

The Nation

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE & ART

VOLUME LXVIII

FROM JANUARY 1, 1899, TO JUNE 30, 1899

NEW YORK

THE EVENING POST PUBLISHING COMPANY

1899

5746
TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL
JAN 28 1904
COLLEGE

P 0682

2
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

which are among the most thrilling, heroic, tragic, and shameful in American annals. One who desires to view the subject on this side should turn rather to Levi Coffin's memoirs or to William Still's 'Underground Railroad Records.'

The work is not pure history. It is frankly that of an entire sympathizer with Underground motives and methods. It has, further, a thesis, which is, that Underground activity furnished a connecting link of sentiment between the earlier and the latter-day abolitionists, and that the "institution" had a far larger part in determining emancipation—by telling upon the patience of the slaveholding oligarchy, and impelling them to secession—than historians and biographers commonly allow. But this is somewhat to confound two factors in the situation: one, the humane sympathies which led Northerners of whatever political affiliation to hide the outcast and speed him privily on his way to a free country; the other, the open revolt against the Constitutional provision and the Fugitive Slave Law in particular, as evinced by Personal Liberty laws and vigilance committees, Shadrach and Jerry-rescues, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and John Brown's wild scheme of a wholesale hegira. The annual losses by escapes, aided or unaided, the South could and would have put up with but for the signs of the growing public sentiment of abhorrence of slavery, with desire and resolve to restrict the extension of the slave area. This manifestation of a militant Northern conscience was due almost wholly to the persistent, organized, and uncompromising propaganda of the abolitionists, with its inevitable effect upon the creed of parties. A man did not have to be a Liberty Party man, Conscience Whig, Free-Soiler, or Republican to be merciful and helpful to the fleeing victims of slavery—if not systematically, at least on occasion. Here there was no touchstone but a common humanity. But, had there been no specific anti-slavery agitation, we might to-day be living under the conditions of 1860.

For this argument, two facts are decisive: one is that secession was fomented and precipitated by the fire-eaters of the Gulf States, or the parts of the South which suffered least from abduction or fugaciousness. The other is, that nothing but a divinely inspired madness prevented the leaders of secession from accepting at the hands of Congress and the States in 1861 terms of constitutional amendment and guarantee which would have fortified the Slave Power beyond its wildest dreams in 1787. The real moral which Prof. Siebert's monograph points, though he does not (we think) remark it, is that had two incompatible contiguous confederacies been established by secession on this continent, the Underground Railroad (impossible to suspend as long as man was man) would have speedily led to a renewal of hostilities. To doubt that the Southern leaders foresaw this, is to discredit their discernment; but then we must infer that their aim was not independence, but to make this country, in Lincoln's words, "wholly slave"—that is, at least to make slave property in transit inviolable in every part of the Union.

Prof. Siebert's explorations have sometimes stopped short of first-hand authority. On p. 38 he professes ignorance of a Philadelphia Underground society of Quakers censured by Washington in 1786 (April 12, not May; the citation is at third hand). The organization in question can hard-

ly have been other than the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the abolition of slavery, the relief of free negroes unlawfully held in bondage, and for improving the condition of the African race." It was at that date on the point of revising its constitution, and in 1787 it made Franklin its first President. (See Edward Needles's 'Historical Memoir' of this society, Philadelphia, 1848, or the late W. F. Poole's 'Anti-Slavery Opinions before the year 1806,' Cincinnati, 1873). As Washington complains of "a vexatious lawsuit respecting a slave," the case and the Society together are removed from the Underground category. On page 219, our author cites newspaper and magazine authority for extending the operations of the U. G. R. R. to Nova Scotia as well as to Canada. His "settlements of ex-slaves near Halifax," however, are only the remains of the Maroons introduced in 1796 from Jamaica, and mostly afterwards deported to Sierra Leone. Dependence on Henry Wilson's 'Rise and Fall of the Slave Power' has made him miss both the exact date (May, 1843) of Mr. Garrison's address of welcome and promised succor to fugitives, and the significance of it as a criticism on a similar invitation penned by Gerrit Smith. For this he should turn to the *Liberator* (13: 87). We have noticed one error on page 99, in Francis Jackson's letter to Theodore Parker, where "Brynes" stands for "[Anthony] Burns." The excellent index escapes this pitfall so far as to admit no Brynes; but then Burns is cheated of an entry due him.

Matter, Energy, Force, and Work. By Silas W. Holman. Macmillan. 1898. 8vo, pp. 257.

Very competent physicists may have a difficulty in forming perfectly clear conceptions of the fundamental ideas of physics; and the more difficulty they have, the more likely they are to want to write books on the subject, and the more deleterious those books will be. These are the minds which neglect the maxim of logic that the meaning of a word lies in the use that is to be made of it, so that every term of general physics ought to stand for a definite general phenomenon; and whoever clearly apprehends to what phenomenon a physical term refers, has nothing further to learn about that term except its grammatical construction. For instance, the word *mass* serves to express the law of action and reaction. If *mass* is defined as "the quantity of matter," then what is meant is the quantity of matter as measured by action and reaction. *Mass*, therefore, has to be distinguished from *weight*, if by weight we refer to the pull toward the earth against the elasticity of a spring-balance. But to introduce distinctions of terminology which refer to no differences in the phenomena, is an idle pedantry that only confuses at once the language and the ideas of students, and puts them out of *rappor*t with the body of scientific men. Prof. Holman's word "weightal" is as superfluous as it is unbeautiful.

The only way to keep scientific terminology free from confusion is to recognize the right of him who introduces a given conception into science to confer upon it its scientific designation and symbol, which should never be rejected nor changed except for really substantial reasons, such as the previous use in another signification of the word chosen. No man of sense will upon

any light occasion violate all usage in this matter, any more than in any other. For instance, the word *gravitation* is appropriated by all writers to that fixed attraction between distant bodies which varies only as their mass, while *gravity* is used for the acceleration of bodies toward the earth under the influence of gravitation combined with centrifugal force. It is, therefore, injudicious for Mr. Holman to attempt to reverse this practice by calling that "gravity" which is known as gravitation, and that "weight" which is known as gravity. He seems to be particularly enamoured of the word "kinergety" for kinetical energy; but it is not likely to be adopted.

As an example of the want of clearness of the book, we may take the following, which is printed in italics: "The sufficient evidence that all resistance is due to the action of energy lies in the fact that through resistance change in state of motion of bodies occurs." If, however, by "due to the action of energy" is meant, as should be meant, due to the production by kinetical energy of changed positions with changed positional energy, and the production by the distribution of positional energy of accelerations working changes of kinetical energy, then it is plain that, unless the conservation of energy be assumed at once, a resistance need not be "due to the action of energy." Great fallacies may lie hid behind the word "due."

Le Sage's theory of gravitation is discussed, without being criticised from a logical point of view. But if this theory is proposed in the hope that impact and a wonderful elasticity of incompressible bodies may supersede positional energy, then it would seem to be a blow aimed at the ideas of the differential calculus and of logic itself; for it would be an endeavor to form a conception of nature as discontinuous, and consequently as radically unintelligible as possible. If, however, positional energy and action at a distance are not to be attacked, why not admit that gravitation is such an action, until some facts are ascertained to the contrary?

The vortex-atom theory is regarded with great favor by Prof. Holman. Yet, though mathematically only too profound, it is logically not much better than the theory of Le Sage, being an attempt to get rid of action at a distance in another way. As for Prof. J. J. Thomson's verifications of its results by chemistry, they are too trifling to have much weight, not to speak of the difficulties they involve. There is nothing but *a priori* metaphysics against action at a distance, which is indissolubly bound up with the principle of energy.

Prof. Holman allows himself to treat with silent contempt Newton's theory that space is an absolute entity, although it is a scientific doctrine based upon the fact that bodies tend to preserve their absolute aspects of rotation. He falls into German metaphysics in accepting as self-evident Leibniz's hypothesis that space and motion are entirely relative, a notion unsupported by facts. Some of the German upholders of this doctrine say that bodies do not preserve their plagues of rotation absolutely, but only relatively to an otherwise unknown body, which they name "Body Alpha." This "Body Alpha" is for all intents and purposes identical with Newton's Absolute Space. Dr. Ernst Mach wishes to substitute for Body Alpha the *tout ensemble* of the bodies in the universe. The idea that a distant star by its motion

should instantly affect the rotation of a top, not by a physical force, but by a principle of dynamics, is contrary to all experience, and subversive of the validity of space as a representation of the relations of things. These people maintain that it is just as true to say that the earth stands still while the heavens move round it, as the reverse; so that we may say without falsehood that, by moving round the earth, the stars produce the phenomena of centrifugal force on the earth. This is action at a distance, with a vengeance. It is to be remarked that the preservation of the plane of rotation depends upon the law that a body unacted on by any force moves in a right line; and if the aspect of the plane is not absolutely preserved, then the body moves in a straight line, not absolutely, but only relatively to Body Alpha or to whatever substitute for that fetish may be imagined. All this because the Leibnizians obstinately adhere to a metaphysical notion that does not fit the observed facts.

Geometers are unanimously agreed that it is impossible to prove that the sum of the angles of a triangle equals two right angles except by a premise as little axiomatic as Euclid's celebrated postulate concerning parallels. But if it be axiomatic that all motion is relative, there is no difficulty about the triangle. For in that case two bodies may have any velocity in any direction and yet remain at rest relatively to one another. Now, this is impossible if the sum of the angles of a triangle is greater or less than two right angles.

L. L. Boilly; Peintre, Dessinateur et Lithographe. Par Henry Harrisse. Paris: Société de Propagation des Livres d'Art.

From Fragonard and Greuze and the court painters of the eighteenth century, to Géricault and Delacroix and the Romanticists of the nineteenth, French art for most people means nothing but David and his school. David, it is true, was the great man of the day; his influence was paramount in the studios, his classical creed was supreme. But still there were a few painters so entirely out of "the movement," apparently so unconscious of the tendency of their age, that, instead of reducing everything to the classical formula, they went on painting the scenes and events of every-day life just as they saw these, truthfully, faithfully, simply, with no striving after notoriety—painters who to-day, as M. Harrisse says, would be called "des naïfs." But it is really because they were so naïve, so matter-of-fact, because they knew their limitations and attempted neither the idyllic with Watteau nor the high heroic with David, that their work now has its value. It was never great; most of it would be altogether forgotten were it not for its interest as an historical document.

Of these painters we agree with M. Harrisse that Louis Boilly holds the first rank. He was not by any means a master; he was not an artist of special distinction. But he had his own game in art—a game Thiers has defined as the painting of ourselves and our customs—and he played it extremely well. He was really the Frith of his day, which, it should be remembered, extended through the Revolution, the Directory, the Consulate, and the Empire, and, indeed, long after the Restoration. While most men were busying themselves with the making and unmaking of states, with war, with political and diplomatic adventure of every kind, Boilly, the

humble little provincial, was engrossed with the more familiar and intimate incidents of life. He painted his contemporaries as he saw them, the men in their cafés, the women in their homes; he painted the people waiting in line for the distribution of milk in days of distress, and for the distribution of wine in days of rejoicing; he painted the departure of the conscripts and the arrival of the latest news; he painted the crowds in the Louvre staring at David's famous picture of the Coronation, and the crowds in the streets gathered to see the start of the diligence. In a word, he painted just those things which the artist of his generation, supposed to be inspired by Greece, despised as petty and trivial, though to us they are far more amusing than the toga-draped heroes and the correctly balanced groups of the classical painter.

Much the same subjects are repeated in the lithographs of Boilly, who was one of the first to practise the art of Senefelder as soon as it was fairly introduced into Paris by Lasteyrie and Engelmann. His prints sometimes, to tell the truth, are very tiresome. We have absolutely no patience with the series of *Grimaces* by which he is best known, though it must be admitted that the exaggeration of feature and form that irritates us was quite in accord with the fashion of the time. Even Daumier, later on, often enough fell into the same trick. But whatever fault you choose to find in them, the fact remains that Boilly's paintings and drawings and lithographs are invaluable as a chronicle of a very important and very fascinating period in French social history. It is for this reason we are glad that M. Harrisse has thought it worth while to make a catalogue of them, and the Société de Propagation des Livres d'Art has been willing to publish it.

M. Harrisse has done his work thoroughly and excellently. He has prefaced his catalogue with a sketch of Boilly's life and an estimate of his work. Of the artist's life, there is not much to tell. He was born in 1761, at La Bassée, a little town in the neighborhood of Lille. He was trained to be a house painter, but his ambition was to make himself a painter of pictures, and he managed to earn enough money, chiefly by portraits, to settle in Paris in 1785. He married, he had many children, he worked quietly, despite the social upheaval that was disorganizing France. Only once was he interrupted, when the engravings after his pictures were thought too gallant and gay by a Republican Society of Arts, and he had suddenly to take to painting the "Triumph of Marat." He worked indefatigably, for his fame was never sufficient to bring him large prices for his pictures, and it was merely by his unflagging industry that he succeeded in living by his art. Some idea of his industry is to be had when we learn from M. Harrisse that in the course of his career, besides everything else, he painted not less than 5,000 portraits. As M. Harrisse has pointed out, his pictures suffered, first because of the change in public taste brought about by David, and afterwards because of the new change ushered in by the Romanticists, for he did not die until 1845. But the public delighted in him, as the English public delights in Frith. M. Harrisse thinks, however, that he will be more and more appreciated by competent judges and critics, as time goes on. We are not so sure. We cannot help wondering if his work will not

always be prized for his subjects rather than for its artistic merit. If he will not be remembered as the chronicler rather than the artist.

M. Harrisse has catalogued no less than 1,364 pictures, drawings, and lithographs. He has made a separate list of the pictures exhibited at the Salon. In every case he has given all available information as to size, subject, and history, but he modestly declares that he can make no claim to completeness, that he has probably accounted for but half of Boilly's work, so much of it has disappeared. If, out of his forty-eight Salon pictures, presumably his most important, but seventeen can be found, there is no doubt that there were innumerable pot-bollers of which not a trace is left—no great loss, we fancy, to Boilly's reputation. M. Harrisse hopes his readers may fill up many of the gaps, but it is a question whether there is any one to-day who can pretend to a tithe of M. Harrisse's knowledge of a painter now so obscure and forgotten as Boilly. The catalogue is well printed, and is illustrated with a sufficient number of photogravures and process blocks after Boilly's most characteristic designs to give a fair idea of the artist and his work. Altogether the book must prove of immense service to any one studying the social history and the art of France during the long period of which Boilly kept so accurate and often so amusing a record.

The Whitefoord Papers. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. A. S. Hewins. M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1898.

The name of Whitefoord is most familiar to Americans in connection with the negotiations which ended the Revolution. Caleb Whitefoord was an intimate friend of Benjamin Franklin, and for this reason became sole secretary to the Commission which negotiated the preliminary treaty in 1782. He is also the main figure in the volume of correspondence now under review. The family was Scotch and of ancient origin. Its founder lived in the last half of the thirteenth century, and held lands near Paisley, in the shire of Renfrew. For some centuries his descendants were only of local consequence, but, during the English Parliamentary Wars, one of them, Col. Walter Whitefoord, gained some reputation as a truculent supporter of the Stuarts. It was he, for instance, who on May 2, 1649, assassinated the regicide, Dr. Dörilaus, in his own apartments at The Hague, whither he had been sent on a mission by the Commonwealth. No one of the name has ever reached very great eminence, but in the eighteenth century two Whitefoords (and those the two with whom we are here concerned) attained a certain degree of distinction. These were Franklin's friend, Caleb, and his father, Col. Charles Whitefoord.

To associate one's self with Sir Walter Scott is always a short and sure way of attracting public attention, and Col. Whitefoord merits notice for having given the author of "Waverley" a valuable hint. One of the finest incidents in the first novel of an immortal series is the relationship between Baron Bradwardine and Col. Talbot. Scott found the basis of their romantic friendship in an actual occurrence of the battle of Tewkesbury. As Alexander Stewart of Inverhyle was leading a charge which routed

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY