

Entered at the post office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month, 50 Cents; Per Year, \$5.00. SUNDAY, Per Year, \$2.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$6.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, 50 Cents.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 120 Nassau Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 20 Nassau Street, Treasurer, J. J. Conboy, 120 Nassau Street, Secretary, J. W. Quinn, 120 Nassau Street.

London office: 15 Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. The daily and Sunday papers are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Cannon Street, and at Messrs. G. B. Jones and Co., 11 Green Street, Farringdon Road, London, E.C. 4.

Paris office: 20 Rue de la Paix, Paris. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at 120 Nassau Street, near the Grand Hotel, Room 17, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de la Concorde, 13, Boulev. des Capucines, corner Rue de la Paix, Paris.

If our friends who have not yet received their copy of the Sun will please send us their names and addresses for the purpose.

The Bible in the Campaign.

The final campaign argument of the editorial associates of Mr. ROOSEVELT is somewhat of a departure from their secular exhortations. The Outlook of November 5 prints in capital letters the advice which JETHRO gave to his son-in-law MOSES, according to the eighteenth chapter of Exodus:

"PROVIDE OF THE PEOPLE ABLE MEN, SUCH AS FRANKS, MEN OF TRUTH, HATING COVETOUSNESS, AND PLACE THEM OVER THEM."

The Rev. Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT and associates remark that "the counsel which JETHRO gave to MOSES is not antiquated. It was good counsel in America in 1910 A. D. as it was in the Wilderness in 1200 B. C."

In a spirit as reverent as that of the Rev. Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT himself, we venture to point out to him that this excellent advice was not addressed to a Chosen People about to elect rulers by the exercise of free suffrage under existing institutions. It was addressed by JETHRO to MOSES individually, and it referred exclusively to the individual choice by MOSES of his subordinates in a new and autocratic form of government. In order to make the counsel seem applicable to the present case, the Outlook has distorted the meaning and badly garbled the sacred text. JETHRO said to MOSES:

"...and thou shalt show them the people ordinances and laws, and thou shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the words they must go."

More accurately, what JETHRO said to all the people able men, such as Frank, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place them over them, to be rulers of thousands and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens.

And let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge: so shall it be easier for thee, and they shall bear the burden with thee."

It is evident that JETHRO's scheme was a perfect New Nationalism; an ideal centralization of responsibility and power, a system by which the powers and responsibilities of wisely chosen subordinates were concentrated upward in a single supreme, despotic ruler of the people, himself responsible to no other human being.

The advice, therefore, was such as either JETHRO or the Rev. Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT might properly have urged upon Colonel ROOSEVELT, were he a duly constituted autocrat about to relieve himself of details by naming his Greasers, his Collines, his Bettises, his Parsonses and his Dunns.

This essential difference between the case in the Wilderness in 1200 B. C. and the case in New York in 1910 A. D. the Outlook ignominiously attempts to conceal by garbling its quotation from Exodus. Better might that organ of a personal ambition and a specialized hysteria have set before its readers part of the eighth chapter of Acts:

"But there was a certain man, called Simeon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, saying that himself was some great one."

"To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God."

"And to him they had hearkened, because that a long time he had bewitched them with sorceries."

The main question to be determined in 1910 A. D. by the votes of a self-governing people is as to the qualifications of a candidate for the position of MOSES, ISIMON, who would be MOSES, a God-fearing man in the sense of JETHRO's requirement, a man of truth, unswerving of arbitrary power and personal self-aggrandizement? Do the people want SIMON placed over them as MOSES?

Colonel Roosevelt and Judge Simon E. Baldwin

Our neighbor the Tribune endeavors to turn against THE SUN the charge of pettifoggery brought against Colonel ROOSEVELT in the matter of his controversy with Judge SIMON E. BALDWIN of Connecticut. The Tribune quotes a part of Judge BALDWIN's opinion in the Hoxie case as follows:

"The position of the defendant, as an actor in the drama of the Hoxie case, is that of a man who has cast such a light over the drama that his shadow darkens the stage of all the European countries. GEORGE BERNARD SHAW was brilliant enough at one time to be independent of the ordinary rules that are indispensable to the making of a play. His originality and his wit were exceptional enough to make their impression in whatever medium their author elected to express them. In the form of dialogues acted on the stage they were so continuously brilliant that their lack of dramatic value was not apparent, but after the vein began to grow thinner and there were no longer the old spark and audacity and whimsicality the unsuitableness of the stage as a means of exhibiting the Shavian views of life and morals became apparent."

But the harm had been done by that time. The Shaw comedies had assumed the dignity of a formula. Dramatists, interested might go, being talked as if they were not, and it was not until the Federal act of April 22, 1908, applied only to men in the employ of a railroad company who received wages for their services. The Tribune by detaching and

isolating a part of a paragraph of Judge BALDWIN's opinion and failing to print the context seeks to convey such an idea. It would have been only fair to Judge BALDWIN to add his explanation of the view that Section 5 was unconstitutional. It follows right after the opinion so baldly quoted, and we give it here:

"The contract may be one made on a full consideration by an employee, or one seeking to become such, who is fully capable of understanding its meaning and effect. He may be the general manager of a great railroad system, the damages resulting from the loss of whose life might justly be estimated at a vast sum. His salary may have been agreed on in view of the provision of an employment contract, and yet let the other provisions of the contract stand, would necessarily work rank injustice. It would virtually deprive the carrier of his property, and under the construction of that phrase adopted by the courts of the United States, do so without process of law. Adair vs. United States, 208 U. S. 161, 172, 23 Sup. Ct. Rep. 277."

If the term in the act "any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier" included workmen to whom wages were paid it also included men in posts of great responsibility who received salaries for their advice and labor. Holding that view as one not to be avoided, and as indicating lack of precision in framing the law, Judge BALDWIN deemed it his duty to point out the distinction and to show that in the case of a contract by a general manager, or similar officer, who had obligated himself to waive compensation for damages in consideration of a liberal salary, the company in being compelled to pay damages to him through the operation of the act of April 22, 1908, would suffer a loss of property "without due process of law."

When Judge BALDWIN said that "the contract may be one made on a full consideration in view of the provision of an employment contract, and yet let the other provisions of the contract stand, would necessarily work rank injustice," he was fully capable of understanding its meaning and effect, and he instanced "the general manager of a great railroad system," obviously he drew a distinction between salary earners and wage earners which Colonel ROOSEVELT, who made the Hoxie decision the basis of his second attack on Judge BALDWIN, refuses to see. In his third letter, Colonel ROOSEVELT, evidently coached by some one who is hiding behind him, cites for the first time Judge BALDWIN's view as to the constitutionality of Section 5 and forges for it a new version of denunciation; but, like the Tribune, he fails to include the context which explains the view of unconstitutionality. If this is not pettifoggery we don't know what to call such suppression.

If it is an offence and a sin to consider the interests of the employer as well as those of the employee and apply a constitutional test, Judge BALDWIN stands convicted, but all the other Judges of the Court of Errors in Connecticut, Judges C. J. HALL, PRENTICE, THAYER and ROBARCK, most of them Republicans, shared his guilt; for they concurred in the opinion in Hoxie vs. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company. This circumstance has of course not escaped Colonel ROOSEVELT's notice. Were all the Judges of the Supreme Court in Connecticut "fossilized" and retrogressive? Or is the brand to be fixed only on the brow of the ex-Judge, who happens to be the Democratic candidate for Governor of Connecticut?

The Shavian Mania

The same cry has just reached New York from two centres of culture so far apart as St. Petersburg and London. In the English metropolis as many as eight plays have been produced in the same number of weeks and met with such little success that they were promptly withdrawn from the unfortunate boards that had presented them to the world. In St. Petersburg, whose dramatic problems very little resemble our own or those of London, the young dramatic season has been a complete failure in spite of the prestige that it received from a new play by MAXIM GORKY. That effort has been no more successful than the other new works that have seen the light this year.

Now it rarely happens that there is any analogy between the condition of the stage in Russia and London. But it is evident that there has at last come to be some common cause for complaint of their theatrical troubles. The dramatists from whom they have expected their crop of plays have disappointed them. The Russian public complains that even the once beloved GORKY now preaches, and has lost, since he began to spend so much time abroad, the essentially Russian and dramatic character which made his theatrical efforts welcome to his own countrymen and in some cases of sufficient general significance to travel through the Continental cities. In London there is the complaint that the plays of the young dramatists no longer possess sufficient dramatic action to interest the public. Nowadays all the playwrights do not feel their duty is done until they begin to preach.

The fault that discourages the theatregoers of London as well as of the Russian capital seems to be the same. One genius has cast such a light over the drama that his shadow darkens the stage of all the European countries. GEORGE BERNARD SHAW was brilliant enough at one time to be independent of the ordinary rules that are indispensable to the making of a play. His originality and his wit were exceptional enough to make their impression in whatever medium their author elected to express them. In the form of dialogues acted on the stage they were so continuously brilliant that their lack of dramatic value was not apparent, but after the vein began to grow thinner and there were no longer the old spark and audacity and whimsicality the unsuitableness of the stage as a means of exhibiting the Shavian views of life and morals became apparent.

But the harm had been done by that time. The Shaw comedies had assumed the dignity of a formula. Dramatists, interested might go, being talked as if they were not, and it was not until the Federal act of April 22, 1908, applied only to men in the employ of a railroad company who received wages for their services. The Tribune by detaching and

isolating a part of a paragraph of Judge BALDWIN's opinion and failing to print the context seeks to convey such an idea. It would have been only fair to Judge BALDWIN to add his explanation of the view that Section 5 was unconstitutional. It follows right after the opinion so baldly quoted, and we give it here:

"The contract may be one made on a full consideration by an employee, or one seeking to become such, who is fully capable of understanding its meaning and effect. He may be the general manager of a great railroad system, the damages resulting from the loss of whose life might justly be estimated at a vast sum. His salary may have been agreed on in view of the provision of an employment contract, and yet let the other provisions of the contract stand, would necessarily work rank injustice. It would virtually deprive the carrier of his property, and under the construction of that phrase adopted by the courts of the United States, do so without process of law. Adair vs. United States, 208 U. S. 161, 172, 23 Sup. Ct. Rep. 277."

If the term in the act "any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier" included workmen to whom wages were paid it also included men in posts of great responsibility who received salaries for their advice and labor. Holding that view as one not to be avoided, and as indicating lack of precision in framing the law, Judge BALDWIN deemed it his duty to point out the distinction and to show that in the case of a contract by a general manager, or similar officer, who had obligated himself to waive compensation for damages in consideration of a liberal salary, the company in being compelled to pay damages to him through the operation of the act of April 22, 1908, would suffer a loss of property "without due process of law."

When Judge BALDWIN said that "the contract may be one made on a full consideration in view of the provision of an employment contract, and yet let the other provisions of the contract stand, would necessarily work rank injustice," he was fully capable of understanding its meaning and effect, and he instanced "the general manager of a great railroad system," obviously he drew a distinction between salary earners and wage earners which Colonel ROOSEVELT, who made the Hoxie decision the basis of his second attack on Judge BALDWIN, refuses to see. In his third letter, Colonel ROOSEVELT, evidently coached by some one who is hiding behind him, cites for the first time Judge BALDWIN's view as to the constitutionality of Section 5 and forges for it a new version of denunciation; but, like the Tribune, he fails to include the context which explains the view of unconstitutionality. If this is not pettifoggery we don't know what to call such suppression.

If it is an offence and a sin to consider the interests of the employer as well as those of the employee and apply a constitutional test, Judge BALDWIN stands convicted, but all the other Judges of the Court of Errors in Connecticut, Judges C. J. HALL, PRENTICE, THAYER and ROBARCK, most of them Republicans, shared his guilt; for they concurred in the opinion in Hoxie vs. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company. This circumstance has of course not escaped Colonel ROOSEVELT's notice. Were all the Judges of the Supreme Court in Connecticut "fossilized" and retrogressive? Or is the brand to be fixed only on the brow of the ex-Judge, who happens to be the Democratic candidate for Governor of Connecticut?

The same cry has just reached New York from two centres of culture so far apart as St. Petersburg and London. In the English metropolis as many as eight plays have been produced in the same number of weeks and met with such little success that they were promptly withdrawn from the unfortunate boards that had presented them to the world. In St. Petersburg, whose dramatic problems very little resemble our own or those of London, the young dramatic season has been a complete failure in spite of the prestige that it received from a new play by MAXIM GORKY. That effort has been no more successful than the other new works that have seen the light this year.

Now it rarely happens that there is any analogy between the condition of the stage in Russia and London. But it is evident that there has at last come to be some common cause for complaint of their theatrical troubles. The dramatists from whom they have expected their crop of plays have disappointed them. The Russian public complains that even the once beloved GORKY now preaches, and has lost, since he began to spend so much time abroad, the essentially Russian and dramatic character which made his theatrical efforts welcome to his own countrymen and in some cases of sufficient general significance to travel through the Continental cities. In London there is the complaint that the plays of the young dramatists no longer possess sufficient dramatic action to interest the public. Nowadays all the playwrights do not feel their duty is done until they begin to preach.

The fault that discourages the theatregoers of London as well as of the Russian capital seems to be the same. One genius has cast such a light over the drama that his shadow darkens the stage of all the European countries. GEORGE BERNARD SHAW was brilliant enough at one time to be independent of the ordinary rules that are indispensable to the making of a play. His originality and his wit were exceptional enough to make their impression in whatever medium their author elected to express them. In the form of dialogues acted on the stage they were so continuously brilliant that their lack of dramatic value was not apparent, but after the vein began to grow thinner and there were no longer the old spark and audacity and whimsicality the unsuitableness of the stage as a means of exhibiting the Shavian views of life and morals became apparent.

But the harm had been done by that time. The Shaw comedies had assumed the dignity of a formula. Dramatists, interested might go, being talked as if they were not, and it was not until the Federal act of April 22, 1908, applied only to men in the employ of a railroad company who received wages for their services. The Tribune by detaching and

do not realize that. So they keep on writing in the same manner, just as if their views and their ways of expressing them were equal to the first happy flights of the Irish writer.

So it is not surprising that London and St. Petersburg, and as the railroad maps say, all intermediate points, are suffering from an excess of the Shavian dramatic principles. It will take a generation to eradicate the microbes that think they can be just as smart as their brilliant model. His example has already been of incalculable damage to the drama. There are signs, however, that the playwrights may turn from an ideal that has brought them no little prosperity and return to their older gods. Not until they do, moreover, will there be any alleviation of the troubles that beset the theatres from London to St. Petersburg, with possible detours to include every great capital in Europe as well as our own New York.

The Hoosier Epile

The centre of the universe has been shifted again. It is not Orator PUFF, it is Indiana and consequently The Grand Young Man. For the moment the voice of the Hon. FRED LANDIS possesses the world with a sound even more engaging than the fluttering of the handkerchiefs that salute the loveliest of statesmen.

The nation, the friends of free government everywhere, look on Indiana in this battle for the issue. Are the people capable of self government? This question is not answered by that word which drives men to death in times of war. It must be answered also in times of peace when foes of liberty with Apache hearts and Apache strength attack to the people's affairs. Free government so called, is a many headed fraud unless the average voter can judge public men amid the babel of campaigns and stand by such a man by him in spite of all temptations. For the people to abandon to his foes him whose foes were in the people's cause—that is base ingratitude, plus economic heresy.

Bring on the Jesse Jameses of high finance, with all their dirty gold. Are we live stock or are we men? The answer is one name, IRVING BRIDGES, for in the code of honest men this name means honest government.

The Jesse Jameses of high finance plunk with a wild wail of despair into the tawny Wabash. They sink to the bottom with all their dirty gold, and the pure gold of Hoosier literature glitters about the Infant Phenomenon of the Senate; fiction, poetry, the drama, weep proudly on that unbowed, ingratiating neck. We quote from the G. Y. M.'s speech at Warsaw:

"Another thing I am proud and grateful for is that the writers of America are with us Indiana progressives in this tremendous fight, such as the most critical fight in the nation this year. WINSTON CHURCHILL has come here to speak, others have written articles. Still others have written personal letters."

The other day EMBERRON NORTH wrote me words that burn, words of faith and hope and courage. ROBERT W. CHAMBERS, GEORGE ADE, JOHN MCCUTCHEN, BOOTH TARKINGTON, DAVID GRAM PHILLIPS and others are with us heart and soul. Brilliant FRED LANDIS is my most effective aid on the stump—FRED LANDIS who associated the country with his remarkable book 'The Glory of His Country' and by his short stories in 'The Saturday Magazine'."

Last Sunday I got inspiration from the most read, most beloved of all of them, JAMES WHITTIER, the Baylyer."

"What does all this mean, men and women of Indiana? Does it not mean the same spirit moving the depths of American moral public opinion that moved the same depths in the glorious '49? Does it not mean the beginning of another period like that when LOWELL awoke the land, when WHITTIER wrote his words of fire, when EMBERRON philosophized in the music of reasoning, when JULIA Ward Howe penned the 'Battle Hymn of the Republic' sounding forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat?"

For BEVERIDGE all the arts, all the graces, all the vineclad cottages in Indiana, all the vertiginous and the virtues that the Colonel doesn't need in his business. "Ye Sibel arts, in one stern knot, be all your offices combined!" And even if the Jesse Jameses win, what a trust of genius will condole with the victim. Still, may we be permitted to say that "BEVERIDGE" as an answer to the conundrum "Are we live stock, or are we men?" is not only worthy of FRED LANDIS, but would have honored LEWIS CARROLL.

The Making of an Aviator

Mr. JAMES RADLEY, the English airman, a term which seaman seems to justify, illustrated in a grimly humorous way one of the perils of aviation when he said in Baltimore recently:

"Guides are made nowadays when a man's engine breaks on him, of course the guide must be taken to the water, but the engine doesn't, it is the motor that is the trouble. It is an instant for the descent to take to gain one's own backseat as a rule, and the result is unpleasant. But it is not difficult immediately to adjust the planes, although some gentlemen have not acted quickly, have died a moment later."

Happily more gentlemen of the air have lived when something went wrong with the motor and it ceased to spin the propeller blades. Of all the men who risk their lives in sport the professional aviators seem to us the most intelligent, alert and resourceful, a type, indeed, apart. If they were not quick of brain and supple of wrist their tenure of the air would be brief, for the exigencies of their business require them to attempt feats of daring that the amateur who takes up flying as a recreation may avoid. Especially was this the case in the period when the aeroplane was in the experimental stage and the man who was to test it in the flimsy web of control felt like making his will before leaving the firm and familiar earth.

We have sometimes wondered what the evolution of a professional aviator was, when and how he began to take an interest in flying, and what was the process of his development from first principles. The story of the WRIGHT brothers, who call themselves inventors rather than professional aviators, has been told piecemeal, their reticence being equal to their modesty; but until Mr. ATGUEST'S Post described in the Century for November the failures and triumphs of Mr. GLENN H. CURTIS as a student and practitioner of aviation our curiosity will be unquenched. Ben at Hammondport, on the shore of Lake

Kouka, New York, May 21, 1878, CURTIS from his earliest years had speed on the brain. He constructed the fastest hand sled in the village as a very small boy, next he took to the ice in a sailboat on runners, made by himself, early he became famous as a winner of bicycle races and before taking up flying machines he built motor cycles, and fitting wheels he made a record of a mile in 23.25 seconds at Ormond, Florida, which Mr. POST says, still stands as the greatest speed ever attained by man with a machine.

CURTIS left the high school with a record of 100 in arithmetic and 99 in algebra. He had a genius for mending and improving machines of every kind. A telegraph instrument made out of wooden spoons, wire nails, tin and wire was one of his juvenile achievements. He repaired bicycles and electric bells, and wired houses for electricity. He constructed acetylene generators, the first one by using tomato cans, which he also applied to crude motor cycle carburetors and even to the radiator of an early flying machine. He fitted a gas engine to a bicycle. His first motor cycles were crude affairs, but one of them attained a speed of thirty miles an hour. Captain THOMAS BURT BALDWIN saw one of his light motors and ordered one for a dirigible balloon. CURTIS then got interested in flying machines. Mr. POST says of one of his experiments:

"To try out the power of the motor built for Captain BALDWIN and to test the efficiency of an aerial propeller, CURTIS built a 'wind wagon' with one wheel in front and two wheels and a fan propelled behind. Great was the consternation caused in the valley when the machine was driven up the dusty road. An automobile was sent on ahead to clear the way, but it was soon left behind and the whirling three-wheeled engine flying machine rushed along leaving a trail of dust and splashing the leaves from the trees and frightening the birds which were hardly more surprised than their drivers."

The inventiveness of young CURTIS attracted the notice of Professor ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL, and it was a red letter day when the scientific man invited CURTIS to join Lieutenant THOMAS E. SELLERIDGE, J. A. D. McCURDY, F. W. BALDWIN and himself in forming the Aerial Experimental Association. CURTIS was made director of experiments. He built a glider and used it on the Hammondport hills, and "Red Wing," a real flying machine with a motor attached, "White Wing" and "June Bug" followed in quick succession. In "June Bug" CURTIS flew a mile and a half on July 4, 1908, winning the Scientific American trophy for a kilometer flight. In the spring of 1909 he was teaching aviation on Hempstead Plain. Urged to go to France and compete for the international aviation trophy at Reims, he built a biplane in a few days and sailed. The machine was never properly "assembled" until he arrived at the racing grounds, and his first flights with it were made in the early days of the meeting. In fact he flew for the great prize with little knowledge of his machine and on the spur of the moment, and defeated the great BIGNOT by only six seconds. It was one of the rashest enterprises that an aviator ever embarked on. His fame now secure, CURTIS returned to the United States and had a joyous reception at Hammondport, which, by the way, is only three miles from Reims, N. Y. The flight down the Hudson from Albany was the flight of 120 miles over Lake Erie from Cleveland to Cedar Point "in view of perhaps a million people."

Mr. GLENN CURTIS, considering the variety of his achievements, may be called, without injury to the reputation of others, the foremost American aviator, and the story of his own evolution, beginning with a passion for speed of motion and keeping pace with the improvement of the flying machine, strikes us as one of unusual fascination.

The Republican party is coming together on a safe and progressive platform. The Union is indivisible.

That is, the party is sane, and the Colonel is progressive in the West.

The sole literary executor of GOLDWIN SMITH, in legal possession of all his works, has just published a volume of his manuscripts, ARNOLD HALLTAIN of Toronto, for nearly a score of years the private secretary, confidant and intimate associate of Mr. SMITH in the daily life at The Grange. Mr. HALLTAIN's qualifications for carrying out the trust are not merely those of opportunity; he himself is known to judicious readers by writings of exceptional refinement. With a view to the publication later of a selection from the many private letters written by GOLDWIN SMITH to correspondents with whom he discussed political events or other matters of general interest, Mr. HALLTAIN is asking that his readers be entrusted to him temporarily. It is scarcely necessary to say that in making any selection the literary executor will be careful not to print anything which the recipients of such letters would not like to be made public. Mr. ARNOLD HALLTAIN's address is The Grange, Toronto, Canada.

THE STATE FLAG.

A Plea for Fixing It Over the Schoolhouse With the Stars and Stripes.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: It would be an exaggeration to say that half the children of any Commonwealth do not recognize the State flag when they see it. Now that the national flag floats over every schoolhouse in the land and the flag salute is required to every child in the State, it is a matter of all attention to call attention to its own flag. State sovereignty went out with the civil war, but State loyalty is too precious ever to lose. It is the little leaven that shall leaven the whole loaf, and it is the strongest link in the chain, and it follows that the stronger the good citizenship of any State the stronger the good citizenship of the nation.

But to inculcate loyalty to a far away national Government we need to make government and loyalty concrete conceptions. Patriotism, like charity, begins at home, and sacrifices for town and State must precede sacrifices for the nation. We are told many times in the Bible that the hope of the nation is in the public schools, and again there has been a plea for State schools. Let every State encourage every school within its borders to own and fly a State flag. Let every State encourage every school to observe the good citizenship of the State. The State flag is the concrete symbol of State pride. As it flies it will inculcate loyalty to the State and the nation. State history and tradition will be brought out and our children will be taught the meaning of the State flag and the meaning of the good citizenship of the Commonwealth. On such a basis of good citizenship, the good citizenship of the nation will be built. E. T. VALLEY FALLS, R. I., November 5.

GOLDWIN SMITH'S STORY OF HIS LIFE AT OXFORD.

II.

The Years of Tutorship. With Recollections of Dean Stanley, Professor Jowett, Mark Pattison and Others.

My life during the years that followed (1872) rather a medley. It was for a time tutor at University College, was assistant secretary to the royal commission of inquiry into the University of Oxford, and secretary to the Parliamentary commission of reform which followed it. I tried the study of law for a time in London, but found that the profession would be beyond my strength; fell back on the university and became regius professor of modern history; during my tenure of which office I was a member of the National Education Commission.

Fellows at colleges were then all unmarried and lived in college; such of them as were in orders waiting for college livings, dined together in hall, and after dinner had one that around the fire in common rooms. The common room at University College was the room that had often been a guest. Over its mantelpiece stood the bust of Alfred, our legendary founder, by Bacon, a copy of which now stands in the hall devoted to liberal studies at Cornell. Living among our pupils we saw a good deal of them. The marriage of fellows and their residence out of college must have greatly loosened the old ties. This is a pity; but the change was necessary to secure teachers permanently devoted to their calling, which the celibate fellows and tutors of former days could not be.

There is, I believe, little difficulty in managing young English gentlemen, if they are not asked to know what they respect their feelings. They will bear reproach when they are conscious that it is deserved, and submit to all that is really necessary to the enforcement of law. Sarcasm, which hurts their self-respect, mistrust of their word and honor, or espionage they will not bear. Of course, it is necessary to remember that boys are boys, and while you hold the reins firmly, not to be always pulling at the horse's mouth. Tricks were sometimes played on the dons, the authors of which, if you were wise, you were not over anxious to discover. From the having which is the average opportunity of American colleges we were almost exempt. Once an unpopular student of our college was hazed, the college officer who had to deal with the case said in effect, "Boys will be boys, and if you play pranks on me or my colleagues you will be punished if we are so unlucky as to catch you; but we are not insulted. Your fellow student, if you maltreat him, is insulted. We are the guardians of the honor and feelings of everybody under this roof, and we mean to fulfil our trust." One appeal to good feeling was enough.

As tutor of University I stepped into the place of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, whose name of those days great and to High Churchmen terrible, is now almost forgotten, while the progress of the higher criticism has left the most daring of his heresies far behind. Stanley's influence as a theologian and a religious philosopher never very great apart from the charm of his personal character, has ceased. His best works are his "Life of Arnold," his historical lectures and his "Sinai and Palestine." The work last mentioned called forth his utmost enthusiasm and gave the fullest scope for the display of his special gift, the historical picturesque. In his lectures on the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque vivacity of his style. His lectures on the Jewish Church lack a critical basis and strictness of critical treatment altogether. The lecturer too often escapes from a critical difficulty into preaching. To account for the subsistence of the Israelites during forty years in the wilderness, with the minimum of miracle, he labors to make out that the desert may once have been less barren; a desperate hypothesis if carried to the extent of the Eastern Church he shows his ardent historical sympathies, his power of delineating historical characters, his comprehensiveness of view, and the picturesque viv