

pression of his views on the silver question is one of undoubted patriotism.

The decay of broad patriotism—such as Mr. Cleveland appears to possess, is having an incalculably injurious effect upon the country. From every quarter of the land come clamors for reform. Unfortunately, however, the demands are not as a rule based on national needs. They come from classes seeking benefits for themselves. They are of such a nature that to grant them in the shape of legislation would constitute preferred classes. This is destructive to republicanism, whose legitimate aim is to treat all citizens alike. These demands for legislative preferment are based upon the unequal privileges already possessed by some sections of the people. To grant the new demands would only increase the disparity and multiply additional demands from other quarters, until confusion worse confounded would prevail. The universal aim should be to secure only such measures as will be beneficial to all classes, without giving undue preference to any.

The great clashing of interests and pandering to self and caste are causing many thoughtful people to question the durability of the government. Hence such gloomy additions to the literature of the country as "The Fall of the Great Republic," "The Stricken Nation" and "Will the Republic Last Another Hundred Years?" The nation is flooded with newspaper articles in the same despondent vein, while publicists utter kindred sentiments from the pulpit and rostrum, and the pens of such thinkers as Prof. J. Rhodes Buchanan are predicting strife and disintegration as the breakers into the surf of which the American ship of state is about to dash at the peril of her existence.

What the country wants is more broad patriotism and less selfishness and partisanship in men who otherwise have leading capacity. A noted American thinker and writer made this assertion: "Did the people know the actual selfishness and injustice of their rulers, not a government on earth would stand. The world would ferment with universal revolution." Since this utterance was expressed, the facilities for the people becoming familiar with the shortcomings of their rulers have wonderfully increased. Their wrath has proportionately enlarged, and the consequence is that the situation pointed to by Theodore Parker is becoming a threatening aspect of human affairs.

King Oscar's private fortune is estimated at \$25,000,000.

## SOCIAL EXTREMES AND INDICATIONS

Two events occurred in New York City on on February 5, of this year, which are occasioning considerable discussion both among newspaper writers and political reformers. The events, however, fully illustrate the anomalous condition of our social organization, as contrasted with our political system. How such extremes in society can arise in a country where universal franchise prevails, is one of the questions which puzzle the political philosopher. For example read this dispatch:

"New York, Feb. 5.—At high noon today Miss Louisa Shepard, daughter of Colonel Elliott P. Shepard and granddaughter of the late William H. Vanderbilt, was married to William H. Schieffelin.

"Privileged friends were allowed to look at the wedding presents this morning. They are stored in the grand parlors and present a startlingly brilliant array. At the least computation they represent a monetary value of \$500,000.

"Among other things is a silver dinner set of six pieces, each of which is gold lined and magnificently wrought. A card attached bears the legend: 'With the compliments of Mr. and Mrs. B. Harrison.'

"The most costly gift is a necklace of diamond pendants, the whole formed in the shape of a fleur-de-lis. In this necklace are 295 diamonds, many of them of several carats weight. Represented in money value the ornament is offset by \$100,000. It is the gift of Mrs. and Mrs. W. J. Sloane. Other gifts are both magnificent and costly."

It will be seen that the wedding gifts in this case amounted to half a million dollars. Also that the President of the United States and his wife are among the donors of these presents. And further, that a private person named Sloane makes a present of 295 diamonds, worth \$100,000 in cash. There would seem to be nothing wrong in all this.

Here is the other event:

"New York, Feb. 5.—Starved to death in the very heart of the city. Such was the sad issue that befell Mrs. Mary Rosenberg, a handsome young woman of 26, who lived in the basement of a house on Broome Street.

"Stretched at full length on the cold, bare floor lay the woman's body all day yesterday. Several candles burned on the floor near the head of the corpse and throw their flickering, uncertain rays about the miserable quarters. In the room sat two men, while playing merrily about were two innocent children, both of whom were less than seven years old. One of the men was the heart-broken husband.

"When food became scarce the woman had heroically given up her portion to her two children, eating only what was absolutely necessary to sustain life. The husband and father, Max Rosenberg, was out of the city looking for work, and when a week ago the food supply dwindled to nothing Mrs. Rosenberg ceased eating. The children got a good living from charitable neighbors, but the real condition of affairs in the house was unknown, and Mrs. Rosenberg would neither talk of her affairs nor stoop to ask for charity.

"Tuesday afternoon the woman lay on a miserable cot, her eyes sunken, her features white as marble. Every few minutes she went into violent convulsions. She gradually grew worse until she died."

It cannot be denied that these extremes show a great wrong in the prevailing social system. And the question arises, can the condition exist with safety to the Republic? The *Chicago Times* contends that the lavish display of diamonds at the wedding, can, in no sense, be responsible for the death of the starved woman at the other end of the street. It says that if all the wealth of the Vanderbilts were distributed in New York, hunger would still prevail. It says that Nero fiddled while Rome burned, but that the fiddling did not cause the conflagration.

Technically this is all true. Nero did not burn Rome, he fiddled while it burned and then punished the Christians for burning it. The Christians held that such a man as Nero, presaged the destruction of Rome. For saying this they were murdered as traitors and disloyalists. The condition of Rome at that time was socially on a par with what ours is now. The wealth of the empire was being concentrated in the hands of a few families, the populace were growing poorer and poorer. The tie that formerly bound rich and poor in Rome was dissolved. That tie was Roman citizenship, and the ambition of all was the grandeur, supremacy and dignity of Rome. In Nero's time the change had come. The rich ignored the poor, and even denied them citizenship. It is true large amounts were distributed in alms, but these alms were made a means to gain political power, and to lull the people while corruption was rampant.

The Vanderbilts fiddled in New York, the other day while an American mother starved to death. Vanderbilt can't be blamed. It is probable that if he knew such a tragedy was being enacted within a stone's throw of his residence, he would have hastened to relieve the poor woman. But it is the condition which produces a Vanderbilt and a Gould which now threatens the disruption of society. The man who would condemn this state of things is liable to be classed as an anarchist, but who can deny that we are approaching a crisis similar to that which destroyed Rome?

It is a disgrace to our boasted religion, humanity and civilization that a young mother should die of hunger in one of our richest cities, and while a millionaire's wedding was in progress. The press which licks the rich man's plate is much to blame. Why did it not help to relieve the starving woman as well as to congratulate the jeweled bride?