

THE EVENING STAR. With Sunday Morning Edition.

WASHINGTON. SUNDAY, August 21, 1910.

THEODORE W. NOYES, Editor.

The Evening Star Newspaper Company.

Business Office, 11th St. and Pennsylvania Avenue.

New York Office, Tribune Building.

Chicago Office, First National Bank Building.

European Office, 3 Regent St., London, England.

The Evening Star, with the Sunday morning edition, is delivered by carriers within the city at 45 cents per month, daily only, 25 cents per month, Sunday only.

By mail, postage prepaid: Daily, Sunday included, one month, 60 cents; three months, \$1.65; six months, \$3.00; one year, \$5.40. Single copies, 10 cents.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Washington, D. C.

In order to avoid delay on account of personal absence, letters should not be addressed to any individual connected with the office, but simply to THE STAR, or to the Editor or Business Department, according to tenor of purpose.

The Bailey Tariff Plank.

The tariff plank of the platform recently adopted by the Texas democratic convention has attracted the attention of the press here and there.

Cholera in Europe.

In seeking the cause of the cholera spread in Russia, which is rapidly increasing, the President's health officials at St. Petersburg have inclined to the belief that the infection first was started from a band of religious pilgrims who went from Odessa to a shrine at Bari and absorbing the contagion there.

Numerous Mosques.

There is no use of reminding certain publishers that a distinguished contributor to the editorial is interesting himself in politics to an extent that is likely to interfere with his office work.

Shooting Stars.

The National Press Humorists' Association could not omit to send accounts of its proceedings to those carping Englishmen who claim there is no such thing as an American humor.

Vaulted Cloisters.

The great center of the mosque is inclosed by vaulted cloisters. Heavy arches support the upper stories and the ponderous roof.

Shooting Stars.

Who are the all-around stars? But then, the pessimist, in sooth, has nightmares quite as void of truth.

A Hard Position.

"Who is that man who never seems to have any fun?" "That's Growcher," replied the base ball fan. "He is always so sure against it. Then he goes to the game and can't root for anybody."

A Handicapped Official.

"You let me of the swiftest auto scorcher get by without a word?" "I know it," replied the village constable. "My glasses don't suit my eyes like they used to, and I can't do anything with an auto that ain't goin' slow enough for me to read the number."

A Twilight Song.

When de moon is a-shinin' An' de day is declinin' An' de stars is a-gleamin' An' de world is a-dreamin'.

Senatorial Instructions.

In Nebraska Mr. Burckett carried the republican instructions for senator. He is a regular, and in the primary was ticketed as such.

Senatorial Instructions.

Mr. Hitchcock carried the democratic instructions for the same office. He was the regular on that side, the Bryanite candidate being a sort of insurgent.

Senatorial Instructions.

Mr. Hitchcock carried the democratic instructions for the same office. He was the regular on that side, the Bryanite candidate being a sort of insurgent.

Senatorial Instructions.

Mr. Hitchcock carried the democratic instructions for the same office. He was the regular on that side, the Bryanite candidate being a sort of insurgent.

Senatorial Instructions.

Mr. Hitchcock carried the democratic instructions for the same office. He was the regular on that side, the Bryanite candidate being a sort of insurgent.

association with M. S. Quay, and Mr. Cameron saw no reason to be afraid. It is not a creditable chapter in his history that he assisted the growth. He was not, however, of the Quay kind.

In New Jersey there is a curious situation, which will tell on the situation at Trenton next winter. The law makes it possible for candidates for the Senate to claim the sense of the voters at a primary election.

The primary election is a curious situation, which will tell on the situation at Trenton next winter. The law makes it possible for candidates for the Senate to claim the sense of the voters at a primary election.

In Indiana there is still some gossip about Mr. Beveridge's seat. A prominent republican of the state is quoted as declaring that the senator cannot succeed. Mr. Cameron is confident that the republicans will at the polls Mr. Beveridge will lose in the legislature; that forty per cent of the republican candidates for that body are anti-Beveridge and are paying no heed to the action of the convention, which of instruction to the senator.

There is a good deal of loose talk going on, and this would appear to be of that order. No action taken by the republican state convention was more binding than that instructing for Mr. Miller to be elected.

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

GRAND MOSQUES OF BOKHARA.

BY WILLIAM E. CURTIS. Special Correspondence of The Star and the Chicago Record-Herald.

BOKHARA, Central Asia, July 29, 1910. For more than a thousand years Bokhara was ranked next to Mecca as the most influential, educational and ecclesiastical center in the Mohammedan world.

At last, however, the same paled. It has that way with some men. Mr. Cameron yielded to the temptation of the farm. After long political fever, he crops well. The public will be glad to hear it.

President Tarz was unduly lenient with the four West Point cadets who were caught partaking of a certain bowl of punch recently at the Midt Bell Academy. These young men, in defiance not only of the specific regulations of that institution, but of certain unwritten laws governing army behavior, mixed themselves a beverage the component parts of which call for special description.

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

There is a regular in the state not in duty-bound to support him? Would not his defeat by a republican legislature be both a personal and a party outrage, as injurious to the party as to him?

FIFTY YEARS AGO IN THE STAR.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.

The Prince of Wales landed in this country in August, 1860, at Prince Edward Island. In the Star of August 12, 1860, there is a paragraph telling of his visit to Charlottetown.