

sities, that out of these universities come many voices that speak and fear not, that out of these universities comes much of the best reasoned and most powerful advocacy of the control or regulation of public franchises, and for reform of the conditions which breed monopoly and plutocracy, and much of the best resistance to social and economic fallacies that have cheated and betrayed in other times, and yet seem new and praiseworthy to a class of newspapers which have faith only in the omnipotence of their own conclusions, and to a class of politicians who seem to believe that a plurality in the ward can overturn the decrees of Divine Providence. The universities of the United States are producing a body of social and economic literature that must be very influential in determining courses of public policy, and the more of the students trained under these sound and progressive economic thinkers we can get into journalism the better for the press and the better for the people.

There is a growing opinion that the press ought to be in very responsible hands, and perhaps a disposition to exaggerate its faults and follies, and undervalue its inestimable work for the moral and material welfare of mankind. We have got far away from the old notion that there was a touch of infallibility in the utterances of a public journal; but we must recognize that it is still possible for a sensational press in times of unrest, when the public temper is eager and the popular mind distressed and disturbed, to raise the furies in a community and effect grave national and international mischiefs. It is powerful to build and create, but, perhaps, not less powerful to pull down and destroy. Hence there is, under conditions of settled opinion, an increasing demand that the press shall show capacity for self-discipline, that it shall exhibit something like the self-restraint of a prudent and responsible statesmanship, and shall deal wisely and warily with questions that threaten a country's domestic peace or imperil its international relationships. Nowhere is the press more mischievous than in the realm of international affairs. In no other field is the press more powerful. It is the servant of intriguing diplomats, the mouthpiece of ambitious Ministers; it lashes popular opinion into fury, forces free Parliaments to bow to the opinion it has created. It is the screaming devil of France. Vulgar, scurrilous, venomous and ugly, it has no regard for private character, no respect for high office, no sense of public responsibility, no appreciation of the delicacy of international relationships. Bodley, borrowing from one of the best of the French journals the statement that electoral literature under the Third Republic is "abject." He declares that there "a political opponent is not, as in countries where the Parliamentary system is a tradition, a fellow creature to be treated with respect and even cordiality in the intervals of party battles, but a dangerous monster to be exterminated." He puts among the reasons which keep capable men out of the Legislature in France, quoting high authority for his statement, "the abject character of electioneering literature, in which a candidate finds every intimate detail of his private life lampooned, and so has to retaliate with like poisoned weapons; the unedifying coarseness of journalistic polemics, which is not attenuated even in the rare cases where a candidate is an Academician." We do better than this in Canada; but here, too, we have

our share of bitterness, of violence, of unnecessary personal attack, and of deliberate misrepresentation of men's words and motives in order to serve the ends of party or the business interests of rival newspapers.

Anglo-Saxons everywhere rejoice to-day over the extraordinary growth of good feeling between Great Britain and the United States. No other international development of our time promises so much for the peace of the world, and for all the good ends of humanity and civilization. It is to the honor of the press of Great Britain that this great reconciliation was nobly and splendidly promoted by its foremost writers, as well as by the statesmen at Westminster. We cannot say as much for the press of this continent, neither on this side of the border nor on the other. There is more of the spirit of statesmanship, more of moderation, more of restraint, more of that sober calm and steadfast courage which become men who labor with world-wide issues and carry world-wide responsibilities in the press of Great Britain than in any other press in the world. Even there, however, if Lord Salisbury were less the steady, stalwart and staunchly immovable figure that he is, Great Britain would have been hurried into a premature war with Russia. He was forced to stand "four square to all the winds that blew," even against the press of his own party, in order to save the world's peace and avert a tragedy that would have brought this splendid century to its close in blood and ruin. Bismarck used a subservient press to make mischief all over Europe, to further the secret aims of an insidious statecraft, and to promote at any cost his imperial designs for the creation, the unification and the consolidation of the German Empire. Most of us believe that final good will come out of the destruction of Spanish power in Cuba and in the Philippines, that in those islands freedom and progress will take the place of servitude and reaction, and that, next to the British Empire, the free Republic of the United States is, to employ Lord Rosebery's term, the secular agency in the world best worth preserving. But there have been more admirable things than the spirit in which a great part of the press of the United States drove the republic on to that war, and we may feel sure that the story of American rule in the new possessions of the republic will read better to future generations of Americans than the story of the methods by and the conditions under which those possessions were acquired. One wonders why such sober-minded statesmen as Mr. James Bryce, and such brilliant journalists as Mr. Massingham, of *The London Chronicle*, who gave their hearty assent to the war against Spain, should express such stern doubt as to the necessity of the war in South Africa. If, in the first case, they could give the benefit of the doubt to the United States, surely, in the second, they could give the benefit of the doubt to Great Britain. In the calm judgment of the historian very few of the wars, even of the last half century, were either just or necessary. But in all of these wars the press drove on the nations to the combat, and, necessarily, was the eager ally of the combatants. For this last attitude one should perhaps be slow to censure. When war is on, the patriot holds up his flag and gives his heart and his prayer to the armies of his country.

(CONCLUDING PORTION IN NEXT ISSUE.)