

## MR. KNAPP AND THE RAILWAYS.

Mr. Knapp, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, must have managed to instil a somewhat Delphic quality into his speech to the Railway Business Association last week. Thus, one of the newspaper headlines the next morning read: "Knapp Flouts Our Railroad Laws"; another, "For Railway Competition"; a third, "Fears Competition More Than Monopoly"; a fourth, "Head of Commission Favors Higher Rates." As a matter of fact, no one of these captions describes at all correctly the actual burden of Mr. Knapp's remarks, which derived such importance as they possess largely from the official position of the speaker and from the occasion on which he uttered them.

We must confess to a little doubt on our own part, however, as to the full scope intended by Mr. Knapp for some of his observations, and to a good deal of doubt regarding the propriety, under existing circumstances, of just such a public discussion by a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The questions on which the speaker touched, such as railway competition, railway combination, and railway revenue and dividends, are topics which largely underlie the rate controversy now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Whether Mr. Knapp's views on these subjects were correct or not—and much of what he said was entirely sound—the uttering of them, *ex officio*, by the chairman of the Commission ignored the fact that the inquiry now pending is of a quasi-judicial character. The speech can hardly be called a fortunate precedent.

We also feel compelled to criticise Mr. Knapp's remarks for a certain obscurity in his dealing with some highly important questions, which may be explained, but would hardly be excused, by the fact that the speaker realized on what delicate ground he was treading. For instance, we find it somewhat difficult to understand what the Commissioner meant by "the system of unbridled competition which it is still our policy to enforce"—"a mistaken policy." If he was talking exclusively of the railways—the context seemed to indicate that he was—then we fail to see the basis for his statement. Enforcement by the Government of unbridled competition among the railways is about as far as we can imagine from a correct

description of the present status; on the contrary, the whole crux of the present rate discussion lies in the fact, admitted by both sides, that competition has virtually ceased to exist in the function of railway rate-making, and that therefore restriction and supervision over the making of rates must be undertaken by the Government.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Knapp intended to set forth a view that competition is an obsolete means of progress in the field of industry at large, then he was taking upon his shoulders a pretty heavy burden of proof. We are quite aware that such a view has found wide acceptance, even in certain economic circles; but the argument, so far as it has been sanely and intelligently conducted, has in our judgment directed itself against what, in the earlier chapters of our industrial history, used to be known as "cut-throat competition." Even the more plausible of the arguments on that basis have encountered some difficulty in escaping the inference that monopoly, or if not monopoly then State ownership, would be the logical desideratum. But both these alternatives Mr. Knapp expressly rejected.

Exactly what Mr. Knapp means by the remark that "the error and futility of our efforts to make stationary rates I believe has been fully demonstrated," we find it difficult to understand. It is not conceivable that he applied this description to the power, newly granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, of reviewing and in its judgment vetoing an advance in rates. That policy has never been asserted by the Government as a policy for stationary rates; and, in fact, the argument for a stationary price for anything that is sold has been made most persistently, not by the public authorities nor by the travelling and consuming public, but by an advocate so far removed from their position as the Chairman of the United States Steel Corporation. From his views on the policy of stationary rates, Mr. Knapp draws the conclusion that railway freight and passenger associations should be legally sanctioned. This is a conclusion at which very many thoughtful minds had already arrived; but scarcely, we imagine, through the process of deduction adopted by Mr. Knapp.

We have dwelt at some length on this speech, especially in its references to competition, because it seems to us to

embody a good deal of the hasty and sweeping generalization which has of late become too familiar. All of us know the argument which begins with the assertion that "we have outgrown competition," and most of us, after listening awhile, have carried away the lurking suspicion that the presumption fairly launched the argument on the way to socialism. Mr. Knapp, for instance, correctly finds in old-time railway competition the root of the evils of discriminating rates, and therefore concludes that competition itself belongs to a bygone age. One might have wished for a word on what competition has done for railway service, and for Mr. Knapp's idea as to whether that service, at its best, would or would not have been achieved, and would or would not be likely to be perpetuated, without the stimulus of competition, and without the knowledge that unfit service would mean failure in the race, and consequent loss of that return on investments in the railway which Mr. Knapp would apparently somehow guarantee.

## THE DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

Events in England have marched with unexampled swiftness. Scarcely had we heard of the failure of the Conference when it was given us to understand that another general election was imminent; and now we have the actual dissolution of a Parliament not yet a year old, with writs issued, the voting to begin immediately, and the new House of Commons to be chosen before Christmas. Such speed is almost unprecedented, and the whole procedure finds no parallel in the Constitutional text-books. It is the more important, therefore, to give close heed to what the leaders of the two parties say about the political crisis.

Let us first look at the Conservative position. This was stated by Mr. Balfour in his speech at Nottingham, and again in his reply to the Prime Minister in the Commons, as also by Lord Lansdowne in his statement in the House of Lords. It is, in brief, that, in the first place, there is no Constitutional warrant or political necessity for the abrupt procedure of the Ministry; and, furthermore, that the end avowed—namely, a reconstitution of the House of Lords, and a readjustment of its relations to the House of Commons—could be reached by fair discussion and mutual concessions in the existing Parliament. There

is undeniable force in the first point. The Government has not met with a defeat. No measure was pending on which it was desirable to take the opinion of the country. No Government bill had been rejected by the House of Lords. Here was a Parliament only ten months old, with an overwhelming coalition majority in the House of Commons; yet no business is attempted; no parley with the Opposition is sought; but a dissolution is rudely announced. On the other hand, if the object aimed at is to make over the House of Lords, here are the Lords themselves undertaking their own reform and passing the Rosebery resolutions, which, if not entirely satisfactory, at least furnish a basis for debate and for settlement within the Parliament. Under these circumstances, what could be more arbitrary, what more precipitate, than rushing into a general election on a stale register and at a time most disturbing to trade?

To this Conservative argument, which we have stated as strongly as possible, the Liberals make a vigorous reply. Mr. Asquith declares that he is facing, not forms, but realities. Technically, it may be true that the Ministry has not been blocked by the Lords, but, in actual fact, it has been. The veto resolutions which passed the Commons in April by large majorities, were certain of contemptuous rejection in the Lords. Mr. Balfour openly conceded this. Indeed, he made the admission, logically disastrous to his cause, that "an election could not be deferred for more than a relatively small number of weeks or months." That was on the safe assumption that the Lords would not agree to the plan of the Commons. Well, then, says Mr. Asquith, why delay the inevitable issue? The whole thing has got to be decided by the people, and they may as well do it at once as to wait. According to the implications of Mr. Balfour, there would have to be a general election every year—that is, every time the Lords threw out a Liberal measure. They threw out the budget last year, and were forced by the electors to accept it. If the Government should again send up the Education Act of 1906, or the Plural-Voting bill, they would throw them out again, and on each one force an appeal to the country. That sort of thing cannot go on. The general procedure behind particular bills must be fixed once for all. The Liberal party cannot tolerate the

continuance of that condition of things in which, as Mr. Balfour once incautiously boasted, the Conservative party "would control, whether in power or whether in Opposition, the destinies of this great Empire."

This Liberal policy of Thorough is dialectically strong, beyond all question, but the doubt remains whether, in practical result, it will much advance matters. It is possible, though not probable, that Mr. Asquith will come back with such a greatly increased majority that the Lords will scuttle before him. But it is not at all likely that the country will give so clear a voice on the main question that the Government can proceed triumphantly to demand that the Lords shall accept the veto resolutions without altering a word. Even if they did, the infinitely difficult matters of detailed legislation would have to be threshed out in Parliament, and would almost infallibly lead to another Conference—or to another general election. Indeed, it is broadly hinted that what the King now hopes for, or even expects, is that the election will leave the balance of parties so little altered as to necessitate a second Conference which shall not fail like the first. In that event, all the throes of the general election would have done little but put the affair back where it was before.

At present, of course, Mr. Asquith is taking a high hand. He describes himself as going out to consult the will of the people, and declares that the Lords will have to submit themselves to it. This raises the question of the "guarantees" which he may have received from the King. On that point, he would not speak in the Commons, urging that the King must be kept out of party warfare. But Mr. Asquith's statement of last April is recalled, when he said, speaking of such a crisis as has since arisen, that a dissolution of Parliament would, "in no case," be resorted to, "except under such conditions as will secure that in the new Parliament the judgment of the people as expressed at the election will be carried into law." This is generally understood to mean a promise by the King to create enough Peers to force the veto resolutions through the House of Lords; and the inference is that Mr. Asquith has obtained such a pledge from King George. But that monarch may have agreed simply to use the influence of the Crown

in other ways; by persuading the Lords to desist; or by insisting upon another Conference which shall not break up without ending the controversy. In any event, the country is facing the general election with many misgivings, in which such sober Liberals as Lord Courtney plainly share, not knowing what secure harbor lies beyond the troubled seas.

#### THE NEGRO AND THE UNIONS.

Mr. Gompers, in a telegram to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, made haste to deny that in his recent speech before the Federation of Labor Convention he had said "anything derogatory to the negro race or proposed to read the negro out of the labor movement." As reported, he had conveyed the impression that he wanted all negroes eliminated from unions because we could not expect "a people with all their traditions tending to tear down, to understand the fundamental philosophy of human rights; this is not a theory but a condition with which we have to deal." Not unnaturally from Booker Washington down there have been protests. If the labor-union movement has any justification, it is because it intends or was originally intended to aid those classes least able to help themselves, the classes beset by ignorance and prejudice and exploited by greed and cunning. It is precisely for these reasons and the inability of the working women to vote that the movement to organize women workers in unions has been making headway in New York city.

If to become a philosopher first is essential to the acquirement of a union card, it is obvious that many cards would have to be revoked. Labor unions that draw the color-line or refuse admission to Italians or other nationalities give the lie to the union assertion that theirs is a movement for true economic equality and genuine democracy. But if Mr. Gompers denies that he attacked the negro race and wished to exclude them from the unions, there is nothing in his utterances at St. Louis or elsewhere which we have seen that indicates an earnest desire to enroll many negroes among his supporters or to give them a real welcome. He dwells upon the difficulties of handling the colored workers; he does not seem to declare that these are precisely the difficulties the union movement likes to

grapple with and meet. As a matter of fact, his attitude reflects, in the main, that of the unions throughout the country. Few welcome the negro with open arms, though there are some that do so, notably in the mining districts of Alabama. Some, like the engineers' union on the Central of Georgia Railway, would confine him to the lowest grade of engine-labor, while others, particularly in the North, are sullenly indifferent, or admit only a few men of color, if any.

Take the situation in New York city. According to Miss Mary White Ovington, who has given years to investigation, there were, in 1906, one hundred and two trades or divisions of trades which have no negro members. This discrimination, Miss Ovington feels, is due to the fact that there are few skilled negroes in the labor market, and that the union, "endeavoring to maintain a high standard of living for its members, may decide for a time to adopt a policy of restriction of membership," by means of excessive entrance dues, or by admitting for a long time only the friends of the men already in the organization. Miss Ovington finds that, while this policy bears hardest upon the negro, the Jew suffers from it, and to a smaller degree the Italian. But both of the latter are, in New York, in so much larger numbers that the unions feel them to be more of a menace to the institution, and therefore are more ready to admit them. "This discrimination is primarily economic, not racial, but it is hard to determine where economic motive ends and race or caste discrimination begins." Men in plenty are debarred solely because of their color; have not the locomotive engineers put the word white into their constitution?

So far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, it originally took the position that it would admit no union which discriminated in its charter against the colored man. But that high ground has been abandoned. In 1902, it recognized the legality of excluding negroes from local unions, central labor bodies, or federal labor unions; national unions which expressly exclude negroes are now affiliated with the Federation and, in 1902, the Stationary Engineers altered their by-laws so as to exclude negroes. At the Atlanta University conference on the negro artisan in 1902, a list was given of forty-four of

the most important unions, several with a membership of over 30,000, which have not a single negro member. Obviously, in view of this drift in his organization, it is highly significant that while Mr. Gompers denies having advocated the *putting out* of negroes from unions, he does not deny having advocated their not being admitted.

To those who do not believe in the unionization of all laboring men, who, while admitting the benefits gained by organization, feel that there ought always to be a large body of free labor to offset the evils of the unions, this attitude of the Federation and its leader will give some satisfaction. Excluding the negroes means that there will be a steadily growing body of skilled and unskilled laborers available for those who wish to employ non-union labor. For Mr. Gompers and his workmen, in the long run, the proper policy is to admit negroes and to ask for them the education which, in many sections, is virtually denied them. But even should a reactionary policy of rigid exclusion prevail, it cannot keep the negro down industrially; it will doubtless handicap him in many sections, but the only people who can keep the negroes in an inferior economic and social position are the negroes themselves. A race that has risen so rapidly against such wonderful odds is to be held back by no organization of workingmen, however powerful.

#### NEW YORK IN THE CENSUS.

State after State tells the now familiar story of rapid urban growth and slow increase, or even decrease, in rural population. New York is no exception to the rule. The total population of the State, by the census of 1910, is 9,113,279, an increase of 1,844,385 above the figures of ten years ago. The rate of increase is 25.4 per cent. for the decade; a result the more striking in that it marks the fifth consecutive decade showing a percentage of increase greater than that of its predecessor. The Civil War decade, naturally enough, showed only 12.9 per cent. increase, which was by far the lowest in the history of the State; but 1870-80 gave only 16 per cent., and 1880-90 only 18 per cent. The decade preceding the one now closing showed an increase of 21.1 per cent., and now we have 25.4 per cent., which is on a par with the decade of 1850-60, and which has not been materially ex-

ceeded since the early years of our history. In 1820-30 the rate of increase was 39.8 per cent.; but since that time 27.5 per cent. is the highest rate recorded.

But while the State as a whole shows this rapid growth of population, there are no less than twenty-four out of its sixty-one counties which have either actually declined or been virtually stationary in numbers. There are fifteen counties that have less population now than they had ten years ago, and there are nine others in which the rate of increase in the decade has been less than 2 per cent. These are, of course, rural counties. And how largely the list of this class of counties would have to be increased if the urban population in counties mainly agricultural did not come to the rescue, only a careful examination could disclose. Of course, the later publications of the census, dealing with the occupations of the people, will give information bearing directly on the degree in which the farming population is failing to hold its own, either relatively or absolutely; but even without this, interesting conclusions might be drawn from a detailed examination of the data.

The causes of this drift of population so long familiar in New England—and in old England—are too deep-seated to encourage the expectation that any great change will take place, in the near future at all events. The most fundamental cause is the enormous extension and cheapening of facilities for transportation and communication. And this operates with two-fold efficacy, in that it affects both the economic and the more strictly human aspect of the situation with about equal force. On the one hand, we have the most fertile land, or the land most easily worked on a great scale, in any part of the country brought into direct competition with the land that may have been occupied and tilled a century ago, when the advantage of a hundred miles, or two or three hundred miles, in proximity to a market was decisive; such a thing as a special local market for staples can hardly be said to exist nowadays. And, on the other hand, the railway and the telegraph and the cheap magazine and the one-cent daily paper have made the idea of going to the city familiar to every farmer's boy, and placed the possibility of doing so within his easy reach. The

forces making against the maintenance of the population of outlying farming districts are such as cannot be gainsaid.

There is one element in the case which perhaps has not received the attention to which it is entitled. In spite of all the talk that there has been in various quarters about the rich getting richer and the poor poorer, and about modern inventions and discoveries having done nothing to lighten the burdens of the working people, the fact is that the past half-century has witnessed an enormous rise in the material standard of living of the masses. Physical discomforts which were regarded as matters of course a generation or two ago, except for the favored few, are now thought of as almost intolerable hardships; and the long hours of unrelieved toil in the fields which the grandfathers of the young men of to-day looked upon as part of the order of nature offer anything but a satisfactory prospect to the minds of the youths of the present generation. There may be many a case in which, in spite of the competition of Iowa and Kansas, the farmer in central or western New York might make the two ends meet as his father or grandfather did, were he content to work as unremittingly as they did, and to get on with as little of the comforts and luxuries of life. In connection with this aspect of the matter, it is to be remembered that the rise in the prices of agricultural produce—a rise not merely absolute, but also relative in comparison with other things—is a very recent thing. If it should be maintained, it is by no means impossible that it will have a marked effect in encouraging the maintenance and growth of our rural population, a thing devoutly to be wished.

Both the New York and the Ohio census may serve as a reminder of the large share which the big States of the Union have in the composition of the House of Representatives. New York's share of the total population of the country has more than held its own; Ohio's has nearly done so. Like New York, Ohio shows a greater percentage of increase during this decade than in the preceding; the rate from 1900 to 1910 was 14.7 per cent., as against 13.2 per cent. from 1890 to 1900. The equal representation of the States in the United States Senate gives rise to some anomalies, and there may possibly lurk in it a certain amount of danger; at the time of the silver agi-

tation, the fact that a little group of thinly settled Rocky Mountain States had a power in the Senate vastly disproportioned to their population was a real grievance. But on the whole, the arrangement works well enough. It is desirable, in a polity like ours, that something else should have weight besides a mere count of heads; the individuality of some of the small States has always been a source of national vitality, and it is well that their importance should be maintained at a point above that marked out by size of population alone. That there are evils, actual or potential, connected with the extreme disproportion that exists in some cases cannot be denied; but it is not likely that they will ever be very serious. In the House of Representatives, a few large and wealthy States have together a commanding position. Thus, in the present Congress, out of 391 members of the House, there fall to New York 39, to Pennsylvania 34, to Illinois 27, to Ohio 23, to Massachusetts 16; so that 139 members, or more than one-third of the whole membership of the House, come from these five States.

#### GOOD RECORD OF THE PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY.

As throwing an important light upon the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government, we have seen nothing of late to compare in interest with the examination in the current *Political Science Review* of the recent extraordinary session of the Philippine Legislature. This article is from the pen of Mr. James A. Robertson, the librarian of the Philippines Library, and is written in an unbiased and scientific spirit characteristic of the journal in which it appears. Mr. Robertson is an American familiar with American legislative customs and procedure. Yet he does not hesitate to declare that this special session of the Philippine Legislature, which met on March 28 last and adjourned on April 19, "marks an epoch in the history of the Philippine Islands." This statement, Mr. Robertson declares, "is no idle panegyric," but is based upon his personal attendance at many sessions and his acquaintance with various members of the Assembly. The session as a whole he declares to have been remarkable in these respects:

For the discipline exercised by the Speaker; for the earnestness displayed by the Representatives in general; for their dig-

nity of bearing; and for their freedom from jingoism; and, outwardly at least, from party passion—outwardly, I say, because considerable party passion and personal feeling did at times creep into committee and secret meetings. In general, it may be said that this Assembly in its quietness and dignity of action, has established a precedent that can well be taken as a form for future sessions.

That the Speaker's discipline was due to caciqueism, or bossism, Mr. Robertson admits to have been freely charged in Manila, and he thinks that there may be some truth in the charge, precisely as the warmest defenders of Speaker Cannon have admitted that he bosses the House, but declare that he bosses it well. The Philippine Cannon, Señor Osmena, is also charged with having been too subservient to the Philippine Commission which forms the upper house of the Legislature, and to the Governor-General; but the Assembly's refusal for a second time to pass the Government's irrigation bill (for which Mr. Forbes has just appealed anew to the October session) shows pretty plainly that the Assembly is not altogether dominated by the Palace. Of course, Mr. Robertson does not suggest that all the legislation proposed was wise or judicious; "sometimes, indeed, it bordered on the ridiculous." But of what American Legislature could this not be said? One humorist desired to put the famous Constabulary Band up at auction; and there was a movement in committee seriously to cripple the civil service; but the matter was straightened out when the bill came before the Assembly.

Coercion by party leaders and a sheepish cleaving to party lines were also to be observed in Manila. Much of the work was naturally done in committee, and here Mr. Robertson thinks there was a lack of smoothness as well as a tendency to waste time over details which he thinks will disappear as the legislators become more experienced. On the whole, however, the delegates were "men of relatively superior intelligence, alert, and anxious" for the welfare of the Philippines. Mr. Robertson was struck by the fact that, while elected to represent certain localities, the delegates were keenly conscious that they represented also the whole of the archipelago. There was considerable sectionalism, but the growth of a larger feeling of nationalism was quite apparent; as racial antagonism among the Filipinos dies out there will come "a feeling of solidarity and homogeneity."

As for the parties, the Nacionalistas, under Speaker Osmena, supported the Government, although pledged to independence; the Progresistas, who espouse the Taft policy of making progress slowly toward independence, were the Opposition. Nothing reflects more credit upon both parties, in our observer's opinion, than their refusal to seat Dr. Dominador Gomez, the labor agitator with a prison record, whose case was, by a vote of 44 to 29, referred to a committee that brought in a remarkably clear and able report, absolutely disqualifying Dr. Gomez. All in all, seventy bills were reported and discussed, many of them passed, but some defeated. Agriculture and allied industries received especial consideration, and so did matters of sanitation. In accordance with the Governor-General's desire, a "calamity fund" for use in possible emergencies was established by the Assembly. The organic law of the city of Manila was amended so as to confer upon it the right to grant certain franchises; the period during which timber and stone may be taken from public lands without fees, when used for necessary fuel or building purposes and not for commerce, was extended to ten years. The general appropriation bill, the failure to pass which was the cause of the extra session, was also voted. In this bill the various estimates of several departments, endorsed by the Government, were not accepted. In the exercise of an intelligent judgment the Assembly cut some of these and increased still others. The important irrigation bill was debated for five or six days, only to be laid upon the table until the October session.

When the first regular session of the second Philippine Legislature opened in Manila last month, Mr. Forbes had comparatively little to recommend. He reported that the loss in customs receipts due to the Payne-Aldrich tariff was more than offset by increase in miscellaneous and internal revenue receipts, and he asserted that under the new tariff there had been a quickening of trade throughout the islands. Beyond the irrigation bill, which Mr. Forbes earnestly urges anew, he recommends pensions for civil servants of long service, betterments in the lowest courts, a law to prohibit slavery or involuntary servitude, an increased penalty for cattle-stealing and forging public documents, and a fund to fight the locust pest. Alto-

gether, it appears, first, that there are no gravely vexing public problems requiring legislative action, and, secondly, that the success of the Philippine Assembly is not only far beyond what might have been expected, but ground for the early award of other opportunities for self-government.

#### SWISS NOTES.

ZURICH, November 10.

Plans for the new university buildings at Zurich have been completed and adopted, and their execution will be begun at once. The site is the old one which commands a fine view of the town and of the lake. The cost of the new buildings will be five and a half million francs. Of this, a considerable part will be spent on the Biological Institute. An additional sum of a million francs will be devoted to the construction and installation of an Institute of Hygiene. Even as in the United States, great attention is being paid to this subject at the Swiss universities. Not many weeks ago, the Institute of Hygiene and Bacteriology at the University of Berne was inaugurated in the presence of the entire faculty and many foreign visitors. The chief address was delivered by Professor Kolle, dean of the medical faculty. Germany was represented on this occasion by Gaffky of Berlin, who is Koch's successor, and France by Vidal of Paris. The Berne Institute is thoroughly modern; and special attention will be given to the study of contagious diseases.

The magnificent collections in the National Museum at Zurich have been somewhat damaged by smoke. The building is close to the central railway station. There was not room enough to enclose all the fine objects in glass. The result has been that some of the ancient textiles, such as vestments, altar-cloths, and handkerchiefs became blackened. It was found necessary to have them cleaned with great care. For the present, many of them have been stowed away for their preservation. Among those thus concealed from the visitor's view are the collection of the "Mödelplatz," and the famous baptismal *couverture* brought from Fribourg. It is proposed to build a new wing for the museum, or else to transfer these frail treasures to the neighborhood of the Polytechnicum where the smoke will not reach them.

The Cavour anniversaries recalled the fact that the Italian patriot was half-Swiss. His mother was the cultivated Mademoiselle Adèle de Sellon of Geneva, whose sisters made brilliant marriages among the French nobility. For many years Cavour made frequent visits to Geneva, and had always close affiliations with Swiss statesmen and men of letters. He wrote for the *Bibliothèque Universelle*; and it is not improbable that

his ideas of freedom and democracy, if not derived from his acquaintance with the Federation, were at least encouraged by his Geneva associations. From Turin he wrote: "If Geneva was not separated from Turin by Mont Cenis, I would have come to ask your hospitality, for I know no intellectual atmosphere more healthful than that which one breathes in Switzerland."

At Berne there has appeared an interesting although fragmentary book of travel. It is an account of the explorations of Dr. Walter Volz, who three years ago met a tragic death in Bussia. This volume contains his biography, and all his scientific and literary remains. Many of these are memoirs and letters written on the spot, during his sojourn in eastern Asia, Polynesia, and East Africa. The adventurous and energetic character of the author, as well as the valuable information which he collected, make this a graphic picture of the regions with which he was so familiar.

During the recent meeting at Bâle of the Swiss Association for the Investigation of Nature, Professor Ostwald delivered an interesting lecture before the "Ido" Universal Language Society. After referring to the progress towards unity and organization in the world, he said that the introduction of the aeroplane had quite changed man's place in nature. Man is a tri-dimensional being; but hitherto his life has been only bi-dimensional. Now, thanks to flying machines, the scope of his activity has been extended; and, moreover, the boundaries formerly separating nations are likely to become less defined. With this increasing cosmopolitanism and unification, there is more than ever a demand for a universal speech. At present, 50 per cent. of the time in German schools is taken up in teaching modern languages. This great waste should not continue. He suggested that some civilized state should take the lead and insist upon the acquisition and employment of a world-language within its territory. It seemed to him that Switzerland with its central position in Europe, and its somewhat international population, was destined to adopt this course. He added that, should such a language be adopted, a central academic authority would be necessary to preserve the purity of the new tongue, and check the development of dialects.

A. A.

#### NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES

In 1640 an otherwise unknown missionary who was laboring among the natives of Guatemala printed a small treatise, whose punning title may be literally rendered "The Pointer Pointed with Short Points on the Manufacture of Vegetable Ink." The appearance of the surviving copy of this curious publication is said to suggest rather strongly that the inventive friar manufactured his type as well as his ink, and doubtless his

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.