SOME NEW BOOKS.

A German's View of Americans.

There is no doubt that Englishmen learned a good deal about themselves, that, perhaps, they had not suspected, from reading Taine's "English Notes." We now have a chance of gaining some self-knowledge in a similar way. The opportunity is offered in a large octavo volume of some six hundred pages, entitled *The Americans*, by HUGO MÜNSTERBERG, professor of psychology at Harvard University (McClure, Phillips & Co.). This book it should be kept in mind, was written for a German audience, though it is with the author's diffident approval that an English translation has been made by Mr. Edwin D. Holt, one of Harvard's corps of instructors. In a singularly modest and winning preface, Prof Münsterberg disclaims any intention of producing an exhaustive treatise. For a scientific study of all the facts relating to the United States, he is inclined to think that a division of labor would be needful; the historian, the politician, the economist, the jurist, the engineer and many another would have to cooperate in a scholarly investigation of American events. The author, for his part, professes to be only a psychologist; he has not set out to discover new material. The sole aim of his book is to study the American man and his inner tendencies, and it is suggested that perhaps an accurate name for the volume would have been "The Philosophy of Americanism."

For such a relatively humble task, Prof. Münsterberg submits that an outsider may be, after all, not quite unsuited, since a country's characteristic forces make themselves more easily felt by him than by those who have breathed the country's atmosphere from their childhood. Inasmuch as the author himself tells us where the accent of his book lies, we shall invite attention less to the chapters on economic and political problems than to those headed respectively "The Spirit of Self-Direction," "The Spirit of Self-Realization" and "The Spirit of Self-Assertion." We may give at the outset the keynote of the work by saying that it is extremely optimistic. Herein it is the antithesis of the author's former book on "American Traits." Are the two volumes irreconcilable? On the contrary, according to Prof Münsterberg, they are meant to be alike the twin pictures of a stereoscope, which must be seen together if one is to get the full plastic effect of reality. "It is certainly important," he says, "to remind the nation frequently that there are political corruption and pedagogical blundering in the world, but sometimes it is also worth while to say that Americanism is something noble and inspiring, even for outsiders, with whom, naturally, other impulses are stronger." By way of introduction, it remains only to add that the book before us has been translated faithfully from the edition that appeared in Germany six months ago. The events and statistical figures of the last few months have not been inserted, the author holding that the philosophy of Americanism is independent of the happenings of yesterday. The only changes in the translation are abbreviations, except that certain chapters which dealt with the German-Americans are left out, as being more suited to an esoteric discussion for Germans. So far as a German-American remains German, he falls short of being a typical American.

I.

That part of the book which directs notice to the American spirit of self-direction deals, we need scarcely say, with our political structure, national, State and municipal, with the dynamic effect of public opinion thereon, and with our internal and external political problems. Nothing in this section of the volume deserves such careful consideration as what the author has to say about the influence of "public opinion" in the United States. He does not hesitate to aver that the organized political parties, with all their paraphernalia, constitute merely the lower house of the nation, whereas public opinion is the upper house, exercising a selective function and a veto power. These two houses, taken together, form the entire national political life. "In a way, the parties express quantitatively the will of the nation, while public opinion does it qualitatively. Whenever a quantitative expression is wanted the issues must be sharply contrasted, in order to separate clearly the adherents of each; all fine shades and distinctions have to be sacrificed to an artificial clearness of definition, much as is done in mechanics when any motion is schematically represented, as the diagonal in a parallelogram of two other forces." The great advantage of the lower house, formed by political parties, is that its deliberations can be brought to an end and its debates concluded. Every political election is such a provisional result. "Public opinion, on the other hand, accepts no abstract and artificial schematizations, but considers the reality in all its complications, and in its discussions gives no weight to any show of hands or other demonstration of mere numbers. Crass contrasts do not exist here, but only subtle shadings; men are not grouped as friends and foes, but they are seen to differ merely in their breadth of outlook, their knowledge, their energy, and their singleness of heart. The end in view is not to rush politics, but to reform politics, and in all matters to shape public events to national ideals. Here one vote is not like another; but a single word, wisely and conscientiously spoken, is heard above the babel of thousands. And here the best men of the nation have to show themselves, not with programmes or harangues, but with a quiet force which shapes and unites public opinion and eventually carries all parties before it."

Prof. Münsterberg points out that public opinion may be responsible now for a Presidential veto on a bill of Congress, now for the sudden eclipse of a party leader, or the dropping of a list of candidates, or, again, it may divide a party in the Legislature. In a word, public opinion forces the parties in spite of themselves to make mere party advantage secondary to a maturer statesmanship. Our author's optimism, however, does not carry him so far as to make him assume that public opinion in the United States is the quintessence of pure goodness or pure wisdom. He recognizes that public opinion in this country would be no true indication of the forces at work in the nation if it did not represent all the essentials of the typical American. In order to find this typical man it would be misleading simply to take the average of the millions. On the contrary, one must leave out of account the great herd of colorless characters and select the man who harmoniously combines in himself, without exaggeration, the most striking peculiarities of his countrymen. He is not easy to find, since eccentricity is frequent; one man is grotesquely patriotic, another moral to intolerance, another insipidly complacent and another too optimistic to be earnest or too acquisitive to be just. Yet such has been Prof. Münsterberg's experience—"if one goes about much in American society one finds oneself now and then, not only in New York or Boston or Washington, but quite as well in some small city of the West, in a little circle of congenial men who are talking eagerly, perhaps over their cigars after dinner; and one has the feeling that the typical American is there. His conversation is not learned nor his rhetoric high flown; but one has the feeling that he is alive and worth listening to, that he sees things in sharp perspective, is sincerely moral and has something of his own to say. Party politics do not interest him specially, although, as citizen, he goes to a few meetings, contributes to party funds and votes on election day if the weather permits. But he speaks of politics generally with a half smile, and laughs outright at the thought of himself running for the Legislature."

II.

If some one should ask our author who makes public opinion in America, he would be referred at first to a class which at present does not, as a whole, enjoy the suffrage, and presumably will not for some time to come—the women. The American woman cares little enough for party politics, and this is not so much because she has no right to vote. If she felt a sufficiently deep interest in the matter, she probably would have the right. But "while the best people have no wish to see their women brought in contact with the routine of party machinery, this is not at all in order that they may not concern themselves with the public problems of the day. On the contrary, American women exert a marked influence on public opinion; and here, as might be expected, it is not the organized crusades, like the temperance movement, which count, but rather their less noisy demonstrations, their unobtrusive influence in the home and their general rightness of feeling. Every reform movement which appeals to moral motives is advanced by the influence of women, and many a bad piece of jobbery is defeated by their instrumentality." Turning from women to men, our author finds that the masculine springs of public opinion flow, not from officials and professional politicians, too busy with strictly party affairs to read correctly the nation's will, but from the educated and substantial members of the commonwealth. These springs are often tinged at first with a personal coloring; but the streamlets gather and go far from their sources until every vestige of an individuality is lost. "Ideas pass from man to man, and those which are typically American find as ready lodgment with the banker, the manufacturer or the scholar as with the artisan or farm hand. Any man who appeals to the conscience, morality, patriotism or brotherly feeling of the American, or to his love of progress and order, appeals to no special parties or classes, but to one univocal public opinion, that, namely, which is formulated and uttered by the community of high minded citizens to the extent of their disinterestedness."

It is as clear, however, to Prof. Münsterberg as it is to the most observant native American, that even such a public opinion as is described in the book before us needs some organization and support. He goes on to demonstrate his fitness for the interpretation of American life by telling his German fellow countrymen that, "bold as the statement may sound, the American newspaper is the main ally of public opinion, serving that opinion more loyally than it serves either official politics or the party spirit." It is not the literary significance of the American newspaper that is considered in this place, but only its public influence. "An American philosophizing on the newspapers takes it as a matter of course that they serve the ends of party politics, and it is true enough that party life as it is would not be possible without the widely disseminated influence of the newspaper." Later on, however, we read: "The better sort of American newspaper is neither a party publication nor yet merely a news sheet, but the conscious exponent of public opinion. Its columns contain a tiresome amount of party information, it is true; but a part of this is directly in the interest of an intelligent public opinion, since every citizen needs to be instructed in all the phases of party life, of political and Congressional doings and in regard to the candidates who are up for office. It is to be admitted, moreover, that some of the better newspapers, although not the very best, are unreservedly committed to the leaders of some party; in short, they are party organs. In the same way, several newspapers are under the domination of certain industrial interests and cater to the wishes of a group of capitalists. But any such policy has to be managed with the utmost discretion, for the American newspaper reader is far too experienced to buy a sheet day after day which he sees to be falsified; and he has enough others to resort to, since the competition is always keen, and even middle sized cities have three or four large daily papers." Our author does us but justice when he adds that, on the whole, the American newspaper, compared with Continental journals, is extraordinarily non-partisan on public questions, notwithstanding the statements made in many German books and periodicals to the contrary. It is true, as Prof. Münsterberg testifies, that the ordinary reader might peruse almost any newspaper for weeks, except just on the eve of an election, without really knowing whether it was Republican or Democratic. "Now one party and then the other is brought up for criticism, and even when the sheet is evidently in favor of a certain side it will print extracts from the leading articles of opposing journals and so well depict the entire situation that the reader can form an opinion for himself."

In a subsequent paragraph we come upon a conclusive proof of the mastery which the author has acquired of the subject which he has undertaken to discuss. He points out that "while the newspapers are in this way largely emancipated from the yoke of party, they are the exponents of a general set of tendencies which, in opposition to party politics, we have called public opinion. In other words, the papers stand above the parties with their crudely schematic programmes and issues, and aspire to measure men and things according to their true worth." Though ostensibly of one party, an American journal will often treat men of its own side to biting sarcasm and magnanimously extol certain of its opponents. The better political instincts, the conscientious longings for progress and reform are appealed to; and, if doubtful innovations are often brought forward and praised as reforms, this is not because the newspaper is the organ of a party, but rather because it is prompted by public sentiment, or what it supposes to be such. The American newspaper reflects in its own way all the peculiarities of public opinion—its lightheartedness, its often nervous restlessness, its conservative and prudent traits, its optimism and its ethical earnestness; above all, its humor and drastic ridicule. The cap and bells are everywhere in evidence; nowhere is there anything dry or pedantic. "From the dextrous and incisive leading article to the briefest jotting, one notes the same good humor and playful satire which are so characteristic of American public opinion. This general humorous turn makes it possible to give an individual flavor to the most ordinary morsels of daily news, so that they have a bearing considerably broader than the bare facts of the case, and may conceivably add their mite to public opinion. Herewith has come in a special newspaper style, a combination of a photographically accurate report and the whimsical feuilleton. Thus it happens that the best papers editorially persuade where they cannot dictate to their readers, and so, apart from party politics, nourish public opinion and create sentiment for or against persons and legislative or public measures, while ostensibly they are merely giving the news of the last twelve hours."

It is Prof. Münsterberg's conviction that, taken all in all, the American press represents worthily the energy, prosperity and greatness of the American nation; though at the same time, with its superficial haste, its occasional vulgarity and chronic excitability, with its lively patriotism and irrepressible humor, it clearly evinces the influence of democracy. "The better the paper, the more conspicuous are the critical and reflective features, while the wider the circulation, the more noticeable are the obtrusive self-satisfaction and provincialism and the characteristic disdain of things European." It is not for a moment disputed that the best American papers attain to a standard which in many respects is higher than that of the best journals of the Old World. "A paper like the Boston *Transcript* will hardly find its counterpart in the German newspaper domain; and much good can be said of the *Herald* in the same city; of THE SUN, *Tribune*, *Times* and *Post* in New York; of the *Eagle* in Brooklyn; of the *Public Ledger* in Philadelphia; of the *Sun* in Baltimore; the *Star* in Washington; the *Tribune* in Chicago; the *Evening Wisconsin* in Milwaukee, and many others which might be named. Even small cities like Springfield, Mass., produce such large and admirable papers as the *Springfield Republican*." The assertion would be commonplace and unedifying if the author did not add that "to be just, one must admit that the bad papers could be condensed into tolerably good ones by a liberal use of the blue pencil. For their mistakes lie not so much in their not having good contributions as in their inclusion of crude and sensational material by way of spice."

In another section of his work, namely, in a chapter headed "Literature," the author considers American newspapers from a strictly literary point of view. He tells his fellow Germans that apart from newspaper politics, and apart from the admirable organization of the journal, considered as an industrial entity, the newspapers of the United States are a literary product whose high merit is too frequently underestimated. "To be sure, the style is often light, the logic unsound, the information superficial. But, taken as a whole, the newspaper has unity and character. Thousands of loose jointed intellects crowd into journalism every year—more than in any other country; but American journalism, like the nation as a whole, has an amazing power of assimilation. Just as thousands of Russians and Italians land every year in the rags of their wretchedness, and in a few years become earnest American citizens, so many land on the shores of American journalism who were not intended to be the teachers or entertainers of mankind." These are either eliminated quickly, or, in the course of a few years, quite assimilated. "The American newspapers, from Boston to San Francisco, are alike in style and thought; and it must be said, in spite of all prejudices, that the American newspaper is certainly literature. From the Washington letter to the sporting gossip everything tries in a way to have artistic merit, and everything bears the stamp of American literature." Prof. Münsterberg thinks that "in the weekly papers America has achieved still more. The light, fresh and direct American style there finds its most congenial field." He adds that "the leading social and political monthlies, like the venerable *North American Review*, which errs merely in laying too much emphasis on the names of its well known contributors, are quite up to the best English periodicals."

IV.

The only part of this capacious and full-freighted volume in which the author shows himself out of sympathy with American ideas is the chapter on "External Problems," in which several pages are devoted to an argument in favor of discarding the Monroe Doctrine. We deem it highly probable that nothing in the German edition of the work gave more pleasure to its German audience. Even in the United States, the author's views upon the subject will be read with respect and interest (though not, we think, with assent) as being those of a sincere well wisher. Prof. Münsterberg undertakes to demonstrate that the two fundamental motives which prompted the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine have long since ceased to exist. It is pointed out that the original contrast between Europe as a land of tyranny and America as a Democratic free soil no longer holds. On the one hand, all countries of western and central Europe now enjoy popular representation, while, on the other, the Latin republics of South and Central America, with the exception of Chile and the Argentine Republic, are absurd travesties of freedom and democracy. "The conditions which exist in Venezuela and Colombia are pretty well known. In those so-called commonwealths, about one-tenth of the population consists of highly cultivated people of pure or nearly pure Spanish descent, who take no part in politics, and suffer under shameless administrative misrule; some eight-tenths are a harmless and ignorant proletariat of partly Spanish, but mainly Indian descent—people who have no political interests, and who are afraid of the men in power; the remaining tenth, which is of mongrel Spanish, Indian and negro blood, holds in its hand the so-called republican government, and keeps itself in power by every conceivable device of extortion and deception, from time to time splitting itself up into parties which throw the whole country into an uproar merely for the personal advantage of party leaders." Our author asserts—though we are not inclined to accept the assertion without qualification—that "even in America there is no longer a political backwoodsman who supposes that a republic, like what the founders of the United States had in mind, can ever be made out of such material; and when, in spite of this, as in the negro question, some one gets up at the decisive moment of every discussion and tries to conjure with the Declaration of Independence, even such an appeal now often misses its effect. Since the Americans have gone into the Philippines, they can no longer hold it an axiom that every Government must be justified by the assent of the governed. People have learned to understand that the right of self-government must be earned, and is deserved only as the reward of hard work; that nations which have not yet grown to be orderly and peaceable need education like children who are not yet of age, and do not know what is good for them. To say that the pitiable citizen of a corrupt South American republic is freer than the citizens of England, France or Germany, would be ridiculous; to protect the anarchy of these countries against the introduction of some European political system is at the present time not a moral obligation, surely, which the American Republic need feel itself called on to perform."

Turning to the other motive which impelled President Monroe to formulate the doctrine associated with his name, namely, the security and peaceful isolation of the United States on the Western Hemisphere, Prof. Münsterberg contends that to-day it has not the slightest validity, but on the contrary it is a superstitious faith in this doctrine that, conceivably, might endanger the peace of the country. It is conceded that this assertion is true only in so far as the doctrine applies to South America: it is not applicable to Central America, under which geographical term we suppose the author to comprehend the Isthmus of Panama and the neighboring coasts of Colombia and Venezuela. "It would, indeed, be impossible for the United States to allow, say, Cuba, in passing from Spanish hands, to come into the possession of another European nation. In fact, no part of Central America could become the seat of new European colonies without soon becoming a seat of war. The construction of a canal across the Isthmus will confirm and assure the moral and political leadership of the United States throughout Central America and the Antilles." Prof. Münsterberg holds, however, that as regards the major part of South America the situation is entirely different. "The Americans are too apt to forget that Europe is much nearer to the United States than is, for instance, the Argentine Republic, and that if one wants to go from New York to Buenos Ayres the quickest route is by way of Europe." Moreover, "the United States have really very little industrial intercourse or sympathy with the Latin-American republics. A European Power adjoins the United States on the north from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean; yet the fact that England, at one time their greatest enemy, abuts along this whole border has never threatened the peace of the United States." Why, then, should it be presumed that a catastrophe would be threatened if England, or Italy, or Holland, or Germany, should get hold of a piece of land far away in South America, in payment of debts, or to insure the safety of misused colonies? Our author goes on to argue that, so long as the United States were small and weak, the exaggerated dread of unknown developments was intelligible; but, now that the country is large and strong, and the supposed contrasts between the Old and New Worlds no longer exist, seeing that the United States is much more nearly like the countries of central and western Europe than it is like South American republics, any argument for the Monroe Doctrine on the ground of fear or misgiving is downright hysterical.

The strongest point made by the author is, not that the motives which first led to the Monroe Doctrine have been shorn of their original potency by the course of events, but that the highest interests of the United States now demand that the moribund doctrine shall be definitely repudiated. "It was never doubted that the exclusion of the Old World countries from the new American continents was only the corollary from a premise, to the effect that the Americans themselves proposed to confine their political interests to their own continent. That was a wise policy in the times of Washington and Monroe, and whether or not it would have been wise in the time of McKinley, it was in any case at that time thrown over. The Americans have united with the European forces to do battle in China; they have expanded their own domain toward Asia; they have sent men of war to Europe on political missions; in short, the Americans have for years been extending their political influence around the world, and Secretary Hay has for a long time played an influential part in the European concert of Powers. The United States have too often defended their Monroe claim on the ground of their own aloofness from these Powers to feel justified in urging the claim when they no longer do keep aloof."

Prof. Münsterberg urges upon our attention another no less important consideration. He challenges denial of his assertion that the real interest of the United States with regard to most of South America is solely that the land shall be developed as far as possible; that its enormous natural resources shall be turned to account, and that, out of a continent, become prosperous industrially and commercially, important trade advantages shall accrue to the United States. He submits that this is possible only by the establishment of order there—the instant termination of anarchy. His contention is that as long as the Monroe Doctrine is upheld the miserable and impolitic stagnation of that vast continent can never be bettered, since all the consequences of the doctrine work in just the opposite direction. "It is sufficiently clear that progress will not be made until fresh, healthy, enterprising forces come in from outside; but now, so soon as an Englishman or German or other European undertakes to earn his livelihood there, he is at once exposed to the shameless extortion and other chicanery of the so called Governments. And when European capital wishes to help the development of these countries, it receives absolutely no protection against their wretched politicians. And all this is merely because the chartered rascals in power know that they can kill and steal with impunity, so long as the sacred Monroe Doctrine is there, like an enchanted wall, between them and the mother countries of their victims; they know only too well that no evil can come to them, since the statesmen at Washington are bound down to a prejudice and required scrupulously to protect every hair on their precious heads. All this prevents any infusion of good blood from coming into these countries, and so abandons the land entirely to the indolence of its inhabitants. The conditions would be economically sounder, in almost every part of South America, if more immigrants came in, and more especially if those that came could take a larger part in the Governments."

Our author himself acknowledges that the force of his objections to the Monroe Doctrine would be impaired, if not extinguished, by such a corollary as that propounded by President Roosevelt in his letter which was read at the Cuban dinner, and which has since excited so much misgiving throughout Latin America. It would be, he admits, "somewhat different if the United States were to recognize, as a consequence of the Monroe Doctrine, its own responsibility for the public administration of these countries, for their debts and for whatever crimes they commit; in other words, if the United States were virtually to annex South America." At the time when this book was written the author could say with truth that apparently there was no thought of assuming such an attitude on the part of the Roosevelt Administration.

V.

We pass over that section of the work which treats of the American spirit of self-initiative as attested in our economic development and exemplified in our economic problems. We imagine that our readers would rather see what the author has to say about our national spirit of self-assertiveness, especially as this is shown in the self-assertion of American women and in some aristocratic tendencies imputed to American "society," in the narrow sense of the word. Prof. Münsterberg points out that the European visitor who expects to witness in the New World the horrors of upstart equality is quickly reassured. He finds that even in New York social classes are nicely distinguished; no workstained overalls are found where a frock coat is in order. It is but a short distance from the luxury of Fifth avenue to miserable tenement districts; an abrupt social contrast is thus presented in all its Old World sharpness and hardness. If, then, the newcomer in surprise turns for information to those who know the United States, his questions will be differently answered by different persons. The average citizen will try to save his country's reputation for equality. Unquestionably, he will say, equality rules in America—equality before the law and equality of political rights. Of course, this sort of equality exists in most European countries also. The citizen of a less typical habit of mind may reply, with the wink of the thoughtful American, that there is no more equality in America than in Europe. Our author holds that both replies are false, or, at least, fail to touch the root of the matter. Of course, one can no longer speak of an equality of wealth or means of enjoyment in the United States—an approach to which was noted by De Tocqueville—nor yet, in spite of occasional claims to the contrary, of an equal opportunity for education. It is nevertheless pronounced a mistake to assume on this account that the spirit of equality is to be encountered only in judicial and political spheres. "There is another, a social equality, of which most Americans are not conscious, because they do not know, and can hardly imagine, what life would be without such equality; they do not meditate on social equality, because, unlike political or legal equality, it is not capable of abstract formulation. The American first becomes aware of it after living some time in Europe, and the European grasps the idea only after a serious study of American life."

Our author is at some pains to explain what to his German readers must have looked like a paradox. He perceives it to be doubtful whether a European can fully appreciate an American's social point of view, because the former is too apt to distort the idea of equality into an ethical one. The American, on the other hand, "presupposes, as a matter of course, that the citizens of the United States are socially equal, whether they live in the White House or work in a coal mine; and this point of view is not dependent on any ethical theory, but is itself the basis of such a theory." The American constructs a morality of comradeship which is as far from the morality of submission as it is from that of lordship; which is unlike either the morality of the pietists, founded on the religious assumption of immortality, or the morality of Nietzsche, based on biological exigencies. The morality of comradeship is based entirely on the American conception of society. In the United States "the fundamental feeling is that the whole interplay of social forces will have no meaning, and social ambition and success will yield no pleasure, if it be not clearly understood that every other member of the social community is equal to oneself, and has the absolute right to make such a claim of equality." The criminal, indeed, and the man destitute of honor have forfeited that right; they are practically excluded from the American community, and cut off from the social game. On the other hand, "distinctions of position, of education, of heredity and of property, have nothing to do with this right." Those who strive for social success in America must take for granted at the outset that all men and women are comrades, participating in the various labors of the great gay world, with mutual approval and mutual esteem; and they must show that they believe this by their action. Passing from generalities to particulars, Prof. Münsterberg says that "a stranger first notices the perfect confidence with which everybody goes about his business, without feeling oppressed by those above, or exalted by those beneath him. There is no condescension to those beneath, nor servility to those above. In every social situation the typical American feels himself self-assured and equal; he is simply master of himself, polite but frank, reserved but always kind. He detests patronage and condescension as much as servility and obsequiousness. For condescension emphasizes a difference in the rank, and presumes to challenge a possible forgetting of this difference, by suggesting that both the persons do recognize the distinction as intrinsic. A man who asserts his true equality, and expects in every other honorable man the same self-assertion, scarcely understands how purely technical differences of social position can affect the inner relations of man to man."

A remarkable power of observation will be recognized by Americans in a subsequent statement by the author. "Envy," he says, "was not planted in the American soul. Envy (properly defined) is not directed at the possession, but at the possessor; and therefore acknowledges by implication that the possessor is made better by what he owns." No such acknowledgment is imputable to an American. Envy is psychologically incompatible with his self-assertiveness. "A person who asserts himself strains every nerve to improve his own condition, but never envies those who are more favored. Envy would be to him as great a degradation as pure servility. Undoubtedly here is one of the most effective checks to socialism. Socialism may not spring directly from envy, but a people given to envy are very ready to listen to socialism. In America socialism remains a foreign cult, which is preached to deaf ears. A man who feels himself inferior, and who envies his wealthier fellows, would be glad to bring about an artificial equality by equalizing ownership; whereas the man who accounts himself equal to every one else is ready to concede the external inequality which lends fresh impetus and courageous endeavor to his existence; and this the more as the accumulation of capital becomes an obviously technical matter, not immediately contributory to the enjoyment of life. The billionaire enjoys no more than the millionaire, but merely works with a more complicated and powerful apparatus." Prof. Münsterberg finds thoroughly characteristic the customary tokens of greeting in the United States. Certainly they are sharply distinguished from German conventionalities. "An American doffs his hat to ladies out of respect to the sex; but men meet one another without that formality; and the finer differences in the nod of the head, expression of the eyes and movement of the hat indicate the degree of personal familiarity and liking, but not of social position. Position is something technical, professional and external, which is not in question when two Americans meet on the street. They greet because they know each other, and in this mutual relation of personal acquaintance they are merely equal human beings, and not the representatives of professional or social grades. The careful German adjustment of the arc through which the hat is carried, and of the angle to which the body bends, in deference to various grades of social position, strikes the American as nonsensical. The fundamental disregard of titles and orders is, of course, closely connected with such a feeling."

We would invite the reader's attention to another profound remark. The author sees that out of the American feeling of equality spring far reaching duties. The typical American asserts himself to be equal to all others who are worthy of esteem; he therefore feels that he must recognize for himself all the duties which those who are richer, more educated and more influential impose upon themselves. In short, he must behave like a gentleman. "The motto, which certainly has nothing to do with religion, is *noblesse oblige*, but the nobility which imposes an obligation consists in being a citizen of America, and as such, subordinate to no man. The duties which accrue, however, are quite similar to religious obligations. The gentleman requires of himself self-control and social discipline." Thus it comes about that the European visitor finds in the United States a sexual purity which is not known on the Continent: "One may sit in jovial men's society after dinner, with cigars around the fireplace, a hundred times without ever hearing an unclean story; and, if a young fellow tried to boast to his friends of his amorous adventures in the European manner, he would be snubbed. Nowhere in the world is a young girl so safe in the protection of a young man." The relation of one man to his neighbor is correspondingly upright. The spirit of self-assertion educates to politeness, helpfulness, good nature and magnanimity. European books on America are fond of saying that the fundamental principle of American life is "Help yourself." Our author has observed that the motto is thoroughly misleading, if it be taken to mean that every one must help himself because his neighbor will not help him. "A readiness to help in every way is one of the most marked traits of the American, from the superficial courtesy to the noblest self-sacrifice. * * * The readiness of the American to give to good purposes is the more impressive the closer one looks. From a distance one sees gifts of millions of dollars which less impress one; everybody knows that men like Carnegie and Rockefeller make no sacrifices in contributing sums even in seven figures. But the person who is nearer the scene observes that there is also the widow's mite, and that the well to do middle class often gives away a proportion of its income that seems almost too large according to European ideals. Vanity hardly figures at all; the largest gifts are often anonymous and unheard of by the newspapers."

We must refer the reader to the book itself for the best chapter in it, that which depicts the American woman. Never has a more discriminating and graceful tribute been paid to her. When one reads this chapter—indeed, the same thing may be said of the whole work—one can understand the author's reluctance to set before us a translation made with his own hands, lest the praise bestowed on us should seem excessive. Under the circumstances, however, not the faintest doubt can be cast on his sincerity. The book, as we began with pointing out, was made exclusively for Germans, and it is not to the author, but to another, that we are indebted for the English version. M. W. H.

Africa From South to North.

An admirable piece of thorough, useful, geographical exploration is recorded in Major A. St. H. Gibbons's "Africa From South to North Through Marotseland," two volumes (John Lane, the Bodley Head). It is the scientific survey of Marotseland, the careful exploration of the Zambesi and its sources that give the chief value to the book, though the journey through the continent may appeal more to the popular fancy.

It is not the Africa of Livingstone, not even the Africa of Stanley, that Major Gibbons had to deal with. Even in the region where he was able to make important discoveries, he was annoyed and hampered by savages who knew about Buluwayo and prices there and who wore the castoff garments of civilization. The principal chief of the land, Lewanika, had made the journey to England and had been lionized in London. There was plenty of savagery left, and particularly the lack of means of transportation and of subsistence, to make travel arduous in the extreme, as is likely to be the case in interior Africa for many years to come, but the experiences even now are not wholly those of pioneers and discoverers.

The journey north to Khartum, on the other hand, is rather a manifestation of the hold Europe has now on the dark continent, than of dangerous adventures. There were gaps, to be sure, long and critical ones, but from the time Major Gibbons left Lewanika's land he was always within reach, though not immediate reach of course, of some outposts of civilization, whether Congo State, or German East African, or British missionary, or Soudanese stations.

The story is told directly and unpretentiously, and is accompanied by an admirable large scale map of the Zambesi surveys. Its plain sincerity may not appeal to the general public, but it makes the book the more valuable from the scientific side, so that it is sure to be quoted frequently. The work is done so well that it will not need to be done again in a hurry, even when the British push their railroad over the Victoria Falls gorge.

Major Gibbons's book has had the unavoidable misfortune of being delayed in publication by the Boer war. He and two of his assistants, one of whom was killed at Mafeking, rushed to the front as soon as they could get out of the wilds. The general outline of the story was therefore known several years before the book could be prepared, and this, while in no way impairing its scientific value, may affect popular interest.

A strange and striking picture appears at the end of the first volume, which closes the Marotse survey. Four Englishmen are dining together at Liagui, on the upper Zambesi, planning to get to the coast and home. Instead of holding together, each determines to go by himself, and each takes a different point of the compass. Mr. Coryndon goes south, the easiest way, to Buluwayo and Cape Town; Capt. Hamilton goes east, down the Zambesi, to its mouth; Capt. Quicke turns west to the coast at Benguela, while Major Gibbons starts north, for the lakes and Khartum and the Nile.

The volumes are illustrated by many photographs, which might have been reproduced in larger form with great advantage to distinctness.

Childhood Minutely Recalled.

One of the essays in Walter Russell's handsome book entitled "The Age of Innocence" (Dodd, Mead & Co.) begins: "Remember the long, happy days of summer, before you ever dreamed of being a grown-up, when each moment was full of the countless joys which nature provides for healthful youngsters like yourself. Remember that daisy field—don't you remember that wonderful daisy field beyond the stables?"

Presently we come to a cherry tree in the daisy field. A cherry partly eaten by a robin lies under the tree. A solicitous parent has instructed us not to touch any cherries, but we pick this one up. The essay continues:

"It must be ripe, else the robin would not have eaten one side out of it. You nibble the other side. Oh, how lucious! 'My, that's ripe!' you exclaim; and then, somehow, you find yourself on the fence reaching for more, and thinking, thinking, way back in your head somewhere, that mother would not have forbidden you eating them if she had only known how ripe they really were—on this tree especially—and just on this especial branch."

The essay does not allow evil to go unpunished. You are disturbed by a shout from your brothers and sister, who, provokingly, happen along at this moment and tauntingly remark: 'Ah, ha, mister sneaky, you just wait till mother knows what you are doing and then see what'll happen to you—u—u. You just wait.'"

So much is but a slight indication of the joys and terrors of the daisy field, but we will pass on to the old barn. Of this memorable resort the essayist says: "Without any exception whatever the old barn is as good a place to have fun in as any place you ever knew. You could go there any time, even when it rained, if you would only remember the rules that mother had made."

Mother had a comprehensive eye. She knew the dangers of the old barn as well as the dangers of the daisy field. We read along: "First and foremost, you must never use a pitchfork in any way, and you must always see if any were sticking in the hay; if so, you must put them in a certain place, prongs downward. Then you must search the hay for hens' eggs, for a few of the hens always lay their eggs in the hay. Then you must not climb to the high beams in any part of the barn that did not have hay under them, for Johnny Litchfield did it and fell on a hay cutter and broke his arm. Then, let us see—oh, yes, you are not to hide in the cowshed part of the barn when you play hide-and-seek."

The game of hide and seek is considered with much detail in the essay on the old barn. We must pass it by, likewise what is said about the peat meadow, the brook, the camp fire, the swimming hole and the frog pond. The snow battle we must also pass by, save only the very end. At the last:

"Harvey throws his hat high in the air and shouts, 'Three cheers, three cheers and a tiger for Gen. Ted!'

"'One!'

"'Hurrah!'

"'Two!'

"'Hurrah!'

"'Three!'

"'Hurrah! Ti-i-g-e-r-r-r!'"

It will be seen that the book is very faithful to the realistic idea. It is illustrated by the author with many charming pictures of children. It is dedicated to the younger children of President Roosevelt, and Ethel and Archie Roosevelt are pictured in a colored frontispiece.

The Bible as Literature.

Times have changed in the Massachusetts Bay colony. What would the Pilgrim Fathers have said, or their Puritan brothers of Boston, of the publication in the three-hilled town of the Bible, not as inspired revelation, but as a specimen of English literature, and from a press called after that seat of all abominations the Merry Mount of Thomas Morton? It is enough to make Cotton Mather rise from his grave, where he must have been restless enough since his own Harvard College began a course on the Bible simply as good English.

It is a splendid edition of the King James version that comes to us from the R. H. Hinkley Company, Boston, in fourteen stately volumes, admirably printed and handsomely bound in oakwood covers and pigskin backs. It is the work of D. B. Updike at the Merrymount Press, and the page is as beautiful as any we have seen, clear black type, liberal spacing and leading and margin. It is not in the shape to which we are accustomed, for marked changes have been made in the traditional arrangement for the sake of literary clearness.

In the first place, the numbering of chapters and verses has been abandoned, making reference according to established usage impossible. The chapters are separated, but not obtrusively, and a system of paragraphs according to the sense is employed. Next, the marking out of words interpolated in the translation by the use of italics is given up, and they appear as integral parts of the narrative. Finally, those parts of the Bible narrative that are considered to be poetry are printed in broken lines like poetry. The result is a page as unlike the familiar page of the Bible as is possible, though the words are those of the greatest of all English texts, the King James Bible. The publishers go too far, perhaps, when they say: "It is because the Bible has never been printed in an intelligent way that the reading of it is a task, when it ought to be a delight." The reading of the familiar words in this form certainly gives novelty to them.

It is a great merit of this edition that it contains no word of comment, no word of explanation. It is merely the text of 1611 in a new typographical arrangement. The first nine volumes contain the books of the Old Testament, volumes X. and XI., the Old Testament apocryphal books, and the last three volumes the New Testament. The one fault we have to find with the edition is that it has illustrations. These are etchings from paintings, and seem selected with little regard for religious feeling. It is likely that even if only great masterpieces had been chosen they would have seemed equally trivial, for it would need artistic work of a very high order to match the dignity of the typography and the make-up of this edition.

Fourteen volumes octavo may seem many. They are not too many, however, even from the purely literary point of view, for the book that has impressed itself on the English language more strongly than all the rest of its literature put together.

Muskallonge Kept Channel Open.

Woodruff correspondence St. Paul Dispatch.

What has been regarded as a peculiar phenomenon of nature was explained to-day. Ever since Rice Lake was frozen over it has been noticed that a narrow channel was always open at the entrance to the thoroughfare leading into Alder Lake.

Tom Miller early this morning noticed that a thin coating of ice had formed during the night. While looking at it he was astonished to see a big muskallonge start from the east shore and, acting for all the world like a tug backing heavy ice, break its way to the other shore. Reaching that, the big fish, which, according to Miller, must have weighed seventy-five pounds, started back, trimming up the rough edges of the channel. Mr. Miller says it was the most remarkable sight he ever witnessed.

How a Load of Coal Shrinks.

From the Des Moines Register and Leader.

"You cannot realize the amount of coal stolen from a railroad train in one journey of ten miles," said Special Agent Gump of Moberly, Mo. "Every town along the railroad has a number of residents who think that because the railroad carries a lot of the bituminous product it has a lot to spare. Nearly every one of them, with sack, wagon, basket and all kinds of receptacles, pile into the cars and take what they want. The trainmen have a running fight every winter with coal thieves. No sooner do they get rid of those from one town than they are in the next and a new lot pile on. The shrinkage of a car of coal in a 100 mile haul is sometimes as high as 16 per cent."