The Sun.

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1907.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

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.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosques 14 and 77, Boulevard des Capucines, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens.

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.

The State and the Hudson-Fulton Celebration.

The celebration of the tercentenary of the discovery of the Hudson by HENRY HUDSON and of the centenary of the first use of steam by ROBERT FULTON in navigating the river, that is to say, the joint celebration of the famous exploring voyage of the Half Moon and of the epoch making voyage of the Clermont to Albany, will be incomplete and disappointing unless the State cooperates with the city of New York.

The city has appropriated $3,000,000 for a Hudson Memorial bridge across the Spuyten Duyvil at Inwood; also it is proposed to create a municipal park of seventy-five acres at Inwood Hill, from whose wooded heights a spacious view up and down the river may be had. To the white man the progress of FULTON'S steamboat on its waters was as wonderful as the intrusion of the quaint Half Moon seemed to the lurking savage, and it is fitting that the discovery and the invention which have signified so much to geography and science should be celebrated together, especially as the tercentennial of HUDSON'S exploration and the centennial of FULTON'S triumph occur so close together in point of time. The city, as becomes the chief beneficiary of the achievements of HUDSON and FULTON, has decided of its own initiative to perpetuate those achievements and has planned memorials on an imposing scale. The State has been asked to do its share in a modest way by appropriating $125,000 for a public park at Verplanck's Point in the town of Cortland and county of Westchester, one of the finest observation places in the Hudson Valley. The land can be obtained for a reasonable price, and as a site for a park it is also desirable for its Revolutionary memories. There stood Fort Fayette; there WASHINGTON received Count ROCHAMBEAU and the French auxiliaries in 1782; and at Verplanck's Point was the King's Ferry so much used by the patriot army in its operations against the British.

In a strenuous session Representative APGAR'S bill providing for the appropriation has not received the recognition it deserved. At present it waits on the favor of the Committee on Rules. No reason can be assigned why the State should not join in the celebration and acknowledge the debt of the Hudson River valley above the city to the explorer and the inventor. The first proposal submitted to the Hudson-Fulton Celebration Commission was that a world's fair or an exposition similar to that at Jamestown should be held in New York, and if that plan had been adopted the State would have been called upon for a very generous appropriation. It gave $610,000 for the Columbian celebration at Chicago and $353,000 for the Pan-American exposition at Buffalo, and in 1904 its contribution to the Louisiana Purchase world's fair at St. Louis was $390,000. But no such tax on the liberality of the State has been thought of in connection with the commemoration of the discovery of the Hudson and its conquest by steam, although they appeal powerfully to local pride.

Can the State spare $125,000 for a people's park at historic Verplanck's Point, a memorial to Hudson and Fulton which would endure as long as the nation? It seems a reflection upon the pride and dignity of the Commonwealth to ask such a question. We are sure that if the matter is properly presented to the Legislature the Apgar bill will be advanced and passed before adjournment. To defer action upon it until next year would be to cripple the Commission in its public spirited endeavors to achieve a celebration worthy of the great occasion.

Preventable Fires.

In 1906 there were 8,331 fires requiring the services of the Fire Department in Manhattan, The Bronx and Richmond, and the Fire Marshal reports that 3,895 of these were due to carelessness, while he believes that of 2,765 fires of which the causes were not ascertained a large proportion were the result of heedlessness with matches and tobacco. Of the fires resulting from preventable causes 887 were traceable to carelessness with matches, half as many to cigars and cigarettes, 915 to bonfires and brush fires, 386 to unguarded candles and tapers, 228 to children playing with matches or fires, as many to curtains blown against unprotected gas flames, and nearly 900 to faulty or unwatched chimneys, stoves and flues. In Brooklyn and Queens 732 fires are charged against matches igniting awnings, bedding, clothing, rubbish and waste. Of this disquieting record Commissioner LANTRY says:

"I believe that every city department which has officers or inspectors constantly coming in touch with the people should take cognizance of this condition of things through their officers or inspectors calling the attention of the householder to the dangers arising from carelessness as indicated in this report. Furthermore, I believe that it would be a good idea if the Board of Education was asked to give directions to school principals and teachers that would result in instructions being given to the children of our public schools of the dangers arising from what may apparently seem to be trifling carelessness, and yet may be productive of great loss. It seems to me that if the warning against fire causing carelessness is properly disseminated among the scholars in the public schools it will have a lasting effect, and it will not only be beneficial at an early day, but for years to come, so that the necessity for caution will be deeply impressed upon the minds of the children and will remain with them as they grow to be men and women."

Fire Marshal SEERY'S inspectors have learned that the use of candles in religious exercises in the home gives many opportunities for accident, and he criticises the negligence of landlords who allow the deadlights over vaults and cellars to fall into disrepair, thus inviting discarded cigars and cigarettes to fall in rubbish stored in the cellars. Another fruitful source of fires is the lack of protection of inflammable substances hauled through the streets. Sparks from the elevated third rail, burning tobacco and matches fall on hay, excelsior, cotton and the like, and frequently cause smouldering fires that are not discovered until it is too late to prevent great damage. Fires originating in this way would be almost unknown if carmen covered all loads of combustible materials with tarpaulins while in transit.

Certain insurance companies continue to encourage negligence and arson by their lax methods in issuing policies. The authorities frequently find cases in which goods of nominal value are covered by several policies in amounts greatly exceeding the value of the property. It is plain that in numerous instances no attempt has been made to investigate the applicant or his possessions, and the companies have done their utmost to add to the fire hazard.

Will Germany Join the Peace Combination?

There is good sense in the suggestion of the London *Spectator* that Germany should be courteously invited to enter the ring of alliances and understandings by which three European Powers have combined with the strongest Asiatic Power practically to guarantee their respective possessions in the Far East and to cooperate in assuring peace in that quarter of the globe. We refer, of course, to the Anglo-Japanese alliance, the Franco-Russian league and the treaties between Japan on the one hand and Russia and France on the other, which for some time have been in course of negotiation, and about the conclusion of which there is no longer any doubt. The only great Powers which as yet stand outside this circle of amity and concord are Germany and the United States. Why, asks the *Spectator*, should not these two be included?

So far as Germany is concerned we know of no reason why she should repel an invitation to join the combination. Obviously, Emperor WILLIAM would have something to gain, and nothing to lose, by joining the pacific coalition, so long as its aims should be limited to upholding the respective interests of the parties in the Far East, and should not be extended to the Near East, where the hopes and plans of Germany are less easily reconcilable with those of Russia, Great Britain and France. As things are now, Russia's grasp on the Amur region, northern Sakhalin and Vladivostok with the Usuri coast strip, Japan's hold of southern Sakhalin, Corea, the Liao-tung peninsula, the Loochoo archipelago and Formosa, Great Britain's possession of Hongkong with an adjoining riparian district and of Wei-hai-wei, and the wide dominion acquired by France in Further India, are now immune against aggression, or will be when pending treaties are signed. Why should not Germany desire like security for her leasehold of Kiao-chau, on which she has already expended great sums of money, and on which she counts to give her something like an equal foothold with that gained by her commercial competitors in China? We believe that she can get such security for the asking. It cannot be for the interest of Great Britain or France, nor even of Russia, if the last named Power be well advised, to bar out Germany from a cordial understanding with Japan.

Whether the United States should make a treaty with Japan agreeing in its main features with those which France and Russia are about to conclude is manifestly a question that stands on a different footing. Our historical policy forbids us to enter into entangling alliances with foreign Powers. Now a treaty which bound us to guarantee Japan's possession of the acquisitions made by her during the last twelve years in return for a similar guarantee of our ownership of the Philippines would, on the face of it, be entangling. At first sight, therefore, the question raised by the *Spectator* would have to be answered in the negative. It is conceivable, however, that on second thought it might be held that through our annexation of the Philippines we have ceased to be exclusively an American and have become to a certain extent an Asiatic Power, and that consequently our traditional policy is no longer applicable so far as our new Asiatic interests may be affected. It may be argued that it does not follow because we may be tempted to accept certain reciprocal obligations in Asiatic waters that we should be logically driven into corresponding entanglements in other parts of the world. This branch of the inquiry mooted by the *Spectator* is, at all events, worthy of mature consideration.

Railway Valuation.

The soundness of Mr. ROOSEVELT'S position in the matter of physical valuation of railway properties is shown by the fact of his general agreement with the views of such eminent economic and political experts as WILLIAM J. BRYAN, Senator LA FOLLETTE and HANKS the Repudiated.

In a letter written to Mr. HENRY M. WHITNEY, under date of March 25, 1907, Mr. BRYAN said:

"I have contended that the present value of the railroads should be ascertained by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the commissioners of the various States, in order that investors may know when they are buying stock of intrinsic value and when they are being cheated."

Mr. BRYAN'S view of the proper basis of valuation is the cost of reproducing the road, presumably at the time of appraisal. This system ignores the fact of fluctuation in land values and in cost of material and equipment. Under it an annual valuation would be practically obligatory, if, as he proposes, valuation should be made the basis of earnings and dividends.

The bill introduced in the Senate by Mr. LA FOLLETTE declares that "the Interstate Commerce Commission shall investigate and ascertain the fair value of the property of every railroad engaged in interstate commerce. For the purpose of such investigation the commission is authorized to employ such engineers, experts and other assistants as may be necessary." Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S opinion, based on his experience in the valuation of Wisconsin railroads for purposes of State taxation, was that the cost of the proposed investigation would be about $5,000,000 and the time required for the work about two years.

We do not at the moment recall just what Mr. HANKS said about it, and doubt if any one else does. We only remember that he spent some of his own time and a lot of the nation's money to exploit a futile scheme for squeezing the water out of overcapitalized railroads.

Just at the present moment the President does not seem to be quite sure of his position. He is evidently at least half convinced that physical value has something to do with rates and dividends and ought to be the basis of both. That his faith in this theory is less absolute than that of his fellow workers in the great cause may be inferred from his deviation, in his Indianapolis speech, from the straight and narrow way of basic principle to become mired in the uncertainties of policy and expedient. He does not seem to be quite sure that it would be well to treat all roads alike and get the value of all down in indisputable black and white figures. He proposes that the Commission be authorized and equipped to undertake the physical valuation of each and any road which that body, in its wisdom and judgment, may see fit to chase down.

It is unfortunate that Mr. ROOSEVELT did not show the country, and particularly the railway managers, just how physical valuation is to be made a sound working basis for rate adjustment. It is true that neither BRYAN nor LA FOLLETTE, nor again HANKS, has revealed the secret.

Mr. Bryan Calls Again.

Tireless and unafraid, the Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN will invade New York once more this week, to continue his efforts for the decimation of the Democratic party. Here it was that he proclaimed his devotion to Government ownership of the railroads. Here dwell many of those base creatures who, hesitating to accept the sacred initiative and referendum as fundamental principles of pure and undefiled Jeffersonian doctrine, find Mr. BRYAN ejecting them from their party and closing the door of the Democratic temple against them.

Yet even Mr. BRYAN'S herculean labors have not accomplished the utter overthrow of the Democracy of New York. Last year, in spite of the heavy handicap imposed by its nominee for Governor, it was able to defeat all the Republican candidates for State office except Mr. HUGHES. It possesses more power and controls more patronage now than it has since ROSWELL P. FLOWER quitted the executive mansion at the end of 1894. It has opportunity to rehabilitate itself and to prepare for a campaign against the Republicans next year to be conducted on terms more nearly approaching equality than those of any on which it has entered in a dozen years.

Naturally Mr. BRYAN is alarmed and displeased as he studies such a portentous prospect. He sees that his unequalled powers as an organizer of discord and disaster are needed in the Empire State. Whom will he read out of the party on his visit to New York this week?

So far, at least, 1907 has produced no opportunity for the bore who asks: "Is it warm enough for you?"

When a tipsy tailor crawled aboard the President's car and was carried along clinging to the rear platform, who opened the door and whose right hand was extended in cordial welcome? None other than the Hon. CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS, the disciple of buttermilk, did these kindly acts, did them out of the overflowing cordiality and sympathy of his warm heart, did them spontaneously and without thought of the convention or hope of reward. The Consolidated Buttermilk and Alcohol Consumers' Fairbanks Club will be heard from in 1908. Temperance and Tolerance! FAIRBANKS, the universal candidate!

It is somebody else's turn next time.—*President* ROOSEVELT *to a third term shouter.*

But that somebody else must be of The Type.

A most significant and in some cases surprising opposition to an early revision of the tariff is the result of a mail canvass which has just been made by the Home Market Club of its own members, of the members of the principal Republican clubs in Massachusetts, and of the National Association of Manufacturers composed of both Republicans and Democrats and scattered throughout the country.—*The Protectionist.*

Similar "significant and surprising opposition to an early revision of the tariff" is also reported among the members and employees of the American Protective Tariff League.

Civilization in the South.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In the first editorial column this morning you say that "the South still maintains an undefiled Anglo-Saxon civilization," but on what you base your assertion God only knows. From personal observation I can say that in no part of the United States is murder of both black and white more frequent and flagrant; free speech is practically unknown, while the white men have about the lowest standard of morality; in fact, a majority have none at all where a black woman is concerned. As a genuine Anglo-Saxon myself I resent your libel.

NEW YORK, June 1. EDWARD WHITE.

The Tree.

It shades us from the sun and storm
Its branches wide we see,
But mark the course of mortal life
In ages of the tree.

First on its trunk a lusty youth
In most romantic part
Entwined initials deftly carved,
Surrounded by a heart.

Time runs. The busy years fly by
On pinions swift and true:
He cuts a switch. Folks hear him say:
"This hurts me worse than you."

In lean and slippered pantaloon
He hums an old refrain,
And then for final age of all
From it he cuts a cane.

MCLANDBURGH WILSON.

AUGUSTE RENOIR.

What Is Impressionism?

II.

The impressionists claim as their common ancestors Claude Lorraine, Watteau, Turner, Monticelli. Watteau, Latour, Largillière, Fragonard, Saint-Aubin, Moreau and Eisen are their sponsors in the matters of design, subject, realism, study of life, new conceptions of beauty and portraiture. Mythology, allegory, historic themes, the neo-Greek and the academic are under the ban—above all the so-called "grand style." Impressionism has actually elevated genre painting to the position occupied by those vast, empty, pompous, frigid, smoky, classic pieces of the early nineteenth century. However, it must not be forgotten that modern impressionism is only a new technique, a new method of execution—we say new, though that is not exactly the case. The home of impressionism is in the East; it may be found in the vivid patterns woven in Persia or in old Japan. In its latest avatar it is the expression of contemporaneous reality. Therein is its true power. The artist who turns his face to the past—his work will never be anything but an echo. To depict the faces and things and pen the manners of the present is the task of great painters and novelists. Actualists alone count in the future. The mills of the antique grind swiftly—like the rich, they will be always with us—but they only grind out imitations; and from pseudo classic marbles and pseudo "beautiful" pictures may the Lord of Flies deliver us.

That able and sympathetic writer Mr. D. S. MacColl has tersely summed up in his "Vision of the Century" the difference between the old and new manner of seeing things. "The old vision had beaten out three separate acts—the determination of the edges and limits of things, the shadings and the modellings of the spaces in between with black and white, and the tintings of those spaces with their local color. The new vision that had been growing up among the landscape painters simplifies as well as complicates the old. For purposes of analysis it sees the world as a mosaic of patches of color, such and such a hue, such and such a tone, such and such a shape. * * * The new analysis looked first for color and for a different color in each patch of shade or light. The old painting followed the old vision by its three processes of drawing the contours, modelling the chiaroscura in dead color, and finally in coloring this black and white preparation. The new analysis left the contours to be determined by the junction, more or less fused, of the color patches, instead of rigidly defining them as they are known to be defined when seen near at hand or felt * * * 'Local color' in light or shade becomes different not only in tone but in hue."

To the layman who asked, "What is impressionism?" Mauclair has given the most succinct answer in his book "L'Impressionisme": "In nature," he declares, "no color exists by itself. The coloring of the object is pure illusion; the only creative source of color is the sunlight, which envelops all things and reveals them, according to the hours, with infinite modifications * * * The idea of distance, of perspective, of volume, is given us by darker or lighter colors; this is the sense of values; a value is the degree of light or dark intensity which permits our eyes to comprehend that one object is further or nearer than another. And as painting is not and cannot be the imitation of nature, but merely her artificial interpretation, since it has only at its disposal two out of three dimensions, the values are the only means that remain for expressing depth on a flat surface. Color is therefore the procreatrix of design. * * * Colors vary with the intensity of light. * * * Local color is an error; a leaf is not green, a tree trunk is not brown. * * * According to the time of day, i. e., according to the greater or smaller inclination of the rays (scientifically called the angle of incidence) the green of the leaf and the brown of the tree are modified. * * * The composition of the atmosphere * * * is the real subject of the picture. * * * Shadow is not absence of light, but light of a different quality and of a different value Shadow is not part of the landscape where light ceases, but where it is subordinated to a light which appears to us more intense. In the shadow the rays of the spectrum vibrate with a different speed. Painting should therefore try to discover here, as in the light parts, the play of the atoms of solar light, instead of representing shadows with ready made tones composed of bitumen and black. * * * In a picture representing an interior the source of light [windows] may not be indicated; the light circulating, circling around the picture, will then be composed of the *reflections* of rays whose source is invisible, and all the objects, acting as mirrors for these reflections, will consequently influence each other. Their colors will affect each other even if the surfaces be dull. A red vase placed upon a blue carpet will lead to a very subtle but mathematically exact exchange between this blue and this red; and this exchange of luminous waves will create between the two colors a tone of reflections composed of both. These composite reflections will form a scale of tones complementary of the two principal colors.

"The painter will have to paint with only the seven colors of the solar spectrum and discard all the others; * * * he will, furthermore, instead of composing mixtures on his palette, place upon his canvas touches of none but the seven colors juxtaposed [Claude Monet has added black and white] and leave the individual rays of each of these colors to blend at a certain distance, so as to act like sunlight upon the eye of the beholder." This is called *dissociation* of tones; and here is a new convention; why banish all save the spectrum? We paint nature, not the solar spectrum.

Claude Monet has been thus far the most successful practitioner of impressionism; this by reason of his extraordinary analytical power of vision and native genius rather than the researches of Helmholtz, Chevreul and Rood. They gave him his scientific formulas after he had worked out the problems. He studied Turner in London, 1870; then his manner changed. He had been a devoted pupil of Eugene Boudin and could paint the discreet, pearly gray seascapes of his master. But Turner and Watteau and Monticelli modified his style, changed his way of envisaging the landscape. Not Edouard Manet but Claude Monet was the initiator of the impressionistic movement, and after witnessing the rout and confusion that followed in its wake one is tempted to misquote Nietzsche (who said that the first and only Christian died on the cross) and boldly assert that there has been but one impressionist; his name, Monet. "He has arrived at painting by means of the infinitely varied juxtaposition of a quantity of color spots which dissociate the tones of the spectrum and draw the forms of objects through the arabesque of their vibrations." How his landscapes shimmer with the heat of a summer day. Truly, you can say of these pictures that "the dawn comes up like thunder." How his fogs, wet and clinging, seem to be the first real fogs that ever made misty a canvas. What hot July nights, with few large stars, has Monet not painted! His series of hayricks, cathedrals, the Thames are precious notations of contemporary life; they state facts in terms of exquisite artistic value; they resume an epoch. It is therefore no surprise to learn that in 1874 Monet gave the name (so variously abused) to the entire movement when he exhibited a water piece on the Boulevard des Capucines entitled "Impression: Soleil Levant." That title became a catchword usually employed in a derisive manner. Manet earlier had resented the intrusion of a man with a name so like his, but succumbed to the influence of Monet. One thing can no longer be controverted—Claude Monet is the greatest landscape and marine painter of the second half of the last century. Perhaps time may remove this limit clause.

In his very valuable contribution to the history of the cause Théodore Duret, the biographer and friend of Whistler and Manet, has in his "Les Peintres Impressionistes" (recently published) held the scales very much in favor of Manet's priority in the field over Monet. It is true that in 1863 Manet had drawn upon his head the thunderous wrath of Paris by exhibiting his "Déjeuner sur l'Herbe" and "Olympe"—the latter is now in the Louvre and is by no means a representative effort of the painter's genius, despite its diabolic cleverness. (It reveals a profound study of Tizisno and Giorgione.) But his vision was in reality synthetic, not analytic; he was a primitive; he belongs to the family of Velasquez, Ribera, Goya. He imitated Hals—and with what glorious results in "Le Bon Bock"! He manipulated paint like an "old master" and did astounding things with the higher tones of the color scale He was not an impressionist until he met Monet. Then in audacity he outstripped his associates. Discouraged by critical attacks, his courage had been revived by the greatest art critic France had thus far produced, Charles Baudelaire, who fought for Richard Wagner as well as for Poe and Manet. To the painter the poet scornfully wrote: "You complain about attacks? But are you the first to endure them? Have you more genius than Chateaubriand and Wagner? They were not killed by derision. And in order not to make you too proud I must tell you that they are models, each in his own way and in a very rich world, while you are only the first in the decrepitude of your art." Sinister and disquieting that last phrase, and for those who see in impressionism the decadence of painting (because of the predominance given to the parts over the whole) it is a phrase prophetic.

Manet is a classic. His genuine power—technically speaking—lies in his broad, sabrelike strokes of his brush and not in the often niggling *taches* of the impressionists—of which the *reductio ad absurdum* is *pointillisme*. He lays on his pigments in sweeping strokes and his divisions are large His significance for us does not alone reside in his consummate mastery of forms and colors, but in his forthright expression of the life that hummed about him. He is as actual as Hals. Study that "Boy With the Sword" at the Metropolitan Museum—is there anything impressionistic about it? It is Spanish, the Spain of Velasquez, in its beautiful thin, clear, flat painting, its sober handling of values. The truth is that Manet dearly loved a fight, and being *chef d'école* he naturally drifted to the impressionists' camp. And it is significant that Duret does not give this virile spirit a place in his new volume, confining the estimate of his genius to the preface. Mauclair, on the contrary, includes Manet's name in his more comprehensive and more scientific study, as he also includes the name of Edgar Degas—Degas, who was a latter day Ingres, plus color and psychology.

The title of impressionism has been a misleading one. If Degas is an impressionist, pray what then is Monet? Pissaro, Sisley, Cézanne are impressionists, and in America there is no impropriety in attaching the handle to the works of Twachtmann, Alden Weir, W. L. Metcalf, Childe Hassam, Robert Reid, Ernest Lawson, Paul Cornoyer, Colin Cooper Campbell and others. But Manet, Degas! It would have been a happier invention to have called the 1877 group independents; independent they were, each man pursuing his own rainbow. We may note an identical confusion in the mind of the public regarding the Barbizon school. Never was a group composed of such dissimilar spirits. Yet people talk about Millet *and* Breton, Corot *and* Daubigny, Rousseau *and* Dupré. They still say Goethe *and* Schiller, Beethoven *and* Mozart, Byron *and* Shelley! It is mental inertia, this coupling of such widely disparate temperaments.

That uncritical bull in the culture shop, Max Nordau, has demonstrated to his own dissatisfaction that the votaries of impressionism suffer from diseased eyesight. Nevertheless, divided tones and "screaming" palette do not always a picture make. Mediocrity loves to mask itself behind artistic innovations. For the world at large impressionism spells improvisation—an easy going, slatternly, down at the heels process, facile as well as factitious. Albert Wolff thought these things when he sat for his portrait to Manet. His surprise was great when the artist demanded as many sittings as would have the painstaking Bonnat. Whistler shocked Ruskin when he confessed to having painted a nocturne in two days, but with a lifetime experience in each stroke of the brush Whistler was a swift worker, and while he claimed the honor of being the originator of impressionism—didn't he "originate" Velasquez?—he really belonged to the preceding generation. He was impressionistic, if you will, yet not an impressionist. He was Japanese and Spanish, never Watteau, Monticelli, Turner or Monet.

Mr. MacColl has pointed out the weakness of the scientific side of impressionism. Its values are strictly æsthetic; attempts to paint on a purely scientific basis have proved both monotonous and ludicrous. The experiments of the neo-impressionists (the 1885 group), of Signac, Seurat, were not very convincing. Van Rhysselberge, one of the few painters to-day who practise *pointillisme*, or the system of dots, is a gifted artist; so is Anquetin. Van Googh, a Dutchman, and his friend Paul Gauguin were the two big fellows of the new crowd As a school impressionism has run down to a thin rill in a waste of sand. It is more technical than personal, and while it was lucky to have such an exponent as Claude Monet, there is every reason to believe that Monet's impressionism is largely the result of a peculiar penetrating vision. He has been imitated, and Maufra and Moret are carrying on his tradition—yet there is but one Monet.

We know that the spectral palette is a mild delusion and sometimes a dangerous snare, that impressionism is in the remotest analysis but a new convention supplanting an old. Painters will never go back to the muddy palette of the past. The trick has been turned. The egg of Columbus has been stood once more on end. Claude Monet has taught us the "innocence of the eye," has shown us how to paint air that circulates, water that sparkles. The sun was the centre of the impressionistic attack, the "splendid silent sun." A higher pitch in key color has been attained, shadows have been endowed with vital hues. (And Leonardo Da Vinci, wonderful landscapist, centuries ago wrote learnedly of colored shadows; every new discovery is only a rediscovery.) The "dim religious light" of the studio has been banished; the average palette is lighter, is more brilliant. And Rembrandt is still worshipped; Raphael is still on his pedestal, and the millionaire on the street continues to buy Bouguereau. The amateur who honestly wishes to purge his vision of encrusted painted prejudices we warn not to go too close to an impressionistic canvas—any more than he would go near a redhot stove or a keg of gunpowder. And let him forget those toothsome critical terms, decomposition, recomposition. His eyes, if permitted, will act for themselves; there is no denying that the principles of impressionism soundly applied, especially to landscape, catch the fleeting many hued charm of nature. It is a system of colored stenography—in the hands of a master. Woe betide the fumbler!

In conclusion we congratulate the Metropolitan Museum on the possession of a rare work of art in the Renoir portrait. It should be supplemented by some Monets, for those now on view are loans. It is the same with the Rodins And volumes of praise would not suffice to reward the house of Durand-Ruel for its pluck and *prévoyance* in encouraging and assisting the heads of the impressionistic movement thirty years ago, at a time when even as an investment the prospect was disenchanting. That M. Durand-Ruel has made a fortune and the fortunes of Monet and the rest is a testimony not only to his courage but also to his critical powers. Without Durand-Ruel impressionism would have been delayed from reaching the world for at least a quarter of a century. The secret of success is, never to be satisfied—with mediocrity The immediate predecessors of Manet, Monet, Degas, Renoir were, the greater number, industrious, self-satisfied, shallow artists. Auguste Renoir was never satisfied.

MEDICAL UNIFICATION BILL.

Religious Practices Contemplated by the Exemption Clause in Section 14.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In reply to "G. M. D.," whose letter appears in THE SUN of May 31, I wish to say that the exemption clause of Section 14 of the medical unification bill recently enacted into law was not intended to benefit or apply to Christian Scientists, but to a very much larger class of citizens who believe in the performance of certain religious rites which would come under the practice of medicine or surgery not only according to a recent decision of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, but also according to the definition of the practice of medicine given in the bill referred to. Instances of these religious practices are Jewish circumcision and the belief by many Catholics in the healing properties of the relic of St. Ann.

It is hard to see how any law could be enacted that would prevent sane adults from resorting to any method of treatment they wished to employ. Such letters as those written by "G. M. D." and others tend to help Christian Scientists by making martyrs of them.

"G. M. D." complains that the law was promoted and passed without sufficient opportunity for examination or indorsement by the medical profession. It is most surprising that any physician or other citizen in this State has the hardihood to make such a confession of ignorance.

As a matter of fact, the bill was introduced early in the session of the present Legislature, being No. 154 in the Senate and No. 160 in the Assembly, and public hearings were held before the committees on Public Health of both houses. It was also discussed and indorsed by nearly every county medical society in the State, the county societies of New York and Kings taking an especially active interest in the bill.

It was also earnestly promoted by the State Medical Society through its efficient committee on legislation, and by the State Board of Education. Above all, it successfully stood the scrutiny of our able and cautious Governor. Indeed, the passage of this bill marks the happy culmination of long years of strife and creates a condition of affairs highly satisfactory to the majority of public spirited, broad minded members of the medical profession. Without doubt it will work for the benefit of the community at large—which after all was the chief object sought. HARRY S. PURDY, M. D.

NEW YORK, June 1.

An English Opinion of Samuel L. Clemens.

From the Spectator.

Some thirty-five years ago Mr. Samuel Clemens—or Mark Twain as it is pleasanter to call him—was deputed by his fellow passengers to ask for recognition from the Royal Humane Society for the captain and the lifeboat crew of the steamer Batavia for saving life at sea. Quite characteristically, he asked for no reward for himself. He was satisfied if he had been of any service "standing around the deck in a furious storm, without an umbrella, keeping an eye on things and seeing that they were done right, and yelling whenever a cheer seemed the important thing." That was enough for him; but what he asked for was recognition for the captain and the crew from the humane society, who, he wrote, would "in so remembering them increase the high honor and esteem in which the society is held all over the civilized world." Perhaps we may reapply the words to the position of the author at the present moment. Another "humane society" is proposing to confer a distinction upon an honored personage. The University of Oxford has offered an honorary degree to Mark Twain, which will be conferred upon him at the forthcoming commemoration, and it is certainly true that in honoring the great American writer Oxford honors herself. * * * But he is, above all, the fearless upholder of all that is clean, noble, straightforward, innocent and manly. If there is a certain meaning to the phrase "American journalism" which is distasteful to Englishmen, Mark Twain, of American writers, stands for all that Englishmen like best. He has his extravagances; some of his public, indeed, would insist on them. But if he is a jester, he jests with the mirth of the happiest of Puritans; he has read much of English knighthood, and translated the best of it into his living pages; and he has assuredly already won a high degree in letters in having added more than any writer since Dickens to the gayety of the empire of the English language.

Indian Court's Verdict.

Mandan correspondence St. Paul Pioneer Press.

According to C. L. Timmerman, vice-president of the First National Bank, who has just returned from a business trip to the Standing Rock Indian reservation, an Indian Judge and jury rendered a remarkable decision in the case of an Indian who sued another for the alleged alienation of his wife's affections.

Mr. Timmerman says that the trial lasted for an entire week and that many witnesses were examined. After due deliberation the jury decided for the plaintiff, and the Judge sentenced the defendant to haul eight loads of hay. The husband who made the charge was ordered to haul seven loads of hay and the squaw was ordered to sit by the roadside and keep tally on the loads of hay as they passed.

An interpreter explained to Mr. Timmerman that the Court in passing this sentence took the ground that if the husband had devoted more of his attention to making the home life of his squaw pleasant the woman would not have allowed herself to be beguiled by another.

Thoughts of a Pedestrian.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In THE SUN of to-day was a humorous account of the arrest of a broker for throwing an apple core in the street. No doubt the officers were too zealous in their duties, but some measures should be taken to prohibit the throwing of banana skins and other débris about. A horde of pushcart men infest the financial district selling fruit, and the results of impromptu lunches from their wares are a menace not only to a man's health but his equilibrium. Recently I shot the shoots on a banana peel and received a painful injury. Possibly if the broker had a similar experience he would not have been so indignant at the officers for enforcing a just and sensible ordinance. B. D. M.

NEW YORK, June 1.

The Policeman's Duty.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A policeman arrested a man for throwing an apple core into the street; the Magistrate discharged the man and chided the policeman.

This action of the Judge is a direct encouragement to lawlessness and dirt. If other policemen neglect their duty, that would not justify this policeman in following their example. E. H. J.

NEW YORK, June 1.

Undesirable.

Jasper—Do you think that any wolf could kill an elk as Dr. Long says?

Jumpuppe—Well, if he could he would be a very undesirable wolf.

THE DUTY OF MEXICO.

Pacification of Guatemala Declared to Be Within Her Sphere.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* During the long, tedious years that elapsed between the shooting of several members of the Virginius expedition at Santiago de Cuba and the blowing up of the Maine at the port of Havana, which precipitated a conflict that was looming up on the horizon ever since the Spaniards challenged the assumed right of Americans to take more interest in Cuban affairs than it was conceded to most foreigners at the time the former held sway in the Pearl of the Antilles, it was the fashion in America to dwell on the God given right to intervene in what they called then and still call their "sphere of influence." More than once in American newspapers we came across long and exhaustive arguments intended to show that it was perfectly proper for the United States to meddle in the difficulties of the Cubans with their old mother country because geographically the island belonged to the great republic of the North and therefore it was within its sphere of action. Prominent American statesmen in order to emphasize those sentiments went so far as to advance the theory that when the house of an impotent neighbor was on fire it was the duty of the one threatened with the sparks to put out by himself the menacing conflagration.

That was then the old line of argument which carried the greatest weight with the American public and which to the eyes of the world justified the waging of a war against Spain which brought about untold results for the winner and the defeated. And now, when our country, Mexico, sees itself burdened with what Kipling calls the "white man's burden" in its dealings with a stubborn neighbor whose government is universally reckoned as a source of mischief and a menace to the peace of Central America, some of the newspapers of the United States laugh at the idea that Guatemala should be within our "sphere of influence" and refer derisively to our main argument.

"What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," and the more so if the gander hails from the same yard as his mate of the opposite sex. What was true in the case of the United States toward Cuba would seem far more convincing considering Mexico in her dealings with Guatemala. We must bear in mind that the latter country is in many senses a continuation of the republic of Mexico, and that the historic ties of race and language would make more natural and logical the rumored annexation of Guatemala to Mexico than that of some of the West Indian islands to the United States.

We beg to call attention to the inconsistency of our critics just to show their weakness and forgetfulness, and not with any desire to advocate a war of conquest in Central America, which we know is as far removed from the ulterior purpose of our wise and patriotic Government as it is from the Czar of Russia to dispense justice to his downtrodden subjects. In her controversy with Guatemala Mexico is bound at all hazards to set aright all wrongs inflicted by imported conspirators on foreigners living in her vast domains, to have her laws respected and to compel the unreasonable and quarrelsome Government of that State of Central America, with which she is now at odds, to gauge the real potentiality of our country as a power for good on the American continent. Dreams of conquest do not enter into the calculations of President Diaz, our beloved ruler.

FELIPE G. CANTON F.

NEW YORK, June 1.

Plain Talk From a Countryman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have been a Republican ever since I could walk. I voted for Mr. Roosevelt twice, but should seriously consider next time if he runs. He is too destructive to suit me.

The very thing that the country avoided in Mr. Bryan is constantly coming out in Roosevelt. I am sick and tired of his talk about "predatory wealth," "corporate wealth" and "individual wealth"—pitting the poor against the rich, engendering class hatred, &c.

Can you imagine what a howl of rage would go up from the country had Mr. Bryan been the inhabitant of the White House during the last four months, when one considers the terrific shrinkage in values? Should we not have all said "I told you so"?

We fear Roosevelt—can it be said we love him?—for the enemies he has made. Has he really the lovable qualities we ever found in Lincoln and McKinley? These men we were drawn to by an indefinable something. Now every one is holding his breath, expecting something more is going to drop that will cause a stampede. Are we to be kept in this constant alarm for seventeen months more?

I have nearly all my possessions invested in railroads and industrials, and the shrinkage has been terrific. I am not a gambler. I bought for investment and expected to participate in the great prosperity. I am now fearful of dividend reductions and further slumps. I am opposed to this railroad agitation. It seems to me that every one I meet who hasn't a railroad stock or bond says: "Sick 'em, Teddy! Go for the sons of guns! Lambast them!"

I consider the railroads have made 90 per cent. of this great country; but how they are going to come out of this nagging, I wonder.

I predict one thing. If this state of affairs keeps up you will see Mr. Bryan in the White House some day.

I well remember when Mr. Roosevelt was running that the Democrats used the expression "Big Stick." I thought only of it as a political slogan, and it meant nothing; but surely my eyes have been opened.

I well remember the time of the last great coal strike. I said then that the President had no more right to interfere than he had to come to my employer and tell him how to run his business. Those owners of the mines were fighting for a principle, and I said the sore had only temporarily healed, that it would have to be fought out to a finish some day, and so it will.

May THE SUN ever brighten our path.

May 31. A COUNTRYMAN.

British California Oil Profits.

That our British cousins are making money out of California oil is evidenced by the 1906 report of California Oilfields, Limited, a company entirely owned in Great Britain. After providing for all the necessary depreciations of the year the report shows a net profit of $372,065. One dividend of 10 per cent. was paid during the year and a second of 20 per cent. ordered, in all 30 per cent. for the year. Profits like that must almost stagger British shareholders, who usually look upon 4, 5 or 6 per cent. as "big returns." In addition $50,000 was carried to "reserve," which is now $200,000. The balance of the year's large profits was carried forward.

Southern California oil, as well as southern California climate, fruits and flowers, is an attractive and profitable proposition.

Automobile Statistics.

Until a year ago France led the world in the production of the motor vehicle. Now the United States has taken the lead. According to M. Faroux, a French statistician, the 1906 production of automobiles was:

United States	60,000
France	55,000
England	28,000
Germany	22,000
Italy	19,000
Belgium	12,000
Total	196,000

In 1901 France built 23,711 cars, while the United States built only 314. There are 20,212 automobiles owned within fifty miles of City Hall Square, New York city.

An Erie Bridge.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Allow me to call the public's attention to the dangerous condition of the bridge across the Hackensack River, over which numerous trains of the Newark branch and Greenwood Lake branch of the Erie travel each day. This bridge is in an extremely insecure state. Signs have been posted at each side of it warning the engineers to move slowly for the last eighteen months or more, and still it is apparently not the intention of the company to give the structure proper attention. The bridge is in such a condition that it wabbles each time a train passes over it. Even railroad employees are fearful that sooner or later, and possibly sooner than the public may expect, this bridge will be the cause of a heavy loss of life. A COMMUTER.

NEW YORK, June 1.