

ocratic policy true to democratic principle and the Democratic organization loyal to its democratic policy.

If political parties could be made and unmade easier than they can be directed, something might be said for the policy of making side parties to order when new and more radical issues begin to demand consideration and action. So, also, if established parties were only partnerships of corrupt politicians. But neither suggestion applies. The great imponderable force in established parties is their traditional vote—the vote which thoughtless or superficial men in vast numbers give to one party or the other from habit. It is only in times of great crises, stirring men to the depths, that the ordinary voter breaks away from his traditional party moorings. This is the potent fact in politics which side party enthusiasts neglect, but to which corrupt politicians and more corrupt plutocrats give supreme attention. They secure control of the machinery of established parties, not because there is any peculiar power in the machinery itself, but because with the machinery goes the thoughtless vote, which is overwhelming. That is the explanation of the un-democratic behavior of the Democratic party. Because the plutocrats seek to control the machinery of the Democratic party, instead of forming side parties, and so many democratic Democrats form side parties instead of suppressing their pride of opinion long enough to secure control of the machinery of the Democratic party, the plutocrats hold the party in check and often turn it against its own principles. With only a fraction of the energy necessary to put political breath into the weak body of a side party, when there is no tidal wave demand for it, a party which can at best never be more than a political plaything, complete control of the Democratic organization, with the thoughtless but dominating popular vote that clings to it from force of tradition and habit, could be secured. Within that party, every

thoughtful voter would count as a host against the political trader and the plutocratic adventurer. He could influence the masses that give power to the party. But outside he counts for nothing with the great thoughtless horde of traditional voters. It is to be regretted, therefore, that the Texas People's party has decided, good as its intentions doubtless are, to remain outside the real field of the fight between democracy and plutocracy.

For one thing, however, the Texas People's party conference is to be strongly commended. It recognizes the importance of promoting the Winnetka system of direct legislation, a description and explanation of which will be found at page 340, and in its address it approves that system in these terms:

We believe in the doctrine of the pure democracy, and the way out of the fog and difficulties that now surround us is to clothe the people with power to pass upon all general legislation and the right to initiate and enforce the enactment of laws that will benefit all the people. By this means we will be able to overthrow the political power now exercised by the cliques, rings and machine bosses that now dominate both the old parties in every state where they are now in power. To this end we invite your attention to a system by which we can secure the adoption of the initiative and referendum without constitutional amendment, and we earnestly invite the cooperation of men of all parties in our state so that we this year may secure the adoption of majority rule. We advise the voters of Texas and of all other states as well that they demand of every candidate for legislative honors that he sign a written agreement to vote to submit to the people the right to pass upon all general laws affecting the whole people at the ballot box before it goes into effect, and if he fails to do so to see that he is defeated and a man elected who will agree to such action. By this course we will free our legislative bodies from what is known as the third house (the lobby), overthrow the bosses and political machines and restore to us a government of, for and by the people.

Direct legislation would make the mass of voters think, whether they are inclined to or not; or in default of their thinking it would automatically disfranchise them. It cannot come

toosoon in any form, and the Winnetka system seems to offer an opening to bring it into practical use without waiting for the aid or consent of any political organization.

The catlike tenacity to life of a well-groomed lie is illustrated by the following irrelevant comment in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune of the 14th upon ex-Gov. Altgeld's speech at the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln banquet in Columbus. Saying that Altgeld devoted his time to corporations, the Commercial-Tribune proceeds:

Yet the sale of his stock in the Chicago corporation which requires its tenants to pay their rent in gold was not announced—at least not loud enough to allow anybody to hear it.

This is an allusion to an old campaign charge, that although Altgeld was a free silver man he obligated his tenants of the Unity building, in which he was a controlling stockholder, to pay their rent in gold. The truth is that the "gold bug" mortgagees of that building inserted a clause in the mortgage requiring principal and interest to be paid in gold, and that this made it necessary to pass along the same obligation to the tenants. The further truth is that Mr. Altgeld was long since frozen out of his interest in the building, his labor of management and his investment of capital being entirely lost. That would not have happened if while governor he had been as friendly to monopoly interest in Chicago as the Republican legislature was.

#### ROYAL AMENITIES.

The speech of Representative Wheeler, in the lower house of Congress last week, in which he denounced the American flunkysism now in evidence in connection with the approaching visit of Prince Henry of Germany, has furnished a text for whole yacht-loads of editorial comment, much of which unintentionally goes far to justify Mr. Wheeler's bitter criticism.

In this connection it is to be observed that the journalistic comments refer only to some of the sensational and hardly excusable things that Mr.

Wheeler said in the excitement of the moment. They do not consider his speech as a whole. Reference to the text of the speech as published in the Congressional Record will show that it was not so discreditable a performance as it has been described to have been, but was on the whole a much needed rebuke to a growing disposition in this country to toady to royalty.

This spirit of toadyism is quite different from the spirit which caused even greater excitement upon the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales prior to the civil war. The motive then was only curiosity to see something out of the common. It was the same motive that caused quite as much excitement at about the same time over the arrival of the mammoth steamship, the Great Eastern. To the American public in those days a royal personage was like a royal Bengal tiger in a menagerie—an animal well worth going miles to the circus to see, but not desirable for a domestic pet. It is different in these days. The excitement over the visit of Prince Henry is generated less by curiosity than by the appetite for royalty that has been stimulated by the "world power" imperialism toward which we are drifting.

Prince Henry's visit will be better understood as an indication of imperial tendencies in this country, if we divest it of those purely polite incidents that have connected President Roosevelt with it.

The Emperor of Germany has royal reasons for wishing to cultivate a good understanding with the United States. It is more than suspected that in behalf of certain cliques of German capitalists he wishes to sail smoothly through the Monroe doctrine into a policy of South American expansion, whereby our benighted southern neighbors may be civilized up to the German standard and in time be benevolently assimilated. It is certain, moreover, that he doesn't like the American goings-on with Great Britain. But whatever his motive he has proceeded in accordance with royal usage to promote friendship with America by making royal overtures.

His first step was to order the construction of a magnificent royal yacht

in an American ship yard. President Roosevelt couldn't help that. Nobody could, and there is no reason why anyone should have wished to.

He next requested the president to allow Miss Roosevelt to perform the ceremony of naming the yacht in American waters. That request could have been denied by President Roosevelt, but why should it have been? If one gentleman requests another gentleman to do him the social honor of allowing his daughter to preside over the ceremonies of naming an expensive toy, it might be boorish for the second gentleman to decline. We see no reason, at any rate, for criticizing President Roosevelt for granting the German emperor's request. It was as personal a matter as his entertaining of Booker T. Washington at luncheon, and nobody's business but his own.

Then the Emperor was moved to propose sending his brother Henry over the Atlantic to participate in the yacht-naming ceremonial, and President Roosevelt appears to have graciously acquiesced. Here, too, it is difficult to see how he could have done otherwise; and, whether he could or not, the matter was one which, again like the Booker T. Washington episode, was exclusively a personal affair.

But after that the matter took on a new and objectionable phase. From a social and purely personal affair, Prince Henry's visit was turned into an international event. He is not accredited to this country—not openly at least—as a German official on official business; yet we are urged to treat him as if he were. He is not here upon any declared mission of friendship between our people and the German people; yet we are asked to take him to our hearts as the German people's trusted envoy. He does not represent the German people on this occasion, but only his elder brother's private interest in a new yacht; yet, because that brother happens to be the German emperor, the American people are admonished that unless they receive him cordially as a public guest, they will offend the German people, both those at home and those who are American citizens.

It may be worth while to interject, with reference to Germans who are

American citizens, that if they are so attached to German royalty as to regard reflections on the sanctity of members of the German royal family as an insult to the German people, they had better have remained in Germany where lese majeste laws protect everybody from that kind of insult. One of the reasons urged against Chinese immigration is that the Chinese bring their superstitions along and persistently cherish them. If that is a good objection to Chinese immigration, it ought to hold good against European immigrants who prize the odor of royal sanctity. We do not believe, however that those papers and politicians are right that charge German-Americans with a disposition to regulate their American citizenship by their devotion to royalty. On the contrary, German-Americans seem as a rule to be singularly free from royal attachments. That is why they have come here. This view of the Wheeler speech is doubtless indicated fairly in the extract from the "Waechter und Anzeiger," the German-American paper of Cleveland, in its issue of the 15th, which follows:

With the speech which Congressman Wheeler delivered in the House yesterday, viewed from the only permissible standpoint, of republican America, one can only agree. The side cut which the speaker—evidently guarding against the possibility of being called a partisan hater of England—seemed to feel himself called upon to direct against Germany (not as a country, but as a monarchy, exactly as in the case of England), in view of the coming to America of Prince Henry, does not detract from the merit, as a matter of principle, which the speaker achieved. A protest, such as he raised, in view of the palpable departure from the old landmarks, such as has been the vogue in Washington since the Spanish-American war, would have been the proper thing long ago. . . . We are certain that the speaker uttered the sentiments of every real American, of every one to whom republic and monarchy have not yet become a distinction without a difference. . . . And it is our opinion, moreover, that nowhere else will this speech delivered in the American House of Representatives, in spite of the hue and cry which it has raised, be received with such satisfaction as in Germany itself—in Berlin. From the republic of the old style, Germany has nothing to fear; but it has something to fear from the republic as it

has shaped itself since the Spanish-American war—from a republic which, in contradiction to old traditions, enters into entangling alliances with other nations, especially with England, in order that it may play an important part on the world's stage. With such a republic it is possible to get into conflict with the modern world-constellation everywhere. Therefore, honor and praise to the man who has dared in the American House of Representatives so vigorously and freely to speak in such manner as to place the republican principle ever against the monarchical principle.

Another demonstration of the good American sense of German-Americans was made by Congressman Kern on the floor of the House on the 19th. He represents a strong American district in southern Illinois, but he stood for American democracy and against royal toadyism.

All Germans doubtless see that Prince Henry is not coming as the envoy of the German people. They know that he represents the Hohenzollern family and nothing else, and that it is German royalty and not the German people, either in Germany or in America, that we honor, when with official and semi-official demonstrations we celebrate his private visit to Mr. Roosevelt and the private tour he is making of some parts of our country.

These demonstrations are in keeping with our dispatch of special envoys to the crowning of King Edward. Both are conventional expressions of imperialistic sentiments, sentiments that are fitly even if accidentally symbolized by the extinguishing at this time of the light in the torch of that magnificent statue in New York harbor—"Liberty Enlightening the World." The pretense that they are tokens of affection for the people whose crowned rulers we thus honor is unfounded. There is a world of difference between admiration for royalty and affection for the subjects of royalty; and this difference could have no more striking exemplification than may be found in the recent history of our own country.

Were the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State any less objects of our affection than are the people of Great Britain or Germany? Clearly not. If we

were in love with foreign peoples, there is no reason why we should not have loved the Boers too. But when their accredited representatives came to this country, the President limited his attentions to an informal chat on the back porch, and they were welcomed by the people only at spontaneous and unofficial receptions. Why didn't we express our love for the Boers by officially honoring their envoys?

Or, if this indicates only indifference to weak peoples rather than preference for royalty, let our laws speak for us. By immigration statutes we head off poor Germans and poor Englishmen from coming to our shores; and along the Canadian border we try to prevent British subjects, honest workmen, from crossing the line to earn their living. That is one of the indications of our love for the people with whose hereditary rulers we hobnob on pretense that as they represent their subjects we are thereby honoring the subjects.

A more precise illustration of this hypocrisy may be obtained by comparing our present attentions to British and German royalty with the reasons that have been urged within the decade in support of our "protection" policy. The same newspapers and politicians, even the identical political party, that apologize for our participation in the amenities of royalty, urging that in this way we signalize our affection not for royalty but for the people who are its subjects, were then appealing to American voters to declare commercial war against the very people with whose royal rulers they would now have us "mix." The English and German people were then denounced as "paupers" whose products must be kept out of this country; while all arguments for free trade as a token and guarantee of international friendship were scouted as sentimental. And when in consequence of the policy of American protection so secured a British or a German industry broke down, the event was hailed on this side by these haters of foreigners as if it had been a victory in battle. There has been no change of sentiment among them since. Their enmity toward the British and the German people, which is expressed in our restrictive tariff laws and was brutally declared by Repub-

lican speakers and papers in the political campaigns that produced those laws, still exists in the same quarters. The delicate attentions they would now have this country pay to the British and the German crowns, is no evidence of a change of heart toward the British and the German peoples. It is simply an exhibition of flunkeyism toward European royalty.

The distinction between the friendliness of one people for another and the friendliness of one set of rulers for another set is not difficult to define. Free trade, in its fullest sense of unrestricted intercourse, such as exists between the states of this Union, is the only possible evidence of cordial affection of one people for another. When this courtesy toward the people themselves does not exist, no regard for them is expressed by courtesies toward their hereditary rulers.

When free traders advocated their beneficent doctrine of friendship with and mutual exchange of service among all peoples, the leaders and organs of the Republican party called them "sentimentalists," or accused them of being bought with "British gold," and railed virulently at the British people. But now that American imperialism has progressed to the point of an "understanding between statesmen" with the tory ministers of Great Britain, they call this "understanding" a friendly alliance with the British people. In like manner, without the slightest regard for the rights of the German people, they point to our contemplated reception to a scion of German royalty as evidence of our love for the German masses. Is this idiocy or hypocrisy? Is its tendency in the direction of a truer spirit of democracy and higher ideals of republicanism, or toward the brutal ambitions of a world-power and the lower levels of imperialism?

Our new royalists assure us that we can send special envoys abroad to a royal crowning, and with official display receive at home a royal dignity on a private tour, without sacrificing our democratic spirit or our republican institutions. That is true. We can do so. But the point is that we don't. We permit this conduct at the expense of the democratic spirit and of republican institutions. These

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