

Nobel's fortune was made in the manufacture of guns, ammunition, and other explosives. For years he held contracts for supplying several of the great armies of Europe with fighting material. That this man should offer such a munificent reward to those whose talents are spent in preventing war is thought by Mr. Curtis to be very strange.

Probably no man had a better opportunity than Nobel to rightly estimate the disastrous consequences of an appeal to arms. Men did not fight because Nobel made ammunition and guns. Nobel made ammunition and guns because men fight, and consequently require ammunition and guns with which to settle their differences. But having amassed a fortune because of the disposition toward war, it was brought forcibly to the attention of this man that no greater service could be performed by a human being than to contribute to the peace of the world. He fully realized, as few other men do, the awful waste when nations embark upon an organized disturbance of the peace, and however much we may say by way of compliment to his wisdom in seeking to contribute to the advancement of physical science, chemistry, medicine and literature, nothing that we may say on these points could be of so complimentary a character as the tribute we must pay to him because of his evident disposition to advance the peace of the world.

Above all the other prizes, the peace prize increases in importance according to the care with which we scrutinize present day conditions throughout the civilized world.

Attention, Ambassador Choate!

A terrible commotion is on among the English nobility. A number of balls are to be given during the ceremonies attending the coronation of the King of England. It has been the intention of the politicians in England to make the American guests on this occasion more conspicuous than they have been on any previous occasion. The purpose of this is to give emphasis to the claim that American sympathy is with Great Britain in its struggle with the Boers, and that the relations between Great Britain and the United States are growing closer as the days go by.

But it has suddenly been discovered that American women do not know how to dance, and an "expert on dancing," writing for a London publication, makes this startling statement:

American ladies especially appear ridiculous when they try to dance. Their vertical demonstration is exaggerated and their bodies (I will not say their grotesque bodies) sway about most absurdly in an attempt to follow their male companions. American ladies never dance acceptably in the smart circles of London without first getting instruction at the hands of capable teachers who are Englishmen. Englishmen find it quite impossible to follow their vigorous, complicated gyrations.

This is a terrible arraignment. The generous impulses of our British cousins, however, will probably be shown on this occasion when, even in spite of this defect, they admit women as guests at the coronation ceremonies.

We have heard much in recent days of the

many things in common between Englishmen and Americans. These, we have been told, speak the same language, worship the same God, follow the same social customs in many respects, have coursing through their veins the same Anglo-Saxon blood; and yet just as we have prepared ourselves to participate in King Edward's coronation ceremonies we are suddenly told that we do not "dance acceptably."

It is too bad, indeed! But it is interesting to observe that this same "dancing expert" in conclusion holds out the hope that there is possibility for reform even in this respect. If American women will but put themselves in the hands of capable teachers who are Englishmen, the Englishmen who attend the coronation balls "may find it possible to follow their vigorous gyrations." Let us not overlook this very pressing duty. We must not appear to disadvantage at the coronation ceremonies. All the sacrifices we have made for the purpose of courting English approval will have been wasted if our women do not "dance acceptably in the smart circles of London."

This is a matter which Ambassador Choate should immediately take under consideration, if, indeed, he has not already realized its enormous importance.

Nebraska Democrats Firm.

The Democratic State Convention held, at Lincoln September 17, adopted a strong platform endorsing the principles of the Kansas City platform, and nominated one candidate for Supreme Judge and two candidates for regents of State University. The convention was one of the largest ever held in the state. The Populists met at the same time and the ticket named was agreed upon by both conventions. The candidate for the bench, Judge Conrad Hollenbeck, is a Democrat and J. H. Bayston and L. G. Hawksby candidates for regents are Populists. The fusion committees expect to get out a full vote and elect the entire ticket. Mr. Bryan had not met the representatives of the two parties since the last presidential election. In addressing the conventions he avoided partisan politics owing to the death of the President. In the course of his remarks he said that the loss of the state brought more humiliation to him than the national defeat (not that he regretted it more, as some papers reported). He said that he would remain a citizen of Nebraska and help win back the state.

Slavery in the Philippines.

The Chicago Tribune of August 21 contains a Washington dispatch in which it is set forth that the war department is having considerable difficulty with the question of slavery in the Philippines. It is announced that the war department has determined that the "sale of children in the Philippines shall be stopped." In this dispatch it is stated:

In the third district of the department, where Major O. J. Sweet is in command, the slavery question is a constant source of trouble on account of slaves escaping from one master to another. That officer says: "Whenever a question relating to

slaves comes before me I simply make the owners prove their slaves beyond doubt, in which case I have nothing to do with them, but in case I can pick a flaw in their title I give the alleged slaves freedom papers. Thousands of Moros are held as slaves who are by right free people."

It would be interesting for the people of the United States to see one of their army officers on territory where United States sovereignty has been proclaimed, sitting in judgment on the ownership of human beings. It is reassuring to be told by this Solomon, now sojourning in the Philippines as the representative of the greatest republic on earth, that whenever a question relating to slaves comes before him he "simply makes the owners prove their slaves beyond doubt." It would be all the more interesting if this army officer would reveal to the American people the character of evidence which he requires in such cases. Certainly the evidence must be strong, because he insists that the proof shall be "beyond doubt." What proof can establish title to a human being according to American law?

It is also interesting to be told by this army officer "in case I can pick a flaw in their title I give the alleged slaves freedom papers;" and yet we are at liberty to infer from the tone of this officer's statements that there have been cases in which he could not "pick a flaw in their title." Perhaps it has never occurred to this, or any other army officer, that it is the easiest thing under the sun to pick a flaw in any alleged title to a human being on territory over which United States sovereignty has been declared and over which the United States flag waves. The evidence at hand is not the mere word of an irresponsible Filipino native; it is not the unsupported testimony of a bystander; it is nothing more nor less than the constitution of the United States, the 13th amendment to which declares that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist "within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction." That is the weapon that hews to pieces any claim made, on territory under United States sovereignty, to the body of a human being; and that weapon destroys the alleged title of the Sultan of Sulu or any other pretending monarch as effectually as it does the alleged title of the humblest farmer in the Philippine archipelago.

A Good Bill.

The commission which is at work revising the federal statutes suggests a bill making it a capital offense to kill or attempt to kill an executive officer of the federal government, when the attempt is made for the purpose of obstructing the government. The suggestion is a good one. The qualification avoids the objection which might be urged if the law applied to all kinds of assault, but where the purpose of the assault is not to injure the man as an individual but to injure the government through him, it becomes an offense against all the people.

Suppress anarchy and then make the government so just that no one can doubt its beneficence.