

Correspondence.

MR. SCHUYLER ON AMERICAN DIPLOMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: Pray allow me a word with regard to the accusation brought against me by Mr. W. H. Smith in a recent number of the *Dial*, and commented on in the *Evening Post* of June 11. I stated in my 'American Diplomacy,' page 8, referring to Mr. Washburne, that in six days he "removed the greater number of consular and diplomatic officers," and "filled their places with new and inexperienced men, appointed solely for partisan political services." Mr. Smith quotes my enumeration (on page 86) of 707 consular officials, denies my statement, and asserts that Mr. Washburne made only three or four foreign appointments.

If we exclude the consular clerks, who are irremovable, and the consular agents, who are appointed by the consuls and not by the State Department, we shall find in 1869 about 300 consuls and commercial agents appointed by the President. But of these more than one hundred did not receive compensation either by salary or fees amounting to \$1,000 per annum, and are of too little importance to be considered. There were then about 200 consular officers with a salary of \$1,000 or over, and about 50 diplomatic officers. In using the words "greater number" I did not have in mind a mere numerical majority, but meant the "more important." I should certainly have expressed my meaning better if I had said "removed the chief and most important officers, and those whose salaries seemed to promise lucrative positions."

But even here I may be wrong; and if I am wrong, I shall gladly alter the statement and apologize to Mr. Washburne for having made it. I must admit that I trusted to my memory without verifying my very strong impression on the subject. Exact verification is difficult. It would be possible to obtain from the State Department the dates of the commissions, but these are no criterion of the dates of the original nominations to the Senate. Those are filed away in the Senate archives. But, while impossible for me at this distance, it would be easy for any of your readers who is interested to verify my statement roughly by the lists of the nominations sent to the Senate between March 4 and March 12, 1869, published in the chief New York daily papers of the time. By those lists I am willing to abide.

May I, in turn, make two or three observations on your criticism of my book in your number for June 10? I nowhere state, as my critic represents, "that the management of our foreign relations involves a grave departure from constitutional theory," nor do I imply that the change in the working of our Government has had any appreciable effect on the methods of the State Department. Quite the contrary. It is because Congressional leaders have as yet devised no way of undermining and counteracting the old and essential functions of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury that those officers still form part of the real inside working Government. It is because these two secretaries still possess independent powers that their offices seem to me better worth studying than the more clerical and administrative duties of the War, Navy, and Interior Departments. Every branch, however, of our Government demands exposition, and none more so at the present time than the offices of the First and Second Comptrollers, and the evolution of these nominally subordinate officials of the Treasury Department into uncontrolled, independent officers;

judges who decide without a hearing and from whom there is no appeal; who are able, if so disposed, to stop all the wheels of government.

Further on, by a partial quotation and by a misapprehension of what I wrote, my critic makes me seem to approve of abolishing the diplomatic service and of intrusting diplomatic duties to consular officers. I really stated exactly the reverse, and thought that my meaning was clear. My whole book is intended to show the necessity of a diplomatic service, and I endeavored to make plain the distinction between conferring consular functions upon diplomatic officers, of which I approve, and of intrusting diplomatic duties to consular officers, which does not seem to me feasible or advantageous.

I may add here that within the last few weeks the Italian Government has decided to suppress its consuls at St. Petersburg, Belgrade, Shanghai, Yokohama, and Tangier, when the consular duties will be performed by a secretary of legation or a clerk. It is proposed to transfer the seat of the legation in China from Peking to Shanghai.

I must confess that I do not understand the references in the final paragraph of your criticism to the "ponderous volume of instructions." The last edition of the 'Personal Instructions to the Diplomatic Agents of the United States' (1885) is a foolscap pamphlet of seventy-seven pages, of which twenty-four are forms, index, etc., and relates chiefly to accounts, the forms of despatches, and to special duties imposed by our laws and the regulations of the Department. This pamphlet is considered confidential, as I stated on page 132, and I should therefore say that the edition of which I speak was published after I left the service, and was never officially communicated to me. The 'Consular Regulations,' a small octavo volume of about 600 pages, two-thirds of which is taken up with extracts from treaties and the Revised Statutes, and with the necessary forms for consular acts, consists of the instructions issued at various times by the State Department, which, owing to the requirements of our laws, are sometimes very minute and detailed. The book is not only useful but necessary to even the most experienced consular officer. It is similar to the consular handbooks of other countries, whether they are published officially by the Government or privately by one of the officials (as in England); but it is better than these, and instead of exciting "amazement," calls out the admiration of foreign diplomats and consuls for its method and thoroughness.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

EUGENE SCHUYLER.

ALASSIO, July 2.

[At Mr. Schuyler's request, we have ourselves examined the files of the daily papers for March, 1869, expecting to find some confirmation of the statement about Secretary Washburne's appointments, as this has been a very general belief. To our surprise, between the dates specified (March 4-12), but a single nomination was reported from the Department of State. Moreover, on March 10, the *Tribune* correspondent at Washington telegraphed: "Secretary Washburne to-day stated an interesting fact in reply to the personal application of an office-seeker. He said he should make no appointments whatever while he remained in office, and that he could only receive the papers and place them on file; that his stay in the Department would be limited to a few days, and he did not intend to interfere in the question of appointments in that Department." No nominations were, in fact, forthcoming up

to March 17, when the same correspondent reported Mr. Washburne formally relieved by Mr. Fish's taking the oath of office, nor, with a single exception, until April 3, when three nominations were sent to the Senate, and there were no more till April 12, when the weightier appointments of Motley, Curtin, Jay, etc., with others, to the number of thirteen in all (making eighteen to date), were handed in. Further we have not searched.—
ED. NATION.]

THE COUNT OF PARIS AND THE PANAMA CANAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: It would be rather curious if the Panama Canal affair were to end in placing the Count of Paris on the French throne; yet things much more unlikely have come to pass.

The canal shares are still at par, kept there by Lesseps's wonderful prestidigitation. The collapse must come, and Leroy-Beaulieu predicts that the resulting financial panic will be greater than anything that the world has seen since the time of Law. Great numbers of intelligent Frenchmen feel that the republic is a failure. It has made a vast expenditure of treasure and blood, and has very little indeed to show for it either in Tunis, Tonquin, or Madagascar. It expels royalist leaders, but fears in any way to molest the anarchists. The status of the municipality of Paris is a continual danger. There exists a widespread dissatisfaction and uneasiness to which the maladroit Government has virtually presented a leader and chief in the person of the Count of Paris. Now let a great financial crisis come in which multitudes of small investors in canal shares find their ruin result from the collapse of an undertaking sanctioned and promoted by the republican Government, and what is more probable than that that Government, already weakened in the affections of the French people, should be overturned for the benefit of the Count of Paris?
M. C. LEA.

BAR HARBOR, ME., July 18, 1886.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: Having drawn one illustration from Great Britain, I should like to take another from France. There has been nothing finer in history, hardly even excepting our Constitutional Convention, than the way in which, after the fall of the Second Empire, the country rallied its force, elected an assembly, paid the fine, and got the Germans out of the country. It was done, as in the case of Washington and Victor Emmanuel, by following a leader, Thiers, and there is something deeply pathetic in the history of his struggles to hold the jarring elements together. But after his death executive power began rapidly to decline. The Chamber was broken up into groups, the finances managed by a budget committee, weak ministries continually falling from power; while the President, M. Grévy, seems to think his duties are summed up in self-effacement. As always happens, the control of the Chamber falls into the hands of the most violent and irresponsible portion. One fatal step was the removal from Versailles to Paris. Just as the Jacobins got control of the old Legislative Assembly, so the leaders of the Paris mob are again slowly but surely getting the upper hand. The expulsion of the Princes, the quarrel with the Church, the treatment of the strike at Decazville, are unmistakable symptoms. The Comte de Paris sees what is coming, and his manifesto is a bid for the succession, but he has probably

too little vigor and too much scruple. The talk about Gen. Boulanger has something of the old flavor of Bonaparte, but there is a long gap yet. The prize is almost inevitably awaiting some military adventurer; but that does not prove that the country wants him, or that France does not prefer peace and economy to the hazards and disasters of military rule. It only proves that she has not learned to organize executive power strong enough to hold a legislature in check without dispersing it by force of arms.

It will be said, "But France has what you so earnestly plead for—a responsible Ministry, with seats in the Chamber." Very true; but observe that they are too much responsible to the Chamber and too little to the nation. The English have learned by two centuries of practice to carry on a ministerial executive system which is directly responsible only to Parliament, and only indirectly to the people. Even there the danger of Parliamentary usurpation is manifesting itself. But in France the system is clearly unworkable. Not even the President is elected by the people, while the Ministers are the mere tools of Parliamentary faction. In Germany we see a Minister who holds his own in spite of Parliamentary defeats, and the result is at least favorable to steadiness of administration. It is an interesting illustration of putting the veto where it belongs—with the legislature and not with the executive. God forbid that I should hold up the German empire to imitation! But there is a vast difference between an irresponsible, divine-right, bayonet-supported Emperor and a President elected, in effect directly, by 10,000,000 of votes of a free people. I have a strong conviction that there is something splendid ahead of us in a President supporting his Cabinet against an adverse Congress, until both sides carry the issue, fully discussed and defined, to the impartial tribunal of the national will. But unless we do provide for this, unless we furnish to the executive some means of holding a domineering legislature in check, the warning is as plain as the handwriting on the wall at Belshazzar's feast. What French Chamber was ever more impotent, more completely in the hands of factious intrigue, than Congress has been during the last session? Certainly the circumstances and the character of the people are vastly different, but this does not change the principle. Anarchy has led us once into civil war already. How many such experiments the country can stand may be a question. They will, however, be much worse in the form of social disintegration than of sectional secession, and that sooner or later they must come, with the present state of things, is as certain as any demonstration in mathematics.

G. B.

Boston, July 24, 1886.

THE MORRISON SURPLUS BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a Democrat, I have no desire to deny your impeachment of the Democratic party for its financial heresy, as shown in its support of the Morrison resolution. That the execution of this measure would be a public calamity, there is little room for doubt; and it is fortunate that the President and the Treasury Department can be relied upon to use all their power against it. An analysis of the vote, however, shows that the friends of sound financial legislation have more to contend with than the Democratic Congressmen. A majority of the Republican votes were cast in favor of the measure; and of more than fifty Republican votes from Western States, only six were cast against it. How the Senate will deal with the matter will have been decided before this is in print, but it will be remembered

that that body has already demonstrated its unsoundness on the silver question.

It seems to be the opinion of the *Nation*, and is probably the opinion of Eastern men in general, that Western and Southern Congressmen are misrepresenting the people of their districts in their action on this question. It would be fortunate if this were so, but it is a mistaken view of the case. If the Morrison resolution could be submitted to a vote of the people, the South and West would give an overwhelming majority in its favor. There is no ground for comfort in the fact that "Bill Allen" was defeated in Ohio in 1875, on a soft-money platform. That vote has no significance as a test of the opinion of Ohio on the silver question. Outside of the New England and Middle States, the popular feeling in favor of the silver dollar is probably stronger today than when the Silver Bill was passed. It may as well be recognized that there is a long, hard fight ahead of us, and it will be fortunate indeed if the masses can be won over to the support of sound currency without going through the ordeal of financial disaster. W.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA., July 23.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL AT ATHENS ONCE MORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The letters of Prof. Goodwin and Mr. Fowler in reply to mine on the American School at Athens differ in the sense of their attacks on it, and to a certain extent are opposed to each other. Prof. Goodwin does not in the main disagree with me in the designation of the end to be attained, but he takes exception "to the spirit in which it is done." If by this he means that this spirit is one of anything but good will towards the School, I would gladly have had him express his idea more definitely, that I might repudiate it more formally. As for Mr. Fowler's letter, I can only say that his opinions on the School have the *prima-facie* relation to mine that those of an undergraduate of a university may have to those of a man who has watched classes come and go, and seen them in and out of the school bounds. I have had the good fortune to be a good deal in Athens, and to have been there at various periods of the School's existence, hearing what is said by disinterested outsiders about it and its work and prospects. I have heard, too, the evidence of a number of its pupils. The letter of Mr. Fowler, as a reply to mine, is, to borrow his own phrase, "simply absurd." Simultaneously with the *Nation* which contains these letters came to me here a private letter from an American scholar, who has every right to express an opinion on the School at Athens and its work, saying how glad he was I had written the letter, and "wishing only that you had spoken in stronger terms about the recent management."

In reply to Prof. Goodwin's implied accusation of my motives in writing, I can only say, as I have always said, that I most earnestly desire the advancement and pecuniary prosperity of the School, and am at all times ready to do what I can, if I can do anything, to contribute to its prosperity. But it is useless to attempt to conceal that I regard the recent management to have been carried on on wrong lines, and such as will not lead the School to success so soon as a sounder policy might. I will not attempt to discuss Greek grammar or education in ancient or modern Greek with Prof. Goodwin or any of his colleagues, but I am capable of forming the opinion, from what I see of education, that the especial object to be gained, and the only one, so far as I can see, by having a School of Classical Studies at Athens is to give the students a chance to study archaeology in a practical way; because, as I have said before, Greek grammar may be better learned at

a German university or at Oxford. And this I do not say with any disparagement of the admirable Hellenists who have been delegated by the managers of the School to conduct it, but simply because, in the nature of things, it is not merely what a veteran literary Greek scholar can give that is wanted to conduct this School at Athens to such a position as will command support by showing success of a practical kind, but the demonstration that something can be done for American culture there which cannot be done elsewhere. And as to this the testimony of the students whom I have known is almost unanimously negative. And, if Prof. Goodwin will permit me to say it, his statement of "my principal argument" (paragraph 1 of his letter) is a *reductio ad absurdum* which sins by absurdity. His consequence is neither implied in my words nor involved in my opinion. There is no necessary connection between Greek scholarship as such (excluding epigraphy, of which I hold the absolute necessity) and the study of archaeology. I know some very clever archaeologists who are not good Greek scholars, and I know at least one admirable Greek scholar who detests archaeology.

Now, I believe this plan of sending directors to the School for one year a mistake which is fatal not only to the progress of the School itself, but to its securing the public support which will follow its having gained any ever so slight distinction in that special ground for which Athens, as a *locus standi*, is peculiarly fitted, and for which, therefore, the managers can appeal to the general public for support. The whole cultured world is to a certain extent interested in Greek archaeology and its results—in museums and a knowledge of ancient art; while the number of those who are interested in the progress of Greek literature is comparatively small, and less able, or disposed, to give. You begin to teach a child to swim by putting him into water, and you make archaeologists by teaching archaeology; and it is only, in my opinion, by a school of actual archaeology, achieving some results which shall confer honor on the American name, that that enthusiasm will be excited which is the only efficient patron of the higher culture in America. Therefore, I say that the first thing to be done to win public support is to put at the head of an archaeological school at Athens some one whose position there is, and is likely to become *still more so*, a matter of national pride; and so far as I know, or so far as the general opinion of archaeologists whom I know goes, Dr. Sterrett is the only man we have who occupies this position. And I much mistake my countrymen if an appeal for funds to prevent this brilliant scholar, who has already won himself a European reputation in the most difficult branch of archaeology, from being relegated to the obscurity of a Western college, instead of being put at the head of a (in some sense) national institution, would not bring in more contributions to the funds of the School than the project for a building of which the ostensible use excites no enthusiasm. You cannot excite enthusiasm in the American public for an abstraction. One brilliant discovery in things tangible and comprehensible, and which serve to raise the American national pride, will call out more contributions than the making a dozen good Greek scholars, even if this could only be done at Athens.

"There is," says Prof. Goodwin, "little or no real difference of opinion between Mr. Stillman and the managers of the School as to the ideal to be aimed at," but there is immense difference between our opinions as to what is to be done to realize that ideal. The managers apparently propose to go on with the plan at present followed, until funds offer enough to endow a permanent directorship; but the object of endowing an

indefinite and permanent directorship is far less likely, *me jndice*, to attract the support of the public than that of keeping a man who honors the country in a position to increase that honor and emphasize our position among cultured nations. My plan is, then, to secure the proper head to the School and then appeal to American public spirit to support him; and this, I believe, would not only give the fund, but also construct the school building, if the funds for that were to be asked for still. The conclusion which might be drawn by outsiders asked to contribute is (I am not supposing that there is any such plan), that it is intended to secure a fund which may be devoted to putting some person indifferent to the contributors into a permanent comfortable position where no public sentiment is gratified by seeing him; and as the success of the present system has not been all that is needed, I suggest that a change be tried. My acquaintance with Dr. Sterrett is very slight, and there must be many scholars who know him far better than I do, and who are better able to recommend him; but I am in a position to know that his appointment as the head of the School at Athens would give it at once a European recognition which, in my opinion, it could not expect in a long time with any other head that I know of.

I was informed at Athens, and by the head of the Archaeological Department of the Ministry of Instruction, that a new archaeological law will be introduced this winter (one which I have for years labored for in Greece, and as a friend of Greece), which will facilitate excavations for foreign societies, museums, etc., and permit the retention and exportation of such of the objects found as are not necessary to the completion of the history of Greek civilization. If we might greet this enlargement of Greek liberalism by an appropriate appeal to American patriotism, it would give every American interested in classical culture (and me not the least) a pleasure which Greek literature will be long in furnishing; and I mistake my countrymen if this appeal for Dr. Sterrett's retention in that field would not be a success. He is a poor man, and has already expended all he possessed, and contracted debts in his researches. He cannot refuse a professorate should he not see his way open to some more congenial position to which he is entitled. My practical opinion is that it were better to devote the money raised (if the giving made it possible) to the support of a permanent head, even if it be not Dr. Sterrett, than to the building of which there is no absolute need, while of the head there is. These are the general and particular grounds for my difference with the managers of the School, not any want of interest in it.

Yours truly,
W. J. STILLMAN.

THE INTELLECTUAL WOMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the interesting letter of "E. R. S.," entitled, "Why Not Make Her an Intellectual Woman?" I heard a remark the other day of a lady connected with Vassar College that is worth considering. Said she: "Do you know one cause of the many divorces nowadays among Americans? It is this: the husband, coming constantly in contact with the world, with men of business, men of ideas, men of inventions, and with the new ideas in the newspapers, magazines, etc., is constantly *growing* intellectually; while the wife, confined within her narrow circle at home, remains *stationary*; and the husband *grows away* from her, and finally is compelled to leave her. How often you find wives complaining that their husbands are taken up with their books, and have not a word for them. This is because the wives don't care for what the books contain; they have no liking nor knowledge of

these things, and their husbands find nothing to say to them. Now, let our young women get a good classical education, and this complaint will cease; their husbands *will never grow away from them.*"

ROBERT WATERS.

WEST HOBOKEN, July 30, 1886.

"WOMAN IN MUSIC."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am very glad that Philip Hale, your correspondent whose letter appeared in the *Nation* of July 22, has replied to some statements which were published in the *Nation* June 17, in a review of Mr. Upton's 'Woman in Music.' Your correspondent not only places the women composers of France in their true light, but he gives to French musicians their just praise: a distinction too seldom accorded them by critics living at a distance from Paris. It is to be regretted that the French performers and composers are so little known and consequently unappreciated.

Among the galaxy of talented composers of Paris to-day Mlle. Augusta Holmès is recognized for her ability and originality. I lived in Paris the year Mlle. Holmès entered "Les Argonautes" in the "concours de la ville de Paris." M. Ernest Giraud, the composer, told me that Mlle. Holmès's poems and musical composition indicated great talent and originality, but he considered her style as somewhat *bizarre*, and, in her effort for musical "effects," she used an exaggerated manner of composition. This meant that Mlle. Holmès had departed from the more frequented path of rule and tradition. However, this has often before been the course of genius.

The compositions of all the competitors had been thrown aside, excepting two, "Les Argonautes" and "La Tempête"; the judges were slow to decide to which of the two candidates the prize should be awarded. Paris was excited over the delay, and the daily papers were full of the "concours." If I remember correctly, Mlle. Holmès failed by only one or two votes to obtain the "prix du concours." It was given to M. Duvernoy, the author of "La Tempête." The city of Paris voted a sum of money for the performance of Mlle. Holmès's work, a worthy testimony of the respect in which her composition was held.

I should like to add to the list of women composers the name of a young musician of this city, Miss Helen A. Clarke. This young lady is not only a distinguished pianist, but a composer of more than usual promise. She has written charming songs, and piano pieces of decided merit. Recently she composed a sonata for piano and violoncello, which discloses the artist's knowledge of counterpoint and melody. This sonata was performed in public a season ago by Miss Clarke and Mr. Charles Schmidt.

The reviewer of Mr. Upton's book says: "But perhaps the chief reason of woman's failure lies in the fact that music is an impersonal art." Impersonality is a quality that either man or woman should possess in order to succeed in any line of intellectual labor, whether artistic or scientific. It depends in a measure upon the kind of education the person receives, if his or her mind regards things personally or impersonally. The physical sciences are the best means of cultivating the intellect to think on any subject impersonally. The introduction of scientific studies into women's schools and colleges will have telling results, and we may prophesy that the ranks in all departments of science, philosophy, and art will be crowded with women thinkers.

The position of woman, with few exceptions, for centuries has not been one to develop her intellectual faculties to their fullest extent, and until the influence of the present educational advantages are felt, it is premature to claim personality

or impersonality as the exclusive property of one or the other sex, or to advance the thought that impersonality is a sex distinction and the cause of the fundamental difference between men and women composers.

The great Novalis says: "Effort is towards the higher; man's effort is towards woman; and woman's towards—what?" In reply, it can be said that woman's effort is certainly not towards the personality incorporated in mankind, but to those lofty peaks of Spinoza and to the impersonal. "And though the way thereto be steep, yet it may be found: all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare."—Yours truly,

HELEN C. DE S. ABBOTT.

1509 LOCUST ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 22, 1886.

Notes.

FREDERICK WARNE & Co. will issue in the fall an entirely new edition of Napier's 'Peninsula War,' in six volumes, uniform with their Chandos Edition of 'Knight's Half-Hours,' also, in the "Chandos Classics," a new edition of 'Shah Námeh of Firdausi,' carefully revised by the Rev. J. A. Atkinson, M.A., son of the original translator.

Henry Holt & Co. signalize a new invention in flexible cloth book covers by starting "The Leisure Season Series," of which the initial volume will be Miss McClelland's 'Oblivion,' borrowed from "The Leisure Hour Series." No. 2 will be a new novel, by Thomas Wharton, author of 'A Latter-Day Saint.'

Cupples, Upham & Co., Boston, have in press 'The Winnipeg Country; or, Roughing It with an Eclipse Party,' illustrated with heliotypes, wood-engravings, and a map. They will also publish, by arrangement with the *Pall Mall Gazette*, a third pamphlet edition of 'The Best Hundred Books.'

'An Introduction to the Study of Robert Browning's Poetry,' by Prof. Hiram Corson, of Cornell, is announced by D. C. Heath & Co., Boston. A bibliography of Browning criticism will be given in an appendix.

Our readers will remember an entertaining account by our French correspondent of the recently published life of Éléonore d'Olbreuzé (*Nation*, Nos. 1038 and 1040). This interesting work, by the Viscount Horric de Beaucaire, has been translated and published in handsome form by Remington & Co., London (New York: Scribner & Welford), under the title 'A Mésalliance in the House of Brunswick.' This French girl, maid of honor to the Princesse de Tarente, married Duke George William of Zell, and was mother of Sophia Dorothea, Queen of George I. of England. The "mésalliance" is therefore an event of considerable historical importance, seeing that from it are sprung the royal families of England and of Prussia. The translation is in general easy and idiomatic, but is marred by the persistent use of French forms and titles and even of mixtures of French and English. We have "Georges-Guillaume, Duke de Zell," while on his brother, "Duc Ernest-Auguste," becoming titular Bishop of Osnabrück, we are told that "M. d'Osnabruck and Madame l'Évêque left Hanover, etc." So we have (p. 16) the "Electeur de Brandebourg," and the statement that "all the counties north of the Elbe, the Hante, and the Basse-Saxe of the Bavière belonged" in olden time to the House of Brunswick. What this means we are really at a loss to understand.

The Superintendent of the New York Department of Public Instruction is establishing at Albany a permanent educational exhibit, to which nothing comes amiss in the shape of text-books, periodicals, reports, school apparatus—even pho-