

OUR COUNTRY—ITS FUTURE.

Our Republic has developed its growth when the pulsations of humanity have been rapidly quickening, when the developments of science, the spread of liberal principles, and the modification and disintegration of religious creeds have constantly varied the phases of society. The discovery of the new world made room for the expanding energies of the Caucasian race—the advance of revolution and progress.

The aggressive energies of the Anglo-Saxon have collided with ancient Orientalism on the banks of the Ganges and the Indus, whose waters have reflected the images of magnificent temples of idol worship since the time of Abraham, and Japan with an intelligent impulsiveness, which overthrows our preconceived notions of Asiatic immobility, is rapidly accepting political, commercial and social revolution. In fact, that part of the world, which seems to have been traveling around the same beaten track down the centuries, is waking up to take its share of history in the world's regeneration.

Scientists may yet inquire, whether there is not a mysterious sympathy between the feverish impulses of nations and elementary nature, for she is displaying unusual activity in storms, floods, fires, earthquakes and meteoric phenomena.

What would have been the labor of several lives a few generations ago is now condensed into one. Cause and effect follow each other with the throbbing activity of steam and electricity, instead of keeping pace, as formerly, with the slow locomotion of beasts of burden.

The germs of nationalities, planted in the new world, furnished an outlet for the elements of freedom which had long struggled for existence in the old. These young nationalities quickly acquired a reactionary influence, and the politics of Europe are being revolutionized by the development of liberal principles, on the debris of the ancient civilizations of the Western Hemisphere. Will America continue to lead the advance of human progress, or decay develop with the rapidity of growth, and she retrograde into the slough of despotism or the whirlpool of anarchy—an object for the contemptuous sneers of crowned heads?

The early settlers of the North American colonies, on leaving the venerated systems of Europe, the grandeur of courts, the trappings of feudalism, and the showy pageantry of Romish and Episcopal worship, soon claimed their titles of nobility from nature, and considered themselves the peers of kings. Self respect and personal dignity took the place of that reverence for dignitaries which characterized the populations of Europe. The pioneers of a continent—they trod the Atlantic's shores, trusting in God and themselves. They were a step in advance of their age, but still the offshoots of an aggressive ancestry, whose mergence into civilization had been through bloody revolutions, and that civilization highly seasoned with the barbarism from which it emanated. In fact they were still tinctured with the intolerance and superstitions of their ancestors.

The different climatic influences under which they settled, produced a variety of manners and customs, and the diversity of religious creeds caused a wide range of religious opinions. They lacked one great element of national longevity—the bond of a general religious faith. Their great diversity of social elements, made religious tolerance and political freedom a mutual necessity, and extraneous pressure forced union for general defence.

In time the God of providences, through the inspiration of honest hearts, organized the best government, this side of a heaven-revealed theocracy, ever devised for man's intellectual and moral growth. Its perpetuity depends on its heirs inheriting the pure patriotism and honesty of purpose of its founders.

A century has not passed away, since the *Magna Charta* of American liberty became the star of hope to oppressed millions, and the development of the germs of evil originally embodied in the government and inherent in the people, have produced rapid changes from high-toned, honest hearted republicanism, to the love of self aggrandizement and centralization of power. Before we can scarcely claim the status of national man-

hood, that love of the right, and that nice perception of the spirit of our institutions which characterized their founders, are becoming obsolete, and men's patriotism is becoming a commercial commodity, and public and private virtue is acquiring cash values.

When, in 1787, the delegates of thirteen sovereign States met in convention to organize a permanent government, they found it difficult to reconcile the natural antagonism of free institutions and involuntary servitude. Circumstances forced them into close proximity, but affinity was impossible. They never blended together in harmony. Liberalism is the leading, absorbing idea of the age; the institution of slavery, in attempting to check its progress, was crushed. It proved the adder nourished in the bosom of the Republic, until it threw it into convulsions and spread desolation and mourning around the hearthstones of the nation.

Time may prove that the great change made in the position of the negro, has only changed the form instead of curing the evils of slavery. It is possible that the nation has acted with more enthusiasm than reason, with more impulsiveness than judgment, in raising over half a million of men from servitude to the dignity of the franchise before they were capable of comprehending their position. It has made a great addition to that element out of which unprincipled agitators get up riots and revolutions.

The revolution originating in the institution of slavery, with John C. Calhoun for its great agitator, under the lead of State Rights, and of which South Carolina Nullification was a way mark denoting progress, appeared to culminate before Richmond in 1865.

While the advocates of State Rights are forced to silence in the South, if "coming events cast their shadows before," the agitation of the question in New England, during the second war with Great Britain, terminating with the Hartford Convention of 1815, and the close of the war, indicates that the conservative North may yet become the strong advocate of the principle, particularly if pushed to the wall by the centralizing policy of the General Government.

If the principles of State Rights and centralization are forced to an issue, in connection with other existing elements of revolution, judging by our antecedents, the past is only a prelude to events that will shake our fair fabric of freedom into fragments, and occupy its place with the ashes of desolation. In countries where a general religious faith is the heritage of the people, it might be expected that some intolerance would be manifested towards innovating religious sects. But where the government emanates from the people and that people is made up of numerous religious sects, religious freedom is necessary as the safeguard of general unity and national stability.

If the spirits of those who fought the battles of the Revolution, and labored to complete the superstructure of Freedom, are permitted to take cognizance of human affairs, they must deeply sorrow over the degenerate sons of the Republic, who could withhold the rights of citizenship on account of religious belief, and curse the land with the marks of desolation, for opinion's sake.

That intolerance which has ever been the attendant of pagan and Romish superstitions, and seems more or less inherent in man's fallen nature, was developed in the people by the revelation of the principles of primitive Christianity by Joseph Smith, and the precedent for religious persecution was established, by the spontaneous action of a portion of the people and the silent consent of the masses, and of State and general government officials. In a few decades the persecutions of the Latter-day Saints, in republican America, will be looked upon as one of those barbarous deeds, which have occasionally made a dark spot in the history of Christianity, and the names of the perpetrators, if not already sunk in oblivion, will be consigned to the records of infamy.

Desolated rural districts and silent cities, where the rank weeds and grass cover the former play-grounds of happy groups of children, and push their undisturbed growth between the hearthstones of deserted habitations, as evidences of religious persecutions, are incompatible with the spirit of the age, and more in keeping with the dark cen-

turies, when bigotry was the handmaid of ignorance, when intolerance was the rule and freedom the exception, when the luxury of free labor, free thought and free worship, was not appreciated, when the people were bound up in scholastic creeds, and when the feudal system goaded the toiling millions to pamper the favored few.

The persecutions of the Latter-day Saints originated in the lower stratum of society, hounded on by the hatred of bigoted religionists, and encouraged by the obsequiousness of small officials. The flame has been fanned by the breath of popular clamor, until, to win favor, the official guardians of law and order have met this tidal wave of misguided public opinion with the smiles of patronage.

Compare the sentiment of George Washington, expressed in his valedictory address to the American people, "It is, indeed, little else than a name, when the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprizes of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property" with the reply of President Martin Van Buren, to a petition of the Saints for the redress of their grievances, "Your cause is just, but I can do nothing for you;" and we have the antipodes of firm, honest patriotism and truckling imbecility. Mr. Van Buren's reply has immortalized him, and written a dark page in the history of our country. It wrote *mene tekel* in dark characters across the escutcheon of our liberties, which subsequent events have only rendered more indelible.

The successive persecutions of the Latter-day Saints have accumulated precedents, and accustomed the minds of the people to acts of religious intolerance, and prepared the way for an antagonism of creeds, that may wreck our liberties in the mazes of anarchy, or crush them under the weight of some overshadowing hierarchy.

Our ample domain has ever been invitingly open, for the occupancy of all who were seeking freedom and room for progress. In obedience to that instinct of humanity, to better its condition when opportunity offers, the Chinese have flocked to our shores. Instead of leaving time and circumstances to assimilate their habits to our own, their closer economies of life have engendered jealousy, which has led to frequent abuse, and often to downright oppression. This, in a country being occupied by many nationalities, is a bad example of social intolerance, not likely to end with the Chinese.

Western civilization, regardless of the rights of nations to manage their own affairs, and for the purpose of financial gain, has for some time been forcing an issue with Mongolian exclusiveness. In 1638, Japan, in defence of her hereditary institutions, and to save herself from commercial plunder, erected the barriers of non-intercourse and maintained them for over 200 years. In 1853, a fleet of American war steamers entered the harbor of Yokohama. With the aggressive spirit of an autocrat, and more in keeping with the times when Dane and Saxon ravaged the coasts of Britain, than with the American liberalism of the nineteenth century, a demand was made that the empire of Japan be opened to the commerce and aggressions of western nations, regardless of the wishes and inherited rights of thirty millions of people.

A people who can thus see their government force, without remonstrance, the policy of a foreign nation, and deny them the rights they themselves hold sacred; a people who can oppress foreigners, who have sought the benefits and blessings of their country, because they differ from them in the economies of life; a people who can quietly permit the expatriation of 20,000 of their fellow citizens, merely for a difference of religious faith; a free people, whose history is thus identified with prominent acts of religious, political and social intolerance, are, with their own hands, lopping off the branches of the tree of liberty which has sheltered them, and are themselves forging the shackles for tyrants to bind them.

The great struggle between slavery and that leading idea of the age—men's civil equality, has given undue prominence to military power. Disregard of constitutional restrictions has too often been excused under the plea of military

necessity. The soldier's education and habits have a tendency to unfit him for the administration of free government. He is so accustomed to forcing the solution of difficulties with the sword that the process of civil adjudication seems irksome and tedious.

After Caesar had passed the Rubicon, the liberties of Rome waned before the supremacy of her victorious legions. It requires no lengthy detail of facts to show the undue prominence given to military authority. The "Reconstruction Acts" of 1867 embody about all that is known of military despotism and are still fresh in the minds of the people.

Woe be to the future of our country, if we have spent such a vast amount of blood and treasure to force back to allegiance ten States of the Union, whose population is so given to anarchy and misrule, that, after the war had ceased, martial law was necessary to restore law and order. If the necessity did not exist, it makes the future but little brighter, that our national legislature is so ready to give power to absolutism, by setting in motion a system of petty tyrannies, to probe deeper the wounds already made, and increase the festering elements of future revolutions.

JAMES A. LITTLE.

NUMBER ONE.

SOME OF THE PRINCIPLES ON WHICH BUSINESS MUST BE CONDUCTED TO MAKE IT SUCCESSFUL.

Our article on the "egoistic and altruistic theories" has drawn out a number of communications from our readers, showing the hold which the discussion has taken of the public mind. One of these writers claims to have been startled by our announcement that Christianity and sound political economy alike require every man to love his neighbor as himself, and he asks how this is possible in ordinary commercial intercourse. He insists that he consults his own interests alone in every bargain, and that a man who does not look after "number one" will soon go to the wall.

To this we reply that every man's own interest, and a due regard for the initial number indicated, require an equal consideration for the interest of others. If the only concern of a boot-maker is to obtain ten dollars for a pair of boots, and he has no consideration for the interest of the buyer, he will soon lose his custom. He must see to it that if he asks ten dollars for his work he gives the customer ten dollars' worth of boots. There is no antagonism of interest, but a mutual profit. The best workmen are evermore looking out for customers who will appreciate their skill and faithfulness, and every honest customer is in quest of a workman who will give him the value for his money. The buyer who is seeking to cheat the maker by employing him at a price too low, and the maker who is seeking to obtain his price without giving the buyer a good article as an honest equivalent for the money, are each acting on the "egoistic" theory, but not in a true self-interest.

This is the great mistake made by those who through artificial means endeavor to circumvent the laws of trade, and secure for their calling an undue relative price. The journeyman who makes the ten-dollar boots insists that seven dollars is not enough for his labor, and strikes for nine dollars or refuses to work. If his employer gives nine and continues to sell for ten he is ruined, and the workman loses his place. If the employer raises his price to twelve dollars the extra cost diminishes the demand. The old boots are worn longer, shoes are substituted, some go with bare feet, and in various ways the sale is diminished. In addition, the extra cost of boots, increasing the annual expenses of all who wear them, augments the cost of everything the journeyman has to buy, so that his selfish effort has resulted to his absolute disadvantage. It is for the interest of all who have anything to do with production to give the consumer his fair equivalent in a good article at a reasonable price. Any other course, however sagacious it may appear, is really injurious to its "egoistic" author.

There are many who admit this principle in the direct interchange of this class of services. They can see far enough to recognize the fact that the doctor for his patient, the lawyer for his client, the artisan for

his customer, must act on the principles we have stated, and best consults his own interest when he works for the interest of his patron. But they are often blind to the evidence, abundantly offered to one of quick discernment, that the same law holds true in the mere distribution of products.

An old merchant of this city once told us that he thought more tradesmen failed through a lack of interest in their customers' welfare than for want of devotion to what they selfishly considered their own advantage. This merchant was noted when in the retail trade for his candor in advising his customers against any purchase which he thought would not give them permanent satisfaction. He would always forego a sale if he believed the article under examination was not the one which the buyer really required. When he left the retail trade, and engaged in a large wholesale business, he continued to practice upon the same principle. He did it conscientiously as a matter of duty; but he always insisted that it was the true mercantile policy. His customers could pay him because they were enabled to sell everything they bought of him at a profit. They liked to trade with him because he sought their interest, advised them what to purchase, and would not, to clear out his own stock, transfer to their shelves any article he did not believe they could turn to advantage. He would often take back to his own present loss, some fabric which proved unsaleable. He called such dead stock "shopkeepers," and he often declared that he would rather dig a hole in the ground and bury them than to have them lie year after year on the shelves of his patrons, a continual reminder that they had made a bad bargain in the purchase.

This may sound strangely to some of the fast young merchants of our day, but it is the true theory of business. The distinguished writer we quoted in our last article may sneer at this as an "altruistic" method, ruinous to enterprise, because it seems more outgoing than self-seeking; but we can assure him and all others who will listen, that He who wrote for every subject the grand requirement, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," has with the same hand established the irrepealable laws of trade, and a breach of one is a violation of the other. He who seeks his own interest in a loving regard for the well-being of others will find the rule of Christian ethics profitable for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come.—*New York Journal of Commerce.*

It is Better.

Better to wear a calico dress without trimming, if it be paid for, than to owe the shopkeeper for the most elegant silk, cut and trimmed in the most bewitching manner.

Better to live in a log cabin all your own than a brown stone mansion belonging to somebody else.

Better walk forever than run into debt for a horse and carriage.

Better to sit by the plain pine table, for which you paid three dollars ten years ago, than send home a new extension black walnut top, and promise to pay for it next week.

Better to use the old cane-seated chairs, and faded two-ply carpet, than tremble at the bills sent home from the upholsterers for the most elegant parlor set ever made.

Better to meet your business acquaintances with a free, "don't you owe a cent?" smile, than to dodge around the corner to escape a dun.

Better to pay the street organ-grinder two cents for music, if you must have it, than to owe for a grand piano.

Better to gaze upon bare walls than pictures unpaid for.

Better to eat thin soup from earthenware, if you owe your butcher nothing, than to dine off lamb and roast beef, and know that it does not belong to you.

Better let your wife have a fit of hysterics, than to run in debt for nice new furniture, or clothes, or jewelry, or any other thing that women wish for. A fit of hysterics, properly managed, is often of more real benefit to a woman than anything you could buy. It is better to treat them in this way: "When she begins to cry for something she ought to know she cannot have, try to reason with her a little."