

the least of his claim to infallibility? When every suggestion even of his temporal power has vanished will the Pope still retain his supreme authority in the spiritual affairs of his church? These are a few of the many queries that arise at the mere suggestion of the Pope's changing his residence. It seems reasonable to believe that Catholics in this country could hardly fail to lose much of their superstitious respect for his holiness. Much of the reverence paid by Catholics in America to his holiness arises from his position and surroundings, rendered sacred by the hallowed associations of the past. This reverence would, we fear, be largely dissipated if the Pope were to dwell here. How far this reverence would be replaced by a more rational and a more ennobling respect would depend almost altogether upon the character and acts of the Pope. But if then the Pope were to be judged upon his own merits, his infallibility would receive no consideration whatever. But if not regarded as infallible, how then will he be the pope of the Catholic church? The Catholic church has in this a vexed subject to consider. We see no escape from the conclusion that if the Pope change his residence to the United States, a revision of the standards and doctrines of the Catholic church will be necessary. Only thus can they be adapted to the changed state of affairs and to the new relations involved.

It is trite to say that the latter part of the Nineteenth century has been and is a period of mighty change and marvelous advance. Yet it is doubtful if one person in a hundred has a real appreciation of how mighty the change has been or how marvelous the advance. There is no better way to gain such an appreciation than to compare the opinion people now have and the opinion they held twenty or thirty years ago of the reformers of society. Almost any young man can remember when good people generally put socialists, anarchists, communists and such like into class. That class, moreover, was worthy the utmost condemnation. It could not be denounced too vigorously. A socialist was as bad every whit as an anarchist. A communist was a "cumberer of the earth." It is well to note too that these reformers themselves did not then entirely refuse to be classed together. Undoubtedly one reason for this was because they all believed together that society must be revolutionized. Beyond that their ideas were not altogether clear. The anarchist, in fact, would go no further at all. The government destroyed, every man should then do as he saw fit. The communist would have some government. A simple arrangement of community of interests was his aim. The socialist of that period would have a strong new government to enforce community of production as well as community of distribution. How do matters stand now? How do good people classify and regard social reformers now? They are classed according to their principle and doctrines. They are judged according to the merits of their respective systems. Why, many good people are socialists to-day. How about the social reformers themselves? Are they still united? Not at all. Even European socialists and anarchists have separated. Just recently at the Socialistic Congress at Erfurt, the anarchists withdrew largely to escape expulsion. The communists have been almost entirely absorbed by the socialists. The socialists, moreover, have changed in great part from revolutionary to evolutionary social reformers. From being stigmatized not only as visionary but also as absolutely pernicious, the principles of socialists have come to be regarded as highly proper and wholesome. Indeed, it has become quite the "fad" among literary people to avow adherence to socialistic doctrines. Let it be remembered, however, that cultured socialists of to-day believe in reorganization of society by evolution

rather than by revolution. This distinction is but another evidence of change and of progress almost beyond belief.

But a small proportion of the citizens of this country gain a college education. A somewhat larger proportion finish a high school course. Considerably larger are the number of those who stop with the grade. Every one, probably, knows this. If there is any one that does not, to him it likely is new. With him, however, we have nothing to do.

Now the question arises, what do these graduates of the various schools do in a literary way after leaving school? A college graduate is supposed to have been trained sufficiently to be able himself to direct his course of study and of reading. How many are able to do so? How many do so? Some high-school graduates should be able to rely upon their own judgment in the choice of reading and of studies. The fact is, however, that they do not have such reliance, even though competent for it in themselves. Graduates of grade and of district schools are but little fitted for good and independent judgment in regard to reading and study. There has arisen among these classes of graduates a demand for some sort of reading. The demand is for matter in every way consonant with the times. The demand has been supplied. Living bodies grow by evolution in accordance we are told, with an "appropriate idea". Thus in the literary world, the demand has brought forth the supply. There has grown up in this country something unique in the literary world. It is the illustrated monthly magazine. To a wonderful extent this has become in this country the popular educator. This was well illustrated by the Kennan lecture. Wherever those selling tickets went, people eagerly bought, saying, "Oh yes, I want tickets; I have read all about Russia in Mr. Kennan's articles in the *Century*". From a number of instances of those who shook Mr. Kennan's hand after the lecture, two are worthy of notice. One gentleman warmly grasped the lecturer's hand and exclaimed enthusiastically, "Mr. Kennan, I have followed you in every step that you have taken". Another said with deep earnestness, "Mr. Kennan, I have come over 250 miles to hear you. After reading your articles, I felt that I must hear you." All this shows the wonderful hold that the monthly magazine has upon the reading public. Perhaps, the magazine is not calculated to give a thorough and complete education. For general education and general culture, however, it has a place and a place of no small extent.

Lincoln, the seat of six colleges, is becoming every year more and more a typical city of colleges. Its religious organizations include almost every denomination and every shade of creed. Its philanthropic organizations are such as a broad liberal, humane, and educational spirit fosters. Its entertainments are becoming each year better suited to refined taste and culture. Lincoln has always been called a "good opera town", that is, for the general run of plays. It is now becoming more so. Lecturers of eminence are now called for. Musical entertainments of the highest order are required and are liberally patronized. Theatrical artists of superior excellence receive due appreciation and high favor. The church-going public of Lincoln now demands ministers who are not only good but also cultured and eloquent. The broadening, ennobling, and refining spirit of liberal education is becoming more and more present and apparent. Truly, ten years hence it will be a privilege and a delight to dwell in this city of culture and education and to partake of its spirit. Not that it is not now a pleasure to live here. But then how much more so!

Newspapers, politicians, et. al., tell us that this is an "off year" in politics. After reading charges of villainy against