WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVI. WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1898 NO 26

Washington Sentinel,

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

Fred Schade, Business Manager

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS

$3 per year for single copy sent by mail to subscribers, payable in advance.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch, $1.50; second insertion, 75 cents Liberal deductions made for annual advertisements. Special notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion should be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 804 E Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

EXPANSION.

This year has been crowded with history and crowded with glory. It is also to my mind crowded with danger. The flag of Spain, formerly the proudest power on earth since the day of the Roman Empire, has gone down in darkness and blood before the victorious army and navy of our country. The flag of the United States has consequently arisen in the eastern sky like a new constellation. Let us not accept the duties and responsibilities of this victory in any temper of vain glory, still less of a vulgar greed for power or gain. The United States comes to these oppressed people east and west as a great deliverer. To deal with this great occasion by talking about coaling stations and trade advantages degrades and belittles it. We have not overthrown Spain, we have not imperilled the precious lives of our sons to make money out of our new relations. If we carry out this policy, will it not involve dishonor on our part? Would we not dishonor our own declarations that we went to war for humanity sake? To those who may ask who are the Philippinos I would say that they are a downtrodden race, slowly recovering from an iniquitous Spanish rule. And that their leaders are men in every sense of the word, and fully capable of governing themselves, their heroic deeds and brave actions in conjunction with Admiral Dewey in front of Manila have clearly demonstrated. Did they not utterly put to rout the Spanish forces and actually capture 13,000 prisoners? Is there any better argument for paying Spain $20,000,000 for these islands than for Cuba and Porto Rico? Did not Spain receive the price for all she has lost, when she blew up the Maine and accepted war with us?

Twenty million dollars is a whole lot of money. When this money gets into the United States Treasury every cent of it has been taken from the earnings of the American people. A war in which the justly vanquished receive a solatium of twenty million dollars is indeed a novelty. The United States has never been in the habit of paying indemnity to nations with whom it has been compelled to fight.

There are some individuals who claim that these people are not capable of self government. What do they know about it? Did not England say the same thing about us in 1776? Does not Aguinaldo positively say that he will fight for the freedom of his country until the last man in his army is dead? Is not this a patriotic declaration? Shall we, the present generation of this great and glorious republic, proud to stand in front of all human progress, be less wise, less openhearted than were our forefathers in recognizing, fostering, and upholding freedom, liberty and republican form of government wherever it may be set up? Are we to depart from this old traditional policy? Are we going to upset our constitution and impair our own liberties? The first duty of the American people is to themselves, and this is said in no spirit of selfishness or indifference to mankind. On the contrary the highest service the American people can render to mankind and to liberty is to preserve unstained and unchanged the Republic as it came to us from the fathers. It is by example and not by guns or by bayonets that the great work of America for humanity is to be accomplished.

The danger to which we are exposed is that we are to be transformed from a Republic founded on the Declaration of Independence and guided by the counsels of Washington, into a vulgar, common place empire founded on physical force. I for one am not dazzled by the example of England. The institutions of England which have enabled her to govern successfully distant colonies and subject States are founded, as Mr. Gladstone stated, on the doctrine of inequality. Our institutions are founded on the doctrine of equality. If we are to outstrip England in national power, it must be by pursuing our own paths and not by following hers. There is not a single Republic in the world which has gained any advantages financial or otherwise from its colonial possessions. France with her colonies loses eighty-three million francs a year, but still she is forced to retain them on account of her pride.

It is said that the Philippines are already ours. This is not so, and there is no authority under the Constitution for the United States to acquire any foreign territory save by a treaty approved by the Senate by a two-thirds vote, or by an act of legislation in which the President, the House of Representatives and the Senate must unite. It is claimed that the Philippines are already ours by right of conquest. Have we conquered the insurgents? Will not thousands of our boys be sacrificed in such a contest? Human beings—men, women, children—peoples are not to be won as spoils of war or prizes in battle. It may be that such a doctrine finds a place in the ancient and barbarous laws of war, but it has no place under the American Constitution and in the code of morals of our people. In the case of the Philippines, are we not asked to subject a nation and to hold it in subjection? Do we not get them from conquest and hold them by force? Is that republicanism?

Can we avoid, if we should acquire this territory, repudiating the wise advice of the fathers of the republic and keep clear of entangling alliances with other nations? Why reach out our arms nine thousand miles beyond the limits of our present territory; endanger our peace, imperil our security and invite those present conditions which all the great leaders of thought of our nation have warned us against? Why not heed the voice of Washington when he said: "Why leave our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why by interweaving our destiny with any other part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the intrigues of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice?"

Imperialism means government without the consent of the governed. It means taxation without representation, it means the very things against which the Declaration of Independence remonstrated and against which our fathers rose in revolution. If the Philippine Islands become our own then, under the late decision of the Supreme Court, every child hereafter born in them becomes an American citizen, free to come, free to go. Are we going to hold them as subjects? Are we going to have the national tax gatherer the most frequent and the best known visitant to every American house? Are we going to increase manifold the national debt? Are we going to saddle the war tax permanently upon our people? What is to become of the Chinese immigration laws? These things are involved in this wild and impassioned cry for empire. Are the American people going to submit to such a transformation? Shall we surrender the Monroe Doctrine, a doctrine that has proven so beneficial to our national peace and security? Shall we abandon a principle which has challenged the respect and commanded the admiration of the arrogant, watchful powers of Europe? Shall we again open wide the door of this hemisphere to foreign intrigue and aggression? To annex these islands will upset all the safeguards of the Monroe Doctrine by our own departure from its principles. Surely this cannot be the evidence of wisdom, nor the inauguration of a sound public policy.

To adopt the Imperial policy would probably bring about a great change in our domestic affairs. The tariff would have to be reformed, for protection in its highest form cannot endure with a world wide business with all nations. We should have to throw our weight into the scale for open ports and free trade and as the most enlightened and educated nation, we would have to wage war against oppressors of all people. An American citizen must be protected in his business and his personal rights wherever he might be. This would entail a vast navy in the Atlantic and Pacific, and cruisers in every clime with well fortified coaling stations and dock yards for the repair and refitting of our ships. All of this will cost millons and millions of dollars and there is not a scintilla of evidence which tends to show that even if we did secure the entire Philippine trade that the latter would reimburse us for the enormous expenditures we would have to make. And that we will be compelled to make enormous expenditures is clearly demonstrated by Sec. Alger in his recent report when he asked to be entrusted with money at the rate of $200,000,000 a year for military purposes. Are we by these means going to force our government upon these people? Ought not our desire be to aid the oppressed and to assist them in establishing their own independence and government? Does not liberty, humanity, justice demand this of us? Are we going to degrade our victories and depreciate laurels won for the cause of universal freedom by following this imperialistic policy? Are we going to insult our noble flag, our starry emblem of liberty and freedom which has always waved over the land of the free and the home of the brave—insult it by forcing it into the despotic position formerly occupied by the Spanish emblem and so forever more compel us to lord it over an oppressed people? *Quo Vadis, Patria?*

F. S.

Bryan to Lead Agian.

The other day Colonel William Jennings Bryan resigned his commission in the volunteer army of the United States. Those who know him will understand that it is not in order to seek a life of inactivity that Colonel Bryan retires. It is probable rather that he finds the routine duties of a soldier when no war exists too trivial for his active spirit, and turns eagerly to those opportunities for serving his country in civil life which the existing political situation offers him.

For his determination to leave the army Col. Bryan is to be heartily applauded. His hold upon the minds and the hearts of the people was won in the activities of statesmanship, and to-day there is loud demand for his return to the political field. The recognized leader of the Democratic party in the nation, he has been estopped from active leadership by his subjection to military rule. There can be no criticism upon his act in volunteering, for it was done when the President was calling for men, and the place for a patriot was in the ranks of the defenders of the country.

The power of the Administration which for months was employed to keep him in a position offering no hope of distinction was at the same time used to break down the political edifice which he had with inspiring enthusiasm and political skill builded. The spectacle was presented of the leader of one great party faithfully and silently serving his country in the camp, while his Commander in Chief and chief political rival stumped the country in a partisan contest.

Colonel Bryan has done his duty and the Democratic party has offered its sacrifice with his. A new duty now confronts him. A task in which there will be no more camp life awaits him. Forces as menacing to the welfare of the nation as ever were the Spaniards are installed at Washington. The trusts and the spoilators are in the saddle. Upon the Democratic party rests the duty of repelling the shock of their assaults. It is well that Colonel Bryan has determined to resign, and the more promptly he gives his resignation effect the better.

In the military field the Republican politicians were able to place Colonel Bryan where they chose, circumscribe his activities and silence his voice. In the field of politics he will choose his own position, and it will be the Democratic position.

THE decrease in the exports from France to the amount of one hundred and forty-five million francs during the last eleven months, and the increase of imports to the amount of four hundred and thirty-five million francs in the same period, represent pretty accurately the other side of our increased exports and diminished imports. The figures lend an added interest to the question as to where Mr. Dingley is going to get his customs income with which to pay the expenditures of Imperialism.

Liquor in Vermont

Vermont is a typical "dry" State. That is, it drinks as much liquor in proportion to its populace as other States do, only it pretends that it doesn't. In fact, if one may trust his own eyes as he goes through the manufacturing villages, it drinks more than other States and it takes it straight and bad. Prohibition never prohibited and never will. It is a distinct injury in this respect: that it tends to prevent the use of beer and light wines, which, because they are light, must be carried in bulk, and are therefore liable to be seen and seized, and substitutes for them liquors in which the minimum quantity insures the maximum of intoxication. Moreover, by limiting competition it keeps out of State and town boundaries the better sort of liquors, and restricts the supply to such as are made up of alcohol, fusel oil and other poisons. There is another reason for this degradation of quality, and it is that the liquor dealer, who has to sell surreptitiously, knows that he is liable to be arrested any day, and he wants to make as much money as possible in the time before he has warning to get out, and more is to be made on vile whisky than on good liquor. A distinct injury to the morale of a village is the emergence of spies—often as hard drinkers as any, but led into dirty work for the sake of fees and secret profits. Espionage is not mean where a real reform is the aim; in war it is noble, but where the money consolations of the spy are the sole thought in obtaining arrests the instrument of the law is a deplorable creature.

One curious result of attempted and spasmodic enforcements of sumptuary laws is the rapid succession of candidates for business wreckage. This is seen especially in some of the villages in prohibition States where the tavern is the traditionary fountain for the alleviation of thirst. The spies will not let a man run a tavern for more than a month or two, yet the patrons of the inn will not let him be without a supply of alcoholic solaces. He is between two fires. If he does not keep liquor he loses custom. If he keeps it he loses everything. So he takes a lease that is as elastic as a garter, and does not attempt to run his house well, for he knows that in a little while he must run away and give way to the next landlord, who is to act as a blind for the owner. He makes no improvements, for he cannot afford to. He keeps the same cook and servants, no matter whether they are good or bad, for it is not worth while to instal a new service for the little time he has to stay. Travelers lodge with him not more than once, because the place lacks the order, stability and comfort of a well managed hotel. The owner leaves everything for the landlord of the moment to do, and as the owner expects to take his flight as soon as a drunken man has been seen to leave his premises he does no more than he is compelled to.

Another evil growth of prohibition is hypocrisy. Liquor is not banished from the State. It is intrusted in small quantities to a so-called town agent, who is allowed to sell it under certain restraints: that is, he can sell it as medicine. He meets a fellow citizen who is perfectly well, and he knows it. The citizen says that he has some trouble with his head, or his feet, or his works, or his freckles, and wants a quart of whiskey to get well on. Nothing is the matter with the citizen, but he has to pretend that there is, in order to get his whiskey. Thus, men who in old times used to be pillars of uprightousness and who would not stoop to a lie for less than $100, now falsify glibly for seventy-five cents worth of unspeakable liquid misery. These things are moral harms at least as great as the physical harm worked in a community by liquors.

Lastly, the economy of the matter is to be considered. Every prohibition State casts out a vast sum every year that it could otherwise cover into its treasury, in the form of licenses. Whenever a license is proposed the usual cackle arises, that it is an encouragement of drinking, that it allows liquor to be sold openly. You can not make the good souls who make this outcry understand that it is better to drink openly than to drink sneakingly; that there is a fascination in the breaking of any law which attacks individual liberty; that the taste for stimulant pertains to humanity as a race and though perhaps to be educated out of the individual is not to be legislated away from communities; that in those countries where beer and wine are free there is less drunkenness than in our own land where the selling and drinking of stimulants is under repression. No; the people who make the turmoil shut their eyes to facts. They do not want to hear of any fact that proves counter to their prejudices. Hence they revolt whenever a proposition is made to sell liquor under a license that makes the seller responsible, that does away with sneaking, spying and hypocrisy, that induces the dealer to make his place clean and attractive and to surround it with moral as well as sanitary safeguards, knowing that the eye of the whole public is now upon him, instead of the eye of the spy only on the lookout, that permits, indeed forces him, to keep a better stock of liquors than he kept in his dingy cellar and back room.

But fortunately, the prohibitionists are in most States a minority, and in others a doubtful majority. The mass of mankind have sense. Prohibition has been tried, and has everywhere been found wanting. The only merit claimed for it is that theoretically it lessens drunkenness. This claim is false. It rather encourages it. The constant infraction of a law tends to lower the worth of law, and that is perilous. It brings into contempt the makers of such laws and that is not so perilous. There are rustics in the Legislatures of all "dry" States who feel compelled by popular sentiment in their constituencies to offer measures they do not themselves believe in, and that in their inmost hearts they do not think their constituents believe in, either. These things they offer because they are moral cowards, and find it easier to shift the blame for their conduct on the people than to obey the promptings of their own hearts and understandings.

For the first time in years Vermont has been confronted by the question of license. It has wearied of shifts and falsities, it has sickened of the quality of its liquor, it has viewed with envy the sums created in other States by high licenses, and that must be made up in dry States by oppressive and often unjust taxation. It has elected some legislators on the express understanding that they vote to modernize the State. The example of Vermont is one of national interest, since the experiment that has miserably failed there has also been tried in other States and is contemplated in others. It will fail everywhere. The fullest liberty consistent with public order is the birthright of an American. If he cannot enjoy that, his republic is an oppression.

Bribes to Legislators.

It is not in human nature that the Senators appointed on the Peace Commission at Paris—an attractive combination of grand junket and distinguished honor—should not have been influenced by the appointment. It is the high prerogative and duty of the Senate to sit in judgment on treaties negotiated by the President. That body is a part of the treaty-making power. It may ratify, reject or amend any treaty submitted to it.

Yet three Senators, one of whom before his appointment had not favored the imperialistic program, have helped to make a treaty on the exact lines laid down by the President, and are coming home to press its ratification by the Senate. They have lost the separate and judicial standing. They have acted as the agents and will return as the attorneys of the Executive.

Bribery is not too strong a word to describe this misuse of the executive power.

Dreyfus Heard From

Daily News—London, Nov. 29.

Capt. Dreyfus, at length permitted to communicate with his wife and his lawyer, telegraphs that his health is good, and that he is confident of the result. It is wonderful that he should have preserved his sanity, and our only wish is that some of his persecutors could be sent to the Devil's Island in his stead M. de Freycinet cut a poor figure in the debate. He is afraid of General Zurlinden, who is afraid of the truth. He undertook that the Supreme Court should have all the documents at the War Office which did not concern the national defence. It is foolish to suggest that information four years old could not be published without danger now. Nor is it details that are required, but the facts which are supposed to identify Capt. Dreyfus with the traitor. M. Dupuy rose to a higher level than M. de Freycinet. * * * M. Barthou confirmed M. Poincare's statement, and M. Dupuy did not deny it. It may, therefore, be accepted, and it shows how terribly the accusers of Captain Dreyfus feared any light upon their proceedings.

OUR FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the SENTINEL.

ENGLAND.

THE FUTURE OF PALESTINE.

London Spectator.

On paper no scheme looks better for the future of Palestine than that which is connected with the Zionist movement. Roughly, it is that the Jews should be placed in the Holy Land as the trustees for Europe. They would hold Jerusalem and the rest of the Holy Land under guarantees from the powers, and maintain the *status quo*. They would, in fact, step into the shoes of the Turks, and hold the balance fairly between the different Christian sects—Greeks, Latins Armenians and Protestants, As the Jew is, or at any rate is supposed to be—most unfairly we believe—never really an Englishman, or a German, or a Frenchman, but only a Jew, he would, it is urged, be uninfluenced by any national predilections, and therefore no one power would be able to say that it was unfairly treated. Again, there would be a certain fitness in allowing the Jews to return to their own land after their bitterness against the Christians had died out, and after Christian animosity towards them, or at any rate towards their creed, had ceased to be professed by the civilized nations. Lastly, how convenient it would be to provide a place where the Jewish usurers and petty traders who are not wanted in Europe could be "shot" by the Governments who do not desire to prosecute any one for his religion, but who desire to expel "undesirable citizens," and especially those who have hooked noses and a natural capacity for doing better in commerce than the average of their neighbors. In fact, the foundation of an internationally guaranteed Zionist State in Palestine would do beautifully, and would settle the vexed question of who is to have the Holy Land when the Turks go. Unfortunately, the scheme is only good on paper and only acceptable by those who believe that the world is governed by reason and not by human passion. The Jews may be the ideal caretakers of Palestine, but they will never act as such, because though the various Christian sects and the Mahommedans hate each other cordially they all hate the Jews a degree worse. The one bond of sympathy between everybody in Jerusalem who is not a Jew is hatred of the Jews, that hatred being a concentrated essence of religious fanaticism and race prejudice. The Jews would require a far greater military force than they would ever be likely to obtain to keep the Christians and Mahomedans under proper control.

But if the Jews are incapable of acting as substitutes for the Turks, who can be found to act as guardians of the Holy Places? An ingenious, but of course impossible, suggestion is that America should be put in to keep the peace. America is a Christian power, but not officially either Protestant or Catholic or Greek, there being, of course no State religion. Again, America is not a European power, and therefore there would be less jealousy of her. Lastly, owing to the American missions and the American College at Beyrout, the Americans have a very large interest already in the Holy Land. Needless to say, however, the idea is absurd. No power but England would agreee to ask America to occupy Palestine, and even if the powers were unanimous in their request, it is as certain as anything can be that America would refuse. In that case, if and when, the Turks go, either Russia, France, Germany or England will become the possessor of the Holy Land. England may, however, be ruled out. We do not want Syria, and would not take it as a gift. We might not like to see a strong power there; but as long as we command the sea an invasion of Egypt from Syria is quite impossible, and if we do not command the sea we have ceased to count as a nation, and certainly shall not hold Egypt. Therefore, though we might grumble, it may be assumed that we shall never take Syria. There remain Russia, France, and Germany. Ten, or even five, years ago one would have said that France, as the protector of the Latin Christians and with her socalled historic claims, would probably carry the day. No one would say that now. French influence in Syria and Palestine has greatly declined. In the first place, France has been too busy worrying us about Egypt and other places to be able to pay proper attention to her Syrian interests. What, however, has had a worse effect upon the position of France in Syria, has been the alliance with Russia. You cannot be courting a Power in Paris and growling at the same power in Damascus and Jerusalem. France had to make herself agreeable to Russia in the Holy Land, and the result has been an immense increase of Russian activity, and a corresponding decline in French influence. * * * * To complete the injury to French interests came the rise of German power in Syria and the Emperor's visit. Theoretically, no doubt, Germany has also robbed Russia of a portion of her power, but in reality the loss has all been French. The Russian agents on the spot were, in fact, unaffectedly delighted to see the power of the Latins, as represented by France, so successfully challenged by Germany. While France is fighting to maintain her somewhat vague claim to be protector of the Latin Christians, Russia is in a very businesslike way pressing the claims of the Orthodox Church, of which she is the unquestioned and unquestionable protector,

We have only one word more to say. People often ask how it is that the future of Palestine presents such difficulties. The reason is simply that Jerusalem—you cannot separate Jerusalem from Palestine—is the sacred city of so many creeds and warring faiths. Not only is it the Holy Place of all the Christian Churches, and two of them quarrel bitterly over it—the Greeks and the Latins—but it is also one of the most sacred places in the Mahommedan world. Mecca and Medina are hardly more sacred than the Mosque of Omar. That is a fact which is often ignored by Europeans, who forget that to turn the Mahommedans out of the Temple Enclosure would disturb the whole Moslem world, from the Straits Settlements to Albania. We must never forget that Mahommedan pilgrims from India visit Jerusalem, just as Christian pilgrims visit it from Europe. Lastly, Jerusalem is profoundly sacred to the Jews, and the Jews are beginning to be locally numerous and important. Most certainly there are no elements of difficulty wanting in the problem of the future of Palestine. Yet perhaps after all the difficulties that seem so great will somehow disappear. The mountains from the plains appear an impassable wall. Yet when you get up to them you always find a pass. We can only hope that Palestine will not prove an exception.

THE CHARGE AGAINST COLONEL PICQUART.

Times.—London, Nov. 20.

The debate which took place yesterday in the French Chamber of Deputies does not exhibit either the Dupuy Cabinet or the majority of the Assembly in a very enviable light. The Premier and the Minister of War refused to interfere to prevent the court martial on Colonel Picquart from being hurried on before the proceedings ordered in the Dreyfus affair by the Court of Cassation, in which he is an indispensable witness, have been completed. The Chamber gave its approval to this decision, though, curiously enough, on grounds which the Prime Minister himself, as well as M. Ribat, who is esteemed a high constitutional authority, had repudiated—namely, the assumption that to order the postponement of the proceedings against Colonel Picquart by the military authorities would be a breach of the rule which marks off the independent spheres of the judicial and the executive powers. But though the determination of the Government to remain seated, at this crisis, on the fence has been approved by a majority of 437 votes against 73, the debate gave not a little encouragement to those Frenchmen who have been fighting a long and, as it seemed at one time, a hopeless battle in the cause of justice.

It is within the bounds of possibility that General Zurlinden may have no stomach for a fight which promises to be a much severer one than he originally contemplated. The rumors of his resignation may be unfounded or premature, but they cannot be put aside as devoid of probability, and the same thing may be said of the report that Colonel Picquart is likely to be released on bail. In any case, it is doubtful if the military fanatics will dare, in existing circumstances, to wreak their vengeance on the man they hate as an obstacle in the way of their schemes If the present movement of public opinion in France continues, they will have to assume a defensive rather than an offensive attitude. The frank disclosures of M. Poincare and the maladroit intervention of M. Cavaignac, have placed General Mercier and his immediate associates in the proceedings on the Dreyfus trial in a most critical position.

Daily Telegraph—London, Nov. 21.

For the moment, the Dreyfus affair is merged in the still graver conflict between the general staff and the civil law. General Zurlinden and his colleagues have scored the first trick, but they will hardly venture to claim the honors. There are, however, signs, not to be mistaken, of a healthy reaction against this all absorbing Cæsarism. The reception given to M. Cavaignac, and the intense excitement with which the confessions of the two ex-Ministers were listened to, even the tumults in the streets, are symptoms, the significance of which is not destroyed by the vote of the Chamber. People who have allowed themselves to be convinced that Dreyfus is a scoundrel for whom no punishment is too severe are obviously taken aback by the undisguised and unscrupulous conspiracy to ruin Colonel Picquart. France is slowly awakening, and we are much mistaken if she does not have a stern reckoning with those who have besmeared the good name, not of the army—for that is above reproach—but of its general staff.

Daily Chronicle—London, Nov. 29.

A military pronunciamiento against a weak and suspected Government might be possible; but a *coup d'etat* directed against the highest judicial authority in France would be a highly unpopular and doubtful enterprise. We believe, therefore, that, in spite of yesterday's strange events, the cause of justice will prevail, and that an honest revision of the Dreyfus case will come about. Two things only we will say. If there is to be a revision which the world will accept, it must not be a second court martial, but a trial by the Cour de Cassation itself; and if in the interval Colonel Picquart, who is now the real hero of the tale, is ruined, a new scandal will have been created, and the latter state of France will be worse than the first.

THE MAD MULLAH.

The Mad Mullah is reported to be at Bandai, at the mouth of the Nipki Valley, and the gathering with him is slowly increasing. The British movable column is encamped near Chakdara Fort, awaiting developments.

Standard—London, Dec. 1.

The sudden advance of the Mad Mullah on Chakdara and Malakand is an unpleasant reminder that the pacification of the Northwest Frontier of India has still to be accomplished. Lord Elgin, it is true, has effected a satisfactory settlement with the Afridis, but elsewhere the situation is not quite so promising. The Waziris, far away to the south of the Khyber Pass, must needs make raids on the territory of Abdur Rahman; and their trespasses in this direction are almost as embarrassing to the Calcutta Foreign Office as a foray on the British side of the border. But the recent activity of the Mad Mullah—more correctly styled the Mad Fakir—is, or may be, a still graver affair. At the same time it cannot be regarded as an unforeseen trouble. The insecurity of this section of the Northwest Frontier has been apparent ever since the outbreak of July last, if not longer. When the name of Lord Elgin's successor was announced, we pointed out that the problems with which Lord Curzon would have to deal included that of the Malakand-Chitral line. A policy which, if it closed the door to Chitral from the north, left our own communications with this outpost unprotected against the onslaughts of Mad Fakirs and Pathan adventurers, was obviously in need of amendment.

SUNDAY CONCERTS.

Daily News.—London, Nov. 26.

The County Council by a large majority decided yesterday to support the recommendation of its Licensing Committee, and as the result Mr. Newman, who has done so much to promote good music in London, has announced the abandonment of his Sunday concerts.

The churches and chapels may do their best to attract worshippers; and yet in this vast city there will be room on Sundays, and especially on Sunday afternoons, for all those other aids to the higher life which music and art and nature may supply. In itself, therefore, the stoppage of the best Sunday concerts which have ever been provided in London seems to us to be an unfortunate curtailment of its spiritual resources.

But there are other sides to the question, and it is important to bear these in mind, as the action of the County Council is likely to be a good deal misrepresented. It will be said—it was said already last night in some of the reports—that Sunday concerts have been stopped by the County Council. This is not correct. They have not been absolutely stopped, but conditions have been imposed. We see no sign in the debates in the Council that the majority were actuated by any extreme Sabbatarianism. There is no reason, so far as we can see, why a Sunday concert society should not be formed for the purpose of supplying its members and the public generally with classical and sacred music neither for private gain nor by way of trade. One of the Sunday Societies does this already. If Mr. Newman is really anxious to promote the cause of high class Sunday music for its own sake, he could let his hall and supply the services of his orchestra at cost price. That, we imagine, would satisfy the conditions of the new license, and the law is satisfied already, as we know from Lord Justice Collins' decision, by the provision of free seats. The Council is opposed, said Mr. Yates, the chairman of the Licensing Committee, not to Sunday concerts, but to Sunday trade.

Morning Post—London, Nov. 26.

The London County Council has once more shown its want of good sense by adopting the report of its Licensing Committee as to the Queen's Hall, and the decision makes it sufficiently certain that we shall have no more of the magnificent concerts which have been given there under the auspices of Mr. Robert Newman. To such use does this body put its powers! There are all sorts of excellent persons who continue to hold ideas as to the proper observance of Sunday which would have been regarded as severe in the most rigid days of Judaism. They have still some power, as is shown by the decision of the London County Council, but they are notably unable to recognize the significance of the facts that daily come before their notice. There are in London hosts of people who have no home life at all. On Sunday when almost every place of public resort is closed, they are painfully at a loss for occupation and companionship. They may or may not go to church at all; it is certain that they cannot be there all day. The well meaning Sabbatarians who have influenced the committee and the London County Council can hardly expect that they will stop at home and read. If the Councillors had the capacity of confronting facts in the proper spirit they would see that their action tends to drive a host of respectable people from rational amusements to amusements which are worse than irrational.

Daily Chronicle—London, Nov. 26.

Proprietors of halls will be free to let them for such purposes as those of the Sunday League, but the individual who starts Sunday concerts as a matter of business will not receive a license for Sunday performances. At all events, we hope that the Sunday concert in this form is safe; it would be a crying shame if it were not. We cannot think that this state of things is at all satisfactory, nor does it seem to us to be capable of defense on the grounds of logic. The council may or may not have been bound by the Lord's Day act in their decision; but it is pretty evident that they were embarrassed by it. Public bodies, from Parliament downwards, do not act on strictly logical principles, and if the County Council had chosen to ignore the Sunday clause in the license altogether their decision might not have been upset. We should not have been surprised if the bulk of the electors would have voted for such a course themselves had the matter been referred to them. As to the obsolete enactment which has been used to cut down the supply of the best kind of entertainment, the sooner it is got out of the way the better. When judges wink at evasions, and transparent artifices like the free seats at the Queen's Hall are debated solemnly at licensing sessions, this belated act has become hardly respectable.