CIVIL HISTORY OF THE WORLD.

TWO WORDS, CONSTITUTIONALISM AND NATIONALISM BEST EPITOMIZE IT.

Two awkward words give in epitome the civil history of the world at large in the nineteenth century. They are "Constitutionalism" and "Nationalism." They stand for two great principles, cognate and proceeding pari passu in the evolution of the best type of the modern State. There have been, it is true, constitutions without nations and nations without constitutions. But these either have been insecure and ephemeral or have failed to realize the reasonable ideal of a civilized community. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the constitutional theory of government and the national idea in the formation of sovereignties were still in embryo. To-day they dominate the world. And toward this consummation the wars, the revolutions and the great public movements of the century, peaceful or violent, have unerringly made way.

The year 1801 saw the constitutional principle firmly established in the United States, but the national idea by no means well developed. The story of this country is, however, dealt with in detail elsewhere in these columns, wherefore, with a mere reminder of its example to and influence upon other nations, our present attention is turned elsewhither. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, which came into being on the first day of the century, showed forth the constitutional and national principles more fully than any other European land. Yet even there some vestiges of absolutism survived, and the popular feeling was still more clannish and feudal than national. The wars of the first two decades, the reform and emancipation laws, and the vast extensions of the franchise and of local self-government in the last two decades of the century, have consistently and effectively made for perfection of the British Constitution and for the best development of a truly national spirit.

GROWTH OF EUROPE'S NATIONS.

As for Continental Europe, the initial year of the century saw scarcely one consistent nation of important rank, and only here and there a faint foreglimmering of constitutional light. Italy was a "geographical expression." The Teutonic States were still nominally within the reactionary and decadent bonds of that Holy Roman Empire which has well been described as neither holy nor Roman, nor yet an empire. The frenzy of the French Revolution, with its visions of a constitution, had subsided into the absolutism of Bonaparte, under which constitutional liberties and national aspirations were ruthlessly crushed. The Iberian kingdoms were still mediæval. The Scandinavian States had been shorn of their earlier importance. And the eastern part of the Continent was in the grasp of two great despotisms, the Muscovite in the north and the Ottoman in the south.

The fall of Bonaparte was followed by a period of apparent or superficial reaction, under the malign portents of the Holy Alliance. Beneath the surface, however, a potent leaven was at work. The constitutional idea had taken root in France and elsewhere, and was not to be extirpated. The restoration in great measure of the status quo ante in boundaries and sovereignties promoted the spirit of distinct nationality. Peoples which had suffered overrunning and arbitrary alien domination under Bonaparte began to prize the national integrity which had been violated and then restored to them. The result was that by the end of the first quarter of the century the Continent was ready for revolutionary—or, rather, evolutionary—movements of high import. Such movements began in the small States on the borders. Greece struck first for rehabilitation of her national status and for its confirmation under a constitutional system. Reactionaries of the Metternich school looked with disfavor upon such aspirations, and Russia was inclined to join hands with Turkey in suppressing them. From Western Europe, and especially from Great Britain, came aid and comfort, however, and at length the independence of Greece, upon a national and constitutional basis, was achieved. Almost simultaneously the national spirit asserted itself in the Southern Netherlands, and the new constitutional sovereignty of Belgium came into being.

THE LEAVEN OF REVOLUTION.

France, too, felt the generous impulse, and in a brief but decisive revolution replaced reactionary absolutism with a liberal constitutional monarchy. Meantime a vigorous national spirit had begun to assert itself in Egypt, and all the States of Central and South America had repudiated the dependent colonial status for that of independent commonwealths of national dignity. Such progress was effected in the first third of the century.

These things, however, were only the foremutterings of the storm which a few years later burst with full force upon the Continent in the revolution year of 1848. In that epoch of flux there were both progress and reaction, felt in almost every land of Europe. The immediate result was, upon the surface, repression and reaction. German Liberals were driven into exile, Hungary was crushed by Austrian absolutism with Russian aid, and even France bowed her neck to the yoke of a pinchbeck despot. The word "constitution" was, however, writ large and bold in bloodstained letters across the German Confederation as a sure omen of the future, while Charles Albert of Piedmont and his son, "Il Re Galantuomo," set up a standard for the nations in the "Statuto" which neither the cajoleries nor the menaces of Austria could prevail upon them to rescind.

Thus the leaven continued to work. Despot though he was, Louis Napoleon professed a devotion to the doctrine of nationalities; and though he more than once violated that doctrine he also promoted it. Four strangely assorted and discordant figures worked strangely together to transform a "geographical expression" into a constitutional nation—Mazzini, the visionary agitator; Garibaldi, the heroic free fighter; Cavour, the far sighted statesman, and Victor Emmanuel, the honest and heroic King. With the unlamented fall of "Bombalino" the new Kingdom of Italy was all but complete, a nation with a free constitution. Meanwhile in Germany the trend of events was unmistakable. Otto von Bismarck expressed contempt for parliaments and constitutions, yet in developing the puissant sovereignty and paramountcy of Prussia he was, whether consciously or unconsciously, at the same time developing a national spirit that would make a constitution a necessity. In the war of 1866 he overrode most ruthlessly some minor nationalities, but in so doing he merely opened the way for the establishment a little later of the immeasurably greater nationality of United Germany. Nor was Hungary to have her aspirations perpetually denied. The genius of Deak succeeded the meteoric zeal of Kossuth, and, finding sympathy and co-operation in Beust, where Metternich would have given only resistance and scorn, finally erected the transleithan land into a sovereign and constitutional nation. In France Louis Napoleon found himself constrained through sheer selfish apprehension to move toward constitutional lines of government, while in Spain and the minor States of the Continent the same course was perforce pursued.

A GLORIOUS CULMINATION.

The culmination of these processes in all but universal constitutionalism and nationalism was reached in the last third of the century. The Titanic conflict between France and Germany had a far more important result than the defeat of the one and the success and aggrandizement of the other. In the abolition of Bonapartism and the establishment of an enlightened and progressive republic, which has now considerably outlasted any other regime of the century, France gained that for which even the fearful losses of the Terrible Year were scarcely too great a price to pay. As for Germany, her gains, too, were vastly more than the two provinces and the five milliards of francs. The war transformed a congeries of twenty-five kingdoms, principalities, grand duchies, duchies and free towns into a single harmonious and united nation, under an enlightened and progressive constitution. At the same time the work of Italian unification was immeasurably advanced by the occupation of Rome and the re-establishment of the national capital in that historic city. A few years later Spain ended a revolutionary epoch with the restoration of her ancient line of sovereigns upon a constitutional and comparatively liberal basis. Portugal, largely under British influence, had adopted a liberal constitution early in the century. The Scandinavian kingdoms revised their constitutions in accord with popular representative government in the last third of the century. Switzerland, too, always democratic, made from time to time material advances into still greater liberality, and Austria and Hungary, the citadels of conservatism, put themselves in line with constitutional, parliamentary and popular institutions.

Within a decade after the colossal changes in France and Germany, another great alteration in the map of Europe was effected, in the southeastern corner. The early success of Greece in throwing off the Ottoman yoke and the occasional raids of Russia into Turkish Territory inspired the non-Turkish peoples of the Balkan Peninsula with the desire for free national independence. Various successive steps in that direction culminated in the great conflicts of 1874-'78, which resulted in the partitioning of the bulk of the Turkish Empire in Europe. The principality of Montenegro was enlarged and made independent. Servia became a minor but sovereign kingdom. The Danubian provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia were raised from the rank of a dependent principality to that of the independent kingdom of Rumania, now ranking almost among the great Powers. The Bulgars of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia had their national aspirations gratified by erection into an autonomous and all but independent principality, and, finally, Bosnia and Herzegovina were practically added to the heterogeneous congeries of tribes and nations and fragments of forgotten peoples which compose the Austrian Empire. The closing years of the century saw the immemorially vexed island of Crete at last invested with a liberal constitution and made substantially an autonomous nation.

EUROPE IS CONSTITUTIONALIZED.

Thus, while in 1801 there was scarcely one free constitutional nation in the whole continent of Europe, the close of 1900 saw practically every land west of the Baltic, the Vistula and the Pruth enjoying that status. There are, it is true, Italia Irredenta and Rumania Irredenta, and some ungratified national aspirations in Bohemia and Croatia, an Irish faction would undo the union of a century ago and Albania, Macedonia and Thrace are still subject to the Ottoman horde. But these are insignificant details. Europe has, as a whole, in these hundred years become nationalized and constitutionalized west of the Baltic, the Vistula and the Pruth. East of that line of demarcation, however, the genius of the nineteenth century has been impotent. Alexander of the Holy Alliance was no more resolutely opposed to constitutions, and no more regardless of national aspirations than Nicholas of the Peace Congress. The opening years of the century saw Russia's seizure of Finland and confirmation of her grip on Poland. The midcentury saw her extinguish the last remnant of Polish nationality. The end of the century saw her arbitrarily annulling the Finnish constitution and destroying all that was left of Finnish nationality. "Republican or Cossack," said Bonaparte; or he is said to have said it. Republican and Cossack is the fulfilment of the prophecy. West of the Baltic, the Vistula and the Pruth are nations with constitutions. East of that line is a Czar.

COLONIES GROW TO NATIONS.

Elsewhere in the world national forces have been enhanced and constitutional influences extended. Through alternations of anarchy and empire Mexico has become a great republic. The benevolent constitutional empire of Brazil has likewise been democratically transformed. Scattered and jarring British colonies in North America and some wastes of untracked wilderness have been erected into a nation as great as the United States was a century ago. Australia, little known save to explorers in 1801, has entered 1901 an autonomous nation under a constitution largely copied from our own. South Africa was a century ago all but an unknown land, save within gunshot of Simon's Bay, while to-day it is a cluster of populous and wealthy States, soon to be united in national dignity. Perhaps most striking of all has been the marvellous development of Japan, which began the century an unknown hermit land, which in midcentury reluctantly opened its doors and revealed itself far more archaic than our legends of the Middle Ages, and which closes the century in the forefront of modern civilization, constitutionalism and popular sovereignty. It has compressed into a century that which to the rest of the world required a millennium.

Such in brief outline has been the story of the world in the nineteenth century. The vast bulk of the civilized part of the human race has been divided into nations, according not to the selfish and arbitrary caprice of despots, but to the natural classifications and predilections of the people, and these nations have been endowed with constitutional governments. In such achievements, such progress and such beneficence to the civil welfare of mankind the nineteenth century stands alone, unique and unapproachable. In that respect it is to be compared—as has well been said of it in other respects—not with any one other century, but with the sum of all centuries of the Christian era, if not, indeed, with the sum of all eras of recorded time.

W. FLETCHER JOHNSON.

BENEFITS OF ELECTRIC TRACTION.

O. T. Crosby, in The Street Railway Journal.

Taking our amount of work to be done as this—the transport of a sixteen foot car over a distance of one mile, without regard just now to speed of transmission—we find, as nearly as can be calculated, that of such car miles three million are made every day in the year in the United States, and that the cost of each car mile is actually by electric power, say, 12 cents, and would be by horsepower, say, 18 cents. Hence, every day there is a saving in actual daily expenditure of $180,000 on this item of the Nation's movement. Without here detailing the investigation, necessarily limited, leading to the particular figures, I shall assume one mile as the average haul, and four miles an hour as the average difference, i. e., between six miles per hour and ten miles per hour. The total number of passengers carried by electric cars is about twelve millions per day. At six miles per hour each passenger would be on the horsecar ten minutes; on the electric car at ten miles per hour, six minutes, or 0.1 of an hour. The total economy is, therefore, 0.066 hours per passenger, or a total of 792,000 human hours per day.

The persons engaged in what the census reports call "gainful occupations" constitute about 25 per cent of the total population, or 45 per cent of all those over seven years old. The average daily wage, as given by Atkinson, is about 50 cents, and if the average daily duration of work be eight hours, we may say that the money value of a man hour is 6.25 cents, using the term man hour as covering only those human beings capable of work. In the 792,000 human hours per day above stated there are, it appears, therefore, 45 per cent of man hours—a total of 356,400. These figures at 6.25 cents per hour give a daily money value in time saved by electric over horse cars of $22,275.

By adding the money saving in time of the workers on the average one mile ride basis, to the saving in operative cost, we have a total of $202,275 per day. But against this must be set over interest charge on an investment much greater than would be required for horsecar service. This excess of investment is approximately $10,000 per mile, there are approximately 17,969 miles of electric service. The total excess becomes $179,690,000, on which the daily interest charge at 4 per cent per annum is very nearly $19,600. Subtracting this from the sum above given, we have a net daily saving of $182,675.

The total daily wage of the Nation, assuming twenty-five million workers and 50 cents per day at eight hours, is about $12,500,000. The daily saving just deduced is nearly 1.5 per cent of this total daily wage. Hence, by virtue of the electric motor, and assuming the movement actually made as necessary to be made, it appears that every American worker could stop his daily work 7.2 minutes earlier without diminution of the total general output, as compared with that which would be possible if the same movement were made by horses. If this sum of leisure were taken by individuals, each at eight hours per day, it appears that 375,000 workers might be withdrawn from the "army of occupation" without lessening the bread, coats, tables, books, pictures, houses, etc., that are produced and divided among the people.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Arthur V. Abbott, in The Electrical World and Engineer.

Wireless telegraphy is only a few years old, and in the natural course of evolution may develop as usefully as the telegraph or telephone. As electric waves differ only in speed and amplitude from others, they obey the same laws of reflection and refraction. Therefore it should be possible to concentrate them and produce an electric beam by means of proper mirrors or lenses, in the same manner as a searchlight ray is obtained. It seems possible that the circuits in the receivers and oscillators could be so adjusted that they should only mutually respond to each other, like a pair of sympathetic tuning forks. Theoretically all this is within the nature of things, and if achieved would go far toward removing the present impracticabilities. Mr. Marconi claims, it is said, to have solved these problems, and to have produced a syntonic receiver and transmitter that only respond to the particular waves emitted by the one and that are intended for the other. He also, it is claimed, has produced a projecting apparatus that emits a well defined electric beam, and has replaced the vertical receiving masts by an equally efficient and more compact collecting cylinder. As yet, however, these are nothing but the merest rumors, unless a very indefinite letter from Professor Fleming may be regarded as confirmatory evidence. Possibly the first year of the new century will reveal some discovery that may be a panacea for all of the "ills which Hertzian signalling is heir to," but from the cold and calm standpoint of present facts the way appears to be tedious, the road hard and difficult and the goal a long way in the future.

PROMINENT FIGURES IN THE DRAMA OF THE LAST CENTURY.

A CENTURY OF THE DRAMA.

VAST GROWTH OF THE THEATRE-GOING PUBLIC HAS REVERSED THE STAGE'S EARLY STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the American stage was an institution of but slight importance. It had existed, under many difficulties, for about fifty years. The principal theatres were situated in Philadelphia, New-York, and Boston, while minor theatres led a precarious life in Albany, Hartford, Providence, Washington, Williamsburgh, Annapolis, Baltimore, and Charleston. The dramatic field was narrow and the actors were few. The total population of the United States did not much exceed 4,000,000. The city of New-York, as late as 1807, contained only about 80,000 inhabitants, while Boston contained about 36,000. The reigning theatrical potentates were Wignell, in Philadelphia, Hallam, in New-York, and Powell, in Boston. Communication between the towns was maintained by means of stage coaches, and professional excursions were occasionally made by two or three stock companies. The starring system,—which is said to have been introduced by Fennell (1806),—had not then been established. The chief playhouse of New-York was in John-st., and it was designated, simply,—and, for those days, sufficiently,—as "The Theatre." Hodgkinson, Cooper, Harwood, Holman, Bernard, Fennell, Jefferson (grandfather of the Jefferson of to-day), Warren, Twaits, Blisset, Wood, Mrs. Marshall,—whom General Washington had admired,—and Mrs. Merry (Anne Brunton), were among the conspicuous players of the time.

The average salary paid to actors, of every rank, was about twenty-five dollars a week. The plays customarily offered were such as had already been well received in England. The actors, on some occasions, would go from house to house, soliciting patronage and selling tickets to their performances. The press derived no material benefit from theatrical advertisement and gave but little attention to the theatre,—its comments, in general, being perfunctory and ponderous. The social status of the actor was, comparatively, low. Barrooms were often associated with the theatre, and not only then but for many years afterward, females engaged in vice as a vocation were allowed access to a certain part of it. Most things were provincial. The standard of taste, however, as to intellectual matters, was high. The audience, in general, was fastidious; the tragedies of Shakespeare and the comedies of Farquhar, Sheridan, Colman and Goldsmith were popular; and the art of acting was earnestly practised and seriously viewed. Many of the actors of that period were men who had received a classical education. The dramatic tide, of course, flowed out of England, as it had done from the first.

It has long been customary to descant on "the public taste" as an inherent force, and to intimate that conditions ensue upon fluctuation in that faculty; but, as a matter of fact, "the public taste" is fortified and led by external influence. In theatrical history periods have always been dominated by exceptional and redoubtable individuals. In the sixteenth century Burbage, Lowin, and Tarleton appear to have set the fashion. In the seventeenth century Betterton and Mrs. Bracegirdle reigned supreme. In the eighteenth century Garrick, Barry, Wilks, Peg Woffington and Mrs. Cibber overshadowed everybody else, and led the world captive. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, and when the scene had been newly set in America, Hodgkinson and Cooper were in the ascendant, as tragic actors, and Jefferson, Bernard, and Warren as comedians. George Frederick Cooke and Mary Duff came in 1810, and Edmund Kean in 1820, and their influence upon our stage, preserved and transmitted through a long professional lineage, is still potential. The year 1832, so fatal to renowned persons, saw the death of Warren and Jefferson, and by that time Anne Brunton and almost all the shining dramatic lights of the period had been extinguished. Cooper had retired from the theatre. Mary Duff was in her decadence. Cooke died in 1812; Kean in 1833. The American career of the elder Wallack began in 1818; that of the elder Booth in 1821; that of Edwin Forrest in 1826; and the second quarter of the century was illumined by those three actors,—each a chieftain in his peculiar domain, and each potent to diffuse the abiding force of a fascinating and irresistible example.

Wallack was the most accomplished and the most iridescent of comedians, in the higher walk—playing Don Felix, Benedick, Rover, Doricourt and Massaroni as nobody else could ever play them. Junius Brutus Booth was the poetic insanity of dramatic genius incarnate. Forrest, with a spark of the divine fire, was the most splendid animal force that the stage has seen; he had all the vigor of Salvini, and a finer voice. Booth died in 1852; Wallack in 1864. Forrest, reaching his zenith and passing it, between 1836 and 1856, began then to decline, till, worn out with trouble, sorrow and bitter mental conflict, he died, in 1872. Meantime Edwin Booth, born in 1833, had served a hard novitiate in California, and about 1857 his superb genius, intellectual and spiritual as well as humanly sympathetic and winning, burst like a diamond sunrise on the Eastern cities, and thereafter, for well nigh thirty years, and throughout a period remarkable for fecundity of dramatic enterprise, wealth of diversified contemporary ability, and splendor of dramatic achievement, he led the stage and was the standard of his time, in tragic art; and his time was adorned with such names as James E. Murdoch, E. S. Conner, Charles Kean, Charles Fechter, J. W. Wallack, jr., Edwin Adams, C. W. Couldock, G. V. Brooke, James Stark, E. L. Davenport, Charles Mathews, Lawrence Barrett, John McCullough, William Creswick, Davison, Sonnenthal, Haase, Rossi and Salvini, together with Charlotte Cushman, Ellen Tree, Emma Waller, Charlotte Crampton, Julia Dean, Matilda Heron, Fanny Janauschek, Sarah Bernhardt, Adelaide Neilson, Helena Modjeska and Mary Anderson. Booth died in 1893, at the age of sixty—"and hath not left his peer." Among other actors, native and foreign, but mostly of the latter class, who deeply impressed the public mind, in the course of their transit, and who largely contributed to the moulding of the stage and the establishment of popular views as to that institution, were Augustus A. Addams, who began his career in Boston in 1823, appeared in New-York in 1830, and died in 1851—a man of extraordinary genius; Henry J. Finn, a great comedian, lost in the Lexington, in Long Island Sound, in 1840; W. C. Macready, one of the greatest of actors, 1826; Mme. Vestris, who first came in 1828, and who came again, as the wife of Charles Mathews, in 1838; Tyrone Power, 1833; John Reeve, 1835; Mr. and Mrs. Keeley, 1836; Chippendale, 1836; and J. B. Buckstone, 1840. The first of the "society actresses"—a painful lot—was Mrs. Mowatt, 1845. Among the great singers of old days, who visited America, were Charles Incledon, 1817; the enchanting Malibran, 1825, and the incomparable Jenny Lind, 1850.

The plays produced during these successive periods, have been, in the main, such as leading actors deemed best adapted for their personal display. A hundred years ago the sentimental comedy still had its exponents and its admirers. Shakespeare has always held his place. The first regular dramatic performance given in America,—in a building in Nassau-st., New-York, March 5, 1750,—was a performance of "Richard III," as adapted by Cibber; and from that time onward the chronicles teem with mention of the best of all dramatic poets. Cooper, Cooke, Kean, Forrest, and indeed all the tragedians of the century, acted Shakespeare, though not to the exclusion of everything else. Forrest gained the bulk of his great fortune with "Metamora"—a play that he abhorred, but one that he had taught his public to like, and one in which he appeared to great advantage. Musical plays, such as "Guy Mannering," were much favored, in the early part of the century, when such actors and singers as Mrs. Richardson (Elizabeth Jefferson), Charlotte Cushman, Peter Richings, and Henry Placide, were extant to interpret them. Melodrama was very popular about the middle of the century; no such acting, in this particular line, is ever seen now, as that of Charlotte Cushman in Nancy, J. W. Wallack, jr., in Fagin, and Peter Richings or E. L. Davenport in Bill Sikes. The greatest dramatic genius of France, the incomparable Rachel, visited America in 1855, and cast upon many minds a magic spell, of which the glamour has not yet wholly faded. The decadent drama of France was first introduced on the American stage about the same time, in an English form, by Jean Davenport,—now Mrs. Lander—who first in this country, 1852-1853, acted the part of Camille. Matilda Heron, a woman of astonishing genius, seized on that part in 1855-7, and, in the nimble phraseology of her Hibernian manager, "clutched the dramatic diadem at a bound."

All sorts of things have arrived since then (the mere mention of them would fill columns), and every species of influence has been liberated in the theatre. The last quarter of the century presents much to be deplored, but much also to be admired and extolled. Joseph Jefferson, acting Rip Van Winkle, has diffused happiness all over the land, and at the same time has exemplified the perfection of the comedian's art. Lester Wallack (1820-1888), closing a career of exceptional and sustained brilliancy, has exploited the treasures of old English comedy, and has left precious memories that will long survive. Adelaide Neilson, that wonder of genius and beauty (early and most cruelly and sadly blotted out of life), has filled the stage with images of loveliness and pathos that can never be forgotten. The noble and stately Mary Anderson has splendidly exemplified some of the highest ideals of poetry, and therein has done much to endear the theatre to the best minds of her time. Augustin Daly, making a superb battle for intellect, beauty, and refinement in the contemporary drama and in the conduct of the stage, and raising the American theatre to conspicuous dignity and renown, has blessed the age with many joys and dowered it with the glory of a shining example; his theatre was started in 1869, and in 1890 he died. The fame of Ada Rehan as a Shakespearian actress has been firmly established and widely diffused. Richard Mansfield has won great distinction and favor. Minnie Maddern Fiske has deservedly gained an honorable and auspicious eminence. But the most potent influence of all, within the last twenty years,—affecting the stage in every department, and affecting society in every rank,—has been that of the famous English actor Henry Irving, whose several visits to America, since 1883, with that rare, imaginative, enchanting actress, Ellen Terry, and with their London Lyceum company and theatrical productions, have exhibited dramatic art in surpassing excellence, and theatrical embellishment in unprecedented and unrivalled completeness and splendor. The Irving productions, in particular, have illustrated and enforced the wisdom of scrupulous attention to every detail, and Irving, like Booth, has devoted his life to great subjects, giving to the public, not what they are supposed to want but what they ought to have. In comedy the American stage has seen the best that could be shown, and the names of Charles and Fanny Kemble, John Barnes, W. R. Blake, W. F. Gates, Dion Boucicault, John Brougham, William E. Burton, James H. Hackett, John E. Owens, Charles Burke, John S. Clarke, John Gilbert, Charles F. Coghlan, Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, and that exquisite artist, John Hare, have been written on the age in letters of light.

As the century closes the field of the drama extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific and includes the vast population of 70,000,000. There are more than 3,500 theatrical towns in the United States, and more than 5,000 theatres, and there are at least 600 travelling companies in continual activity. At this moment,—much to the injury of the dramatic profession, and much to the discredit of most of its leaders,—the stage is girdled with the tentacles of an octopus, having its head in this capital and its limbs extended throughout the land. A Theatrical Trust has been formed, and, under its sordid and ruthless tyranny, the theatre has been turned into a sort of Department Store. The motive of this ring is mercenary and the tone of it is vulgar. Such an influence must, in the nature of things, make everything that it touches commonplace and mean. One of the blessings most to be desired, at the beginning of the new century, is the destruction of this syndicate of speculative corner-grocery traders in the arts, and thereupon the restoration of a fair competition in business. The stage can be preserved only by the preservation of its charm. To make it common is to insure its ruin. In the immediate dramatic prospect there is but little promise of fine achievement, but, in the domain of the stage, as in other domains, there are always salutary and noble forces working beneath the surface, and the hope should be encouraged that, in this, as in all realms of human activity, evil will ultimately be defeated and good will conquer.

WILLIAM WINTER.

EVOLUTION OF THIS NATION.

A CENTURY OF EXPANSION AND UNIFICATION—HOW OUR GOVERNMENT GREW STRONG AND ENDURING.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the United States had an area of 827,844 square miles and about 5,500,000 people. At the close it has a continental area of 3,501,000 square miles, with more than 76,000,000 inhabitants, together with Hawaii, Porto Rico and the Philippines, comprising 130,000 square miles, with a population of about 9,000,000. In 1801 it was a loosely knit and dissoluble confederation of mutually jealous States. To-day it is a compact Nation, organized on a federal basis, but possessing, nevertheless, power to perpetuate itself, to enforce its authority everywhere at home and to meet its responsibilities everywhere abroad. The wonderful material progress of the American people, who have conquered and transformed a continent and are now just beginning to comprehend their possibilities of worldwide commercial dominion, has been accompanied by a no less remarkable political and constitutional growth.

The two most striking characteristics of the United States in the nineteenth century are its expansion and its nationalization. Through all the changes of parties, in spite of Administrations seeking contrary results, the pressure of the country's fate has been working toward the establishment of the supremacy and independent vitality of the general Government.

UNIONISM GREW SLOWLY.

The idea that this Government was something besides the creature of the individual States, and that it could not be broken up at the convenience of those who joined to create it, took root slowly. The doctrine of a terminable contract was not in essence partisan or sectional. The Virginia and Kentucky Republicans of 1798, the Essex Junto of 1800, the Hartford Convention Federalists of 1814, the South Carolina Nullifiers of 1832 and the Confederate Secessionists of 1861 alike failed to grasp the fact of American nationality, which, in spite of the disintegrating tendencies prevalent for years previous to the Civil War, had become firmly fixed before it was attacked in force. Yet if the conception of a nation and not a league had been fully understood by the framers of the Constitution it probably would not have been adopted.

The Constitution, though written, is a living thing which adapts itself to the growth of the country and reveals new meanings as the Government faces new problems and needs to exercise new powers. This is its unique glory among written constitutions—that it can provide a scheme of government meeting the requirements and suiting the conceptions of people a century apart, with greatly differing ideas as to the nature and scope of that government.

BUILDED BETTER THAN HE KNEW.

The century opened with the apparent triumph of the disintegrating over the fusing policy. Twelve years of work under Washington, Hamilton and Adams in building up a centralized power culminated in the election of Jefferson, who doubted the constitutional right of the United States even to build a lighthouse for the protection of commerce. Yet, curiously enough, Jefferson was fated to do more than even Hamilton for loose construction of the Constitution and the growth of a consolidated American empire. In 1803 he purchased Louisiana, more than doubling the area of the country and opening the door to an expansion utterly changing its character. He regarded this act as extra-constitutional, but put aside his scruples because of the manifest benefit of the acquisition. Then, with the aid of Congress, he established the doctrine of the plenary power of the United States to govern subject territory by setting up a civil administration in New-Orleans which had no specific warrant in the Constitution, and denied to the people some of the personal rights guaranteed by that instrument. Jefferson also sent out Lewis and Clark to explore and preserve to the United States the Oregon country, and thus took the first step toward American domination of the Pacific Ocean.

The War of 1812 was a piece of rashness and an outbreak of blind rage. France had treated the United States if anything worse than England. Both had been irritating and insulting beyond endurance, and the spirit of the young West, led by Henry Clay, must needs strike back at somebody, regardless of prudence. The country was ill prepared, and the campaigns were wretchedly managed. The direct objects of the war were not gained, but its indirect benefits were worth all it cost. It taught Europe that the new democracy was not to be despised, that it would risk war in a just cause even with the strongest nation. It extinguished the last remnant of colonial feeling or special French or English bias as a partisan division among Americans. The war stimulated the growth of a real national character among those who had before been provincials in combination, and left a united country, except for the then insignificant slavery question, which was soon to open a new gulf and put nationality to its greatest trial.

PERIOD OF INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS.

Immediately following the War of 1812, however, came a period of quiet, in which the people made great industrial progress and the Government gathered strength for coming contests. Chief Justice Marshall was interpreting the Constitution and confirming the Federal Government in the exercise of truly national powers. The needs of the growing country for internal improvements transcending State limits became apparent, and though Jefferson, Madison and Monroe vetoed improvement acts as unconstitutional, and thought they had settled the question, Clay's view of the fundamental law, as expressed in the question, "Are the narrow, limited necessities of the old thirteen States forever to remain a rule of its interpretation?" in the end suited all parties better, and by general consent the old doctrine was abandoned.

A tariff for protection, tried under Hamilton's lead at the formation of the Government, was also adopted as a settled policy at this period, and laid the foundation for our great manufacturing industries. In 1819 Florida, with an area of 59,268 square miles, was added to the Union, and in establishing a civil government for the territory Congress again took occasion to assert sovereign powers, and Andrew Jackson, as Governor, proceeded to exercise them without regard to the Constitution. The next year the slavery question first became serious, but a truce was arranged in the Missouri Compromise, recognizing the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories.

MONROE DOCTRINE'S BIRTH.

From 1817 to 1829 John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State and President, was the dominating force in the control of the American foreign policy. He wanted the world "familiarized with the idea of considering our proper dominion to be the continent of North America." In 1815 he was ready to ask Great Britain for Canada as a matter of mutual convenience, he negotiated the Florida treaties, he repeatedly proclaimed Cuba indispensable to the Union, and in July, 1823, speaking of Alaska, said to the Russian Minister: "The American continents are no longer subjects for any European colonial establishments." This was the first promulgation of the "Monroe Doctrine." In the December following President Monroe announced that policy in his message, and assumed for the United States the position as arbiter of American destinies, which Europe, however much it has since grumbled, has not cared to dispute.

Another notable incident in the growth of National sentiment was the Webster-Hayne debate of 1830, in which the South Carolina nullification doctrine was promulgated and popular loyalty to the Union received its greatest intellectual stimulus. Two years later the overt act of nullification was precipitated by the tariff, and the resolute attitude of President Jackson compelled for the time being obedience to the Federal Government, but not an abandonment of the secession theory.

The next step in expansion was the annexation of Texas, in 1845. This added 376,163 square miles to American territory and opened to slavery the prospect of indefinite extension of its power, but in fact paved the way for its downfall by stimulating it to new pretensions. The Mexican War followed, and with it, in 1848, the acquisition of 545,753 square miles in California and New-Mexico, to be rounded out in 1853 by the Gadsden purchase of 44,064 square miles.

THE SLAVERY CRISIS.

The problem of governing this new territory led to new constitutional debates, and to the slavery crisis. Calhoun developed his theory of the extension of the Constitution to the Territories, protecting slavery in them as in the States, while Webster and Benton asserted the right of Congress to exclude it. Calhoun wished then to force the issue to actual disunion, and, wisely from his point of view, for all the time the party prepared to defend the title of the United States to be a nation was growing stronger. Clay's Compromise of 1850 seemed a sinful thing to Abolitionists, but Webster, the great Unionist, did right to support it, for it gave ten years for the maturing of the union spirit, and that time was needed, since the influence of the slavery agitation had been decentralizing in the North as well as in the South. Meanwhile Cass and Douglas developed their notion of "squatter sovereignty" as a substitute for National authority, thereby giving mob rule a fallacious theory of legitimacy.

The Supreme Court in 1857 by the Dred Scott decision sought to divest the National Government of the essence of its sovereignty and establish as the rule of constitutional interpretation the extreme Jeffersonian doctrine of limited powers, which Jefferson himself in office had abandoned.

THE WAR OF SECESSION.

Then came the war of secession. The dispute was about slavery, but the vital question at issue was whether the United States was a Nation able to enforce its laws in all places of its dominion or a helpless association dependent on the will of each of its parts. It was on this issue that Abraham Lincoln prosecuted the war, greatly to the chagrin of extreme anti-slavery men, and the defeat of the secession movement not merely abolished slavery, but established beyond dispute that the American people had grown up to Hamilton's and Marshall's conception of their Constitution as furnishing them a government fit to make the American empire equal in essential power and freedom of action to any in the world.

At the end of the war Secretary Seward made a practical application of the Monroe Doctrine, and forced France to abandon the Government she had set up in Mexico. He purchased the 532,409 square miles of Alaska from Russia in 1867, thereby adding to this country its first considerable tract of non-contiguous territory acquired without any intention of ultimately making it a State. He also planned to secure for the United States ascendency in the Caribbean Sea, and negotiated the purchase of the Danish West Indies, but the country was not yet ready for this project. Nor did President Grant's proposal to annex San Domingo in 1870 meet with favor. The people were devoted to internal development on a vast scale, and then had little care for the extension of their political or commercial influence.

In 1892 Hawaii, civilized and largely settled by Americans, prayed for annexation, but President Cleveland on taking office withdrew the treaty of acquisition from the Senate, and it was not until 1898 that American sovereignty was extended over those islands. Mr. Cleveland had occasion in 1895 once more to assert our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine and our unwillingness to tolerate any possible European aggression in this hemisphere. The result was the settlement of the British-Venezuelan boundary dispute by arbitration.

RECENT ACQUISITIONS.

The intervention in Cuba, which American statesmen had for three-quarters of a century foreseen as some day inevitable, was forced upon the Government in 1898. In a moment of forgetfulness of the settled conviction of Administrations of all parties that ultimate control of the island was necessary to our peace and security, Congress pledged itself to the independence of Cuba. So we are now confronted with the difficult problem of setting up an independent government there, as in duty bound, and at the same time guarding against the island being made the foothold of an enemy at our door. Another result of the war with Spain was the acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and the question now at issue concerning the power to rule these outside possessions puts to a new test the status of the United States as a Nation equal to other nations, able to hold territory as its expanding political and commercial relations may require, without incorporating those chance holdings into its own system.

The story of the United States in the nineteenth century is the story of the evolution of a confederation into a full fledged nation, and the last step in that constitutional development is coincident with the commercial and industrial triumphs which promise American predominance among civilized peoples, and call for the means to promote and maintain it.

ROSCOE C. E. BROWN.

OUR ULTIMATE COAL PRODUCTION.

F. W. Saward, in The Coal Trade Journal.

The British coal output having now reached a total of 220,000,000 gross tons, from an area of about 8,000 square miles, the opinion is prevalent that the maximum output of that country is within sight. This being the case, the question naturally arises, How does the situation in the United States compare with this, and what will be our maximum tonnage? Our coal areas of the United States comprise upward of 150,000 square miles, so that so far as area is concerned we have fifteen times as much coal land as Great Britain, and the impression might prevail that in due time the United States might produce ten times, at least, as much coal. Yet this is subject to marked modification, although thirty-five years ago the total coal production of the United States did not exceed 15,000,000 tons, and to-day it is at the rate of 250,000,000 tons per annum. Pennsylvania now produces at the rate of 135,000,000 tons per annum. It is very doubtful if the output will ever be more than twice as much as it is now, or, let us say 300,000,000 tons. Illinois, too, has an ultimate output of 60,000,000 tons, or two and one-half times the present tonnage. West Virginia may in time produce three times its present output. For Ohio a total output of 35,000,000 is all that can be expected. Alabama we shall enter as 70,000,000 tons. Indiana may produce 10,000,000 tons fifty or seventy-five years hence, but at that time Maryland may be worked out, or nearly so, and if we continue that State at its present figure we shall be generous. Let us put down 20,000,000 tons for Iowa, and the same for Colorado. Kentucky will be a large producer, and 15,000,000 tons may come thence. Kansas and Missouri will probably not increase so much. Ten millions for the two is our estimate. Tennessee will probably produce as much as both, and so will Wyoming. For Washington and Virginia we may set down 6,000,000 tons each. The Montana output may be run up to the same figures, and the Indian Territory and Arkansas tonnages may reach 5,000,000 tons apiece. New-Mexico may produce 4,000,000 tons per annum in time, so also with Texas and Utah. Michigan will probably never exceed 2,000,000, and 1,000,000 for Georgia is a liberal estimate. California, North and South Dakota, Oregon, North Carolina, Nebraska and Rhode Island may all be pointed credited with a product of 1,000,000 tons. Here then we have a total of 669,000,000 tons as the ultimate maximum output of the coal mines of the United States.

MONTAUK FIRE DETECTIVE WIRE.

The North German