

requires himself to pay them in gold, so long he will have to continue to borrow gold with which to pay them.

But for this condition of things he is not alone responsible. If Congress is of the opinion that coin notes should be paid in silver if we have not on hand gold enough to pay them with, it should say so explicitly. If it does not say so, the President has a right to believe that Congress shares his opinion with him; and as Congress presumably represents the people of the United States, he has a right to believe that the people of the United States share his opinion with him. Those who think that he is wrong in his judgment ought not to malign his motives. They ought to demand of Congress that it should take away the discretion which it has lodged in him. We should like to see the President use his option and at least try the experiment of paying the coin notes in silver whenever paying them all in gold threatens to drain the Treasury of its gold. If the result should be a permanent difference in the value of gold and silver, it would go far to disprove the bimetallic theory. If the result should be that silver remained substantially at par with gold, it would go far to disprove the monometallic theory; and although it is possible that the country might suffer a temporary reverse during the period of the experiment, it is hardly possible that such a reverse could inflict more injury than is inflicted by a chronic state of uncertainty. In our judgment, the result of the experiment would be worth all that the experiment would cost.



An Unreasonable Prejudice

The recent war excitement has revealed an amount of anti-English sentiment in the United States which has been, to those who love the mother land, a great surprise. It is not wholly an inexplicable prejudice. The causes which have produced it are easily discerned. It has been in part inherited from Revolutionary times; and the recent revival of Revolutionary sentiment, witnessed and developed by such organizations as the Sons of the Revolution and the Daughters of the Revolution, has revived and intensified this inherited sentiment. The course of the English aristocracy during our Civil War indicated, if it did not demonstrate, a desire to see the Nation broken into fragments and republicanism proved a failure. Generous natures forget injuries and remember services rendered; but all natures are not generous, and too many Americans remember only the English oligarchy which let loose the Alabama, and forget the English workingman who gladly suffered want rather than sanction any National act in aid of slavery and secession. They remember Lord Palmerston, but forget Prince Albert and Queen Victoria. England and America are commercial rivals, and the rivalry is not always, perhaps not even generally, chivalric; and the public agitation for a protective tariff has often been a public agitation against English manufacturers. Irish immigrants have imported their prejudices with them, and political competitors for the Irish vote have sedulously cultivated the prejudice which statesmanship would have endeavored to allay. More generous motives have contributed to influence the passionate antipathy of the Irish emigrant to "Bloody England." The American is by instinct a Home Ruler, responds to Gladstone's fiery invective against England's centuries of wrong-doing toward Ireland, forgets that Gladstone is also an Englishman, and would like to see England pay some penalty for her injustice. If the morals of most Englishmen are worthy of our emulation, the manners of most Englishmen are not. A great many traveled Americans have been irritated by a certain superciliousness characteristic of John Bull; and when one people easily give offense

and another are quick to take it, antipathies are readily aroused. English superciliousness has infected English literature. The treatment of America by English writers, from the days of Dickens's "Notes" onward, has rankled in American breasts; we have pretended an indifference to English satire which we did not really feel, and the satire has not always been good-natured.

Nevertheless, we call the anti-English prejudice in America an unreasonable prejudice. It is unreasonable because it is indiscriminating; because it remembers only England's faults and forgets her virtues; because it recalls only the wrongs she has inflicted and forgets the services she has rendered. It is worse than irrational, it is unjust, because it desires only to repay her for real or fancied wrongs endured, and has no desire to recognize and repay the debt we owe her for great gifts received at her hands.

There are two Englands: feudal England and democratic England; oligarchic England and republican England; the England of a landed aristocracy and the England of the common people; the England of William the Conqueror, the Norman freebooter, and the England of Harold, the Anglo-Saxon martyr king; the England of Henry III., the ardent defender of arbitrary power, and the England of Simon de Montfort, the founder of the English House of Commons; the England of Bloody Mary and Bishop Gardiner, and the England of Queen Elizabeth and Walsingham; the England of Charles I. and the Cavaliers, and the England of Cromwell and the Puritans; the England of George III. and Lord North, and the England of the Earl of Chatham and Edmund Burke. In our Civil War there was an England that would have interfered to promote the dissolution of our Union and an England which forbade that interference. It was to this latter England that Henry Ward Beecher spoke in those famous English addresses; it was the response of that England which prevented interference. "To my amazement," says Mr. Beecher in giving an account of his English experiences, "I found that the unvoting English possessed great power in England; a great deal more than if they had had a vote. . . . Parliament would at any time for three years have voted for the South against the North if it had not been for the fear of these common people who did not vote." We call that an unreasoning prejudice which forgets democratic England, the England of the plain people, the England that protested, although in vain, against the attempt of the English Government to coerce the Colonies in 1776, and protested not in vain against the desire of the English Government to destroy the American Nation in 1863. This is the England of John Morley and Lord Rosebery and William E. Gladstone. This is the England that is equally indignant at Lord Salisbury's pacific temper toward Turkey and his patronizing temper toward the United States. Policy and principle alike demand that we recognize this England as our friend, as equally desirous with ourselves to secure justice and equal rights for the common people everywhere, as equally republican with Americans in sentiment, and far more republican than the military oligarchies which rule and ruin in the so-called Spanish republics. Policy and principle alike demand that we ally ourselves to this democratic England in its undying hostility to feudalism everywhere, and not make war upon it—not even a war of words—in a blind and indiscriminating prejudice against everything English.

If democratic England is allied to us by its ideals, its aims, its spirit, no less are we bound to democratic England by the historic services which it has rendered in the maintenance and development of free institutions. All the

earlier problems of free government were wrought out by Englishmen on English soil. All the earlier battles for our freedom were fought out by our English ancestry, and the victory won by English bravery and blood. Alfred the Great laid the foundations of the American Commonwealth. By the constitutions of Clarendon religious liberty and the subjection of ecclesiastics to the law of the land were established for America, yet unborn, as well as for England. The barons, when they wrested the Great Charter from the hands of King John, hazarded their lives and fortunes for us. Simon de Montfort founded the American House of Representatives when he won for the common people a right of representation in Parliament, a constituent part of which has ever since been the House of Commons. The forty years of Elizabethan diplomacy prevented these United States from becoming Spanish colonies, subject to an Inquisition more ruthless than that of Spain. In the battles of Marston Moor, Worcester, and Culloden was achieved the deliverance of America from the despotism which the House of Stuart would have imposed on all English-speaking peoples. To Chatham and to Burke not less than to Adams and to Jefferson we owe the recognition of American independence and the birth of the American Republic. Are we to forget this unpayable debt to a splendid ancestry because British manners have sometimes offended American sensitiveness, British industries have put us on our mettle to compete with them, and British policy has been too aggressive in its methods and too brusque in its spirit?

England and America should be one people in everything but government. We have one history, one faith, one language; we should have but one aim. United we can dominate the globe with our literature, our ideas, our free spirit, our Christian faith. Whatever policy estranges these two nations is inimical to both; whoever inflames the prejudices of either against the other is an enemy of the human race.



The Atlanta Exposition

The Cotton States and International Exposition, which closed its doors in Atlanta on the eve of the New Year, may fairly be expected to result in material good for the community which created it and to the section which furnished its chief support. It was, in the main, a Southern exposition. What it possessed of international character was furnished by purely commercial exhibits, for it followed too fast upon the heels of the great Chicago World's Fair for foreign governments to interest themselves in it. The same cause deprived it of as wide official recognition by the States of this Union as was extended even to the Cotton Centennial Exposition at New Orleans in 1884. At Atlanta New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois, California, Alabama, and Georgia were represented by State buildings, but other commonwealths had only such slender representation as honorary commissioners might be able to secure without the appropriation of funds by the State.

Though not in the proper sense international or even broadly national, the Atlanta Exposition was still highly creditable. Nature did much to make its appearance impressive, for the park in which it was placed abounded in lofty ridges, which were used by the landscape gardeners with good effect. From a dozen points within the gates the whole group of buildings, soberly colored gray and green, could be seen, and the beauty of the illumination of the grounds at night was not exceeded by anything in Chicago

in 1893. No such stimulus to architecture as resulted from Chicago's Fair can be expected of the Atlanta Exposition, for in the construction of all the buildings economy was the guiding principle, and, though there was no conspicuous instance of bad taste shown, the architecture was monotonous and even commonplace. Indeed, it was on the side of art that the Exposition was weakest.

Yet that so great an enterprise could have been carried to completion at all by the citizens of a town of barely 100,000 people borders on the marvelous. The undertaking was in proportion greater than that of Chicago, and its projectors encountered obstacles such as the Chicagoans never met. Atlanta, though richly provided with railroad facilities, is not in the midst of a densely populated region. The nearest of the great Northern cities is full fifteen hours' ride away. The volume of Northern attendance upon the Exposition was, when all facts are considered, amazingly large. Chicago dispatched thither in one great excursion nearly 2,500 people, including a whole regiment of militia. But it was hardly to be expected that the attendance of Northerners would be great enough to figure very heavily in the gate receipts. The people of the South, for their part, had not in late years enjoyed such widespread prosperity as to enable them to undertake expensive sightseeing. For these reasons the attendance fell far below what had been anticipated, reaching only 1,200,000 in the season of fifty-four days; and the revenue from gate receipts was so insufficient as to more than once threaten serious embarrassment. At such times a brilliant illustration of public spirit was given by the Atlanta gentlemen who were intrusted with the conduct of the enterprise. Repeatedly, and with unabated cheerfulness, they gave of their own funds to avert threatened disaster.

Much profit will accrue to Atlanta, and even more to the South as a whole, from this very creditable Exposition. The city has acquired a reputation for enterprise which cannot fail to be of advantage to it. The resources of the region for which it is the natural distributing point have been widely advertised. But, aside from the purely material advantages, the Exposition has profited the whole South in a fashion the effects of which will be long felt. Wise management, foresight of a sort which statesmen might envy, led the Atlantans to give to the colored people the widest possible share in the Exposition. Professor Booker T. Washington spoke for his race on the opening day, and no words spoken during the entire course of the Exposition produced so notable an effect as his. A Southern audience cheered him to the echo, and the Southern press applauded his address as that of a man of brilliant parts and of pure patriotism. And in the exhibits gathered in the "Negro Building" the thoughtful visitor might see evidences of the aspirations and upward striving of a race no longer content with being mere hewers of wood and drawers of water.

There has resulted profit to the whole country, too, from the demonstration of the spirit of hearty good fellowship manifested by all communities for this plucky Southern town. The rule of the American press in dealing with the Atlanta Fair was *nil nisi bonum*. Much there was that might have been criticised. There were shortcomings of plan and of execution. But the newspapers of the land ignored the flaws and celebrated the perfections. And from every quarter of the United States flocked to Atlanta excursions, drawn thither as much by the widespread desire to help a Southern enterprise as by any curiosity to see the show. If Atlanta was unbounded in its hospitality, as indeed it was, the Nation was unstinted of sympathy and encouragement.