TIMELY TOPICS.

WOMAN AS A VOTER.

Mrs. Blackwell to Bishop Doane.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mrs. W. W. Crannell, in coming to the defence of Bishop Doane's anti-suffrage statistics, shows more chivalry than knowledge of arithmetic. According to the official returns the vote on the so-called referendum in Massachusetts stood: Nays, 187,837; yeas, 109,204. Therefore, when Bishop Doane says: "In Massachusetts 95 per cent. of the population of the State declined it (woman suffrage) by a popular vote," it is clear that his statement conveys an incorrect idea.

Mrs. Crannell calmly assumes that everybody who did not vote either way is to be counted as voting in the negative, an assumption unwarrantable under any circumstances, and especially so in this case, in view of the strenuous efforts that were put forth by the "Massachusetts Man Suffrage Association" to bring every opponent to the polls. But even if we assume that everybody who did not vote either way voted in the negative, it would not give Bishop Doane his 95 per cent. Let any one take Mrs. Crannell's statistics and work out the problem in arithmetic; it is a simple one. There is no wriggling out of the fact that the Bishop has allowed his dislike of woman suffrage or his over-reliance upon the statements of other "antis" to betray him into an untenable assertion.

Mrs. Crannell went exceedingly wide of the mark when trying to give the figures of the women's school vote in Massachusetts. She says it was a misprint. I am, of course, bound to accept her statement. But if the long series of inaccuracies in her pamphlet are all of them to be set down as typographical errors, she must have had the very worst proofreader in the United States.

Undoubtedly the school vote of women is small. There is a great deal of human nature in women, and their vote varies like that of men. At a Presidential election the vote of men is large; at an ordinary State election much smaller; at a municipal election smaller still; and at a school election, wherever school elections are held separately, only a fraction of the men ever turn out to vote. Where women have only school suffrage their vote is small; where they have municipal suffrage it is much larger, and where they have full suffrage they vote as generally as the men.

Mrs. Crannell, in her pamphlet, points to the small school vote of women, and asks contemptuously: "Does any one suppose that women would do better if they had full suffrage?" It is not a question of supposition, but of fact. In 1861 the women of Kansas were given school suffrage. Their vote was small. In 1887 they were given municipal suffrage. Their vote at once became much larger, and has increased at succeeding elections. In 1876 the women of Colorado were given school suffrage. Their vote was small. In 1893 they were given full suffrage, and now more than four-fifths of them vote. So says a statement just issued, signed by four Governors and ex-Governors of Colorado, by all the State officers, all the Judges of the Supreme Court, the President of the State University, the President of Colorado College, the Mayor of Denver, and other dignitaries. In Wyoming Judge Kingman has collected statistics showing that about nine-tenths of the women vote.

The importance of having good school boards can hardly be overestimated, and it is undoubtedly regrettable that women do not cast as large a vote at school elections as they do at Presidential elections. But it is only a new proof of the truth of Mrs. Poyser's saying: "I'm not denying that women are foolish; God Almighty made them to match the men."

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.
DORCHESTER, Mass., Jan. 19, 1897.

THE DESPERATION OF THE MUGWUMPS.

In Their Downfall They Vainly Strive to Bring Everything to Ruin With Them.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I find from the conversation of my Mugwump friends that they are now deep down in despondency. It is true that their view of our political conditions has always been gloomy, but formerly they were cheered by hopes that they would yet be able to set straight the crooked. Those hopes having been dispelled by the last campaign, they are at last forced to confess that all their labor has come to naught. They feel that their occupation has gone, and that there is no place for them in the political movement now in progress, for they themselves begin to see that the Mugwump episode in our politics has come to an inglorious conclusion. Their own downfall, however, they regard as simply the prelude to a general smash.

A few evenings ago the most prominent of the little Mugwump band prophesied bitterly that our political institutions would not last four years longer. Another Mugwump put off the day of doom a few years longer. The end will come, he declared, within ten years at most. The last campaign kept them so much occupied with efforts to save their property from destruction that they had no leisure for the luxury of woe in which the Mugwump temperament delights to revel; but when it was over and McKinley was elected they had a respite during which to reflect upon what they had done. They had been forced by the sheer instinct of self-preservation to establish more firmly the very system it was the prime function of their existence to destroy. Last spring when a distinguished foreign publicist asked a leading Mugwump in my hearing what would be the positions of the two great parties in the coming campaign on the currency question, the Mugwump replied confidently: "There is no hope from the Republican party; it has been thoroughly corrupted by protection; but the Democratic party will be right." This was said at a time when to discriminating political observers it was evident that the silver men were going to control the Democratic Convention, and that the gold party would be dominant at St. Louis. The bitter disappointment of the Mugwumps, whose frantic purpose has always been Republican destruction, and their terrible straits when they were compelled to support the Republican candidate can therefore be conceived; nay, it is hardly conceivable. The thing they hated most they were forced to foster with all their strength. They had to support protection in the person of its chief representative. Mugwumpery was driven into alliance with McKinleyism.

Hence the Mugwumps came out of the campaign sorely bruised in spirit. They had assisted in their own condemnation and in the refutation of the very theory upon which they had built their hopes. Instead of having broken up the Republican party, it remained as the only political organization between American society and social disruption; and for the time being, at least, it was supported by all conservative Democratic sentiment. The practical consequence of all their activity for twelve years was that the policy and the political methods they had striven to demolish were more strongly intrenched than ever, and that opposition to them had been inseparably linked to ruinous economic and political doctrines. Instead of advancing, Mugwumpery had gone backward; its case was worse than when it began. All its hopes had been dashed. New issues had risen, and the Mugwump's occupation was gone. He had never been a considerable factor in the political situation, but he had thought himself of some importance, and now to be compelled to acknowledge even to himself that he was impotent and without possible consequence was a bitter trial for him.

The Mugwump gloom, moreover, was increased by the collapse of the Choate movement. The hope of destroying Platt at the close of the late campaign had served to sustain the Mugwump heart during that period of awful self-repression and self-effacement. The plans for accomplishing the destruction had been laid long before, and included an alliance between the Mugwumps, the Milholland Republican faction, and Parkhurst. Platt was to be overthrown by suddenly precipitating the candidacy of Choate for Senator at an opportune moment. Public opinion was to rise up in indignation against the Boss; the Legislature was to be terrified by the uproar; Platt was to be cast down and Choate lifted up. Everybody knows the actual and inevitable result; but what furnished only amusement for the rest of the public was gall and bitterness to the Mugwumps. They were terribly bruised.

Now all hope has departed from them, and they are hopeless also concerning a political future from which they have thus been debarred from taking any part. Because Mugwumpery is down in the dust the whole political fabric seems to theta to be tottering. The wish, too, is father to the thought. Such influence as they may have, it may be assumed, will hereafter be expended in an effort to bring about the catastrophe they are predicting. I see evidences of such a concerted purpose in their papers and in their conversation. They are seeking to provoke discontent and to interject angry disputes fatal to political security and to business prosperity. They are trying to destroy public confidence in all public men and measures, and to spread abroad through the community the pessimistic or bear spirit which is in their own sore hearts. To the extent of their power they will plot treason; for it is always with them, Rule or Ruin.

Of course all this spiteful energy will be wasted. Instead of the outlook for the republic being dark, it is nothing except brilliant promise ahead of us, unless it be the prospect of the affliction of hearing ceaseless repining from the Mugwumps because the evil they prophesied and tried to bring to pass has not come upon the country they would betray to ruin.

NEW YORK, Jan. 22. MANHATTAN.

THE RIGHT TO FIGHT.

Questions That Cannot Properly Be Submitted to Arbitration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The supersentimentalists are too much elated over the arbitration treaty. Of course, until the actual text is carefully studied no just and final opinion can be formed about it. But there is a fundamental vice in the notion of "arbitration" which should not be overlooked in studying this treaty. When two men differ upon a question of private wrong, and cannot settle by personal discussion or friendly mediation, they usually resort to courts clothed with ample power to decide and to enforce the decision. Sometimes, by agreement, the matter is left to arbitrators, but their judgment rarely satisfies. For it is nearly always based upon compromise and lacks the authority and finality of a court's decree.

As it is between two men, so it may be between two nations. Certain cases of minor importance may be submitted to arbitration; but no grave question involving honor, integrity, or principle should be submitted to the judgment of another. The individual or the national conscience must judge for itself every such question—then face the result.

What is the worth to man or nation of the power to enforce a right if he, or it, cede the authority to pass upon that right to any other body? It would be surrendering the *ultima ratio regum*, that final arbiter, the sword, and would be equivalent to saying, "I will not fight." It would end all true virility!

All of life is a constant battle—against sin and wrong and for right and health. And the man or nation who gives up the right to fight surrenders that splendid masculinity which alone can give real greatness to persons or peoples. It would put our great country down to the level of a ten-mile principality if we should submit a difference with it to arbiters. The weak ones are also apt to be the most cunning; will be swift to quarrel with the strong when assured that the strong will not thrash them; that the utmost to be feared will be the award of arbitrators.

We are strong; we intend no bullying, will submit to none; we need no arbitrators to settle any dispute that may arise, and we will not surrender the vital right of being able (if we deem it right) to resort to the supreme arbitrament of the sword.

Sweet and greatly to be desired is peace, but it may become so nauseous with dishonor that every virile heart in the land would cry for grim-visaged war to burn away the disgrace. For a state of war is by no means the worst state. Luxury, effeminacy, vice, cowardice, means more to write patents of ruin than war.

Let us ever be ready to peaceably settle everything not involving a just point of honor or right, but God forbid that either our men or our nation should let others decide those prime questions for us, or should for a moment dream of surrendering our right to fight.

MANLINESS.

MR. CLEVELAND'S RETIREMENT.

A Nahuatl Prophecy About the New Chair to Be Established at Princeton.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* On pages 80-81 of "Ancient Nahuatl Poems" (Brinton), is so remarkable a prophecy, remarkable, not only in its partial fulfilment in the past, but also in its imminent consummation in the future, that I must ask you to spare space for its insertion. Should you do so, its publication can only result in an enormous increase in the number of students of autochthonous literature. I only give part of the Nahuatl, because your readers will be able to recall the rest, and because the Chair at the university alluded to in the text has not yet been filled, and, as it is evident from the text that poetry is the specialty referred to, it would, in a measure, be forcing the hand of the faculty. The poem opens:

XIII. Xopancuicatl neconotzalcuicatl ipampa in aquique ame on mixtilia in yaoc.

Nictsotzonan nohuahuauh niculcatlamatiqueti, &c., &c.

A Spring Song, A Song of Exhortation, Because Certain Ones Did Not Go to the War—I strike on my drum, I, the skilful singer, that I may arouse, that I may fire our friends who think of nothing [an evident ellipsis, "but themselves"], to whose minds plunged in sleep the dawn has not yet appeared, &c., &c.

The second verse is exhortatory like the first. The third begins:

3. There the tigers roar, there the various dear children are cut to pieces; there the youths are split into shards and ground into fragments.

It might seem at the first glance, as if the bard had the intent to take part in this mimic war; perhaps as might be supposed, as center rush, but a more careful examination will show that he reserves to himself the "flowers of song;" as is distinctly stated in the fifth verse. As an addition to the literature on the subject as to what the new Chair might lecture on, and more than that, might be ready to lecture us on, I consider this verse as important.

PRINCETON, Jan. 18. A STUDENT.

MISSIONARY ZEAL AND THE RELIEF FUNDS IN TURKEY.

An American Armenian Charges Our Missionaries with Abuse of Trust.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* According to advices from Constantinople, complaints have been received in the Armenian Patriarchate from various parts of Turkey and Armenia regarding the methods of the American missionaries in distributing the relief funds sent to them from America to succor the distressed Armenian victims of the massacres. It is stated that the missionaries are taking advantage of the distress of the Armenian Christians to constrain them, through the relief work, to become converts to Protestantism. The funds are disposed of inequitably, and discrimination is made between their own converts, the Protestants, and those belonging to the ancient Apostolic Church of Armenia. Thus, those who are desirous of receiving their share of the benefit of the relief fund sent from America are constrained to become Protestants, or at least to pretend to be so, in order to meet with the approval of the missionaries.

This is a serious charge against the missionaries, yet those who have known them closely and are familiar with their methods cannot be surprised. It is very much like these missionaries. They did the same thing on another occasion years ago, during the famine in 1878. But we cannot help being indignant when they resort to such methods at a time when Armenians have been made the victims not of a natural misfortune but of religious persecution for the sake of Jesus Christ.

I am glad to learn that Patriarch Ormanian, the ecclesiastical and civil head of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, has paid prompt attention to the complaints, and has decided to resume the relief work which had been so effectually carried on by ex-Patriarch Izmirlian, and was suddenly stopped on his abrupt downfall last August. Patriarch Izmerlian collected and distributed more than $100,000 without any unnecessary sweeping or fussy display. It is hoped that Patriarch Ormanian will do the same thing with as much success.

It is a shame that the missionaries have taken advantage of such a national calamity to increase the roll of their converts. In their anxiety and excessive zeal for extending their influence over a larger portion of the Armenian people they are making themselves more odious in the sight of Armenians than ever before. My father last week received an appeal from the Parish Council of Everek, where the latest of the numerous massacres occurred on Oct. 30 last, signed by the chief priest and notables of the town, urging him to "intercede with the humane American people" in their behalf to succor the unfortunate victims of the massacre and incendiary in their distressing plight by sending help through direct channels. The fact that they have not directly applied to the missionaries on the spot, who have relief funds at their disposal, speaks volumes.

The Armenians are a deeply religious people, strongly attached to their ancient Christian Church, for whose sake thousands have preferred to give their lives when presented with the alternative of Islam or death. Their conscience and religious feelings are so tender that many of them would rather starve than receive the help of the missionaries in the manner that it is being offered.

The missionaries have no right to use the relief funds for the furtherance of their mission work. Those funds have been raised from the donations of humane Americans who have compassion for the martyred Armenians and have given their money on purely humane feelings. The money is intrusted to the missionaries to be distributed to the distressed Armenian victims without discrimination of creed. The missionaries have no right to use the funds according to their own pleasure and interest. I have learned of a case where a sum of 100 Turkish pounds, or $432, has been given to one man out of the relief fund, and this man's family had not sustained any bodily injury; their house had merely been pillaged in the absence of the family. But he was a Protestant pastor laboring with the missionaries, and an exceptional favor was made to him, although he continued to receive his good salary from the Mission Board as pastor and was not in urgent need compared with others.

Thus, a Protestant pastor would receive more than 400 Armenians of the National Church put together. Is not this partiality intended to tempt the Armenians to be converted to meet with the favor of the missionaries? The manner in which the missionaries are disposing of the relief funds gives the Armenians the impression that it is the money of the mission.

I am glad to state that Patriarch Ormanian has appointed a Relief Committee in the Armenian Patriarchate in Constantinople to collect and distribute funds to the distressed Armenians without discrimination of creed. All those who desire to extend to the Armenians a real help without any machinations and jugglery should intrust their donations to this committee of the Patriarchate. Every dollar sent to this committee would reach its direct destination without a large percentage of it being deducted for "general expenses," "salaries of officers," fancy circulars, and a lot of that sort of thing. The Rev. Maghachia V. Derounian, the rector of the Armenian church in Worcester, Mass., is the sole representative of the Patriarch in this country. All funds sent to him for this purpose would be transmitted faithfully to the Relief Committee of the Armenian Patriarchate in Constantinople. His address is the Rev. Maghachia V. Derounian, Armenian church, Laurel street, Worcester, Mass.

I have no doubt that this will interest a large number of your readers and you will be kind enough to put it in THE SUN. Had I not strongly felt it to be my duty to present this matter to the public I would not claim your valuable space for this long letter. This is a matter of justice to the wronged, and I believe it would interest you.

ARMAYIS P. VARTOOGUIAN.
NEW YORK, Jan 17.

PREJUDICE AGAINST CREMATION.

The Rev. Dr. Hughes Discusses How It Can Be Removed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Although cremation has been revived among us for the last twenty years or more, it does not appear that there is any widespread movement in favor of the burning of the dead. This is all the more notable when we remember that a very large number of Christian ministers have pronounced in its favor. Bishop Potter of New York sympathizes with those who are seeking to introduce it and so do many of his clergy. Dr. Rainsford is quoted as heartily favoring this method of the disposal of the dead. Dr. Ward, the editor of the *Independent*, is not aware of any argument against cremation that deserves consideration, while Dr. Edward Everett Hale of Boston is well known as a strong advocate of its introduction. And yet of the total number of those who died during the past year, scarcely 750 persons were cremated. In the face of the strong testimony of physicians in favor of incineration it is remarkable that such a condition of things should exist, especially as the rapid growth of the cemeteries of our great cities is becoming somewhat alarming. The injury inflicted by great burial places on the neighborhood where they are located has been clearly demonstrated, and the critic has only to visit the town of Newtown, Long Island, in which township there are not fewer than twenty-two cemeteries, to realize how alarming the true condition of things is.

From a careful study of the subject I am convinced that the opposition to cremation arises from the Christian sentiment of the masses, and the want of care taken by crematory companies to conciliate this Christian sentiment. This conviction has been intensified by a recent visit to the crematory at Fresh Pond, Long Island, in which the urns containing the ashes of the dead are arranged around a large room, very much like bottles in a drug store. Then, again, there is a conviction among people generally that cremation is more or less associated with rationalistic thought and unbelief, and very little has been done to remove or to modify such convictions. There is no question that in the early days of Christianity the burial of the dead among Christian people was universal, and that the early Christians had a deep-rooted prejudice against the burning of dead bodies. But it is also observable that the early method of disposing of the dead bodies of Christians was in no sense in harmony with our modern religious feelings on the subject. The dead were not placed in the ground, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, and dust to dust," according to our improved system of "earth to earth burial." They were embalmed and preserved in niches and vaults. In fact, there is nothing more revolting and heathenish than the manner of disposing of the dead among Christian peoples in past ages. That it should have been so is a condition of things not very easily accounted for.

Unfortunately, the committees of cremation companies do not seem to be in as full sympathy with Christian thought on this subject as one would wish. The ordinary method of handling of the urns containing the ashes of the cremated dead are not in harmony with Christian thought. To carry out the Christian idea, the ashes should always be interred in the earth, and if the crematories had shady groves attached to them where the ashes could be so disposed of they would be less likely to excite Christian opposition. It is not necessary to regard the act of cremation as in any sense a religious ceremony. The burial service should be held in church, the body should be taken to the crematory for incineration, the ashes should then be collected and placed in a receptacle (not unlike those used by the heathen), and conveyed to God's Acre, and there placed in the ground with a Christian service, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," in hope of a joyful resurrection "when the earth and the sea shall give up their dead."

Such a disposal of the dead would also admit of a revival of the burial crypt in our churches. As matters now stand the time is not far distant when burials will cease to take place not only in St. Paul's and in Westminster Abbey, but in the churchyards of this country, for physicians are fully satisfied that the present sepulchre of the dead is attended with inestimable evils. Contamination of well water has been traced directly to cemeteries situated more than half a mile distant, and decomposing human remains pollute not only the earth, but the air, around large cemeteries.

Perfectly suggests that in all cases the body should be cremated in the casket or coffin, and special shells or coffins should be made for this purpose. About seven years ago I took part in the cremation of the mother of a family. A religious ceremony had been held at the house and the family had taken an affectionate leave of the mother as she lay peacefully in the casket. But when she reached the crematory the body was taken out of the casket. This seemed to me to violate all sense of propriety, especially after a peaceful Christian service. Upon inquiry I find that it is not absolutely necessary to remove the body from the coffin, and it will do something toward making the incineration of the dead more popular than it now is if the body remains undisturbed until it is placed in the furnace for cremation.

A very popular argument in favor of cremation is the dread which many people have of being buried alive. I wish I could say that my long experience in connection with such matters proves the fallacy of such fears, but it does not. There are many well-authenticated cases of premature burial which are truly horrifying. One is that of the late Miss Alice Woodward at Eldon, Ia., in 1891; another, that of a young woman named Mosley in West Middlesex, Pa., on April 27, 1881. But I have three well-authenticated cases in connection with my own experience. One is that of a young lady in Sunderland, who was found to be alive in her coffin just on the eve of interment; another, that of the father of Col. Fitzgerald of the Rifles, in the West Indies, who came to life just as the coffin was being screwed down; and the third, that of a soldier of the Black Watch in the British army, who was found to be alive just as his body was about to be lowered into the grave, in the camp at Chumkanni, near Peshawar, in 1867.

Cremation would, of course, insure death before burial, and the opportunity which friends would have of viewing the body just before the act of cremation would be satisfactory on this score. It is probable that more people feel inclined toward cremation from this fear of being buried alive than from any other reason.

NEW YORK, Jan. 21. THOMAS P. HUGHES.

TWO FLAGS OF FREEDOM.

The Memory of Washington and the Struggling Cubans.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Next month we shall celebrate the birthday of the great father of American freedom. No tribute of honor and gratitude to Washington will be too great for us to pay. No expressions of joy for the priceless boon of national liberty which he helped to bestow will be extravagant. The lapse of time does not dull our appreciation of his glorious services. The sight of oppression elsewhere makes our own liberty the more dear. As we look back over the 120 years of American freedom our hearts go out yearningly to the patriots who are struggling to throw off the yoke of the tyrant in Cuba. As we tell our children the story of Washington and the war for American independence, let us tell them also of the brave Cubans who are fighting to free themselves from a far worse oppression than that which our forefathers suffered. As we greedily celebrate our own deliverance in doing honor to the immortal Washington, let us give our earnest sympathy and put out a helping hand to the Cubans who are following the example we set them. Moreover, let us do this in a way which cannot be suppressed by the un-American Government that now misrepresents us at Washington.

On Feb. 22 millions of American flags will be proudly displayed in honor of Washington and American freedom. I move you, Mr. Editor, that, on this day, when we give ourselves up to rejoicing in the fruits of our own country, we all that it means to us, and the memory of him who carried that flag to victory—I move you that we display everywhere with it the flag of the republic of Cuba. This flag and ours are both red, white, and blue. What an additional bond of sympathy and fellowship! Let every patriotic American procure, in addition to his own precious Star-Spangled Banner, the banner of the Cuban patriots, and then display it below the protecting folds of Old Glory on Washington's Birthday.

Three cheers for the red, white, and blue of free America!

Three cheers for the red, white, and blue of free Cuba!

Let us make Feb. 22 a national flag day for them both. EUGENE TWINING.
MT. VERNON, N. Y., Jan. 21.

THE ARGENTINE TREATY.

The Queer Effort of the Administration for the Delivery of a Country's "Own Citizens."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The contention on the part of the Executive relative to the insertion of a clause in the extradition treaties now pending between this country, the Argentine Republic, and the Orange Free State, "that each of the contracting parties shall deliver up their own citizens or subjects in virtue of the stipulations," is certainly not requested by the Argentine Government. Argentina, during the year 1895, endeavored under the terms of its extradition treaty with France, to obtain the custody of the man Trembler, charged with the murder of one Farbos, in Buenos Ayres. The French Government denied the request, for the reason that Trembler, a French citizen, was on French territory; was alleged to have murdered Farbos, another Frenchman, and it was therefore considered that although the crime took place in Buenos Ayres, extradition could not be granted. The Argentina legal authorities objected to this decision, pleading that the crime was committed in Buenos Ayres, where the witnesses needed were resident, and that the ends of justice would be met if Trembler was returned under the provisions of the treaty to the Argentine.

The French Government, however, again refused the request, and the witnesses and medical experts went to France at the expense of the French Government.

Here, therefore, is plain proof that no ground exists for the contention of Mr. Olney, and it is unlikely that any such request could have emanated from either the United States Minister at Buenos Ayres or the Argentine Foreign Office when the treaty was negotiated. M.

A CARD FROM HERR AHLWARDT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* THE SUN on the 16th of this month printed an article about some private affairs of mine. With the exception of the sending of a certain sum of money to my wife, which statement was correct, my affairs were entirely misrepresented.

The same misleading reports were printed by other papers, especially by the *Morgen Journal*, the day previous to the publication in THE SUN, and as it is my firm conviction that the *Morgen Journal* printed that report with malevolent intentions, I shall most certainly take legal proceedings against that paper to protect myself in future against such insults, a lawyer of this city having kindly agreed to take my case in his hands.

THE SUN, on the other side, I expect justice, and hope that you will grant me space in your esteemed paper, and permit these lines to appear.

I came to the United States with the intention of calling the citizens' attention to the danger which threatens the whole world through the increasing overspreading of the Jews, and for this purpose I founded two weekly papers, the *Gentile News* and *Der Anti-Semit*, both printed at 89 Christopher street, in this city.

It was necessary for me to remain here until I had created a firm ground for the papers to stand upon, in which I have succeeded to my entire satisfaction. I am living in the most happy family circumstances, quite contrary to what the papers report, and most fortunately for myself.

When, years ago, the Jewish banker, Mr. Partser, as was confirmed in a public court, tried to induce me to cease my agitation in return for 360,000 marks, I thoroughly went over this matter with my family, and the result was that my wife agreed fully with me that we should rather undergo the severest privations than that I should become a traitor to our just and good cause.

Although I have not been on a bed of roses during my stay in this country I have made it possible to forward to my family sufficient money for their support. This money was sent on Oct. 27 and Dec. 22 last year, through the Western Union Telegraph Company, and, as I am able to prove by a letter from my wife, both remittances have been delivered to her, the one through a London, the other through a Leipsig bank.

There is no wealth or other advantage for me personally connected with my mission and the battle I am fighting in the interest of the whole human race; and this fact leaves me quite indifferent whether the combined Jewish press of the whole world does its best to lower me and my mission in the eyes of its readers; but one thing I will not stand—that is, their impudent attempt to interfere with my family ties, for which they will not go unpunished.

The proprietor of the *Morgen Journal* is not a Jew, but the paper is written almost wholly by Jews and in the interest of the Jews, and if this gentleman should be of the opinion that the staff of Jews who came to him together with the *Morgen Journal* have been he bought the paper is composed of Germans who have the power to influence the Germans of this city in their political views, he will soon be taught better by the lawsuit I intend to bring against him. I am, sir, HERMANN AHLWARDT,
Member of the German Reichstag.
89 CHRISTOPHER STREET, city, Jan. 22, 1897.

A PATRIOTIC NEGRO.

The First Blood That Flowed for American Independence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am only naturally sensitive in noticing a present disposition to consign the colored American to oblivion, to dampen his lawful aspirations. I have reasons for judging the motive to be to curry favor with those with whom there has been a war. As I have conscientiously struggled to win justice for my race, to beget for it as it shall merit respect and consideration, I would have nothing I have presented gainsaid, unless the gainsaying may be substantiated. I have made the statement that the first blood that flowed for American independence was that of a negro. Will you be more explicit as to what will be regarded a counter statement given in your issue of yesterday? Will you give us names, dates, and other corroborative facts? My statement, taken from the Massachusetts Historical Society, is as follows:

"The Boston massacre, March 5, 1770, may be regarded as the first act in the drama in the American Revolution. 'From that moment,' said Daniel Webster, 'we may date the severance of the British empire.' The presence of the British soldiers in King street excited the patriotic indignation of the people. * * * It was not for the wise and prudent to be the first to act against the encroachments of arbitrary power.' A motley rabble of saucy boys, negroes, and mulattoes, Irish leaders and outlandish Jack tars,' as John Adams described them in his plea in defence of the soldiers, could not restrain their emotion. * * * Led by Crispus Attucks, the mulatto slave, and shouting, 'The way to get rid of these soldiers is to attack the main guard! Strike at the root!' This is the best, if not the mere valor than discretion they rushed to King street and were fired upon by Capt. Preston's company. Crispus Attucks was the first to fall. He and Samuel Gray and James Caldwell were killed on the spot and Samuel Maverick and Patrick Carr were mortally wounded."

The anniversary of this saint was publicly commemorated in Boston by an oration and other exercises every year until after our national independence was achieved, when the 4th of July was substituted for the 5th of March as the more proper day for a general celebration. Boston, to her credit, has erected on her Common a monument in verification of the fact to which I invite attention.

GEORGE T. DOWNING.
NEWPORT, R. I., Jan. 19.

VARIOUS THEMES.

The Propositions from Canada.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The propositions made by Messrs. Farrer and Charlton, the Canadian Commissioners, make it plain that the Canadian Government is not prepared to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States admitting the free exchange of a line of manufactured articles which discriminates against Great Britain.

If we admit Canadian cotton manufactures, for example, into this market free of duty and English goods of the same class are admitted free into Canada, what will prevent their free admission into the United States. Such a treaty as Messrs. Farrer and Charlton propose will open a wide door for fraud on our revenue.

Messrs. Farrer and Charlton also propose that Canada should unite with the United States and build a ship canal from Lake Erie to tide water at Montreal. This means simply the enlargement of the Canadian canals at the joint cost of Canada and the United States. Such canals will simply divert American trade from Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston to Montreal. And in the event of war between the United States and Great Britain British ships of war would pass into Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. The proposition is too absurd for serious consideration.

We are now maintaining a trans-continental railway through Canada by allowing it to prey upon American traffic. Why should we go further and aid in constructing a ship canal from the lakes to the Atlantic seaboard so long as Great Britain controls the mouth of the St. Lawrence River? GRANGER.
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 16.

Ethnology of America.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Why cannot the Anglo-maniacs allow the Anglo-Saxons to rest quietly in their graves? It is now more than one thousand years since the last Anglo-Saxon went the way of all flesh. To this day no greater insult can be offered to an Englishman of good family than to tell him that there is Saxon blood in his veins; to say so would be equivalent to telling an American of good family that there is the blood of Malay pirates in his veins.

The best thing that can be said of the persons who are prating about a union between the Anglo-Saxon countries, England and America, is that they are ignorant of the fact that nearly all the great men of Great Britain and the United States are of ancient British or Celtic-Roman or Norman descent. The ablest men and women who composed the bulk of the Puritans who settled at Salem and Boston came from Lincolnshire, where a majority of the inhabitants were descendants of Romans and ancient Britons. When Prof. E. A. Freeman was in New England he met several distinguished men of affairs descended from Puritans, whom he pronounced fine specimens of men, of undoubted descent from Romans settled in England. In the opinion of competent specialists familiar with racial traits shown in individuals the Hon. Thomas B. Reed is a fine specimen of the type of sixteenth century English-man of Warwickshire, who were in the main descended from Romans and Celts.

Painters and sculptors in Boston and New York find it easy to procure sittings of native Americans of prominence in the affairs of the nation when they paint pictures of Roman scenes or make busts representing Roman statesmen and warriors. One of the great pictures by an American artist which sold abroad last year was entitled "Cicero Denouncing Catiline." Art critics pronounced the heads of Cicero and Catiline the finest types of ancient Romans painted by a modern artist. The artist's intimate friends know that he found the faces, figures, and action of Cicero and Catiline in a club house in Boston, where a prominent lawyer who is a Republican and a college professor who is a Mugwump fell afout of each other concerning the Wilson bill. Both are descendants of old Roman stock from Lincolnshire. The population of England is so mixed that it is hard to tell descent, but the Anglo-Saxon strain would not amount to 3 per cent. In our country the people of Celtic or Teutonic stock are in the majority. Herr Tamsen and his brother jailers are the nearest things to Anglo-Saxons in our country.

BOSTON, Jan. 22. G. WILFRED PEARCE.

The Decadence of the Cincinnati.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As well as doing good, our patriotic-hereditary societies have yet done harm.

To be sure they have been of large benefit to the tinsel and ribbon trades, and have, by their squabbles, added to the gayety of nations. But they have well nigh ruined the grand old order founded by Washington—the Society of the Cincinnati. As instituted by Washington, this society was to be composed only of field officers who had risen above the rank of Captain, and who had actually served for at least three years in the field, and who, otherwise, for character and worth, were entitled to the perpetual admiration of posterity, and of their lineal male descendants in each generation (that is, the son of a son, always).

But the ancient order, to compete with the modern patriotic societies, is now composed of many State chapters, whose credentials for membership vary. Some of these chapters, for example, allow any male descendant (as the son of a daughter) to become a member. Others admit "honorary" members, *i. e.*, any acceptable or desirable person (as, *e. g.*, the Governor of a State, the President of the United States, the General-in-Chief of the Army, &c.). Only, &c., claim that any Revolutionary officer of a lesser grade than a Captain would have been eligible if he had applied for membership, and that, therefore, Washington and his co-founders were in error in not admitting them, or unfortunate in not having had an opportunity to admit them. This is, perhaps, the most ridiculous claim of all, since it is impossible to know whether these officers ever applied or not. But nevertheless, upon the strength of this claim, many State chapters admit the descendants of officers who, had they applied at the close of the Revolution, would (so far as known to the contrary) have been eligible to membership. Of course eligibility to original membership did not entitle *ipso facto*. The questions of character or of conduct, of morals, reputation, &c., then as now, would have had their effect. And again, other States ignore the original requirement of three years' field service (which was inserted in order to insure that the member had done faithful service and endured the hardships and discouragements of the struggle), or that, by his superior (not regimental) officers, he had been promoted for gallant deeds. To be a member of the Society of the Cincinnati today, therefore, means (or, at least, may mean) nothing at all. And I think I am right in charging this unhappy decadence of an illustrious order to the contagious disease—for so it appears to be—of founding hereditary societies which has attacked this people within the last ten years or so. JOSIAH AVERY, JR.

No Tunnels for City Traffic.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am a resident of Chicago, but come frequently to the metropolis, and am always interested in the matters of public improvement here, and especially such as relate to better transit facilities. In Chicago, as you perhaps know, we have an extensive system of elevated roads, propelled wholly by electricity, giving peerless service—free from smoke, dust, and noise, and withal, rapid; and of economical maintenance. Reading in THE SUN of a proposed tunnel at Union square, I thought that a line or two from one who knows whereof he speaks, might be acceptable.

The north and the west side cable systems in Chicago use tunnels in passing under the Chicago river, for it is by this means only that they can get uninterruptedly into the business section of the city. These tunnels have been in use for years, and it is safe to say that a passenger never goes up or down the steep grade of these tunnels but what he fears for his life. Accidents are almost an every day incident. Physicians will tell you that the nervousness generated by the fright inseparable from the passage through these tunnels is something appalling, especially to the delicate female organization. Notwithstanding the appliances used for the safety of the cars while descending or ascending the grade, the cars are frequently lost to the control of the motorman, and, shooting out of the tunnel, either to become a wreck at the bottom, or to crash into other cars that impede the passage.

Apart from the dangers that surround the passengers are the equally hazardous entrances and exits of the tunnels to the pedestrians. Imagine cars emerging suddenly from a hole in the ground into a street crowded with people, and you get an idea of what a tunnel means in the business section of the city. It is confusion worse confounded. Thousands of passersby have been maimed for life by being struck by these cars as they have come from the tunnels. The danger attendant upon these dead man's curves are not "a circumstance" to what they would be were these cars to go up and down a grade at this point. Your traction company is seeking this privilege, and would much more likely stand no bar the way to real rapid transit on Broadway underground, when the necessities of your increasing population impel it? This traction company can send cars around all curves in New York city easily without reducing speed at other points, unless the law of mechanics is different here from what it is in Chicago. We have no trouble there with curves—in fact, the cars go slower while swinging around the corners than on a straight road. The "trouble" in Chicago is with the tunnels; and the City Fathers of New York would commit an unpardonable blunder to sanction a scheme of this sort, and it is strange, indeed, that the suggestion has a single honest supporter. Make the rounding of curves at a rapid pace a penal offence, and your traction officers, by consulting our Chicago engineers, can solve your problem in the twinkling of an eye.

WORLD'S FAIR.

Books for Sing Sing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is indeed a very praiseworthy object of Evangelist Moody and the good "Sing Sing Angel," Mrs. Booth, to propose to raise a $1,000 fund to add more books to the Sing Sing library. There are now 2,000 or more volumes in the Sing Sing library, but nine-tenths of the books are novels and religious works. Of the 2,000 or more books now in the Sing Sing library but very few are of any value or interest to prisoners—perhaps a couple of hundred volumes of standard historical works—all the rest, to use an expressive slang phrase, are "nit." The chaplain of Sing Sing, a very narrow-minded prejudiced and bigoted person, has full charge of and the selecting of all books permitted in the prison, and any book reflecting against the rich and powerful, or the plutocracy, or books advocating political and social reforms, works by many of the world's greatest thinkers and reformers, just such works as an intelligent prisoner would be interested in, are not allowed in the prison. Even such a work as "The American Pilgrim's Progress," by Joshua Howard, of Oklahoma, and published by an old and reputable New York publishing house, and other similar works, are excluded.

ONE WHO KNOWS.

Bachelor Marriages.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Apropos of the discussion as to bachelors marrying, I firmly believe that every man having arrived at years of discretion should cast his weather eye around for a suitable mate; a woman near enough to his own age to be companionable, old enough to be sensible, young enough to be attractive, bright enough to be entertaining, and pretty enough to be pleasing to the eye at all times. With such a woman of congenial tastes the average man would find married life a paradise, compared to the empty, aimless, desultory life the bachelor ordinarily leads. With a home of his own, to which to come, a loving wife to greet him, children to call him father, any man worthy of the name will find his only true and satisfying happiness therein, and every man in his heart of hearts instinctively feels and knows this, though there may be a reason for his single blessedness. Let every man who can, marry. This advice from a bachelor, reluctantly so through force of circumstances: financial ones.

A. E. W.

Stradivarius Fiddles and Labels.

TO TH