

the forms as well as many ideas of modern English poetry.

Without doubt, the great social as well as, in some respects, political event of the past week has been the royal marriage at Athens. Never, perhaps, in its long, eventful and almost immemorial history has the city of Athens witnessed so great an assemblage of royal and illustrious personages as have gathered there under the shadow of the ancient Acropolis to celebrate the marriage of the Duke of Sparta (the heir apparent to the throne of Greece) with the Princess Sophie of Prussia. The associations of ancient and modern history are mingled together in the most surprising manner on this interesting occasion. Since the days of Homer, Xerxes or Alexander, no such assemblage of royal personages has met in Greece as the past week has assembled there. The name of Greece carries us in imagination back to the most remote antiquity. The names of the bride and bridegroom remind us of the most modern of European dynasties. The romance of royalty has seldom been more strikingly illustrated than in the fortunes of the present royal family of Denmark. A little more than a generation ago it occupied a comparatively obscure station. In the course of a generation it has given a Prince of Wales to England, an Empress to Russia, a king to Greece, and a daughter to the House of Orleans. Within the same period, Denmark has engaged in an unequal struggle with the German powers, and though it emerged defeated and despoiled, the King of Denmark has lived to see his grandson married to a sister of the German Emperor, whose own Imperial crown was won in the conflicts which arose more or less directly out of the Danish war. What an epitome of history, ancient and modern, is associated with this modern royal wedding! The marriage in itself is only a family affair, but when we take into consideration the alliance of this family, it will be at once perceived that the marriage more or less interests nearly all the great dynasties of Europe. Among the nearest relatives of the bride and bridegroom are the King and Queen of Denmark, the grandparents of the bridegroom; the Prince and Princess of Wales, who are alike uncle and aunt of both bride and bridegroom; the Empress Frederick, the bride's mother; and the Czar and Czarina of Russia, the bridegroom's uncle and aunt. All these were present except the Czar and Czarina, who were, however, represented by their eldest son. The absence of the Czar from a ceremony which has attracted so many royal personages to Athens may be accounted for on purely personal grounds. St. Petersburg is a long way from Athens, and the Czar is a busy man who bears almost upon his single shoulders the burden of a great empire.

But while our attention is drawn toward the pomp and pageantry of courts and the alliance, of Royal families, let us not forget that there is an ever-increasing volume of dis-

content among the masses of most of the continental nations. "The schoolmaster is abroad" in more senses than one. In Russia the propagandists of nihilism are for the most part the teachers in the universities and high schools. The multiplication of books, pamphlets and newspapers, the increased facilities of travel by railway, etc., a closer view of the luxuries of life and some little taste of its meaner comforts—all these things have deepened and extended the feeling of discontent which is known and dreaded under the name of socialism. How much it is spread, how much it is dreaded in such countries as Russia, Germany and Austria can scarcely be understood in England, much less in America. Hence the craving for colonial expansion which has seized upon all the continental governments. Emigration acts like a safety-valve for the escape of turbulent or discontented spirits. At the same time it is natural for each nation to wish to retain under the flag of the Fatherland the swarms of emigrants who from poverty or dread of conscription stream off to other countries and are lost in them.

A colonial expansion implies an increase of commerce and a powerful navy; for no nation from the times of ancient Phoenicia to modern Britain has ever succeeded with the former without the latter. Hence the rapid increase of navies among all the principal nations during the last twenty years.

The discontent of the people has become so great that governments seem compelled to seek for new markets for their manufactures—new countries that will accept the manufactured products of the toiling, half-starved millions of Europe and give to them the necessary breadstuffs and raw material. Hence the scramble that is going on for Africa. It is positively amusing to look at a lately published map of the "Dark Continent." The various claims of the different European nations are all marked out in appropriate colors. One immense stretch of Africa is claimed by Portugal; another vast portion by Great Britain; here is a vast tract painted with German colors and there another with Belgian. Spain, France and Italy also assert their rights to territories large enough for the foundation of empires. In fact, there is scarcely a square mile of territory left for the black man to call his own.

For more than a hundred years it has been the boast of Britain that her colonies touched those of no other European nation. Today her frontiers extend side by side with many others of the great powers of Europe. Those who are acquainted with American history will remember the terrible wars that European nations waged against each other concerning their possessions in America. Many candid students of history are asking "Will history repeat itself?" Will Africa be the bone of contention that will start a general European war?

J. H. WARD.

EUROPE, Nov. 4th, 1889.

INDIAN LANDS.

At present attention is largely directed to the civilized and uncivilized tribes or nations of Indians located in Indian Territory. Since the time when the land purchased from the Creeks and Seminoles by the last Congress—now known as Oklahoma—was opened to settlement, and thousands from all parts of the United States flocked into the new country, interest has been constantly increasing, both among those who make themselves concerned from without and the Indians and white citizens from within; the former thinking the Indian lands so much better than their own, that they should be possessed if possible, while the latter are seeking to render the situation as profitable as possible to themselves and to be protected in their rights.

In August last the Commission visited Tahlequah and communicated their object and propositions to Chief Joel B. Mayes in regard to the selling of the land known as the Cherokee Outlet, used for grazing purposes by a large cattle company, from which the nation receives \$200,000 revenue annually. This, when it accumulates to a certain amount is to be paid out to the people per capita, as the expenses of the government, the support of the public schools and orphan asylum are paid from the interest on over \$3,000,000 which the United States government holds in trust for the Cherokee nation. The chief's reply was that when the council or legislature of the nation convened, the propositions would be considered. From that time on the commission has been in different parts of the Territory visiting other Indians and learning as to what they would do in the matter, supposedly that if the Cherokees refuse to sell their lands at the government's offer of \$1.25 an acre, the United States, if deemed necessary, may do as provided in the treaty they can, settle friendly Indian tribes thereon, and pay the Cherokees 47 cents to 49 cents per acre and thus purchase the other Indians' land.

The national council assembled on the 4th inst., but as contested cases, resulting from a close election, are not yet disposed of, they have not began work. All interest is centered in what they will do, as important questions regarding the people and their welfare will come before them. The questions concerning the land are: Shall they sell it to the government at \$1.25 per acre while they have been offered from \$3 to \$5 by a private corporation, to whom, however, they could not give a good title unless the United States is a party to the transaction; and which the chief maintains they cannot sell at all without changing their constitution. Shall they retain the lands and accept the offer of the cattle syndicate, which has requested a release for fifteen years, and will pay \$200,000 a year for the first five years; \$400,000 each year for the second five years, and \$720,000 each for the remaining five years, or have them allotted in severalty, and sell the remaining land? Each propo-