

number of years ago. But her home was a hospitable resting-place, where men of genius were at ease, without demands made on them or exhibition made of them. Among her intimate friends were Holmes, Longfellow, Whittier, Mrs. Stowe, Lucy Larcom, Stedman, Phillips Brooks, Henry Ward Beecher, Wendell Phillips, Garrison, and Sumner. Mrs. Claflin has given the public a little glimpse of this beautiful life in her last book—"The Old Elms." She was a woman of remarkable executive ability, of singular poise of character, with that excellence of judgment which such poise generally confers, with a refined culture, the result of a long life spent in really the best society of the country—best measured by heart and mind—and a fine literary taste, showing itself as truly in her conversation as in her too infrequent contributions to literature. All her gifts she consecrated with great singleness of purpose and unconscious simplicity of nature to the service of others. No one thought of envying her the wealth, position, culture, and friends she possessed, because they were all used by her to confer blessing upon others. "I know," says Paul, "both how to be abased and how to abound." There are not too many Americans who know how to abound. This is a knowledge which Mrs. Claflin possessed in an eminent degree, and it won for her from all who knew her at all intimately that love which is so much to be desired above mere admiration. She was admired for her abilities; she was loved for her unselfish employment of them. Many a charity will miss her as sorely as will the social circles which she helped to create and inspire.



## The Republican Platform

The Republican platform, in its clear enunciation of principles and in its wise silences, is superior to any recent platform literature in our political history. It is wisely silent respecting the issues which grew out of the war. It has turned its face from the past toward the future. With the exception of the planks on the subject of temperance and woman—planks so platitudinous that a reasonable sense of humor should have sufficed to exclude them—the platform expresses, in clear and cogent English, positive convictions on the great National issues of the hour. Its most important utterances, by which the issues of the campaign will practically be decided, are those upon protection, currency, and our foreign policy.

Its protection plank seems to us to mark a decided advance toward a permanent protective policy over any previous utterance of the Republican party. Whether a comparison of this with previous platforms would justify this declaration or not, it is certain that protection as defined in this platform is proposed, not as an incident in a revenue-raising tariff, nor as a temporary expedient for promoting infant manufactures until they are strong enough to meet with foreign competition, but as a permanent National policy for the purpose of excluding foreign competition and raising domestic prices—protection, not of manufactures by the admission of raw material free, but of the products alike of the field and of the factory. With this is coupled a declaration in favor of reciprocity—"free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce." The principle of protection as thus defined seems to us to have as its intended effect the building up of a wall between nations. If generally accepted by other nationalities, we should find our breadstuffs excluded from England and our pork from Germany, for it is a poor rule which does not work both ways. The Outlook desires, on contrary, to see all walls between nations taken down,

and the same unrestricted traffic between all the civilized nations of the globe which now exists between all the States of this Union. Reciprocity might bring this about, but not reciprocity as defined by the Republican platform. The voter, however, has to decide, not between ideal systems, but between such systems as are practically offered to him in the alternatives of a political campaign. Between a tariff system organized for the protection and promotion of all American industries, agriculture and manufacturing, and such a hybrid as finally passed the Congress of the United States, by which, despite a platform declaring in favor of tariff for revenue only, protection was offered, not to all American industry, but to certain special industries favored by financial interests in the Senate, we cannot think the American people will long hesitate. The Republican platform offers a definite, consistent, self-respecting policy. So did Mr. Cleveland's famous message; so did the Wilson Bill as it proceeded from the hand of its author. So did not the present tariff measure after great corporate interests had exerted their influence upon it.

On the currency question the Republican party declares itself "opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved." This is perfectly explicit, and the country is to be congratulated on so definite and clear a statement. On all currency questions we speak with reserve. They are confessedly most difficult; they require expert judgment; and, unfortunately, expert judgment is not always disinterested. We believe that the gold standard has worked, and is working, serious injury and serious injustice; but, so far as we can judge, the abandonment of the gold standard by this country without the co-operation of the other nations with which it is commercially united would work greater injury and greater injustice. It would almost inevitably give us two kinds of money, of unequal value. It would almost inevitably shake, if it did not shatter, the credit system on which the prosperity of the Nation depends. It would almost inevitably separate us from other nations with which our commercial prosperity is identified, and impair our credit alike in our own country and in other countries. It would not improbably delay, and possibly prevent, the adoption of a bimetallic standard by international agreement, so effectively urged by Mr. Whitney in his letter from which we quote in another column. Whether it produced these results or not, it would be a leap in the dark; and a leap in the dark it is never wise for a people to take, and the Anglo-Saxon people are never inclined to take it. As between the free coinage of silver and the maintenance of the present standard until bimetalism can be secured by international agreement, the latter we believe to be the more conservative, the more cautious, and the safer course.

Upon the third great National issue, perhaps the most important of the three, the Republican platform favors what may be properly termed an aggressive foreign policy. It believes that the Hawaiian Islands should be controlled by the United States, that "the Nicaraguan Canal should be built, owned, and operated by the United States," that the Danish Islands should be purchased for a naval station, that increase of colonial possessions in either the North or South American continents, even by purchase, should be resisted, and that our navy and our harbor and seacoast defenses should be further enlarged. Upon these points The Outlook differs from the Republican platform. We believe that it is wise to leave the Hawaiian Islands to take care of themselves; not to interfere with the affairs of

the South American States, except for the protection of our own National interests in the remote contingency of their being in peril; to leave the Nicaraguan Canal to be built by private enterprise whenever there is a prospect of sufficient commercial profit to justify so great an undertaking; and, finally, we doubt the wisdom of any further enlargement of our navy, and we think that a permanent court of arbitration would be a far more effective and a far less expensive protection to our coast than any enlargement of harbor and seacoast defenses.

### Professor Phelps on International Arbitration

Professor E. J. Phelps, in an article in the July "Atlantic Monthly," states from the conservative point of view the objections to a permanent court for the settlement of all issues between nations—a supreme court of Christendom, analogous to the Supreme Court of the United States. His objections may be briefly stated to be (1) that "an arbitration cannot extend the rules of international law beyond what is already established, since those rules find their only sanction and authority in the general consent of nations;" (2) "nor can it be expected that any controversy whatever which involves national honor will be submitted to arbitration by any nation capable of self-vindication;" (3) "that the same considerations will likewise prevent the reference to such a tribunal of any dispute involving the integrity of the territory of a nation;" (4) and, finally, that "in no case whatever can that remedy (arbitration) be successfully proposed where popular feeling on the one side or the other has reached fighting heat and has passed beyond the control of representative government."

Anything which Professor Phelps writes on this subject is entitled to be treated with great respect by all readers of intelligence on both sides the Atlantic. Nevertheless, we cannot but think that Professor Phelps's article shows more of the spirit of the lawyer than of the statesman; of the man who is governed by precedents than of the man who is guided by principles. There is danger, certainly, in the visionary who evolves an ideal out of his own imagination and then seeks to conform his practice or the practice of the community to this ideal. But there is also danger in the traditionalist who imagines that nothing can be which has not been, and measures all propositions for reform by historical precedents. The wise philosopher does neither; he considers the history of the past chiefly that he may learn from it what are the principles by which mankind should be guided and governed, and when he has elucidated these principles he applies them with unhesitating courage to new conditions. Thus, he perceives that a permanent tribunal has taken the place of wager of battle in the settlement of questions of personal and property rights; that public opinion has taken the place of the duel in the settlement of questions of personal honor; that the Supreme Court of the United States has taken the place of war in the settlement of controversies in this continent arising between over forty independent States; and, finally, that in the last century more than seventy-five different questions arising between different nations have been settled by appeal to courts of arbitration. From this history of the progress of the past he deduces the conclusion that the day is not far distant when all questions between nations will be settled by an appeal to reason, as now all questions between individuals are settled and all questions between the States of this Union.

To answer Professor Phelps's objections as briefly as

we stated them: (1) An international tribunal would be the method of determining what is the general consent of nations, as now the State tribunal determines what is the general consent of individuals. (2) No question of national honor can be stated which would not better be solved by the appeal to reason than by the appeal to force of arms. (3) The integrity of national territory, regarded, as it ought to be, as a sacred trust, would be better protected by such an appeal than by the arbitrament of arms, which settles nothing but the relative force of the combatants. (4) And, finally, the creation of a permanent court, to which as a matter of course all issues arising should be referred, would prevent popular feeling from passing beyond the control of representative government exactly as it has prevented popular feeling from passing beyond such control, except in one instance, during the hundred years of our national existence.

It appears to us that Mr. Phelps has not acquainted himself even with the latest precedents. At least there is nothing in his article to indicate that he is aware of the fact that, within the last twelve months, France has, by the nearly unanimous action of its legislative chambers, proposed a permanent treaty of arbitration between that country and the United States; that negotiations are now pending between England and the United States for a permanent tribunal for the settlement of issues arising between those two nations; and that the International Parliamentary Conference, in which were members from fourteen different European Parliaments, has not only proposed to its respective Governments the organization of a permanent tribunal, but has formulated a plan for its organization. With these indications present before us, we ought not to go back one or two hundred years to determine what can be done in this close of the nineteenth century and this opening of the twentieth for the substitution of reason in the place of force as a means of settling questions of justice between the nations.

### Growth Through Experience

There is a general agreement among men that experience is the most effective and successful of teachers; that for many men no other form of education is possible; and that those who enjoy the fullest educational opportunities miss the deeper processes of training if they fail of that wide contact with the happenings of life which we call experience. To touch the world at many points; to come into relations with many kinds of men; to think, to feel, and to act on a generous scale—these are prime opportunities for growth. For it is not only true, as Browning said so often and in so many kinds of speech, that a man's greatest good fortune is to have the opportunity of giving out freely and powerfully all the force that is in him, but it is also true that almost equal good fortune attends the man who has the opportunity of receiving truth and instruction through a wide and rich experience.

But individual experience, however inclusive and deep, is necessarily limited, and the life of the greatest man would be confined within narrow boundaries if he were shut within the circle of his own individual contact with things and persons. If Shakespeare had written of those things only of which he had personal knowledge, of those experiences in which he had personally shared, his contribution to literature would be deeply interesting, but it would not possess that quality of universality which makes it the property of the race. In Shakespeare there was not only knowledge of man, but knowledge of men as well.