

THREE ORIGINAL STORIES.

During the coming year, and commencing December 1st, the *West* will publish three prize stories of California. The first, the prize of \$100, will be for the best story of the month of December, to be entitled, "The Ventures and Adventures of Charlie Gold." This is an intensely interesting story of the Stock-Gambling period of California, and was written by Edward F. Cahill, of Los Angeles. The price of the *West* Union will be \$2.50 per annum.

THE BEST PAPER

Published in California to-day, for the family, the business office, the shop, the market and the field is THE SACRAMENTO WEEKLY UNION, issued in semi-weekly parts; i. e., every Wednesday morning and every Saturday morning, an eight-page part of the paper appears, the two making up a paper of 16 large close pages, the whole furnished by mail, prepaid, one year, for \$2.50. The advantage of the *Union* in being sent out twice each week must be obvious to all. It brings the news of the day and fresher to every reader, and thus forestalls the news in the daily style of weeklies. But the *Union* is the best paper in matter of all kinds. Its editorials are bold, clear, positive and logical; its miscellany choice, chaste and varied; its news department full, fresh and from the most approved sources; its market quotations reliable, its correspondence from the best of writers, and in all its departments it is, by all odds, the leading paper of the coast.

NEWS OF THE MORNING.

In New York yesterday Government bonds were quoted as follows: 112 for 48 of 1897; 101 1/2 for 48 of 1891; 112 for 48; sterling, \$4 81/2 @ 83; silver bars, 114 1/2.

Silver in London yesterday, 51 1/2; ounces, 99 15 1/2; 5 per cent. United States bonds, 104 1/2; 4 1/2, 116 1/2.

In San Francisco gold dollars are quoted at 41 cent; par; Mexican dollars, 90 1/2 buying, 91 selling.

At Liverpool yesterday wheat was quoted at 10s @ 10s 4d for good to choice California.

The South Boston Mining Company has levied an assessment of twenty-five cents per share.

The market for mining stocks in San Francisco yesterday morning was quite weak. Utah stock down to 80, a decline of \$1 from the best price Thursday; Sierra Nevada dropped to \$8 and Union Consolidated to \$10 7/8, a decline of 1/2 and \$3 respectively from the best prices Thursday.

The whole Comstock line of stocks was lower, the decline varying from 1/2 to \$1 per share. Consolidated Virginia fell to \$2 1/2, the lowest price since the opening of the body ore in 1873.

William Hudson, a Constable, was shot in Santa Barbara county while trying to arrest a party of drunken bonanzas.

The official count in Oregon shows a Republican majority of 703.

The new Masonic hall at Willows, Colusa county, was dedicated yesterday with appropriate ceremonies.

The accused were hanged at Washington yesterday for murder.

A firm of grain dealers failed at Odell, Ill., yesterday, owing nearly everybody in the vicinity.

Dox's Grain and Provision Exchange at Chicago also failed.

Governor Williams, of Indiana, is seriously ill.

General Mills has been appointed Chief Signal Officer.

Brigadier-General Zeller, who died in Washington Thursday, was in the service on this coast in 1867-7.

Herman Schmidt shot himself at Buffalo yesterday.

Fire near St. Louis.

John Williams was burned to death at St. Louis yesterday.

It is believed that the treaty concluded between the United States and China will be perfectly satisfactory to the people of this coast.

The population of Philadelphia is 540,080.

The steamer which foundered on the coast of Wales had a crew of 27 and 7 passengers.

Jamison, Pitman county, was totally destroyed by fire yesterday.

A boiler explosion yesterday near Stevenson, Ala., killed four men and injured four others.

Another nihilist conspiracy is feared in Russia.

Evidences continue to be carried out with great cruelty in Ireland, causing intense suffering in many instances.

The President and Secretary Evans have gone to New York to attend the unveiling of a statue to Alexander Hamilton in Central Park.

The spinners of Fall River, Mass., are asking an advance of 10 per cent. in their wages.

Riza Pasha has been summoned to Constantinople from Duligno.

The public debt of Mexico amounts to \$144,000,000.

The British steamer *Mildred*, from New York for Marseilles, has foundered in the Atlantic, and 23 persons drowned.

An explosion of fire-damp occurred in a coal-pit near Mohr, Belgium, yesterday.

In Los Angeles county this season 1,800,000 gallons of wine and 250,000 gallons of brandy will be manufactured.

General Garfield celebrated his 49th birthday yesterday by a family reunion.

The number of dead by the Minnesota asylum fire is now given as thirty-two.

A boy has confessed to killing the Chinaman recently shot in Chicago.

The inside pages of to-day's *Record-Union* will be found to contain much valuable and interesting reading matter.

GENERAL GRANT'S CLAIMS UPON THE COUNTRY.

For some time past there have been indications of a consciousness that the country ought to do something for General Grant. It is understood that his means are slender, and that he finds it necessary to look about for some way of earning a livelihood. The feeling to which we have alluded has led sundry well-disposed people to propose a sort of national subscription for the purpose of raising a fund for his support. This plan however is open to very serious objections. In the first place it would too much resemble the offering of alms to the recipient of the bounty. In the second place it would be an informal, circuitous and ungraceful way of doing that which ought to be done openly, formally and with the full consent and approval of the nation. The services which General Grant has rendered to his country were not performed in any such manner. They were performed in the face of Heaven, with all the guarantees and support that the law could give. There is therefore no reason for the surreptitious method suggested. It is on the other hand time to address the American people seriously and forcibly, and to ask them whether they do not consider that the splendid services of General Grant deserve national recognition. It is a shame and disgrace to this great republic that its foremost soldier, the captain to whose skill, resolution and sagacity it may be said to owe its very existence, should be permitted to descend to a struggle for bread in his declining years, as though he were cast off and repudiated by the country he gave his best energies to save. It has been said of old that "republics are ungrateful." Is there any peculiarity in that form of government which renders them oblivious to the obligations which monarchies and empires acknowledge and redeem so magnificently? The comparison has often been made between England's treatment of the Duke of Wellington and America's treatment of General Grant; but it cannot be said that the contrast is worn out until the American people have manifested a more generous and exalted conception of their duties in the premises. England could not do too much for her great commander. She lavished rewards upon him with a prodigal hand. She purchased for him a splendid estate and mansion. She showered honors and rank upon him. She decreed him hundreds of thousands of pounds from her treasury. In a word, she showed her appreciation of what he had achieved for her right royally. And what has this country done for its great captain? She made him General of the army, with a salary of \$17,500 a year, and elected him President twice. Is that enough? Assuredly it is not enough. The life of such a man ought to have been made secure against all the blasts of fortune. His condition ought to have been so established that at least no sordid cares should threaten his old age. The possibility of his being compelled in his old age to seek for work ought to bring the blush of shame to every patriot's cheek. If it is the measure of republican gratitude for the highest services that a man can render to his country, how shall the republic hope in the future to secure such services in her hour of need?

When we see the frequent rumors that General Grant is about to take the Presidency of this, that or the other commercial company; when we see that name, which ought to be so honored, hawked about as a bait for speculators, or as a means of influencing the stock market; we cannot but wonder that the people should fail to realize the discredit nature of such things, or should not apprehend the slur which is thus being cast upon the honor of the country. And when it is timely suggested that something ought to be done for General Grant, there seems to be an apprehension lest the public should view any proposition of the kind with disfavor, and wealthy men talk of getting up a collection in a quiet way, as though the destined beneficiary were some obscure person, whose necessities could not be expected to concern the nation in any way. This is all wrong. Not only ought something to be done for General Grant, but that something ought to be done in the most open, emphatic and solemn manner possible. If Congress has not the power to do it, then in the name of all that is right and decent and becoming, let the power be created by an amendment to the Constitution. The nation cannot afford to play the niggard in this matter. It must remember its own dignity as well as the deserts of its great citizen. The wealth of the United States has often enough been squandered upon undeserving objects. It has too frequently been diverted to enrich knaves. It can never be put to any nobler or higher use than in making secure the future of General Grant. There ought not to be any dickerings or hair-splitting about the extent of the provision to be made for him. It should be ample, even magnificent. It might be as graceful and appropriate a deed to restore to him his military rank, but not with the income of the grade. We believe that the people are ripe for such an act of recognition and appreciation as we have suggested, and that they will not be disposed to bargain with the man to whom they owe so much. We should like to see this question brought forward in Congress at the next session, and that boldly and frankly. If General Grant is in need the United States should be his indulger. That is the sentiment which the people ought to hold, and which we believe they do hold.

THE TREATMENT OF THE SOUTH.

The *New York Times*, discussing the solid South problem, says: "The task of the Republican Administration reduces itself to a judicious organization of the civil service in the South on the one hand, and to an impartial enforcement of the laws necessary to the protection of equal suffrage on the other. It is the duty of the House, from every point of view, and affords the only hope of success. The requirement that appointments in the South shall be of the highest character, that they should be made with only so much reference to political views as would secure fidelity to the principle of equal suffrage, and that they should be made, as far as possible, among Southern men, is not only reasonable but imperative." This is a very fair presentation of a very moderate policy. The solid South cannot be made less solid by any recurrence to the methods which were in use before the present Administration.

WHITTAKER.

The petition which has been sent to the President by Hon. J. Hyatt Smith and others regarding the reinstatement of Cadet Whittaker at West Point, appears to us to be an exceedingly ill-judged document. It bases this request on the allegation that "the case was not proved against the boy." That statement is only technically admissible. The evidence adduced at the trial in support of the theory that Whittaker invented the whole alleged outrage was so overwhelming that no unprejudiced mind could fail to be convinced by it. The testimony of the experts clearly fastened upon him the authorship of the pretended note of warning which he said he had received some days previous to the commission of the assault. The condition in which he was found was altogether inconsistent with the statement he made in explanation of it. It was shown that the semblance of unconsciousness which he bore when discovered was deliberately assumed by him. It was proved that though within easy reach of help he must, according to his own account, have submitted in perfect silence to the ill-treatment of the hypothetical persecutors. The injuries which had been inflicted upon him were extremely slight, and such as he could easily have caused himself. He was fastened in such a way that he could have released himself without difficulty. In short every circumstance of the affair, when rigidly analyzed, told against him, and against nobody else, and we think it may be taken for granted that the Court which investigated the case has no doubt as to his guilt. In deference to a very unreasonable public sentiment, however, opportunity has been afforded him to withdraw from West Point disgraced, under cover of a leave of absence which doubtless would have been made perpetual. If now it is insisted upon that he be reinstated, no course will remain open to the West Point authorities but to appeal to the results of the inquiry, and to pass sentence upon him in accordance with those results. Perhaps after all this may be the best way to end the matter, but it certainly is due to the other cadets, who were all discredited by Whittaker's accusation that a young man who has practically been convicted of so flagrant and injurious a fraud should be sent back to insult and degrade them by his companionship. If in short Whittaker has any judicious friends, the best thing that they can do for him is to keep him out of the way, and accept quietly the means of safe retirement the clemency of the West Point authorities has left at his disposal.

SOUTHERN VIEWS.

Senator Ben Hill and Governor Colquitt of Georgia have recently had something to say about the South and the election of Garfield. The former has in a many way condemned the attempt of Barnum and his gang to tamper with New York, and has expressed his opinion that the South would "once more save the country from revolution," by refusing to have anything to do with such devices. Nevertheless he believes Northern sectionalism, and fears that the South will never have justice done to it. Governor Colquitt has spoken, in his inaugural address, much in the same strain. He looks upon Hancock's defeat as evidence of the decline of the republic. He thinks the main reason for Garfield's election was "Northern hatred of the South," and he "fears that sectionalism will be perpetuated, because of Northern interference." Let us hope that both these gentlemen are mistaken, and permit us to point out that there is to-day no other reason for the survival of sectionalism than Southern obstinacy and blindness. It is not the North that is sectional; it is the South. There never would have been a solid North had there not first been a solid South. If the South will abandon that policy, and manifest an intention to respect the laws of the United States, all trouble and all sectionalism will disappear at once. The Northern people know nothing about sections. They are American citizens, not Westerners, or Northerners, or Easterners. Let the South pull down the barriers which divide it from the rest of the country; let it abandon the old, stupid, mischievous breeding spirit of local pride; let it content itself as all the rest of the country does, with being an integral part of this great nation; let it drill some moderation and common-sense into the heads of its journalists; let it refrain from attempts to count out the colored voters; let it pay attention to its commerce and agriculture, and leave politics alone; and it will very soon find that sectionalism is a mere chimera. The North is always ready for good feeling and harmony, but the abandonment of sectionalism must come from the South, simply because it exists in no other part of the country.

SECRETARY THOMPSON'S MISTAKE.

Secretary Thompson appears to have got himself into a scrape of a very singular nature. It is said that he neglected to invite the principal officers of the navy to the recent naval review at Fort Monroe, and that they are alike amazed and indignant at this omission. It is indeed so peculiar a blunder for the Secretary of the Navy to have committed that we are tempted to attribute it to that phenomenal ignorance of naval affairs which was ascribed to Mr. Thompson when he first took office. It is stated that at that time he went on board a man-of-war, and that being moved by curiosity to approach an open hatchway he was seen to start backward with every appearance of horror and alarm, and was heard to exclaim: "Good heavens! that thing's hollow!" Now it is evident that a Secretary of the Navy who had such remarkable theories about naval construction might have equally curious notions about naval etiquette, and that therefore his omission to invite the Admiral and his staff to the naval review may have been caused by genuine ignorance of what was appropriate under the circumstances. If this is not the explanation it will be necessary to conclude that the relations between the Secretary and the officers of the navy was anything but friendly, but even this supposition could not justify Secretary Thompson in ignoring the professional claims of the officers whom he thus humiliated and insulted. There is in fact reason to apprehend that neither the Secretary of the Navy nor the Secretary of War are on the best terms with the services they control, and therefore it is satisfactory to know that in a few weeks both these departments will have new heads.

SENATOR GROVER'S HEALTH.

We consider the news concerning Senator Grover's health to be bad. It is stated that he is suffering from a complaint which is vaguely and obscurely spoken of as spinal irritation, and that he is being treated for this complaint in some sort of medical house, which we take to be a new name for an asylum. Spinal irritation of any kind is exceedingly dangerous, and in nine cases out of ten leads to insanity, or death. It may end in softening of the brain or in violent dementia, but it is very unlikely to be overcome by remedies. If, therefore, the Senator from Oregon suffers from such a disease it is not probable that he will be able to occupy his seat at Washington this winter, if he ever does again.

REVIEW OF BOOKS.

The Law and Witness of History by William A. D. Appleton, New York: D. Appleton & Co.

It is one of the unamiable habits of mankind to be intolerant of greatness. Though on the one hand a slavish subservience to superiority of circumstances is too usual to be remarked, on the other hand it is abundantly apparent that nothing delights most men so much as carping criticism upon those whose genius it has been impossible to deny. In literature this mean enviousness has always been particularly rank and flagrant. The hatreds of literary men to one another surpass even the hatreds of women. Yet the most fiercely assailed literary reputations have outlived not alone the injuries but the very memories of the assaults, or the latter are recalled in no other way than as the feeble creatures who, Don Quixote-like, fought windmills. The disposition to depreciate literary excellence is as great to-day as it has ever been; and as impotent. The dictum of the critic has never been less potential, and the long array of dooms which have fallen to fate effect constitutes an odd commentary upon the ancient prophetic fore of those who arrogate to themselves the peculiar gift of intellectual discrimination. It would be difficult to name a really great author who has not, even in this century, been attacked and belittled in this way. Macaulay has been overrun with the Lilliputian hosts since his death, and they have for many years taken a special delight in belaboring the memory of Buckle. They have in fact invented a sort of special cant to fit his case. They could not dispute his industry or his erudition. So they fell foul of him on the ground that he had not sufficiently perfected his generalizations. Now to acquire the intellectual right to criticize a man like Buckle it is obvious that his opponents ought to be able to regard him from at least the same mental level. Buckle was certainly not a man of ordinary powers. To the fragment of the great work to which his life was devoted he had given the labor of twenty years; of twenty years such work of his contemporaries could have performed. He possessed a prodigious memory, in that resembling Macaulay. He was gifted with an excellent intellectual digestion. His conclusions are alike broad and deep. His authorities are always at hand and always to the point. He is cautious and bold, careful yet decided, together. He reaches positive conclusions because his researches have been profound and comprehensive. It is therefore not unnatural, though inexcusable, that the assurance of conscious understanding should be deemed as dogmatism, and that the firmness due to a clear and sweeping vision should be ascribed to the inflexibility of a pedagogue. These defractory criticisms rarely denote the ignorance of the critics, but the justice of the censure, but of course they have never perceived this. And as criticism has its fashions like everything else, and as they are as destitute of sense as other fashions, so it has become the mode to sneer at Buckle, to pooh-pooh his views, and to wave him away as an author greatly overrated in his time, but now happily found out and accurately appraised. In this as in so many of their flippant judgments the "advanced" critics are wrong. Buckle is not the obsolete author they would make him appear. It will be long before any man equally well equipped for the work he undertook is found. Generations hence those who desire to understand the tendencies of European civilization prior to the nineteenth century will have to repair to his masterly volumes. The brilliant reputation which the first view of his great work secured for him will revive and glow with increasing lustre as time separates him from his readers. For in literature it is the centuries alone which obtain justice for authors. There is no difficulty in procuring candid and unprejudiced judgments concerning the productions of Shakespeare or Bacon, of Moliere or Racine, of Dante or Petrarch, because they are far removed from all existing interests. But let the question be of a living author—of Matthew Arnold, or Anthony Trollope, or Victor Hugo, or of recently living authors such as Buckle or Macaulay—and at once the critic is warped and biased, and becomes incapable of rendering justice to his subject. It has been said of Buckle peculiarly, and Mr. Huth has done a real service not only to the memory of his friend, but to the public, in publishing this interesting and valuable biography. We here see the methods by which Buckle acquired his enormous erudition. We perceive how exceptional his whole life was, and how all his conditions fitted into the magnificent literary scheme to which he had bent all his exertions. And when we realize how vast and all-embracing a knowledge was deemed necessary for the first beginning of the work which he did not live to complete, we feel more than ever the impertinence and the folly of those critics who have presumptuously questioned the information of a man to whom they must have been as mere school boys. He was a great man, beyond serious question, and he has given the world a great work of permanent though it be. That work, moreover, may well be studied with confidence and admiration, for assuredly no man competent to pass judgment upon the question of its merits has thus far appeared in the critic's chair, and the powers and preparations of its author afford an ample guarantee for the soundness and solidity of the conclusions he has reached.

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM: ITS FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

By Samuel S. Cox. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

The Hon. Samuel S. Cox, or "Sunset" Cox, as he has long been familiarly called, is an enthusiastic free-trader, and he is also a believer in free land as well as trade. These two beliefs have led him to write this little work, which is a valuable and timely contribution to economic literature. The main purpose is to show, by recapitulation, how the English suffered from the policy of Protection as embodied in the Corn Laws; what incredible misfortunes were endured by the masses of that people before their legislators could be induced to remove the restrictions which were strangling the nation; how the abolition of the Corn Laws was followed by an almost miraculous return to prosperity; and how the late troubles of the country have been caused mainly by the ill-regulated state of the land question. The lesson of the English Corn Laws is indeed one which may well be learned by the people of the United States, for it is pregnant with instruction. The lesson of Protection, however, is one which our farmers ought to be able to learn without recurring to the experience of England for their own benefit. There is no danger of Corn Laws here, but there are laws in existence which are as unjust to our masses as these imports were to the masses of England. The abolition of the Corn Laws was rendered comparatively easy by the fact that they pressed upon the seat of life. A law which strikes at the very life of a people will always be more easily repealed than one which merely robs them by degrees. The Corn Laws made the food of the populace dear, and so menaced them with starvation. We, however, have cheap bread, and dear everything else. The situation in fact is reversed, and therefore it must be expected that it will take much longer to secure the reform of our obnoxious tariff. Our farmers are very slow to realize that they are being plundered. They cannot have protection, but they are made to pay over their hard-earned money that others should be protected. There is not and never can be any reason or justice in the theory of Protection. It can only be made equal by nullifying it. So long as it really protects any interest it is unjust. For example: A is a hatter, B is a tailor, and C is a dry-goods dealer. A says he wants five dollars a year bounty by way of protection. B demands a similar bounty. Now if C claims the same, it is evident that at the end of the year they will neither of them have received anything, but merely passed the same money backwards and forwards. But if A claims a bounty, and B also, and C has to pay them both, without receiving anything in return, then there is real Protection, but C is robbed. And that is the actual condition of things in this country at present. C is the American farmer. A and B are the protected manufacturers, for whose sole and special benefit the interminable tariff has been framed, and is maintained. The want of political education was shown in the last campaign, when the advocates of a tariff impudently addressed themselves to the farmers, and actually convinced them that it would be detrimental to their interests to be relieved from the enormous taxes they have been paying for the last twenty years to the rapacious manufacturers. Had not the Democrats been doomed they would have made short work of the pro-tariff arguments, and now that the election is over we have no doubt that a general disposition will be manifested to agree to tariff reforms. For it is very certain that either the Protectionists will have to consent to such reforms, or the work will be taken out of their hands, in which event the whole tariff is liable to go by the board. A tariff for revenue such as Messrs. Wells and Moore have already prepared might very easily be substituted for the present mischievous and unwieldy schedule. It would be productive of immense benefit to the country, but it is not probable that it will be necessary for the American people to gain their experience through suffering, as the English did before them. We have not yet a Sir Robert Peel, a Cobden, a Bright, a Villiers, or an Ebenezer Elliott, to stir up the people on this subject, but then neither is it so vital a consideration with us as it was

REVIEW OF BOOKS.

The Law and Witness of History by William A. D. Appleton, New York: D. Appleton & Co.

It is one of the unamiable habits of mankind to be intolerant of greatness. Though on the one hand a slavish subservience to superiority of circumstances is too usual to be remarked, on the other hand it is abundantly apparent that nothing delights most men so much as carping criticism upon those whose genius it has been impossible to deny. In literature this mean enviousness has always been particularly rank and flagrant. The hatreds of literary men to one another surpass even the hatreds of women. Yet the most fiercely assailed literary reputations have outlived not alone the injuries but the very memories of the assaults, or the latter are recalled in no other way than as the feeble creatures who, Don Quixote-like, fought windmills. The disposition to depreciate literary excellence is as great to-day as it has ever been; and as impotent. The dictum of the critic has never been less potential, and the long array of dooms which have fallen to fate effect constitutes an odd commentary upon the ancient prophetic fore of those who arrogate to themselves the peculiar gift of intellectual discrimination. It would be difficult to name a really great author who has not, even in this century, been attacked and belittled in this way. Macaulay has been overrun with the Lilliputian hosts since his death, and they have for many years taken a special delight in belaboring the memory of Buckle. They have in fact invented a sort of special cant to fit his case. They could not dispute his industry or his erudition. So they fell foul of him on the ground that he had not sufficiently perfected his generalizations. Now to acquire the intellectual right to criticize a man like Buckle it is obvious that his opponents ought to be able to regard him from at least the same mental level. Buckle was certainly not a man of ordinary powers. To the fragment of the great work to which his life was devoted he had given the labor of twenty years; of twenty years such work of his contemporaries could have performed. He possessed a prodigious memory, in that resembling Macaulay. He was gifted with an excellent intellectual digestion. His conclusions are alike broad and deep. His authorities are always at hand and always to the point. He is cautious and bold, careful yet decided, together. He reaches positive conclusions because his researches have been profound and comprehensive. It is therefore not unnatural, though inexcusable, that the assurance of conscious understanding should be deemed as dogmatism, and that the firmness due to a clear and sweeping vision should be ascribed to the inflexibility of a pedagogue. These defractory criticisms rarely denote the ignorance of the critics, but the justice of the censure, but of course they have never perceived this. And as criticism has its fashions like everything else, and as they are as destitute of sense as other fashions, so it has become the mode to sneer at Buckle, to pooh-pooh his views, and to wave him away as an author greatly overrated in his time, but now happily found out and accurately appraised. In this as in so many of their flippant judgments the "advanced" critics are wrong. Buckle is not the obsolete author they would make him appear. It will be long before any man equally well equipped for the work he undertook is found. Generations hence those who desire to understand the tendencies of European civilization prior to the nineteenth century will have to repair to his masterly volumes. The brilliant reputation which the first view of his great work secured for him will revive and glow with increasing lustre as time separates him from his readers. For in literature it is the centuries alone which obtain justice for authors. There is no difficulty in procuring candid and unprejudiced judgments concerning the productions of Shakespeare or Bacon, of Moliere or Racine, of Dante or Petrarch, because they are far removed from all existing interests. But let the question be of a living author—of Matthew Arnold, or Anthony Trollope, or Victor Hugo, or of recently living authors such as Buckle or Macaulay—and at once the critic is warped and biased, and becomes incapable of rendering justice to his subject. It has been said of Buckle peculiarly, and Mr. Huth has done a real service not only to the memory of his friend, but to the public, in publishing this interesting and valuable biography. We here see the methods by which Buckle acquired his enormous erudition. We perceive how exceptional his whole life was, and how all his conditions fitted into the magnificent literary scheme to which he had bent all his exertions. And when we realize how vast and all-embracing a knowledge was deemed necessary for the first beginning of the work which he did not live to complete, we feel more than ever the impertinence and the folly of those critics who have presumptuously questioned the information of a man to whom they must have been as mere school boys. He was a great man, beyond serious question, and he has given the world a great work of permanent though it be. That work, moreover, may well be studied with confidence and admiration, for assuredly no man competent to pass judgment upon the question of its merits has thus far appeared in the critic's chair, and the powers and preparations of its author afford an ample guarantee for the soundness and solidity of the conclusions he has reached.

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM: ITS FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

By Samuel S. Cox. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

The Hon. Samuel S. Cox, or "Sunset" Cox, as he has long been familiarly called, is an enthusiastic free-trader, and he is also a believer in free land as well as trade. These two beliefs have led him to write this little work, which is a valuable and timely contribution to economic literature. The main purpose is to show, by recapitulation, how the English suffered from the policy of Protection as embodied in the Corn Laws; what incredible misfortunes were endured by the masses of that people before their legislators could be induced to remove the restrictions which were strangling the nation; how the abolition of the Corn Laws was followed by an almost miraculous return to prosperity; and how the late troubles of the country have been caused mainly by the ill-regulated state of the land question. The lesson of the English Corn Laws is indeed one which may well be learned by the people of the United States, for it is pregnant with instruction. The lesson of Protection, however, is one which our farmers ought to be able to learn without recurring to the experience of England for their own benefit. There is no danger of Corn Laws here, but there are laws in existence which are as unjust to our masses as these imports were to the masses of England. The abolition of the Corn Laws was rendered comparatively easy by the fact that they pressed upon the seat of life. A law which strikes at the very life of a people will always be more easily repealed than one which merely robs them by degrees. The Corn Laws made the food of the populace dear, and so menaced them with starvation. We, however, have cheap bread, and dear everything else. The situation in fact is reversed, and therefore it must be expected that it will take much longer to secure the reform of our obnoxious tariff. Our farmers are very slow to realize that they are being plundered. They cannot have protection, but they are made to pay over their hard-earned money that others should be protected. There is not and never can be any reason or justice in the theory of Protection. It can only be made equal by nullifying it. So long as it really protects any interest it is unjust. For example: A is a hatter, B is a tailor, and C is a dry-goods dealer. A says he wants five dollars a year bounty by way of protection. B demands a similar bounty. Now if C claims the same, it is evident that at the end of the year they will neither of them have received anything, but merely passed the same money backwards and forwards. But if A claims a bounty, and B also, and C has to pay them both, without receiving anything in return, then there is real Protection, but C is robbed. And that is the actual condition of things in this country at present. C is the American farmer. A and B are the protected manufacturers, for whose sole and special benefit the interminable tariff has been framed, and is maintained. The want of political education was shown in the last campaign, when the advocates of a tariff impudently addressed themselves to the farmers, and actually convinced them that it would be detrimental to their interests to be relieved from the enormous taxes they have been paying for the last twenty years to the rapacious manufacturers. Had not the Democrats been doomed they would have made short work of the pro-tariff arguments, and now that the election is over we have no doubt that a general disposition will be manifested to agree to tariff reforms. For it is very certain that either the Protectionists will have to consent to such reforms, or the work will be taken out of their hands, in which event the whole tariff is liable to go by the board. A tariff for revenue such as Messrs. Wells and Moore have already prepared might very easily be substituted for the present mischievous and unwieldy schedule. It would be productive of immense benefit to the country, but it is not probable that it will be necessary for the American people to gain their experience through suffering, as the English did before them. We have not yet a Sir Robert Peel, a Cobden, a Bright, a Villiers, or an Ebenezer Elliott, to stir up the people on this subject, but then neither is it so vital a consideration with us as it was

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM: ITS FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

By Samuel S. Cox. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

The Hon. Samuel S. Cox, or "Sunset" Cox, as he has long been familiarly called, is an enthusiastic free-trader, and he is also a believer in free land as well as trade. These two beliefs have led him to write this little work, which is a valuable and timely contribution to economic literature. The main purpose is to show, by recapitulation, how the English suffered from the policy of Protection as embodied in the Corn Laws; what incredible misfortunes were endured by the masses of that people before their legislators could be induced to remove the restrictions which were strangling the nation; how the abolition of the Corn Laws was followed by an almost miraculous return to prosperity; and how the late troubles of the country have been caused mainly by the ill-regulated state of the land question. The lesson of the English Corn Laws is indeed one which may well be learned by the people of the United States, for it is pregnant with instruction. The lesson of Protection, however, is one which our farmers ought to be able to learn without recurring to the experience of England for their own benefit. There is no danger of Corn Laws here, but there are laws in existence which are as unjust to our masses as these imports were to the masses of England. The abolition of the Corn Laws was rendered comparatively easy by the fact that they pressed upon the seat of life. A law which strikes at the very life of a people will always be more easily repealed than one which merely robs them by degrees. The Corn Laws made the food of the populace dear, and so menaced them with starvation. We, however, have cheap bread, and dear everything else. The situation in fact is reversed, and therefore it must be expected that it will take much longer to secure the reform of our obnoxious tariff. Our farmers are very slow to realize that they are being plundered. They cannot have protection, but they are made to pay over their hard-earned money that others should be protected. There is not and never can be any reason or justice in the theory of Protection. It can only be made equal by nullifying it. So long as it really protects any interest it is unjust. For example: A is a hatter, B is a tailor, and C is a dry-goods dealer. A says he wants five dollars a year bounty by way of protection. B demands a similar bounty. Now if C claims the same, it is evident that at the end of the year they will neither of them have received anything, but merely passed the same money backwards and forwards. But if A claims a bounty, and B also, and C has to pay them both, without receiving anything in return, then there is real Protection, but C is robbed. And that is the actual condition of things in this country at present. C is the American farmer. A and B are the protected manufacturers, for whose sole and special benefit the interminable tariff has been framed, and is maintained. The want of political education was shown in the last campaign, when the advocates of a tariff impudently addressed themselves to the farmers, and actually convinced them that it would be detrimental to their interests to be relieved from the enormous taxes they have been paying for the last twenty years to the rapacious manufacturers. Had not the Democrats been doomed they would have made short work of the pro-tariff arguments, and now that the election is over we have no doubt that a general disposition will be manifested to agree to tariff reforms. For it is very certain that either the Protectionists will have to consent to such reforms, or the work will be taken out of their hands, in which event the whole tariff is liable to go by the board. A tariff for revenue such as Messrs. Wells and Moore have already prepared might very easily be substituted for the present mischievous and unwieldy schedule. It would be productive of immense benefit to the country, but it is not probable that it will be necessary for the American people to gain their experience through suffering, as the English did before them. We have not yet a Sir Robert Peel, a Cobden, a Bright, a Villiers, or an Ebenezer Elliott, to stir up the people on this subject, but then neither is it so vital a consideration with us as it was

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM: ITS FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

By Samuel S. Cox. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

The Hon. Samuel S. Cox, or "Sunset" Cox, as he has long been familiarly called, is an enthusiastic free-trader, and he is also a believer in free land as well as trade. These two beliefs have led him to write this little work, which is a valuable and timely contribution to economic literature. The main purpose is to show, by recapitulation, how the English suffered from the policy of Protection as embodied in the Corn Laws; what incredible misfortunes were endured by the masses of that people before their legislators could be induced to remove the restrictions which were strangling the nation; how the abolition of the Corn Laws was followed by an almost miraculous return to prosperity; and how the late troubles of the country have been caused mainly by the ill-regulated state of the land question. The lesson of the English Corn Laws is indeed one which may well be learned by the people of the United States, for it is pregnant with instruction. The lesson of Protection, however, is one which our farmers ought to be able to learn without recurring to the experience of England for their own benefit. There is no danger of Corn Laws here, but there are laws in existence which are as unjust to our masses as these imports were to the masses of England. The abolition of the Corn Laws was rendered comparatively easy by the fact that they pressed upon the seat of life. A law which strikes at the very life of a people will always be more easily repealed than one which merely robs them by degrees. The Corn Laws made the food of the populace dear, and so menaced them with starvation. We, however, have cheap bread, and dear everything else. The situation in fact is reversed, and therefore it must be expected that it will take much longer to secure the reform of our obnoxious tariff. Our farmers are very slow to realize that they are being plundered. They cannot have protection, but they are made to pay over their hard-earned money that others should be protected. There is not and never can be any reason or justice in the theory of Protection. It can only be made equal by nullifying it. So long as it really protects any interest it is unjust. For example: A is a hatter, B is a tailor, and C is a dry-goods dealer. A says he wants five dollars a year bounty by way of protection. B demands a similar bounty. Now if C claims the same, it is evident that at the end of the year they will neither of them have received anything, but merely passed the same money backwards and forwards. But if A claims a bounty, and B also, and C has to pay them both, without receiving anything in return, then there is real Protection, but C is robbed. And that is the actual condition of things in this country at present. C is the American farmer. A and B are the protected manufacturers, for whose sole and special benefit the interminable tariff has been framed, and is maintained. The want of political education was shown in the last campaign, when the advocates of a tariff impudently addressed themselves to the farmers, and actually convinced them that it would be detrimental to their interests to be relieved from the enormous taxes they have been paying for the last twenty years to the rapacious manufacturers. Had not the Democrats been doomed they would have made short work of the pro-tariff arguments, and now that the election is over we have no doubt that a general disposition will be manifested to agree to tariff reforms. For it is very certain that either the Protectionists will have to consent to such reforms, or the work will be taken out of their hands, in which event the whole tariff is liable to go by the board. A tariff for revenue such as Messrs. Wells and Moore have already prepared might very easily be substituted for the present mischievous and unwieldy schedule. It would be productive of immense benefit to the country, but it is not probable that it will be necessary for the American people to gain their experience through suffering, as the English did before them. We have not yet a Sir Robert Peel, a Cobden, a Bright, a Villiers, or an Ebenezer Elliott, to stir up the people on this subject, but then neither is it so vital a consideration with us as it was

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM: ITS FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

By Samuel S. Cox. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

The Hon. Samuel S. Cox, or "Sunset" Cox, as he has long been familiarly called,