

churia shall be controlled by Russian officers; that Russia shall have the right to work the Manchurian mines, and that part of the province of Kianchau shall be leased to Russia. Russian influence has long been dominant in Korea. Thus the entire Empire north of the Great Wall is practically in Russian control. Russia is also using the possessions of France in Tonking to check Japan. The new masters of the island of Formosa have made no secret of their intention to become masters also of the Philippine Islands, and the unhappy state of Spanish finances causes them to hope that their indemnity proposal might be agreed to by Spain. It is even said that the Philippine rebellion was fomented by the Japanese; at all events, the Japanese Government has issued orders to send a warship to the islands. Russia has now made a counter-proposal to Spain, and it is rumored that Spain would be ready to grant the concession of a naval coaling-station on one of the islands if Russia "would manifest her friendship at this time of trial." What that phrase may mean as regards the United States is not quite clear, but it is clear enough that Russia proposes to checkmate the recent advance of Japan in Pacific waters.

Prince Luitpold, the Prince-Regent of Bavaria, is the first of the present rulers of Continental Europe to take a definite stand against dueling. The Prince recently canceled the decision of a court martial which had sentenced an officer to be dismissed from the army because the latter had declared himself opposed to dueling. In his general order the Prince-Regent instructs his Minister of War to announce that henceforth, so far as the Bavarian army is concerned, the compulsion to fight duels is abolished. It is to be hoped that the other Continental sovereigns will follow this good example. In our own country the practice of dueling is now confined to certain parts of the South, and we rarely hear of duels even there. Nevertheless, it is a pleasure to learn that Mr. Alfred S. Clay, who has received the Democratic nomination for Senator from Georgia to succeed General Gordon, has had the moral courage, in an atmosphere favorable to dueling, to refuse to fight. In declining a recent challenge sent him, he said: "I am opposed to dueling. I am opposed to it because it is prohibited by the Constitution of this State, that I have frequently sworn to support and defend. I am opposed to it because it is condemned by every principle of our laws and every doctrine of our religion. I am opposed to it because I am unwilling to commit murder, or to become a party to its commission by others. I never intend to take the life of a human being, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so in self-defense. . . . Nor have I done you any wrong that entitles you to redress at my hands. I have done you no injustice. If I had, I am manly enough to confess it and make the proper reparation for it."

### Machines in Politics

At the Manhattan and Brooklyn Conference held at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City, the other day, Benjamin F. Blair, Esq., a well-known member of the New York Bar, read a very significant paper on the subject of political duties. Much of this paper went over ground with which our readers are familiar. The speaker condemned the indifference of citizens to their political obligations; gave illustrative facts showing the extent of this apathy; insisted that simply voting on election day is not a sufficient discharge of the duties of citizenship; reminded his readers that the word idiot was one which the Greeks

applied to people who gave their whole time to their own private affairs and neglected their public duties, and lamented the number of idiots we have in America; dwelt on the value both of conscience and of party spirit as motive powers in inciting men to the performance of their duty; showed how party spirit could be consecrated to noble ends; reclaimed the words politics and politicians from the undeserved reproach put upon them by public and indiscriminating sneers; called on his audience to commend public officers who had faithfully performed their duty to the city, the State, or the Nation; insisted that if good men are to reform politics they must not be Pharisees—they must be willing to associate politically with all sorts and conditions of men; and brought his address to a close by the following practical counsel to those who wished to defeat self-seekers in public affairs:

"If you are going to 'beat the machine,' you must have another machine to do it with. And, other things being equal, if you are to win, your machine must be either the stronger or the better managed of the two. But if you have forces sufficient to build such a new machine, then you have forces sufficient to capture the old one, and as soon as you have done that your battle is won; whereas, after you have performed all the labor of organizing your new machine, the battle is still to be fought, and the chances—nay, the very decided probabilities—are that, by the time it is over, both sides will be exhausted, your party distracted and weakened, and the opposition party, with its machine, no whit better than the one you have been trying to beat, intrenched in power. I say, then, do not waste your time in organizing leagues to 'beat the machine,' but go into the existing organization of your party and *capture the machine.*"

Mr. Blair's advice is that of a man who is at once a moral reformer and a practical politician; who is familiar with political machinery; who has taken an active part in the politics of his city, not for what he could get out of it for himself or for others, but for what he could do for the community in which he lives. There may be cases in which the only way to destroy a bad machine is to organize a new one, but these cases are rare. Except where non-partisan action is needed for special ends, the best thing the citizen can do is to co-operate with other citizens like-minded with himself, go into his party machinery, and convert it from base to noble uses. This is not impossible. It has often been done. It cannot be accomplished without persistent courage, but there is nothing worth doing which persistent courage cannot do. If conscience is to conquer selfishness, conscience must not remain unorganized.

### Dr. John Watson

Dr. John Watson brought to a close what has been a continued service and a continued ovation in the United States by giving his last public address in this country last Sunday in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. The church was crowded to its utmost capacity. It was, indeed, only with the greatest difficulty that pewholders were able to get their seats, and some of them doubtless were among the hundreds turned from the doors of the overcrowded house. The church pursued the democratic method it has always pursued in similar cases; no tickets were issued; the throng were admitted as rapidly as they could be with due regard to the rights of pewholders. Dr. Henry M. Field, of the New York "Evangelist," and Dr. Lyman Abbott, the pastor of Plymouth Church, occupied the pulpit with Dr. Watson, and conducted the service of worship. Dr. Watson intro-

duced his sermon in the following words of farewell to his American friends:

"Dear friends, as this is the last public occasion on which I shall speak before returning home, I desire from my heart, and with feelings far deeper than I can express, to acknowledge the great kindness which I have received from the American people during my tour in your country. It has been not only far more than any man could expect; it has been far more than any man could deserve; and the effect is to send one man home with a humble and a full heart, more than ever convinced of the abounding charity and kindness and consideration that are in human nature. May I say that I count it a privilege to stand in the pulpit in which my friend Dr. Abbott preaches; a pulpit in which a great apostle of God told of the great Evangel in days of light and in days of darkness. I trust I may not be out of spirit with the Evangel and the thoughts that have been preached in this place, for I will speak of the optimism of Jesus."

We shall not attempt a report of the sermon, for any abstract would despoil it of its life—the life of an abounding charity, exhibited alike in a quaint and restrained humor and a gentle and wholly unaffected pathos, eliciting not so much alternate tears and laughter as laughter in tears, like sunshine making the rain radiant. Such life is too delicate for the reporter's pen.

Dr. Watson's physical endurance has been put to no small test in the ten weeks of his American visit. He has traveled as far West as Minneapolis and St. Paul; has lectured nearly every night; preached frequently on Sunday; often given one and sometimes two readings during the day; delivered a course of nine lectures on preaching at Yale Theological Seminary, since revised and published in "The Cure of Souls," which is noticed in another column; and attended breakfasts, luncheons, dinners, and receptions without number. But he shows no signs of fatigue, and sails from America apparently as fresh as when he landed here the last of September.

Doubtless this abundant life is partly due to a remarkable physique. But it is also partly due to a remarkable spirit. If we might characterize him by a single word, it would be by saying that he is a most human man. His interest in everything which interests humanity is absolutely illimitable. In this respect he reminds one who has known them both of Henry Ward Beecher. His sympathy with his fellow-man is genuine, natural, spontaneous. Every one whom he touches contributes to his life, and contributes something worthy. For he possesses himself that characteristic insight which in his sermon on the "Optimism of Jesus" he so graphically attributed to Jesus Christ—the insight which discerns the best in men. We quote from memory, and therefore not with Dr. Watson's verbal felicity of expression: "Above all men Jesus had the most marvelous insight into human goodness. In John, whom men called dreamer, visionary, indolent, unpractical, Jesus saw the spiritual seer and prophet of the future Church. In Peter, noisy, turbulent, unstable, he saw the strength of purpose which would make of him the rock on which the Christian Church should be founded. In Thomas, the skeptic, who did not and would not believe in the resurrection, he saw the love which was ready to die with his Lord, and the faith which would make him the first to bear witness to his Lord's divinity." Unconsciously, in this portraiture Dr. Watson described his own habit of mind. He who thus sees the best in men evokes the best from men, and unconsciously and unintentionally feeds his own life by the very process by which he nurtures theirs.

This vision of clear-eyed charity, which is so characteristic of Dr. Watson's books, is equally characteristic of the preacher and the man. He sees the seeds of goodness in very common soil, and by the warm sunshine of appreciation makes them germinate and grow. For years it has been common for the ministry to criticise the medical pro-

fession for its tendency to materialism: Ian Maclaren sees a Dr. MacLure, and straightway wherever his book has gone to eyes before blinded, Dr. MacLure is discovered, though before unknown, and scores of letters come to the author from every part of the civilized world assuring him that the original of his portrait is ministering mercy there. This charity, commingled with keen vision and making it the keener, warms all his humor and irradiates all his pathos. Never have we seen the truth that humor and pathos are of one blood better illustrated than by Ian Maclaren, unless it be by Dr. Watson: for it is even more apparent in the preacher and the man than in the author. His art is unartificial, the true expression of his nature; and he himself is seen and felt to be greater than his stories or his sermons—greater, if in very truth love is, what Henry Drummond has called it, "the greatest thing in the world." America is richer for his visit; and the benediction of unnumbered hundreds, whom his words have warmed and quickened, goes with him to his home across the sea in hopes and prayers that he who has so enriched others may be himself enriched. He will be, if love and prayers can compass their desires.

## Government by Injunction

A member of the New York Bar comes to the defense of government by injunction, in a letter which we publish in another column. We pursue our usual course of not replying to this letter in detail, contenting ourselves with a simple restatement of the issue as we understand it, and of our position, leaving it to the intelligent judgment of the reader, in the light of our correspondent's letter, to decide whether that position is correct or not.

The question is not whether the Court possessed authority to issue the injunction in the Debs case, and to enforce it by proceedings for contempt.

Nor is it whether the Court acted justly in the exercise of that authority.

It is the question whether that is an authority which it is safe and wise to intrust to courts of justice. Our answer to that question is—No.

There are two legal principles which apparently come into collision. The first is the principle that every man accused of crime is entitled to trial before a jury of his peers, who are free from all interest and all prejudice for or against him. The other principle is that courts of equity shall have power to enforce their decrees by proceedings for contempt. In our judgment, when these two principles come into apparent collision, the second must yield and the first must be maintained. That is to say, when the charge of contempt involves the charge of doing a criminal act, the person so charged is entitled to the benefit of the first principle. He is to be tried by a jury of his peers, in a court free from all suspicion of interest or prejudice against him. And we affirm this principle, not because we distrust the character of our Federal judges, not because we expect that they will resent disobedience to their orders as a personal affront, but because history demonstrates, beyond all peradventure, that the mere possession of arbitrary power by a judicial tribunal is certain to corrupt the tribunal and to endanger the community. We agree with our correspondent that law is a growth; but there are some growths that are dangerous and need to be repressed; others that are beneficent and need to be promoted. A growth in the direction of increasing the power of a single judge over the liberty of his fellow-citizens is a growth which is dangerous and should be repressed. "The easy remedy, to have the contempt dealt with by a judge