

pliance with its provisions is entailing heavy expense on railroads, as a large proportion of the rolling stock in use at the time the law was passed required remodeling to make the draw-bars the proper height. Many roads have not yet made the needed changes in their cars and engines, and have petitioned, or will petition the Interstate Commerce commission for more time.

In view of the premises, the commission, under date of Oct. 8, 1897, made an order fixing Dec. 1st as the time for hearing all such petitions, filed on or before Nov. 15; the place of hearing being at the office of the commission in Washington, D. C. The order specifies the facts which must be set forth in a petition, and requires each road filing one to publish a notice to the effect that it has done so. The notice must be posted at terminal and junction points, and must be printed in some newspaper having a general circulation in the largest town on the line.

No doubt the petitioning roads will be given a reasonable extension of time in which to equip their rolling stock as required by the act; but all roads carrying interstate traffic must do this within the time fixed by the commission. The result will be great additional protection both to passengers and employes, especially the latter. The danger of loss and destruction of freight and other property will also be greatly reduced, though this feature does not interest the general public as much as it does the railroads, as such losses fall mainly upon the roads themselves.

REVIVAL OF ISLAM.

A Mohammedan writer in the Nineteenth Century contributes an interesting paper on the revival of Islam. He says that signs of such a revival are visible everywhere and he reviews some recent events by which it has been caused.

One of these was the Armenian question. As long as this only assumed the form of a protest against the massacre of Christians, the author says educated Moslem not only in India but also in Turkey were in sympathy with the movement; but soon the matter became, in the hands of Christian ministers, an anti-Islamic agitation. The caliph was styled "Abdul the damned" and "the great assassin," and such radical language aroused suspicion. The echo of the intemperate denunciations in England reached all parts of the Mohammedan world and believers felt that the question now had become one of a crusade against their faith. They were alarmed and commenced to discuss the steps necessary for self-preservation.

At this juncture the Greek folly came. Turkish arms have not been very successful for several generations, but in this war they were, and the Turkish victories were the theme of conversation everywhere, in mosque, in street and in market place. In Africa the victory of the Abyssinians over the Italians, the Anglo-Egyptian expedition to Khartoum and the bombardment of Zanzibar are among the events that have caused great commotion throughout the Mohammedan world.

Among the numerous pilgrims the all-absorbing topic has for years been the danger threatening the caliph, the holy shrines and the religion itself from the Christian powers. They have looked upon England as their friend and Russia as their enemy. A change has taken place in this regard. The sultan has joined hands with the czar and the influential pilgrims support this changed policy.

Another important move in the Mohammedan world is the approach of

the different factions towards one another. There is talk of a Moslem triple alliance, the powers interested being Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan. It seems that just before the assassination of the late shah, the sultan sent a special ambassador to Teheran in order to congratulate his Persian majesty on his jubilee, and pave the way for what might be termed the reunion of Islam. The mission was headed by one of the ablest scholars and diplomats of Turkey, Muniff Pasha. Just before the arrival of Muniff Pasha in Teheran, the shah was killed and the suggestion consequently postponed. The sultan, however, did not recall the envoy but appointed him permanent ambassador at the court of Teheran. The new shah, it is reported, sent very valuable presents to the sultan immediately after the former's accession to the throne, and the envoy who brought them had an unusually long interview with the sultan. If the two rulers continue, for some years, to show the same brotherly attention to each other as they have been doing of late, an alliance between their two Islamic countries is considered an accomplished fact. The ruler of Afghanistan also seems to be thoroughly in touch with contemporary Moslem feeling and aspiration. Not long ago "the light of the nation and religion" sent some rare presents to a holy shrine in Persia, and the compliment was very much appreciated by the countrymen of Sadi and Hafiz. The recent much-talked-of visit of some notable Afghans to Constantinople, and of some Turkish gentlemen to Cahul, clearly indicates sympathy and cordiality between the nations to which the visitors belong.

The Mohammedan author whose review of the situation in the Islamic world has been here briefly condensed does not touch upon the probable result of the revival of Islam, but it is probable that its effects will be manifested in history, should it be of a permanent nature. It is probable, too, that an alliance between the two great factions represented by the sultan and the shah would not be for the purpose of maintaining peace, inasmuch as that is hardly in accordance with the fundamental principles of Islam.

A PLEA FOR FREE SPEECH.

Two days before the election, Rev. Heber Newton, pastor of All Souls' church, New York, and one of the most noted and talented clergymen in the United States, preached what the New York World called a "memorable political sermon," "a timely and eloquent denunciation of the machines of Platt and Croker." The speaker's topic was "Politics Viewed from an Ethical Standpoint," and in treating it he made an "appeal for Seth Low and honest government." On the same day a highly dramatic scene occurred in the People's church, New York, of which Rev. Thomas Dixon is pastor. His theme was a tribute to Henry George. Just before he began his address, W. J. Atkinson, son-in-law of Henry George, asked and was granted leave to speak, and he urged the voters in the congregation, amid a storm of disapproval, to vote for Henry George Jr. Mr. Dixon followed in a powerful address in which he urged his hearers to support Seth Low.

While the campaign was on, ministers of various denominations, including the most prominent and influential, took part in it, speaking in the pulpit as well as from the platform in behalf of the cause and candidates they favored. Generally they were opposed to Tammany, and supported Seth Low, and there is no doubt that many votes were cast for him through their efforts. But not a New York paper, so far as

the writer has observed, has raised the cry so familiar in Utah whenever a church man of a certain denomination speaks upon politics—the cry of "Church influence."

Why cannot we here in Utah have free speech, as it is enjoyed in New York and all the other states of the Union? Why do we here forbid to speak upon burning public questions, men of a class everywhere regarded as most thoughtful, conscientious and intellectual, and best qualified to advise the people? We have here in this State a large number of men who were among its founders, and who have been leaders in every movement tending to its upbuilding and advancement. They are men of wide experience, great practical wisdom, and a patriotism pure and deep. No men within the State are better qualified to counsel the people in relation to public matters than are they. And yet the astonishing fact exists that a word of advice from them, uttered publicly or privately, in regard to a class of subjects in which all citizens are profoundly interested, gives rise to such groans and protests that the individuals referred to prefer to forego one of the dearest rights of American citizenship rather than to so disturb their fellow-citizens by exercising it.

The status is strained and unnatural. Popular government without free speech is a ship without a hull, a nice frosted cake lacking the cake.

A POTENT QUESTION.

The case of the State of California vs Theodore Durrant, while not outclassing many others so far as relates to its essentially criminal features, has assumed a position among the celebrated cases that is more conspicuous than almost any of them. The reader is doubtless tolerably familiar with the nature of the case, if not with most of its details, so a general reference to it for the purpose of comment is all that will be done here.

After a long and tedious trial, Durrant was convicted of the murder of Blanche Lamont, being also under indictment for the murder of Minnie Williams at about the same time. His case underwent all the stages of appeal, but to no avail, and finally he was sentenced to be hanged at San Quentin. Pending the execution, the jailor subjected him to the same rigors and discipline that were imposed upon the other prisoners—his hair was cut short, his face shaved clean, he was made to wear the striped clothing of the jail and to eat and sleep according to and observe all the rules that those who were simply "doing time" had to observe. This gave his attorneys some new ground to stand upon, with the assurance of gaining a longer lease of life for their client, if not eventually getting him out of trouble altogether. Durrant, in their estimation, was and is being punished in advance of the chief punishment imposed, and as the chief punishment is paramount, it is held that it should supersede all others. The spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution is against double punishment, and beyond all question Durrant is being punished while waiting for the punishment in chief. Thus equipped, the attorneys for the defense entered the Federal circuit court and applied for a writ of habeas corpus, on the ground that their client was being punished either for something he had not done, or that he was being punished in advance for what he had been pronounced guilty of, both essentially strong points but failing in their abstract application, as the sequel has shown. The circuit court denied the writ on the ground that it had no jurisdiction, the state having conclusive