

ing to state pride when the university catalog announces that freshmen in the Nebraska university have passed the same examination offered to applicants for admission to Ann Arbor and Princeton. The national standing of the university would be lowered if the entrance examinations were made to fit the actual educational conditions in Nebraska and without reference to what other universities exact. But in building from the ground on a solid foundation there are substantial advantages. In order to fit the public school scholars for the university, which is only the last and the highest four grades of the public school system, more work is assigned to each grade than its average pupil is capable of performing well. The lack of sincerity in the school curriculum, its variety and the consequent hurry and superficiality of the training produce just the sort of pupil who without knowledge of, or practice in good English, applies for admission into the state university. Their general education being what is called finished at the state university, they erect a legal, medical or commercial career on the shaky foundation built for them by the public schools under the stimulating influence of the university. Thus it happens that the court must contend with ambiguous legal papers, and that all sorts of misleading communications and documents drawn up by young gentlemen to whom Nebraska has given her most munificent gift, are daily annoyances of commercial intercourse.

When a great university like the one in Chicago begins to perceive that her alumni do not think or write lucidly or spell correctly, there is some hope that the unnatural system may be corrected. And in time, of course, the Baconian method of making a school system conform to the needs and capacities of the scholar, instead of crowding the scholar into the system, may appeal to the Nebraska educators who have induced school boards to bring high schools into the accredited list, without regard to the overwhelming majority who never go beyond the high school grade and without regard to the educational needs and conditions of a new state.

Mr. Thompson and His Plain Letter.

D. E. Thompson has written and is circulating a "plain letter" evidently called for by the prevalent belief that his action after being defeated in the senatorial caucus which nominated M. L. Hayward was such as to call for the defeat of the legislative nominees in this county pledged or instructed to support him for the senate. By way of excuse for putting forth his letter he therein says: "I make it that those who are seeking the truth, and the success of the republican party, may know the facts." He would leave the impression that the truth relative to the facts may be found in his letter. The value of Mr. Thompson's statement, the credit that is to be given to his word can be best determined by facts. In an affidavit sworn to on the 5th day of last June and published in the Journal on the 10th of last June E. E. Hairgrove swears with reference to the signature of Thompson being attached to the proposal which it has been repeatedly charged that he signed, as follows: "I am well acquainted with the signature of D. E. Thompson and know that the signature to that paper was the signature of D. E. Thompson." With reference to the same affidavit of Mr. Hairgrove Mr. Thompson in his letter says: "One republican, a Mr. Hairgrove, a lobbyist, who

was much opposed to me in the last campaign, made an affidavit that he believed it was my signature." Why does this man over his signature write that Hairgrove swore he believed the signature to the agreement was Thompson's? The searcher after truth will hunt long before he find an appreciable quantity in Mr. Thompson's "plain letter."

"Wan Women."

Mr. Bryan said in a just-before election speech to a yelling, interrogative, just-before-election crowd, that as he traveled up and down and across America, he had noticed what a lot of wan faced women there were. He attributed their wanness to a republican administration. The poor, wan women in the crowd he was addressing at that time were doubtless encouraged to believe, that when Bryan was president all the conditions which make women pale, such as the constant care of a brood of children and incessant house work, would be changed. Women under a Bryan administration, they inferred, would not age nor stale with time. Bryan alone, of all presidential candidates, that ever ran, is willing to promise to change woman's woe to gladness. His promises read like the confident ones of the traveling patent medicine fakir, but as there are hopeless ones who believe the latter and buy his bread pills, so these wan women, suffering from one knows not what predisposition to melancholy or real misery cheered Mr. Bryan and longed to vote for a man who could promise so much so prettily.

The Western Woman Voter.

The statement that women do not vote where the state constitutions permit them the privilege is disproved by the facts in the case. Some prophet who is the author of a long article upon the history of female suffrage in the four states where it has been tried says:

"Very few of the western women take much interest in politics, and not more than fifty per cent of the female vote of these four states will go to the polls this year." The reason, he alleges, is that "the novelty has worn off."

Nearly every paper in the United States has repeated in substance his prediction and the belief obtains that women in the west take very little interest in politics. In Wyoming women have had full suffrage for thirty-one years. The novelty might be supposed to have worn off there if anywhere. Yet the official statement of the Wyoming secretary of state says that at the last presidential election ninety per cent of the women voted. In Colorado, not long ago, a joint resolution was passed by an almost unanimous vote of both houses of the legislature declaring, among other things, that ever since the suffrage was granted, women have exercised the privilege as generally as men." Governor Frank Steunenberg of Idaho says in a recent article in Harper's Bazar that the women cast forty per cent of the total vote of that state at the last elections, and that their vote promises to increase.

Any one who has been reading in the newspapers from day to day the accounts of the enthusiastic crowds of men and women that have greeted both Roosevelt and Bryan in the enfranchised states will hardly believe that "very few of these western women," whether democrats or republicans, "take very much interest in politics."

I claim to know just as much about women from a life-long association

and from identity of sex as this discredited prophet, who says that "not more than fifty per cent of the female vote in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and Idaho will go to the polls this year, because the novelty has worn off." The novelty never wears off of politics for woman whether she is free to vote for the officers who administer the taxes she pays or not. In England the women who go about to the borough meetings are pelted with stale vegetables and eggs, but that does not weaken their enthusiasm. Women are more emotional than men and that sort of opposition only intensifies whatever opinions and personal preferences they hold. Neither one party nor the other need convince itself that the women of these western states will not vote. To a woman, they will vote and they will stand in line for hours if necessary in order to deposit their ballots. I have not seen nor heard of a woman from Colorado who does not intend to vote. My acquaintances and those of others who possess friends in Colorado are not remarkable. They represent the average female resident of Colorado. Utah is the only western state that possesses a unique female population and the plural wives are meeker than the lone mistress of one heart, and will vote as their Mormon husband directs. He will get his barem out because Utah is peculiarly and very closely related to politics.

No one who has attended state and national federations can have the least doubt that women are interested in politics. They are intensely interested in the issues involved and in the candidates. There are no neutrals. Every delegate takes one side or the other openly and with a conviction indelible. The large proportion of female saints in the calendar suggests the tendencies of women to take sides and die for her choice or faith. She is just as willing now to die for a platform and the incarnate representative of it as she was five hundred years ago to be burnt alive for the doctrine of the Trinity or for the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Imperialism.

Mr. C. O. Whedon has issued a pamphlet on "Mr. Bryan and His Platform," some parts of which for their timeliness and for their concrete replies to the vague, oratorical accusations of Mr. Bryan are herewith reprinted:

Upon the subject of "Imperialism" and "The Consent of the Governed," Mr. Bryan expresses himself thus in his platform:

"We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny, and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic. We hold that the constitution follows the flag."

Imperialism then consists in imposing upon any people a government to which they do not consent, a government of force. If this is a correct definition of imperialism it has existed here from the beginning and the complaint against it comes too late to be effective. When our ancestors purchased Louisiana from France did they obtain the consent of the inhabitants of that territory? No. Thomas Jefferson was president when that purchase by which 1,171,931 square miles of territory was added to the national domain was made. He bought the territory and the treaty by which the purchase was evidenced provided that the inhabitants of the

ceded territory should be incorporated into the union of United States. Was their consent to such incorporation asked? Never. History records that the people of Louisiana were opposed to the transfer and that in New Orleans many wept when they saw the flag to which they had rendered allegiance pulled down. Suppose Jefferson had waited for the consent of the governed before acquiring Louisiana, when would the state of Nebraska, carved out of the Louisiana purchase, have furnished a presidential candidate? Having concluded the purchase of Louisiana without waiting or caring for the consent of the governed, President Jefferson on the 31st day of October, 1803, approved an act of congress which gave him imperial power over the newly acquired territory. That act is to be found in the second volume of the United States statutes at large, page 245. It authorized the president to take possession of the newly acquired territory and to maintain order therein to employ any part of the army and navy of the United States or of the militia authorized by the act of March 1st of that year. The act provided that until the expiration of that session of congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the territory should sooner be made, by congress, all the military, civic and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of that territory should be vested in such persons and exercised in such manner as the president should direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

What greater power could be conferred upon an emperor than all the military, civil and judicial powers of a government? Jefferson derived none of these powers from the governed nor did he acquire them by their consent. They were conferred upon him by congress and without any carping about "imperialism" or the "consent of the governed," that man who wrote the Declaration Independence accepted these powers and exercised them.

When we acquired Florida by the treaty of February, 1819, and thereby added to the national domain 56,268 square miles of territory, the president sent Andrew Jackson to occupy the country and to make and execute laws for the government of the inhabitants; was the consent of the governed asked or solicited? Not at all. We never sought nor obtained the consent of the Mexicans to the annexation of the 600,000 square miles of territory acquired from Mexico. Upon the people of that territory we imposed a government of force and when they revolted and murdered the governor appointed over them by President Polk, the army inflicted severe and merited punishment without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth.

The 577,390 square miles of Alaskan territory we purchased from Russia for \$7,200,000 and we never thought to enquire whether the people consented to the government which we imposed upon them or not.

And now we have acquired from Spain by the treaty of Paris 119,868 square miles of territory for \$20,000,000. So great a bargain, so valuable an acquisition that Mr. Bryan's duty to his country, as he viewed it, impelled him to resign his commission as commander of the Third Nebraska, then about to embark for Cuba, and hasten to Washington to exert his influence in favor of the ratification of the treaty. That treaty contained this clause.

"The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of