

ties are the only ones which appeal to us in the Leighton pictures, and that their unspontaneity can never reach passion. An example of this is the "Hercules Wrestling with Death," shown at the Chicago Exhibition. Yet there was so much that was admirable in Leighton's linear idea, its symmetry and precision, and in his composition and conception, that perhaps no man since Ingres has done more to satisfy the art critic in these respects. As to Frederick Leighton's official character—so far back as 1854 Thackeray said: "Millais, my boy, I have met in Rome a versatile young dog called Leighton, who will one of these days run you hard for the presidency." In 1878 the presidency of the Royal Academy, made vacant by the death of Sir Francis Grant, was filled by Leighton's election. Then followed a knighthood, a baronetcy, and at the beginning of the present year a peerage. Lord Leighton did not live long enough to take his seat in the House of Lords, in which his varied gifts would have commanded attention. As the President of the Royal Academy, it may easily be said that no one has ever sat so worthily in Sir Joshua's chair. A man of superb physical presence, of exquisite manner, a remarkable linguist, of broad and painstaking culture, he has realized fully the Englishman's idea of a gentleman and a scholar.



Alexander Macmillan

Alexander Macmillan, who died in England on Saturday of last week, was the younger of the two brothers who just about a half-century ago began in a humble way a publishing business which has now become one of the largest in the world, while inferior to none in the quality of its literary output and its close alliance with scholarship and critical thought.

The story of the life of Daniel and Alexander Macmillan is one of success won by sturdy independence, business sagacity, and high principle. They were the sons of a typical Scotch farmer, honest, industrious, but of slender means and of a narrow outlook on the world. Both of the lads showed a strong liking for books and study, and pushed their way to an education through all difficulties. Alexander for a while was a school-teacher, but he soon followed Daniel to London and became a fellow-clerk with him in a publishing house. In 1843, when the combined salary of the two was not much over a thousand dollars, they resolved to strike out for themselves. They opened a small book-shop, were recognized by the trade as worthy of credit and support, struggled manfully against lack of capital, and at last began to see the tide of business success rise about them. The bookselling business carried on in London was moved to Cambridge, where relations were established with the University; then it was joined with a small publishing venture; soon it became established in London as a regular publishing house; and thereafter the increase in the importance and number of books published by the firm was steady and progressive. Such a business history as this implies not only industry and native worth, but a remarkably keen literary intelligence and a just understanding of the currents of thinking and the advance of learning. The published correspondence of Daniel Macmillan (in the Memoir by Mr. Thomas Hughes) showed how close was the relation between these publishers and many great writers. Alexander Macmillan was a man of fine perceptions and broad sympathies. He played a very important part in the literary history of

England. Such firms as that which he and his brother established make possible the career and service of the great authors.

⊗

At an important meeting held in Sion College, London, January 14, the following resolutions, moved by W. Hazell, M.P., and seconded by Canon Wilberforce, were unanimously passed:

"We, the undersigned, desire to express our deep conviction that, whatever may be the differences between the Governments in the present or the future, all English-speaking peoples, united by race, language, and religion, should regard war as the one absolutely intolerable mode of settling the domestic differences of the Anglo-American family.

"As any appeal to the arbitrament of the sword in disputes between English-speaking nations is repudiated by the conscience of the race, we would respectfully suggest to our Government that the present is a 'fit occasion' for giving effect to the resolutions in favor of Arbitration passed by the House of Commons and by both Houses of Congress.

"Without expressing any opinion upon pending controversies which may be regarded as *sub judice*, we would earnestly press the advisability of promptly providing some treaty arrangements by which all disputes between Britain and the United States could be referred for adjudication to some permanent tribunal representing both nations, and uniting them in the common interest of justice and peace."

An able committee was appointed to give effect to these resolutions and to secure signatures to the declaration embodied in them from leaders of all denominations. In this committee we note the names of such men as the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott), Cardinal Vaughan, Dean Farrar, the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Dr. Clifford, Dr. Adler, Lady Henry Somerset, Mr. W. T. Stead.

⊗

Last week the majority of the political prisoners at Pretoria were released on giving bail. Dr. Jameson and the officers who accompanied him in his raid have started under an escort to Natal, where they will be turned over to the British authorities for trial. All the members of the Johannesburg Reform Committee were admitted to bail with the exception of Messrs. Lionel Phillips, President of the Chamber of Mines, Percy Farrar, proprietor of the South African paper "Country Life," John Hays Hammond, the American mining engineer, and Colonel Francis Rhodes, brother of the ex-Premier of Cape Colony. As to Dr. Jameson's trial we have conflicting forecasts. Much influence has been brought to bear upon our State Department to secure clemency for the Americans under arrest at Pretoria. In response to Secretary Olney's inquiry, Mr. Bayard, our Ambassador at London, telegraphs that "according to his present information uniform, humane, and indulgent treatment is being extended to all persons, including Americans, by the Boer Government." All the Americans are out on parole except Mr. Hammond, whose case differs from that of the other Americans in that he signed a conditional invitation to Dr. Jameson to come to Johannesburg. Those familiar with the laws of the South African Republic believe that if penalties for treason are enforced in full, the Boer Government will become greatly enriched through the confiscation of property of those convicted of that crime. It is estimated that the total money value of such property is \$70,000,000. In his speech on Friday of last week, General Joubert, the commander of the Transvaal forces, declared that Dr. Jameson's raid was not the work of the honorable section of the British residents, and that the Boers were proud of the sympathy manifested by the people of Cape Colony. He foresaw a great future for South Africa if it were united, in which opinion we entirely concur.

⊗

The Ashanti war of twenty years ago was begun by the

natives because the British refused to pay the annual tribute to the King which the Dutch—the previous masters of the African Guinea Coast Colony—had paid. In spite of Lord Wolseley's expedition, the result of which made Ashanti nominally tributary to the British Gold Coast Colony, the King has claimed to be an independent sovereign over his 2,000,000 subjects, and has continued his fierce despotism. Last year the Governor of the Gold Coast Colony sent word to the King that a Resident would be sent to the capital with power to define the limits of Ashanti and to repress the horrible human sacrifices of slaves which were daily taking place. These demands were resented, upon which an expedition was organized to enforce the ultimatum. After a march through 150 miles of jungle, the capital has been easily captured, and the King compelled to sue for peace. It is supposed that he will be reduced to the position of an Indian Prince under allegiance to the Queen, but the country is, of course, not settled enough to permit a British Resident to be stationed at the capital without a regiment for his protection. The immediate gain to civilization will be great, for British rule will undoubtedly stamp out the inhuman slavery which has long existed in Ashanti. It is also reported that Mr. Chamberlain is arranging the transfer of the business of the adjoining Niger Coast Protectorate into the hands of Crown agents who will substitute colonial rule for the trading of the Royal Niger Company, and that an amicable arrangement has been made with the French, who are England's next-door neighbors. One sad incident, however, will always be connected with the present Ashanti campaign—the death of Prince Henry of Battenberg. Two members of the English royal family—Prince Henry of Battenberg and Prince Christian Victor—enlisted for the Ashanti war. The former was attacked by swamp-fever and was conveyed to the coast, where a steamer took him to Sierra Leone, but he died before reaching that place. He was a brother of the late Prince of Bulgaria, and, had his opportunities been the same, might have exhibited similar self-command and bravery. Every one will sympathize with Princess Beatrice in her great sorrow, and with the Queen, whose later life has been clouded by many family bereavements.



A report to the "Pall Mall Gazette" affirms that a treaty has been entered into between Russia and Turkey by which Russia extends a protectorate over Turkey, and Turkey guarantees to Russia an open exit to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles. The report is doubted, and lacks official confirmation, but we do not think it improbable. France has long wished to secure the withdrawal of England from Egypt; Russia has long wished for an open pathway to the Mediterranean; Turkey would be unable to maintain herself in Europe at all if deprived of protection from some Christian power, and the protection of England, on which she has relied in the past, has become very problematical. If such a treaty exists, and is carried into effect, England's command of the Suez Canal will be seriously threatened. The wise diplomat is influenced but not governed by the traditions of the past. If Lord Salisbury had been a wise diplomat, he would have perceived that it is impossible much longer for England to maintain the Turkish supremacy on the Bosphorus, and he would have avoided the hazard of Russia's hostile control by entering into an alliance with Russia to give her what she has so long desired, and in return secure the protection of the Christians in the Turkish Empire. Russia as an enemy with free passage through the Dardanelles will be far more dangerous than would have been Russia as an ally and friend.

War or Law?

The shock given to the two countries by the Venezuelan incident promises to have the good effect of accelerating immensely the dissemination among thinking men of a knowledge of the possibilities of an immediate advance in civilization, such as has been for many years the hope and expectation of jurists.

Two or three years ago a committee of jurists in sympathy with a movement for the creation of a permanent tribunal for arbitration was appointed, consisting of leading judges, statesmen, and lawyers in both Europe and America. William Allen Butler and Cephas Brainerd, at the request of the originators of the movement, have prepared a careful plan for the organization and administration of such a tribunal. Other steps of a similar nature have been taken, but none of them have hitherto received sufficient encouragement to lead to rapid progress or promise immediate practical results.

The inertia of public sentiment is not surprising. The change involved is as great a change as ever has been proposed, in government, at one stroke, since the framing of the Constitution of the United States. It amounts in effect to taking the power of declaring war out of the hands of the executive and legislative branches of the government, and interposing judicial process, judicial investigation, judicial reasoning, and a calm judgment of an impartial tribunal as necessary preliminaries. This is so radical and far-reaching a measure that it is not strange that nothing short of an actual emergency bringing us face to face with the possibility of a hasty and unreasoning declaration of war should suffice to make men in this busy commercial age give it the necessary attention.

The Venezuelan incident could not have been better devised to bring this distinction clearly before the American mind. If the President's message had stopped with the recommendation that Congress provide for the appointment of a competent tribunal to investigate the facts and make them known fully to our people and to the civilized world, Mr. Cleveland would have been justly credited with an admirable device and a noble step in advance toward future peace, by establishing a precedent for an inquiry upon judicial methods, instituted by a nation which, though not a party to the controversy, might be seriously affected by its continuance or its results. Such an investigation, though it might be necessarily *ex parte*, in the sense that Great Britain might have refused to take notice of its proceedings or give to it an explanation of her course, would have been impartial in the sense of being an investigation by a third nation not a party to the controversy and made with a view to attaining a right understanding of its own interests or duty and the duty of other civilized nations. What shocked the country, while at the same time it accelerated this wholesome discussion, was the addition in the same message of an implied threat to Great Britain, giving her to understand that if she did not abide by whatever conclusion our Commission might come to she must prepare for war with us. This was like issuing execution before trial and judgment.

Nevertheless there are aspects in the results of this recent incident which are encouraging. There are already precedents for judicial co-operation between nations, as Professor Thayer has shown in the "University Law Review," it being already the custom of courts in one nation to send to courts of another nation requests to take evidence for use in trials in the country whose courts make the application; and other lines of legal usage confirm the propriety of such comity. Many jurists, it is true, have