

dred dollars or more, and her husband is more than particular about her dress. Some husbands are. Is it her duty to wear a cheaper gown because some of her club sisters must? Here is a nice question in club ethics. One's husband may count his money by the hundred thousands or even the millions; both he and the children may be strenuous about the mother's clothes. What is her duty? Shall she go against the wishes of her own family, not to mention her personal taste in the matter, and studiously avoid wearing good gowns when she goes to the club—simply because there are women there whose husbands can scarcely afford the "ready made tailor" or the home-seamstress-made silk which they are wearing? "Why don't you bring some of your fine gowns up here with you?" asked the country relatives of a rich woman. "We like to see them even if our meeting house and rag-carpeted sitting rooms don't seem just the place for them." A great many club women feel the same way. They like to see pretty clothes, even if they cannot wear them. And no woman really likes to feel that she isn't worth dressing for; or that she must be dressed down to. So let us not worry over this matter of dress. It will right itself. If the woman who is apt to overdress—to whom dress is the main object in life—comes into the club, she will soon absorb a higher ideal and come to feel that there are greater purposes than are covered by the Paris fashion plates, and worthier subjects of contemplation and discussion than whether to ruffle or not to ruffle the skirt. And do these not need the club just as much as those that dwell in low places and perhaps long ago learned to combine high thinking with plain living? O sisters, we none of us realize one another's needs. How do we know that she whom we have been envying as possessing everything heart could wish, is not the most miserable of women? How do we know that the quiet, insignificant woman in sparrow-like raiment has not exactly the help which we are secretly craving? Let us come out of our shells and see.

There is no good reason why sailors should receive prize money and soldiers should not. The taking of a city has been accompanied by greater loss of life on the victorious side in this war, than the sinking of the ships. And the value of a city is many times that of a ship. The long established custom by which Admiral Sampson receives forty thousand dollars over and above his salary and Commander in Chief Miles nothing is absurd. The former has a luxurious cabin and is served in solitary state, the sailors on board the ships of his fleet have been trained for years by the rigid discipline of the navy. The commander in chief of the army puts up with a nomad's accommodations and his army is composed of regulars and raw recruits upon whose performance the success or failure of the campaign depends. The naval victories of this war have been brilliant but without the army they would have been ineffective. The government builds the battle ships and arms them with guns and ammunition at tremendous cost. The government pays liberal salaries to the officers and rather niggardly ones to the sailors. If any prizes are taken they should be handed over to the government, which pays the bills.

If there is to be a distribution of prize money it should be divided among officers and men in equal shares. The basis of distribution now

is rank and the man who stands in the most exposed posts, is served the poorest and coarsest fare and works the longest and hardest, receives the least money. Military caste and military division of the spoils is a survival older than the Egyptian off-with-his-head absolutism. The difference between man and man is not what the military regime makes it. Absolute obedience to officers is necessary, but the caste which makes it a court martial offense for an officer to treat a Jacky or the American Tommy Atkins as if he were a man like unto himself is repellent and tends to keep many a brave fellow who is willing to die for his country out of his country's service.

Going without shoes and stockings and a carefully regulated diet are the principle remedies of what is called the Kneip cure. From bare feet to bare hands is but a long step and we have taken it. A few years ago a modish woman would have felt awkward and ashamed to go upon the street without gloves. Now only the most punctilious and conservative think them indispensable even on informal occasions. The reform has at last reached the head and in the eastern summer resorts the hatless young man is no longer an object of curiosity because there are so many of him. Of course girls left off hats in summer resorts many seasons ago. But the masculine attachment to hats has persisted in spite of baldness, headaches and scalp diseases caused by the suffocation of the follicles. Fashion has accomplished what considerations of good health has failed to. The thick hair of the Esquimaux the Patagonians and the dwellers of central Africa teach investigators that the air is as necessary to hair plants as it is to larger vegetable growths. Bald heads which are shiniest and baldest at the crown, which is the spot furthest away from the edge of the hat, should have convinced the hat fiend of the cause of his disease. Fashion knows no law but caprice has at last ordered man and woman to go without their hats, not spasmodically or for the few hours when the male animal is asleep or at dinner or in raising it to the ladies, but when he is out doors in temperate weather. Fashion's immediate courtiers, the men of wealth and leisure in the country, have obeyed. The custom will gradually creep west until the many whose crowns now catch the light and reflect it, will first be covered with a fuzz and then with real hair. The effect upon the country will be like the discovery of a real fountain of youth. Middle-aged knobs, whose owners have allowed time to polish them without attempting to dodge, will, by obeying fashion, grow young and fascinating again.

The meeting of the science association a few weeks ago in Boston was of unusual interest. A time, a specific and recognized time arrives when theories, whose announcement created consternation and bitter opposition, after having been tried by scholars as well as by intelligent people with no especial training for a decade or so, are revised and accepted or definitively rejected as having been disproved by experience or sounder thinking. The doctrine of evolution has been accepted by the world of intelligence but that part of it which refers to the missing link has been on trial. Some years ago a biologist announced that man and monkey were derived from the same stone originally and went through various forms of animal evolution in company but a

time came when the vertebrate that was a fish, a reptile, and had come from some invertebrate clam which had been an aspiring vegetable born of an inorganic rock, parted company with a vertebrate that had also been a reptile, a fish, a clam, a vegetable, a stone. One started on the road which in some one hundred million years would again bring him to the stone age a naked man with a stirring something in his head which led him to sharpen and scoop out stones, and the other started on a road which in very few years made him a grinning ape from the beginning of time till the end of the world. At this meeting in Boston the scientists accepted this theory as in harmony with the greatest number of facts. The missing link theory is finally, therefore, disposed of and monkeys will no longer be expected to develop into men. The curious human formations who resemble monkeys can no longer lay their conduct to a prehensile ancestry. In all probability it is a hundred million years since their ancestors wore tails and they were of the pollywog character. All attempts therefore to evade responsibility for the inconsequence which is a characteristic of the monkey tribe, will no longer be considered. The local survivals of a prehistoric age can no longer be comfortably laid to monkeys. In forgiving their lazy development however, we can still blame an indolent ancestor who refused to live up to his lights.

The type setting machines, like other inventions, have drawbacks. They have to a large extent destroyed the individual aspect of papers. The old familiar type faces whose weekly or daily arrival was recognized at first sight, have been replaced by a uniform pale line containing more transpositions, incorrect and impossible syllabic divisions and beheadings than any apprentice compositor dared to make. As each line is a line of type solid, corrections entail a resetting of the whole line and trivial errors which do not destroy the sense, of the kind enumerated above, are not corrected. The result even on the best papers is a hodge-podge of poor spelling and capitalizing. This page is printed by machine and a comparison of it with the former clear and heavier hand-set type is much to the disadvantage of the linotype. Of course the machines throw out of employment a large number of men who had accomplished accuracy and swiftness and comeliness in type setting. This last result is the effect of all machines which do more work in an hour than a man can do in a day, but the readjustment which all such inventions compel entails a suffering which is none the less poignant because the next generation will have learned to accept it. The illegibility of newspapers which use the machines and neglect to keep them in order is another very serious objection to the linotypes. Man's ingenuity has not been overpraised or over-appreciated but the early days of a new invention cause starvation and in most cases the deterioration of the product. Hand work has a value and a beauty that the most cunning machine work can never equal.

The Czar's proposition that the nations of the world reduce their armaments and agree to settle disputes by peaceful methods is accepted by dreamers who like to plan Utopias as the beginning of a millenium which it will take thousands of years to systematize and get into running order. There are others, grown suspicious of

theoretical reforms, that suspect the Czar of the most oppressed peasantry on the earth, of desiring to allay the suspicions of the Americans and the English and the Japanese so that they will not make a coalition against the rest of the world.

It is a question if we are ready for the surcease of war. Men who take their stand in front of guns and continue to advance while their comrades are falling about them are too good to kill but such heroism fuses the hearts of a nation into one. It has been difficult for either north or south since the civil war to appreciate the manliness of the other section. Since they have fought together against a common foe they are eager to claim kinship. What commerce and self-interest has not been able to unite, war has melted together without a rift. Another generation would hardly do what a few months of war has done to destroy all signs of Mason and Dixon's line.

Imperialism means to Carl Schurz a forcible bringing together of unrelated and incompatible peoples under one government. In spite of the absorbent quality of the United States which has been tested again and again, Mr. Schurz is sure we cannot incorporate the islands of the sea. He seems to think the savagery of the islanders will dilute the quality of our own civilization rather than be mitigated by us. He does not reckon on the widening of our horizon, the enlargement of our market and the subsequent change of view in regard to intercourse with other nations. Mr. Schurz, although he lives in this country, is a Teuton. His arguments, though he may have tried to conceive them from an American standpoint, are suspected of being written from the standpoint of what is best for Germany.

Imperialism, with the establishment of any permanent governmental institutions not essentially democratic would be an inconsistent and unwise policy for a republic to adopt, but congress does not propose to establish an emperor in Manila. Instead, the United States will teach her new subjects how to govern themselves. Their incorporation will eventually be as much a matter of course and of mutual benefit as it is with any one of the forty-five states.

As to the inconsistency of the policy of expansion we have been expanding spasmodically ever since we landed on the rock of Plymouth in 1620. It would be a departure from tradition to stop now.

The Rough Riders have proved as dashing and adventurous as their name and purpose of assembling led us to expect. They have brought romance into modern life. Roosevelt is Richard Coeur de Lion starting on a crusade and his followers are knights careless of all but honor. The cowboys of the plains who joined Roosevelt's company are no less knightly than the New York club men. They gave their lives as freely at Caney and they made a joke of the fare and lodging with as courtly an indifference, but then they were all Americans and these have inherited chivalry and freedom and all that makes the English speaking nations gentle to women and not afraid to die. Roosevelt can be governor of New York if he wants to, for if we do love a lord we like a king better. Roosevelt is not afraid of his party or of combinations. He has the wit and the conceit to neglect gangs upon whom, politicians warn him, his political success