

silly enough not to renominate Governor Hughes; in Illinois Democrats have a slight chance, because of Republican strife; Massachusetts is, of course, Massachusetts. Yet these four States contain almost all of Mr. Hearst's strength. Say that he vindicates his boast of carrying Massachusetts. He will only earn Mr. Bryan's gratitude for reducing the Republican electoral vote. Even if Mr. Hearst flourishes a very heavy knife, he cannot get at Mr. Bryan's vitals. But Hearst journalism and Hearst money are mobile and resourceful. Will they not invade those central States in which Bryan contemplates a serious campaign? Cannot the National Independence party make just enough headway in Ohio, Indiana, Kansas, and Nebraska to blast whatever hopes the Democracy may cherish? The outlook for a Hearst boom there at Bryan's expense, or, for that matter, at any one's expense, is not bright. With at least three different brands of radicalism to choose from—the Taft-Roosevelt, the Bryan, and the Debs kind—the voter should scarcely be in a mood for a fourth variety, and especially one that has just been placed on the market. We can imagine, on the other hand, an old-fashioned conservative finding it impossible to vote either for Taft or for Bryan; for Bryan because he is Bryan; and for Taft because he is Roosevelt. That the conservative who cannot stand Bryan will accept Hearst is manifestly absurd. Such a vote will go to the Prohibitionists, or to no one at all. To imagine Hearst winning new ground with his radical platform more or less eclipsed by other radical platforms is very hard. We doubt, indeed, whether he can keep his strength even in his own citadels. In this State signs of dissolution in his following are abundant. A drift back to Bryan is perceptible, notably in New York city.

+ +

Difficult Division of Labor.

Puck (New York), May 6.—Hamilton Mable, he of the rhythmically-ticking mind, believes that it is all right for a man to make all the money he can, "so long as he doesn't allow the thought of it to possess his soul." Which is another case of hanging your clothes on a hickory limb and keeping away from the water.

+ + +

What, then, has forestry done in Germany? Starting with forests which were in as bad shape as many of our own which have been recklessly cut over, it raised the average yield of wood per acre from 20 cubic feet in 1830 to 65 cubic feet in 1904. During the same period of time it trebled the proportion of saw timber got from the average cut, which means, in other words, that through the practice of forestry the timberlands of Germany are of three times better quality to-day than when no system was used. And in fifty-four years it increased the money returns from an average acre of forest sevenfold. Yet to-day the forests are in better condition than ever before, and under the present system of management it is possible for the German foresters to say with absolute certainty that the high yield and large returns which the forests now give will be continued indefinitely into the future.—United States Dept. of Agriculture.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

LINES.

For The Public.

Not now is honor given
As in the times gone by,
When glory, but a bloody thing,
Was gaudy to the eye.

But now is honor given
To him whose way of gain
Can take the lives of others,
Yet leave the dead unslain;

Who by the rite of custom,
And through the law of need
Can arm his hand with progress
To force the Jungle Creed,

And in the mill and market,
And by the road and mine
Press from the brow of manhood
The tithes of corn and wine.

The tides of social marches
Bear up to crown and throne
The changed that still unchanging
Can wield the words, "I own."

W. S. ROGERS.

+ + +

CIVIL FREEDOM A UNIVERSAL RIGHT.

Professor George Bush in "Priesthood and Clergy,"
Published in 1857.

Is not every man at liberty to utter his sentiments on any subject that he deems of moment to his fellow-men, and even if those sentiments should be intrinsically erroneous or mischievous, are not the evils incident to a restraining power greater than any that could flow from the most unlimited freedom of speech? So we sometimes hear men talk about certain portions of the human race not being fit for civil freedom. But when arose the right of one portion of mankind to judge for another on that score? Does not God create all men free? How has it happened that one class of men deems itself entitled to sit in judgment on the capacity of another to enjoy the birthright with which their Creator endowed them? And how can they restrict this right without injustice and oppression? We do not of course say that all men *are* equally prepared to use civil freedom without abusing it, but we do say that this fact does not annul the original right, and that the evils of usurped coercion are greater in the final issue than those of self-asserted liberty.