honesty on one side, as well as liberality on the other. Not only does Congress owe the adoption of such a rule to the cause of public morals, which throughout large portions of the West is rapidly yielding to a spirit of lawless repudiation, but it is a necessary condition of "justice." Why should the holders of dishonored Arkansas and Missouri bonds, that have supplied those States with a large share of the commercial facilities they possess, be called upon to contribute further to their systems of internal improvements, when they cannot get even thanks from their supercilious debtors? It is time these matters were being considered, both in view of the increasing demands upon the nation's bounty, and the growing indifference of large sections of the country to the sacredness of their legal obligations. It is time that Eastern Congressmen were having their attention called to them, and that Eastern constituencies were selecting representatives who will weigh them. The subject has been too long neglected by those who have had charge of the national purse. One illustration on this point is sufficient. At the last session of Congress, in an appropriation bill which was hurried through in the last turbulent hours, there is said to have been a considerable grant for a public building at, and chiefly for the benefit of, Kansas City, in the State of Missouri. Kansas City is in a county and a township that together owe three-quarters of a million of dollars on bonds which were sold by their own agents, of which they have the benefit, and about the equity of which no question can be raised, but on which, although perfectly able, they pay not one cent. Not another dollar of public money should go to that work while that state of things continues. Other similar instances might be given.

THE ALLIANCE OF THE EMPERORS.

PARIS, July 11, 1878.

THE work of the Congress of Berlin is progressing with a stupendous rapidity, and the easy manner in which questions of the greatest magnitude are solved with a *trait de plume* would sufficiently show that preliminary arrangements had taken place between the great Powers, if the whole world had not been made aware of it by the trial of the unfortunate clerk who sold for a few pounds a copy of the famous Memorandum signed by Count Shuvaloff and Lord Salisbury.

It is becoming more and more evident to all who have eyes and are willing to use them that the so-called alliance of the three Emperors has always been a stout and solid reality; that Russia entered into the Eastern war with the permission not only of Germany but of Austria. Count Andrássy had a difficult task, and, on the whole, he may be said to have performed it well, perhaps owing to his defects as much as to his qualities; by his defects I mean a natural indolence, a sort of *laissez-aller*, a great dread of written engagements. He had to take care of the Hungarians, who have all along been in full sympathy with the Turks, and who have a great contempt for all the Christian Slavs; it pleases the Magyars to have one of themselves Chancellor of Austria-Hungary, adorning the court with his fine person and his dazzling uniforms. The Hungarians have been amused all along by a simulacrum of opposition to the plans of Russia, or at least by bold and high-sounding declarations that Austria-Hungary would defend Austro-Hungarian interests as soon as they were endangered. Then came the "accomplished fact"; Turkey was crushed at Plevna, the whole fabric of the Ottoman Empire fell to the ground; it was perceived that after all this dreaded empire was but a shell, and the shell was broken. If the Russian armies had chosen to enter Constantinople they would have met with no serious resistance. The mere fact that they did not crown their victory by the occupation of Stamboul was a new demonstration that the alliance of the three Emperors was not an empty word; it is clear that Constantinople was forbidden ground and a sort of *ne plus ultra*.

So far all went well with Russia; the Hungarian demonstration was not very serious, the German Chancellor paid not the slightest attention to the complaints of those intolerant Germans who were beginning to think that the "Colossus of the North" was becoming too big and endangered German interests. At this moment England entered on the scene. The real difficulties only began then, and the peace of the world seemed already in peril. What would have been the consequences of a war between Russia and England it is difficult to imagine; but everybody felt that Europe, and perhaps extra-European Powers, would be fatally drawn into its vortex. Already dangerous questions of maritime law were discussed; cruisers were bought or were preparing their armaments; the battle of the elephant and the whale, as Prince Bismarck called it, would necessarily have been long and full of unforeseen incidents. The Treaty of San Stefano seemed at one moment to have been completely torn in rags; the sweeping circular of Lord Salisbury left nothing untouched in the work of Prince Ignatieff. England was arming in earnest; she sent her regiments by the Suez Canal to Malta. It had been said all along that she had no army; her little army of England could not be a match for the stupendous Continental armies of the present day. But the statesman who added the title of Empress of India to the title of Queen of Great Britain had not done it for the vain object of adding a few rays to the lustre of the crown; he had intended to make England truly Asiatic, to make her the greatest power on earth, not only by the addition of acres and acres of land, but by the support of thousands and millions of men. The arrival of the gorgeous Indian regiments on the scene of Europe is one of the most extraordinary events of our time, of which all the consequences can hardly be foreseen.

Still, it was a bold, it was even an imprudent course to throw the Treaty of San Stefano away with contempt; to deny to Russia the right to alter the frontiers and the treaties without the consent of Europe; to refuse to her what was contained in her victories. Russia was not so exhausted as her enemies said. She had, owing to the opposition of England, only been allowed to borrow a little money at Berlin, in Holland, and in France; her foreign debt had only been increased by six hundred and fifty millions of francs—all the rest had been borrowed at home, in the shape of paper money. The rouble had lost much of its value, but the Minister of Finance had profited by its depreciation in buying back roubles with treasury bills; the Russian people was thoroughly used to the paper rouble; a little more or less in the circulation could not much affect the welfare of the country. Russia comes out of the war with her foreign debt very little increased, and her credit as a nation will undoubtedly soon be as good as it was before the war. As a nursery of men and of soldiers Russia can well be said to be inexhaustible. It seems, therefore, idle to say that she has been forced to make peace by her internal condition. England knew well what were the resources of Russia, and, though her statesmen assumed a very haughty tone and were willing to risk a war for the defence of English interests, they always preferred in their heart a pacific solution. It was felt by Count Shuvaloff, who is now well acquainted with English society, that England would after all be quite satisfied with a diplomatic victory, and that she was willing to give much of the substance to Russia if she could only keep for herself what could not well be called the shadow, but what is more properly included in the French word *prestige*. To appear before the world as the arbiter of peace and war, as the law-giver of nations, as the indispensable Power without whom nothing can be definitively settled, done, or undone, was enough for the pride of England. As for Russia, her subtle diplomacy has always known how to avoid all extremities; it was clearly her interest to keep as much as possible of the Treaty of San Stefano without going to war with England. She had asked for a maximum in order to be sure of a minimum. The minimum which she keeps can content a patriotic Russian, if it does not content thoroughly the Panslavic party. Russia has a despotic government, which is not placed under the control of the press and of a parliament. The Russian Government is, therefore, better placed for making great diplomatic concessions. Before the public, England maintained the right of Europe to have the *whole* of the San Stefano Treaty placed on the table of the Congress; but while taking this attitude she conducted negotiations with Russia, and the two Powers came to an agreement. Lord Salisbury's circular was the screen behind which the secret negotiations were conducted. The Crown Prince, who was at the time in England, had probably much influence on the issue of this secret negotiation; Nobiling's attempt on the life of the Emperor William was, indirectly, a powerful instrument of peace. How could the members of the Congress come to Berlin, under the painful circumstances created by this horrible attempt, without being determined to come to an agreement rapidly? Could they intrigue, fight, quarrel before the old, dying sovereign? Could they not all feel that more was in question in Europe than the fate of some half-barbarous countries in the East? This famous alliance of the Emperors, which had been the corner-stone of the policy of Prince Bismarck, was it to come to an end at the very moment when one of the Emperors had been twice in a single month threatened by assassins? What were Rumelia and Bessarabia and the Dobrudja, what was Batum and what was Sophia, compared to the terrible questions which were in the minds of all European statesmen?

Prince Bismarck is not an idler, he is not an *idéologue;* when he came back from Varzin and found his old king, now become an Emperor, in the state in which he still lingers, he probably made up his mind to end this miserable Eastern Question as well and as soon as he could. Something is rotten now in the state, not of Denmark, but of Germany; something is going wrong in Russia: Sara Vassulitch has become in Geneva the guest of the French Communists. Bismarck may have himself reflected bitterly on the *Kulturkampf* and the May laws, and asked himself if it was safe to introduce in the common school theories on which the highest thinkers cannot pronounce. The immense development of wealth created by the railways and by industry, the corresponding misery, the revolutionary agitations of the last thirty years, the wars, the uprooting, if I may say so, of all human existences, have all contributed to shake European society to its very foundations. The governments, if they understand their mission, had better keep the keys of their own houses and act at home with prudence, firmness, and sagacity, rather than fight among themselves.

The Congress began with the alliance of the three Emperors, and how does it end? It ends by an alliance of the four Emperors (is not Queen Victoria Empress of India?). What happened in the East has been compared to the first partition of Poland, which was soon afterwards followed by a second partition. So it may be; but surely the new Principality of Bulgaria, under a Russian gendarmerie, with a Christian prince, will be happier than it was under the pashas; Austria will take better care of Bosnia and Herzegovina than Turkey had done before her. The new settlement, though it may be only a step towards a final settlement, marks a real progress for civilization. Even the Dobrudja, when it shall be crossed by dikes and cease to be a swamp, will be one of the most fertile countries in Europe. Turkey proper, crossed by roads and railways, will be a new country in a few years. As for the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, it remains to be seen how they will be transformed under the joint and, let us hope, harmonious influence of Russia and England.

SOCIALISM IN GERMANY.*

I.

HAMBURG, July, 1878.

THE social and communistic movement in Germany is older than is commonly known. It has passed through two stages of development. The first was theoretical, harmless, and sentimental; the second, however, is practical, materialistic, and highly dangerous.

The first period of German socialism began a few years prior to the Revolution of 1848, and was subdued a little later. It originated in 1844, when the linen-weavers in the mountainous districts of Silesia could no longer live on their scanty wages, so that a famine desolated several villages. In the summer of that year they rose in desperation, destroyed some factories, and attacked some of their employers, but a military force quickly quelled the riot, and the courts sentenced the ringleaders to severe punishment.

Insignificant as the whole affair appears in comparison with later events, the impression it made on the public mind was deep. It was as if society had suddenly discovered the fathomless chasm which separated two classes of the same people. It became alarmed, and by partly well conceived, partly foolish measures tried to atone for the shortcomings which announced their existence with bloodshed and fire. The well-to-do classes formed associations for the amelioration of the condition of the poor working-classes; philanthropists, high officials, and professors of universities organized societies for the moral advancement of mechanics and laborers; students and young people in general called for radical remedies, and even the Government directed its attention to the cure of the evil. While those who advocated reform and the peaceful social development called themselves, or were called, Socialists, the more radical, who pleaded for a social revolution as the only means of salvation, or who proposed to abolish private property, were designated as Communists.

At that time Germany had hardly begun to throw off the last remnants of feudalism and to develop her rich material resources. With the exception of some parts of Silesia, Westphalia, and Rhenish Prussia, agriculture and husbandry prevailed all over the country; 75 per cent. of its population were rural; there were no great industrial establishments, but few manufacturing interests, and no masses of working-people concentrated in great cities or in large industrial centres. German manufactories were in a transition from handiwork to machine-work. This process had just been initiated in the line of weaving and spinning; hence the poor weavers could not compete with the machines which were imported from England and Ireland. Shortsighted as they were, they considered as avarice on the part of their employers what was only the unavoidable consequences of modern industrial improvements. Comparatively, however, so small was at that time the number of those suffering that the Government was enabled in a great measure to alleviate their wants by teaching them another trade. The Minister of Commerce, under the superintendency of expert agents, sent dozens of skilled weavers to England, Belgium, and Turkey, where they learnt the weaving of Brussels, Smyrna, and other carpets. Thus a new industry was introduced into Germany, and enterprising manufacturers soon founded large factories. The town of Schmiedeberg, in the Giant Mountains, has since become one of the centres of elegant and fine carpet-weaving establishments. Several houses there work exclusively for the American market. A great many Smyrna carpets which you buy at present at Stewart's or Sloane's in New York have never seen the East, but are directly imported from Schmiedeberg.

Together with these benevolent and beneficial steps went a new social literature, the character of which was in general sentimental. Novels, poems, essays, and tragedies painted the misery of the working-classes in glowing colors and admired the generosity of their character, while they attacked the heartlessness of the better-situated minority and denounced the cruelty of the existing laws. Social periodicals were as numerous as short-lived; but they seldom dared to enter into disquisitions on leading social questions or politico-economic arguments. At that period even German public men and writers had but a faint idea of political economy, and only exceptionally made it a subject of their studies. Instead of expounding the fundamental laws of an exact science, they addressed their readers with glittering generalities and entertained them with harmless Utopias. Soon, however, a host of young and able men devoted their skill and energy to the propagation of Socialism. On this field, as on so many others, the first impetus was given by France; for at that time the social problem was almost the sole absorbing theme of her public life, and her authors—for instance, George Sand, Louis Blanc, Considérant, and Proudhon—tried to solve it. No less a man than Heinrich Heine, then living at Paris, who had already in earlier days been the interpreter of the creeds of St. Simon, Enfantin, and Fourier to the German mind, in 1844 published a wild revolutionary song on the sufferings and famine, the woe and the martyrdom, of the Silesian weavers. Almost all his poetical productions of that period bear the communistic and revolutionary red-hot stamp. Other poets like Georg Herwegh, Alfred Meissner, Moritz Hartmann, Ferdinand Freiligrath, and Carl Beck followed in his steps. Professor Lorenz Stein wrote the first systematic treatise on French Socialism and Communism, and thus made scholars and students acquainted with them. Newspaper correspondents like Moses Hess and Carl Grün studied the new doctrine at its sources in Paris and daily sent letters on the subject to their papers. German "ouvriers" returned year by year from Paris fresh with the new gospel they had imbibed in the workshops of that city, and which they were eager to reveal to their friends at home. The police arrested these apostles wherever it could, but was unable to prevent the spread of the new ideas among the working and even the so-called higher classes. One of the most fanatical of these prophets was a tailor by the name of Wilhelm Weitling, of Magdeburg, who in 1843 published his 'Guaranties and Harmonies of Freedom,' and for a time was a great authority among the Socialists. The critical part of his pamphlet is brilliant, while its constructive part is quite dull and in some of its deductions rather stupid. Weitling afterwards went to New York, and, having flattered himself in vain for years that he had invented a buttonhole sewing-machine, died some time ago while in the employ of the Commissioners of Emigration in Castle Garden.

These men, however, were only the forerunners of Karl Marx, who first based the social movement on scientific principles, and for more than thirty years has been, and still is, the spiritual leader not only of German but also of European Socialists and Communists. Remarkable by his indefatigable industry and the thoroughness of his studies as well as by the wide range of his researches and the philosophical and critical turn of his mind, he ranks among the first scholars of the time. His chief collaborator was and is Friedrich Engels, the son of a rich merchant at Barmen, who had spent several years at Manchester and studied there the condition of the English working-classes. Engel's book on that subject, published in 1845 in Leipzig, proved the author to be an able ob-

* This article is the first of three which we shall publish from the pen of a German writer of very high authority.—ED. NATION.

server and a sound political economist. His work distinguished itself as well by the fulness of its details and the boldness of its reasoning as by its bitter attacks on the manufacturing classes, and made a deep impression in Germany. The brilliant qualities of this man, however, are overshadowed by a reckless, domineering spirit, an insatiable ambition, and an intolerant character which blackens, vilifies, and, if possible, destroys everything and everybody in its way. He who does not believe implicitly in Marx, or who dares to have an opinion of his own, is doomed, driven out of the church, and denounced to the Philistine as a "bourgeois," as a spy, as an "agent provocateur," and in the eyes of the right-minded (as the slang of the church, the so-called Schwefelbande, goes) ruined and annihilated for ever. Like all founders of new creeds, Marx knows only obedient tools and blind admirers, and has but few friends.

Having studied philosophy in Bonn and Berlin, he adhered in his youth to the radical wing of Hegel's school, and associated with the most advanced German thinkers, whose respect he won by the keenness of his intellect and the acuteness of his reasoning. In 1842 he was appointed editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* (Rhenish Gazette), an opposition journal established at Cologne by prominent merchants and bankers, such as Hansemann, Camphausen, and Mevissen, who in 1848 became reconciled to the Prussian rule, and, leaving behind their old liberal aspirations, cheerfully accepted seats in the Cabinet. Marx made his *Gazette* the leading one of all the opposition papers, and by its merciless criticism of Government measures, its bold and menacing tone, its sarcastic sneers at Prussian red-tapeism, raised such a storm that, although being daily submitted to the censorship, in the spring of 1843 it was, nevertheless, wholly suppressed by the Prussian authority. Marx himself, in the preface to the first number of his 'Political Economy,' says that when assuming his editorial duties he understood nothing of political economy, and that his attention had at first been called to it by being compelled to plead for the alleviation of the misery of the poor wine-growers on the Moselle. He soon after went to Brussels and Paris, and in the latter city published, in company with Arnold Ruge, the *Deutsch-französische Jahrbücher* (German-French Annals), a radical philosophical and political monthly, which, however, did not survive two numbers. After this he gave up all direct political agitation and devoted himself exclusively to the study of political economy. Driven out of Brussels, he again went to Paris, and, expelled thence by order of Guizot, he went back to Brussels, where in 1847 he wrote his pamphlet, 'Misère de la Philosophie,' against the "bourgeois" Proudhon's just-published 'Philosophie de la Misère.' In the spring of 1848 Marx returned to Cologne and started the first red republican and communistic German daily, the *New Rhenish Gazette*. A few days before the outbreak of the Revolution of February he had published his communistic manifesto, with the motto: "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" Here, as well as afterwards in his paper, Marx unfolded the banner of Communism, laughed at the idea of a mere political revolution, and boldly proclaimed for the war of classes (*Klassenkampf*), *i.e.*, the war of the fourth class (proletarians) against the third class (bourgeois).

Germany, however, was not yet ripe for this doctrine, originally of French growth. Her manufactures being still in their infancy, and her middle classes having scarcely been emancipated from the supremacy of feudal noblemen, her citizens were not independent enough, and politically not far enough advanced, to be able to rule the country. The respect for the higher classes was too implicit to allow them to claim more than a moderate share in the government. The workingmen in general had no professional pride, and, having for centuries suffered under all kinds of official and private oppressions, were happy to make a modest living. Marx, therefore, with very few exceptions, did not win over to his side the rank and file which he wanted for the carrying out of his plans, and, frightening the well-to-do Liberals, drove them into the arms of the Conservatives. Much as he glorified the Paris barricade battles of June, 1848, audaciously as he attacked the reactionary system at home, eloquently as he appealed to passion and prejudice, he did and could not create the social revolution, but only paved the way for the counter-revolution. When in the spring of 1849 the revolutionary movements in all parts of Germany were subdued, and when the state of siege was declared in Cologne, the Prussian Government, of course, eagerly suppressed the *New Rhenish Gazette*. The last number was printed in red ink, and the poet Freiligrath, one of its editors, headed it with a wild revolutionary chant, in which he compared the Prussian officials with the Kalmucks, a savage tribe of Eastern Russia.

Marx went to London, while his friends dispersed to other parts of Europe or to the United States, and organized a staff of a handful of followers who formed the nucleus of the new communistic international party. Slowly but surely secret associations sprang up in all parts of the world and communicated with each other by way of London. Marx now became the chief saint of the communistic church, the expounder of its orthodox creed, and was worshipped by the pious like a second pope. Leaving the intriguing among the refugees, the agitation among the workingmen, to the saints of the lower order, to ex-lieutenants, apothecaries, merchant-clerks, ex-foresters, penny-a-liners, or music-teachers, the prophet himself meanwhile corresponded for years with the New York *Tribune*, which owes him a series of excellent articles on European politics, occasionally wrote political pamphlets, such as 'The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' (published 1852 in New York), a masterly exposition of the character, aims, and probable (afterwards real) end of that adventurer, and laid down the principles of his system in his great work on 'Capital,' which has been and still is the arsenal of all communistic doctrines, from Lassalle down to the smaller fry, the Liebknechts, Bebels, and Mosts.

The gist of the first volume of Marx's work, two-thirds of which consists of extracts from English parliamentary enquiries and official records on the condition of the English working-classes, may be given in a few sentences. As all goods have a twofold value, we distinguish between the profit which they have for society by being used (the value in use) and the importance they acquire by their exchange for other goods (the value in exchange); but all goods, however they may differ from each other, have one common quality, the amount of which forms the standard of their value of exchange. This common quality is the human labor necessary for the production of goods. Thus the value of goods is determined solely by the amount of labor necessary for this production. Consequently, it belongs exclusively to the workingman, and the capitalist has no right to pocket that value. Capital has thus far been created by either robbing and cheating the laborer or by other mean practices, such as speculations and confiscations. Accumulated capital, which pays only scanty wages covering the mere necessaries of life to the hired producer, is the thief that steals other men's labor. Capital has expropriated labor, but it is time that the expropriators should be expropriated for the benefit of the working masses. The system of division of labor has even more enriched the capitalist, has made the producer more dependent on him, and has effected higher values. Each new machine compels the workingman to give up more and more of his individual ability to the capitalist. The high development of the present manufacturing and producing process, based on the ruin of handiwork and of the small producer, transforms the latter more and more into a tool with no will of his own. The enormous power of accumulated capital cannot be done away with, the world cannot return to a patriarchal state of things; but, nevertheless, the misery of the working-classes can no longer continue. Marx proposes as a remedy that all means and tools of production, ground and soil as well as raw materials, should be handed over to society at large, that all trades and professions should be carried on by it for the benefit of all—or, in other words, that private property be abolished.

The platform of the German democrats, which I will give in full hereafter, draws the consequences of Marx's system. Here I will only say that, in my opinion, he is wrong in calling all labor the sole source of the value of a thing, while in fact it is only that labor which satisfies the human wants, and I will add that in order to perform such useful labor capital in some shape or other is required.

To return, however, to the events in Germany. The victory of the armed reaction had crushed Socialism in its germ, or at least made it disappear from the public view. In consequence of the Crimean War a new era of industrial and commercial prosperity began. It developed the rich resources of Germany, as it did those of other countries, and enabled enterprising individuals or stock companies to complete the German railroad system, to establish new steamship lines or other means of communication, to erect new manufactories, and to invest money profitably—in short, to give a sudden impetus to all kinds of commercial and industrial enterprises. From this new movement a larger working-class originated, yearly growing in numbers and importance, and manufacturing centres sprang up which controlled the social and communistic elements of the country. Thus the plant, which until now had been foreign to the German soil, about the year 1860 became of domestic growth.

The panic of 1857 was not strong enough to stop entirely the commercial prosperity. The fall of the reactionary cabinet of Manteuffel and his ilk, the accession of the Prince Regent in Prussia, and the political resurrection in Germany united the middle classes against the oppressive schemes of the new Prussian ministers. Then, in consequence

of the increase of the royal army without previously asking the consent of the Chambers, the years of conflict between people and government broke out and lasted till 1866. Bismarck, the principal Secretary of State since 1862, tried to set aside the constitutional safeguards and to impose taxes without the sanction of the House of Representatives, who thereupon amalgamated into one compact majority the party of progress. After the battle of Königgrätz Bismarck asked and obtained indemnity for his illegal proceedings; but prior to that event he did his utmost to defeat his political adversaries, and even availed himself of the assistance of the social and communistic elements of the country, just organized under the leadership of Ferdinand Lassalle, and at present called the Social Democrats.

Correspondence.

THE MORALITY OF THE BEACONSFIELD MINISTRY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Northcote, according to the telegram, has denied the existence of any secret engagement besides the Salisbury-Shuvaloff memorandum and the secret convention with Turkey, though he admits that there have been "confidential communications." We shall see hereafter what and with whom the confidential communications were; whether they amount in effect to a "confidential" agreement; and if they do, whether the agreement is with France, and has reference to a future division of spoil in the direction of Egypt and Syria. The Suez-Canal shares were not purchased merely for the purpose of holding stock in a French company.

Sir Stafford Northcote was the minister who induced the House of Commons quietly to disperse for the Easter vacation by assuring them that nothing had occurred to enhance the gravity of the situation, he knowing when he spoke that orders had been sent to India to despatch troops to the Mediterranean. At the opening of Parliament the Prime Minister declared that there was no dissension in the Cabinet, though two of his colleagues were then at the brink of resignation. The ground assigned to England and Europe for ordering up the fleet to Constantinople was the protection of British life and property; but now, in attacking Lord Carnarvon, Lord Beaconsfield drops the mask and avows that the fleet was ordered up to check the advance of Russia.

Lord Derby states positively that in March last the Cabinet resolved, in defiance of public law, treaties, its own declaration of neutrality, and its professions to Turkey, to seize, by a secret expedition, Cyprus and a point on the Turkish mainland. Lord Salisbury, on behalf of the Cabinet, passionately denies the statement. On one side or the other there must be downright falsehood, and I venture to say there are not ten men in England who do not in their hearts believe that Lord Derby speaks the truth.

England has gained Cyprus, not a very valuable booty if it has no harbor, but her statesmen have lost, by intrigue, deception, and violence, the reputation for open dealing, truthfulness, and probity which the meanest of them once enjoyed.

Yours, faithfully, Goldwin Smith.

Toronto, August 4, 1878.

[Our correspondent has overlooked Lord Salisbury's statement, in reply to Earl Grey's question "whether there was *any* truth" in the version of the secret memorandum first published in the *Globe*, "that it was *wholly* unauthenticated and not deserving the confidence of their Lordships' House"—the fact being that it was substantially correct; also the official instructions to Lord Odo Russell to oppose the cession of Batum to Russia, after Lord Salisbury had secretly agreed with Count Shuvaloff not to resist it.—Ed. Nation.]

SCHOOL TEACHER AND SCHOOL-HUNTER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A letter from "School-Hunter" in your issue of July 25 inclines me to look at the matter he speaks of from a teacher's point of view. I know some girls who "hate sewing," and to whom "nothing is so unpleasant as the inside of a house"; but it is not a corollary that they "love books"; on the contrary, they are the least cultivated, least feminine, and worst-mannered girls of the set to which they belong. However, this does not prove anything; it is only an aside. What I wish to suggest is, that if the Hunter wants a school so different from the one which ninety-nine in a hundred of his countrymen prefer, he must find half a dozen parents who have his own ideas, and let them club together and support a school of the kind he describes. As you can hardly expect any one teacher, with the information and good sense necessary to his position, to be also a scientific professor, drawing-master, gymnastic performer, and singing-teacher, he must have not less than two assistants, besides masters in French and German, if any of the parents should be so foolish as to require modern languages. Each of these persons must be supported; the principal may have a family dependent upon him; the laboratory and gymnasium are both expensive additions to a school, no matter how simple their arrangements may be; so that, on the whole, it is not too much to expect that each pupil shall contribute four or five hundred dollars a year towards the support of a day-school alone. I speak only of city schools. In a country boarding-school the price would be somewhat less in proportion, but probably at least double what it is now at the very best, because there would be so few among whom to divide expenses. Now, what I want to call attention to is this, that if the model teacher "School-Hunter" is looking for should open a school and promise exactly what your correspondent demands (and fulfil it, too), he would simply starve. Having been for many years engaged in teaching, I know from experience that any effort to do things out of the regular course means commercial failure. A teacher must do what the ninety-nine hundredths demand, leaving the odd one per cent. to make special arrangements for themselves. In most cases the pressure is not for simplicity of instruction, but for increased study. Parents whose children are learning six lessons daily, and reciting them well, come to me and complain that the pupils are too idle at home and need more study to keep them out of mischief; then one or two lessons are added to the list. What I would suggest is that "School-Hunter" should have a private teacher who can work under his direction; in that way he will get just what he wants. Or let him take the risk himself. Let him hire a room, if he has not one in his own house that will answer the purpose, provide gymnastic apparatus and laboratory, engage the necessary teachers at fixed salaries, and then get as many parents as he can to divide the expense with him. Who knows how much good he might do by thus laying the foundation of a more rational system of education?

Yours, School Teacher.

August 2, 1878.

WHY JEFFERSON DAVIS WAS LIBERATED.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I would beg to refer to your decision a point in dispute between some of the American residents in this place, and of interest as an historical fact.

Will you kindly state the *reason* that induced the United States Government to liberate Jefferson Davis instead of hanging him, as seemed to be his just due? A. T. Marvin.

Manila, Philippine Islands, May 28, 1878.

[We believe the reasons were (1) the dislike of the people of the North to the idea of putting a man to death for a political offence; (2) the perception that Davis was not a solitary criminal, but a representative man, to whom punishment would have given the honors of martyrdom; (3) a recognition of the impossibility of finding an unpacked jury of the State and district in which his offence was committed, as required by the Constitution, to convict him. Our correspondent can arrange these in any order he pleases. Davis's case was finally dropped through a division of opinion between the judges of the United States Circuit Court on a motion to quash the indictment, on the ground that the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, in prescribing the disfranchisement of all persons who having held office under the United States had committed treason against it, did away with all other punishment or pursuit. Chief-Justice Chase sustained this objection, but the district judge, Underwood, who got his office for his loyalty and knew no law whatever, dissented. The case ought then to have gone up to the Supreme Court, but it never did. Everybody was tired of it. Mr. Davis was liberated on bail, and now perorates at agricultural fairs like other broken-down politicians.—Ed. Nation.]