

express purpose of fixing the responsibility.

The heroic boys may forget their sufferings; may even refuse to testify to them, but their mothers will not and their fathers will not. Nor will it do to take refuge behind the errors of the civil war. There was then no intentional cruelty, such as seems to have so often prevailed in this war. The sick men were not starved. Sick men were treated with all possible attention and kindness. Water was not sold to fever-racked sufferers at ten cents a glass; food was not sold at 25 cents for a sandwich, and dainties for the dying men were not eaten by the officers. But suppose matters had been a thousand times worse in the civil war, would that be any reason now that our men should be sent with arms out of date, that there should be no ambulances, no pack trains or transportation to carry food to the front; not half sufficient medicines, nor doctors; no proper hospitals, and that men with freshly treated wounds should be left to lie in the mud on a blanket if they had one—without if they had none—nor even why midwinter underclothing should be sent to Cuba and midsummer gauze undershirts to Montana?

The witnesses have established monstrous incapacity. That they have not full confidence in the power of your commission, no matter how good its will, to meet all the requirements the public demands of it, is only echoing your own doubt, but in spite of that they seem to have done their share, and it would seem that it only remains for you to do your best even if that best is not quite satisfactory to yourselves. If done in good faith it will teach the soldiers that at least there is a power which was honestly endeavoring to do them justice.

You can direct your inquiries in the first place to the food supply. Find out who gets the difference between the liberal rations allowed by the government and the meager hard tack, bacon and green coffee served to the soldiers. The witnesses are the books and the rolls in the public departments, to which you have full access.

We have furnished you the facts, shown you brutality, cruelty, neglect, indifference; how men whom the government was under every obligation to protect, and especially because they had a right to rely on such protection, were starved, even in the land of plenty; were uncared for when sick, left without attention; when wounded were abused, maltreated — in some cases practically murdered. We have shown you an indifference and belittling of

human sufferings which continue even now. If this nation is to become a warlike one, if we are to have an army which shall be efficient and to be relied upon, these crimes and blunders must be corrected, and your commission must correct them. It is not for you to make the feeble excuse that our committee, a mere voluntary association with no legal existence even, shall shoulder this responsibility.

#### "ORIGINAL WORK."

Mr. Frederic Harrison, in his article in the *Nineteenth Century* on Freeman's "Historical Method" has some sharp but just things to say about the ravages of what is called "original work" in history. What is meant is terrific labor in accumulating a mass of minute details never before brought to light, but which prove to be either untrustworthy or without significance when the grave-clothes are torn off them. It is this system of "minute realism" in history which gives us so many monographs and studies dull as ditch-water, and leads so many investigators to wreak themselves in mighty volumes upon a "period." Under the triumphant name of "new material" and "unpublished manuscripts," the learned world is deluged with material which, whether new or old, is a weariness to the flesh, and with manuscripts which Heaven seemed specially to have designed never to be published. As Mr. Harrison says, it is this sort of research which is killing the art of historical narration, and rendering history, instead of a synthetic whole, instead of a life-like picture, a mass of dreary fac-similes of queen's washing-lists and inventories of the number of swine kept on a baronial manor in the twelfth century. It is fun for the investigator, but it is death to the reader. The world, observes Mr. Harrison, is "not as fond of 'periods' as a school-teacher and a college tutor."

Mr. Harrison thinks that this blight of minute knowledge which has fallen upon historical composition is due to the system of examinations. Their very life-blood is in subtle points and out-of-the-way scraps of knowledge which form the basis for "marks." But the same tendencies are observable in this country, where examinations have not been developed with such rigor, nor made the sure means of a livelihood, as in England. Many of our historical monographs are as murderously petty and prolonged as anything Oxford can show. And the same methods are carried into other departments. Since literature, for example, came to be "scientifically" studied in our colleges, the fearful and wonderful results of-

ferred us in the name of "original work" have been enough to make a census report fascinating reading by comparison. Our original literary workers dive into a great poem or a masterpiece of prose and come up in triumph laden with statistics. They have counted the number of false rhymes in the "Faery Queen," they can tell you exactly how many times the word "nature" occurs in Burke. Who shall, after that, forbid them the degree of Litt. Doc.? Really "original" literary work seems now, in fact, to be largely an affair of counting. It is arithmetic applied to literature. Criticism is the art of turning out statistics. Thus we read of a devoted woman, painfully toiling after the higher education and the degree of M. A., who wrestled night after night with a thesis on Browning. But what was it all about? Why, the dear lady was counting and classifying the colors, and the animals, and the precious stones, and the flowers, and the figures of speech to be found in Browning's complete works! Of course, she was doing it on the advice of her professor. True monsters of learning, each of them!

It seems probable that all this is partly, at least, the result of the rush of so many to the schools. Out of them all, but here and there one has a mind of true insight, of native taste, of grasp on principles; and what easier disposition to make of the rest than to set them counting? Almost anybody can count so many hours a day. Give a student pigeon-holes enough, and he can in time analyze and classify all literature—and not know the first thing about it when he is done. Certain it is that the scientific organization of the departments of literature in many of our colleges and universities has led thousands to drench and drown their minds in these floods of trifling details, in which every spark of real literary taste is surely extinguished. The system distinctly tends to give us, in the professors' chairs, pottering statisticians instead of inspiring lecturers, and, on the students' benches, a generation that loses itself in verbal forms and weak endings, and remains dull and blank to literature itself.

Perhaps the phenomenon should be treated as one of the inevitable vices of specialization. The time of the wide-ranging intellect seems gone by, in science and economics as well as history and literature. In their room we get 10,000 men, each cultivating his little garden plot, all the while making it smaller and smaller, and bending over it with eyes ever more bleared and short-sighted. David A. Wells was almost an extinct type of economist,

even before he died. Few survive with his vast power of coordination and assimilation. Instead of his wide outlook upon diverse phenomena, the typical worker in economics to-day is the man who will prove, after several years of exhausting labor, that Thorold Rogers was all wrong about the price of wheat in Bristol in the year 1521. In science, too, the men of eagle eye, like Darwin and Dana, are gone, and we know now only the intense specialists who are content to wear out their lives in "settling hot's business." Darwin's son, endowed with a generous portion of his father's spirit, as he is, confesses in his latest book the deadly effect of specialization and of the multiplied apparatus of modern laboratories upon native scientific genius.

All this is not saying that minute research is not necessary and may not, in the hands of masters, lead to most important results. As Mr. Harrison says of Freeman, "new material" and "unpublished manuscripts" were a powerful weapon when it was he that grasped it; but "it is a very dangerous tool in the hands of the lads and lasses who swagger about with it in public." It is little better than a modern superstition to suppose that history can be written by laboriously copying out and stringing together bits of paper dug up in Simancas; or that a man is fitted to discourse on sociology and propose plans for remodelling society simply by having averaged the annual outlay for beer of 237 selected families on Avenue A, or that a critic is qualified to lecture on Shakespeare by having thumbed his works solely to discover exactly how many times the scenes end with a rhymed couplet, and how many times with blank verse. Before we boast of "original work," we should decide whether it was worth doing, originally or subsequently, and whether it leads to something for the worker, besides helplessly floundering in a morass of his own creating.—Editorial in New York Evening Post.

#### THE COST OF EMPIRE.

The mere money cost of this colonial enterprise, even so far as we have gone, will be enormous. The annual cost of our small army on a peace footing is about \$24,500,000. The cost of the administrative force and the miscellaneous and incidental expenses of the war department is about \$7,000,000, making a total of a little more than \$31,000,000. The cost of the navy, counting the appropriation for its increase, is about \$30,000,000. No military authority believes that we ought to main-

tain an army of less than 100,000 men. The pay, traveling expenses, transportation, and general expenses of the army, as it stood before the war, were about \$16,000,000. On this basis the same expenses would amount to quite \$65,000,000, for not only would the pay of the troops be multiplied by four, but the cost of their transportation would be increased in a much greater ratio. The cost of subsistence for the army would be increased from \$1,750,000 to at least \$7,000,000. The item of quartermaster's supplies would grow from \$2,300,000 to quite \$10,000,000 for several years to come, and after that to at least \$5,000,000. There would be an increase of expenditure for horses alone of about \$500,000, and of at least \$1,500,000 for medical and ordnance departments and other incidentals. This estimate, which is moderate, shows an annual increase of \$64,000,000 for army expenses alone if the army be increased to 100,000, while the additional cost of new fortifications, new post buildings, quarters and barracks, would easily bring this up to \$65,000,000. But it is very well understood, even by those who are talking of increasing the army to 100,000 men, that such a force would not begin to be adequate to the demands of the new colonies for their defense and for service at home, and that an army of at least 250,000 men will be necessary for these purposes, including the maintenance of peace at home; and the statesman who is counting the cost of annexation and expansion, if there be such a statesman in the country, would be imprudent to estimate for an annual increase of the army budget of less than \$100,000,000.

As to the navy, we shall, in the first place, be obliged to count on an expenditure of at least \$100,000,000 for the purpose of bringing it into the rank of of first-class "fighting fleets," and instead of appropriating from \$9,000,000 to \$13,000,000 annually for the purpose of increasing it, congress will be obliged to appropriate from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000 if we are to catch up with European governments. Even then they will be obliged to halt for us if we are to speedily arrive at their state of preparation. The annual cost of the British navy is about \$115,000,000, and that of the French navy about \$57,000,000. We shall be lucky if we get off with an expenditure for the navy of less than \$60,000,000 a year in excess of the expenditures of 1897.

After this war we shall have to reckon on large additions to our civil list, which will be made necessary by our new colonies. They must be governed, and governed thoroughly and ex-

pensively, if they are to be governed well. The cost of a colonial service must be largely a matter of conjecture. It depends on the intelligence of congress; and we are painfully aware that the legislative branch of the government is not inclined to expend the public money merely where it is needed. Congressmen are always desirous that it shall go where it will do the most good—to them; that is, where their constituents may get a share, whether government receives a return for its expenditure or not. We are assuming, however, that in time circumstances, which are likely to be delicate on distant frontiers, will compel the establishment of a good colonial service, and in that event we fancy that its cost will be a good deal larger than the present cost of our foreign service, which is in the neighborhood of \$1,700,000. The cost of our diplomatic service must also increase with new international complications, and this increase together with the cost of the colonial service will certainly amount to \$3,000,000.

Thus we have at once an annual increase of expenditures for colonial defense and government of the very considerable amount of \$163,000,000. The calculations on which this estimate is based are necessarily crude, but the result may be depended upon to be well within the sum which the possession of distant colonies will add to the cost of government. Moreover, this great sum must be raised by direct taxation; for the extension of the free-trade principle to these colonies—the principle which obtains between the states—will deprive the government of a main source of its customs revenue. We cannot levy a customs duty on the products of our own country. But in ordinary years raw sugar pays us more than \$50,000,000 in revenue, while tobacco pays us from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000. Are the sugars of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii to come in free, and the tobacco and cigars of the West Indies and the Philippines to be untaxed at the threshold of the country? Certainly, if the countries in which these products are produced are to become part of the United States. Here then we have at least \$60,000,000 to be added to the amount which the colonies will actually cost, making in all something like \$223,000,000 that must be raised every year by direct taxation, in addition to the present ordinary expenses of the government, which are supposed to be enormously extravagant. We repeat that this great sum must be raised by direct taxation, because we assume that in due time our politicians will come to un-