

sumer and that the latter should always have the first consideration, may sound very strange to modern degenerate ears. Our government has for a whole century made the manufacturer the object of its special care, and left the consumer to his tender mercies. The result is that our pampered manufacturers, bred up in the tradition of closed markets, and accustomed to the pocketing of unearned profits, look upon the hundred millions of American consumers much as they would upon a flock of sheep which they are at liberty to shear at will. Nor has this illusion lacked dramatic support from the attitude of the timid consumers, who have played the part of sheep only too faithfully.

But the consumers at last have revolted.

They may not know the principles of international trade, but they know when they are cold and hungry and when the dinner pail is empty. They are now in no mood to stand tamely by while the Tariff Board is calculating costs, when they know that the manufacturer has two sets of prices—one for the American consumer, and another, a lower one, for the foreigner.

They want to know why prices are not as low here as in England, seeing that with our natural resources, our unrivaled machinery, our superior business organization, and the superior skill of our workmen, the advantages of production are on our side.

+

The Democrats have now an opportunity, by sticking courageously to their principles, to serve the consumers by introducing healthy competition, and the self-reliant manufacturers by cheapening their materials. They can only lose that opportunity by supporting the dilatory tactics of the other side and causing the country to lose faith in representative government.

THOMAS SCANLON.

+ + +

DEMOCRACY EQUIPPED AND WORKING.

We are all familiar with the type of man who has aristocratic instincts. He does not believe in his heart in popular government. He believes that government should be controlled by those who are intellectually strong.

There are two peculiarities about this type of man. He prides himself on his practicality in antagonizing the visionary plans of democracy, and he is quite sure that his own intellectual stature entitles him to a place among the rulers.

There is a second type of man. He has democratic instincts. He believes that government exists to regulate common affairs, and that every human being who comes under the dominion of government has a right to a voice in its administration. He neither emphasizes nor minimizes the ignorance of the masses. He holds to the educational theory of Froebel that one should learn to do by doing, that by taking part in the administration of government men learn to administer its affairs wisely.

+

Now, why is it that some men are aristocrats and some are democrats? Why is it that boys born in the same environment, taught by the same teacher, raised under the same influence, become some of them aristocrats and some of them democrats?

I consider that it is because one type holds to the self-centered ideals of childhood, while the other grows into the intellectual ideals of manhood. To me it seems that the aristocratic ideal is sensuous and childish, while the democratic ideal is a result of education, reflection, experience and some knowledge of the basic principles of human nature.

To illustrate my point. When a child first comes into consciousness of things about him, he thinks that this planet is the center of the universe, that the sun, moon and stars are all smaller than the earth and revolve about it. But later he discovers that he has been deceived by his senses—that the earth is a minor planet, in what very likely is a minor system in the great scheme of creation.

In like manner, the child first thinks of himself as the center of things around which all else revolves. His mother is sweeter than all other mothers, his father wiser than all other fathers in the world. But he learns that again he has been deceived by his senses, that he is but a small part of the vast organism of humanity.

Now if it be true that the childish tendency is to emphasize the individual, while the adult tendency is to see in the individual only a small part of a vast social organism, is it not reasonable to regard the aristocratic ideal as that of the child, and the democratic ideal as that of the man?

+

Some such thoughts as these came to me when I listened to a speech by a mighty hunter. He was going up and down the highways of our country preaching the doctrine that honesty in office is the panacea for our national ills.

By taking this for his dominant note he made

discord. At the West he urged the election of men who stand for reforms that Mr. Bryan has advocated for twenty years; at the East he urged the election of a man who advocates the "stand pat" philosophy of Aldrich and Cannon. Thus he would have brought together in Congress a Murdock of Kansas and a Lodge of Massachusetts, whose views are antagonistic and mutually destructive.

Mr. Roosevelt has failed to recognize that a man may be honestly democratic as well as honestly aristocratic; that a man may be honestly wrong as well as honestly right; and that a man who is honestly wrong is more dangerous than a plain "crook." A plain "crook" will work only as long as he is paid; but a man who is honestly wrong will work for the wrong continuously. Mr. Roosevelt also fails to see that there are two ways in which a man may be honest. One of them is to cultivate a moral fiber strong enough to resist the temptations of his environment; the other is to live in an environment where there is no temptation.

Failing to see those things, Mr. Roosevelt fails to see that it is not "crooked" officials that debauch our institutions, but that our institutions debauch officials.

For illustration, no man is strong enough physically to bear the physical burdens of one hundred men. Certainly, then, no man is strong enough morally to bear the moral burdens of a hundred thousand men. Yet this is what we ask our representatives to do. We elect a man to Congress, and during his term he is responsible to no one but himself, yet his official actions are binding on us all. The only wonder is that so few break down morally under the strain.

+

It is not enough to choose for office honest men with good records. We must also safeguard them from temptation.

This may be done by reserving to the people the right of Direct Legislation. Under the Initiative, Referendum and Recall every act of a public official may be reviewed promptly by the people. Under this reservation of people's power, the people may have the last word, whenever they want it, in the enactment of any law. No public official can then make corrupt bargains, nor be tempted to, for the simple reason that no one will bribe an official who cannot deliver the goods.

This reform is captivating the imagination of the American people. Many cities have already adopted it. Among them are Grand Junction and Denver, Colorado; Des Moines, Iowa, and Los

Angeles, California; and there are States, too, with Oregon at the head.

The city of Los Angeles is now engaged in a gigantic municipal enterprise. It involves drawing water some two hundred miles, from the Sierra mountains, to provide light, heat and power for the inhabitants of that municipality. This enterprise necessitates the expenditure of about twenty-five million dollars. In a few years it will pay for itself, and then will doubtless bring in sufficient revenue for all the municipal expenses of the city. Can any one doubt that if the people of Los Angeles had not had the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, private capitalists would have exploited this enterprise for private profit? As a matter of fact, private capitalists did endeavor to secure the plum but the people were on guard; and, what is more to the purpose, the people were in power.

Among the States that have adopted this reform are Oregon, Arizona, Arkansas, Missouri, Colorado, South Dakota and Maine. These States offer an object lesson in democracy which is at once the hope of the people of other States, and the dread of their corrupt politicians and their corrupting business interests.

+

We are thus coming to a time when the strong man in armor will no longer be our ideal. On the contrary, depending upon our own strength, we shall safeguard from temptation the weaknesses of human nature in office.

GEORGE A. BRIGGS.

+ + +

THAT "FAVORABLE BALANCE."

According to the Commerce and Labor report for June (vol. xiii, p. 709), exports of merchandize from the United States exceeded imports during the year from July, 1909, to June, 1910, by \$187,111,349. This is called our "favorable balance" of trade (vol. xii, p. 698; vol. xiii, pp. 482, 699).

But why is it favorable?

+

Someone echoes President McKinley, saying it is because "it is paid for in pure gold."

That explanation, however, is not consistent with the facts; for during the same year, according to the same report, our exports of gold exceeded our imports of gold by \$75,223,310. Instead of helping out the "favorable balance of trade" theory, the gold transactions only make it more difficult to explain.

They increase the balance of exports to \$262,334,659.