The Daily Herald.

THE TIMES-HERALD PUB. CO.
(Incorporated.)
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS.

Entered at Grand Forks, North Dakota postoffice as second-class matter.

Published every morning except Monday morning and every evening except Sunday evening.

All papers are continued until an explicit order to discontinue is received and until arrearages are paid.

Subscribers desiring address changed must send former address as well as new one.

Subscription Rates.

Morning or Evening Edition—
One year by mail or carrier.....$4.00
Six months by mail or carrier.... 2.00
Morning, Evening and Sunday Editions.
One year by mail or carrier $6.00
Six months by mail or carrier.... 3.00

Foreign Representatives: Carpenter-Scheerer Special Agency, Fifth Avenue Bldg., New York; Peoples Gas Bldg., Chicago.

THURSDAY EVENING, NOV. 12.

THE MERCY OF SCIENCE.

It is not many years since the use of anaesthetics was unknown. Surgeons had acquired skill, but the performance of an operation of any kind was an agonizing thing to the patient, for nothing was done, and it was not known that anything could be done to place him in a condition of merciful unconsciousness.

Today it is possible to perform an operation of any character and of any duration without the patient being conscious of anything that is being done. And, if it is considered desirable, a condition of local insensibility may be produced, which will prevent any sensation of pain, but which in no manner affects the general consciousness of the patient. There has recently been described a remarkable operation in which a bullet was removed from a soldier's heart, the patient being perfectly conscious meanwhile, though complete anaesthesia had been produced in the heart and the region surrounding it.

None but those who have come into close contact with many and varied operations can appreciate what science has done for mankind in this manner in lessening suffering, and in the saving of life by lessening those shocks from which death often comes. But anyone can form some conception of the value of this service by recalling operations within his own knowledge, operations which, whatever their efficacy in preserving the life or restoring the health of the patient, have at least been performed without suffering. And it is to be remembered that but a short time ago every step in those operations would have been performed with the patient fully conscious, and with every severed nerve carrying its message of agony to the brain.

It seems strange to most of us now that the use of anaesthetics was vigorously opposed on religious grounds. Pain, it was argued, was divinely ordained, and for a human being to seek, through ways of his own invention, to escape which normally accompanied an operation was held to be a defiance of the divine will. This opinion was held, not merely by illiterates, but by many persons of education and culture. It does not seem to have occurred to them that the operation itself was equally sacreligious, on the ground that it must be a sin to cut off one of a man's legs when Providence had supplied him with two.

The policy of the anti-vivisectionists, too, if it had been generally followed, would have greatly impeded progress in the development of anaesthetics for it has been possible to learn the properties of many of our most useful drugs only by means of experiment on living animals. Fortunately, there has been no general acceptance of the doctrine that the whole human race should be condemned to suffer and die, needlessly, in order that an infinitessimal number of small animals might be spared inconvenience, and, in some cases, a little pain.

FROM THE TRENCHES.

J. A. Hobson, the London scholar, clipped the following paragraphs from the Manchester Guardian and sent them to the New Republic:

According to a wounded officer, a day before the great attack a curious thing happened. A board was hoisted in the German trenches bearing the inscription:

"The English are Fools."

No one wasted a bullet on such poor abuse. The board went down and reappeared with the addition:

"The French are Fools."

It was ignored by the British. Then the board came up again with a third line:

"We are Fools."

A lively interest was now awakened in the board. On its last appearance it bore the inscription:

"Why not all go home?"

Mr. Hobson says the reason is that "those who sent them out there are paralyzed by mutual fears and the misreading of each other's mind."

A COURAGEOUS DEMAND FOR THE FACTS.

New York Times: There will be in many quarters a deeply sympathetic echoing of the demand from the Berlin Vorwaerts that each of the belligerent nations shall make, through its respective government, an explicit statement of the objects for which it is fighting—of the results the attainment of which, so far as it is concerned, will mean the end of the war.

Everybody knows, of course, the trivial incident that supplied an excuse for beginning the conflict, but nobody even suspects that the murder of the archduke was more than the match that fired the long-prepared train and blew up Europe. And we have all heard, often enough, from each of the European capitals, eloquent orations that to the ear sounded like explanations of the purpose and determination that lay behind the movements of the armies. But there has been nothing definite in these speeches. They are what Vorwaerts calls them — "rhetoric"—large and noble generalities, much like the chants that savage warriors sing before they enter battle.

Phrases like "the freedom of the seas," "a place in the sun," "the establishment of permanent peace," "the crushing of militarism," "ready to die for our country"—with all these we have become familiar, but never a word do we hear as to precisely what each of the fighting nations wants—exactly what they will do and get before they will be ready to stop fighting. From their common secrecy on these strictly material and measurable points one might suspect either that none of them knows just what this frightful commotion is about or else that the aim of each is of such a sort as to make its clear definition injudicious.

How the Berlin paper dared to ask its most inconvenient question is mysterious. The question implies criticism of the government, and it more than hints of widespread and utter weariness of slaughter and destruction which, if not purposeless, are for purposes that are and have to be veiled behind sonorous rhetoric.

THE ANCONA CASE.

Whether or not the sinking of the Italian liner Ancona will involve the American and Austrian governments in a controversy similar to that with Germany which grew out of the Lusitania case depends on the conditions under which the ship was sunk. It is to be observed in the first place that agreements which have been made with Germany with reference to the use of submarines are in no sense binding on Austria, although the two countries are allied for the purposes of this war. The relations of the United States with the two governments are with each separately, and no controversy or agreement with the one governs our relations with the other. There is, however, a moral relation growing out of the alliance, and this cannot be overlooked in estimating the propriety of the act, although it may not be permitted to enter into the diplomatic correspondence.

Germany and Austria are operating in this war to all intents and purposes as one nation. Whatever benefits one benefits the other, and whatever injures one injures the other. Not only are their military plans worked out as if the two were one, but in so far as expression has been given to it, their policy with reference to neutrals is identical. The popular interpretation placed on the sinking of the Anconia is likely to be that, Germany having yielded to the representations of the United States with reference to illegal and inhuman features of submarine warfare, the carrying out of the common policy, along substantially the original lines, has been entrusted to the second member of the firm.

The action which the United States will take officially in the Anconia case will depend, of course, on what facts are disclosed as to the circumstances under which the attack took place. If the Anconia, on being summoned to surrender, refused to do so, or sought either to attack the submarine or to escape by flight, no issue can be raised by our government, even though some 30 Americans lost their lives. Dispatches coming from Austrian sources say that the Anconia did attempt to escape. The American attitude must hinge on that.

It is a sad commentary on the depths into which civilized nations have been plunged by this war that even if the conditions were such as to afford technical justification for this act, the lives of so many innocent and unoffending people could have been coolly and callously destroyed for the sake of a military advantage which, under any circumstances, must be slight. Technically the act may be justified. Morally, it remains one of murder.

LIKE FIFTY YEARS AGO.

The countries of the quadruple entente are in a situation quite similar, in some of its features, to that which the United States found itself at the close of the second year of the Civil war. There had been disaster piled on disaster in the field, and mismanagement at Washington. Generals had been removed for inefficiency, and some who were appointed in their stead proved still more incompetent. The armies of the Confederacy had menaced Washington, and, while driven back, the menace was not over. Lee was yet to reach his "farthest north" at Gettysburg. There was discontent everywhere, and it is certain that had the national election been held then, the Lincoln administration would have gone down to defeat.

In Europe, we see cabinets falling, attempts at reorganization of the military forces, and urgent popular demands for the victories which are so slow in coming. The lessons of the past prove that all this is untrustworthy as an indication of what is to come. It is simply the natural result of failure to win success. If success is still further postponed, we shall see more of it. If success should come to the allies soon all the discontent would be forgotten.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

Because of a case which, according to the published reports appears to have been one of undue and improper severity, if not of rank brutality, the Fargo school board has prohibited corporal punishment until further orders. It would be improper to attempt to pass judgment on such a case without knowledge of all the conditions. The action of the board appears to have been intended to meet a special case rather than the adoption of a fixed general principle. Hence it would be premature for those who are opposed, under all circumstances, to corporal punishment in the schools to seize upon this incident as the basis of an argument in favor of their contention.

Corporal punishment is much less commonly used in the schools than it was some years ago. This change has, in most cases, come about, not because of agitation, and not through the adoption of rules and regulations, but through the growth of a better understanding of how children may best be governed. We believe that the change in the schools has not been more marked than the similar change that has been going on in the families, and nowhere that we ever heard of has there been anything in the nature of formal regulations against the use of corporal punishment in the family. Yet, in both fields, corporal punishment has become comparatively rare.

But, while the results of this change, almost wholly voluntary, have generally been good, it is not at all clear that the absolute prohibition of corporal punishment in the schools would produce results equally desirable. The notion that the child is always and under all circumstances capable of proper self government has no basis in fact. The child is as immature mentally as he is physically. Left to himself he would do many things destructive of his own well-being and well-being of those about him. He must, at times, be required to do things the propriety of which, at the moment, he cannot understand. Some faddists assert that everything that the child is required to do should be explained to him until he does understand it, and until he is prepared to do it of his own accord. On that theory the youngster should be permitted to continue throwing stones through the window until the impropriety of his act appeals to his own reason and until his own amiable nature causes him to stop. That is an illustration of what a theory may do when it is permitted to run amuck. In actual practice such a theory will not work.

One of the most important lessons that can be instilled into the mind of a child is to obey, without hesitation and without argument, the instructions of those who are properly in authority over him. And the child must learn to take for granted the reasonableness of many orders which he cannot understand. To secure obedience there is necessary at times, if not the actual use of force, at least its potentiality. The child must know that resistance or rebellion will produce unpleasant consequences. If we grant that, the exact form which punishment takes is a rather minor detail. The old-fashioned spanking may be supported by banishment into a corner, or by the infliction of tasks of various kinds. That matters little. The element of punishment is there the imposition of the stronger upon the weaker, and the use of whatever force may be necessary under the circumstances. No enlightened person will countenance brutality in punishment, nor punishment inflicted in anger, or without proper investigation. But we do not believe that it is possible to train a child either in the school or in the home without requiring him, at times, to do what he does not wish to do, nor without the knowledge on his part that refusal will be followed by punishment.

SHE KNEW.

Olive, four years old, went for a walk with her father one June morning. Hearing a bird singing by the roadside, she stopped to admire his beautiful black-and-white coat.

"Oh, papa!" she exclaimed, "see this bobolink!"

"How do you know it's a bobolink?" asked her father.

"'Cause I 'stinctly heard it bobble," was the reply.

JUST IT.

"I see by the papers old Tompkins has failed for half a million."

"Why, I had no idea he had half so much."

"He didn't."

FRANK WRIGHT IS UNCONVENTIONAL, BUT MRS. NOEL LOVES HIM JUST THE SAME

Mrs. Maud Miriam Noel.

Spring Green, Wis., Nov. 12.—Over Frank Lloyd Wright's bizarre and beautiful country seat near here, the shadow of Mrs. Nellie Breen falls like a curse.

Seated in the living room, looking out upon the silver loops of the Wisconsin river, Mr. Wright discussed the motives that led his former housekeeper to threaten him with prosecution under the Mann act and to make public love letters written to him by Mrs. Maud Miriam Noel, now living at the architect's villa.

"The federal authorities in Chicago," said Mr. Wright, "have announced there was nothing in Mrs. Breen's charges upon which to base a Mann act prosecution of me. But if the federal authorities have dropped the case I am afraid Mrs. Breen has not. I don't know what her next move will be, but I am sure there will be a next move. She may try to have me indicted by the Wisconsin authorities. What I fear most is that she may attempt to kill Mme. Noel.

Tells of Alleged Threat.

"We have learned in Lake Forest woman went abroad, where she died, to escape stories Mrs. Breen set going about her. In a letter to Mrs. Pammler, one of my housekeepers Mrs. Breen threatened to 'get' Mme. Noel and boasted that once she had hired an Italian to throw vitrol at a woman she hated."

While Mr. Wright was in the midst of his discussion of Mrs. Breen, Mrs. Noel appeared in a clinging gown of shimmering white.

"I have prepared a statement," Mrs. Noel said, "which embodies all I care to say about this affair. Mr. Wright and I have smoothed out all our little misunderstandings. I am here at Taliesin to stay. We shall work out our future together."

Loves Him Above All Men.

The statement which Mrs. Noel had set out in her own handwriting has in it the literary quality which gave distinction to her published love letters. It reads as follows:

"Because I love Frank Lloyd Wright and admire him more than all men and honor the life he has lived I am here at Taliesen, his beautiful country home. I understand and deeply sympathize with the struggles and terrible trials his life and his great work have passed through. Now, because of my deep love for him, he is again subjected to persecution.

"My real faith in him has never wavered, but we have passed through deep waters together.

"I believe now, as then, that great as the artist is, the man is greater, but in attempting to have him understand my ideals I have at times belittled him—have been unfair and impatient in my criticism of him, as he has been unkind and impatient in his criticism of me.

"Our struggles with each other have only drawn us closer together. It is easy to worship a hero in him; I could too easily. Our love must be a great, vital, living thing, standing by its own strength, protected by its own virtue.

"I am no advocate of any theories of sex idealism. The only hope of liberation must come not through intellectual concepts or rational propositions, but only through the illumination of the spiritual consciousness.

"If there is any justification of my position here it is that the work we hope to do together and the strength we can give each other is more important than a form which in Mr. Wright's life has become obsolete."

Wright Pays Her Tribute.

"Mme. Noel," said Mr. Wright, "is one of the brilliantly intellectual women I ever knew. She is wonderful, not only as a literary woman, but as an artist."

Mrs. Noel's brilliant literary talent, so warmly praised by Wright, was demonstrated in her published letter to him of August 4 last, in which she said in part:

"I feel like a mountain had fallen on me and I am still alive. The revelations of your last visit, showing your natural character as I never saw it before, have stunned me. I am completely overwhelmed. I have never idealized you. I have expected you to be a fine, good, and noble man, worthy of the clean, loyal love I gave you. When I first met you your ideals seemed so lofty—your love so high—your principles so firmly grounded, and your convictions unswerving. I loved you with a quality of tenderness unequaled in my experience. Gradually I have seen you fail yourself. Little by little I realized that you could not hold to a conviction long enough to prove its worthh—that you were moved by every passing breeze to change your base—that nothing could hold you long. One thing, however, I have held to my faith in you with regard to women—I thought you loved love enough—than I thought that you loved me enough not to insult me.

"Anybody you like can convince you of anything, however distorted. You say you took me into your life too soon. Too soon for what? Before you were ready to be true? Before you had debauched yourself by a thouand infidelities? That is what you want—freedom. You have it, Frank. I give you today your freedom. You are no longer mine.

"I went to pieces at mention of the things that were going on at Taliesin. The disappointment was too horrible. I shall always go to pieces like this, I know. Your letter has just come. For God's sake do not torment me by relating your life as it is at Taliesen.

Fears Her Own Emotion.

"Do not come. I cannot see you again. It will simply precipitate an other outburst. Your carnivals at Taliesin are not for me. I do not want to be in them nor do I want to be told of them. A merry party of debauchers using your house for purposes too shocking for words—invited for that purpose. . . . If you write me again about it, I don't think I shall be able to read the letter. I do not know what I shall do. It doesn't matter. My suffering is too intense to be described, but that doesn't matter either—only one thing matters—THAT YOU BE ENTERTAINED, AMUSED. No, no, I cannot—just cannot——

"You told me that no person was to be invited TWICE to Taliesin. That it was not a matter of entertaining your friends, but of having people there as an expedient, though I have never understood the necessity for such an expedient. You have established a COLONY, it seems, and all for your own pleasures, and Taliesin is the center of a circle of people who either have already or are reseeking adventures. And you ask me to get used to this—to give it a place in the white light of love which envelops me—to place that unworthy thing on the shrine where I kneel to pray:

"Do you ask love not to be love—to be something else? Of course I don't want to hear about it. Can you blame me if I refuse to listen? YOU ARE FREE. Do what you will with your freedom. Do not fear another outburst from me.

"MIRIAM."

"UNITED EMPIRE LOYALISM."

Springfield Republican: It is recorded of Sir Charles Tupper, the Canadian statesman, who died recently in England, that he was of "United empire loyalist descent." As he was born in Nova Scotia, this is not surprising. That the victorious American colonists treated badly those among their number who refused to join in the rebellion against the king is admitted by all later American historians, though the glowing passions of the period and the standards of the time are regarded as an explanation, and partial extenuation.

It is easy to see why the tories who were transported at the end of the revolution to Nova Scotia, and those who emigrated to Ontario, should carry in their bosoms strong resentment against their oppressors. The new nation lost in this way some of its most cultivated classes, though the event had the effect of turning these cultivated classes into pioneers in the domains that still remained under British rule. In Nova Scotia, and perhaps even in Ontario, the old animosity of the "united empire loyalists" still smolders; though it is almost negligible, a politician always has the opportunity of appealing to it when he happens to oppose some measure making for closer relations between Canada and this country.

It should be an idle, but pleasant, speculation for some one to trace out the possible effects on American life if the victorious colonists had shown tolereation toward the tories, just as it was idle, but pleasant, for Lord Rosebery in one of his famous speeches some years ago to picture what would have happened to England had King George conciliated the American colonies. Lord Rosebery saw nothing less than the removal of the British parliament to America, and the transformation of Great Britain into a mere island dependency of an Anglo-American world empire.

Here is a chance to apply the historical imagination to our own country. Happily, at this day, the issues of the revolution can be dispassionately studied on both sides. We do well to remember that the great mass of the English people felt no resentment toward us even during the years of the war. And we also can see that there was nothing illogical in the attitude of those in the colonies who were loyal to their king. History merely denied them the privilege of assisting at the birth of a great nation. That was their misfortune, not their fault.

A CAREFUL MOTHER.

Kansas City Journal: "When, we drank from the same canteen!" roared the old veteran.

"Grandpa," interposed his granddaughter, "the sentiments of that song are praiseworthy, but I fear they may tend to counteract certain health rules I have been trying to teach little Waldo. Don't you know any songs about sanitary drinking cups?"

NATURALLY.

The stupid person sometimes says a witty thing without knowing it. A professor in a medical college had one exasperating student.

"You see, Mr. Smith," said the professor to this young man one day, "the subject of this diagram limps, because one of his legs is a trifle shorter than the other. Now, what should you do in such a case?"

"I should limp, too, I think, sir," replied the student, with an expression of perfect innocence on his face. —Tit-Bits.

EVASION.

"Pa, what's an eye opener?"

"Why—er—an alarm clock, my son."—Boston Evening Transcript.