

DAILY RECORD-UNION

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1889

ISSUED BY THE SACRAMENTO PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Office, Third Street, between J and K.

THE DAILY RECORD-UNION, Published six days in each week, with Double Sheet on Saturdays, and

THE SUNDAY UNION, Published every Sunday morning, making a splendid SEVEN-DAY PAPER.

For one year, \$6.00 For six months, \$3.50 For three months, \$2.00

Subscribers served by Carriers at FIFTY CENTS PER WEEK. In all interior cities and towns the paper can be had of the principal Periodical Dealers, Newsmen and Agents.

The SUNDAY UNION is served by Carriers at TWENTY-FIVE CENTS PER MONTH.

THE WEEKLY UNION is the cheapest and most desirable Home, News and Literary Journal published on the Pacific Coast.

THE SUNDAY UNION is sent to every subscriber to the Weekly Union.

For one year, \$2.00 For six months, \$1.25 For three months, \$0.75

All these publications are sent either by Mail or Express to agents or single subscribers, with charges prepaid. All Postmasters are agents.

The Best Advertising Medium on the Pacific Coast.

Entered at the Postoffice at Sacramento as Second-class matter.

The RECORD-UNION, SUNDAY UNION and WEEKLY UNION are the only papers on the Coast, outside of San Francisco, that receive the full Associated Press dispatches from all parts of the world.

Outside of San Francisco, they have no competitors either in influence or home and general circulation throughout the State.

SAN FRANCISCO AGENCIES.

This paper is for sale at the following places: L. P. Fisher's, room 21, Merchants' Exchange, California street, who is also sole Advertising Agent for San Francisco; the principal News Stands and Hotels, and at the Market Street Ferry.

Also, for sale on all Trains leaving and coming into Sacramento.

Weather Forecasts for To-Day.

California—Warmer, fair weather, northwesterly winds.

Oregon and Washington—Fair weather, northwesterly winds; nearly stationary temperature.

THE LATEST "FAD."

In the Quarterly Journal of Economics, N. P. Gilman, considering the question of "Nationalism" in the United States now being agitated in New England, declares that there is one barrier to national socialism in this country, which it can never surmount; that is, the intense individual life of the States of the American Union.

Mr. Gilman has named the very root of the barrier to anarchism, socialism, internationalism and all kindred ills, in this statement. The Federal idea is too deeply implanted in the American political character to be uprooted without total overthrow of the civilization of the country.

In fact, it is woven with the personal life of the citizen, and so long as republican institutions have any vigor at all, he will not part with it.

This idea of a permanent league in which each State retains its sovereignty beyond possibility of surrender without disruption of the compact of the league; in which each State surrenders for all time its right to assail any other State of the league, and in which all affairs of common interest, for common defense and strength, are committed to a federated body which we know as Congress, is the safeguard of the Nation against the insidious assaults of radical socialism and the new-fangled literary child of Mr. Bellamy.

The practical results of that Federal idea have been a powerful nation of phenomenal growth, and advanced state of general intelligence, the immense betterment of the condition of the working people, a wonderful rise in wages without proportional advance in the cost of living, a national arm equipped with the patriotic strength of millions of devoted freemen, the promotion of science, art and general education, the leveling of class distinctions and the opening up to the lowliest of the broadest possible opportunities to rise socially and politically—these have been the rewards of the idea against which socialism, no matter what its guise, can hurl only theories and speculations of Utopian character.

Without our system of separate and independent commonwealths it is improbable that these triumphs could have been achieved, or this freedom of human action have been secured. But turning to the expression of Mr. Gilman, who has assumed the office of exposing the sophistries of Bellamy's "Looking Backward," we quote: "To the construction of a scheme of socialism which shall recognize the existence of forty or fifty States as distinct as Massachusetts and Louisiana, or Pennsylvania and Oregon, some bold thinker may yet address himself. But the practical difficulties which the simple facts of history and geography have created will be easily annihilated only on paper. Naive writers in the Nationalist find in the formation of a hundred Nationalist clubs in a year and a half, and in the sale of 100,000 copies of an interesting romance, the sure prophecy of an immense change in American institutions within a dozen years, and of their entire transformation within fifty. But not one in a hundred of the readers of 'Looking Backward' has yet joined a Nationalist club even. Should half the population of the United States join the Nationalist party, which has not yet appeared above the horizon, they would find the political difficulties of their programme insuperable."

Mr. Gilman points out that the nervous fear of Mr. Bellamy concerning trusts has led him to conclusions unwarranted by history and the experience of free peoples. That the development of legislation under a democracy to meet evils must to the necessity be considerably posterior to the full evolution of the phenomena with which it deals, since the inventive talent and the business shrewdness of modern men have always an advantage over the cumbersome machinery of Legislatures and Congresses. Scouting the panic of the "Nationalists" as senseless, he holds that Mr. Bellamy's adherence to the European type of socialism is regardless of its peculiarity in the American situation, since he consigns the American State to annihilation, wipes out all local attachment and proposes a plan for industrial socialism that would be unmanageable in a country of such enormous size and population as ours. Nationalism, in short, he declares as founded upon the basis of a clever novel, and distinguished

most of all by a literary character. It is the latest Boston "fad" pushed on by a few bright young journalists and warm-hearted women, and a small knot of clergymen and literary devotees, who expect in a single decade to peacefully revolutionize the existing order of things in America and set up an industrial organization with the President as its chief or head, and governed by an army system of grading. In this arrangement money is unknown, excellence alone justifies promotion, and the men of the learned professions are excluded from candidacy for headship, parties are to be things of the past and buying and selling abolished. The nation is to be the sole producer of commodities, and all persons are to be in the employment of the nation. All exchanges between individuals are to be eliminated, banks and bankers inhibited, needed allowances of necessities are made to the people from Government shops, and as they present credit cards at these shops the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital was made the host of the world during the Exposition, and entertainment was accorded to all comers, no distinction being shown among the worthy. The receptions were so brilliant that it is believed they were never surpassed in the history of France, at the same time the character of Republican institutions was deeply stamped and unmistakably upon them. Such halls and garden parties had never been known in Paris as were given during the summer; they were extended in the nature of entertainments to men and women regardless of titles, and took in delegations of all kinds hailing from reputable organizations—the question was simply this: "Are these our invited guests?" The affirmative answer resulted in such lavish hospitality as the world has not before known. The ball to the 8,000 workmen who erected the Palace de l'Industrie was a masterpiece, and as the correspondent puts it, a sight of extra-

ordinary beauty judged by the artist's standard, and a miracle of intelligent organization, in which a kindly care for the comfort and the pockets of the people was shown.

The celebration of the centenary of the Revolution by the conduct of the Exposition with its scores of minor celebrations and festivities made Frenchmen proud of the Revolution, and prouder still of the success of its commemoration. The Exposition had been boycotted by the crowns and thrones of Europe, but the Frenchman found out that it made no difference to the people of the world, who came to Paris "all the same," and made no complaint that royalty had remained at home and had refused its approval of the great festival. The people from all quarters came, and the Parisian discovered that monarchal patronage was not an absolute necessity to a great gathering.

And when they sent delegations, these representatives met with a cordial welcome at the Town Hall, and were fairly dazed with the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital was made the host of the world during the Exposition, and entertainment was accorded to all comers, no distinction being shown among the worthy. The receptions were so brilliant that it is believed they were never surpassed in the history of France, at the same time the character of Republican institutions was deeply stamped and unmistakably upon them. Such halls and garden parties had never been known in Paris as were given during the summer; they were extended in the nature of entertainments to men and women regardless of titles, and took in delegations of all kinds hailing from reputable organizations—the question was simply this: "Are these our invited guests?" The affirmative answer resulted in such lavish hospitality as the world has not before known. The ball to the 8,000 workmen who erected the Palace de l'Industrie was a masterpiece, and as the correspondent puts it, a sight of extra-

ordinary beauty judged by the artist's standard, and a miracle of intelligent organization, in which a kindly care for the comfort and the pockets of the people was shown.

The celebration of the centenary of the Revolution by the conduct of the Exposition with its scores of minor celebrations and festivities made Frenchmen proud of the Revolution, and prouder still of the success of its commemoration. The Exposition had been boycotted by the crowns and thrones of Europe, but the Frenchman found out that it made no difference to the people of the world, who came to Paris "all the same," and made no complaint that royalty had remained at home and had refused its approval of the great festival. The people from all quarters came, and the Parisian discovered that monarchal patronage was not an absolute necessity to a great gathering.

And when they sent delegations, these representatives met with a cordial welcome at the Town Hall, and were fairly dazed with the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital was made the host of the world during the Exposition, and entertainment was accorded to all comers, no distinction being shown among the worthy. The receptions were so brilliant that it is believed they were never surpassed in the history of France, at the same time the character of Republican institutions was deeply stamped and unmistakably upon them. Such halls and garden parties had never been known in Paris as were given during the summer; they were extended in the nature of entertainments to men and women regardless of titles, and took in delegations of all kinds hailing from reputable organizations—the question was simply this: "Are these our invited guests?" The affirmative answer resulted in such lavish hospitality as the world has not before known. The ball to the 8,000 workmen who erected the Palace de l'Industrie was a masterpiece, and as the correspondent puts it, a sight of extra-

ordinary beauty judged by the artist's standard, and a miracle of intelligent organization, in which a kindly care for the comfort and the pockets of the people was shown.

The celebration of the centenary of the Revolution by the conduct of the Exposition with its scores of minor celebrations and festivities made Frenchmen proud of the Revolution, and prouder still of the success of its commemoration. The Exposition had been boycotted by the crowns and thrones of Europe, but the Frenchman found out that it made no difference to the people of the world, who came to Paris "all the same," and made no complaint that royalty had remained at home and had refused its approval of the great festival. The people from all quarters came, and the Parisian discovered that monarchal patronage was not an absolute necessity to a great gathering.

And when they sent delegations, these representatives met with a cordial welcome at the Town Hall, and were fairly dazed with the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital was made the host of the world during the Exposition, and entertainment was accorded to all comers, no distinction being shown among the worthy. The receptions were so brilliant that it is believed they were never surpassed in the history of France, at the same time the character of Republican institutions was deeply stamped and unmistakably upon them. Such halls and garden parties had never been known in Paris as were given during the summer; they were extended in the nature of entertainments to men and women regardless of titles, and took in delegations of all kinds hailing from reputable organizations—the question was simply this: "Are these our invited guests?" The affirmative answer resulted in such lavish hospitality as the world has not before known. The ball to the 8,000 workmen who erected the Palace de l'Industrie was a masterpiece, and as the correspondent puts it, a sight of extra-

ordinary beauty judged by the artist's standard, and a miracle of intelligent organization, in which a kindly care for the comfort and the pockets of the people was shown.

The celebration of the centenary of the Revolution by the conduct of the Exposition with its scores of minor celebrations and festivities made Frenchmen proud of the Revolution, and prouder still of the success of its commemoration. The Exposition had been boycotted by the crowns and thrones of Europe, but the Frenchman found out that it made no difference to the people of the world, who came to Paris "all the same," and made no complaint that royalty had remained at home and had refused its approval of the great festival. The people from all quarters came, and the Parisian discovered that monarchal patronage was not an absolute necessity to a great gathering.

And when they sent delegations, these representatives met with a cordial welcome at the Town Hall, and were fairly dazed with the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital was made the host of the world during the Exposition, and entertainment was accorded to all comers, no distinction being shown among the worthy. The receptions were so brilliant that it is believed they were never surpassed in the history of France, at the same time the character of Republican institutions was deeply stamped and unmistakably upon them. Such halls and garden parties had never been known in Paris as were given during the summer; they were extended in the nature of entertainments to men and women regardless of titles, and took in delegations of all kinds hailing from reputable organizations—the question was simply this: "Are these our invited guests?" The affirmative answer resulted in such lavish hospitality as the world has not before known. The ball to the 8,000 workmen who erected the Palace de l'Industrie was a masterpiece, and as the correspondent puts it, a sight of extra-

ordinary beauty judged by the artist's standard, and a miracle of intelligent organization, in which a kindly care for the comfort and the pockets of the people was shown.

The celebration of the centenary of the Revolution by the conduct of the Exposition with its scores of minor celebrations and festivities made Frenchmen proud of the Revolution, and prouder still of the success of its commemoration. The Exposition had been boycotted by the crowns and thrones of Europe, but the Frenchman found out that it made no difference to the people of the world, who came to Paris "all the same," and made no complaint that royalty had remained at home and had refused its approval of the great festival. The people from all quarters came, and the Parisian discovered that monarchal patronage was not an absolute necessity to a great gathering.

And when they sent delegations, these representatives met with a cordial welcome at the Town Hall, and were fairly dazed with the amount due the Government is punched out. While every one is privileged to spend his income as he pleases, it is the same for all, the weak, incompetent and crippled having equal allowance, therefore, with the stalwart and skilled, though every one must make a certain amount of effort, and to this he will be pushed by force of public opinion.

Under this proposition, and which may well be termed Bellamyism, clubs are being formed, and that inevitable accessory of all such new movements, a magazine, has been started, which announces the purpose of the new politics and economy to be "the nationalization of industry, and thereby the promotion of the brotherhood of humanity. The economical tendency of the age being favorable to this end, this club seeks to promote its practical adoption by familiarizing the people with the beneficent idea underlying it, and by encouraging national and local measures tending in this direction."

The mother or Boston club has called into being to date seven branches, and of these, seven are in California. Sixty-eight other clubs are in process of formation. There are no business men as yet related to the organization, but a few sincere believing mechanics and a variety of writers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and dreamers are in its ranks. As the essayist referred to well says of the Bellamyism that has ripened into a Boston "fad": "It is a hard and fast bureaucracy, the personnel of which, once instituted by popular vote, would perpetuate itself in the closest routine, for as the power of appointment in the industrial army is in the officers of the grade above, the advantages of monarchal and of democratic rule are equally absent." Mr. Gilman wittily quotes a member of the Bellamyites as saying that the new doctrine "has had but little sympathy from human nature as it is, but derives its support from human nature as we desire to have it." One other paragraph we quote in conclusion:

Meanwhile, it remains true that the skies do not necessarily fall with the appearance of each new phenomenon in economics. Human society has never known such a leap in the darkness as the plunge into nationalism would be. The "colored and conservative class," in the conversion of which "Looking Backward" is intended to have been written, has thus far manifested little inclination to take up nationalism. The American press, with scarcely an exception, treats it with amusement as the latest Boston fad. The ineffective character of the movement so far, as regards its distinctive aim—the nationalization of productive industries—is apparent in its failure to enlist practical men of affairs or teachers of economic science. Nationalism is derided by the labor organs as the sentimental nostrum of people who are out of all vital touch with workingmen. It gets no sympathy from the followers of Henry George. The literary class, from which it has been chiefly recruited thus far, has lent it but a small portion of its sympathy. The amount of serious discussion which nationalism has received in public meetings or in the press is slight, and does not indicate any wild fire spread of the movement. The literary class given it by the friends of which it covers its inspiration, and by the friendship of the guild of letters to the talented author of "Looking Backward," will naturally subside in time. Bellamy's "ism" has not founded a sect, and "Looking Backward" will hardly originate a political party.

HOW THE FRENCH REPUBLICANS WON.

The Paris correspondent of the New York Tribune is entitled to the credit of having given the most lucid explanation yet written of the reason for Republican triumph in the recent French elections. The letter is too long for reproduction here, but the statements made in it should be given wide circulation, since they serve to clear from the American mind some fogs of misconception that the rather involved dispatches caused. According to this writer, the priests, if left to themselves, would not have opposed the Republic, for they come from the people, and are in close touch with them. The Bishops, however, and to vote for Royalists, or Bonapartists, or at the least to vote for a Bonapartist rather than support a Government candidate. But the people discovered that there was no reason why the Republic should be hostile to its own business, and that the fundamental principle of the Republic, tolerance, was fair to the church. The people discovered also, that while Boulanger was professing devotion to a Republican form of government, he was in alliance with both the Comte de Paris and Count Victor.

As a result, suspicion was aroused as to the sincerity of this opponent of the Government. At the same time Carnot's administration proved by the great Exposition that under a Republic there need not necessarily be abandonment of brilliant fets, nor any discouragement of those who cling to the traditions of royalty regarding display and the commemoration of great events. The Administration proved also that the Government is for the people as a whole, and not for a class.

The Nation's capital