

amenities between the servants of a republic ambitious for world power empire, and the royal rulers of monarchies already initiated into the society of world power empires, are having the effect of changing republican ideals. From hobnobbing with royalty our "better classes" are coming to like royalty and to yearn for it.

Already they are busily confusing the distinction between the republican and the royal theories of government, thus exemplifying that law of social change under which the essence is altered while the form remains.

Archbishop Ireland for instance—and we refer to him alone not because there is no one else to quote but because he is a type—made a speech last week in Chicago in which he distinctly declared for the monarchical idea. That point in his speech was applauded on the 17th by the Chicago Record-Herald, a leading Republican paper, in an editorial which approvingly summed up the archbishop's thought in this pregnant sentence:

. . . Archbishop Ireland takes the very sound and tenable position that the national government is concreted in the chief magistrate. . . .

Only once before has the essence of monarchical government been so perfectly yet briefly described. That was when the autocratic Louis XIV. of France exclaimed: "The state! I am the state."

It is exactly this idea that distinguishes the principle of monarchy from that of republicanism. According to the monarchical theory, the executive is the state; or, to quote the Record-Herald's approving expression of Archbishop Ireland's thought, "government is concreted in the chief magistrate." He personifies the people as a whole. To strike at him, therefore, is to strike at them; hence the propriety of laws making his person more safe, his life more precious, than the person and life of any other individual. To compliment him is to compliment them; hence the significance of royal amenities as expressions of international regard.

The republic that accepts this monarchical theory of government may, notwithstanding, long continue to be a republic. But only in form. In essence it will be a monarchy even though the monarch be elected—or

reelected—every four years, and a popular legislature nominally makes the laws. "To turn a republican government into a despotism the basest and most brutal," says a thoughtful American writer, "it is not necessary formally to change its constitution or abandon popular elections. It was centuries after Caesar before the absolute master of the Roman world pretended to rule other than by authority of a senate that trembled before him. But forms are nothing when substance has gone, and the forms of popular government are those from which the substance of freedom may most easily go. Extremes meet, and a government of universal suffrage and theoretical equality may, under conditions which impel the change, most readily become a despotism. For there despotism advances in the name and with the might of the people."

The republican theory of government is diametrically opposed to the monarchical idea of King Louis and Archbishop Ireland. It excludes every concept of identity of the government with the executive. It does not conceive of "government as concreted in the chief magistrate." It does not admit that the head man is himself the state, or that he personifies the people as a whole.

On the contrary, it regards every official, from the humblest roadmaster to the head executive, not as a ruler of the people but as their servant. His official function, according to the republican ideal, is simply to direct the execution of their formally expressed will. In other respects he is but one of the people, divested of none of the personal rights which they enjoy and invested with no peculiar sanctity. To kill him is the same crime as to kill any other citizen. It does not affect the government, for sub-roadmasters and vice presidents instantly take the place of their murdered chiefs, and government goes on as before. To honor him is not to honor the people, except when and to the extent that they have directed him to represent them at ceremonials intended for their honor. In all official respects he is their servant and nothing more; in all private relations he is his own master and nothing less.

To realize and conform to this clear distinction which the republican idea draws between monarchies and republics, is to avoid the dangers to republicanism of official relations with royalty.

Every government must deal with every other through officials. Consequently it must deal with royalty in order to deal at all officially with monarchical countries, for these, however arbitrarily and unjustly, are represented only by royalty. And it ought to treat rulers and their representatives with the same courtesy that it extends to the popular servants of republics and their representatives. Inasmuch, also, as international intercourse of an official character incidentally involves social courtesies, these should not be neglected with reference to royal representatives by the servants of a republic. One need not try to be any the less a conventional gentleman because he serves a republic and believes in the spirit of democracy.

But official courtesies to foreign tourists merely because they happen to be members of royal families or come on the private business of royal potentates, are quite another thing. So is the sending of special envoys to a royal coronation, where the guests are assigned places not with reference to the importance of the nation they represent but with reference to their family relationship to the person to be crowned. Courtesies of this sort are not international; they are inter-royal. And the republic that practices them, if it would escape the contamination of royalism, must be much more firmly grounded in republicanism and much more loyal to the democratic spirit than is our republic at the present time.

NEWS

Later British reports of the unsuccessful attempt to surround De Wet (p. 712), describe picturesquely and with unusual detail a hard-fought battle extending over a wide area of country. This scheme for De Wet's capture is characterized as "the most extensive carried out during the present war." At Heilbron the battle raged from nine o'clock at night on the 7th until two o'clock in the morning of the 8th. To quote from the London news dispatch:

Throughout the five hours a fearful ring of fire from rifles, cannon and pom-poms swept along the British

lines, holding De Wet's Boers, who made repeated attempts to break out of the circle of troops. From various positions behind rocks and dongas the Boers kept up a vigorous fusillade, hoping to find a weak spot in the line. Simultaneously others charged, but again and again were the Boers repulsed, leaving dead, wounded and prisoners in the hands of the British. Continuing, this dispatch says that on the night of the 7th—

the conflict ebbed and swelled over an area of 40 to 50 miles, in which the long-hunted, harassed and desperate men endeavored to find outlets. The Boers at one spot got within 30 yards of the British firing line, but the barbed wire balked the burghers and forced them to retreat. The firing never ceased. Aided by the electric searchlights, the British harrowed the surrounding territory with shrapnel, shells and Maxim bullets. In the northern section the Boers made a desperate effort to break through. Collecting a number of cattle, the Boers drove them down on the British lines. Bending low in their saddles, they rode among the cattle, making it impossible to distinguish them in the darkness. The British pickets opened a terrible fire and the Boers were met everywhere with a hail of bullets. A long line of flame ran up and down the firing line, nearly 30 miles long, as the armored trains flashed their searchlights over miles of country. The reports of the quick-firing guns along the entrenched line and the booming of the field guns and pom-poms sounded deep amid the sharp crackling of the musketry, while Heilbron fort contributed to the din with the deep roar of its naval gun. This lasted for 20 minutes. Then gradually the rattle died down until only the crack of single shots was heard, and at last all was quiet again. The Boers' attempt to break the British circle had failed. A few of them succeeded in crossing the line, and among them was Gen. De Wet.

The Boers' side of this battle story is of course at present unobtainable. If nothing else stood in the way the British censorship would.

Owing to this censorship all newspaper information regarding the trial of the Boer prisoner of war, Commandant Kritzinger, who, like Scheepers (pp. 664, 668) is accused of crimes against the laws of war, has been suppressed. Through the war secretary, however, in the House of Commons on the 17th, it transpired that the trial had begun on the 15th.

Not only was the British movement of the 7th for the capture of De Wet a gigantic failure, but a similar trap on a much smaller scale, laid on the

12th by a party of Boers for a detachment of British, resulted in routing the latter with comparatively heavy loss. The scene of this affair was on the Klip river south of Johannesburg. The British detachment, consisting of 150 mounted infantrymen, surrounded a farmhouse where they had been told that Boers were in hiding. One Boer broke away from the house and was pursued by the British, who had not followed him far when the party of Boers opened fire upon them from three sides. They fell back, finally reaching the cover of one of the British block houses, but their loss in the fight was 12 killed, including the major in command, and over 40 wounded.

Spain is disturbed again (p. 89) by riots at Barcelona, reported as labor riots but probably more or less political in character, since Barcelona lies in Catalonian territory and among the Catalan inhabitants a strong secession spirit survives. It is estimated that in consequence of labor strikes 80,000 persons are out of employment in Barcelona. Martial law has been proclaimed, and on the 17th ten persons were killed and 65 wounded in encounters between strikers and Spanish troops. All the newspapers of the city are "tied up" by strikers. Similar encounters on the 18th resulted in further casualties. The reported cause of the strike is a demand for a nine-hour work day, which the large employers have refused. Since the street fighting the captain general of the province of Barcelona has formally urged the employers to concede the demand. But all news regarding this disturbance must be taken with caution, as the Spanish government has established a censorship, which is calculated to discredit every report, official and unofficial.

In the United States the most important political event of the week is the passage in the lower house of Congress by a unanimous vote, of a bill unconditionally repealing the war taxes which were put in force July 1, 1898. It is estimated that if this repealing bill becomes law, the Federal revenues will be thereby reduced by about \$77,000,000.

But the importance of this event depends rather more upon the manner in which the bill was carried through the House than upon its ef-

fect upon public revenues; for its passage was secured by the most extreme instance of the recent tendency of the House to abandon deliberation and automatically to confirm the reports of committees. The bill was not allowed to be subject to amendment, and it was not debated. The ways and means committee had decided to recommend the bill. But the protection elements on the majority side of the House feared that in its passage amendments repealing the protective tariff on products of trusts would be offered, and that Republican members whose constituencies are opposed to protecting the trusts any longer would be forced to support these amendments. For that reason a rule of procedure was brought in which allowed two days for debate but prohibited all amendments except such as might be offered by the ways and means committee. The anti-trust Republicans had been induced to support this rule. The Democrats denounced it as a "gag" rule. When the previous question on its adoption had been moved by the Republican leader, Mr. Dalzell, a motion to recommit the rule was made by the Democratic leader, Mr. Richardson, and that motion being decided by the speaker to be out of order while the previous question was before the House (thus overruling Speaker Reed, Republican, but following Speaker Crisp, Democrat), the test of strength came on the vote upon an appeal from this decision. The decision was sustained by 165 to 123, and thereupon the rule was adopted by 158 to 120. It was at this point that the course was taken by the Democrats which resulted in exposing the non-deliberate character of the whole proceeding. Mr. Richardson, addressing the chair, said:

I rise to make a request for unanimous consent. In view of the fact we are not permitted to amend the pending bill and in view of the fact that two days' debate is absolutely fruitless under this rule, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be put upon its passage now.

One objection would have frustrated Mr. Richardson's tactics, but the Republicans could not very graciously object to the immediate passage of a bill which their own committee had prepared and with which they were so well satisfied as to forbid even the consideration of amendments. So no objection came, and the bill passed without debate and without dissent. Though no debate took place permission was given the members to print