

man's grammar and the white man's table manners. But savagery is stubborn, and does not yield to stiff linen collars, Prince Albert coats, low yellow shoes and the forms of speech. If it take four generations to make a gentleman out of a common Caucasian, it will certainly require a much longer time to make a white man out of a red indian, so very well set are the colors of barbarism. The African negro responds much quicker to civilization than the Indian, for the very reason that the negro has been enslaved long enough to thoroughly learn the ways of white people and the comfort of cleanliness.

Slavery to the black people of the south was not an unmitigated racial misfortune. The southern blacks are several centuries more civilized than the savages of Central Africa, who still eat their captured enemies. The slaves who were indoor servants learned in a comparatively short time the fastidious habits of clean men. Emigration to Africa is now obnoxious to the negro, because if he went there he would have to associate with savages whose king lives in a squalid hut and eats food disgusting to the American black man. It is a matter of taste with the African, too. Between him and his African brother whose grandfather happened not to be caught by the slave traders, there is more difference than there is between two average examples of the black and white race in America. The negro in America resists manfully all the hints and plans made to colonize him in Africa. He considers himself, and he is superior to the negroes whose ancestors outran the slave hunter in a race for liberty a hundred years or more ago. No laws and no precedent can remove a social disability. Booker Washington has disarmed criticism and made friends in the south by declaring that his race was a young race, that it had its own salvation to work out, and that social distinction was far from his own thought of what is best for his people. To learn to be of use in the building trades and in agriculture, and in the many ways in which men make themselves of the greatest economic importance, is Mr. Washington's constant advice to his people. He is one of the truly great men of his time. The President thought it a privilege to have him as a guest at his own table. There is no doubt that this man and several others of his race are equal to the finest white product of the time, but the southerners obstinately consider the invitation was addressed to a colored man and refuse to consider the character and accomplishments of the President's guest.

Like all men born with a love of literature and of greatness, the President long ago forgot the essentially local and temporary distinctions which separate man from man in localities. Then to be president cosmopolitanizes a man. Before he took the oath of office he was Theodore Roosevelt in the direct succession to the presidency, but standing at one side and exercising no initiative influence on national affairs. After he had taken the oath and realized his relation to seventy-five million people he was as a man upon whom a miracle had been performed. There is no color to character or to mind, and President Roosevelt was unconscious of color when he invited his distinguished visitor to dine with him. This emancipated mind is peculiarly the mind of the president of white men, black men and red men.

What the New York Women Did.

A week ago Mrs. William H. Schiefelin, Mrs. Douglas Robinson and Mrs. Charles H. Strong, President

Roosevelt's sister, representing the Women's Municipal League of New York, carried \$32,500 entirely subscribed by women and collected by them to the treasurer of the Citizen's Union Headquarters. They presented it to the treasurer to use in the anti Tammany campaign. The revelation of what the control of New York by Croker means, the unspeakable "cadet" system and the collection of subscriptions by the police from "guns," madams, and all sorts of law-breaking saloon keepers, has implanted the crusading spirit in the breasts of the women of the metropolis.

The work of collecting this money was done in consequence of the advice of Justice Jerome delivered at the home of Mrs. Strong, a little more than a fortnight ago, to the members of "The Women's Municipal League" in session there. The League was organized to fight Tammany, on the issue of the slavery of women and the "cadet" system, but, lacking experience in campaign work, the women decided to call on Justice Jerome for advice. He was equal to the occasion and told them that all the horrible stories had been printed and rehearsed until every one knew them. What was needed was money for legitimate campaign expenses. He told them not to go down on the East Side and exhort, by no means to do that, but to collect money and hand it to the treasurer of the Citizen's Union. They accepted his advice and in a week collected the surprising sum of \$32,500.

Like all reform movements in which victory will make no man rich, the Citizen's Union is short of funds. Tammany of course has money to spend because every one who contributes as a matter of course has a financial interest in the result. The men who hold sinecures and semi-sinecures contribute money to elections as a man puts money into his business to extend or maintain it. While the good men whose business is legitimate have only a patriotic and moral interest in the success of the reform party.

It is perhaps true that the ministers and truly good men who are willing to pray for the election of Mr. Low and of the whole fusion ticket are as anxious as the dive-keepers for the success of the movement they began by denouncing Croker from the pulpit; nevertheless it is true that these people do not easily respond to the assessment, or envelope, system. Tammany is strong because from the most inconsiderable office within its power to confer upon a man, to the highest, every office has its fixed rent, collected by the police in envelopes and gradually transmitted to Croker with losses on the way as toll to the different officials through whose hands it must pass to reach him. An old organization has established the assessments which police officers, dive-keepers, gamblers, "guns," clerks and all sorts of workers and loafers must pay to Tammany.

The reformers say they are willing to work, which means to talk, lecture, etcetera, but they do not readily respond to the assessment system, the very system which has made Tammany victorious in so many elections. Of course an honest city government means that the reformers' pockets will not be picked in the many indirect ways that Tammany has of getting back from the good people the money which it was necessary for the bad people to spend at election time. If the reform movement could be organized so that every man who expresses vigorous opinions on the subject of an honest and pure city government could be taxed pro rata for quality and weight of his indignation, it is not likely that in a season or two there would be a recrudescence of Tammany. The contribution of

the New York women to the funds of the fusion campaign is a timely and most pertinent suggestion to the voting reformers as to the best way to conduct a campaign of reform in opposition to one of the most perfectly organized machines in the world. For collecting money from everybody, rich and poor, bootblacks, newsboys and contractors, there is no organization like Tammany. Any movement, however deeply set in the moral consciences of the people, must be supported as soundly and by just as many small contributions.

It is likely that Omaha will be aroused by the revelations of Josiah Flynt to elect an honest mayor at the next city election, a mayor who will appoint a chief of police who will not be in collusion with the Omaha criminal class. When the struggle begins, the women of Omaha who are organized in one of the strongest and most efficient clubs of the west will be of great help. The example of the New York women is worth considering. Betting men are not talkers as a rule. If a real sport is overheard expressing extravagant opinions some one of his con-fraternity is apt to demand bigger odds than the sport thinks just, but having expressed an extravagant opinion it is a point of honor to back it up. Reformers are not especially careful of what they say, because, whatever it is, it will not cost them anything. The word of a reformer, therefore, is lightly considered by the men who bet on elections and races. But the day has come when it is cowardly to denounce vicious municipal government and thereafter refuse to pay a small assessment towards reforming it. The magnanimous women who are so greatly interested in the triumph of virtue that they contributed \$32,500 to the reform forces have set an example both to other women who desire the town they live in should not be a den of thieves and a safe retreat for the vile from all parts of the country, and to pious men who ardently long for the political regeneration of their neighbors.

Fashion.

Listening to the slow translation of Cicero by a student of Latin, the modern phrasing and sonorous divisions of the long sentences are striking. I mean modern as Daniel Webster, or Henry Clay, or Charles Sumner, or Patrick Henry are modern, not contemporary orators. Students of schools like Harvard or Yale use short, simple sentences and they do not use at all the melodramatic, classic oratory after the manner and style of the worthies just quoted. It sounds like heresy to say that the speech is no longer constructed on the model which Daniel Webster found so effective. But read the speeches now made in congress and the addresses delivered by the best lecturers and preachers of the day. Then read Webster's reply to Hayne and the pose and the deserted style of the burning words of the latter's speech can be felt: "When my eyes shall be turned for the last time to behold the sun in heaven. . . . Let their last feeble and lingering glance rather behold the ensign of the republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as 'What is all this worth?' nor those other words of delusion and folly, 'Liberty first and Union afterwards;' but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole

heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart,—Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!"

There are people who can write like this now if such writing were popular. Although it is doubtful if there is a single man alive in the United States who has so distinguished an appearance and the power to utter this long sentence as it was first uttered in the senate. Daniel Webster made a commotion just by walking along the street. He dwarfed other men, body and head. Leonine, with the majesty of a lion, a seated audience was swept by the emotion of a great presence before Webster spoke. There used to be a saying that no human being was ever really so great as Daniel Webster looked. "He had, in fact that temperamental tendency to pose found in some preachers and all actors. And this he enforced in a manner which was thoroughly acceptable to the America of his time, by an extremely elaborate rhetoric based partly on the parliamentary traditions of eighteenth century England, and, partly, like those traditions themselves, on the classical oratory of Greece and Rome."

Some of the soporific, sonorous, hundred-legged sentences constructed by Grover Cleveland indicate that he made, at some period of his life, a conscientious study of eighteenth century English oratory. Most politicians of superficial culture and dizzy ambitions, coupled with what Mr. Morton of the Conservative calls "gab," fall to studying Webster and Clay, Pitt, Burke and Fox just as soon as they decide what they want and discover a chance of getting it. Without impertinence and in all humility let me suggest that these models are no longer copied by men of culture and knowledge.

A debutante might as suddenly expect to make a favorable impression on society by copying the gowns of the Empress Eugenie, arguing that she was a great belle and set the styles for the world in the time of the Empire. But hoops are not worn now and her partners would be embarrassed by the ancient style, and she would not be able to convince them by asserting Eugenie's popularity and beauty. There is a style in oratory as well as in crinoline.

A Children's Theatre.

Most theatrical performances are unfit for the eyes and ears of children. All successful drama, comedy, tragedy or melodrama is based on love, and love, as it is understood and felt by men and women, is a region unknown to children. Sometimes, to be sure, there is an eerie little child with inhumanly selfish parents who take him into a theatre auditorium polluted by the rank, unwholesome respirations of clean and unclean human beings. Children learn quicker than adults and a course of entertainments selected by the sort of mother who takes her baby wherever there is a crowd, rapidly teaches him things he is not old enough to comprehend, and which can only harm him. The harm once done is done forever. When a bud is once forced open by anything less skillful and more abrupt than the atmosphere, sunlight and time, forever the bud is blasted, and the sweet consciousness of the rose, a consciousness of ineffable purity and of fresh creation, is never realized. To such a child, blasted by cruel, clumsy fingers, childhood is not a fairy-land but a nightmare to which the awakening of maturity is a relief and a laying down of responsibility because of the knowledge and defensive power that arrive with maturity. When infants cry in a church or auditorium of any character stuffed