

"were but a wand," of what will certainly happen if Mr. Bryan is elected, recalls the doleful assurance of an old-time politician in Massachusetts, who solemnly pledged his word that if a certain candidate were elected Governor, "hell would take place in ten minutes." The dreaded candidate was elected, but there was no noticeable irruption from the infernal regions; the world did not come to an end then, nor will it with the election of Mr. Bryan, an event which now seems not so improbable but that we may as well prepare ourselves to accept it if necessary. The predictions of cataclysmal disasters to occur in case the other fellows win, are old and well-worn features of political campaigns.

In your appended comment you say, "We propose to do what we can to prevent this people from giving its seal of approbation to the present misruler of its destinies." This is a wise and patriotic purpose, involving the sum of existing political virtues and obligations; and if it can be gained in any other way than by the election of Mr. Bryan, will you not kindly explain to your perplexed but not discouraged readers, what that other way is, that they may strive with you to attain it? "Lead kindly light, amidst the encircling gloom," and show the better way.

FRANCIS FISHER BROWNE.

CHICAGO, August 8, 1900.

[Our way is very simple—to refrain from voting for McKinley, and to persuade as many other people as possible to do so.—ED. NATION.]

SILVER DOLLAR CIRCULATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial comment (No. 1832) on the money of the country, in an article under the head "What Bryan Has Done and May Do," you say (in relation to the number of silver dollars): "Large quantities are not generally within his reach. Nearly all are absorbed in the circulation of the country." Now I see by a Treasury statement in to-day's paper the following, viz.: "Of the half-billion of silver dollars . . . 430,341,739 are in the Treasury, . . . and only 66,429,476 in circulation." Did you mean that the great bulk of them were in circulation through the means of "silver certificates"?

It seems to me a strange thing that, after all the claims which the Republicans have made for the credit of having established the country on a firm gold basis, they should fall back on a flaw in the act by which this desirable condition was accomplished to show the very act itself was not to be relied on. Shall we ever be on a really firm basis as long as any portion of the 460,000,000 legal tenders are in existence?

Yours truly, JAMES B. NOURSE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 11, 1900.

[Of course we meant that the bulk of the silver dollars in the Treasury could not be used by the Secretary for the purpose named, since they are held for the redemption of outstanding silver certificates. We shall not be on a firm basis as long as Government legal-tender notes are in existence. A clear and strong statement of the reasons why we shall not, is contained in the late Pro-

fessor Dunbar's article on "The Safety of Legal-Tender Paper" in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.—ED. NATION.]

"NEWS-MAKING."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Theophrastus, in chapter viii. of his 'Characters,' has anticipated some features of our modern journalism, as shown especially in recent 'news' from China. I quote from a translation of 1715:

"News-making properly consists in relating things which have neither been said nor done, but are invented by the news-maker and put together at his will."

A reflection on the next page is less "up to date": "I have often wondered what this sort of men could possibly propose to themselves, by inventing and spreading such groundless stories."

They had no telegraph then, and no printing-press. Mr. Sheng doubtless finds his account, or thinks he does, in this "inventing and reading"; and his collaborators, the brilliant young foreign correspondents, have their salaries to earn. Like A. Ward's bank-note engravers, "they make money, and good money too"—probably including an extra tip for each intellectual triumph in the way of an unusual sensation. F. M. B.

S. BETHELEHEM, PA.

THILLY AND WUNDT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a recent number of your journal the reviewer of my 'Introduction to Ethics' states that my classification of ethical systems, as presented in the table on page 128, is substantially borrowed from Wundt. In order that the reader may judge for himself, will you kindly permit me to give Wundt's scheme, and then append my own? I quote from the English translation of Wundt's 'Ethics' (vol. ii., p. 164):

"We thus obtain the following classification: I. *Authoritative Ethical Systems*. These may be divided into *politically* and *religiously* heteronomous systems. They either avoid taking any account of ends, or affiliate with some one of the autonomous systems as regards the question of ends. II. *Autonomous Ethical Systems*. (1.) *Eudæmonism*, under the form of (a) Individual Eudæmonism or Egoism; (b) Universal Eudæmonism or Utilitarianism. (2.) *Evolutionism*, under the form of (a) Individual Evolutionism; (b) Universal Evolutionism."

Here is my scheme: "What makes an act right or wrong? The *Theological School* says: The will of God; The *Common Sense School*: Conscience; The *Teleological School*: The effect of the act. What is the effect? Pleasure, says *Hedonism*; Perfection, says *Energism*. Whose Pleasure? Pleasure of self, says *Egoistic Hedonism*; Pleasure of others, says *Altruistic Hedonism*. Whose Perfection? Perfection of self, says *Egoistic Energism*; Perfection of others, says *Altruistic Energism*. The *Theologico-Teleological School* says: An act is good because God wills it, and God wills it because of its effects."

I also request the reader to compare the classifications given in the following works with Wundt's and my own: Bain's 'Mental and Moral Science,' 1868; Lecky's 'History of European Morals,' 1869; Sidgwick's 'Methods of Ethics,' 1874; Jhering's 'Der Zweck im Recht,' 1877; Paulsen's 'System der Ethik,' 1889; Seth's 'A Study of Ethical Principles,' 1894; Hyslop's 'Elements of Ethics,' 1895; Dörner's 'Das

menschliche Handeln,' 1895; Külpe's 'Einleitung in die Philosophie,' 1895; Lipps's 'Ethische Grundfragen,' 1899. A perusal of these books will show that there is little difference in the classifications of the different authors, and that modern Ethics has reached a certain degree of fixity with respect to its divisions. My own scheme resembles the schemes of all of these writers in some points, and differs from them in others. So does Wundt's. Mine is no more like Wundt's than Wundt's is like Bain's and Sidgwick's and Jhering's. It is to be noted that not one of the writers mentioned in the above list gives credit to anybody. And there is no reason why he should; no more than why a modern biologist should give credit for using the current zoological classifications.

Yours respectfully, FRANK THILLY.
COLUMBIA, MO., August 9, 1900.

CREDIT TO WHOM CREDIT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your No. 1832, in your paragraph concerning Mr. Moorfield Storey's 'Life of Charles Sumner,' in my 'American Statesmen Series,' you say that Mr. Storey has not mentioned the name of Mr. E. L. Pierce, though relying throughout upon the elaborate biography written by that gentleman. It seemed to me, and may seem to others, that this was an intimation that Mr. Storey had gathered his material in Mr. Pierce's field, and had not been polite enough to say, "Thank you." Now, Mr. Storey was in friendly relations with Mr. Pierce, and it was to him that Mr. Pierce said: "You will find all the facts in my book"; therefore, a suggestion of discourtesy is very painful to Mr. Storey, and it becomes my duty to say that if any error has been committed, it has been wholly my own.

I, as editor, advised Mr. Storey that it was not worth while, nor required by literary usage, that he should insert a prefatory note whereof the sole purpose and contents would be to say that he had sought aid at the great reservoir which Mr. Pierce had conspicuously and laboriously prepared. Of course he had; if he had not, that fact would have demanded admission, to his own discredit. I may have been wrong, but I do not think that such obvious acknowledgments are required by literary courtesy. In all subjects, there are some authorities which all writers are assumed to use. Furthermore, I happen to have been so close to Mr. Storey in his preparation of this volume that I am fortunately able to say that, for all the matters of a public nature, concerning Sumner's statesmanship, Mr. Storey relied upon and used the works of Mr. Sumner very much more than he did the biography by Mr. Pierce. With the full historical introductions and the many letters to Mr. Sumner, embodied in the works, Mr. Storey was able to find the substantial and sufficient basis for his own views and treatment. His personal knowledge, also, of the latter part of Mr. Sumner's life was thorough and abundant for his needs. The originality and merit of his work would have been more apparent had I not been under the unfortunate necessity of greatly curtailing it in order to bring it within the rigid limits of my volumes.

JOHN T. MORSE, JR.
Editor American Statesmen Series.

Boston, August 9, 1900.

[We are glad to find Mr. Storey ac-

0 00740