The Shades Discuss the Inequality of Wealth

Washington, Jefferson and Adams in a Frank Debate With the American Multi-Millionaire as the Theme.

By Frederick Upham Adams.

Man Not More Marvelous Than Nature.

(Copyright, 1905, by McClure, Phillips & Co.)

(INTRODUCTION—The Shades of Washington, Jefferson and Samuel Adams return to the country they helped to establish. Late at night they visit the library room of Smith, an author, and find him in conference with his friend Brown. A number of conferences ensue, after which the shades depart on a tour of the country and make a study of existing conditions. They are again visiting Smith and Brown when the following discussion takes place.)

AS I have previously stated, I am by nature and by training of a conservative turn of mind, and was not a little dismayed at the radical trend of the discussion. Even at the risk of offending my distinguished guests I determined to convey to them a hint and a warning.

"It was with your permission," I began, "that I have kept a record of these debates, with the understanding that I have the privilege of making them public. You have been perfectly frank with Mr. Brown and me, and it is only fair that I be equally so with you. Therefore, I must say to you," I concluded, addressing myself more especially to Mr. Jefferson, "that I do not see my way clear to exploit views calculated to create a class feeling. While I am perfectly willing to admit that the unequal distribution of wealth constitutes a problem, and possibly a menace, I hesitate to become involved in a consideration of it. I certainly must decline to record any views hinting at confiscation, be it by taxation or any other method."

"May I ask your reason for this attitude, Mr. Smith?" said Thomas Jefferson.

"I will be candid with you," I replied. "The reputable author must look to those who are more or less satisfied with existing conditions. When you hint at disturbing or reforming the system which gives that class an advantage, you make of it your enemy."

"Possibly so, but it will continue to be your reader," smiled Jefferson. "Such writers as Dickens, Thackeray, Carlyle and Hugo boldly attacked institutions fortified by tradition, wealth and royalty, and won fame and fortune by the patronage of those against whom they leveled their shafts of eloquence and ridicule. Were I to give advice to a young author I should urge him to be radical—entertainingly radical, sanely radical and patriotically radical. Have you no better reason, Mr. Smith, for hesitating to question the justice of the supremacy of wealth?"

"I have another reason," I said emphatically, "and it is this: It is idle to protest against the inequality of wealth for the reason that it is natural and inevitable that such inequality should exist. There have always been rich and poor, and ever will be. It is nature's decree, and we cannot appeal from it."

Everything Is Natural.

"Since we are the children of nature, it follows that we are governed by her laws," remarked Jefferson. "Since nature or God—and the two are one—since nature does all things, it logically follows that everything which is, and that everything which happens is natural, does it not?"

"There can be no other deduction," I said, after a moment's reflection.

"Therefore the word 'unnatural' is meaningless," continued Jefferson. "To love is natural, to hate is natural, to desire peace is natural, to make war is natural; to be ambitious is natural, to be satisfied is natural; to give life is natural, to take life is natural. When we say that a certain thing is unnatural we mean that it is not normal. A crazed mother kills her babe. Her act was natural, else it would not have taken place, but it was not normal, hence it was not right. Do you grasp the distinction, Mr. Smith?"

"I do, but I fail to see its relevancy," I replied. "Moreover, you have wandered far away from the subject, which was the inequality of wealth and the means which should be employed to remedy it."

"You have asserted that nature has decreed that an inequality of wealth shall exist," said the shade of Jefferson, with thoughtful deliberation. "In making that statement you have sounded the stock argument urged in defense of every wrong which ever cursed this earth. It is a half truth around which are centered a million economic and religious lies. Listen to me, sir! Nature is a composite of Good and Evil. With one hand she showers blessings, with the other she scatters curses. In the brain of man she planted love, friendship, generosity, charity, self-sacrifice, honesty, loyalty and patriotism; in that same brain she planted hate, envy, parsimony, malevolence, greed, dishonesty, disloyalty and treason.

"The greedy, revengeful and dishonest man can lay as just claim to accord with the decrees of nature as can his charitable, forgiving and upright neighbor. He can point to the fact that nature is merciless—and he does so in order to condone his own inhumanity. He can prove that beasts, birds and fishes prey on their kind—and he does so in order to justify his rapacity against those who fall into his clutches. He can appeal to the Bible, to the law, to customs and traditions, and find a thousand excuses for injustice, but he dares not appeal to his conscience when he oppresses his fellow man. You cannot justify an unfair distribution of wealth and of opportunities by asserting that it comes from natural causes. Men and nations both are judged by whether they do the right thing, not by the standard of their natural inclinations."

"Let me see if I can make this clearer to our young friend," proposed Samuel Adams. "The primitive man gave full rein to all of his passions, and the baser ones predominated. The savage was governed by his natural instincts. What we term civilization is simply an attempt to regulate or suppress our baser inclinations and to encourage and cultivate our more ennobling traits and ambitions. The settler kills wild beasts, fells forests, drains swamps and in one hundred ways struggles against nature. In a sense all progress is artificial, and the same is true of most laws, systems and governments. The man who consents to live in civilization has no right to appeal to the barbaric law of the wilderness for precedents. As Mr. Jefferson has said, greed is as natural as charity, and much more common; but civilization is attempting to progress away from it. The gigantic accumulations of wealth with which you are familiar, give rise to a problem which is of vital interest to a self-governing people. If it be right that a small percentage of your people shall hold a large percentage of your property, it certainly follows that the system which gave them that advantage should be adhered to; if it be not right, that system should be altered or abolished. It is an economic question which cannot be kept out of politics, and the sooner your people meet it and discuss it frankly and courageously, the better it will be for all concerned."

Just and Unjust Possessions.

"I have followed this argument with much interest," said Washington. "There is not the slightest question but that many nations and civilizations have been overthrown by an internal inequality in wealth, an inequality leading to enervating luxury on one hand, and to ignorant and degrading poverty on the other. I am not prepared to express the opinion that this nation has neared the danger line, but I am convinced that the question of the methods by which individuals and corporations shall be permitted to accumulate property is one which should engage the thoughtful attention of every American citizen. There is no demand for an absolute or even approximate distribution of wealth, the most radical of your socialistic and other theorists and reformers recognizing the right of an individual to the ownership of what he has earned, but my study and observation convinces me that the overwhelming majority of your people believe that the line which separates just and unjust possession has long since been passed."

"What leads you to this conclusion, General Washington?" I asked.

"The tone of your press, magazines, literature, pulpit, and the trend of your state and municipal legislation pointedly indicate that this subject is coming to the fore," was his reply. "Even more significant are the conversations of your citizens. It is the pervading subject of serious talk not only with your work people, but with your farmers, merchants, manufacturers and those who possess moderate fortunes. We have listened to many such conversations, and I do not recall an instance in which a speaker made threats or expressed envy. Your people are considering this question calmly, but seriously. Few of them have formed an opinion as to what shall be done, but the great majority of them are agreed that 'something must be done.' When such becomes the conviction of a people, action is inevitable."

How May the Limit Be Fixed?

"What sort of action?" I demanded. "Let us concede, for the sake of simplifying matters, that there is a glaring and unjust distribution of wealth. Let us concede, for the moment, that no man should own a billion or a half billion of dollars. The question then arises, how shall he be entitled to hold. Shall we permit him to inherit or amass $100,000,000? If that is too much, how about $50,000,000, $25,000,000, $10,000,000 or $1,000,000? We must fix the limit of a proper amount of wealth somewhere; what is the figure? Suppose we set it at a million of dollars. Two questions at once present themselves. Since a man is not permitted to increase his fortune beyond this figure, it naturally follows that he cannot engage in any business or occupation which will increase his fortune. He must spend his annual income or give it away. The average income on a million of dollars is about $40,000. The citizen who has attained that goal is therefore condemned to spend the remainder of his life in idleness. On the—"

"Permit me to suggest that there is nothing to prevent your unfortunate millionaire from offering his services to the community which contributes that $40,000 annually," interrupted Jefferson. "I am informed by your National Bureau of Statistics that the average wealth of an individual in this country is about $1000, and that nearly half of your population have no tangible or assessable property. The citizen who is permitted to own the equal of a thousand of his fellows should be willing to contribute his services to his community, state or the nation, and I should be so merciless as to make such service compulsory. Most men are unable to earn $40,000 by the hard labor of a lifetime. Let us not waste too much sympathy on our millionaires. Please proceed, Mr. Smith."

How Make the Division?

"I set the maximum at a million only for the sake of illustration," I continued, "and before I am through I shall convince you that such a step, or any similar one, would result in ruin to commerce, industry, agriculture, education and in the downfall of all our great institutions. But I will not anticipate my second question. But if we fix a maximum of, we will say, a million, how shall we dispossess those who have tens of millions and hundreds of millions? When you have answered that question, I will ask you another question: If we appropriate the excessive wealth now held by certain individuals, what disposition shall be made of it? Shall it be divided among the people? That project is so visionary that we may dismiss it at once. Since it is to be raised by taxation, in a manner which must amount practically to confiscation, it will naturally flow into the National or state treasuries. According to the most recent statistics, there are fully 6000 persons in this country who are worth $1,000,000 or more. They would be compelled to surrender many billions of dollars."

"They would have to give up about $30,000,000,000 in round figures," volunteered Brown, who prides himself on his knowledge of such matters. "According to our most reliable authorities, 40,000 of our citizens own two-thirds of the wealth of the nation, or about $60,000,000,000. About 6000 of these have passed the million mark, and as near as can be estimated their holdings amount to a total of $35,000,000,000. If they retain a million each, the tax gatherer would collect about $20,000,000,000, and I would like to be the collector."

"Now I propose to show you," I said, "the absolute absurdity of attempting to limit the amount of wealth which can be held by an individual. If this plan were carried into effect, we should have 600 persons worth $6,000,000,000; a second division of 32,000 persons worth $34,000,000,000; a National treasury loaded with $30,000,000,000 in money or securities, and the remaining $20,000,000,000 scattered among the people, as it is now. The 6000 who are to be despoiled are also debarred from engaging in business lest they commit the added crime of possessing more money than the law allows. These men have demonstrated that they are best fitted to conduct vast enterprises, but they must retire from all commercial activity. Those who are not yet under the ban must take up the burden of financing and managing the industries of the nation and likewise must cease when they have reached the legal limit. This is sheer folly. The lower the maximum of wealth is set the greater will be the damage. Put it at half a million and you will bar every financier and captain of industry of recognized ability."

Jefferson laughed heartily, and even Washington's stern lips relaxed in a smile. For the moment I was entirely satisfied with the contention I had set up.

"You certainly have demonstrated the folly of attempting to establish a maximum holding of wealth by an individual," declared Jefferson, "but I am sure that so far as General Washington, Mr. Adams and myself are concerned you have demolished a man of straw. I venture to speak for both of them when I assert that we have not the slightest sympathy with any such expedient."

The two distinguished shades gravely nodded in approval of what Jefferson had said.

"I am delighted to know that no such plan has your approval," I said. "While it has no reputable advocates of standing there is a deep-seated popular belief that it offers the most available and most direct remedy. All economic students and practical men of affairs know that existing conditions arise from natural causes."

"And will be changed by natural causes," quickly rejoined Thomas Jefferson. "If 40,000 of your citizens own two-thirds of your National wealth, nature will find a way to restore an equilibrium, but she will adopt no such artificial device as a maximum or minimum of personal wealth."

"Those statistics are not reliable," I protested.

"Call it 400,000 or 4,000,000 and the problem remains the same," asserted the shade of the statesman. "We are discussing questions which do not depend for their solution on statistics."

Note—In the following installment, The Shades depart for Washington, where they will interview Senators and other public men on questions of current interest.

What Could Our Navy Do If . . . . . ?

The United States Fleet as Compared With Other Nations

Continued From Page 38

the Iowa fired 135 aimed shots. Two 4-inch guns on the same ship threw 440 shells in that same period. The Oregon hurled out 1775 shots in the short chase.

After the war, all the guns of the entire fleet were efficient, needing no repairs, with the exception of four which had been ruined through the explosion of shells while still in the bore.

Is it to be weight of individual projectiles? The tables already given in this article answer that in such a case the United States Navy is prepared.

Shall swiftness of engines decide the next great naval battle? The American Admiral could take 26 battleships, 12 armored cruisers, 23 protected cruisers, 6 unprotected cruisers and more than a dozen gunboats into a fight and depend on their being able to move in perfect unbroken formation at a least speed of 15 knots an hour, or he could send out from that fleet at least 15 cruisers to make 20 knots an hour, and ten of these detached vessels would be nearly the equivalent of as many battleships in a running fight at ranges between one and a half and three miles at any speed that the best battleship in the world has ever attained.

Our Swiftly-Grown Torpedo Fleet.

Shall the torpedo-boat and the submarine be a commanding craft? The fighting fleet of 1907 that bears the Stars and Stripes, can be ringed round with torpedo-boat destroyers and torpedo-boats to cover the sea for 130 miles. Of the 16 destroyers, not one will be less than 245 feet long—as long as the cruisers Detroit, Marblehead or Montgomery. The slowest will be capable of going 28 knots an hour, while five are expected to hold a speed of 30 knots.

In the torpedo-boats the sizes of the vessels have increased as the size of the little fleet itself has increased. The smallest of the sea-devils is 60 feet long; the biggest is 213 feet. The slowest of the 51 is the foreign-built Somers, which is a 17-knot boat. The next slowest do not fall below 19 knots, and there are not half a dozen as slow as that. Few range under 20 and 22 knots, and the fastest are 30-knot boats.

Eight submarine boats, 160 horsepower each, 63 feet long, and each armed with five torpedoes, form our invisible navy.

The Vast Armored Ship.

If the armored ship has finally and incontestably proved herself as the vital element of modern naval strength, we are prepared for that even better than we are prepared for torpedo war or submarine war.

Steadily in our armored ships, from the Indiana to the present type, we have done what the frigate-builders of 1812 did for the navy; we have piled on tonnage, speed and preponderating gunfire.

Today we are building armored ships—both line of battle and heavy cruisers—that at least equal the very best product of the same type in any other modern navy.

Of our 26 battleship line, the oldest and least is the Texas, launched in 1892. The next oldest are the Indiana, Massachusetts and Oregon, completed in 1893. Then comes the Iowa, finished in 1896. None of the others dates back farther than 1899, eight are less than five years old and seven will be brand new when they take the sea.

This means that while our battleship array does not compare imposingly in numbers with Great Britain's stupendous line of more than 70 of all classes of battleships, it does compare gratifyingly well in point of modernity and correspondingly high efficiency; for less than 12 of her greatest battleships are as new as 15 of ours.

The American battleship fleet of 1906 will be capable of the widest action almost as a unit. With the exception of the Texas, our weakest battleship is still powerful enough to stay in any fight that the strongest can take up. In speed the entire fleet could stay together in a cruise of 4000 miles at 16 knots which would leave the Indiana only slightly astern in a 24 hours' run, for her speed is a little less than 16. The fastest vessels of the Virginia type, are to develop 19 or more at top speed.

Problematical Elements.

It would be foolish to affirm that they are perfect. There are problematical elements in the best of the American battleships that may prove unfavorable in the sudden test of severe service.

Opinions still differ, for instance, as to the superimposed turret design of the Kentucky and Kearsarge class with their great turrets, each bearing two 8-inch cannon, built on top of other turrets that hold two 13-inch guns.

The idea that led to this design was to give all the ship's great guns a free range forward or astern. Before that, the attempt has been made to achieve this by training the 8-inch guns from another part of the ship so that in case of necessity their projectiles could be fired over the top of the 13-inch gun turrets; but it was found that the blast of the 8-inch battery made the sighting hoods of the 13-inch turrets untenable.

The importance of giving all the big guns aboard ship free range ahead or astern is growing greater with each year of naval advance, for the object of each modern ship is to engage the enemy as soon as a gun can reach and therefore the fight opens head on while the ships are still approaching.

The superimposed turrets achieve this radius of range; but the objection to them is that all the guns must be trained on the same line, whereas it might be desirable in a sea fight to train the heaviest guns on the armor belt of an enemy's waterline while the lighter guns played against some other part of the hostile ship, or even against another ship.

Again, it is likely that should the lower turret be disabled, the upper turret with the two 8-inch guns would be out of action too, although its armament might be perfect.

These are serious objections; but the decision to try the superimposed turret was reached only after all these points had been considered. If it is an experiment, it is one that was not made lightly.

Have They Enough Gunpowder?

Another objection to the new battleships being urged by some of our naval experts is that batteries of seven and even 8-inch guns are too light for the modern, first-class, seagoing coast line battleship. Great Britain is arming her new ships with 9-inch guns and it is being urged that none of our new great ships should be armed with batteries of guns smaller than that, because the ranges at which future sea fights are likely to be fought preclude the effective use of lighter cannon.

Extreme opinion in American technical minds is that we should arm the battleships of the New Hampshire type with 10-inch guns throughout, or even with 12-inch guns in their entire main batteries.

But neither of these matters, important though it may be, is of a nature that would make our battle line radically defective.

There is nothing in them so grave as the allegation just raised in Great Britain that the great wire-wound guns, which are the adopted form of British main battery armament, are so ineffective as to render fifteen British battleships practically unfit for service.

It is known, too, that many of the most powerful British cruisers have not a full armament of modern steel guns and that some vessels actually still carry smooth bores, or did a couple of years ago, owing to delay in supplying the ordnance for which they were designed.

The calamitous failure of the famous 110-ton guns on the British battleships of the first class is still fresh in the minds of naval authorities. The doubts that have been cast on the French Navy's true efficiency also remain to be cleared away satisfactorily. There was something grave the matter with the ships in all probability.

No Serious Problem.

There apparently is no such serious problem in the United States Navy.

So much for actual conditions. Now how will our newest type of battleship compare with the best of the foreign nations, at least on paper and theoretically, assuming that wisdom of design and skill in construction will be the same in all—a generous assumption which certainly gives us the worst of it, for the actual chances are that, in construction at least, our type will be superior to that of any other nation except Great Britain.

Our Highest Type and Others.

The following will show at a glance how we will compare in strength among the world's greatest battleships:

British, King Edward VII type: Tonnage, 16,350; 12-inch guns, 4; 9-inch guns, 4.

German, Deutschland type: Tonnage, 13,000; 11-inch guns, 4.

France, Republique type: Tonnage, 15,000; 12-inch guns, 4.

Japan, Kashima type: Tonnage, 16,500; 12-inch guns, 4; 10-inch guns, 4.

United States, New Hampshire type: Tonnage, 16,000; 12-inch guns, 4.

British, King Edward VII type: Smaller than 7-inch guns, 40; length, 425; speed, 18¾ knots.

German, Deutschland type: Smaller than 7-inch guns, 45; length, 400; speed, 18 knots.

France, Republique type: Smaller than 7-inch guns, 46; length, 440; speed, 18 knots.

Japan, Kashima type: Smaller than 7-inch guns, 44; length, 435; speed, 18¾ knots.

United States, New Hampshire type: 8-inch guns, 8; 7-inch guns, 12; smaller than 7-inch guns, 50; length, 450; speed, 18 knots.

Thus the New Hampshire type, while she may be behind Great Britain in point of big caliber guns over 8-inch, is superior to the leading type of other powers. And should the theory of extra large caliber not prove itself as compelling, she is ahead of the leading type of any nation whatsoever, because she ranks equal with all in the chief battery of 12-inch and is superior in having eight 8-inch guns against only four 10-inch rifles of the Japanese type or four 9-inch rifles of the British type.

Her eight 8-inch battery can throw 2000 pounds of steel against the 2000 pounds thrown by the Japanese ship's four 10-inch guns and the 1520 pounds of the British ship's four 9-inch guns.

The New Hampshire class is to be represented by the ship of that name and the Connecticut, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota and Vermont.

Next comes our Virginia class, which, while 15 feet less in length and 2000 tons less in displacement is planned for a speed of 19 knots. This type will carry practically the same armament as the New Hampshire type, and the waterline belt protection will be only one inch less in thickness.

The Virginia class comprises that ship and the Rhode Island, and is like the Kearsarge and Kentucky in having the superimposed turrets.

Then comes the Idaho class of 13,000 tons, with four 12-inch and eight 8-inch guns in turrets and eight 7-inch guns in broadside—an extremely powerful broadside armament, superior to that of most battleships in any navy. This is a 17 knot type and is represented by the Idaho and the Mississippi. They are armored with 9 inches at waterline, making a complete belt nine feet wide and covering all except 60 feet at bow and stern where the armor gradually tapers off until it is four inches thick.

The 7-inch guns are protected with 7-inch armored and the smaller secondary batteries of 3-inch guns are behind 2-inch nickel steel armor.

These Will Be Glories of the Fleet.

The glories of the United States Navy in all except sheer brute hammering power will be the new armored cruiser class of which 10 will all be entirely alike in size, armor, speed and armament.

They will be longer than the longest battleship in the fleet, being 502 feet waterline. They will run 14,000 tons at least in tonnage, and their speed is to be 22 knots. Their waterline belting will be five and six inches of steel and their gun turrets are armored in six and six and one-half-inch plate. They are all practically ready to enter the service. In case of need they could be hurried into commission in a short period.

Each of these swift ships mounts four 10-inch guns and 16 6-inch guns in the main battery. The secondary batteries carry 22 3-inch guns, 12 3-pounders, four 1-pounders, two 3-inch field pieces and four 30-caliber pieces. Four torpedo tubes project below the waterline of each. They cost more than the battleships, for while the estimated cost of the Idaho and Mississippi battleships is $3,000,000 each, the armored cruisers will cost $4,500,000 at least before they are ready for sea.

Could Smother Old Type.

Their immense batteries are so far superior to the batteries, both main and secondary, carried by the two armored cruisers of the old type, the New York and Brooklyn, that the new armored cruiser class could smother those two ships with both armor-piercing projectiles to crush the waterline armor and smaller shells to affect upper works and personnel.

The new type has a preponderating strength over the old, in every way, exceeding the New York and Brooklyn by 5000 in tonnage, more than 100 feet in length, 5000 in horse-power, and having almost double their armor belt at the waterline.

Against the terrible battery power of the new type, the Brooklyn carries a main battery of 8 8-inch and 12 5-inch rifles, and the New York has 6 8-inch and 12 4-inch guns. Neither ship carries any 3-inch guns except two field pieces.

Still, with all this superiority, the new armored class can include both of the old armored cruisers in its formation and still remain a homogeneous whole, because, though their waterline belting is much thinner, the barbettes of the old type are heavily protected; and as far as speed is concerned, the New York and Brooklyn are only a knot inferior and thus could steam in perfect formation in any ordinary cruise. The slower of the two old ships is the New York with 21 knots. The new type is designed for a uniform speed of 22 knots, as said.

The cruising radius of the twelve in squadron at ten knots an hour is such that they can go around the world with not more than seven stops for coal; that is, they would never need to depend on foreign coaling stations even in circumnavigating the globe, for they could always reach an American naval station before their coal bunkers were exhausted.

California, Colorado, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Montana, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington and West Virginia are their names. The armored cruisers, like the battleships of the United States, are named after the states, while the protected cruisers and gunboats are named for American cities.

An Armored Ship for Each State

The exceptions to this rule of nomenclature are the battleship Kearsarge, the armored cruisers Brooklyn and New York, each named after the cities of those names, and the armored monitors Arkansas, Florida, Nevada and Wyoming. The only states that are still to stand godmother to United States armored ships are Delaware, North Dakota and Utah.

So it is no mere dream to say that before long there will be a great armor clad afloat for every state in the Union.

This is an amazing growth since the day of the "White Squadron," the "Squadron of Evolution" of which the country was so proud just twenty years ago. The four ships of the "fleet," the Atlanta, Boston, Chicago and Dolphin are almost negligible factors now as elements of naval strength.

We smile at ourselves when we remember the exulting pride with which we viewed that little gathering of unprotected small cruisers, and the Baltimore, Charleston, Yorktown, Concord and Petrel that followed, yet they were highly efficient ships of their class. The Baltimore, Boston, Petrel and Concord were the ships that followed the new Olympia into Manila Bay and they made good, old and superseded as they were by the new steel monsters.

But in that day of evolution we had not a battleship, not an armored cruiser, not a torpedo-boat afloat. There was not a nation that needed to do us reverence, save for the wholesome respect that it had for the tradition of American naval enterprise.

Today we rank high among the naval powers of the world. Sixty-five private steel plants and ten Government Navy-Yards from Maine to California were kept busy for the fleet last year. One hundred and sixty million pounds of steel were accepted for warship use. Almost 20 ships, from first-class battleships to torpedo-boats, have been launched in the year just ended.

That Navy costs the people of the United States an annual sum that makes the share of each inhabitant of the country a little more than $1.

We Have True American Sailors.

Of the total enlisted force of 29,321 men, 80 per cent are native born. Only six years ago the Secretary of the Navy had been forced to report that the crews of American warships were "composed largely of foreigners."

What kind of Americans are these sailors of 1905?

Here is an answer in financial terms that any one can understand.

Some time ago Congress authorized the paymasters of ships to receive money from the sailors on deposit, and pay 4 per cent interest on it. Money so deposited is forfeited to the Government if the depositor deserts.

In the year ending in June, 1904, the seamen of the fleet deposited $375,094. One might almost call that a bond of more than half a million dollars put up by the Nation's sailors to guarantee that they will stick by the ship.

Big as our naval expenditures were in the last fiscal years, the average of the last three years being almost one-third as high as Great Britain's, $10,000,000 more than Russia, $4,000,000 more than France and $20,000,000 more than Germany, yet the administration of the department may justly be called economical. That item, usually so dubious in civil lists, "salaries and expenses," does not amount to 1 per cent of the entire expenses in the Navy budget. The money is spent for ships, guns and men, and not for clerks or sealing wax.

That it isn't badly spent may be deduced from the simple fact that of the 162 ships bought in mad haste at the beginning of the Spanish War, 85 are still on the list and in active service, despite the fact that the Government could exercise only very little control over the officers detailed to buy them. Of the remaining 77 ships, the Merrimac was sunk in front of Santiago, two were wrecked and five are serving the War Department as transports. That only leaves nine ships that didn't turn out permanently useful.

The 205 vessels of all kinds carried on the active lists by name do not comprise all that there is of the floating elements of the fleet. There are 109 coal barges, 13 ammunition lighters, 11 water barges, 32 lighters of all kinds, and 22 cascos, which are Filipino boats captured and bought in the Philippines.

In addition to all these are the small boats, launches and sailing and rowing cutters carried by each ship. There are more than 1500 of them.

The Naval Organization.

The system that cares for and uses all these craft has an Admiral at the head of it. Under him are 26 Rear-Admirals. Then follow in order of rank 386 Captains, 122 Commanders, 199 Lieutenant-Commanders, 343 Lieutenants, 113 ensigns, 104 midshipmen, 16 medical directors, 15 medical inspectors, 86 surgeons, 280 assistant surgeons, 135 pay directors, inspectors and paymasters; 22 chaplains; 12 professors of mathematics, 57 naval constructors and assistants, 32 civil engineers, 140 boatswains, 116 gunners, 84 carpenters, six chief sailmakers, 180 machinists and 52 pharmacists.

The great defect in this organization at present is that the promotions and retirements are too slow. As a result our warship Captains average higher in age than those of any other great power. If Professor Osler could get control, he would chloroform them all, for the average age of the Captains of our battleships last year was 57 years.

In the English and German navies the average age of battleship commanders is 48, and the average age of the Captains of the five heaviest Japanese ships in the fight in the Sea of Japan was 45½ years.

The Gunnery of Our Men.

Much has been printed about the fine gunnery of American sailors. Of course, most of this has come from purely American sources, official and unofficial. To prove that the American view of it is not an exaggerated one, the writer has examined Spanish and German reports of the operations during the Spanish-American War, and finds the following references to American gunnery, in sources none of which can be suspected of flattery.

Lieutenant Jose Y. Tejeiro, the second in command of the local Spanish naval forces of Santiago, said in his report:

"On the night when the cruiser Reina Mercedes was sunk, the hostile ships fired on her with the same accuracy as if it had been daytime."

The same officer reported that during one of the bombardments the American ships to the east of the harbor were firing at the Mercedes, and, "though she was hidden from them by the hill of the Socapa, she received 35 shells in her rigging and hull, which caused two fires to start. At this time, too, large caliber shells fell all around the Maria Teresa and the Vizcaya."

These bombardments, it must be remembered, were under the most unfavorable conditions, for the American ships had orders not to approach the Spanish batteries, and the Spanish vessels were anchored under the protection of the land, so that only glimpses of them could be caught.

(Copyright 1905.) JULIUS MULLER.

Who Are the Six Most Famous Women?

CONTINUED FROM PAGE FORTY.

Glover, Patterson and Eddy, was 74, and the edifice used by the mother church in Boston was dedicated, the Church of Christ (Scientist) was scarcely known outside of New England. Yet today there are almost a thousand churches and societies using the Christian Science form of worship, and their membership is said to be nearly 1,000,000, scattered through 75 of the world's countries, though naturally the great majority live in America.

Mrs. Eddy was by no means a pioneer in mental healing. Indeed, her opponents declare, she herself was treated in the middle '60s at Portland, down in Maine, by one Dr. Quimby, a professor of "Spiritual Science." In much the same way she and her followers have since treated others. However that may be, it was (Mrs. Eddy and no one else who gave the system body and permanence. "The light of science," she says, came to her in 1866, just one year less than four decades ago. Ten years later, in 1876, she organized the first "Christian Science Association" in Lynn, Mass. She founded the first regular Church of Christ (Scientist) in 1879.

Meanwhile, ever since the death of Dr. Quimby, she had been "healing," first in an obscure way, later in Lynn, where she called her system the "Science of Divine Metaphysical Healing," and still later in Boston, where, in 1881, at 60, she established the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, from which, in its eight years of life, about 4000 healers were graduated. As her nominal fee was $300, some newspapers have figured that her gross receipts must have been $1,200,000, to say nothing of the sale of her books. Just how much she has profited, financially, from the institution and the various "Science" publications no one knows, but she is surely a very rich woman. In Concord, N. H., where she has lived in retirement since 1889, the newspapers rate her wealth at more than $1,000,000.

During all her career as a personal healer Mrs. Eddy's church grew slowly, but after she had given the costly plot of ground for the mother church and her followers had spent their money freely in putting up the edifice, the growth of Christian Science seemed as miraculous as her followers consider her healings; its spread, indeed, suggests nothing so much as the flashing of fire through a mass of tow sprinkled with gunpowder, to which a spark has been touched.

Concerning the future of Christian Science, who can speak with certainty? Will it continue to increase, or will it dwindle under the guidance of the man, as yet unidentified, who, she is reported to have said, will be the leader after her? The pulpit has uttered its thunders against her, the law has been invoked to stop her disciples from "healing," the medical profession has fought her, the newspapers have assumed to expose her private life and show her to be unworthy of confidence, many writers, including Mark Twain, have ridiculed her, but nothing has availed to check the steady progress of her "Science."

Perhaps her death—and she is now 84, according to an apparently authorized statement—may bring a space of peril to the cult. The transmission of supreme power within the church will surely be a delicate operation, for she has maintained her iron rule with a gentle touch, and her successor may clutch the reins with a rude hand, but probably its existing momentum will carry the organization along. There have been many rumors of her death, but she still lives.

World's Most Famous Suffrage Champion.

WELL known at the ripe age of 85, wherever there are women with political aspirations, is Susan B. Anthony, one of the few famous women who have never married and a surviving pioneer of the fight for woman's right to vote.

It is only fair to say for this brave soul—brave, you must admit, whatever you think about equal suffrage—that she has never fought for fame, but always for her cause. And though the right to vote has been extended to women in only a few states, she has won many legal rights for her sex, such as the married woman's joint legal proprietorship in her husband's real property, in some states, though in no state has he any rights in hers.

To understand the nature of some other rights which Miss Anthony has won for women, let the reader be reminded that when, in 1853, only 52 years ago, she made her first public address before a teachers' convention, after a long and heated debate of protest by the men present, a minister of the Gospel told her that while "the matter and the manner" of her address were entirely unobjectionable, he would rather his wife and daughter were dead than that either had just spoken in public as she had. Today none is scandalized by a woman speaking in almost any public place; this is true in Europe as well as in America, and "Aunt Susan" and her friends are proud that she helped to bring it all about. Miss Anthony has registered and voted, too, in her time, swearing in her vote, and afterward being arrested the same as any other illegal voter must be. But her battle for the suffrage is not now so strenuous as once it was, and she does not expect to see complete victory.

She has never won wealth along with her fame, and the boons she has secured for her sisters. Today her modest little home in Rochester, N. Y., is about all she has to show in a material way for her life work.

Bernhardt the Actress; Patti the Singer.

TODAY no American actress possesses fame that is really world-wide. Perhaps Mrs. James Brown-Potter has played in more countries than any of her countrywomen, though her abilities are not to be compared with Mrs. Fiske's or Mrs. Leslie Carter's. But none of these are today to be written about on the same page with Sarah Bernhardt, child of France; Eleanora Duse, daughter of Italy, or Ellen Terry, Englishwoman. The world was kinder to Terry in her youth than to either of the others. Duse, child of low-grade Italian strollers, traveled from place to place on foot, and sometimes barefooted at that; often she had to act under the skies, the poverty of her father and mother, with whom she tramped, being such that they were almost never able to engage a theater, no matter how mean, and were lucky when they could afford even a tent.

As a girl, Bernhardt was "long, lean, thin and skinny." Even as late as 10 or 15 years ago her personal appearance was often ridiculed. Her first audience laughed at her. She lost one of her early engagements through slapping the leading lady; she tried singing in fairy extravaganza and failed; she boxed the ears of the leading actor at the Odeon and was discharged again; from the beginning her course was stormy and erratic but she won before reaching middle life, and now, at 61, many consider her the world's leading actress. Her "affairs" have been many; her husband, M. Damala, is not famous for any deeds of his own.

Ellen Terry married young, but was separated from her husband for the sake of her art. She is 58. Duse is the youngest of the three, being only 44. She married a nobleman, but they separated, and her unfortunate attachment for D'Annunzio, the decadent novelist and poet, has embittered her later years. Bernhardt has a son, Terry a daughter; Duse is childless.

Though she will sing no more, Adelina Patti, Spanish by birth, but winning her first renown in America, is probably known to more people at 62 than Melba, Nordica, Calve, Eames, Ternina, Sembrich, or any of the younger, more robust song birds who now hold the stage and exchange their golden notes for the gold which lures all humanity. Though Patti, like some other among the famous women, has been much married—her present husband, Baron Cederstrom, being the third, (or is it the fourth?) and each a man whose only distinction has been his union with the wondrous diva—she has had no children.

Red Cross Women Celebrities.

THERE was a day when the name of Florence Nightingale—named Florence because of her birthplace, though her parents were English—would surely have belonged to the most famous half dozen. It was of her that Longfellow wrote—

The speechless sufferers turn to kiss
Her shadow as it falls
Upon the darkening walls—

because of her inestimable service to the soldiers as nurse in the Crimean war. Her work furnished the impulse that led to the formation of the Red Cross, now performing blessed services on the Far Eastern battlefields. When a grateful England subscribed $250,000 for her, she built with the money the Nightingale Home for Trained Nurses, in London, and so established a new and beautiful profession. She is still living at 85.

Time was, too, when Clara Barton, now 75—the Florence Nightingale of the Civil War in this country—would have been named among the world's best known six, but other times bring new names to the front.

Mme. Oyama, wife of Japan's great field marshal Japanese by birth, like her husband, but educated at Vassar College on the Hudson's banks, is the most eminent woman in the Red Cross work today. Though brought into world-wide notice through the war in the Far East, her fame is also due to her because of her own personality, and the race has granted it freely.

The former Empress of France, Eugenie, living at the age of 79, survivor of almost every vestige of the order of things of which she was a part, is almost forgotten, but her fame survives, and she deserves at least a line or two in this rapid survey.

In Science, Philanthropy, Salvation.

THE scientist would surely present the name of Mme. Curie, codiscoverer, with her husband, of radium, that mysterious element which is revolutionizing many long-established scientific notions. And from the scientific viewpoint, who shall say he is wrong? Mme. Curie has won fame young—she is only 37 and she is pretty besides. Her path to fame, though full of endeavor, was not racking; in her Polish home she was surrounded by incentives to scientific research, and her husband, who loves her more even, perhaps, than their beloved joint discovery, is constantly working by her side in their laboratory. The Curies never really strove for fame, only to do their work nor for money. Fame they have won, but money has not, and probably will not, come to them.

Miss Helen Gould, known not for her wealth but for the way she gives it away, has fame of a sort that carries with it a feeling of universal regard and respect, since she is devoting her life to the best uses she can devise for the millions that came to her by inheritance.

Nor should the women of the Booth family—Eva Booth, head of the Salvation Army in America, and Mrs. Ballington Booth, cohead of the American Volunteers—be left out of the list of candidates. Even if they cannot find a place among the first half dozen, their fame has been won by endeavor of the sort that helps those who need help most, and it will last, perhaps, long after some of the others now well known to the world shall be forgot.

True Friendship.

Milwaukee Sentinel.

Two canny Scots, the story goes, were drinking at an inn,
And stowed away beneath their kilts a good supply of gin.
Like Tam o' Shanter and his chum they noticed not the hour,
Nor thought they of their scolding wives disconsolate and sour.
McDougall swore to Sandy that their friendship should endure,
And Sandy bought a round to make the obligation sure.
They laughed and wept together and chuckled and caroused,
And left the inn at midnight in a state that's known as "soused."
Now Sandy was a rugged man who had an iron will
And though he had within him what would stock the average "still,"
He resolutely plugged along, swaying from left to right,
Until McDougall slipped and fell—it was a sorry sight.
"McDougall, are ye doon?" he cried. "Ay, Sandy," said his friend.
And flat upon his face he lay, his journey at an end.
Then Sandy said, "McDougall, I have nae the strength to guide ye
Nor carry ye clear hame, and so I'll lay me doon beside ye!"