

the Armenians continues, and that it should bring every influence to bear upon the civilized nations of Europe which may cause them to present a united front in demanding that such atrocities cease at once and forever." A second letter is addressed by them to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In this they truly declare that the persecution of the Armenians is distinctly a religious persecution; that "the number of martyrs already sacrificed is probably larger than in any of the persecutions of the early Church," and that "a crusade supported by Christians the world over would be truly warranted;" and they ask "that the great Church of England, through her Episcopate, shall take decisive action, that our suffering fellow-Christians may find, not only ready sympathy, but speedy deliverance from their foes." A third letter has been sent to the Czar of Russia, the Emperors of Germany and of Austria, and the President of the French Republic, imploring them "in Christ's name to come to the aid of our persecuted brethren." These letters are signed by sixty-two Bishops of the Episcopal Church in this country. We believe that there is no other Protestant Church which has a permanent body analogous to the Bishops who can speak with authority for it, but individual clergymen might very legitimately and wisely address personal letters to President Cleveland, urging him to take action by submitting to the powers of Europe the resolutions of protest adopted by the Senate and the House. President Cleveland has shown himself on many an occasion not indifferent to the Christian sentiment of this country, and if he is satisfied that this sentiment unanimously demands at least an official and National protest against the continuance of these massacres, we do not believe he will refuse to allow that protest to be presented to the Christian powers.

In recent State reports the most interesting figures relate to the effect of the depression upon wages. In the Connecticut labor report returns are published from nearly four hundred leading establishments, giving employment to nearly one-half the manufacturing labor of the State. Directly from the books of these establishments were taken the number of employees, hours of employment, and wages in the prosperous year 1892 as compared with the period between June, 1893, and August, 1894. It was found that a little over half of the establishments had reduced wages, and that the usual cut had been ten per cent. The heavy losses of the wage-earners, however, came, not from reduced pay during employment, but from reduced employment. The average number on the pay-rolls had been cut down fifteen per cent., and many of those nominally retained received work irregularly. All of these reductions reflected themselves in the total wage payments. These had decreased twenty-five per cent. If these firms were typical of the State at large, the great mass of families in Connecticut had their incomes reduced one-fourth. The Massachusetts "Statistics of Manufactures" for 1893 and 1894 indicate the substantial justice of the conclusions reached in the Connecticut report. The Massachusetts reports, which have been issued yearly for nearly a decade, cover the great bulk of the manufacturing labor in the State. The last two volumes show that the money value of the product of the manufactories, as well as the wages of the laborers, have fallen greatly since 1892. Taking 1892 as a standard, the percentages have been as follows:

	1892.	1893.	1894.
Total value of product.....	100	92	83
Average wages when employed.....	100	96	93
Total wages for year.....	100	92	84

In other words, though the nominal wages of laborers

when employed had fallen but seven per cent., their annual wages had fallen sixteen per cent. since 1892. Inasmuch as the value of the product in these manufactories had fallen in approximately the same proportion, it is evident that the incomes of employers suffered as much as the incomes of employees. These figures would seem to show that, temporarily at least, the incomes of the producing classes in the manufacturing States were reduced almost as much as those of the farmers by the universal fall of prices which began with the exclusion of silver from the mints of India in June, 1893.

An event of extreme interest and importance to all archæologists and students of the old Greek life is announced in a letter to the New York "Tribune" from Professor Benjamin I. Wheeler, of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. The Government of Greece has granted to the American School the exclusive right of excavating at Corinth. This concession is hardly less valuable and promising than that of the privilege of excavating at Delphi, for which the American School asked a few years ago, but without success. Indeed, Professor Wheeler points out that in some respects the newly granted privilege is likely to be the greatest of all the excavating concessions. None of the large Greek cities has been uncovered, and Corinth was the second ancient Greek city in size, the first in wealth. Ancient Athens is, of course, covered in great part by the modern city, while Corinth has above it nothing but grain-fields, and Professor Wheeler tells us that even on the surface of these grain-covered fields there are many indications of the great buildings lying beneath. It may be confidently hoped, therefore, that when, after several years' work, a considerable part of the site of ancient Corinth has been uncovered, the explorers may see before them the actual arrangement of a Greek city, with its streets, its homes, its temples and theaters, and—most interesting of all—its Agora, or chief square. In this way it will be possible to reconstruct the old Greek life in many of its external features with a fullness and accuracy which has never before been attained. The work will be one of great labor, and will undoubtedly extend over several years. The compliment to the American School of Classical Studies implied by this grant is a great one. It has been made because of the excellent work done by the American School at Athens, and is a graceful recognition of American scholarship. The people of the United States in return can surely do no less than to furnish the means for carrying on the excavation. At present the American School has no adequate funds in its possession. At least \$10,000 will be required for the work. Professor Wheeler invites those interested in the subject to correspond with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Greece.

We have received from the translator, John Gennadius, formerly Minister from Greece to the United States, a copy in English of the reply of the "Holy Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church of the East"—that is, the Greek Church—to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. on Reunion. The gist of this reply is that the Greek Church is ready to receive proposals of reunion based on the Gospels and the decrees of the seven Holy Ecumenical Councils; that this can be done only provided "the Bishop of Rome shakes off once and for all time the many and diverse innovations which, contrary to the Gospel, have been stealthily introduced into the Church;" that, in particular, the Church must abandon the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, must use leavened instead of

unleavened bread, trine immersion in lieu of sprinkling, permit the laity to partake of the sacred cup, abandon the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and erase from its creed the novel dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Why the Greek Church should insist on being bound "by the rules of the first nine centuries of Christianity," why it should not either go back to the Gospels themselves, or else recognize the possibility of growth for the nineteen centuries, we fail to see; but it is tolerably clear from this reply that the union of the Greek and Roman Churches is not much nearer than it was a century after the schism took place; nor can we think this reply, though not directed to the Anglican Church, can have the effect to encourage Anglicans to hope for the union of the Greek Church with themselves on any common basis of either doctrine or ritual.



The Greater New York Bill

The present movement to make a Greater New York is a movement to make a worse one. Unquestionably it finds support from some honest men, and is acquiesced in by a great many who are uninformed. But the political forces back of it are those of politicians who hope to undo the work of reform and restore the rule of ring.

New York City has never had so good a government as to-day. It ought to be better, and would be if the bill for the reorganization of the police had passed. But it is administered by clean men, who have the interests of the city at heart. The Police Commissioners are honestly enforcing the laws; the streets are clean; the city is not paying double prices for poor quality of goods and service. In Brooklyn the non-partisan administration of Mayor Schieren is followed by the Republican administration of Mayor Wurster, and its quality is yet to be proved. But Mayor Wurster was an anti-ring candidate, and, if he does not raise the standard of his predecessor, he certainly will not go back to the standards of some previous administrations. In both cities the people are relatively well served; the politicians are out.

And the politicians want to get in. That is the secret of the present purpose of the Lexow Committee to put these two cities together, whether the cities like it or not. Such a union will necessitate a new administration, a new set of officers, a new "deal." The reform governments will be legislated out of office. Pending the transition the two cities will be governed by Commissioners appointed by the Platt-Tammany combination and confirmed by the Governor. The work of Mayor Strong, Mr. Roosevelt, and Colonel Waring will be undone. A similar revolution in the interest of the same set of politicians will be accomplished in Brooklyn. The reforms already achieved will be overturned. Future reform will be made very difficult. What we need is not a Greater New York but a better New York. And the present is a plan to create a worse one.

Whether New York, Brooklyn, and vicinity should be united in one city or not, the union should not be intrusted to the present men, nor carried out in the present methods, nor for the ends now sought. It is monstrous to transfer two-thirds of the citizens of Brooklyn to a new government because one-third voted for the transfer. That is what the present bill proposes to do. It is monstrous to unite two millions of people in a new government without even telling them beforehand what the government is to be. That also is what the present bill proposes to do. It is monstrous to interfere in a great beneficent reform wrought by local self-government, to deny the right of self-government for the purpose of overturning the reform,

and to reinstate the corrupt elements which have been unseated. That also is what the present bill proposes to do. Whether New York and Brooklyn would be better as one city or two is a fair question, not wholly easy to be answered; but, if they are to be united, there is a right and there is a wrong way of uniting them; and the present is the wrong way. If such a union is to be effected, the problem should be carefully studied by experts; the best light obtainable from other cities in America and Europe should be obtained; a plan should be perfected; that plan, in its general features if not in its detail, should be submitted to the people and their approval asked; and the union should not be consummated without a clear majority of the voters of both cities in its favor, after full deliberation. To force the two cities to abandon the reforms they have won with such difficulty, and to unite in a new and unknown organization, without telling them what it is to be, is an act of despotic and arbitrary power without precedent in American history. But if this precedent is once set, it will be followed by analogous acts of tyranny over other cities, by the same corrupt methods and for the same corrupt ends.

We urge our readers in New York State outside of the two cities immediately affected to interest themselves in this matter, and to call on their legislators to defeat the present ill-devised and retrogressive measure.



"American Dislike for England"

We reprint on another page an article which appears under the above caption in the London "Spectator" for January 25. We reprint it because we think it ought to be widely read and considered by every American who believes in the brotherhood of man, and especially the brotherhood of the English-speaking people of the world. The "Spectator" probably exerts as great an influence upon the thought of Englishmen of the highest type as any other one journal published in Great Britain. What it says, therefore, on so important a subject as the friendly relations of England and America commands attention. Moreover, in this article it manifests a spirit of deep friendliness which we believe exists underneath the surface among the great body of both Englishmen and Americans, notwithstanding the efforts of some newspapers and politicians to stifle it. It seems to us to be the duty of every patriotic American to respond heartily to the desire expressed by the "Spectator" for a clearer and healthier understanding between the two countries, and to its conviction that a day will come when "the two nations will be equally anxious to substitute affection for dislike."

Responding to this article, we may say, first of all, that America's dislike for England has been greatly exaggerated, America's affection for England little comprehended. The recent blast of passionate anti-English feeling was followed in five days by a voice from the American pulpit which was not merely a protest against war as a method of settling National disputes, but also a protest against the anti-English prejudice which excited the war fever. These pulpits represented in America much the same constituency which the "Spectator" represents in England—a constituency which is slower to speak, but not less influential for that reason. But, making due allowance for this fact, we must concede an amount of anti-English feeling in the United States which has been quite as great a surprise to some Americans as to most Englishmen. Apart from recollections of ill treatment inherited from Revolutionary days and aggravated by more recent recollections of the Civil War, apart from a certain brusqueness of manner