

press companies. In this country we already have a limited parcels post; its benefits are restricted to shipments to foreign countries. For instance, a 4-pound parcel of merchandize can be mailed from Chicago to New Zealand for 48 cents, whereas the postage on the same parcel mailed from Chicago to Milwaukee would be 64 cents. More than that, a merchandise parcel weighing 11 pounds can be mailed from Chicago to New Zealand for \$1.32, whereas such a parcel cannot be mailed from Chicago to Milwaukee at all. From any point in the United States to any other, packages of merchandize exceeding four pounds in weight must go by express or freight. Now, why should this accommodation be confined to transactions with foreign countries? If it is a good thing to furnish parcels post facilities for shipments abroad, why not furnish them for domestic shipments? The answer must be looked for where most answers to such questions are found, in the influence of some powerful financial interest like the express company adjuncts to the American railroad monopolies.

◎ ◎

Mr. Bryan in India.

Wherever his voice is heard, William J. Bryan makes the same impression of a great orator, a great democrat, and a sincere man. The account of his speech of March 28th at Bombay, India, which appears in *The Times of India*, is especially expressive in these respects. The gathering is described as wonderful for its size (which was 3,000), for its cosmopolitan character, and from the fact that although it consisted of divers races and creeds, Mr. Bryan held its undivided attention for an hour in an address on "The Prince of Peace," a subject with which "at least two-thirds of those present could have had but little if any sympathy." Whoever has heard Bryan at his best will recognize the truth of this Bombayan description of his style, that it "never loses its deeply impressive character, and one feels that the man is giving vent to feelings right from the heart."

◎ ◎ ◎

OPPONENTS OF DEMOCRACY.

If we take democracy to be a state of mind which puts first the equality of men in their common humanity, and regards as quite secondary the more or less superficial inequalities of education, rank, wealth, or official dignity, we can readily see that the privileged occupants of the upper side of the inequalities are by no means the mainstay and prop of the universal anti-democratic régime. The privileged occupants of

the upper side are, and have ever been, the few. They could not for a year maintain their ascendancy, could not for any year in the centuries have maintained their ascendancy, if they did not find, and had not through the centuries found their supporters in the rank and file of the people. What Chesterton says of the House of Lords is universally true. It is not the lords who keep the lords a-going, but the masses who worship the lords.

The fact is that many of the world's best democrats have been, by birth and wealth, subject to the classification of aristocrats. And on the contrary, multitudes of the proletariat have in all ages been earnest supporters of the aristocratic ideal.

It is so in modern America to-day. In fact, our much praised, so-called, middle classes are mostly imbued with the aristocratic mind. They worship family, rank, and wealth. They carry their worship of rank and position into all their interests and activities. This is the reason why they are so lauded as the mainstay of conservatism.

In America all our churches and schools are imbued with the aristocratic spirit. The very Methodist who talks about the Pope's Court is himself a veritable courtier to his own Presiding Elder, and he stands as much in awe of the Bishop as if he called him Your Grace or My Lord. And the schools, with their increasing paraphernalia of gowns and hoods, are doing all in their power to promote the aristocratic mind, by emphasizing petty distinctions.

Let no one imagine that the line between fundamental democracy and fundamental aristocracy can be found in any class lines. Whoever pays court to any external distinction is essentially aristocratic.

The democratic mind shows respect and politeness to every man, as being a man, and finds this enough. It inherently dislikes and opposes all ceremonies and functions that demand kowtowing. Those who relish this sort of thing, whether they be members of a church convocation, or of a college faculty, or of a labor union, are essentially undemocratic. It does not matter whether the mind be educated or uneducated, if it puts external distinction above the reality of the dignity of man as man, it is an aristocratic mind.

J. H. DILLARD.

◎ ◎ ◎

"No use trying to explain things to a woman; she can't understand scientific terms; now, here's—"

"Oh, yes, I can, Charles! Heredity is what a man blames his father and mother for, and environment is what he blames his wife and children for!"—Chicago Record-Herald.