

EDITORIAL NOTES

and other matters of interest
to the readers of the
Courier.

Including clippings from our
exchanges and miscellane-
ous matters.

A portrait of the American Duchess of Marlborough makes one of the attractions of Peterson for June. The beautiful picture is accompanied by an interesting illustrated article on Blenheim Castle, the place which England built for the famous warrior duke. "A Glimp of Sunshine," by Patience Stapleton, is among this favorite author's best stories. In "Plants For House And Garden," by Joyce Ray, much practical information will be found. "Curiosities in Embroideries," by Margaret V. Payne, is a delightful account, illustrated by wonderful relics that belonged to Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, and others. "Ornary Wilt," by Ella Higginson, is worthy of the reputation of this worthy writer. "Women At The World's Fair," by Annie Curd, is an exceedingly comprehensive and timely paper. The engraving, fashion plates, household talks and the like are even superior to this magazine's ordinary high standard. The July number begins a new volume, and will be a good time to subscribe. Terms, \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. Address, Peterson's Magazine, 306 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.

How Larson Talks!

LEE, North Dakota.

MR EDITOR: Will you please insert the following in your paper.

I had intended not to write any more about the school, no matter what you might write about my first article. But in the first place, you seem to be very much misinformed, stating that I compel my people to send their children to parochial school. In the second place you have misunderstood me. I have never even attempted to compel anyone to send their children to our school. On the contrary, I took the school law to the people in the district where Rukke resides, and read it and explained it to them, and told them that they would have to see to that their children had attended public school the length of time required by law. If you will inquire of Gronlid or Forde or Tande they can testify this.

When I stated that I would work against your paper if you go on as you have done of late, I had no reference to what you did on the jury. It is not for me to punish that. You will have to see to how you may answer for it on the day of judgment. What I have reference to is your paper. You have at least, twice in a short time, taken the part of infidels, against religion—and if you will edit a paper for infidels, you have no reason to complain because christians do not want it. And you have no reason to complain of a pastor for striving to keep such a paper away from his people. I will relate to you what I mean. About a year ago you had an article in your paper about people seeding. And then you proceeded about in this way: "If it were in order for a newspaper man to pray, we would ask a merciful providence to bless their efforts." Now an expression like that is simply blasphemy, being that you live by the mercy of God every day, surely you need to pray as much as any one else. You remember no doubt how you encouraged people to work on Sunday last fall, and what bitter criticism you passed on a certain Johnson, who was unwilling to thresh on Sunday and was hurt by a team of bronchos. You may be sure that people are but too apt to work on Sundays, and they do not need any encouragement in that regard. When people were threshing nearly everywhere on Sunday last fall, it seemed as though we were in a heathen country rather than a christian one. And now in the case of Gronlid and Forde, you praised Mrs. Rukke for what she had done. From this I can not but judge that you are an infidel, if it is not so I beg your pardon. But then I hope also that you will hereafter take a christian stand point. I do not wish to be at enmity with you, nor with anyone else, but I would rather have you for an enemy, than I would be your friend in the way of sin.

As to Rukke's article I would say that I had no more intended to make any false statement with regard to this matter than I have in any other. I know that the complaint against Forde and Gronlid was not worded so as to indicate that they were prosecuted for religion's sake—that was carefully avoided. It was stated that they sent their children to a Norwegian school. But this was a religious school nevertheless, and the children were sent there for religion's sake far more than for the language. The people had only

the choice of either sending their children to that school at the time or to miss it. The school was brought to the valley by a mistake in me, being that I had forgotten all about the public school when I engaged the teacher and we could not put the school off to some time later, because the teacher had been engaged for that time at another place. It was not until later that the second engagement was put off and it was possible for us to have school two months more. Now such things as that are not apt to occur very often. It has not happened to me before, and people naturally wish to avoid it, for it is no pleasant thing to have two schools and be obliged to miss either the one or the other.

I did not know how much the children of Forde and Gronlid had attended public school in former years, but judging from their own statements and from the number of days that they had attended in the spring of 1891, I was convinced that they would have attended more than sixty days in that year if it had not been for our parochial school. Those people ought to have been fined at a time when they had no such good reason for neglecting the public school. And I venture to say that if Mrs. Rukke had the love and respect for religious instruction that she ought to have, she would never have prosecuted those people under such circumstances, no matter whether she belonged to our denomination or to another. She would rather have run the risk of being fined herself, and there was hardly any danger of that. If the school board agreed with Mrs. Rukke, it has of course, deserved the same censure, but the board did not agree, and Mrs. Rukke had the majority on her side.

Now Mr. Editor, you have done your best to tear down on my person, it is therefore no more than just that you give a place in your paper to this article also. Let me defend myself this time, and I will drop the matter.

TH. H. LARSON.

The above is simply a lot of vaporous mutterings, from a brain surcharged with fanatical religious ideas. The COURIER feels sorry for the reverend gentleman. We have no desire to jump onto Mr. Larson or take any advantage of him, but he seems anxious to provoke argument. So far as the points Mr. Larson has made, he has been amply answered by Messrs. Rukke and Syvertson. The reverend gentleman however, still persists in calling the editor of this paper an infidel. He says: "You praise Mrs. Rukke for what she has done, therefore I must judge that you are an infidel." That is a brilliant argument indeed. If, because we make a stand for the enforcement of the school laws, it makes us an infidel, we are perfectly willing to be called one. Our aim is to see the laws of this country, especially the school laws, enforced, and we should be just as quick to praise anyone else for trying to uphold the laws as we did Mrs. Rukke. He says we are an infidel because we advised farmers to thresh last fall on Sunday, when their grain was in jeopardy, and it was absolutely necessary. If we are an infidel for that we are willing to be called one, and shall offer the same advice again if the occasion warrants. It is far more wicked to run the risk of starving your family than it is to thresh on Sunday. According to Larson's argument, if his house got on fire Sunday, he would wait until Monday before he would put it out, at the same time he would be pleased to see his neighbor come over on Sunday and put it out. But what sense is there in arguing with a religious fanatic. Mr. Larson should have been born about 1500 and have lived in Connecticut, where it was a crime in those days to walk out on Sunday, unless it were to church and back; it was a crime to kiss your child on Sunday or cook, cut your hair or get shaved. Probably a state of affairs like that would just about suit a man with such a narrow mind as Mr. Larson. The fact of the matter is, religion of every denomination has professed since then, and all christians have higher and broader views of christianity. The only difference is that Mr. Larson is just 400 years behind the times. In regard to the infidelity of the COURIER, we will leave our past record to the readers of the paper. It speaks for itself.

WASHINGTON LETTER.

WASHINGTON, May 16, 1892.

"The president," said a member of the republican national committee, "is to my certain knowledge much more concerned about the success of the ticket to be nominated at Minneapolis than about who shall head it. He wishes the convention to be harmonious, and would like to see the nomination made by acclamation, whoever may be selected to head the ticket. Whatever his friends are doing, and some of them are doing harm, both to him and the party, I know that he is doing nothing to bring about his own nomination, and further that he has fully made up his mind that he will not enter a struggle to obtain the nomination, because of his belief that the ill-will left by such a struggle would have