

over the shelves, and did not even know what books they wanted. Small boys of twelve years gravely presented odd volumes of Schaff's 'History of the Christian Church' to be charged to them, and misfits of the same kind were forced on the librarians' attention every few minutes. Books were selected largely by the binding, without regard to the contents. There were dozens who knew, with pride, the name of one book, and this was usually 'Uncle Tom's Cabin.' Hence this book attained at a bound a phenomenal circulation." Time and practice brought improvement. The lesson most obviously taught by such an experience as that just related is the folly of leaving these untrained minds without assistance. If a tactful assistant-librarian is at hand to explain and give information, there are decided advantages in admitting readers to the shelves. As the report referred to points out, an actual row of books on a shelf, with permission to examine them and "dip into" them at will, is worth more to the average reader than the best catalogue ever made. The report adds: "If the book wanted is not on the shelf, another can be selected at once without delay. The time of waiting is reduced to a minimum, or pleasantly employed in examining books, and the attendant's time is saved. Direct contact with many books is itself an education in literature and curiosity, aroused by the appearance of some work on history or travel, or by a casual glance at one of its illustrations, may cause it to be drawn by one who has heretofore read nothing but fiction." The system has met with great success in several of the large cities. It is, however, no improvement on the old plan unless to it is added the best of supervision and cheerful guidance.



The first general election in Holland under the new suffrage has lately taken place, and its results are of interest. The number of electors has been doubled. As was the case in Austria, the first results in Holland seemed to be contrary to those which one might expect from so great an extension of the franchise. Strangely enough, clericalism triumphed in both Austria and Belgium, as a consequence of franchise extension; and in Holland the

early returns indicated a like victory. Complete returns, however, show that the whole result will not so radically modify the previous distribution of Dutch parties in the national legislature; that modification, however, will be a loss rather than a gain to the Liberal party. Most of the lost Liberal seats will be distributed between those representatives who call themselves "Historic Christians" and the Socialists. The new Chamber will contain forty-three members of the Clerical coalition and about fifty Liberals, while the preceding Chamber had only two Catholics and Anti-Revolutionaries to every three Liberals. The Dutch Ministry has resigned, and no one feels quite sure of what the future may bring forth. The elections, nevertheless, have proved that religion is quite as much an affair of the masses as of the classes, and also that it is possible for Catholics and Protestants to stand side by side up to a certain point. If no Catholic was in the field, the Catholic voted for the Protestant Anti-Revolutionary candidate, and *vice versa*. The Clerical success of the first day's elections was so great that Catholic discretion did not keep back the publication of imaginary lists of the coming Ministry, in which the Catholics were to receive most of the places. The matter was, of course, overdone, and helped the opposite cause instead of hurting it. Still, the triumphs of the Church party in Holland, as well as in Austria and Belgium, are significant enough at any time; in connection with a franchise extension they are doubly so.



The developments in the House of Commons regarding slavery in Zanzibar must bring mortification to British citizens everywhere. Mr. Curzon had to admit to the House that British authorities on the mainland of Zanzibar had actually been forcing British subjects to give up fugitive slaves, and to return them to their masters. Under the pressure of questions addressed to them, both the Foreign Office and the Attorney-General have discovered such action to be illegal, and therefore they have telegraphed to the British Commissioner at Mombasa, informing him that "a British subject is breaking the law if he takes part in restoring to his master or otherwise depriving of

his liberty any fugitive slave." One of the most authoritative of English journals declares that "the nation is profoundly humiliated by the necessity for the sending of such a telegram." It adds:

The Foreign Office fails altogether to perceive the importance of the question, not for philanthropic reasons, but for reasons of statesmanship, and that owing to that want of perception it is far too willing to let the local authorities act on their own judgment in the matter. . . . Why should they be so much better than the State, or tolerate in employees a resistance which the State in the case of slaves makes a criminal offence? We hold that for the sake of our own military power and for the character of our own white caste in our tropical colonies, Parliament should expand the law which forbids the rendition of slaves into a law which declares the holding of slaves to be everywhere under the British flag, in any class of British subjects, a penal offence.

It is asserted that the Foreign Office was aware that documents establishing the existence of a practice of restoring fugitive slaves were in London, but that no attempt was made to see them until the Attorney-General declared the practice to be illegal. It seems almost incredible that the existence of slavery should be condoned in any way in the British Empire.



Freedom of Teaching

Two months ago, when the Populist Regents of the Kansas State Agricultural College secured the resignation of the competent Republican president with the apparent purpose of giving their own party larger representation upon a faculty hitherto almost exclusively Republican, *The Outlook* made these comments: "Honesty is not more essential to the character of merchants, or chastity to the character of women, than is fearlessness in stating convictions to the character of teachers. In so far as the Kansas Populists have proscribed professors because of their views, to that extent they have struck a blow at the integrity of their teaching force and lowered university standards, wherever the influence of this action extends." The justice of this position was not criticized even by those who declared that the Populist Regents had not proscribed their successful president because of his political views. In general the conservative papers which commented upon the Kansas episode condemned the intolerance and party bigotry

exhibited more vehemently if not more strongly than did *The Outlook*. Last week, however, when an episode similar in kind, but vastly greater in consequence occurred in Rhode Island, not a few conservative papers assumed an attitude of apology for the intolerance exhibited. Fortunately in this case the exact facts are accessible to the entire reading public. The reasons for President Andrews's resignation of the presidency and professorship of philosophy in Brown University are fully set forth in the published correspondence between himself and a Committee of the Board of Trustees. We quote from the letter of the Committee dated July 16:

The resolution [appointing the committee "to confer with the President in regard to the interests of the University"] was passed after remarks from several members of the corporation showing more specifically the reason for it. The matters of these remarks expressed the highest appreciation of the services rendered by the President in increasing and diversifying the educational facilities and efficiency of the University, and in multiplying the number of the students resorting to it, and at the same time professed for him personally the warmest admiration and regard.

They signified a wish for a change in only one particular, having reference to his views upon a question which constituted a leading issue in the recent Presidential election, and which is still predominant in national politics, namely, that of the free coinage of silver as legal tender at a ratio of sixteen ounces of silver to one of gold. They considered that the views of the President, made public by him from time to time, favored a resumption of such coinage, and expressed the belief that these views were so contrary to the views generally held by the friends of the University that the University had already lost gifts and legacies which otherwise would have come or have been assured to it, and that without change it would in the future fail to receive the pecuniary support which is requisite to enable it to prosecute with success the grand work in which it has entered.

President Andrews's reply was so short that abridgment is unnecessary:

To the Advisory and Executive Committee of the Corporation of Brown University:

GENTLEMEN—Believing that, however much I might desire to do so, I should find myself unable to meet the wishes of the corporation as explained by the special committee recently appointed to confer with me on the interests of the University without surrendering that reasonable liberty of utterance which my predecessors, my Faculty colleagues, and myself have hitherto enjoyed, and in the absence of which the most ample endowment for an educational institution would have but little worth, I respectfully resign the Presidency of the University, and also my professorship therein, to take effect not later than the first day of the approaching September.