

the matter to arbitrators to be appointed under legal authority, where witnesses could be compelled to attend and submit to examination under oath; he offered to forfeit one thousand dollars if he failed to make good his charges and placed in the hands of the Mayor of Lincoln a certified check for that amount, the proceeds of which were to be devoted to any religious or charitable institution which Mr. Thompson might designate in case he failed to convince the arbitrators of the truth of the charges which he had published; Thompson to withdraw as a candidate for United States senator in case the charges were established. An innocent man would never have permitted such an opportunity for vindication to escape. The acceptance of that challenge and his vindication before the arbitrators, if vindication was possible, meant more to D. E. Thompson than all the "tired mother" excursions, than all the house-top charity in which he has ever indulged. He declined the challenge. Why? There can be but one answer. Because he feared to meet his accuser in a tribunal where he could be compelled to answer under oath; because he dared not face the witnesses who would be called to establish the fact of his proffered perfidy to the republican party. Would an innocent man have declined such an opportunity of forever silencing imputations upon his character and integrity which had been rife since the day that Senator Hayward was elected. Three incentives to the acceptance of the challenge presented themselves; first, the opportunity of a complete vindication if guiltless; second, the opportunity to deprive his accuser of one thousand dollars if innocent; and third, the opportunity of bestowing that thousand dollars upon some religious or charitable organization which he should designate. No man likes better than D. E. Thompson to distribute charity when it is widely advertised and amply fertilized with promise of profit to him; and yet he declined this opportunity. Is guilt or innocence to be inferred from such refusal? Eliminate the sworn statements of Messrs. Allen, Schwind, and Haingrove, and rest the matter upon the action of this man when challenged to submit his alleged action to judicial investigation, and who can doubt his offer to betray the party whose candidate he now claims to be? Brief as his political career has been, it is long enough to show that his political depravity has tried public patience too long.

When put to the test of party loyalty Mr. Thompson miserably failed; he has never proven his loyalty to his country because occasion has not arisen, but when he shall be called to decide between his native country and his personal interest what will his action be? His property interests are principally in Mexico where he is said to possess a valuable improved landed estate of upwards of thirty-two thousand acres, operated by peon labor. The Mexican peonage system of quasi slavery suits Mr. Thompson because in its practical operation it permits him to exercise almost unlimited power over the laborers on his hacienda. If complications should arise between this government and Mexico, and the senate, with Mr. Thompson as a member from Nebraska, should be called upon to act, is it to be supposed that he could be induced to sacrifice any personal interest in order to support an administrative policy which might admittedly be for the best interest of the nation? Where his treasure, his hacienda, is, there his heart will be also. Are there not men competent to represent Nebraska in the

United States senate whose property interests are not principally within the jurisdiction of a foreign government with which this government may possibly come in conflict.

Not only his loyalty to party and country are endorsed, but also the "splendid character" of Mr. Thompson. Opposition to this man has been very largely confined to his political action and methods, but when he induces public bodies to parade his character it becomes a proper matter of comment so far as its real nature is illuminated by his acts which are matters of common notoriety or public record. In November, 1897, the city of Lincoln employed a young man, George J. McArthur, whose duty it was to inspect buildings and property using water furnished by the city from its water system, for the purpose of ascertaining if the city was receiving its just dues from consumers of city water. Mr. McArthur reported to the city council that after a careful inspection of the Brace block at 1501 O street he found the water turned on at the stop box and immediately inside the front wall and connected with the well pump and pipes running through the entire building. The ledger showed no payments for water for more than two years. The schedule rate was \$214 per year. The property known as the Brace block was at that time under the control if not in fact owned by D. E. Thompson. The next day after this report was published Mr. McArthur was taken to the office of Thompson in the Brace block and, as reported in a newspaper at the time, when in the office Thompson applied to this public employe, whose sole offense was that he had faithfully performed his duty, the most approbrious epithets, using the most profane language at his command. Thereupon McArthur filed with the police judge his complaint charging Thompson with assault and with using language tending to provoke an assault by applying to the complaining party grossly vile and insulting epithets. The records in the office of the police judge show that a warrant for the arrest of Thompson was issued, that he was arrested, and upon a plea of guilty of using the language complained of, entered by his attorney, was fined five dollars and costs and ordered committed until the fine and costs were paid; that he paid the fine and was released. If there had been at the Brace block a misappropriation of city water, using it without paying for it, applying profane language and insulting epithets to the city employe who discovered and reported the facts hardly compensated the city for the loss it had sustained; it was not, to many people, satisfactory evidence of the innocence of the responsible party. If there had been no such misappropriation the course pursued by Mr. Thompson can hardly be supposed to have furnished to an injured man an adequate remedy. Will people generally infer innocence or guilt from such conduct? There may be, in fact it appears there are to be found those who are willing to endorse the character of such a man as "splendid," but to the honor of the organization in whose name the endorsement was published, the number participating in the endorsement was small compared with the entire membership. It is no pleasant task to unveil this man's real character, but he makes it a public duty when he produces testimony of its value. It is no light thing that a man, wholly unfit to occupy the position, shall aspire to a high and honorable place where he may be said to represent the people of a great and an intelligent common-

wealth. This man's candidacy is in and of himself alone. The republicans of this state do not want him as their representative in the United States senate. He is pursuing the same tactics now that he pursued two years ago; he has a large number of men who continually assert that now he has enough members of the legislature pledged in his interest to elect him. That song was sung with monotonous repetition during the senatorial contest of 1896, but of sixty-seven votes necessary to an election he was never able to secure twenty. In that contest he placed his political reputation upon a gibbet of infamy and it will take something more than a panegyric from a small minority of the Union Veterans Republican Club to take it down.

Maude Adams in L'Aiglon.

Playing the same play that Sarah Bernhardt is playing and playing it in the same city simultaneously is what Maude Adams is doing. The most unsparing and exacting dramatic critic admits that she is presenting the Eaglet as Rostand conceived him, that the peculiar pathos and isolation of the persecuted grandson whose father is exiled and in prison is apparent in Maude Adams' interpretation and absent from Mademoiselle Bernhardt's. Sardou's brilliant, showy plays have rendered Bernhardt unfit, in her old age to play the poetic parts written by Rostand. Sardou is melodramatic, never poetic. Rostand is always poetic. Sardou's are tragedies of the outside world. Rostand's are tragedies of the heart and inner life. The brilliant Sarah's technique is a trifle hard and rigid and I find myself thinking of the brilliancy of her performance and not moved at all by the agony of a woman whose lover is being tortured and whose screams she can hear. Contrariwise Maude Adams is not brilliant. She has no technique that I can remember but she conveys emotion by the same subtle, indistinguishable means adopted by Mrs. Fiske. It is of the spirit, spiritual and of literature, literary. Maude Adams has long been an idol and her latest New York triumph is a source of congratulation in this office, where no other sacred Ibis is quite so sacred.

A Midsummer Night's Dream.

Shakspeare's plays were written by an actor who understood the opportunities of the stage. He was a poet, a statesman, a novelist, the most competent student of human nature, a lover of his kind, a preacher and a prophet, but first of all he was a playwright with an actor's knowledge of stage effects. In the reading, the literary beauties of *Midsummer Night's Dream*; the poetry the airy inconsequence of the sprites, and the fairy story are most apparent. In the reading, Quince and his company and the play in the play of *Pyramus and Thisbe* are rather tiresome interruptions of the fairy story. On the stage, *Pyramus and Thisbe*, and the carpenters, joiners, and other craftsmen that play lover, loved, the wall the lion and scenery are welcome and enhance the scene of the tryst naturally. For his lack of pedantry and his continuing reiteration of the clown's or rustic place among courtiers and fine ladies and gentlemen Shakspeare is a model for the Andrew Lang people who consider only well-read associates as artistic properties worth their while. Kathryn Kidder and Louis James have assembled a large company and a quantity of electric scenery all ready to be connected with local power. In the moonlight, where Titania sleep

on a bank of wild thyme, the heart of the peonies dully glow while Oberon sings of his love. At an earlier stage of the development of electricity, before signs of Pansy's pills and soaps were strung all over the country and lighted up at night, there was something fascinating in the Faust duel where Valentine's sword and Faust's struck real flames in contact. But there is no illusion now and the sparks and winking lights suggests somewhat too obviously the man at the switch-board. Nevertheless if the play were not put on with the aid of the latest electric illusions, Miss Kidder and Mr. James might be accused of parsimony and of neglecting the latest inventions for making a *Midsummer Night's Dream* more real.

Authors are touchy about a change of text. If Shakspeare could hear his lovely lines mouthed and ruined by the men and women who read his lines today he would be very unhappy. They rattle them off with a huckster's unintelligibility. For all the poetry, romance, literature, inspiration of the lines they might as well have been written by Hoyt. Miss Kidder and Mr. James respect their author and were willing to share honors with him. A very attentive hearer could hear most of what they said. Puck's lines are of especial beauty, but the very graceful young woman who looked the part, did not speak it. She might as well have spoken Hindostanee to us as the hoarse gurgles she used for Puck's dialogue. A laugh is the same in all languages and hers, revealed more than her lines the mischievous impishness of Puck. The presentation as a whole, with Mendelssohn's music is very charming and interesting and fully deserves the approbation Miss Kidder and Mr. James are receiving.

Babs the Impossible.

Sarah Grand's use of what for lack of a better word, I call the supernatural, is interesting, but so far as my own experience goes, as illicit as the introduction of genii to transport ones characters from place to place. True, Scheherazade used genii and such like fairy-tale properties, and her stories are more widely read than any modern novelist's. But new rules have been adopted by the association of writers since her time and the public insists on obedience. Scheherazade was trying, so the story goes, to amuse a bloodthirsty old Sultan who, to insure his consort's faithfulness cut off her head, the day after he married her and in the afternoon on the same day married another. Scheherazade invented the continued story, and never ended a story in the morning. She also invented the device of a chain of stories, as for instance: the first old man's story, the second old man's story etc. The Sultan knew nothing about veritas, Veritas had nothing to do with his court or harem. He believed that he himself was descended from a powerful supernatural being. So Scheherazade had not to convince an incredulous audience. But Mrs. Grand lives in the time of laboratories and of Darwin and all fairy aid is the performance of tasks forbidden by the rules and by the habits and principles of thought of the men of this century. Yet Babs Grand is repeating directions to her stage is uncertain what to do next, she obeys the voices and is guided on her good judgment. In the Cadanhouse, an exalted room Babs rejects only to make another woman by proposing to her. The play is by Babs going off to the moonlight, where Titania sleep