

The background of the entire image is a close-up, slightly blurred photograph of a stack of old, yellowed newspapers. The top newspaper is clearly visible, showing the masthead 'UNITÉ' in large, bold, black letters. Below the masthead, there is a headline in French: 'IL FAUT CONCLURE UN TRAITÉ DE PAIX AVEC LES DEUX ETATS ALLEMANDS'. To the left of the main headline, there is a smaller section titled 'REMERCIEMENTS'. The overall tone is historical and scholarly.

**CARL  
SCHURZ**

***HARPER'S  
WEEKLY  
EDITORIALS  
BY CARL  
SCHURZ***

A stack of old newspapers, likely from the mid-20th century, with French headlines visible. The top newspaper has a large headline 'L'UNITÉ RENAISSANCE' and a sub-headline 'IL FAUT CONCLURE UN TRAITÉ DE PAIX AVEC LES DEUX ETATS ALLEMANDS'. The author's name 'CARL SCHURZ' is printed in white, bold, serif capital letters on a black rectangular background in the top left corner.

**CARL  
SCHURZ**

***HARPER'S  
WEEKLY  
EDITORIALS  
BY CARL  
SCHURZ***

**Carl Schurz**

# **Harper's Weekly Editorials by Carl Schurz**

EAN 8596547029076

DigiCat, 2022

Contact: [DigiCat@okpublishing.info](mailto:DigiCat@okpublishing.info)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

[The Pension Scandal](#)

[Woman Suffrage](#)

[The Arbitration Treaty in Danger](#)

[The Campaign Against Civil Service Reform](#)

[Qualifications for High Office](#)

[Delusions of Bimetallism](#)

[Governor Black's Balance-Sheet](#)

[The Quadrennial Disgrace](#)

[The Citizens' Union](#)

[The President on Economy](#)

[Republicanism and the Civil Service](#)

[A Grave Responsibility](#)

[Wanted — A Republican Form of Government](#)

[The Forestry Problem](#)

[An Urgent Need](#)

[A Burning Shame](#)

[Labor and Prosperity](#)

[Inviting a Deluge](#)

[A Dismal Page in Our History](#)

[Our New Civil Service Law](#)

[The Municipal Situation](#)

[Food for Reflection](#)

[Armed or Unarmed Peace](#)

[A Civil Service Lesson](#)

[The Right to Nominate](#)

[The "Senatorial Prerogative"](#)

[Partisan Municipal Government](#)  
[Obstacles to Currency Reform](#)  
[Murder as a Political Agency](#)  
[The European Outlook](#)  
[True Non-Partisanship](#)  
[Mr. Henry George in the Municipal Campaign](#)  
[The Blindness of Party Spirit](#)  
[Bossism in New York](#)  
[Hawaii and Sea-Power](#)  
[More About the Municipal Problem](#)  
[Civil Service Reform and the People](#)  
[Restricting Immigration](#)  
[Hawaii and the Partition of China](#)  
["Cold Facts" and Hawaii](#)  
[Annexing Hawaii by Joint Resolution](#)  
[About War](#)  
[France After the Zola Trial](#)  
[National Honor](#)  
[About Patriotism](#)  
[A Case of Self-Sacrifice](#)

# The Pension Scandal

[Table of Contents](#)

## THE PENSION SCANDAL.

OUR pension system is like a biting satire on democratic government. Never has there been anything like it in point of extravagance and barefaced dishonesty. Everybody knows this; but the number of men in public life who have courage enough to admit that they know it is ludicrously small. Whenever the general assertion is put forth that, in view of the immense size of the pension roll and the notorious laxity that has long prevailed in the administration of the law, a large number of the pensions paid must be fraudulent, the answer is: "Vague assertions prove nothing. Give us specific cases." The New York *Times* has done the American people an excellent service by furnishing the thing thus demanded. It has, indeed, not undertaken the gigantic task of overhauling the whole pension roll, but it has laid before the public a demonstration sufficiently conclusive. It has sent its reporters to several inland towns in this State to inquire into the cases of individual pensioners living there, and thus it has been able to spread before the public an array of evidence, the representative character of which no fairminded man will deny. Here we have lots of men drawing pensions for "disabilities incurred in the service and in the line of duty," who have given no evidence of the existence of the disabilities alleged — men who were for twenty years



after the war notably strong and able-bodied; men who draw increased pensions for increased disabilities, while they are no more disabled than before; men who draw the maximum pension for total disability preventing them from "earning a support at manual labor," but who are earning a living by manual labor as well as they ever did before; men who have for years been drunken loafers indulging in all sorts of excesses, but are drawing pensions under a law which provides that no disability which is the result of his own vicious habits shall entitle a man to a pension; men who are rich, and should be ashamed to help in draining the Treasury; women drawing widows' pensions long after having forfeited their right to them; and so on. And the proportion of such cases to the total number of pensioners in those localities is more than sufficient fully to justify the saying that the pension roll is "honeycombed with fraud."

The long series of reports and articles published by the *Times* has thus completely shut the mouths of those who asked for further proof of what to any fairminded man is already conclusively proven by the eloquent figures of our pension statistics. It may reasonably be assumed that ten years after the close of the war nearly all those really disabled by wounds or disease in the service had applied for pensions and had been provided for. The war closed in the spring of 1865. In 1876 the number of pensioners on the rolls was 232,137, and the amount paid to them \$28,351,599.69. It might justly be assumed that in the ordinary course of things the number of pensioners and of soldiers widows and of dependent soldiers' parents would decrease by death, that the pensioned orphan children of

soldiers would come of age and that therefore the amount to be paid out in pensions would steadily grow less. So it has been in all other countries and in all times. Instead of which we find that in 1893, nearly thirty years after the war, the pension roll had risen to 966,012 names, and the amount paid out to \$156,740,467.14. This year it is still larger, and the number of new applications for pensions is incredible. In the seven months ending last October no less than 55,399 of them came into the Pension Office. There are, according to the last report of the commissioner, 711,150 claims, original and for increase in the office still to be acted upon. The number of names on the pension roll, not counting the applicants, is much larger than was the number of men in active service at any period of the war. We are paying more for pensions than all other nations together. Our pension expenditure is heavier than the expenditure of the largest military power on earth for its military establishment.

In the face of these fabulous figures the assertion that our pension system is a worthy monument of the generous gratitude of the American people sounds like a fiendish mockery. We need only look at its history to conclude that it is rather a monument to the audacity and skill of our public plunderers, to the cowardice of our politicians and to an enduring patience of our general public, which has long ceased to be a virtue. No people have ever been more shamelessly victimized than the American people have been in this pension business. Our deserving soldiers and sailors had been abundantly provided for, with far greater generosity than any other country could boast of, by the pension legislation that was enacted during and



immediately after the war. Everybody would have been satisfied had not pension attorneys hungry for fees, and politicians hungry for votes, kept telling the veterans that they ought to have more. Still, legislation kept within bounds, and the pension roll began actually to decrease, as in the natural course of things it was bound to do, until, twelve years after the war, the "arrears-of-pensions act" was passed. This act, putting comparatively large sums of money within the reach of pensioners, excited the greed of many veterans, and served to establish the procuring of pensions in great quantities as a regular industry and one of the most profitable in the country. With their headquarters in Washington and their agencies in every State, these pension-attorney firms flooded the land with their circulars, approaching every veteran personally to persuade him that he could have a pension, whether he had sustained any injury in the war or whether he was able to make a living or not, and that they would help him to it. Tens if not hundreds of thousands of pensioners may therefore truthfully say that while they did not think of applying for pensions, they were urged upon them by the attorneys. Thus torrents of applications poured in, for each of which an attorney had his fee.

As the pension attorneys got richer, they became greedier, more daring and more powerful. They organized a manufactory of public opinion. Through organizations of veterans, and through newspapers established by them for the purpose, they assumed to speak in the name of the soldiers, and to demand of Congress more and more extravagant pension legislation to open to them new fields

for booty. In Congress they found little if any resistance. There is no more brilliant illustration of the politicians' abject cowardice than the succession of pension laws asked for by soldiers at the instigation of the attorneys, and obsequiously granted by our Congressmen.

Thus we arrived where we are, not admired by other nations for our generosity, but laughed at for our folly and recklessness. The American people have permitted this preposterous debauch to go on until it not only swallowed up our Treasury surplus, but, however rich this country may be, it actually forces us to borrow money to meet the current expenses of the government. More than that. If by some unhappy foreign complication we should be forced to assume a warlike attitude, it would become a matter of grave consideration how much of that sort of luxury the country could afford to indulge in. From 1861 to 1893 we paid out in pensions no less than \$1,576,503,54442, with probably as much again or more to come. In other words, the pensions, before we are through with them, will have cost us at least as much as the whole war debt amounted to, and perhaps a good deal more, for the pension sharks are by no means through yet with their demands. We shall therefore have to consider not only how much a war may cost us, but that a heavier expense, although spread over a longer time, will begin when the war is over. Thus it may be said without exaggeration that our way of showing our so-called gratitude for military services rendered in one great war, taken as a precedent, renders our financial capacity for carrying on another great war seriously questionable.

We have no space here to discuss at length the demoralization spread by our pension system among a large part of our population, by familiarizing it with a seductive sort of mendicancy in a guise of patriotism, and with the habit of looking to the government for a living. Suffice it to say that nothing is more apt to undermine that popular character which is necessary for the life of democratic institutions. It is the highest time to stop in this mad career. Much of the damage done cannot be repaired. But effectual efforts can at least be set on foot to eliminate the fraudulent cases from the pension roll. We suggested already a year ago that to this end the public display of a list of local pensioners, with a statement of the disabilities, in every post-office in the country would be a great help. The proposition of the *Times* that a commission composed of old soldiers be charged with conducting an examination of the whole pension roll seems to us commendable. Then a method should be devised to make the intervention of the pension attorney between the applicant and the Pension Office unnecessary, and thus to disarm the principal agency of mischief. All such plans will, of course, find the greed of the pension attorney and the cowardice of the politician in their way. But it may dawn at last upon the politician that his cowardice is stupid. For while an earnest effort to reform the abuses of the pension system may cost him, on the one hand, a few votes of interested persons, it will, on the other hand, win him the favor and support of a much greater number of thoughtful and patriotic men. The average American is certainly willing that every deserving soldier who suffered in the war shall have his full share of honor

and of the Nation's bounty; but he is not willing that the people should be plundered by the fraudulent practices of greedy pretenders and speculators, and he will be grateful to the public man who aids in delivering the country of this pest.

# Woman Suffrage

[Table of Contents](#)

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE effort made by many women and men of excellent standing in the community to induce our Constitutional Convention to strike out the word "male" from the State Constitution, and thus to put the two sexes upon a footing of political equality, has given the question of woman suffrage an unusual prominence. It is probable that if the people of the Empire State assented to so radical an innovation, the movement would receive a powerful impulse throughout the country, and have a chance of success where at present it appears hopeless. The action of this State is therefore likely to be of great influence far beyond its boundaries. It must also be admitted that in the public discussions of this subject now taking place the women who advocate woman suffrage have in some respects a decided advantage over their sisters who oppose it. The foremost among the female champions of "the cause" do not shrink from appearing upon the public stage; they are mostly "accustomed to public speaking," and speak well; and they are able to turn to their advantage a good many of those catch phrases taken as political axioms by our people in revolutionary times, or on occasions of self-glorification, although those phrase were never intended to carry the meaning which the woman suffragists now give them. Still, they make captivating battle-cries, and are used sometimes with effect.

On the other hand, the women who oppose woman suffrage, and who believe that the circle of the duties of woman centers in the family, and that she should not permit herself to be unnecessarily drawn into publicity, are by their very principles debarred from demonstrative public manifestations of their views. The "campaign" is therefore, so far as their aggressive vigor and their argumentative vocabulary are concerned, strongly in favor of the woman-suffragists.

But in another respect they find a difficulty in their way which gives their opponents a decided advantage. There was a time when the American people flattered themselves with the pleasing thought that they had succeeded in finally solving the problem of democratic government. The public mind is no longer in this state of self-congratulation. The number of American citizens who are much troubled by the miscarriages of democratic government in the nation, in the States, and especially in our municipalities, is very large and constantly growing. We do not believe that many of them would seriously think of substituting for the present form of government another form not democratic. But we are very sure, the idea that the evils we now complain of can be cured by further extensions of the suffrage, is, after the experiences we have had, entertained by but very few, if any, thinking men. On the contrary, the belief is fast gaining ground that in the democratization of our institutions by enlargements of the suffrage we have gone fully as far as the safety of the republic will warrant, and that it is much more advisable to sift the body of voters by educational

requirements and the like, than to expand it by indiscriminating additions.

The advocates of woman suffrage are certainly entitled to great respect, and there is much force in many of their arguments. When a woman of high character and culture asks us why she should not have the right to vote while a plantation negro or an immigrant knowing nothing of American institutions or of the English language has that right, the appeal to our sympathies is very strong. But calm reason tells us that, after all, the highly educated woman and the plantation negro and the ignorant man from abroad do not stand upon the same level of comparison. If woman suffrage meant only the enfranchisement of the women of high character and good education, there would be little opposition among the men, provided such women actually desired the ballot. But the introduction of woman suffrage means also the enfranchisement of those classes of women who correspond in character and education to the plantation negro and the ignorant immigrant. And now, admitting that among the men enjoying the right to vote there are very many whose mental and moral fitness for the exercise of political privileges is at least doubtful, the question arises whether it would be wise to increase in so sweeping a manner, as it would be done by the general enfranchisement of woman, the proportion of persons of doubtful fitness in the voting body.

It is no answer to this question that as the fit women would be enfranchised with the unfit, the proportion between fit and unfit would, in the voting body, remain on the whole about the same. For here the difference between



man and woman, the existence of which even the most enthusiastic suffragist will after all not deny, comes into consideration. One of our troubles is that among male voters the so-called better classes, the well educated and refined, take generally a much less active part in that political activity which has a direct bearing upon the exercise of the suffrage, as well as in the act of voting itself, than the less well educated and refined, the so-called lower classes. Another is that many voters are ignorant or careless of public questions, or easily reached by dangerous influences, or apt to be controlled by personal considerations or blind party spirit, or have only one object in view, and sacrifice to it all others. Now, if men of refinement are deterred from the necessary political activity by the rudeness of the contacts inseparable from them, is it not probable that refined women will be still more so deterred? Is it not probable that many women, belonging to the most estimable element of society, would keep aloof from all contact with politics on principle, believing it to be outside of their sphere? Is it not probable that even more female than male voters would be ignorant or careless of public questions, or easily reached and controlled by extraneous, especially sectarian, influences, or personal considerations, or anything that appeals more to the emotions than to reason? Is it not probable, in one word, that, while doubtless a limited element of excellent quality would be added to the voting force, not only the positive quantity, but the proportion in it of the element to which some of our most serious troubles are owing, would be largely increased? Even if we were to admit, for arguments

sake, that to these questions there are different answers, is it not certain that so tremendous an addition to the voting force as the granting of unqualified woman suffrage would effect, would involve at least the possibility of a dangerous increase of those evils which the best thought of the country is at present painfully struggling to remedy?

Under such circumstances there would seem to be good reason for the following protest, which, signed by a large number of women, has been sent to the Constitutional Convention: "We, women, citizens of the State of New York (twenty-one years of age), believing that it would be against the best interests of the State to give women unqualified suffrage, thus taking an irrevocable step, at a time when the country is already burdened with many unsolved problems, do protest against striking out the word 'male' from Article II., Section 1, of the Constitution." The woman who wrote this protest has the mind of a statesman. It hits the nail on the head with rare precision. Against the striking common-sense of this one sentence all the able and beautiful speeches made by the advocates of woman suffrage about equal rights and representation with taxation, and so on, avail nothing. Woman suffrage may eventually come. It may appear at some future time even very desirable. But will it not be wise to get more light on the problems which now perplex us, before adding to them, without the possibility of recall, a new complication which may immensely increase their difficulties? As good citizens, we should not permit ourselves one moment to forget that this is very serious business, in the treatment of which we should keep our feelings and sympathies well in hand.



# **The Arbitration Treaty in Danger**

[Table of Contents](#)

## **THE ARBITRATION TREATY IN DANGER.**

IN 1890 the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives adopted the following concurrent resolution: "That the President be and is hereby requested to invite from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration, and be peaceably adjusted by such means." In July, 1893, the British House of Commons declared, after reciting the above resolve of our Congress, "that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that her Majesty's government will lend their ready co-operation to the government of the United States, upon the basis of the foregoing resolution." Thus the Congress of the United States initiated the movement in favor of arbitration, diplomatic agencies failing, as a settled policy for the adjustment of any international dispute, and the British House of Commons heartily responded. Accordingly the President of the United States and the British government took the matter in hand, and after long negotiation treaty which now requires only the consent of the Senate of the United States to go into effect. The organs of public opinion,

not only in the United States and in England, but throughout the civilized world, with an almost unanimous voice congratulate the two countries concerned and all mankind upon the auspicious achievement, as an event marking a grand onward stride in the progress of civilization. And now reports are coming from Washington that the Senate of the United States hesitates to approve this treaty, and that there is grave danger of its total defeat. This is startling news.

Those who attempt to defeat or even to delay the ratification of a treaty of such transcendent significance assume as responsibility so momentous that they must be supposed to have the most convincing and insuperable reasons for their course. So far such reasons have been expressed only in conversations more or less private which have been made public; but although in a still indefinite shape, they may be taken as foreshadowing what is to come. The objections to the treaty, in whatever way they turn up, are of high interest to the world. What are they?

"The treaty goes to far," says one critic. "It interferes with the MONROE doctrine." No one who has ever read the treaty will seriously pretend this. The MONROE doctrine, even in its broadest modern acceptation, concerns only the policy of this republic with regard to the relations between any part of America and any foreign power. Is there anything in the arbitration treaty to prevent this republic from making, if it choose to do so, an alliance with any independent American state to protect it against foreign encroachment, or even, if it deem extreme measures indispensable, from going to war for such a purpose? Let the objectors answer.

While under this treaty the adjustment of pecuniary claims may become subject to the verdict of an umpire to be agreed upon by the two parties, or, if they fail to agree, to be designated by the King of Sweden, controversies touching territorial claims shall go before a tribunal composed of three American jurists to be named by the President, and three English jurists to be named by the Queen, whose award by a majority of not less than five to one shall be final. A two-thirds majority of the *American* judges would therefore be required for a decision against the United States. An award of a less majority shall be final only if neither party protest against it within three months. If such a protest be made, the award shall be invalid. But in this case there shall be no recourse to hostile measures until the mediation of one or more friendly powers has been invited by one or both of the high contracting parties. But as such mediation does not involve any decision, and as the action of either party is as free after the mediation as it was before, what is there in this article — the only one which may possibly affect questions touched upon by the MONROE doctrine — to give umbrage to the extremest and most nervous champion of the MONROE doctrine? What else is it that a rule that, however exciting the dispute, we shall take time to consider before we strike — hoping that, if we do take time to consider, both parties may find it wisest not to strike at all? If there is any fault to be found with this provision, it may be not because it restrains too much, but because it restrains too little.

“The treaty does not go far enough,” says another critic. “Its provisions are insufficient to secure the adjustment of

the most serious disputes.” Granted, for argument's sake. But are there not many differences not belonging to the most serious kind, and these the most frequently occurring, for the peaceable settlement of which the treaty does provide sufficiently? And as to disputes of the most serious kind, will not the treaty, as it stands, at least secure their calm and judicial consideration and discussion before hostile measures are resorted to? Will it not in all cases serve to substitute the sober second thought for the hot unreasoning impulse of the moment? Will it not disarm the reckless demagogue who may seek to inflame the popular mind for the purpose of hurling the country headlong into war? Will it not make war virtually impossible unless one party or the other, after elaborate deliberation, in cold blood, resolves to have war — that is to say, until all imaginable resources of conciliation and peaceable adjustment are exhausted? Will it not thus present to the popular mind war as so remote a possibility that those “war scares” which are apt to be so disturbing and disastrous will be effectually prevented? Will it not, therefore, all its assumed imperfections notwithstanding, be a strong bulwark of peace and a great blessing to both nations and to the world at large? Besides, should the provisions of this treaty really prove insufficient in practice, it would not be difficult, so long as the spirit of conciliation prevails, to procure the necessary amendments.

“But the treaty will benefit England,” says a third critic. So it will. But will it not, by saving it from war and rumors of war, also benefit this republic? And would it not be foolish to reject the treaty, and with it the benefit to the United States, because it promises to benefit both parties alike?



It is also reported that there are Senators who intend to reject the treaty because they hate President CLEVELAND and the Secretary of State, Mr. OLNEY, and do not wish them to enjoy the honor of coupling their names with one of the great achievements of the age. This is incredible; for even the intensest hatred could hardly blind them to the fact that by defeating the treaty to satisfy a personal grudge they would, instead of stripping the signers of this treaty of their laurels, only expose to the fullest public appreciation the glaring contrast between their own smallness and the stature of statesmen who are exalting the glory of their country by ministering to the progress of civilization and to the peace and well-being of mankind.

It is also reported that there are Republican Senators who seek to delay the ratification of the treaty merely in order that after the inauguration of the new President their party may have the credit of it. This is hardly less incredible; for they cannot but know that this credit is already awarded by public opinion, that only those who further the consummation of the great work will have a share in that credit, but that those who seek to steal it by delaying that consummation will only discredit themselves by their foolish attempt. If there really were such a scheme on foot, Mr. MCKINLEY would win high honor for himself by promptly using his authority to stop it.

The Senate should not forget that the enlightened opinion of mankind has already pronounced its judgment upon the treaty, and that this judgment will hardly be changed by any opposition which does not appear to be inspired by the highest public spirit and is not supported by

the most conclusive arguments. It is not exaggeration to say that the eyes of the whole world are on the Senate of the United States at this moment. With the treaty, the Senate is also on trial. Certainly, Senators should not stifle their honest convictions. But unless the Senate can irrefutably prove that, contrary to the universal belief, this treaty will make for wrong instead of justice, for international discord and broil instead of peace, it would, by rejecting or even unnecessarily delaying the ratification of this treaty, present to the world a pitiable display of American statesmanship and American civilization.

CARL SCHURZ.

# **The Campaign Against Civil Service Reform**

[Table of Contents](#)

## **THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.**

IN one Legislature after another bills are presented for the introduction of the merit system in the civil service of the respective States. In a large number of cities, North and South and East and West, the merit system has already been adopted to govern the municipal service — in Chicago by a popular majority of 50,000 — or popular movements led by the most respectable citizens are on foot to secure its adoption. In all parts of the country civil service reform is progressing with a rapidity beyond the most sanguine expectations of its friends. Only in the State of New York, where the merit system exists under the safeguard of a constitutional mandate, a systematic effort is being made to nullify it. An association has been formed for that purpose under the name of “the Progressive Civil Service League,” with Mr. ABRAHAM GRUBER as its drummer. A public meeting has been held, at which the principles of the merit system were vociferously assailed and ridiculed, and its advocates denounced as hypocrites, self-seekers, and monarchists. The grossest and most reckless misrepresentations of the conduct and results of competitive examinations were put forth by the speakers, and vulgar cries characterized the

audience. Their statements impugning the methods of the merit system have with conspicuous swiftness and accuracy of stroke been so completely and crushingly disposed of by Mr. McANENY, the secretary of the Civil Service Reform Association}}, that those who made them should hide their heads in shame as convicted falsifiers. There is no room here for recounting the lies and the refutations. But it may be said that in two respects the meeting served a good purpose. It proved conclusively how little the most unscrupulous enemies of civil service reform have to say in the line of fact against its fruits, and it clearly revealed the real spirit and the true aims of those who assail the merit system as “unpractical” and “undemocratic.”

The champions of this “progressive” movement had for months ransacked the records of the Civil Service Board of this city, which they were freely permitted to do, to the end of finding questions asked by examiners that might be ridiculed, and they had left no stone unturned to discover persons appointed after competitive examinations who had proved unfit for their places. What was the result? As to such questions, the speakers at the meeting scorned the idea that the general intelligence of an aspirant should be tested by such puzzles as who ABRAHAM LINCOLN was, or what city was the capital of this country; and they thought it supremely ludicrous as well as undemocratic that, since HORACE GREELEY had written his editorials in a tangled scrawl, a candidate for a clerkship should be required to write in a legible hand. And, finally, they brought up the well-worn fable that a candidate for the place of street-cleaner was examined about the orbit of the planet Mars — while at the

same time they were obliged to confess that of late the questions asked had been fairly practical. As to the fitness for office of persons appointed upon competitive examination, they knew of one incompetent inspector of buildings, and they had heard of somebody who had found a policeman unable to show him the way to the Bowery, because he had recently come here from Oneida County. These instances of failure were substantially all they produced after a most diligent search in a municipal service counting many thousands of men appointed under the civil service rules. Even if they had found ten or twenty times as many failures among them, it would still be a most brilliant testimony for the effectiveness of the merit system in cleansing and improving a municipal service which, while the old spoils practices prevailed, was swarming not only with incompetents, but with loafers, blackmailers, and thieves.

That the self-styled “progressives” aim at the restoration of those vicious spoils practices was plainly proven at the meeting. All their criticisms of the merit system and all their artful propositions to make the examinations “practical” culminate in the one demand that the person to be appointed to office must belong to the ruling party, and that, as the party in power changes, the administrative machinery must be taken to pieces, to be manned anew with partisans who helped to bring about the change. And all their reasoning in support of this demand is based upon the vile assumption that there would be neither patriotism nor political parties among us if the party man or the patriot had no prospect of reward in the shape of official spoil to

inspire him — as if there had been neither patriotism nor political parties in the early times of the republic before the spoils system existed! This assumption is so revolting a libel upon the character of the American people that the man uttering it should be spurned as a despicable slanderer by every citizen who loves his country.

What was it that gave the civil service reform movement so powerful an impulse all over the country? It was not an agitation carried on by a few theorists, nor the sudden spreading of a “fad,” as Mr. GRUBER and his fellows would make the unwary believe. It was the dearly bought experience that, as the machinery of our national government grew in dimensions and complexity, the public business could not be performed with either efficiency or honesty if the places in the departments were distributed as personal favors or as rewards for partisan activity. It was the constantly growing popular disgust at the scandals of the barbarous spoils carnival accompanying every change of administration. And more than all this, it was the glaring inefficiency and the reeking rottenness of our partisan municipal governments which brought the true nature of the spoils system and of political machine rule home to the perception of every observing citizen. For these intolerable evils a just popular instinct discovered in civil service reform at least a partial remedy — taking the administrative machinery “out of politics,” and thus transforming the public departments from patronage-broker shops into business offices. The same just popular instinct saw the means to this end in the competitive merit system, which opens the way to public place not merely to the favored partisan worker,

but to every citizen, rich or poor, Republican or Democrat, who can show his fitness for the duties to be performed, and which, regardless of politics, religious creed, or social station, gives the best men the best chance. And whenever this system has been introduced and faithfully carried out, it has, as proven by evidence which its detractors labor in vain to refute, wrought so great an improvement in the morals as well as the efficiency of the public service that no patriotic citizen, fairly understanding it, will countenance for an instant its impairment.

No doubt there are people who complain of it. Every party heeler to whom it blocks the road to the public crib; every office-seeker who fears the competition of better men; every political boss seeking to feed his henchmen out of the citizens' pockets; every public man in high or low place distrusting his ability to maintain himself without organizing a following by the distribution of patronage — all these clamor for putting the administrative departments back “into politics” again. And these are the forces engaged in this assault upon the merit system. The trouble which exasperates such politicians as Mr. GRUBER is easily understood. Without the prospect of the spoils of office they cannot hold their hands of heelers together. And therefore they shriek at the top of their voices that because of civil service reform patriotism will die out and popular government will vanish from the earth. What they slanderously attribute to the American people is really true of their own followers. “No pap, no patriotism” is *their* cry. But it is not the cry of good American citizenship. And so it is not the government of the people, but the rule of the