

with ball. The shooting of Courtright was unfortunate; but in no way did it militate against the firm wisdom of Colonel Bloodgood in refusing to palter with riot. It was a strange coincidence that the wounded man, when filling a useful place in society, had been the colonel's brother-in-law, and that they had been friends and college classmates. A painful thing for Colonel Bloodgood, that these former relations with the turbulent agitator should become a matter of public comment, through the pure chance of his regrettable but necessary military action; but Colonel Bloodgood's conscience could not fail to acquit him of blame in the premises. Justification was to be found in the fact of the restored quiet, and the resumption of traffic. All the papers spoke of this resumption of traffic as our forefathers would have referred to the taking up of some sacred practice, like the resumption of public worship after the removal of an interdict.

The *Observer's* story, that the strike had been settled by Courtright, and that he had met his death in trying to convey the news to the commander of the troops, was laughed at as a fake. And no one knew that he was murdered in malice at the command of an enemy, who knew when he gave it that the strike and the necessity of an appeal to force was over. That was a thing quite impossible of belief, even when the story was published that Courtright had written a note to Colonel Bloodgood, asking him to delay the movement of the troops, and apprising him of the fact that Courtright's presence along the line of march would mean that the strike was called off. The *Observer*, it is true, said that some one in