The Sun.

WILLIAM M. LAFFAN.

MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses (which may be changed when necessary) for 70 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

The Wasted Opportunities of Grover C.

It was a little more than nine years ago that Mr. GROVER CLEVELAND, then President of the United States, fixed his attention upon certain doings in and about Chicago. There was a strike of railroad men in progress, in support of a boycott that had been declared against the Pullman Company at the instance of some of its dissatisfied carpenters, and a condition of lawlessness prevailed. Railroad property was being burned, violence and outrage were rife, all State and local authority was set at naught or defied and mob-rule was in full sway.

The railroads whose property was being destroyed, whose business was paralyzed and whose appeals for protection fell upon the dull ears of a vicious and impotent authority, were several in number. They were at the mercy of a mob whose worst passions were unchained and which was led and dominated by modern statesmen and recognized leaders of the voting masses like DEBS and SOVEREIGN. These two were as valiant and as patriotic as any of their kind that the nineteenth century produced, but they lacked due appreciation of their opportunities and their own inherent powers. They lacked the twentieth century method, just as, we fear, the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND, frowning at them from the National Capital, lacked the twentieth century sensitiveness to his own political welfare.

What DEBS and SOVEREIGN would have done in the light of these more sophisticated times, would have been to delegate the conduct of the rioting and murdering and burning to their lieutenants and go themselves to Washington and demand audience at the White House. It is not difficult to imagine the manner of their reception by a twentieth century Mr. CLEVELAND, keenly alive to their political possibilities and animated by a subtle appreciation of their relation to the vote of organized labor. We can see the horny hand of toil crushed in a grasp as good again, and the incisor-canine-tricuspid-and-molar disclosure of honest sympathy, the outward and visible sign of a heart ever ready to bleed for toil—when organized. Then the pressure of the bell, the appearance of the faithful CORTELYOU, and the swift despatch of telegraphic summonses to the guilty myrmidons of capital to appear and plead at the improvised bar.

How easy now to follow, from their ordinary vocations to Washington, the downcast, stunned and humiliated R. R. CABLE, C. E. PERKINS, T. B. BLACKSTONE, JOHN KING, M. J. CARPENTER, M. D. WOODFORD, O. D. ASHLEY, A. B. STICKNEY, STUYVESANT FISH, JOHN NEWELL and S. H. H. CLARK. Every detail of their arraignment is familiar. The thunder of the angry President's awful voice as he confronts them with their own ignominy as employers of labor and hurls into their awakened consciences the depravity of their ambition to control their own property and enjoy the privileges and liberties guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. It is almost possible to see his heavy and menacing hand shaken under STICKNEY'S nose as the question reverberates through the dramatically arranged bedchamber: "What would you say, sir, if I should take my soldiers out to Cook county and seize your roads and operate them myself in the interests of the third party to this outrage, the public? What would you say to that, sir?" And the almost inaudible reply of the unfortunate STICKNEY: "Well, Mr. President, if the Democratic party is willing to assume that responsibility, the sooner you take and operate our roads the better!" Then the creation of a tribunal to try the unhappy prototypes of plutocracy, to ignore the anarchy, bedlam, riot and murder, and to find the plaintiff guilty and award him heavy damages!

What an opportunity Mr. CLEVELAND threw away! Think of the applause of the whole American public, suffering for lack of railroads to ride on, and rising in an irrepressible clamor of approbation of the man who had squelched the Constitution, "recognized" riot and outlawry, and rebuked the pretensions of property to statutory rights! Think of the overwhelming banking up of ballots for another term in the White House; the self-intrenchment in the affections of the emotional and ever grateful masses of the American people!

How primitive, coarse and unremunerative in comparison was the method of Mr. CLEVELAND. The strong hand of the Federal authority, the hand of the Constitution and the Law, reached out to Chicago, and the rioters dropped their torches, the patriots, who ought to have been in Washington, went to jail, the courts exercised their functions, and peace, order and individual liberty were restored. How commonplace; but, formerly, how American!

Had Mr. CLEVELAND known better he might have been President for life, and BRYAN would never have survived the obstetrics of the Chicago Convention.

Turkish Afterthoughts.

Suppose the error in the cipher despatch from Consul RAVNDAL at Beirut to Minister LEISHMAN at his summer quarters at Therapia had not occurred.

Suppose the first intelligence received at Oyster Bay concerning the attempt to shoot Vice-Consul MAGELSSEN had been accurate; namely, to the effect that MAGELSSEN had been fired upon by a person unknown, but had escaped injury.

Under those circumstances, would it have been a sensible or a ridiculous proceeding on the part of the Commander-in-Chief at Oyster Bay to order offhand a naval demonstration at Beirut? Would United States warships now be speeding to the Syrian coast without waiting for Washington to ascertain whether political complications, religious fanaticism or some purely personal hatred or supposed grievance prompted the fortunately harmless assault upon MAGELSSEN?

Yet the attempt is now made to justify the hasty despatch of the warships on the theory that the United States Government has been insulted at Beirut, anyway. This afterthought is alleged in a despatch from Oyster Bay to the *Tribune*:

"In the eyes of the Administration, the circumstance of Mr. MAGELSSEN having been reported to have escaped bodily harm in no wise affects the fact that an attempt has been made on the life of a United States Vice-Consul. The attempt is regarded as in itself a serious affront to the Government which Mr. MAGELSSEN represents."

Let us suppose once more. Suppose this time that it should turn out to be true, as was reported in a Constantinople despatch on Saturday, that the motive of the attack on the Vice-Consul was private revenge inspired by jealousy about a woman.

That may not be the case. But it is quite as likely to be the case as that the shot was fired at MAGELSSEN because the Turkish Government, or some of its agents or instruments, desired to affront the United States Government through its representative.

In the case last supposed is there sufficient warrant for "battering down old Beirut about their ears," as the junior Senator for New York, the Hon. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, dispassionately advises? Is there warrant for regarding the incident as it appears to the eyes of the Administration at Oyster Bay; that is, as a serious affront to the Government which Mr. MAGELSSEN represents? Is it an affair for the President of the United States and the warships of the United States Navy, or for a Turkish police court?

The New and the Old Know-Nothingism.

The Know-Nothing movement of the middle of the last century, now revived without the dangerous religious rancor which inflamed it then, was an episode of agitation in our American politics of which this generation seems to be in much ignorance.

The spirit of native Americanism, expressed in distrust of aliens and opposition to them, began to exhibit itself at the very foundation of this republic. The first naturalization act, passed in 1790, fixed the term of residence at two years. In 1795 the term was extended to five years. In 1789 the Federalists, being in power in Congress, extended it to fourteen years at the time of the famous Alien and Sedition laws; but after JEFFERSON'S election in 1800, the period was restored to five years, in 1802. The Constitutional restriction of eligibility for the Presidency to "a natural-born citizen or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution" was an expression of this native American spirit.

The number of aliens coming to the United States during the whole period from 1789 to 1820 is estimated at only 250,000; but it was relatively large in a population of less than four millions in 1790, and about nine and a half millions in 1820. In this last year immigration statistics were first kept officially, but in the five years from 1820 to 1825 the whole number of aliens received was only 38,689. Thereafter, however, immigration began to pick up. In the five years from 1825 to 1830 it aggregated 89,813, from 1830 to 1835 it increased to 230,442, from 1835 to 1840 to 307,939, from 1840 to 1845 to 400,031. That is, in the twenty years from 1825 to 1845, the immigration had amounted to 1,028,225. The consequence was a sharp revival of native American prejudice and alarm. The sentiment first showed itself in New York, where the alien population had reached portentous proportions, in the estimation of citizens of the old stock. A native organization for political purposes was effected, and in 1844 it succeeded in electing JAMES HARPER Mayor on a Native American ticket.

Now began the great immigration due to the Irish famine, and in the five years from 1845 to 1850 there came in about as many aliens as had been received during the whole twenty years before. Native Americanism flamed up hotter than ever, and its political conflagration extended to other cities and States.

The great volume of the Irish immigration was Catholic, and animosity to that Church gave it fire. At Philadelphia two Catholic churches were destroyed in riots between natives and Irish; at Boston a convent was burned. Six Native American Representatives were elected to the Twenty-ninth Congress, that of 1845, four from New York and two from Pennsylvania. Between 1850 and 1855 the immigration amounted to nearly 2,000,000; and the native spirit was aroused even more hotly. Moreover, the anti-slavery agitation, expressing itself in opposition to the extension of slavery to the Territories, was disturbing party allegiance, and special efforts were made to kindle the native American spirit into a hot flame, with an ulterior motive, it was believed, of turning the current of public sentiment into other channels.

In 1852 the Know-Nothing organization, distinctively, made its appearance. It was so called because it was a secret, oath-bound fraternity, regarding whose objects and whose real name its members always answered when questioned: "I don't know." "Americans must rule America!" was its rallying cry and relentless hostility to the increasing power of the Roman Catholic Church and a demand for the extension of the naturalization to twenty-one years were its main purposes.

The Know-Nothings started off brilliantly. In 1854 they carried the State elections in Massachusetts and Delaware, and polled a great number of votes in New York. In 1855 they elected Governors and Legislatures in New York and four New England States, and at the South they were successful or nearly approached success in nine States. In 1856 eight of the thirty-two States had Native American Governors, but in the Presidential election of that year the party cast only about one-fifth of the popular vote and obtained only eight electoral votes, or the votes of the single State of Maryland. In the Thirty-fifth Congress, 1857, it had five Senators and fourteen Representatives. In the next Congress it had two Senators and twenty-three Representatives, all of them from Southern States.

Thereafter Know-Nothingism, native Americanism, went to pieces rapidly and no more of it was heard in our politics. It had no representation in Congress after the Thirty-sixth.

This is a rapid review of the rise and progress of Know-Nothingism in the middle of the last century. Since the civil war the immigration has far passed all previous records. Our population of alien birth has been increased by more than 16,000,000, the flood continues to come in increasing volume, and a new Know-Nothingism begins to appear. It is no longer inspired by religious rancor, but race distrust is a main feature of it. The present immigration, being chiefly from southern and eastern Europe, is contrasted unfavorably with the earlier immigration from the north of Europe; although it was that very Irish and German immigration which provoked the original Know-Nothingism. A cry for the extension of the period of naturalization to twenty-one years is now repeated, but a new demand, for a qualification of literacy for citizenship, has arisen.

This new Know-Nothingism is not likely to have even the temporary success of the old. Next year the political interests of the people will be concentrated in a different direction and both parties will vie with each other in seeking the votes of the foreign-born.

Art and the Day's Work.

Mr. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS of the University of Pennsylvania has been lecturing at the University of Chicago on "Art and the Day's Work." Mr. ADAMS is a Ruskinian. He believes in sugaring the pill, in mixing the sweet with the useful, in gilding political economy with poetry. He says that "the walls of working rooms in factories should be adorned with oil paintings by the masters; the hallways should be lined with statuary, the masterpieces of the great sculptors; and the manufacturing company should provide a band or orchestra to furnish music for its employees while they toil."

Doubtless, manufacturers will welcome this proposal to add art galleries and music halls to their plants. In this golden age, when workmen are so reluctant to strike, and so eager to enable their employers to carry on their contracts, what good reason can there be to refuse to set apart a portion of the profits for the diversion and æsthetic cultivation of the employees? It is well known that such gratuitous efforts on the part of employers are always appreciated by workmen, and never make them grumble or ask why so much money is taken away from the wage fund and wasted on nonsense. Mr. ADAMS wishes to have idyllic workmen work, or rather play, idyllically. And music, painting and sculpture could not but have a softening effect upon the stern and rugged walking delegate. Indeed, the temperament of the employer would be modified and mitigated. Under the influence of an orchestra, might he not forget that he was paying for it, and in the melting mood raise wages of his own accord?

There might be some little difficulty in the way of the sculpture and painting. Much of this sort of work has been done by "scab" labor and would be inadmissible.

"If we are going to solve the labor problem," says Mr. ADAMS, at the very moment of solving it, "we must make labor more interesting. We must give the laborer something to relieve the monotony." The monotony is already relieved by strikes; but they, too, are growing monotonous.

American Shoes in Cuba.

The footwear of the great mass of the Cuban people is either the *alpargata*, a rope-soled, canvas-topped affair imported from Spain, or a *zapato* of local manufacture. Because of their cheapness and the long established habit of wearing them, it is probable that these will continue for many years to be the popular footwear of a large number of the Cuban people. The *zapateros*, or shoemakers, are found in many localities engaged in producing, by hand, the shoes for the local market.

The trade in American-made shoes is, however, showing a gratifying increase, and appears as follows:

CUBAN IMPORT FROM THE UNITED STATES.

	Pairs.	*Value.*
1901	482,132	$467,778
1902	638,053	596,278

But the great bulk of the Cuban importation of shoes remains with Spain, although the American article appears to have made some inroad upon the Spanish commerce, the figures for Spain standing as follows:

IMPORTS FROM SPAIN.

	Pairs.	*Value.*
1901	1,716,525	$1,212,352
1902	1,590,704	1,191,729

The trade of all other countries is quite insignificant, amounting, in its total, to less than $5,000 a year. Cuba is not a "barefoot" country, and one will rarely see an unshod Cuban. The value of the domestic industry cannot be given, but its importance is indicated by the fact of no greater importation than some 2,200,000 pairs, valued at some $1,800,000, for a population of about 1,600,000.

Moneybags.

In the Nebraska Populist Convention the Hon. M. F. HARRINGTON laid down a line of conduct for the most eminent of Nebraska fusionists:

"If the moneybags of the East control the Democratic convention and nominate a man like GORMAN, and Mr. BRYAN does not walk out, I shall regret every vote I ever cast for Mr. BRYAN."

Mr. BRYAN'S aversion to Eastern moneybags needs no stimulation. There are Western moneybags on which he looks with a kinder eye. To-night, for instance, he is going to make a speech in laudation of a great Western "moneybags" and monopolist, the Hon. TOM JOHNSON. Mr. JOHNSON is rich enough to afford political campaigns on his own hook. He is the largest and most conspicuous representative of the money power in politics. He is moneybags denouncing moneybags; and Mr. BRYAN falls on his neck.

Mr. BRYAN has no objection to moneybags, if some of their contents are contributed to his side of the game.

The Populist State Convention in Iowa met at Des Moines on Aug. 23, 1901, and adopted an elaborate platform, declaring that "We the Populists of Iowa, in convention assembled, do hereby give our unqualified indorsement to that first great declaration of principles promulgated by our party, the Omaha platform, and to each subsequent national platform." Upon this platform a complete ticket was nominated, headed by "Old Calamity" WELLER of Chickasaw county for Governor. At the election Old Calamity polled some 800 votes in a total of nearly 400,000.

Such was the achievement of the Populist party in Iowa two years ago. It was certainly not such as to encourage its members in the belief that they were seriously regarded in the Hawkeye State. On Thursday, however, again at Des Moines, "the Populist party of Iowa," undaunted by its defeat of two years ago, convened for the nomination of a State ticket. Delegates to the number of eight assembled, and again nominated, with a unanimity not difficult to obtain in so small a gathering, Old Calamity WELLER for Governor. The convention made up for the dearth of attendance by the adoption of a platform of unusual length and indefiniteness.

"The Sun" in the South.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have been reading, during the past six months, a large number of the best newspapers and periodicals that are printed in the English language, from the London *Times* to the *Chinquapin News*, and I do not hesitate to say that in ability, truthfulness, breadth of view, clearness of conception and an indefinable sagacity and power of expression, THE SUN stands foremost of them all. It is a great moral power in shaping public opinion, rivalling in this respect for America what the "Thunderer" is for England. I rejoice to know there is one newspaper that is fearless in advocating what is right, and is so just and fair to all sections of the country that its utterances may be taken as an index of the best thoughts and opinions of the intelligent classes in the United States, without respect to party affiliations.

I write this note simply because I feel what I say. J. B. KILLEBREW.

NASHVILLE, Tenn., Aug. 28.

Memories of Fried Cake.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The New England "fried cake" a griddle cake? Not on your life! I don't know how it was compounded, but it was richer than a raised doughnut. It was rolled out in a thin sheet of dough on the mixing board and cut into various forms, as rings, figure eights, hand-fingers, &c., and dropped into a shallow kettle of boiling lard, just deep enough to float the material until it browned. I remember some of the rules. Each cake must be turned over once while frying and taken out as quickly as browned; only three must be put in at a time lest they momentarily cool the lard from its fierce sputtering boil and the grease strike in. The aim was to have the surface brown so quickly that it would ward off the lard from penetrating and the inner part would bake instead of fry; then, after dripping while hot, the cakes would not be greasy. A small boy generally stood near waiting for the first ones to cool enough to eat without burning his mouth. They were never so good as when half cooled and still puffed out with the heat. If rightly made they were digestible and most palatable, but if bunglingly made were a source of more nightmare than mince pie. They were a staple, and every "buttery" had a fried cake jar constantly "on tap." Properly fried cakes, they were occasionally called nut-cakes (vulgar).

I remember once a roving Vermonter called at my grandmother's house and was hospitably received. At the table she passed him the fried cakes, of which he eagerly accepted, remarking: "By jiminy, I will take one. I hain't et a grease cake since I lived to hum with mother."

That was the only time I ever heard that name for them, but I have seen them when it would be quite applicable. When as a lad ten years old I first came to New York I was sent to the bakery to buy "whatever looked good."

"Give me a dozen fried cakes," said I to the baker. He did not know what I meant. I pointed to a tray.

"Oh! you want crullers, do you?"

I had never before heard the name cruller.

NEW YORK, Aug. 30. HARK COMSTOCK.

The Carving of the Pie.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In reply to "New Englander," who desires an answer to his question of "Who should carve the pie?" the solution is simple, if one considers the kind of pie that is produced from an experience of six weeks of married life.

I take it his particular pies are "home-made," and consequently an axe is imperative; and who is more fitted for such a job than the husband?

NEW YORK, Aug. 30. 201 WEEKS MARRIED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In answer to "New Englander's" query, "Who should carve the pie?" I would say much depends upon the establishment. If a butler be kept, then that high official should attend to the pastry affair, but where husband and wife are depended upon to serve their own wants and requirements, then "the better half" should distribute the "sweets." Coming from her hands the dessert would be all the more appetizing. Leave the solids to the man—and let the lady of the house serve the dainties.

NEW YORK, Aug. 29. J. ARTHUR J.

Linear Measure.

From the Indianapolis Journal.

A Northern sportsman went alligator hunting in Florida, and, as often happens with the uninitiated, he got lost. It was near night and he was at a loss what to do. Presently he met a man riding a cow.

"Can you tell me how far it is to Miami?"

"Waal, I reckon it's about two whoops," the man answered.

"Two—what?"

The man seemed to take this as challenging his veracity, for he looked questioningly at the palmettoes and prickly pears beside the path, then began to scratch his head.

"P'r'aps hit may be a smitch furder," he admitted, "but I 'low hit ain't moren' two whoops an' a holler."

MR. LITTAUER'S LETTER.

His Friends Justify His Attack on Odell and Platt.

Republican friends of Representative Lucius N. Littauer of the Twenty-second Congress district acknowledge with something like chagrin that he wrote the letter to President Roosevelt admonishing the President not to trust Governor Odell or Senator Platt. They protest, though, in extenuation, that Mr. Littauer wrote the letter at a time when he was greatly annoyed, worried, and even exasperated by the failure of the Governor to say a kind word for him to the President over the developments of the glove and gauntlet contract scandal. It is true that the Governor at the time was in the Far West, but the newspapers of the United States, supporters of the Administration and otherwise, were printing columns of the scandal, and Mr. Littauer, to use his own words, "was daily losing flesh" over the exposures. In view of the intimate relations that have existed for nearly ten years between the Governor and Mr. Littauer, Mr. Littauer's friends insist that he had a right to expect that the Governor would either telegraph or write a few words to the President in Mr. Littauer's behalf. It is further insisted that Mr. Littauer's relations to the President as well as to the Governor entitled him to consideration in these cataclysmal days. Had not Mr. Littauer accepted the contract (without bonds) to keep the Governor informed of all the President said in Washington concerning New York State Republican politics, and also had not Mr. Littauer accepted a similar contract to keep the President informed of the sayings of the Governor at Albany and in New York city concerning the President's administration and the President's chances for next year?

"When Mr. Littauer advised the President not to trust Odell," continued Mr. Littauer's friends, "did not Mr. Littauer tell the truth? Have the utterances of Gov. Odell in Albany and New York city within the last year and a half not given warrant to Mr. Littauer for his advice to the President?"

"Will the Governor resent or take offence at Mr. Littauer's letter to the President?"

"No," replied Mr. Littauer's friends.

"Why not?"

"When the smash in Wall Street was at its worst in July and early in August, the Governor was far from the scene, while Mr. Littauer was 'Johnny on the spot.' He 'stood by,' as the sailormen say; but when Odell returned to New York the Governor contributed an interview to a New York city newspaper."

The interview was hunted up. It began this way:

WEST BOOMING, WALL STREET SCARE ABSURD.

SO DECLARES GOV. ODELL, WHO FINDS IN TOUR OF THE COUNTRY CROPS GOOD, BUSINESS IN FULL SWING.

COUNTRY BANKERS SEND MONEY HERE TO INVEST.

CASH PLENTY, AND DEMANDS ON NEW YORK WILL BE DECREASED.

NO BASIS IN CONDITIONS FOR THE SMASH IN STOCKS.

WALL STREET VICTIM OF HYSTERIA, OVER-SPECULATION, AND IN SOME CASES OVER-CAPITALIZATION.

MOHONK LAKE, Aug. 9.—It is characteristic of Governor Odell that his first utterance on his return to New York is a sturdy protest against the unreasoning fear which is smashing the stock markets of the metropolis and an appeal for confidence in the financial stability of the country.

"No," reiterated Mr. Littauer's friends, "the Governor will certainly not resent nor take offence at Mr. Littauer's letter to the President.

"Now, as to Mr. Littauer's advice to the President not to trust Mr. Platt," continued Mr. Littauer's friends, "was he not justified in that, too? A year ago last winter did not we all believe that it was the President's intention to appoint Mr. Littauer to be Secretary of the new Department of Commerce, if the bill could be got through? Moreover, do we not know that one of the principal reasons for sidetracking the bill for that session was the objection of influential Republicans to the President's reported selection? We have always believed that it was Senator Platt and his friends who killed the bill for that session because they believed the President was to appoint Mr. Littauer to the new portfolio in the Cabinet. We have also heard that it was Senator Platt and his friends who advised the President to appoint George B. Cortelyou to the place in recognition of what was then known as the McKinley sentiment. With the President's assurances that he would appoint Mr. Cortelyou and not Mr. Littauer, was not the bill passed last winter, and was not Mr. Cortelyou appointed? Mr. Littauer and his friends believe that Platt and Platt's friends knocked Mr. Littauer out of this new place in the Cabinet, and we don't owe Mr. Platt anything, thank you. Let Mr. Littauer fight Mr. Platt to the bitter end for all we care, but there won't be any open rupture between the Governor and Mr. Littauer."

The Question of Women in Churches With Hats.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Do you think it so awful, as some of the clergymen are saying, because some of us women have gone to church without our hats?

I have done it for one. I wanted to stay on the beach, but I thought, "No, it is Sunday. I ought to go to church," and it was an Episcopal church, too.

I was glad when I got there to find a young friend in front of me who did not have on her lovely new hat, covered with feathers and flowers, so I could say my prayers without being covetous.

I have been so happy to think poor dear papa will not have to buy me another new hat this autumn. I have been so careful of mine and now I am called a dreadful bad girl for not wearing it.

Do you think these clergymen who denounce women for going to church without hats are interested in any millinery shops?

ORANGE, Aug. 28. A GIRL WITHOUT A HAT.

Indiana's Reverend Cop.

From the Indianapolis Journal.

BRAZIL, Ind., Aug. 24.—The street carnival of the Order of Eagles was begun here to day. The fair will continue for a week.

The church element is determined that no gambling shall be tolerated and that all saloons must close at 11 o'clock. They have placed the Rev. L. C. Munroe of the Methodist Church, and Prof. T. M. Jones, another member of the church, on the police force, and they are marching up and down the streets swinging their clubs like veterans.

Littauerture.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It's good Littauerture you're publishing these days. Other papers are trying to get hand in glove with you, but they can't succeed.

JIMMIE GLOVER, from Gloversville.

PITTSBURG, Aug. 28.

Keep Going.

The world is moving right along,
You must keep going;
There is no halting with the throng,
You must keep going.
There is no stopping on the way,
The same old hustle day by day,
You cannot stop in some one's way,
You must keep going.

If you would reach fame's topmost rung
You must keep going;
Begin the strife while you are young,
And then keep going.
If you would keep from dire distress,
If you would make a big success,
And reap reward and happiness,
You must keep going.

JOS CONS.

SITES OF HISTORIC INTEREST IN NEW YORK.

Errors in Revolutionary Maps Cause Difficulty in Locating Them.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In answering "J. L. N.'s" inquiries about the exact location of a few historic sites around New York you appear to have been led astray, as others have been, concerning Fort Independence and Tetard's Hill, by consulting British maps of the Revolutionary period or later maps based upon them, which have been fruitful of a very unfortunate crop of errors. In view of the great interest now taken in our local and neighboring historic sites and landmarks, it seems to me worth while to put your readers on guard against these maps, for some or all of their errors are repeated in the maps of many oft-consulted works, like Marshall's "Life of Washington," Lossing's "Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution," Bolton's and Dawson's histories of Westchester county, and Fiske's "American Revolution."

Let me first state where Fort Independence and Tetard's Hill were and then refer to the maps on which they and many other sites are extraordinarily misplaced.

If one will start northward on a bicycle on Sedgwick avenue from Washington Bridge, with his cyclometer set at zero, when it registers just one mile he will be in front of the site of the famous Fort No. 8, the eighth in the series of Revolutionary fortifications which commanded the northern end of Manhattan Island from the mainland on the north and east of Spuyten Duyvil Creek and the Harlem River. The site is on the crest of the hill to the right of the road, back of Mr. Gustav Schwab's house, and is marked by an inscribed boulder. Continuing, the cyclometer will register 1.10 miles in front of New York University; 1.45 miles opposite the site of Fort No. 7, on the right-hand side of the road; 1.55 at the intersection of the Fordham Landing road; 1.70 opposite Webb's School and Home for Shipbuilders; and 2.05 opposite the site of Fort No. 6 or the King's Redoubt. This site is now occupied by the main building of the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum. Four years ago a very conspicuous mound remained.

The intersection of the King's Bridge road will be passed at a distance of 2.20 miles, and 2.50 miles will bring one opposite the site of Fort No. 5. It is to the right of the road, behind the red brick house on the edge of the Jerome Park reservoir. There is nothing to mark it. Riding on, at a distance of 2.85 miles one comes to Giles avenue on the left, and turning up Giles avenue, a distance of 3.05 miles from Washington Bridge brings one in front of the white house with square tower on the left-hand side of the avenue, occupied by Mr. M. S. Eylar. This house stands on the site of Fort Independence, or Fort No. 4. The grounds are terraced to suggest the lines of the old earthworks. Here were excavated the two cannon now at the Van Cortlandt Mansion in Van Cortlandt Park, many cannon balls and other relics. The adjacent Fort Independence street and Cannon place recall the history of the neighborhood.

Forts Nos. 3, 2 and 1 lay just north of Spuyten Duyvil Creek, between Tippett's Brook and the Hudson.

Fort No. 5 stood in the southwestern quarter of Dominie John Peter Tetard's farm of sixty acres. The farm occupied a portion of the hill which rises to an elevation of about 140 feet and extends in a northeasterly direction on the east side of King's Bridge and Tippett's Brook to a point somewhat beyond the site of Fort Independence. This hill was Tetard's Hill.

If Dominie Tetard could come to life again and see how British map makers dislocated his hill and other topographical features hereabouts, he might exclaim with the Psalmist David: "What ailed you, ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams, and ye little hills like lambs!"

The dominie, by the way, was an interesting character, and considering how disrespectfully his hill has been moved around, we may diverge from the subject of maps to say a few good words about him. He was once pastor of the old French Church in New York city. In 1763 he bought the farm above mentioned from Petrus Vermilye, but he did not remove to it until 1766, and then his rustication was coincident with, if not a consequence of, a very reprehensible performance by some of his flock, as set forth in a petition which he addressed to Governor Sir Henry Moore Oct. 17, 1767. In this interesting document, which may be found in full in volume III. of O'Callaghan's "Documentary History of New York," the dominie related that on Sunday, June 29, 1766, "Messrs. Daniel Bontecou, John Hartier, James Buvelot, Francis Basset and Frederic Basset, all of the city of New York, in a riotous manner and contrary to the Peace of our Sovereign Lord the King, took Possession of said Church before the usual time of divine Service and there, by main force, opposed the Elders and every regular officer of the same in their respective Duties, absolutely refused your Petitioner Admittance unto his Pulpit And after having different ways profaned that House of Prayer they then proceeded to break the locks of said Church and affixed Locks of their own to Every door, by means whereof they to this day have most unjustly and illegally kept possession of the same to the inexpressible Detriment of this Pious Institution and to the great Scandal of Civil Society as well as Religion."

Being deprived thus violently of his cure in the city, he established a French school at his farm, probably the first of its kind in the limits of the present city of New York, where he taught the higher branches of literature and science. He also preached in the Fordham Dutch Church. During the Revolution he was a chaplain and interpreter in the American Army, and when Columbia College was organized out of the old King's College, he became a professor of French therein, and so continued with honor until his death. There long stood on Tetard's Hill a stone arch, the origin of which was never explained, and which was variously called "Dominie Tetard's Wine Cellar," "The Powder Magazine" and "The Bakery."

Now, to return to our maps. During the Revolution, many of the fields of operation of his Majesty's army in America were surveyed (or claimed to have been surveyed) by Claude Joseph Sauthier, and were published in London by William Faden, either "by permission of the Right Honble. the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations," or by authority of act of Parliament. These maps are conveniently called the "Sauthier-Faden maps." Faden's map (surveyor not mentioned) of "A plan of New York Island, Staten Island and East New Jersey, with a particular description of the engagement on the woody heights between Flatbush and Brooklyn on the 27th of August, 1776," * * * also the landing of the British Army on New York Island and the taking of the City, &c., on the 15th of September, following, with the subsequent disposition of both armies," locates Fort Independence on the Jersey Palisades opposite the mouth of Spuyten Duyvil Creek. How Fort Independence came to be located thus wrongfully on the mainland across the Hudson opposite Spuyten Duyvil, instead of on the mainland across the Harlem approximately opposite Spuyten Duyvil is a matter of conjecture; but possibly it was due to a very curious mental trick which I have noticed in historical investigation and against which the investigator must be on his guard in accepting both printed and oral testimony. I would like to know if others have observed it.

I refer to the singular mental condition, evidently related to the disease called "heterophemy," in which a person says exactly the opposite of what he means to say. For instance, Gen. Heath, in his "Memoirs," referring to the British vessels sailing down the Hudson past the works at Fort Washington on Manhattan Island, Aug. 18, 1776, at a time when the incident works at Fort Lee were less to be feared than those on the Manhattan side, says that the ships kept close under the "east" bank to avoid the American guns. He so plainly meant the "west" bank that most historians so quote him.

For over a year I have been investigating the question of the exact site of Fort Lee, N. J., which is completely obliterated. I have a letter from a highly cultivated gentleman, a man of national reputation in fact, once a resident of Fort Lee but now deceased, in which he says that the "southeast" bastion was at a certain point when he lived there. All my documentary evidence so far indicates that as the southwest bastion. Before I get through I will either confirm or disprove this evidence of an eye witness of the last trace of the old fort.

But, returning again to our maps. The same Faden map which shows Fort Independence in Jersey opposite Spuyten Duyvil Creek, locates Hackensack south-southwest of that point nine and one-half miles, whereas it is almost due west five miles. Meltown's Pass is placed north of Harlem instead of south. Washington's headquarters near Dyckman's bridge instead of at the present 160th street, and Tetard's Hill north of Spuyten Duyvil Creek between Tippett's Brook and the Hudson. Other features are similarly distorted.

The Sauthier-Faden map "of the operations of the King's Army under the command of Sir William Howe, K. B., in New York and East New Jersey, against the American forces commanded by Gen. Washington, from the 12th of October to the 28th of November, 1776," gives the date of the capture of Fort Lee as Nov. 18, 1776, instead of Nov. 20. Fort Independence is brought back across the Hudson and planted upon the still dislocated Tetard's Hill north of Spuyten Duyvil. The correct bearing of Hackensack is still unknown, and Washington's army is represented as starting on its famous retreat through the Jerseys by steering southwest from Fort Lee instead of west-north-west for Hackensack bridge. Tarrytown (printed Terrytown), and Dobbs Ferry are placed north of the Pocantico River instead of south, Tarrytown being crowded up almost to the mouth of the Croton. The Nepperhan (Sawmill) River is printed Wepperham; and I might mention other errors, more or less serious.

The Sauthier-Faden map of the battle of Fort Washington has a large percentage of accuracy, but the poor Dominie Tetard's Hill is still left between Tippett's Brook and the Hudson. The name "Fort Independence" however, is discreetly removed from the spurious "Tetard's Hill."

Of the many authorities for locating Fort Independence east of Tippett's Brook, one is a map drawn by S. Lewis from the original surveys said to have been made by Washington. It may be found in "Dawson's History of Westchester County," and for the location of Dominie Tetard's farm as well as the fort, one may conveniently consult an excellent historical map drawn by Thomas H. Edsall in Scharff's "History of Westchester County." On this map, Tetard's farm is laid down in conformity with the old farm lines of that section.

I would advise those of your readers who have any of the works mentioned at the beginning of this communication, or any other books containing reproductions of the maps referred to, to make upon them a note of the errors here mentioned.

EDWARD HAGAMAN HALL,
Secretary of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society.

NEW YORK, Aug. 24.

THE ODDS AGAINST SHAMROCK.

Has the Betting Been Unphilosophical and Non-mathematical?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In connection with the America's Cup contest many interesting things have developed, not the least of which is the shocking manner in which the theory of probabilities has been treated.

With the fixing of the odds on any particular race under such conditions as exist no one can become critical, as it is all a matter of more or less shrewd surmise.

But if the same conditions are expected once the odds of one event are fixed, the odds against a second and third event become also fixed.

In the light of this principle the odds quoted together in to-day's SUN of 5 to 1 against Shamrock in to-day's race and 8 to 1 against her "lifting the Cup," in view of the fact that Shamrock has not yet won a race, become astounding.

Presuming the odds of 5 to 1 against Shamrock's winning a particular race are just, her value as a betting proposition corresponds to that of any six numbers on a roulette with the zero eliminated.

When one bets on these six numbers the odds are 5 to 1 against his winning once, 35 to 1 against his winning twice and 215 to 1 against his winning three times.

Without going into the mathematics, the simplest way of arriving at the proof of this is to put a dollar on any six numbers and leave your money down for three turns of the wheel, all of which we will presume you win. After one turn you have $6, after two turns you have $36 and after three turns you have $216.

Taking out your original dollar the odds against a 5 to 1 chance turning up three times show to be 215 to 1, not 8 to 1. Presuming, then, the odds against Shamrock's winning one race are 5 to 1, the odds against her winning the series of three are 215 to 1, not 8 to 1.

NEW YORK, Aug. 29. W. M.

Official Deadheadism and the Law.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I read your article on "Official Deadheadism in the View of Federal Law," in this morning's issue, with a great deal of interest.

For some time I have been looking for you to touch up this branch of violation of the law—particularly in view of the numerous declarations of the President that the law governing interstate traffic must and shall be enforced, and that giving of rebates and discrimination in favor of corporations, combines and individuals must and shall be stopped, or else these combines in restraint of commerce shall be severely punished, if not wiped off the face of the earth.

The courts have been appealed to and injunctions issued forbidding any violation of the Interstate law, and yet the President, who poses as the great enforcer of these laws, and some of the Judges issuing the restraining orders, violate them knowingly every time they ride on free transportation; and that is, as a rule, every time they travel.

The last trip the President took through the Central and Western States, the railroad officials were requested by his itinerary agent to move his train and party free, and by special schedule; and I assume that the cars, Pullman and private, were also "D. H."

All these favors were asked and granted in direct violation of the laws, and without even an acknowledgment of the favor. On the contrary, these very railroad presidents and officials as representatives of so-called trusts and combines were held up by the President in some of his speeches on this trip as the people who were throttling trade and commerce, whom it would be his duty and pleasure to bring to a full realization of and respect for the law, &c. Of all those who entertained him on this trip, the only ones he thought worthy of public recognition were the labor leaders and agitators of the Western mining region.

I am glad the people are taking cognizance of this particular violation of the Interstate law, at this time. It is well to have the matter ventilated, and the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission called to it, before the President and the immense body of