

LYNCHING.

The horrible affair in Maysville, Kentucky, on Wednesday of last week, calls special attention to one of the most valuable portions, if not the most valuable portion, of Booker Washington's book on "The Future of the American Negro"—what he says about lynching. It is valuable because it is the part which most seriously calls for immediate action by the American people, and it is, probably for that very reason, the part that has received the least attention from the newspapers. On all subjects, we love generalities which do not entail obligations that will interfere with "business."

What Mr. Washington says is, in substance, this: That "many good people in the South and also in the North have got the idea that lynching is resorted to for one crime only." Now for the facts. During the past year, 118 were lynched in the South, and 9 in the North and West. Of these, 102 were negroes, 23 were whites, and 2 were Indians. Only 24 of the entire number were charged with rape, or assaults upon women; all the others were charged with offences for the punishment of which the criminal law is instituted and courts established in civilized countries. In other words, 81 of these unfortunates were executed without trial by mobs actually engaged in the work of spreading civilization in the Philippines—of all places in the world—and who at home are squatted on "glory-crowned heights." During one week last spring, Mr. Washington says, he kept a careful record of the lynching of 13 negroes in three States who were all accused of murder or house-burning only. He cites another year, 1892, when 241 persons were lynched in the whole United States. One hundred and sixty were negroes and five were women. Well, out of these only 57 were charged with assaults on women, so that 184 were executed without trial by mobs, for other crimes. To sum it all up, he says, within a period of six years, 900 persons have been lynched in the Southern States. He does not give the proportion in figures of those who suffered for assaults on women for offences ordinarily triable by the courts, but they were numerous.

The Associated Press tells us nearly every week that the practice of lynching is extending to white men also, and that lynchings are attended largely by youths, and sometimes even by children. There is a story of a boy who, returning home, told his mother "that he had seen a man hanged, and he did so want to see one burned." In the latest lynching, in Kentucky, the victim's eyes were destroyed with acids, and women and children fed the fire in which he was burned!

We thus see that the evil is spreading, and that the cause assigned for it by apologists is not the true one. It is

purely and simply a descent into barbarism by people who pretend to be civilized, and, not only that, but are pretending to spread civilization. The recent mutilation and slicing of the negro in Georgia shows that plain lynching was not enough to satisfy the savage instincts of the whites. This had simply dulled their palates. They needed to have them tickled by the torture of a human being—which shows, we think, that, if this practice goes on, Booker Washington, or somebody, will have to write another book on a still more important subject, "The Future of the American White."

It is no wonder the clergy call for more Bible-reading in the schools, but they will find that Bible-reading in the schools will not save them, unless the adult whites can show more regard for life, property, and order. The only sign we have as yet seen of reaction against this barbarism is the rescue by the constituted authorities in South Carolina of five negroes accused of an assault on women, from the hands of a mob, and the bringing of them to legal trial before a court. At this trial four were acquitted, thus casting a dreadful light on the fate of hundreds of others who have suffered at the hands of lynchers. How many unfortunate wretches must thus have been done to death whom even a slight judicial inquiry would have saved? Methodists and Baptists among us hold up their hands in horror over the atrocities of the Inquisition in Spain and of arbitrary power everywhere; but what were the atrocities of the Inquisition in Spain, and what are the atrocities of arbitrary power *anywhere*, compared to the atrocities of lynching mobs among us? The Inquisition at least gave the victim the form of a trial, and there is no arbitrary power except Turkey during a rebellion which does not favor its victims with a drum-head court-martial. But fancy being dragged to death, often in the darkness of the night, by a roaring mob, whom no prayers would pierce and no evidence convince, for they must have their diabolical excitement!

We have allowed this to go on, year after year, with slight notice from the authorities, and not much from the newspaper press, which may be said to have adopted for its motto the Italian inscription on the sun-dial: "*Nessun' ore ricordo che le serene*," which may be freely translated, "I speak only of pleasant things." During the Philippine crusade this has been particularly the case. It does not do to tell a strenuous people that they are not doing their proper work.

"STRENUOUS" EXCITEMENT.

A distinguished European psychologist who discusses human frailties with the calm of a doctor considering symptoms of disease, while talking last summer

called attention to the steady growth of brutality in amusements. He said that in the French democracy at least there was a distinct return in this respect to the Middle Ages. He pointed out that the progress towards refinement and humanity during the fifty years that followed the Revolutionary wars was made while the intellectual classes, or, as he called them, *les classes dirigeantes*, were in the ascendant. Since the democracy has come into power the direction of the tide has been reversed. He pointed to the bull-fights as an illustration. They had always been regarded in France as the amusement of a half-civilized and declining nation. Universal suffrage had not been long established in France before they made their appearance at Arles and other places in the neighborhood of Spain. The sport is prohibited by the French law, but no one is empowered to prevent it. All that can be done is to punish by a fine after the act the persons who get up a bull-fight; but the fine is a trifle compared to the gate-money, so that no attention is paid to it. Bull-fighting had, accordingly, made its appearance further north, in Paris and even in Boulogne, where it draws crowds from England. The philosopher said that it would be difficult to get the law amended, owing to the Representatives' fear of the bull-fighting vote. Since then his theory has received some confirmation by the appearance in Paris of *le boxe* and *la savate*. *La savate* is an entertainment which consists in kicking your opponent in the lower part of his body, or, in fact, in any place that the foot can reach, from which the boxer is precluded by the Marquis of Queensberry's rules. The first match in Paris drew a paying crowd, and *la savate* was easily victorious. We may be sure the experiment will soon be repeated. The rules will probably be revised so as to enable the English boxer to hit below the belt.

These illustrations might be multiplied, but what would be the use? We are greatly afraid that the French philosopher is even now adding to their number from what he has seen going on in America, where also democracy is triumphant. The rapid growth of athletics has, of course, developed a certain contempt for wounds and bruises, whether inflicted on one's self or on other people. One of the most awful facts of human history is the thirst of man for the blood of his fellow-man. He is the only animal who "delights in" and is proud of killing his congeners. We fear the transports of joy with which the war with Spain was received, especially in the West, would not have been displayed over the liberation of Cuba by peaceable means. Many people wanted the excitement of plenty of bloodshed, wounded to nurse, and battle hymns to sing; and, alas, it is a passion on which politicians are always ready to play. Another sign

of the times in which our philosopher will delight is the growth of pugilism in the State of New York, the difficulty (so like that in France about bull-fighting) of suppressing it by law, the election of a fighting Governor to our highest office, his secret sympathy with the pugilistic ring, and the conversion of a room in the Executive Mansion into a sort of studio for learning the art of "knocking out," which we may be sure will figure as illustrations of our philosopher's thesis in his forthcoming work. And his thesis will be that the rapid increase of the multitude, which is always the less instructed portion of the community, naturally increases the temptation both of politicians, legislators, and showmen, to cater to their tastes.

Is it "going too far" to suppose that lynching, which was begun, doubtless, to supply the defects in the administration of the law, is now pursued as a mode of excitement intended to mitigate the dullness of Southern and Western towns? We have not the slightest doubt that this has had much to do with overcoming the old Christian horror of unnecessary wars. This dullness has been undoubtedly rendered harder to bear by the improvements in the means of communication, and the increased spread of cheap literature. When the reader of the cheap magazine hears of the glorious things which are occurring in courts and palaces and on battlefields all over the earth, his discontent with the sight of his own quiet streets and the monotony of his own sad existence is intensified, and he longs for a sensation, no matter of what kind, just as the Frenchman longs for a "bagarre" or "manifestation." But it must, if possible, have a little bloodshed in it. There must be bloodshed in every strenuous life. As Mr. Dooley said of the French trial, every witness must be sworn, else how could he commit perjury? So a strenuous American must stab or shoot somebody, else how could he show his valor? And do you suppose that the children and youths who accompany the "niggers" on their way to be burnt and tortured will grow up Christian gentlemen of the old type? The best thing that can be said of "nigger" torture is that it is the latest sensation for the strenuous world.

THE TREASURY REPORT.

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury possesses an unusual degree of interest this year, by reason of the great changes wrought in the public income and outgo by new taxes and expanding business on the one hand and by the wars in Cuba and the Philippine Islands on the other. The receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, were within a small fraction of \$611,000,000, and the expenditures a fraction more than \$700,000,000—a deficit of \$89,000,000. The postal service (\$95,000,000) is in-

cluded in the totals. Of the receipts, \$273,000,000 came from internal revenue, and \$206,000,000 from customs, and \$12,000,000 from Pacific Railroad refunds. Of the expenditures, about \$230,000,000 was for the army, \$64,000,000 for the navy, and \$139,000,000 for pensions. There was an increase of \$116,000,000 in receipts and of \$161,000,000 in expenditures, as compared with the previous year. For the four months of the current fiscal year, there has been a surplus of \$7,000,000, and the Secretary expects that this will be increased to \$40,000,000 for the full year. He says that it has been impossible in recent years, on account of deficient revenues, to comply with the sinking-fund requirement of existing law, but that he has set apart \$25,000,000 for the purchase of bonds at the market price under the statute.

This is a very gratifying exhibit. It is due in about equal parts to the new taxes and to the revived prosperity of the country. These two factors have made Mr. Gage's task a much easier one than his predecessor had to face.

Next in importance to the balance-sheet is the Secretary's discussion of the currency question, and to this we are glad to give our unqualified approval, both as to the thoughts embodied in it and the manner of their expression. Mr. Gage has been an unswerving advocate of the gold standard not only during his official career, but ever since this question became an issue in national politics. His previous reports have left nothing to be desired on this score. In the report before us he limits himself to a brief but earnest recommendation that Congress declare all of the Government's obligations, whether due now or at a future time, payable in gold coin of the present weight and fineness, and that it be made mandatory on the Treasury to keep the two kinds of money, silver and gold, at a parity under all conditions.

The larger part of the Secretary's discussion of the currency question relates to the banks, and here he shows a leaning toward a credit currency of the kind recommended by the Indianapolis Commission. He begins with a sketch of the processes by which banknotes were first brought into use experimentally, being a part of the operation of exchanging the banker's credit for that of his customers. It is immaterial to the banker whether the claims held by the public against him exist in the form of notes or book credits. His liabilities are the same in either case, and ordinarily they are no more pressing in one form than in the other. Why should not he and his customers be allowed to exercise their choice in this particular unhindered by the law? Evidently, because the public, *i. e.*, the noteholders, are not familiar with banking in general, and have no means of knowing whether the banker's assets are good or bad. Hence they are liable to be cheated. The law rightly

protects them. It may protect them in different ways. It may do so by a deposit of bonds beforehand, as under our national banking law, or by a first lien on assets and unlimited liability of shareholders, as in Scotland, or by a mutual insurance fund, as in Canada, or by other devices which experience has proved to be sufficient. Mr. Gage points out the fact that we had good banking systems as well as bad ones before the civil war, and he recommends that these be studied, with a view to securing a banknote system that shall be both elastic and safe, both responsive to the varying needs of business and at all times redeemable in gold.

It may be asked why it is necessary to discuss this matter at all. Have we not a good banknote currency now? Is it not absolutely secure? Why should we be talking about a change in a system which works well already? Apart from the consideration that the present system is inelastic and unresponsive to the varying but legitimate demands of business, the fact stares us in the face that the national debt is likely to be paid off within a very few years. The bonds owned by the banks will be called in and the security for their circulating notes will disappear. This is the reason, probably, why the Senate Finance Committee proposes to extend for thirty years the bonds that are soon falling due. We observe that Secretary Gage does not refer to the refunding scheme in his report, and this is sufficient evidence that the plan did not originate with him. The refunding scheme can hardly pass the House. It is too full of mystery to be gulped down at one mouthful with all the other things embraced in the currency-reform measure. It is not the habit of Congress to meet any crisis so long as it can be avoided. This one can be avoided a few years longer, and it will be, but meanwhile people should be considering means and methods of issuing banknotes without bond security, as other nations do. Secretary Gage has done well to turn the public mind into that channel.

THE GREAT GODDESS PROSPERITY.

Most civilized countries are just now riding on the flood-tide of prosperity. We are not entitled to thank God that others are worse off than ourselves. England is snapping her fingers at the cost of a bloody war, so overflowing are her coffers. In France the tall chimneys are smoking in a way to please Thiers, if he were here to see his wish fulfilled. Germany is getting rich so rapidly that the medievalisms of the Emperor are forgiven; anything can be pardoned a ruler who brings the nation wealth. Even in Italy, the Minister of Finance reports a surplus as grateful as it is rare. Prosperity is thus a world-phenomenon at the present moment.

It also reveals in all nations striking characteristics in common. One of these is the tendency to exalt, or degrade, government into a solicitor of business. Presidents and Kaisers and Prime Ministers take on more and more the rôle of a commercial traveller. Admiral Beresford went to China, Emperor Wilham to Constantinople and Jerusalem; President McKinley acquires the Philippines—all exactly in the spirit and with the methods of a drummer. There is the same eye for business, the same eagerness to "place" an order, the same fierce competition, and, we must add, unscrupulousness in securing trade at all hazards. That was a terrible caricature which M. Veber made in Paris in connection with the Kaiser's journey to Palestine—William and the Sultan gloating over the butchered Armenians, and exchanging presents and railway concessions. What might not an artist make of our own William striking hands with a polygamous and slaveholding Sultan—all to book an order for goods! No, the modern prosperous nation is not squeamish about the source of the gold that flows to its till. It may smell of blood, but what of that, with all our handy disinfectants and deodorizers? If the balance in the ledger is on the right side, we need not scrutinize too closely either our laws and treaties or our manners and morals. "Let us alone," is the cry that prophets and preachers hear in answer to all their protests; and it is the cry not of dreamy lotus-eaters, but of beings bearing an uncomfortable resemblance to the dwellers in Epicurus's sty.

No one can be ten minutes in company with active men of the world, nowadays, without being struck by their passionate absorption in the golden opportunities for trade now before our country, and by their general moral obtuseness as respects all questions of national right or wrong and State and civic corruption. They look at you with mingled amazement and impatience, if you speak of such things. Are we not all getting rich? Then what can there possibly be to complain of? It is this attitude of "Who cares?" and "What does it matter?" which fills one with dismay, and arouses doubt if, after all, adversity be not, as Bacon said, the true blessing. Prosperity won and used in the right way is an undoubted blessing. Where increasing wealth means increasing comfort and opportunity and education for all classes; where the resulting good is in widest commonality spread, and the new leisure and power are used to drill the raw world for the march of mind, where ideals are heightened and private and public morals purified as men are left more free from the struggle for existence to enter upon the struggle for an enlightened society and good government—then, indeed, abounding prosperity is the delight of philosopher and patriot. But if mounting wealth means declining

civic-sensitiveness; if we erect prosperity into a fetish like the Goddess Diana of the Ephesians, before which we must all go hushed, not daring to point out the thieving done in its name, if, as our bank accounts expand, our consciences must contract, and we are expected to "dodge and palter with a public crime," we cannot too soon go to the poets and the prophets to learn to what frightful catastrophe our pride of wealth is hastening us. It is written, not in vain, that Sheol hath enlarged her desire, and opened her mouth without measure to swallow up a people drunk with power and gold.

One thing is sure. The lean years will follow the fat. Amid all the flaunting banners of modern civilization, it knows that the red flag lurks just around the corner. Crop failures or industrial disturbances may at any moment launch upon us an army of the unemployed and unfed. And be sure that they will practise in those pinching times the gospel our lives have been preaching to them in these prosperous times. Can we then turn about and bid them be patient and moderate, when we have been setting them the example of headlong and unwinking greed? Can we ask them then to consider the public good, when we have been neglecting it for the sake of private gain? Can we appeal, against their passions, to courts and legislature and army, all which we have utilized, or allowed to be debased, to gratify our passions? These are questions which make, to the attentive ear, the prosperous earth sound hollow under our tread. Of the complete absorption of our best men in money-getting, with their impatient dismissal, as complete, of all questions of public purity, justice, and honor, we can only say, as Wordsworth said of the similar insensate and swinish rush of Englishmen to be rich early in this century, "This is idolatry." England had a fearful bill to pay for her idolatrous worship of war-bought prosperity, and so shall we have a sorrowful reckoning day unless we smash our idols betimes.

OUR COLONIAL PRODUCTS.

The beet-sugar men have risen to protest against the admission of cane sugar from Porto Rico and the Philippines free of duty. They are gathering unto themselves the producers of tobacco, rice, and semi-tropical fruits, whose industries are threatened by the competition of these islands. At a meeting held at Omaha on December 5, Mr. Herbert Myrick made a speech, saying that domestic agriculture, as regards these specialties, is about to have "a fight for life." The immediate cause of alarm is the report of the Secretary of War, endorsed by the President in his recent message, recommending free trade with Porto Rico and a reduction of duties on sugar from Cuba. If these concessions are made, Mr. Myrick says

free trade with Cuba and the Philippines may be expected, and then farewell to our rising beet-sugar industry, not to mention tobacco and the other things which can be produced so much more cheaply there than here. "It might be possible," says Mr. Myrick, "for American farmers to raise sugar beets in competition with the coolie labor of the tropics, if our farmers were content to live on an even lower scale than their coolie competitors; but under our code of morality this is not to be thought of."

In order to prevent this degradation of American farm labor, he advocates the immediate formation of a league of sugar, tobacco, rice, and fruit growers, cigar manufacturers, and truck farmers, to oppose every movement for the introduction of these articles from Porto Rico, etc., free of duty. He believes that if the issue can be fairly presented to the American people, "not 1 per cent. of the voters will favor any such prostitution of American agriculture and manufactures for the benefit of colonial syndicates." We think that Mr. Myrick's position is on firm ground. If we are to have free trade, let us have it all around the board, and above board too, not in little spots and by indirect methods. This is a great question, and one which involves much more than the free admission of sugar and tobacco from our insular appendages. It involves the whole question of the "open door" in Eastern Asia. If our tariff applies at once to the Philippines, giving us an advantage over everybody else in the trade of those islands, how can we demand from Russia, for example, equal trade rights in North China? And in such case shall we not be taxing the Filipinos for the benefit of the United States?

Mr. Myrick's voice is not the only one that has been lifted up in protest against the free admission of the products of Porto Rico and the Philippines. The *New York Press*, a true-blue tariff organ, sounded the alarm immediately after the President's message was received. His admonition that it is our plain duty to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets is considered by the *Press* "the greatest victory for free trade since George M. Dallas, as Vice-President of the United States, gave the deciding vote for the adoption of the Walker tariff." In another article the same paper says that "President McKinley has struck the heaviest blow at the American tariff system which it has ever received from a Republican." If this policy is to prevail, it predicts disaster to the Republican party in all the Western agricultural States, including Ohio. It scores Secretary Wilson for his "wretched juggling play on the word 'imported.'" The simple-minded Secretary of Agriculture seems to think that \$200,000,000 of tropical productions coming to our markets

from Porto Rico and the Philippines will do us no harm, if our flag waves over those islands; but if they were free, or if they belonged to Spain, the damage would be immense, because, in the latter case, they would be "imported." Bless your heart, that is what we all thought a few years ago. We were all agreed that it would be disastrous to import Canadian barley and Canadian lumber while that country remains attached to Great Britain, but it would be beneficial to receive them if Canada were a part of the United States. That was the orthodox doctrine a little while ago. The only fault of Secretary Wilson is that he adheres to these earlier lessons. His political economy was interwoven with his patriotism in a manner that was likely to prove disastrous in an emergency like the present, and to call for reproof from wiser and cooler heads like the editor of the *Press*. We are glad to see that the latter is alive to the occasion and does not hesitate to apply the rod to both the Secretary and his chief.

Back of the question of the tariff policy to be applied to the islands lies the question of constitutional law. The Constitution of the United States provides that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Language could not be plainer than this. If we agree that Porto Rico and the Philippines became a part of the United States immediately on the ratification of the treaty with Spain, then the levying of any duties in those islands different from those of our tariff, or the levying of any duties at all on goods from the United States, has been illegal. If we turn to the decisions of the Supreme Court, we shall find cases where it has been held that a treaty of cession of foreign territory to the United States does *ipso facto* spread our customs laws over such territory. On the other hand, it may be said that these decisions are fifty years old, that all the judges who concurred in pronouncing them are dead, that the circumstances of the nation are now different, and that the law must adapt itself to the nation's progress. Notwithstanding these old decisions, it is not unlikely that the courts to-day would uphold any action that Congress might adopt, or any that the Executive might adopt in the absence of action by Congress. Therefore, it must not be considered settled that our customs duties necessarily apply to Porto Rico and the Philippines as a consequence of the treaty with Spain. Nor is it desirable that they should so apply. We are committed to the policy of the "open door" in the East Indies, and it is difficult to see how we can adopt a different one in the West. If our tariff is spread over the Philippines and Porto Rico, we are estopped from complaining against any discriminating policy which European Powers may choose to apply in Chinese territory controlled by them.

ROUSSET'S HISTORY OF THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.

PARIS, November 18, 1899.

It is painful to look back on a period of defeat and reverses such as the unfortunate war of 1870-1871, but just as we are recommended by moralists to make examinations of our conscience and remind ourselves of our sins and misdoings, we ought to look back on periods marked by national catastrophes and to take a lesson from the past. The war of 1870-1871 belongs already to history, and we can judge of its developments with more impartiality than we could have done at first. We have also at our service a multitude of documents which were wanting just after the conclusion of peace, we are able to compare the French documents with the German documents, and especially with the very accurate and precise accounts given by the German staff, a document of the first order, and, we may say, of an almost mathematical exactitude. There is already a whole literature of the war which it would take pages to catalogue completely.

One of the most useful institutions created in France after the war was what is called the "High School of War." It was felt that the old "Etat-Major" had not been quite equal to its task, and that it was not sufficiently numerous. Officers of all arms are admitted to the High School after an examination, they there go through a course of special studies, all bearing on military matters, and, after another and very severe examination, they receive at the end of their studies a brevet which gives them a title to be employed in the staff in time of war. Among the professors of this High School is Col. Rousset, who published, chiefly for his pupils but also for the general public, a very remarkable "General History of the Franco-German War." The work had so much success that Col. Rousset has just published a second edition, much improved and with many valuable additions. The first volume only has appeared, with the subtitle of "The Imperial Army." It extends from the beginning of the war to the first battles fought before Metz.

It opens with a chapter on the causes of the war, which Col. Rousset finds chiefly in the series of questions raised by Bismarck's desire to establish the Prussian hegemony, and to satisfy the growing aspirations of the German people towards unity. These aspirations were sometimes helped, more often thwarted, by the policy of Napoleon. After Sadowa, it became evident that war was inevitable between France and Prussia, and the French Government most imprudently furnished Prince Bismarck with the occasion for which he was waiting. The most foolish and frivolous pretext was seized by Napoleon's Government, and war was declared against Prussia on July 18, 1870.

What was, at that moment, the state of the French army? The law of 1832, the work of Louis Philippe and of the illustrious Marshal Jourdan, had ceased to be in force. This law fixed the duration of the service at seven years, and divided the army into the active and the reserve; the Chamber fixed every year the number of men called to the active army, according to the necessities of the budget. Such as it was, this law gave in 1848 to the Provisional

Government an army of 500,000 men. Several changes were made in the law of 1832 during the Second Empire service in the active army was reduced to five years, in the reserves to four years, and a National Guard was created. The system of substitutes was abolished. The National Guard was called *mobile*, and it was enacted that, in time of war, it should form part of the active army. In 1870 the organization of the *mobile* remained a dead letter. The active army, war once declared, amounted to 639,748 men, but only on paper; and there remained, after deducting the necessary garrison troops, only about 300,000 to make a campaign. "We were thus," says M. Rousset, "at the very beginning, in a state of numerical inferiority." He shows besides that the organization of the army and the character of the great commands were defective. There was no effective or rational preparation for what now goes under the name of mobilization, and in this respect the Germans were far ahead of us.

Gen. Thoumas, in his book on "The Transformation of the French Army," has criticised severely the Imperial army of 1870, with regard to its intrinsic qualities. "The law of 1855," he says, "destroyed the precious homogeneity secured by the law of 1832. There remained, it is true, in the ranks a quantity of good soldiers, but there were also mediocre ones, and if the devotion of the regiments to the country and the flag continued to be undeniable, it was no longer supported by the totality, as was the case in Africa and in the Crimea, where every man did prodigies. The quality had diminished, therefore, as well as the quantity." As for the officers, Gen. Thoumas says.

"Study was not held in honor, officers spent their time at the café, such as might have stayed at home to study would have been suspected of affecting to live away from their comrades. . . . As if this cause of diminution was not enough, literature and the theatre played their part. A novelist of talent invented a ridiculous type of a captain, and, to the good public, all captains became this type. The generals were, to the same public, confounded with the ridiculous type of Gen. Boum [of the "Grande Duchesse"], an operatic personage imagined by 'wo men of wit.'"

This same process of ridiculing, in novels or on the stage, the officers of the army, has been going on since the war. The "Belle Hélène" has again been put on the stage, and will be played, with an extraordinary *mise en scène*, during the entire Exhibition. New types of officers and non-commissioned officers and ridiculous types of common soldiers have been popularized. Gen. Thoumas attaches, perhaps, too much importance to this view of his subject. He says himself, at the end of his criticism: "However, the French army still had enough of what remained of its pristine virtues to be victorious; so much so that, notwithstanding the number and intelligence of its adversaries, it would have been victorious if it had been commanded."

That it was not commanded becomes only too obvious when the campaign of 1870 is studied in its details. The French infantry had an excellent weapon, superior to the German, an admirable *morale*; but it wanted two things, numbers and science. It had not been made familiar with the tactics necessitated by the new weapon. "The cavalry, in 1870, was in a state of great inferiority in the triple point of view of instruction,

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.