

time of making the contract. The case is Thornborow vs. Whitacre. It was tried in 1705. The facts are: Thornborow met Whitacre and said: "Let us strike a bargain. If I pay you a £5 note down *now*, will you give me *two* rye corns next Monday, *four* on Monday week, *eight* on Monday fortnight, and so on, doubling it every Monday for a year?"

Whitacre quickly accepted the offer. When, however, he came to calculate the amount of rye he would have to deliver, he found it came to more than was grown in a year in all England. Thornborow sued Whitacre for failure to perform his agreement. The court said the contract was foolish, but was valid. The defendant claimed the contract was an "impossible contract." The court held it was only so in respect of the defendant's ability to perform it. The plaintiff had judgment.

W. C. S.

WHAT HAS BECOME OF NATIONALISM.

The sudden furor caused by Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* about four years ago, has to all appearances died out within the last few years, and the name of Nationalism, once almost on every lip, is now seldom heard by the ordinary run of the people. Occasionally it will come to our notice. Some one will refer to it in a magazine article or one of its believers will have something to say about it in his conversation, but the general trend of public opinion is that it has died a natural death and gone the way of all such beautiful but impracticable dreams. To people, holding that opinion, Edward Bellamy's article in the June number of the *North American Review* may be somewhat of a surprise. Instead of feeling discouraged Mr. Bellamy seems on the other hand encouraged. He says, and says rightly, that the fusion of the Nationalists and Nationalistic element with the Farmers' Alliance and the other organizations which went to make up the Peo-

ple's Party is a movement of much more importance than it is credited with.

He even goes so far as to make the statement that half the rural weeklies of the West are Nationalistic at heart, and he goes on to quote the words of one brawny farmer at the St. Louis Convention of the People's Party. "Talk about Nationalism," said he, "why west of the Mississippi we are all Nationalists." This statement was of course an exaggeration and was recognized as such, but it was much nearer the truth of the matter than one would think at first. The free, hardy pioneers of the western states made luxurious soil for the tender young plant to thrive in. There was nothing startling in such a radical theory as that to men who had become out as mighty agricultural empire from the wilderness accustomed to change and rapid growth as they are, Nationalistic ideas are but another step forward on their onward march.

The fact of the matter is that Nationalism is not a dead but a very live theory indeed. While we imagined it slept, it has been gaining ground daily; here a convert, there a convert, here a bunch of believers, and there a bunch of believers, till the number of those who really believe in Nationalism or a system on its general plan as the solution of the grave problems which are every day growing more serious would be astonishing if a poll of them could be taken.

The People's Party does not contain all the nationalists by any means. Many as good Democrats and Republicans as ever voted a ticket believe thoroughly in Nationalism.

And why should not the theory make progress. This century has seen a tremendous upheaval in society, a renovation that has destroyed forever the power of the few. In the latter years of the 18th century, England was the only country where the common people were much better than serfs and even there freedom was not what it has since become. The American and French Revolutions were the van of a mighty tidal wave of destiny that bore feudalism away on its crest and