

from. No party is always right, nor no party is always wrong, and right and wrong will be found with both parties. The people, as a body, honestly desire to support what is right. Why, then, is there so much contention—so much bitter party feeling? When our intentions are alike why cannot we see alike? The reason, I believe, is because we are differently informed; we draw our conclusions from our information, and our information is not the same. Our people are an intelligent people, and a reading people; but their reading is largely from party newspapers, which unfortunately are so biased that they mislead their readers. And thus their knowledge of party men and matters is drawn from an over-zealous partisan press from month to month and from year to year, until they become so prejudiced that they will believe nothing else nor hear anything else. Were we only to use a little common sense we would notice that in all other respects men of both parties are about alike. The men who support one party are about as good and intelligent as those who support the other, and if we could only get at the honest, naked truth, without coloring or distortion, we would be very likely to arrive at very nearly the same conclusion, and could with feelings of greater confidence uphold what we believed to be right and condemn what we thought wrong. But the information we can at present gather from the political press of either party is so garbled, warped and one-sided that any unprejudiced mind must receive it with great uncertainty. If we could only cast aside this party nonsense, and break loose from that partyism, with which most of us are more or less (perhaps unwittingly) affected, and work together for our common good and the good of our country, instead of in opposite directions, how much more good we could accomplish. The Grange has done some good in this respect, but much more yet remains to be accomplished; and I am happy to know there is a growing feeling of weariness and dissatisfaction with the unfair and bitterly hostile course pursued by the partisan press of this country." What the country needs then most of all is an independent press; journals that are the servants, not of party but of truth, and that in discussing any subject are willing to give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Anything less is not truth.

ARE WE ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

A WRITER has said that there is "a profound popular distrust of the courage and sagacity of the educated man;" "he is thought to be an idler or a drone, a superfluity, if not a burden upon the great body politic." Dynamite outrages fill the world with horror, blatant anarchists strive to adjust the relations of capital and trade by unlawful and forcible means; but the educated man, instead of practically going to work to reform, contents himself with theories of no utility, and, leaving the work to fiery demagogues, "lifts a panic cry of communism and sinks paralyzed with horror." Strong drink slays its tens of thousands, debauchery drags into its mire the votaries of

pleasure; but the educated class leaves the work of reclaiming to Salvation Armies and ignorant enthusiasts as the "English establishment left the preaching of regeneration to Methodists in fields and barns." They sit idle aloft, as do Carlyle's "Landed," "like living statues, in pampered isolation from the glorious fateful battle-field of this God's-World."

There seems to be something in intellectual advancement incompatible with practical, every-day talent.

"Men strive to *know* too much, to *do* little."

Those who have shown great ability in their sayings and writings have proved incapable of acting upon their own conclusions. Their own views are broad and they reason deeply on human affairs, but they feel themselves lost in every actual emergency, and

"the native hue of resolution,

Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Lord Bacon, who was at once the "wisest" and "the meanest of men," was a striking example of this. Though he had a marvellous insight into human nature and was one of the most sagacious of men in his study, yet he stooped to actions whose impropriety no one could have more clearly shown. Adam Smith taught the nations economy, yet could not manage that of his own house. Johnson said of Goldsmith that no man was wiser when he had a pen in his hand, or more foolish when he had not. Says a French writer, in a free translation: "Neither Bacon, nor Shakespeare, nor Molière, nor Pascal, nor Tasso, nor Dante, would have made a great figure in a revolution. They would have seen too much, comprehended too much, doubted too much, feared too much, suffered too much, foreseen too much, and disdained too much."

Does this order of things still prevail? Are we, the educated class, striving for the educational reform demanded by the exigencies of the times, the rapid strides in invention and discovery and the outgoing in the line of social and industrial progress? Should we carry our intellectual culture to such a degree that we become good for nothing but preservation in "cotton-wool and cologne" as specimens of what the most approved system of education can do? Is not the end of life to be and do rather than to brood over what others have been and done? Is it not better for us to theorize less and work more, to hold less aloof from the world notwithstanding Wordsworth says:

"The world is too much with us?"

The experience gained from books however valuable, is knowledge; but the experience gained from actual life is wisdom; and

"Knowledge and wisdom far from being one,
Have oft times no connection. Knowledge dwells
In heads replete with thoughts of other men;
Wisdom in minds attentive to their own.
Knowledge a rude, unprofitable mass;
The mere materials with which wisdom builds.
Knowledge is proud that he has learned so much;
Wisdom is humble that he knows no more."

That command of old, "Know thyself," cannot be too