CLEVELAND'S NOMINATION.

The nomination of Governor Cleveland by the Democratic Convention makes the way perfectly plain and simple for all friends of good government who are for any reason dissatisfied with the Republican candidate. This time the Democrats have made no mistake. If Cleveland had no other claim to the confidence and support of those to whom parties are simply a means of promoting the national welfare, he would have a strong one in the character of the opposition he encountered in the Convention. As General Bragg finely and happily said in seconding his nomination—"We love him most of all for the enemies he has made." The hostility of Tammany and Butler, and in fact of whatever is basest and most demagogic in his own party, is of itself a tribute of which any public man might well be proud.

But he is by no means dependent on this negative kind of testimony. The eminity of corrupt intriguers might mean after all simply that his intentions were good, and that they merely feared that he would, if put in power, fail to answer their purpose. Cleveland has happily something far stronger than the promise of a strong character to commend him to the suffering of good men of all parties. He is a tried administrator. One of the Biaiano organs in its great agony has tried to relieve itself by calling him "a man destitute of experience." Of one kind of experience—experience in political trickery and manipulation, and in the art of making money for himself and his friends out of politics—he is, indeed, destitute. But the present extraordinary political crisis is due to the profound and growing popular belief that this kind of experience is too common among our politicians, and that the Republican candidate in particular is too rich in it either for his own or his country's good.

Of the kind of experience which the present situation in national affairs most imperatively calls for, experience in administration, Cleveland has more than any one who has entered the White House since 1889, more than any man whom either party has nominated within that period, except Seymour and Tilden—more than Lincoln, more than Grant, more than Hayes, more than Garfield, more than Arthur.

He has at the start the best of all foundations for American statesmanship by becoming a good lawyer. He began his executive career by being a good county sheriff. He was next intrusted with the administration of a great city—as severe a test of a man's capacity in dealing with men and affairs as any American in our time can undergo. In both offices he gave boundless satisfaction to his fellow-citizens of both parties. His nomination for the Governorship of this State came in due course, and at a crisis in State affairs which very closely resembled that which we are now witnessing in national affairs. His election by an unprecedented majority is now an old story. It was the beginning of a revolution. It was the first thorough fright the tricky and jobbing element in politics ever received here. It is the first time in the experience of such politicians gave rise to form an air of reality. But it might, bad Cleveland proved a weak or incompetent man, have turned out a very bad blow for pure politics.

Luckily he justified all the expectations and even all the hopes of those who voted for him. No friend of good government, who, in disregard of party ties, cast his vote for him, has had reason to regret it for one moment. We owe to his vigorous support a large number of reformatory measures which people in this State for forty years had sighed for with little more expectation of seeing them enacted than of seeing the Millennium. In other words, he has arrested the growth of political despotism among Democratic partisans both of young and old voters in this State. His messages, too, have been models of sound common sense and penetrating sagacity, clothed in the terse and vigorous English which shows that there is a man and not a windy phrasemonger behind the pen. Though last not least, his best work has been done in utter disregard of the hostility of that element in his own party which for so many years has been an object of mingled hate and fear to the best part of the American people. He is in truth a Democrat of the better age of the Democratic party. He is not a party of simplicity and economy, and might almost have put its platform into the golden rule of giving every man his due, minding your own business, and asking nothing of government but light taxes and security in the field and by the fireside. No one who has entered the White House for half a century, except Lincoln in his second term, has offered reformers such solid guarantees that as President he would do his own thinking, and be his own master in the things which pertain to the Presidency.

We say, in the things which pertain to the Presidency, because we are all very apt in discussing the merits of Presidential candidates to discuss them on irrelevant grounds. A Presidential campaign rarely occurs in which the constitutional distinction between the different branches of the Government is not completely ignored. In the current popular discussion, the President is apt to be treated not simply as a part of the Legislature, but as himself a supreme legislator. His views on the tariff are considered as axiomatic as if the duties on imports were settled every four years by a proclamation issued from the White House. His position on the labor question is examined as carefully as if he could fix the rate of wages by general order, or, as O'Donovan Rossa thinks, clap a tax on all Englishmen and other obnoxious persons entering the country. The consequence is that the public attention is apt to be totally distracted from the kind of administrator he is likely to make. The true questions for the voter to ask himself about a Presidential candidate are of such peculiar importance as the present, when there is no substantial difference between the bids which the contending parties make for the popular support, are, in what way will he probably behave in the proper sphere of Presidential duties? What kind of nominations to office will be sent to the Senate? What considerations are likely to prevail with him in making removals? What sort of men are likely to surround him and be listened to by him at the White House? What is likely to be his attitude toward the moral and intellectual currents of the day, and toward the upward movements in American politics and society? How does he feel about money and rich men, and about the money-making enterprisers which are the great snare and temptation of modern life? Has he the sobriety of judgment, the steadiness of temper, the maturity of character, and the patient deliberativeness which his high and great career imperatively call for? Is he a sound and prudent man of business, and has he a keen eye for the remote consequences of legislation? Will he deal with foreign nations with the quiet and manly self-respect which becomes the representative of an industrious commercial people, among whom swashbucklers and military adventurers are despised or unknown?

These questions can, we believe, be answered as regards Mr. Cleveland in a way which every friend of good government may be fairly satisfied with, and we do not expect any of the other voters all over the country who long for a better era in politics, as a man to be trusted and worked for. Even those whose Republican traditions are most deeply rooted may rest assured that they can render no better service to the party they have long loved and supported than by securing his triumph. For this time a Democratic victory will arrest peremptorily, and, we believe, finally, the insincerity and hopefulness of the corrupt and freebooting element among Republicans, which has found its final expression in the Biaiano nomination and has at last destroyed that dream of "reform within the party" which has for so many years sustained the patience of tens of thousands of its best members.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

This platform adopted by the Democrats at Chicago bears a striking resemblance to that upon which Mr. Tilden was nominated in 1876. It is about twice as long as the Republican platform, which was itself of unusual dimensions. Both parties appear to multiply words in proportion to the paucity of issues. Either one is long enough for a speech. The Democratic platform is the better speech of the two because, for the first time in the history of the parties, it embodies less demagogism than the Republican. The cheap clap-trap in the Biaiano platform about the Eight-Hour Law is omitted altogether, while the declaration in regard to "contract labor" is rather less offensive. The Republican platform pronounces distinctly against immigration "from Europe or Asia" in cases where the immigrant has agreed beforehand to work for his living. The Democratic platform leaves it open to dispute whether the foreign labor to be excluded is or is not confined to "servile races unfit for habits, training, religion, or kindred, for absorption into the great body of our people." It is perhaps somewhat to the credit of the Republicans that they boldly
declared that they meant to include Irish, Germans, and Scandinavians in their prohibition, while the Democrats leave a shade of indistinctness as to their real meaning. Both are contemptible and at variance with our institutions and the whole course of our history. Nevertheless the general tone of the Democratic platform is superior to the customary deliverance of the party. It implies that the leaders are looking for recruits of a higher range of intelligence than they have been accustomed to court. This is shown also in the literary cast of the platform, which is above the common level of such productions.

The tariff plank, over which there was so much dispute, appears to be satisfactory to such ardent revenue reformers as Henry Waterton, and if not satisfactory to the other side, yet not so offensive as to make trouble in the campaign. While declaring in favor of a reduction of the tariff, "it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth." For the purpose of every Democrat reference is made to the essential parts of the two platforms relating to this subject.

**REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.**

"It is the first duty of a good government to protect the rights and promote the interests of its own people. The largest diversity of industry is most productive of general prosperity, and the great and independent interests of the people. We, therefore, demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not for revenue only, but that in raising the revenues for government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, the white and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

"Against the so called economic system of the Democratic party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest. The Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus.

"The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus not by the vicious and indiscriminate process of horizontal reduction, but by such methods as will relieve the taxpayer without injuring the labor or the productive interests of the country.

"We look upon the importance of sheep husbandry in the United States, the serious depression which it is now experiencing, and the danger threatening its future prosperity, and would meet the demands of the representatives of this important agricultural interest for a readjustment of the duty on foreign wool, in order that such industry shall have full and adequate protection.

**DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.**

"Knowing full well that legislation affecting the oppressions of the people should be cautious, conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pleased to state the high value it attaches to fairness to all interests. But in making reductions in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue; such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regarded in the argumentum ad hominem by quoting liberally from the Advertiser of a former period, when it was under a different management, and was edited by a person not now living. The value of the argument, so far as it seeks to convict the Advertiser of inconsistency, is therefore worthless. As Mr. Mead has given some attention to the Nation also, we propose to take notice of his pamphlet so far as to refresh the public mind upon one important fact connected with the Blaine investigation. Referring to the original groundwork of the investigation, viz., the charge that the Union Pacific Railroad Company relieved Mr. Blaine of $75,000 of Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad bonds after that speculation had turned out badly, paying him $84,000 therefor, Mr. Mead says:

"If, therefore, the present insinuations of the Nation are to be heeded, it must be on the theory of an amount of systematic, dove-tailed, and very dangerous and vulnerable lying [on the part of "Calder and Scott"], which is absolutely preposterous."

The belief that Mr. Blaine did receive the $84,000, which it was proved that the Union Pacific Company paid without any good reason at a time when it was itself in financial straits, rests upon circumstantial evidence of such various and remarkable and self-supporting character that it could not possibly have been invented by any person or any number of persons. It is opposed by the testimony of Thos. A. Scott, who, if the charge were true, was himself particeps criminis, and therefore under suspicion as a witness. Caldwell never appeared before the Committee, was never examined or cross-examined. A cable telegram signed with his name was received by the Chairman of the Committee, purporting to confirm Scott's testimony. While the Committee were still in session, and while they were endeavoring to ascertain Caldwell's whereabouts, in order to secure his attendance, or at least to prove the genuineness of the telegram, Mr. Blaine, with characteristic effrontery, made a speech in the House charging that such a telegram had been received by the Chairman, and that it had been suppressed. He had no means of knowing that it had been received except through another cable telegram from Caldwell to himself, and as to the suppression of it, there was nothing to suppress except upon the grotesque assumption that it was the duty of the Committee to report what they had got by hearsay before they were ready to report what they had got under oath. The testimony of Scott is therefore the only offset to the circumstantial evidence going to show that Mr. Blaine did receive the $84,000 in question.

It was shown near the close of the investigation, and quite unexpectedly by Mr. Blaine's letters, that he did receive from some quarter a large sum of money through a sale of Little Rock and Fort Smith bonds at much above their value. The source from which it came was explained by the witness Mulligan in a very straightforward way. He said that Elisha Atkins told him and Fisher that the Union Pacific Company held a lot of these bonds which came from Blaine, and would be glad to turn...
them for the purpose of reorganizing the Little Rock Company on a new basis; that when Mr. Blaine was pressing Fisher for a settlement, alleging that he had lost heavily by the deal in Little Rock securities, Fisher wrote in reply that his losses could not have been heavy because he (Fisher) knew where he (Blaine) had received $64,000 from the sale of one lot of the depreciated bonds; that Blaine replied that Fisher was mistaken if he supposed the sale was for his own benefit, because he had turn the money over within forty-eight hours to the parties in Maine to whom he (Blaine) had sold the bonds, in order to save them from loss. Mr. Blaine's letter upon this point was dated April 18, 1872. It said:

"The sales of bonds which you spoke of my making, and which you seem to think were for my own benefit, were entirely otherwise. I did not have the money in my possession for forty-eight hours, but paid it over directly to the parties whom I tried by every means in my power to protect from loss."

These facts came out only a few days before the close of the investigation. What had gone before may be briefly recapitulated. May 15, 1876, J. C. S. Harrison, a Government Director of the Union Pacific R. R., testified that at the meeting of the Board in September, 1872, the President of the company presented a letter from the President of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad Company, with reference to some bonds of the latter company held by the Union Pacific Company; that he (Harrison) moved the appointment of a committee to ascertain how these bonds came into possession of the Union Pacific, and that E. H. Rollins, the secretary of the company, took him aside and desired him to withdraw the motion, because it would involve Mr. Blaine: "that the October election was near at hand, and the investigation of the matter would ruin Mr. Blaine and defeat his reelection to Congress." May 18, 1876, E. H. Rollins testified that he had said to Mr. Harrison that "he had heard that these were Mr. Blaine's bonds, and that he might be involved in it." He could not recollect who told him that they were Blaine's bonds. May 15, 1876, Thomas A. Scott testified that he bought $75,000 of Little Rock & Fort Smith bonds of Josiah Caldwell, for eighty cents on the dollar, and sold them subsequently to the Union Pacific Railroad Company, of which he was then President, at about the same price, for $6,000; and that Mr. Blaine had nothing to do with the matter. Being asked how the Union Pacific Co. came to buy these bonds at a price so much above their value, he said that they were taken off his hands as compensation for his services as President of the company in lieu of salary. It was proved that the salary of the President of the Union Pacific Company was only $8,000 per year; that Scott was President only one year; that the difference between the market price of Little Rock and the price asked for the Union Pacific Company took this lot was at least $2,000; that Scott was President of thirteen or fourteen other railroad companies, and gave very little attention to the Union Pacific; that it was not custom-

The testimony of Mulligan was given on the 8th of May, and two or three days following, and the letters were published on the 5th of June. It should be added that Mr. Atkins, although having a generally good opinion of Mulligan as a man of veracity, failed to remember telling him and Fisher that the bonds came from Blaine, but Fisher testified with a good deal of reluctance that "the inference" he drew from Mr. Atkins's remarks on the subject was that "they were Blaine bonds." Mr. Atkins was himself a director of the Union Pacific and a member of its Executive Committee. Fisher admitted that he might have referred to these bonds in his letters to Mr. Blaine, as having been turned over by the latter to the Union Pacific Company, and that Mr. Blaine might have replied that the money went to his (Blaine's) friends in Maine.

These are the links in the chain of circumstantial evidence going to show that Mr. Blaine, notwithstanding his denial, and Scott's queer narrative about the manner in which he collected his salary from the Union Pacific, and Caldwell's suspicious cable telegram, did get the money with which he reimbursed his Maine friends for their losses, in part at least, from the Union Pacific treasury.

THE BOLT OF 1872.

The Milwaukee Sentinel deems the present a suitable occasion to recall the "bolt of 1872," for the purpose of showing how inconsequent the present revolt against the nomination of Mr. Blaine is. Of all recent elections it finds a striking resemblance between the state of affairs then and the condition of parties now, and concludes that the result in November will be substantially the same as in 1872.

The single point of resemblance which the present revolt bears to that of 1872 is that it is a revolt against a party nomination invited by public misdemeanors. The similarity begins and ends there. The accusation against General Grant was not that he was personally corrupt, but that he had an aptitude for falling into the hands of rascals, and giving his confidence to them, which amounted to a continuing public scandal; that he had introduced military methods into civil administration to a dangerous degree, and had treated the Presidency as a personal perquisite. These accusations were perfectly true, and will scarcely be controverted now by his most ardent admirers. The principal charge—his unreasoning adherence to any bad character who had once gained his confidence—was proved to be true in repeated scandals during his second term, and has reasserted itself after the recent explosion in Wall Street. Perhaps nothing short of the ruin of Grant & Ward could have convinced the General himself that there was a substantial foundation for the charge preferred against him by the Liberals in 1872, that the public interests were imperiled through his promiscuity to fall a victim to designing knaves.

Nobody can say what would have been the result of the election of 1872 if Charles Francis Adams, or Senator Trumbull, or any man of similar gravity and repute and statesmanly qualifications and experience had received the Cincinnati nomination. It is not necessary to speculate upon what might have been, but it is certain that the nomination of Mr. Greeley, able as he was in his own department and field of influence, gave an air of comedy to the Liberal movement which was fatal to it. Mr. Greeley had been noted as a marplot during the war and as a crank in many ways. He had made himself so obnoxious to the Democratic party that even the Baltimore nomination could not bring the rank and file with any unanimity to his support. As many Democrats bolted Greeley as Republicans bolted Grant, possibly more. At all events, the fact that the Democrats did not nominate a Democrat in 1872, but did nominate a Republican of the most pronounced type and one who had dealt them some of the severest blows they had ever received, constitutes a remarkable difference between the circumstances of that year and of the present.

Another difference, perhaps even more important, lies in the changed condition of party issues. In 1872 the reconstruction of the Southern States was, in the minds of the great body of Republicans, incomplete. Tales of Kuklux outrages filled the public ear. Louisiana was still under military control. Arkansas and Florida and Missouri were in turmoil. The questions of amnesty and of suffrage to rebels were unsettled. The ghost of the rebellion was still revisiting the glimpses of the moon. The lava passions of the war were but thinly overlaid. They broke out again immediately after the election, and were not finally appeased until the second year of Mr. Hayes's term of office.

The difference between 1872 and 1884 in the state of public feeling on these questions is measured not merely by the lapse of twelve years' time, but by the oncoming of new subjects of public interest, the most important of which is the reform of the public service, national, State, and municipal. At no time since the close of the war, if at any time, has this question engaged the thoughts and services of mankind. At no time has it appealed so successfully to the young and active men who are making their first acquaintance with public affairs. The issues of slavery have ceased to excite men's passions. The war which confused Republicans to the support of Grant in 1872 has lost its power. Whoever wins this year must win by his personal character, and by the promise which it gives of fulfilling the public demand for reform in administration and respectability in high places.

ENO AND THE ASHBURTON TREATY.

The Eno case has resulted, as all lawyers at all familiar with the Ashburton treaty had anticipated, in the escape of the accused; and it is one of those cases where the commun-
sence view and the legal view so thoroughly coincide that the result has caused no surprise to the press or public at large. The English judges decided it long ago in the Winder case, and the recent Tully case in this country and the Eno case in Canada have only followed the Winder decision. Of course it is the enormous amount of money—some $5,000,000—lost through Eno's operations which led to the desperate attempt to kidnap him under the forms of law that has just broken down; and the main value of Judge Carlyle's decision is to make plain to all the world what was known before only to a few, that England and Canada afford a safe harbor of refuge for all embezzlers and swindlers from the United States, and that the United States does the same for England and Canada. Internationally, in other words, the law puts a premium on swindling, a crime which the domestic law of both England and the United States punishes most severely—and which is perhaps the most dangerous offence common in modern commercial states.

The difficulty with the reformation of the law hit here has been a curious one. We have a better treaty with every leading Continental Power, notwithstanding the differences of race, language, and religion, than we have with England. And why? Chiefly because international distrust and suspicion have been repeatedly aroused by attempts at sharp practice in the extradition of criminals and in the construction of the treaty. In this we were chiefly to blame. There was no excuse for an attempt made in General Grant's time to establish the extraordinary doctrine that a fugitive might be extradited for one crime and then tried for another, and the result of this—the passage of the English Extradition Act of 1870, forbidding the surrender of criminals unless a pledge was given that they should be tried only for the extradition crime—was simply a proof of international distrust excited by our behavior. The fourteen years which have elapsed since the passage of that act has been a period rich in the production of enlightened extradition treaties, covering various sorts of breaches of trust, with countries far less advanced than England. With the republics of Salvador, of Nicaragua and Peru, with the Orange Free State, Ecuador, Belgium, Spain, and even Turkey—few of them countries likely to be attractive as an asylum for American swindlers—we have had no difficulty in making treaties which cover other pecuniary crimes than forgery; and in all the European treaties a clause forbidding the trial of the person surrendered for any crime committed prior to that for which he is given up is to be found—a fact which shows that we have abandoned the very point which led to the passage of the hostile Extradition Act by England.

The passage of the Extradition Act, however, was resisted by General Grant's Administration as an indication of a distrust on the part of England of our good faith, and it almost led to a stoppage of all extradition proceedings under the treaty. Fourteen years have elapsed, and a new attempt to evade the provisions of the treaty has been made from our side of the border, and once more it has been demonstrated that our extradition treaty sets a premium upon crime. The evident bad faith of the attempt has converted one of the great swindlers of the day into a popular favorite with the people among whose hands he has taken refuge, and this time not only political antipathy, but religious fervor, has been excited, by the mere fact that the swindler appeared in company with a Catholic priest.

The matter has not, however, been made so clear that a man can understand it. The Ashburton treaty is no protection against the commonest forms of swindling, and if the swindler ever gets away there is no hope of getting him back for trial. Eno, according to one story, is going to settle down in Quebec and set up in business as a broker. The overtures for an amendment to the obsolete Ashburton treaty ought as a matter of propriety to come from our Government, and as the subject is one in which the welfare of the whole Anglo-Saxon world has a deep interest, we devoutly hope that diplomatic sensitiveness will not any longer stand in the way of a determined effort, and that immediately, to have a new treaty drafted ready for ratification when the Senate meets in December.

COLLEGE CONTROVERSY.

The commencement season is over without any very noteworthy incidents. The address of Professor Jebb, at Cambridge, and the unveiling of the statue of Professor Stillman, at New Haven, are the two events which are the most striking in the reports—always excepting the boat races, which in these days command very much the same attention from the public and from the colleges as was formerly given to crotions and alumni dinners. Noteworthy changes are announced in the undergraduate curriculum at Harvard and also at Yale in the direction of still greater freedom for undergraduates in the choice of their studies. The colleges continue to be the recipients of generous benefactions, and on the whole, are steadily growing in influence, wealth, and adaptation to the country without any serious hindrances. Yet there is undoubtedly one danger which may at any time interfere with the welfare of a particular institution—the danger of internal dissension.

Frequently, we may even say with increasing frequency during the last few years, the colleges of this country have been disturbed by internal commotions. These quarrels or controversies have been reported to the public and have been discussed by the newspapers, usually with strong partisan animosity. At least two excellent institutions have been named which have thus been rent with discord during the last two or three years. The epidemic, though one, as we think, to a single cause, is manifest in diverse forms. Sometimes, especially in newly organized colleges, the entire faculty, or a large part of it, incurs the censure of the board of trustees, and sweeping resignations or removals from office are insisted on. It is more often the case that the president is attacked. Either the trustees find him inefficient for the carrying out of the policy which they would like to see prevail, or the faculty regard him as dictatorial and inclined to usurp the rights which they have been accustomed to exercise. It may be that a trustee, by a conscientious devotion to what he believes to be his duty, gives offense to some member of the faculty, who is thus thrown into a state of hostility toward a member of the governing body. It may even happen that the entire body of trustees are brought into collision with the academic staff. These quarrels are generally so obscure that only those who are nearest to the controversy understand what is in dispute. The public at large hears only vague charges and intimations—that "President A is not the man for the place; he does not compare with President B"; or that "the Faculty are trying to manage affairs which legally belong to the Trustees"; or that "Professor X is a mischief-maker, aspiring to show what he can do by so and so"; or that "Mr. M., one of the Trustees, treats the Professors as if he had hired them and had a right to direct their doings."

As similar discussions arise in old colleges and in new, at the East and in the West, in colleges chiefly governed by clergymen, and in those which are under the control of the State, there is probably some underlying cause which can be discovered. It is most desirable that it should be pointed out, before the evil can be eradicated, its sources must be discovered. A specific remedy like the removal of an individual from the office of president, trustee, or professor will not restore harmony for any long period, if it be true that there is some fundamental difficulty quite independent of the persons who are called to the administrative offices.

The writer of this article, after a long acquaintance with the colleges of this country, has arrived at the conclusion that these difficulties are the natural result of a bad system of government. They are not in fact, though they are in form, personal quarrels. They are the conflicts which inevitably arise when men of strong character, independent
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opinions, and great determination are placed in offices the responsibilities of which are serious and the duties of which are ill defined. They are the legacies of a monarchical system which is now out of fashion and is attacked by men who are trained in republican or constitutional usages. In any society where the functions of the different authorities overlap, where the prerogatives of the different offices are obscured by the changes of the times, and especially where the interests which were once homogeneous have become complex and diversified, trouble is sure to come. Is not this the case in the American colleges? Can anybody in any college distinctly define the administrative duties of the trustees, the faculty, and the president? In most cases do not mutual courtesy and consideration constitute the bond of union—a system which works well in times of peace and quiet, but is not adapted to times of conflict?

A reference to the history of our institutions throws some light upon the problem. The college governments of this country had their origins in the usages of the English colleges nearly three centuries ago. The governing authority in every college was a Board of Fellows, whose elected chief was their "Master," or "Rector," or "President." These Fellows resided in their colleges, owned the property, made the regulations, took part in the instruction, and governed the students. Harvard and Yale began by the association of ministers living near to one another for the purpose of obtaining Fellows for the maintenance of a college. They chose their head to be Rector of the college; they acquired and held property, made laws for the instruction and government of students, and exercised parental authority over those who were committed to their charge.

Gradually a separate body of teachers was formed; professors were appointed, who became a faculty, and their head was the head of the Board of Fellows. In other words, two bodies, one of instruction and one of management, were developed, under the common presidency of the Fellows. The President was therefore called upon to act in a double capacity. To the Trustees or Fellows he was the representative of the Faculty, the principal teacher; to the staff of teachers he was the exponent of the Trustees, the principal governor or manager. He was both the chief among those who received appointment to teach, and chief among those who conferred such appointments. His position was, therefore, a very difficult one—for he combined two distinct offices, representing interests which might often be divergent—let us say, for example, the need of expansion and the need of economy. He desired, like a king acting with two petty councils, the Faculty on the one hand, the Fellows or Corporation on the other. All this appears to have worked pretty well until the expansion of simple colleges into universities, with many faculties, much property, manifold relations to the progress of knowledge. A government which claimed to exercise a sort of simple domestic authority is not adequate to the control of a complex organization such as many of our colleges have now become. At Harvard, the President has quite demitted the functions of a teacher; the general administration of the affairs is enough to occupy the strongest man. In small colleges, on the other hand, the president is expected to be chief teacher, chief preacher, chief financier, chief solicitor of funds, chief builder. He is regarded almost as the embodiment of his college.

The faculty used to act in loco parentis, good or bad, with the students by residence among them, by attending divine worship with them, by partaking of a common table. All this worked well enough in simple days; but as everybody knows there is but little left of these primitive usages. The faculty in many colleges have now more to do with the material affairs of the college than the trustees; they solicit funds; they suggest improved methods of instruction; they select new teachers; in short, they are wisely recognized as the party most competent to decide on the standards of a liberal education, and most interested in seeing the progress of the institution to which they belong.

Thus it has come to pass that at the present time the functions of president, faculty, and trustees are more or less confounded, and either branch of the government is liable to be offended by the action of one of the other branches. It is becoming more and more difficult under these circumstances to find individuals who are adequate to the office of college president; more and more difficult to keep in office those who are called to undertake such ill-defined responsibilities. It is the prerogative of college officers, and their sincere devotion to the interests intrusted to them, which keep affairs as steady as they are. Even wisdom, conciliation, and forbearance are not adequate, as the readers of newspapers are aware, to the prevention of internal feuds and occasional open controversies.

The traditions of the older colleges in this country are so binding that it would be no easy task to define the relations of president, trustees, and faculty in terms which would be applicable alike to all foundations, but in the case of the single college, would not be so difficult to frame a written constitution which would serve as a substitute for the unwritten and conflicting usages and theories which are now the cause of so many controversies.

RENAUD'S 'NEW STUDIES IN RELIGIOUS HISTORY.'

PARIS: June 30.

M. RENAUD has given us a volume of 'New Studies in Religious History,' a natural sequence of his 'Studies of Religious History,' published twenty-seven years ago. The new essays are chiefly devoted to Buddhism and to some portions of the middle ages. The essay on Buddhism was composed during the months of the life of Eugène Burqouf. "It was composed," says Renan, 'for the Revue des Deux Mondes, and it was the first work which I offered to this review.' M. Buize, the least Buddhist of men, praised my article as regards some accessory, but as for its essence he would not believe that it was true. A real Buddhist, blood and bones, seemed to him an inadmissible thing. To all my proofs he was answered invariably, 'It is not possible that there should be such stupid men.' Burqouf died, and I left the article in my drawer.' It is fortunate that it is now published, as it gives a very vivid account of the views of Burqouf on Buddhism. The original article has been enlarged, and we find in these pages on Buddhism, part of which are already so old, some of the finest and best qualities of Renan:

"A doctrine which assigns to life as its supreme end nothing but a doctrine which proclaims that the culmination of perfection is the annihilation of life; one in which man is represented as the highest term of which the idea of a Supreme Being appears only at a late period, is such an extraordinary phenomenon of the mind that our reason can only be perplexed and perplexed with some difficulty. And still such a doctrine exists. To make the paradox complete, this doctrine, apparently the most distressing that has ever been professed, has inspired prodigies of devotion in the most various races; the church and pious has returned to our days, without any notable schism, the most compact little body of the people. This is certainly a most extraordinary fact in the history of the human mind. Strange in its destiny, Buddhism is the more so in so far as the doctrine, in the legend of its founder, in the odd style of its sacred books. Unitizing the abuses of the most monstrous licentiousness, the maddest imagination, this religion, which begins without a god and almost without rites, issues in the extravagant mythology. The religion which was the most philosophical at first, and in which some of the most learned schools affect to find the last word of wisdom, has become the coarsest of popular superstitions."

Renan unfolds the poetical legend of the life of Buddha, with all its applications of a style which seems made for such miraculous events. The doctrine of Çakya has never been better explained than by Burqouf in his classic 'Introduction to the Study of Indian Buddhism'; but Renan has a flexibility of words, a richness of imagery, which such a subject demands. The poem is a wonderful impression: "For Buddhism, as well as for Christianity, the sense of the universal vanity of things is the beginning of all wisdom; but after all is vanity the Christian can add except God and the worshiping of God, and the Buddha add nothing and can add nothing." His atheistic religion has certainly not been eminently moral: "As a father who sees his children play in a house which is beginning to burn, so the souls disabled and almost without rites, issues in the extravagance of mythology. The religion which was the most philosophical at first, and in which some of the most learned schools affect to find the last word of wisdom, has become the coarsest of popular superstitions."

"As a father who sees his children play in a house which is beginning to burn, so the Buddha sees all beings, devoured, by birth, by death, by lamentations and tears of the ascetics, the gods and the devils, the gods and the devils, which result from these, constantly coming to life again; and in the midst of this infinity of sorrow they play, they accuse themselves, they do not tremble, they do not even think how miserable they are. And Buddha says to himself: I am the father of all these beings; I will deliver them; I will give them the incomparable happiness of knowledge." The reason of the popularity of a doctrine which seems made for the most sublime philosophers, is probably to be found in its profound simplicity, not only for men for all animals, for all beings. Buddha tries to convert the birds, the gods, the victims, the harpies, the fantastic creatures which constantly dwell in the Indian imagination. The Vedas, which Renan calls severe and aristocratic, could not have this effect on the Oriental. Renan's book shows us all the transformations of the original Buddhism; in becoming popular it organized itself, and became less idealistic. The old traditions were kept up in philosophical schools, and the popular religion became more and more a kind of paganism. The religious symbols transformed themselves so as to give satisfaction to more people, without losing a certain sort of unity.

Almost all the essays of the new volume concern the extraordinary religious movements of
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