosevelt does not lead in the fight, he will be superseded by some one who will.

THE RUMANIAN CIRCULAR.

The condition of the Jews in Rumania forms the subject of an eloquent discourse on the part of Secretary Hay in the form of an official protest addressed to the Powers of Europe, the signatories of the Treaty of Berlin. The fact that we were not one of the parties to the treaty is acknowledged by Mr. Hay. He rests his appeal on broad principles of humanity and morality, and thus far he deserves the support of all men in all countries whose hearts are moved by the spectacle of suffering and injustice. "He takes my life who takes the means whereby I live," is what the persecuted Jew has been saying for a thousand years in all the countries of eastern Europe, and the saying is no less true now than it was at any other time in the world's history. The Jew is not subjected to the thumbscrew and the boot to compel him to disclose his treasures to needy princes. Modern cruelty takes another form. It begins at the bottom of the ladder instead of the top, and prevents the Jew from earning a living in fair competition with his fellows. This form of cruelty is apparently increasing in severity in the countries named. In Russia, not long since, the Jews were actually expelled from large districts where they had resided from time immemorial. Notwithstanding all these facts, we are not exactly the people to point the finger of scorn at other nations in this particular. It is open to Rumania to retort upon us that we have several millions of citizens who are excluded from a large range of employments, not on account of their religious belief, but on account of their complexion. Of the two reasons for discrimination, the one based upon color is the more unreasonable, since the Ethiopian cannot change his skin, whereas any man may change his religion. If the Rumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs spares us such retort, it will not be for want of sufficient material.

The semi-official *Vossische Zeitung* speaks of Secretary Hay's circular as "one of the most interesting documents

in contemporary history," and as "one of the most remarkable political acts of the present day." This is the general opinion of the European press, and in many directions the humanitarian intention and skilful form of the American note find generous recognition. But all European comment, so far, concerns the spirit rather than the letter of this unique document, which diplomacy will, after all, judge very strictly by its letter. Accordingly, it would be as foolish to take the friendly comment of the press of England, France, and Germany to be indicative of the success of the note, as it would be to regard the raging of the anti-Semitic journals as a sign of its failure.

Secretary Hay's appeal to the signatories of the Treaty of Berlin is indeed extraordinary both in substance and in form. The protest against Rumanian oppression of the Jews is of two-fold character. First, Mr. Hay alleges a specific grievance—the forced emigration to the United States of an undesirable class of refugees; second, he avers that this oppression is of so extreme and inhumane a nature as to warrant intervention by the Powers. This double character—practical and humanitarian—of the protest should be kept clearly in mind, for it is evident that what might be excellent humanitarianism might or might not be good diplomacy. Any appeal against an unwelcome immigration at New York or maltreatment of the Jews on the Danube would naturally be made to the offending party, and it seems to be implied in the note that Secretary Hay has made tentative and unsuccessful efforts to open direct negotiations with Rumania. However that may be, he has chosen finally a method rarely used except against semi-civilized nations—that of an appeal for joint action by the Powers.

But, again, his initiative is of an unprecedented kind. Finding that under her terms of inauguration by the Treaty of Berlin, Rumania is forbidden to discriminate against any person on grounds of religion, Secretary Hay points out that this contract has been broken by Rumania to the detriment of the United States. For this reason he requests the signatory Powers to take measures to make Rumania keep faith. Now the United States is not a party to the Treaty of Berlin; and if that were the whole of our case, Mr. Hay would undoubtedly receive an identical note reminding him that in this matter neither the signatory Powers were under contract to the United States, nor was Rumania, with which direct negotiation was always practicable. But Mr. Hay is too fine a hand at the diplomatic game to lay himself open to so facile a rebuff. To provide against that contingency, he secured the support of the British Foreign Office. The terms of its circular to the signatory Powers have not been published, but they are

undoubtedly such as to require a distinct and formal reply. The United States becomes technically associated with the English note, and the plea for the Rumanian Jews can neither be ruled out of court nor answered by a curt identical note. Whatever the outcome of the case, it will remain as a signal instance of joint action by Great Britain and the United States in behalf of an oppressed race. Secretary Hay, too, will receive a certain credit for contriving to appear at a tribunal before which he really has no standing whatever.

As for the grievance: in the three years ending July 31 last some twenty-one thousand Rumanian immigrants, presumably Jews for the most part, have come to this country. Our immigration laws have provided for the deportation of all paupers, criminals, and diseased persons, so that those who have been passed are technically at least desirable immigrants. They have been in any case an inconsiderable fraction of our total immigration. If the remaining 400,000 Jews of Rumania constitute a menace to us, we have the remedy of making our immigration laws more rigid, even to excluding Rumanians as we do Chinese. Such a course we should not take, but it would be far more consonant with our traditions than is interference with the domestic concerns of a remote Balkan state.

Then it might fairly be maintained that Rumania has outlived her tutelage. Clearly, no treaty erecting a dependent into an independent state has indefinite duration. Sooner or later the new nation outgrows the conditions of its founding, and assumes all the dignities of an independent power. Rumania may hardly admit that dependence upon the signatory Powers which Mr. Hay assumes with such confidence. She is a valued adjunct to the Triple Alliance, to the members of which her obligations are more recent and vital than to the Powers at large. Her area of approximately 50,000 square miles far exceeds that of Portugal, or Greece, and is a third larger than the combined areas of Denmark, Holland, and Belgium. Her population of 5,912,000 souls is greater than that of Denmark, Greece, Holland, Portugal, Sweden, or Norway. Her annual revenue is nearly 9,000,000 pounds sterling, imports upwards of 13,000,000 pounds, war strength 168,000 men. This is a lusty state to be kept in nonage, and to be dealt with under a contract compulsory to begin with, and violated with impunity for twenty years past. We may safely surmise that the Triple Alliance will not give Mr. Hay any answer that can be construed as a rebuke of its new coadjutor, that Russia will do nothing to heighten the distrust in which Rumania already holds her, that the appeal to the Treaty of Berlin will be disallowed, and that England and the United States will remain benevolent voices cry-

ing aimlessly in the wilderness, and saved from ridicule only through the fact that there is a certain humane intention in their appeal, which, however, the next punitive expedition of England or disfranchising of an American negro population may strikingly belie.

INDIFFERENCE TO ART.

Artists are, as a rule, convinced that the public is not only profoundly ignorant of art, but profoundly indifferent to it, and this conviction is by no means confined to artists who are materially unsuccessful. Even those whose work is bought and paid for on a fairly liberal scale, have a dissatisfied feeling that it is not really understood, but is admired and liked for what are, to them, inessential qualities. Perhaps they are, at times, a trifle unreasonable—they may even, conceivably, be mistaken in what they think essential. They are frequently accused of caring for nothing but technique, and the accusation is sometimes true. On the other hand, it seems to them that the public cares for nothing but subject. Our landscape painters are, perhaps, least out of harmony with their environment, but even they must sometimes feel that the interest in the thing depicted is out of proportion to the interest in what the artist has made of it: our figure-painters and our sculptors feel it much more.

Two of the most remarkable developments in art, of recent years, are in mural painting and in monumental sculpture. Building after building has been filled with decorations; some of our best artists have been kept constantly busy at such work, and have almost ceased to produce easel pictures; the people have thronged to the Library of Congress and the Boston Public Library to see the paintings. Monument after monument has been erected; our best sculptors have commissions three deep; no soldier or politician appears too unimportant to have his statue. All this seems, at first sight, to show a lively interest in art, but does it? Watch the people in the Boston Library, before Sargent's "History of Religion," consulting their guide-books and puzzling out the meaning of the figures, and you will conclude that the subject is all that interests them. The action of committees, the tone of criticism in the press, all point the same way. The first business of a work of art is to be beautiful; the first business of a decoration is to decorate. But let a painter spend his best energies on devising a scheme of beautiful and appropriate line and color which shall set off and complete the architecture of the room, and he is almost certain to be sneered at for his "meaningless figures," and to be scolded for "not telling anything." Let him make a clever illustration of history or legend, and he will be praised no matter how

confused is his composition, or how full of holes his color-scheme. The true decorator has to pretend to be an illustrator to satisfy his patrons, and he has to fight committees to escape from utterly unmanageable "historical subjects," or to devise ingenious circumventions and allegories which shall allow him some beauty while nominally conforming to the demands made upon him. He does not give art because the public asks it of him; he gives as much art as he is allowed to give by a public which is interested in other things.

The case is much the same with sculpture. Our sculptors are kept busy, but they are kept busy modelling trousers and hats. How often does one of them have an opportunity to produce a really sculptural and ideal work—a figure, nude or draped, treated for its sculptural beauty alone? Our parks and squares are full of statues; how many of them have any real beauty or are really ornaments of the places in which they stand? It is not wholly the fault of the sculptors—they would do better if they were allowed. Of course, there are incompetents among them, but there are also great and true artists, who seize every chance for beauty and often achieve it, though sometimes in devious ways and by side issues. What the public wants is not a work of art, but a monument to this or that man, of whom, often on slight enough grounds, it has made a hero; and generally it insists on a portrait statue, no matter how unstatuesque the hero may have been, and resents, more or less, even the poor little accessory allegory by which the artist tries to escape, for a moment, from the hideous and the real. Our statues are ugly, in the main, because we like to have them so.

The newspaper press may be thought to give a fair reflection of the wants of its readers, and the newspaper reports of the unveiling of statues show a marked indifference to the question of art. Examples abound, and are to be drawn even from journals which habitually show interest in art. Such a one must print the news, sometimes, as it comes to it; and one such printed, the other day, a quarter of a column upon the dedication of a statue to Governor Flower, in which the name of the sculptor was not so much as mentioned, though that sculptor happened to be our greatest master. The reporter may well have thought that art criticism was not his province, and that he was not called upon to attempt it; but he was so convinced of the indifference of the public to art that it did not occur to him that any one might like to know. merely as a matter of news, that the statue was by Saint Gaudens. But if the journal in question took one statue from Mr. Saint Gaudens, it made up for it by presenting him with another, for a few days afterward it spoke of the Channing statue, which is to be erected in the