

interest in it were convinced of the importance of direct legislation.

Questions were sent to the candidates asking them if elected whether they would vote for the proposed measure. Answers were received in the affirmative from 20 per cent. of the candidates, and the rest did not answer, except in one case where a candidate answered no. This candidate was not elected. During the heat of the election period little was done besides writing letters to the newspapers, which are thought to have produced considerable effect.

The measure was introduced in the Senate by a Republican. After its introduction Mr. J. Z. White was asked to make a special visit and address the members of the legislature on the subject. An appointment was made, and Mr. White addressed both Houses just after one of the sessions, making an address of about 15 minutes. All members seem to have been pleased with what he said, and many expressed regret that he did not speak longer.

Following this, the bill was brought to a vote. It passed the Senate by 11 yeas to 4 nays. One of the Representatives who was known to be favorable to the measure, also a Republican, was asked to look after the bill in the House. The bill was brought before the House and was passed unanimously. It may be said, however, that the best friend the measure had in the Senate, and, in fact, in the legislature, was one of the Democratic Senators, and it was at his suggestion that a Republican Senator was asked to introduce it. Care was taken all along not to make it a Democratic party measure.

The Governor having, much to his honor, signed the bill, what remains to be done is to create a sufficient interest in direct legislation between now and the next general election, about 18 months hence, to insure a general popular vote in its favor.

Ways and means of accomplishing this end have been carefully considered, but plans have not as yet been definitely formulated. In general, the following observations may be made. It is a mistake to assume that men of the leading classes are opposed to democratic ideas. Such an assumption frequently has the effect of making them oppose those ideas when under normal conditions they would not. It is very easy to associate democratic ideas with agitations distasteful to persons brought up as they are. As a rule, the great average of these people will adopt anything which is the fashion, and it is just as easy by proper management to make a democratic reform fashionable as not. At any rate it is well to repeat that it is altogether unnecessary and of no advantage whatever to excite their opposition.

When it came to the actual work to be done, it was found that the only persons who would go into it and do anything were single tax men, and perhaps one or two socialists. But contributions could be obtained from almost anyone with the usual difficulties.

F. I. DU PONT.

NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, June 10.

Norway and Sweden.

Since Norway's declaration dissolving her union with Sweden (p. 150), voluminous news dispatches have been cabled from both countries, but they have reported little but gossip and rumors. The future relations of the two countries are still unsettled and doubtful.

One specific event in furtherance of the dissolution occurred on the 9th. The Norwegians formally substituted for the union flag, the distinctive flag of Norway. At Akershus fort, Christiana, the ceremony of lowering the union flag which had floated there since 1814 and running up the Norwegian tri-color, was attended and applauded by 30,000 people, including the members of the Norwegian Storting.

Another event of significance was an informal declaration by the Swedish prime minister, published at Stockholm on the 12th, that the Swedish government will refuse to recognize the independence of Norway, and that motions to this effect will be submitted to the Swedish Diet when it meets in extraordinary session. This indication of the probable attitude of the Swedish government was confirmed on the 13th in a formal announcement by King Oscar in the nature of a defense, in which he said:

It remains for Sweden and for me as king of the union to decide whether the attack by Norway on the existing union shall lead to the legal dissolution of that union.

It was further confirmed by the publication, also on the 13th, of the following official circular which had been sent to all the Swedish and Norwegian consuls representing the union abroad:

After the Norwegian Storting had established a provisional government for Norway and in connection therewith declared the union with Sweden dissolved, the Swedish government decided not to recognize said provisional government. You are therefore instructed to continue the exercise of the functions constitutionally devolving on you as Swedish as well as Norwegian consuls, with this restriction, that you must not enter into communication with the illegal Norwegian government or obey its orders. In all emergencies you must apply to the ministry of foreign affairs for instructions.

Protests against recognition of Norway were filed by Sweden about the same date, with foreign nations. The King had already, on the 9th, refused to receive an official deputation from Norway. His telegraphic reply to the president of the Norwegian Storting was as follows:

As I do not recognize the revolutionary steps which the Storting in violation of the constitution and act of union and in revolt against its king has unfortunately taken, I decline to receive the deputation.

Russia.

The Zemstvo congress in illegal session last week at Moscow (p. 151) has adopted an address to the Czar, which, though suppressed in the regular newspapers of Russia by orders of the police, has been privately circulated throughout Russia, and parts of it have gone abroad in news dispatches. It is said to be a long document, describing the danger of the present situation both in foreign and in domestic affairs, condemning the bureaucracy, warning the Czar that the police are preventing the truth from reaching him, and petitioning as follows:

Sire, before it is too late for the welfare of Russia, command a convocation of representatives of the nation, elected by equal franchise, and let these elected representatives decide with you the vital question of war or peace, thus transforming the war into a national one. Let them establish an agreement with you, a renovated national organization.

A deputation of ten delegates, headed by Count Hayden and Mr. Shipoff, was appointed by the congress to present the address to the Czar. No indication of its presentation has yet been reported, although some dispatches mentioned the 13th as the day on which the Czar had agreed to re-

ceive the deputation provided a certain obnoxious member were withdrawn.

The congress which adopted this address is the second of its kind—a gathering of official representatives of the Zemstvos (or provincial legislatures) of the whole Empire of Europe. At the first congress (vol. vii, p. 535) there appears to have been a split between the conservative liberals, led by Shipoff, and the radicals, the former objecting to a direct ballot and manhood suffrage for selecting delegates to a national assembly. In consequence of this split the second congress was called by Shipoff for the purpose, as an intelligent student of Russian affairs puts it, "of presenting to the government what may be called the irreducible minimum of reform and elaborating a practical and expedient method of electing the first national assembly."

The Russian-Japanese War.

Rumors of skirmishes in Manchuria following the Japanese naval victory (p. 150) have given rise to inferences of a general movement of the Japanese land forces; and on the 14th it was reported from St. Petersburg that the Russian war ministry then believed that a general engagement of the opposing armies had begun. There is nothing yet, however, to confirm this conjecture.

Overtures for terminating the war have been made to both Russia and Japan by President Roosevelt. Immediately after the Japanese naval victory (p. 150) Mr. Roosevelt caused diplomatic inquiries to be made with reference to the spirit in which overtures for peace would be received from him. Intimations having been returned from both belligerents that such overtures would be received in a friendly spirit, he sent to each, through diplomatic channels on the 8th, the following dispatch:

The President feels that the time has come when in the interest of all mankind he must endeavor to see if it is not possible to bring to an end the terrible and lamentable conflict now being waged. With both Russia and Japan the United States has inherited ties of friendship and good will. It

hopes for the prosperity and welfare of each, and it feels that the progress of the world is set back by the war between these two great nations. The President accordingly urges the Russian and Japanese governments, not only for their own sakes but in the interest of the whole civilized world, to open direct negotiations for peace with one another. The President suggests that these peace negotiations be conducted directly and exclusively between the belligerents; in other words, that there may be a meeting of Russian and Japanese plenipotentiaries or delegates without any intermediary, in order to see if it is not possible for these representatives of the two Powers to agree to terms of peace. The President earnestly asks that the [in one dispatch Russian, in the other Japanese] government do now agree to such a meeting and is asking the [in one dispatch Japanese, in the other Russian] government likewise to agree. While the President does not feel that any intermediary should be called in in respect to the peace negotiations themselves, he is entirely willing to do what he properly can if the two powers concerned feel that his services will be of aid in arranging the preliminaries as to the time and place of meeting. But if even these preliminaries can be arranged directly between the two Powers, or in any other way, the President will be glad, as his sole purpose is to bring about a meeting, which the whole civilized world will pray may result in peace.

At Washington on the 12th it was announced semi-officially that both Russia and Japan had accepted President Roosevelt's suggestion in principle, and that plenipotentiaries would be appointed, but neither answer was given out for publication, it being explained that no good purpose could be served thereby. The Russian statement, given out at St. Petersburg on the 13th, explains that the Czar's reply to President Roosevelt's dispatch, after expressing concurrence of opinion "on a general settlement so essential to the good progress of the whole of mankind," declared:

As for an eventual meeting of Russian and Japanese plenipotentiaries charged with ascertaining how far it would be possible for the two Powers to elaborate conditions of peace, the Imperial government would have no objection in principle to such an attempt if the Japanese government expressed a desire therefor.

At that time no communication on the the subject had been received by Russia from Japan.

A Christian Science Explanation.

In the United States, one of the notable events of the week is a message from Mary Baker G. Eddy to the organization of which she is founder and head, the Christian Scientists. It was published on the eve of the annual meeting of this organization at Boston, by the Boston Herald of the 11th, and purported to be a final message to her followers, in the form of a catechism. It is as follows:

Is Christian Science a new religion? Yes, a new old religion and Christianity.

Does it stand in relation to Christianity as Christianity did to Judaism? Somewhat.

Are you an interpreter of Jesus' teachings or have you presented that which is new to his teaching? An interpreter thereof.

Is the text book of Christian Science the word of God in the same sense as the Bible is? All truth is of God, and Christian Science is eternal truth, demonstrable, based on a fixed principle and rules, and is susceptible of proof.

Is "Science and Health, a Key to the Scriptures," a fulfillment of the New Testament promises of a latter day revelation? It is.

Is Christian Science in antagonism to natural science? No, not to natural spiritual science. There is no material science.

Does it (Christian Science) discourage the study of natural science or any portion of it? It is gained by study and rightness.

Does it (Christian Science) deny the existence of disease germs or merely assert man's superiority over such forces? It denies the existence thereof.

Does Christian Science expect its followers to live immediately as though entirely spiritualized beings? No.

Is it proper for a Christian Scientist to disregard the laws of hygiene or to merely disregard them if circumstances make it necessary? To disregard all that denies the allness of God spirit and his laws.

May the Christian Scientist make use of physical culture, use especially nutritive foods, or make use of fresh air treatment as aids to physical well being? No, not necessarily.

Under any conceivable circumstances would a Christian Scientist make use of surgery? Yes, and no.

In case of infectious diseases, would a Christian Scientist yield himself to the customary treatment of isolation and disinfection? If the law demands it, yes.

Does a Christian Scientist regard poverty as a manifestation of disease? No.