its degrees upon those who could pass its examinations. Of late its authorities have admitted women also into its classes, and through a late letter of Mr Moncure D. Conway we learn that a Miss Watson, "young and pretty," took the chief prize this year in applied mathematics and mechanics, over a hundred or so young men. When Prof. Clifford, the great mathematician who is rising into the prestige of a "second Newton!" called out her name for the honor, he said that "hers was the finest mathematical mind he had ever met with in a pupil of either sex, and that a few more students like her would raise the young university above the older institutions," i. e., Oxford and his own Alma Mater, Cambridge. When Oxford and Cambridge comprehend what London is doing they also will probably begin to confer degrees on women; and, last of all, when it is a perfectly established "English" precedent, *Harvard* will bring up the rear by copying that which she ought to have been proud to take the lead in initiating, because the admission of women into colleges at all is so purely "American!"

MELUSINA F. PEIRCE.

A WOMAN'S VIEW OF IT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON POST:

I wish to express my personal gratitude to your correspondent "P." for his placing before your readers, in your issue of the 22d inst., the debate in the House of our First National Congress relating to the titles to be accorded to the President and Vice-President of the United States. Would that amid the cumulative rush of contemporary interests we could more often stop to listen to the wise and warning voices of the noble past!

Three things in this debate I specially notice as in enviable contrast to the National tone of the present day. The first is, the sense of dignity and self-respect which animated all these men as "Americans." *Fitness* is the very essence of good taste—the first law of true art being that a thing shall suit the purpose it is destined to serve. A type of government having been established here different from any that had gone before it, it would have been a mistake to try and follow the precedents of other governments in outward forms. Manhood, simple manhood, had been made the enthroned king in America, and these early patriots rightly felt that it was impossible to go above that conception. A man who was the President of the collective manhood of the United States had reached the highest round that the "American" vocabulary could express. To add anything to it would have been to weaken rather than to enhance the force of the title.

The second thing I was struck with in this debate was the extreme beauty, dignity and elegance of the diction of the chief speakers quoted, Mr Tucker of South Carolina and Mr Madison of Virginia. Where did those gentlemen acquire such a style? Certainly not in anything like our modern schools, for such schools did not exist. But if we judge schools by their results we must admit that in some element or other the schools of 100 years ago must have excelled those of the present day, for it is certain that America has gone backward in the splendid and virile art of oratory for which she was once so famous, and the only one that was native to her soil—"The double fine art," as an admiring French educator said of it, "of standing nobly and speaking in the manly way which was American before the introduction to books and benches." Modern schoolrooms can boast of industrial drawing and of trashy music badly taught, but these hardly indemnify us for the decline of eloquence.

The third element in this debate which we ought to note in an age where, in private circles, one often hears sarcastic and sceptical remarks derogatory to the Father of his Country, is the profound respect which all these statesmen had for him to whom they had entrusted the highest office in their gift. How fine this is, for instance, from a Mr Jackson of Georgia: He "wondered what title the Senate had in contemplation to add dignity or lustre to the person that filled the Presidential chair. For his part he could conceive none. Would it add to the fame of Washington to be called after the petty and insignificant princes of Europe? Would styling him *His Serene Highness*, *His Grace*, or *Mightiness* add one tittle to the solid properties he possessed? He thought not, and therefore conceived the proposition to be trifling with the dignity of the Government."

Yes, they were men in those days—thorough men! And, judging from the letters that have come down to us, the women of those days most thoroughly looked up to them. I fear the gentlemen do not think of it, perhaps they are not aware of it, but there is probably little doubt that one of the principal reasons of the woman-suffrage movement, in the North and West, is the decline of active patriotism among intelligent and educated men, and their indifference to politics. There is nothing that women so respect and sympathize with in men as in devotion to the public interests. Most women would rather see a husband high and influential among his fellow-citizens—looked up to by them, and entrusted with their common interests—than see him a millionaire and a public nobody. This woman-suffrage movement is largely because women feel instinctively that *some* responsible person ought to be looking after public affairs, and when they see the men neglecting them they have an impulse to take hold

SCHLESINGER LIBRARY, RADCLIFFE INSTITUTE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY