

Society has been materially benefited by the treatment accorded the president's assassin. From the day that he shot President Garfield until the day of his execution, Guiteau was permitted to keep himself constantly before the public and the people were required to read each day reports of his doings? But while Mr. McKinley's assassin was accorded every privilege to which he was entitled under the law, he was kept in seclusion since his conviction and in seclusion remained until he was executed. Readers of the daily newspapers heard but little of this assassin. He was not permitted to pose as a hero or to flaunt his murderous doctrines in the faces of the patriotic people of this country. For this the public must be grateful.

Referring to an editorial in The Commoner, suggesting that Mr. Roosevelt would make a better president if he announced that he would not be a candidate in 1904 than he would if he spent the first term trying to secure a second, the Cincinnati Enquirer says:

Colonel Bryan advises President Roosevelt not to be a candidate for re-election. The colonel should be willing to take in good faith any opinion Mr. Roosevelt may have about the Bryan candidacy. The republicans selected the Nebraskan last year as an "easy mark." Mr. Roosevelt may want him, in that way, in 1904.

Mr. McLean has concealed his unfriendliness so long, notably in 1899, that it requires a good deal of space now to give expression to it all. Still, as he is a standing candidate for the United States senate, he might better spend his energies explaining to those whom he would represent where he stands on the "asset currency," the branch bank, the redemption of silver, the trust question, government by injunction, the income tax, and several other questions upon which he seems more anxious to vote than to speak.

When General Buller went to South Africa to take command of the British troops against the Boers, the British public threw up its collective hat and declared that the war was a matter of but a few weeks. But the Boers have pricked more than one bubble of British military reputation. Buller, Roberts, Kitchener, French—the list might be extended to include nearly every British officer above the rank of colonel. The proud and arrogant British commanders have long since discovered a vast difference between fighting naked savages and Boers who fight for liberty; between half-armed Arabs and patriotic farmers who fight for home and country. A few weeks ago it was decided to send Buller back to South Africa in command of an army corps, but in a burst of confidence Buller admitted that he advised the surrender of Ladysmith and immediately the public raised such a storm that he has been retired on half pay. A careful reading of the British newspapers will reveal the interesting fact that the situation in Great Britain is much more desperate than the situation in the Transvaal.

Perry S. Heath, well known as a newspaper man and as a part of the republican national machine, has assumed editorial charge of the Salt Lake Tribune. In assuming charge, he says: "Under its new management, therefore, the Tribune will be as sterling and outspoken in its advocacy of republican principles as all of its energies will admit." This sounds very pretty, but it is woefully indefinite. Editor Heath should outline some of those "principles." Does he mean to urge high

tariff or advocate reciprocity? Does he favor the retention of Cuba or does he favor carrying out the pledge of congress? Does he mean to advocate retention of the Philippines as an American colony or does he mean to stand by the Declaration of Independence? Would he have the flag again an emblem of self-government, or does he favor keeping it afloat over an alien and subjugated people? Will he urge that the constitution be construed in the light of justice, or will he advocate construing it for expediency? Thirty years ago one would have experienced no trouble in understanding what a man meant when he said he "believes in republican principles." But it is different now. Editor Heath should, in justice to himself, be more explicit. But the moment he begins to outline "republican principles" he is in grave danger. On the one hand is the wrath of a public that still believes in the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the supremacy of the constitution. On the other hand is the wrath of the party managers who think more of exploitation and "business" than they do of justice and liberty.

The reading public has long been aware of the animus behind the case against Admiral Schley, but it is well to keep the facts clearly in mind. Judge Advocate Lemley has been striving strenuously to show that the Brooklyn's "loop" was little less than criminal. In order to do this he sought to show that the "loop came near destroying the Texas, and that destruction was avoided only because the Texas stopped and backed away. Finally a witness was found who would testify that the Texas stopped and backed—a man named Claxton. He did so testify, claiming to have done the stopping and backing. Another witness, named Hunley, was called to corroborate this testimony. But it was discovered by Lemley that Hunley was at the port throttle instead of Claxton, and that Claxton had nothing to do with the running of the engines. It was further discovered that Hunley would testify that the engines were neither stopped nor backed. Did Lemley call him to the stand? No. That would have been against the naval clique. But Admiral Schley learned, quite by accident, that Hunley was in Washington, and thereupon Hunley was called, and he testified that the Texas was not stopped, nor backed, only slowed down. Lemley owes some explanation to the people. They want the facts, regardless of whether it hurts Sampson or Schley. That's what Lemley is there for—to get the facts. If anything was needed to show the existence of a cabal to ruin Schley, this action of Lemley in the case of Witness Hunley is sufficient.

A dispatch from Manila says: "Civil Governor Taft says the power of the supreme court in the case of Oakley Brooks, a military prisoner ordered to be deported, but in whose behalf the supreme court issued a writ of habeas corpus, which the military authorities refused to recognize on the ground that the only tribunal having jurisdiction was the federal court, comes from instructions of the president, as commander-in-chief, dividing the power between the United States Philippine commission and the general commanding the troops. The former is directed to protect liberty where civil government has been created and the court's only method for so doing is by habeas corpus. The general's power, therefore, is limited, his instructions being subject to the court's writ." Old-fashioned people were taught that the power of the court, to which Governor Taft refers, came from the constitution which provides that "the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless in cases of rebellion and invasion the public safety may require it." This

would seem to apply to any court and yet Governor Taft, while conceding the power of the Philippine court to issue the habeas corpus writ, says the authority comes "from the instructions of the president as commander-in-chief dividing the power between the United States Philippine commission and the general commanding the troops." The Philippine court is organized under the Philippine commission and according to Governor Taft the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus rests upon the arbitrary authority of the president and those appointed by him.

The Commoner published some weeks ago an article written by Mrs. Elizabeth A. Merriwether for a St. Louis paper regarding the origin of the phrase "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Mrs. Merriwether traces it to the Wycliffe Bible. Her statement was challenged by a reader of The Commoner who insisted that the date given was prior to the invention of printing. The editor has investigated the matter and learns from Mrs. Merriwether that her statement was made upon the authority of Ward H. Lamon's "Recollections of Abraham Lincoln." On page 176 of that volume these words are found: "In the preface of the old Wycliffe Bible, published A. D. 1324, is the following declaration: 'This Bible is for the government of the people, by the people and for the people.'"

Mrs. Merriwether believes, however, that the date should be 1378 instead of 1324, as Wycliffe was but a boy at the latter date. She also quotes the American Britannica Encyclopedia as saying that "Wycliffe made the first complete version of the Bible," and that "Wycliffe's translations of the Bible and his numerous sermons establish his indisputable position as the founder of English writing."

To the objection that the Bible was not then printed she replies that, while the art of printing had not then been invented, written books had been in existence for a long time, and that many copies of the Wycliffe Bible were in circulation.

The Paris correspondent of the New York World informs the public that Mme. Bernhardt has been engaged in a struggle with the English language. Mme. Bernhardt confesses that her ambition is "to act Shakespeare" in English. At the same time she admits that the mastery of Shakespeare is not nearly so large a problem as the mastery of the English language. Mme. Bernhardt explains herself, or rather seeks to explain herself, thus:

"Childish as you will going to think me, the assertion made by newspapers that never shall I be capable acting Shakespeare in original text haunt my sleeping and waking. The memorizing of Romeo in the original by Shakespeare look as deseperating task more and more. Nevertheless of the encouragement you, my various friends and teachers, are giving kindly, I can hear vast differences when Miss Lowell reads it for me and when I recite immediately thereafter myself. It is not same at all. Of course, to now difficulty however tremendous never blocked me when I desired to make something. But this once I really frequently feel as to abandon what seems one hopeless endeavor."

After reading the above one might be inclined to agree with the notion that the mastery of the English language on the part of Mme. Bernhardt is well nigh impossible. Surely this sample of Mme. Bernhardt's wrestling with the English language seems "fearfully and wonderfully made," and yet perseverance may surmount all obstacles; and one is constrained to encourage the French actress, for it is true that if she shall fail finally to conquer the tongue now so foreign to her, in her efforts to do so she will, at least, contribute materially to the gaiety of nations.

Seclusion
Benefits
Society.

McLean's
Waste of
Energy.

Pricking
Reputation's
Bubble.

Lemley
Should
Explain.

The
Habeas Corpus
Writ.

The
Wycliffe
Bible.

The
Gaiety
of Nations.

Should be
More
Explicit.