

avored a policy which was near bringing England to a war with Russia. But to outsiders like myself—and almost every Englishman is an outsider as regards secrets of state—these reports remain rumors and nothing more. They may rest on the highest authority, but the “highest authority” is a personage on whose word no man of sense would risk a penny. The apparent publicity of political life in England makes us forget the reserve maintained by statesmen of all parties with regard to the mysteries of the Cabinet, and no Cabinet secret is so sacred as secrets affecting the Queen.

Hence, when England is just about to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Queen Victoria's accession, there are a host of questions about the Queen to which intelligent curiosity would desire an answer, but which hardly admit of a satisfactory or certain reply. Three of these inquiries occur to me as worth a few minutes' consideration. Is the Queen popular? What, to judge from history, has been her capacity as a ruler? What influence has her character had on the constitutional history of England?

The popularity of the Queen is, of course, in one sense past a doubt. To whatever part of Great Britain she goes, she is certain of a warm welcome from her subjects. Were she to visit the colonies she would be received with enthusiasm, and (though your readers are on this point far better judges than I) her appearance in the United States would, I conjecture, be welcomed with rapture by all classes of Americans except your Irish citizens. Nor is this personal popularity to be deemed a small thing. It is the result of a life which has, in the eyes of the English people on both sides the Atlantic, been felt to be entitled to respect. Since the death of Queen Anne no occupant of the English throne has commanded as widespread respect among the English people. William IV. was for a short time the “patriot King,” but for that brief period he was the hero of a party, and when he ceased to be applauded as a reformer he did not gain any wide esteem with the nation. Of George IV. there is no need to say anything. His father, no doubt, commanded a kind of influence which has never fallen to Queen Victoria. The “good old King” was a real power, but by a large party he was at all times hated. His two predecessors were to the English people unattractive foreigners. Flattery itself would have hesitated to call them popular, lest servility should be mistaken for irony. But when one has allowed to the full for the importance and rarity of general esteem gained by the display of private virtues, the inquiry still remains, whether the Queen is popular in the sense in which a ruler is so called whose wishes have, because they are his wishes, weight with his people.

Would it, for instance, affect the public fortunes of a statesman that he was supposed to have spoken disrespectfully of the Queen? Would the public knowledge of the Queen's personally favoring or opposing the cause of home rule greatly strengthen the hands, as the case might be, of Mr. Gladstone or of Lord Salisbury? The more carefully a critic meditates upon the uncertainties of public opinion, the more doubtful will be his answer to these inquiries. In matters which touch the Queen personally, large classes would, it may be suspected, feel that her wishes ought to command deference. What might be her influence on the results of a doubtful political contest, no man would venture to predict. We here approach a subject to which the attention of your readers has more than once been called in your columns. If Englishmen are in the dark about the character of their nominal sovereign, they are equally in the dark about the character of their real sovereign, namely, the mass of the electors of Great Britain and Ireland. What do

the artisans, what do the agricultural laborers, think about the Crown? Are they irritated by the expensiveness of a court, or do they, as Mr. Bagehot seems to have suspected, admire the showy parts of the Constitution? At the present moment, the question has a purely speculative interest. It may within half a century become of pressing importance. Government by Parliament does not fascinate popular imagination as much as it did when Parliamentary government (which is rather a different thing from government by Parliament) was longed for by all Continental Europe as an escape from all the evils of despotism. And it is at least conceivable that in England a king might at times represent the feeling of the electors better than a House of Commons distracted and weakened by the rivalry of parties which, like the groups in the French Chamber of Deputies, seem each to be just strong enough to prevent the creation of a permanent Government, with power to carry on the affairs of the nation with dignity and consistency. It is pretty clear that, during the reign of Queen Victoria, the problem as to the possible influence of the Crown will, happily for the nation, remain a purely academic inquiry. But whoever could fathom the true sentiment about the Queen now prevailing among the mass of the people, would possess a clue to guide him towards the path which English politics will pursue under her successors.

If any one ask of any ordinary Englishman what has been the Queen's capacity as a ruler, he would probably receive the reply that she has fully performed the duties of a constitutional sovereign. This answer is true enough in itself, but most of the persons who use the well-known formula that the Queen fulfils the duties of a constitutional monarch, hardly realize to themselves exactly what the formula means in the mouth of a modern Englishman. Its real significance is, that the Queen, in the opinion of the speaker, has conformed loyally to the advice of ministers, or, in other words, has shown herself at all times prepared, irrespective of her private feelings, to carry out the policy suggested by the men who had most influence in the House of Commons. How far this has really been the case no one, as I have already pointed out, can know for certain; but, assuming that the general estimate of the Queen's conduct is sound, it implies rather more than people generally realize as to her capacity. It shows that, unless she be endowed with a kind of self-control which is of itself a most rare quality, she must have been a person not very keenly interested in the great party questions of the day. It implies, also, a capacity for acquiescence almost inconsistent with moral or intellectual originality or resource. Englishmen have now made the discovery, when it is too late to be of much practical use, that, had the Queen resided half as much in Ireland as she has lived in Scotland, she might have conferred a great benefit on the nation. This idea, which has dawned on Englishmen with characteristic slowness, was grasped more than sixty years ago by that clever voluptuary George IV. It is difficult to suppose that Her Majesty resisted ministerial suggestions that she should visit Ireland; but it is not unfair to infer, from her own course of action, that she did not perceive the importance of making royalty at least popular with the Irish people. In other words, she has not shown in this matter either acuteness or the possession of what may be called individual initiative. But, though a capacity for acquiescence which must have greatly facilitated the performance of many constitutional duties, is almost inconsistent with high talent, the discharge for fifty years, amid general approval, of the functions allotted to a constitutional ruler proves the possession by the Queen of a great deal more of character and

judgment than falls in general to the lot of hereditary monarchs. When matters go smoothly, everybody assumes that it is easy to preserve habitual smoothness. But the old saying that, though there is but one way of doing a thing rightly, the ways of doing a thing wrongly are infinite in number, has a very wide application. The Queen has avoided mistakes, and to have avoided mistakes—that is, to have done the right thing at the right moment—is itself a sign of a very special talent. In one matter, moreover, and in one only, Queen Victoria has displayed originality. She has come forward as the exponent of that sympathy with misery and pity for calamity which is the marked moral characteristic of the age. The letters in which the Queen has expressed her sympathy with persons whose calamities have attracted public notice, have probably done more to spread the legitimate popularity of the Crown than any other act for which she can be called personally responsible.

From no monarch who has sat on the English throne does the Queen differ more essentially than from each of the two women with whom her name is most naturally associated. Yet it is, I think, something more than a fancy that Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne, and Queen Victoria will each be judged by historians to have rendered, in very different degrees and by very different methods, one and the same service to England. They each have facilitated the passage of the country through a difficult period of transition. The truth of this remark in the case of Elizabeth is certain. When she began her reign, the forces of Protestantism and Catholicism were nearly balanced; when she died, the contest between the two was ended. The singular compromise between the two contending powers embodied in Anglicanism was too firmly established to be in the long run overthrown either by the Papacy or by the Puritans. Queen Anne presided over the transition from a monarchical to a constitutional system of government. The presence of a Stuart on the throne suspended the activity of the Jacobites, and smoothed over the difficulties which might well have hindered the union with Scotland. Queen Victoria ascended the throne within a few years after the Reform Act had undermined the aristocratic system of government without establishing a democratic constitution. Each year which has since then elapsed has brought us nearer and nearer to a pure democracy. The transformation from aristocracy to democracy is now all but complete. That it has been accomplished peaceably, by degrees—almost, one may say, imperceptibly—is certainly due in a measure to the fact that the transition has taken place when, by the good fortune of England, we have had on the throne, not a king in whom acquiescence might have seemed wanting in dignity, but a Queen who could let the powers of the Crown be lessened or effaced without sacrificing any claim to respect. AN OBSERVER.

Correspondence.

THE LOUISIANA LOTTERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your paper of the 28th of April, you indicted the whole people of Louisiana, and there are two counts in your indictment:

(1.) The large number of saloons alleged by the Prohibitionists, who will not help the temperate and sensible people to pass the high-license law.

(2.) The Louisiana Lottery reestablished by the Constitution of 1879.

Will you permit me to place the responsibility for the lottery where it belongs, and that is, on the Republican party? The Constitution of

Louisiana of 1845, article 116, and that of 1852, article 113, prohibited lotteries and buying and selling lottery tickets, and from 1845 to 1864 it was a criminal offence in Louisiana to draw a lottery or to buy or sell a lottery ticket. When Gen. Sheridan, with the aid of his Federal soldiers, forced on the people of Louisiana, under the Reconstruction Act of the Republican Congress, the Constitution of 1868 and the Warmoth government, this prohibition was repealed, and among the first acts passed by the Republican Legislature, elected and held in power by Federal bayonets, was an act to incorporate the Louisiana Lottery Company for twenty-five years. During the whole term of Republican rule in Louisiana, from 1868 to 1877, the will of the people of Louisiana was suppressed by the United States Army, which was sustained in its action by the Republican party of the nation, and no effort was made to repeal this charter.

A Democratic Legislature in 1879, Act 44, repealed the charter of the lottery company, and made it a penal offence to buy or sell lottery tickets in this State. The same Legislature called a constitutional convention. The Hon. Edward C. Billings (a New England Republican, a graduate of Harvard, appointed United States Judge by President Grant), on a bill in equity filed by the Louisiana Lottery Company, held that the charter of the lottery company was a contract between it and the State, and the act of 1879, repealing the charter and making it a crime to buy or sell lottery tickets, was in derogation of the Federal Constitution and void; and he enjoined the sheriff, the police, and all State officers from enforcing in any way this criminal statute of the State against the Louisiana Lottery Company or its servants and agents (see 3d Wood's Reports, page 222).

Many people were thus made to believe that the Federal power in the hands of the Republican party would maintain the lottery company in spite of the State law abolishing it. While the injunction was in force, the Constitutional Convention assembled with about 132 members, of which 30 were Republicans. When the lottery article was before the Convention, on a motion to strike it out the votes stood 59 to 59, absent 14. Every Republican voted against the motion to strike out except one, who was absent, and he, on the last and final vote for its adoption, was present and voted for it. On the third and last vote to adopt this lottery article, which reestablished the Louisiana State Lottery as a contract granted in 1868 and prohibits all lotteries after 1895, the vote recorded 71 ayes, among whom was every Republican except two, and they were absent, and every man of the 52 who voted against the article was a Democrat without exception. An effort was made to allow the people to take a separate vote on this lottery article, and that was likewise defeated by Republican votes. If, therefore, the Republicans had been equally divided, or nearly equally divided, on the lottery article, it would have been defeated. A large majority of the Democratic members of the Convention invariably voted against it.

One clause of the charter of the lottery company, which exempted it from State and municipal taxation, has been recently upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States as a contract, the obligation of which cannot be impaired by the State. (See *New Orleans vs. Houston*, 119th United States Reports, 265, decided 6th of December, 1886.)

Under these circumstances, I submit that neither the present State Administration nor the people of Louisiana can justly be held responsible for the existence of the lottery.—Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

B. R. FORMAN.

NEW ORLEANS, May 3, 1887.

THE COLOR LINE IN MISSISSIPPI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a Mississippi court now in session, a negro teacher was indicted for obtaining money on false pretences, viz., reporting more pupils and more teaching days than he had a right to do. The counsel for the defence was a negro; opposing counsel and *all the jury* were white. *The negro won his case.*

That same negro lawyer had a case to-day with a white lawyer as associate counsel.

What a pity, for the negro's sake, that Cleveland was elected! Æ.

THE KENTUCKY STATE CONVENTION AND THE PRESIDENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Kentucky State Convention which has just met is perhaps deserving of some notice, as being the first of a series which will take place before the next national Convention. It is interesting, not from any doubt which hangs over the result, but as expressing with tolerable clearness the attitude of Kentucky Democrats towards the altered conditions of public affairs. In a State as completely withdrawn from the influence of new, elevating ideas as Kentucky undoubtedly is, in a State in which the voice of the younger generation is either silent or lost in the ancient Bourbon chorus, it is curious to note that men still realize, however vaguely, the advent of a new order of things. The interest in the Kentucky Convention, in a word, revolves around its attitude toward the President.

I think I do not overstate the case when I say that no man of eminence in Kentucky has committed himself unequivocally to the Mugwump idea in politics; and in saying this I do not except even Mr. Carlisle, who has, as far as I know, never announced his position on the matter in perfectly unambiguous language. On the contrary, our Congressmen and Senators are notoriously opposed to it. Kentucky is perhaps not wholly to blame for this; its teachers have treated it very ill, the teachers from whom it deserved better things. The mossback reigns in unquestioned supremacy, and the *Courier-Journal* is the accepted idol of the large mass of the Democratic party. Let us give the devil his due: it has vigorously applauded the firm stand of the President against paternal government; his pension veto; his tariff-reform utterances. But, on the other hand, it is besmirched with the taint of every corrupt monopoly in the State, and has disseminated an idea which has done more to brutalize politics and repel the intelligence of the country than any other agency that could be named. It has maligned and maliciously misrepresented the whole civil-service-reform idea; it has congratulated us on every bad appointment the President has made, provided only a Republican gave way to a Democrat; it has insidiously striven to undermine the President, while conscious of atmospheric indications that point to his renomination; and, finally, it keeps at Washington a correspondent who worships at the shrine, of the immaculate Higgins, and snarls at the President like an enraged and disappointed cur.

And the platform of the Convention reflects just this state of things. Its endorsement of the President ignores the cardinal feature of his policy; its civil-service declaration is as absurd as ingenuity could make it. And yet, after all—and this is the thing to which I wish particularly to call your attention—the omen is good when a Kentucky politician who still glories in the music of the words "Jeffersonian" and "Jacksonian," realizes that the President, despite the slight resemblance he bears to those now largely mythical heroes, must be renominated. This was clearly

the sense of the Convention. They may agree with him or not; they may understand him or not; but they recognize and admit his strength, notwithstanding the fact that it is hard to make his actions harmonize with their traditional notions of a real Democratic President. This recognition strikes me as extremely important; it is, we sincerely hope, the first step towards the comprehension and absorption of his ideas.

A.

LOUISVILLE, KY., May 7, 1887.

WOLSELEY AND LEE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Notwithstanding the comparison suggested between Wolseley and Boulanger, I do not believe that Gen. Walker would maintain that the English soldier whose high reputation and position have been solely the result of professional success, was to be compared with the military politician who has leaped into notoriety by means of the French War Office.

It is hard to differ from so able and courteous an opponent as Gen. Walker, but we should probably not fully agree as to the condition of McClellan's army at Westover, or as to that of Burnside at Fredericksburg, however much we might discuss the question. In his last letter Gen. Walker supports his view of the case by disparaging the testimony of men eminent in the civil and military history of the United States, whose statements were not "opinions," but descriptions of facts by eye-witnesses, or derived from such.

But the point is not there. Lord Wolseley, in an article devoted mainly to other matters, in speaking of the imperfect organization of the American armies and their untrained staffs, referred to Westover and Fredericksburg as instances where these faults prevented Lee from obtaining the full fruits of his success. Lord Wolseley's estimate of the situation is pretty much the same as that, say, of Gen. Hooker in the one case, and of, say, Gen. Palfrey in the other. Gen. Walker takes a different view, and thinks Lord Wolseley wrong. Not only so, but he thinks Wolseley has blundered so inexcusably in following such guides that he speaks of his article as trash unworthy of any one above the grade of subaltern, and of his military criticisms as silly, empty, and vain.

Now, the point Lord Wolseley is illustrating—viz., the defects in organization and especially in the staff service of the armies of both North and South—is one upon which Gen. Walker probably does not differ very widely from Lord Wolseley. These defects were the natural result of the lack of military training among our people. West Point and the other military schools could supply but a small part of the training and experience needed for the thorough management of large armies suddenly called into existence. The remainder had to be got by actual practice in the field. Our armies were therefore very deficient in some respects at first, but improved as the war went on. I entirely agree with Gen. Walker that the former soldiers of both armies should resent unworthy imputations upon the "valor, discipline, and endurance of American soldiers, North and South," but it does not seem to me that Lord Wolseley has made such an imputation. At the first battle of Manassas the ammunition for some Confederate batteries had, in the absence of caissons, to be carried on common farm wagons. I should not think a reference to this clumsy makeshift a reflection upon the Confederate Ordnance Department, nor does the statement of the fact that both sides often suffered during the war from the inexperience of an untrained staff seem to me a disparagement of either of the contending armies.

A word to your Chicago correspondent. I re

gret that I should have done anything to "irritate" a gentleman who informs us that he has become a "sincere admirer and warm friend of the people of the South," but I submit that "E. O.'s" irritation proceeds from some confusion of ideas or of dates. Both "E. O." and myself are now citizens of the United States, and have one country, but it was not so twenty-five years ago. After the beginning of the civil war, Gen. Lee's country was the Confederate States; and when the war ended, he had until his death no other status than that of a Confederate prisoner of war on parole. We doubt whether at that time "E. O." considered Gen. Lee his countryman. In discussing Lee's career during the war, it is proper, therefore, to speak of the South as his country, and of ex-Confederates as his countrymen, in a sense very different from any in which these terms could be used of the whole Union. The connection in which these expressions occur in my letter might have shown "E. O." the indelicacy, if not impropriety, of giving them a wider meaning. I have no doubt that many Americans in the North are "proud of Gen. Lee's splendid talents and still more splendid virtues," but I do not believe that the North is willing to adopt Wolsey's estimate of Lee, or that it will do so during this generation. It would, therefore, have been improper to have extended to the whole country a statement which is true enough of the South—even if by so doing one might have avoided irritating "E. O."

W. ALLAN.

MCDONOGH, MD., May 4, 1887.

COEDUCATION.—A STRAW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The friends of collegiate coeducation have never claimed, we believe, that it is the best method of education for all women, or that it is yet an ideal system. They have asserted that it has its place as well as the separate college for women, and that, as the majority of these latter colleges have been carried on, the tendency of coeducation has been to make women, not of necessity better, but more scholarly. It is at least a significant fact that since the opening of Bryn Mawr College two years ago, the twelve fellowships that have been awarded have without exception been given to graduates of coeducational colleges. It would seem to indicate that until a recent period it has been difficult for a woman to gain as thorough training in a separate college as in one established exclusively for men, and that therefore the urgent petitions of women that the doors of men's colleges should be opened to them have not been wholly unreasonable.—Respectfully,

M.

TRANSFORMATION OF SURNAMES. —FINALLY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Last year a young Italian was employed on a farm in this neighborhood. His name was James Fun. On being questioned about his odd surname, he said that in Italy the name of his family was Fano, but soon after his arrival in the United States "the boys" where he worked, hearing him say that he "wished to be American in everything," advised him to change his surname to Fun. He seemed to be proud of the name as of a badge of true American citizenship, and said he should always "go by it."

T.

NEWBURGH, APRIL 18, 1887.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have been much interested in reading several letters in the *Nation* relating to the transformation of names. Some years ago I had oc-

casion to look up the history of a family whose names had been changed in a most singular way, as it seems to me. About 1641 a German named Rahmsauer settled in North Carolina. Some of his descendants afterwards removed to Georgia, then to Alabama, then to Mississippi, then to South Carolina, then to Tennessee, then to Arkansas, then to Louisiana, and finally to Texas, where some of them are now living, near Ft. Worth. I found that in something more than two hundred years the family name had undergone the following changes: Ramsauer, Ramsaur, Ramsour, Ramseur, Ramser, Ramsir, Sirram, Ram, Sheep, Lamb.—Respectfully,

C.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Thanks to your correspondent who has answered a question that has been a puzzling one for so long—why the family of Darby, who gave its name to the Darbytown Road that crossed the fields of the Seven-Days' Battles around Richmond, should have spelled their name Enroughty. And, as Winchester, Mass., has told us how M. L'Arrivée has translated his name to Cummings, let Winchester, Va., too, add to the record which the *Nation* is making on this subject.

An intelligent French stone-mason, when asked how a Frenchman came to be named Betters, explained that in his native country, Canada, his name had been Le Mieux.

C. L. C. M.

WINCHESTER, VA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of April 21, 1887, you cite the remarkable instance of the family name of Enroughty being called "Darby." As a native of Henrico County, Virginia, in which the Enroughty families have lived for generations, I can give you the local explanation of the anomaly. It is related that the first Enroughty who settled in Henrico County became so incensed and resentful at the mispronunciation of his surname—some calling it *Enrouffty*, others *Enrooty*, and others again *Enrouwty*—that he insisted, whenever spoken to, that he should be called "Darby." It is not stated that he told or was aware of the reason (that his family belonged to the sect called Derbyites) mentioned by the learned divine to whom you refer. Whatever the origin of "Darby," the family has ever been tenacious of the name of Enroughty and equally tenacious of the name of "Darby," and if a stranger should happen to call any of them by any name other than that last given, he would immediately be requested to say "Darby." In all writings, bank accounts, and poll-books—indeed, wherever it is necessary to write the true name—it is spelled Enroughty, but invariably pronounced "Darby." We read, in official reports of the operations of Grant's and Lee's armies below Richmond, of "the battle of Darbytown," but, in truth, the locality was Enroughtytown.

Respectfully yours, GEO. SAVAGE.

412 CATHEDRAL ST., BALTIMORE, May 7, 1887.

Notes.

THE second volume of the Rev. H. W. Foote's 'Annals of King's Chapel' is in the press of Little, Brown & Co., Boston. Meantime from the same firm we have the beautiful volume, 'The Commemoration by King's Chapel, Boston, of the Completion of Two Hundred Years since its Foundation, on Wednesday, December 15, 1886. Also, Three Historical Sermons.' All the arts that go to the making any book good of its kind have been employed here, on a not unworthy occasion. The parish of King's Chapel has stood

on the same spot for seven generations, and embraces descendants of a subscriber to the first building two centuries ago. In that long interval it has gone over from Episcopacy to Unitarianism, and it would be hard to anticipate the judgment of a Puritan of Andros's day as to which service was the more abhorrent. The memorial volume is very interestingly illustrated with portraits of provincial Governors, ministers of the church, old views of the Chapel, etc.

The publication of Mr. J. E. Cabot's biography of Emerson is, as Houghton, Mifflin & Co. announce, postponed till the autumn.

Novels being in season, G. P. Putnam's Sons will bring out '7 to 12,' by Anna Katharine Green, and 'Told at Tuxedo,' a series of tales by two writers; Henry Holt & Co., 'Miss Bayle's Romance,' an English tale of a Chicago girl, "with American revisions"; Lee & Shepard, 'Drones' Honey,' by Sophie May, who has hitherto written for a juvenile audience.

Mr. Frederick A. Stokes has bought out the interest of his partners in the late firm of White, Stokes & Allen; a new book-publishing firm, C. W. Moulton & Co., has been established in Buffalo; Dr. Daniel G. Brinton retires from the editorship of the *Medical and Surgical Reporter* of Philadelphia, but will not abandon medical journalism.

"He" and "She"; or, A Point of Honor,' by Mrs. Annie Edwardes, just published by G. W. Dillingham of this city, is an old book issued with a new name—doubtless for the purpose of taking advantage of the popularity of Rider Haggard's 'She.' It was first published a dozen years ago with the title 'A Point of Honor.'

The Messrs. Appleton are issuing, for their Spanish-American trade, a series of books on zoölogy, for primary schools, under the title "El Reino animal para niños." It must have been an oversight that they allowed their editor to print the following (we translate): "Animals are sometimes likened to different people. Porfirio Diaz, on account of his custom of weeping to cover up his evil deeds, is compared to the crocodile, and it is said that his tears are like those of this fierce and deceitful animal." The prospect of a large Mexican sale for this volume would not seem to be bright.

White's 'Selborne,' Raleigh's 'Discovery of Guiana,' and Macaulay's essays on the 'Earl of Chatham,' are the latest additions to Prof. Morley's "National Library" (Cassell & Co.).

A well-conceived 'Vacation Journal: A Diary of Outings from May until November, with Hints and Information for Tourists,' is sent us by A. D. F. Randolph & Co. The information includes the calendar, the moon's phases, the signal-service flags, postal rates, a dictionary of flowers according to their season, the laws of lawn tennis, etc. Poetical selections usher in each day. The volume is daintily got up.

The well-known work of Karl Marx, 'Das Kapital,' has been translated into English and is published here by Scribner & Welford. Although spoken of in Europe as "the Bible of the working classes," it might better be compared with the Talmud. It is incredible that more than one workman in a thousand, even among the German Socialists, should have read it through, to say nothing of understanding it; and when we consider that these two volumes constitute but a third of the whole work, it seems probable that its doctrine must always remain of a highly esoteric character. The platforms of the "Labor" party embody the more practical of Marx's conclusions; as to the premises from which they are derived, so far as they have a logical derivation, they are obtained by confounding capital with money, and assuming that men would risk their accumulations without any expectation of profit.