

critical article admits this contention in so far as it relates to the principles involved, but denies it as to questions of fact. It claims, accordingly, that the question of whether Chinese immigration would amount to a hostile invasion should be left to the determination of the Coast, as the locality familiar with the facts. That claim cannot possibly be allowed. It is like claiming for the plaintiff in a lawsuit, that while the interpretation of the law in the case should be left to a disinterested judge, the verdict should be left to the plaintiff himself, he being so well informed about the facts. What the Star contends for would never be conceded with reference to an armed invasion. The country would not and ought not to go to war with China because the people of the Coast demanded it on the ground that they knew that a Chinese army was being fitted out for purposes of invasion and that their location and interests made them peculiarly familiar with the facts. Before a nation can justly enter upon defensive war, the nation itself and not merely a hysterical locality must be convinced of the defensive necessity. Equally so, the nation must be convinced, not merely informed by an interested locality, that a current of foreign immigration is a menace to natural rights or national institutions before it is justified in closing its ports under the principle which we have laid down and the Star adopts. This nation is not so convinced with reference to the Chinese and no evidence has yet been presented which justifies such a conviction. So far, with all respect for the sincerity of opponents of Chinese immigration, we fail to find evidence in the case they present of anything but an unwarranted and unworthy race intolerance.

It has been noticed that in popular speech the name of this nation is used in the singular instead of the plural, as formerly; and the congressional committee on revision of the federal statutes has departed from

authoritative precedent by adopting the newer form. A recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune, in calling attention to the change, observes:

The plural form, which was universal once, has given place to the singular form, and grammatical revolutions no more go backward than do other revolutions.

But this revolution is not grammatical alone. Essentially it is not grammatical at all. The revolution in grammatical form is strictly in obedience to a revolution in political sentiment. It marks a reversal of the old idea that this nation is one of strictly limited powers, being only a federation of sovereign states which have invested it with authority to act for them in certain specified particulars. When that idea obtained, grammatical usage conformed to the political principle. We said of the United States that "they are a nation." But now, with the advance of world-power imperial aspirations, that idea is passing into oblivion, and grammatical usage takes cognizance of the fact. We no longer say of the United States that "they are a nation," but that "it is a nation."

It is interesting in this connection to recall a political prophecy made in 1893 by the great publicist, David Dudley Field. His prophecy is rapidly approaching fulfillment. It was made to Prof. Adam S. Hill, of Harvard college, in a letter in which Field discussed the use of the word "is" instead of "are," as applied to the United States. To Field "the United States is," was not only ungrammatical but dangerous to democracy. In his letter occurs the pregnant passage:

In our own history we see unmistakable proofs of a strong flood tide setting in towards federal authority. To go no further than the Chinese deportation act of the last session, enacted and upheld upon the plea of federal sovereignty, it needs no prophet to foretell that, if the foundation of that enactment be not dashed in pieces, the incoming century will see this nation either broken into fragments or converted into a consolidated republic—another name for despotism, which would be

but a prelude to anarchy, and that but another name for an emperor and military dominion.

We are not always in accord with the Chicago Chronicle on questions of democracy. But one of its recent pronouncements we most heartily indorse. It rebukes the Democratic leaders in congress for trying to make reciprocity a Democratic issue. What the Chronicle says on this question is so timely, so true, and so compact in statement that we quote it. Defining reciprocity, it says:

In the first place, it is an attempt in violation of the constitution to take the power of originating revenue bills from the house of representatives, and to place it in the hands of the president and the senate, the treaty-making power. In the second place, it is a scheme of the big protectees to remove their selfish interests from the omnibus tariff bills of the future and to intrench themselves in such a way in treaties negotiated by a few men who can be trusted to look after their welfare that the amount and the character of protection which they are to enjoy hereafter will depend more upon their own ideas and bargainings and less upon the uncertainties of action by the representatives of the people. In the third place, it is indubitable evidence that the whole rotten tariff system is breaking down of its own weight of lies and corruption. Democrats as such have no more reason to interest themselves in these measures than missionaries of the cross have to espouse the cause of a Chinese joss as against the claims of Buddha.

There is a whole battery of democratic principle and argument in that brief quotation. The Democrat in the lower house, if any such there be, who has within him the ability of a statesman and the spirit of true leadership, could make it the text for an epoch-making speech and the dynamic of a great public career. Reciprocity is indeed only the rotten fortification to which special privilege is retreating before the silent but resistless advances of free trade.

Says one of the publications of Dun's commercial agency,—

Prices are now at the highest point in many years, and, in fact, surpass

all records since the present improved methods of manufacture and distribution have been in use and agricultural operations were first begun on the present extensive scale with labor-saving machinery.

That has a prosperous sound. But as wages generally have not increased, it cannot indicate prosperity for the mass of wage workers; and as general opportunities for work are not plentiful, it indicates rather that the "prosperity" cry is all cry and no fodder. Are we mistaken in saying that opportunities for employment are not plentiful? Read this unconscious answer from the Buffalo Times of December 1:

The superintendent of the delivery department of the Western Union was seen by a reporter for the Times yesterday. "Yes, we are getting more men and fewer boys for our service," he said. "There are a great many men out of work at the present time, and as an energetic boy can earn about \$1.50 a day with us, which is more than some men earn, we saw no reason why we should not let the men have the chance. They are more reliable.

When work is so scarce that reliable men can be got to do boys' work at boys' wages, it is in order to ask embarrassing questions about that "prosperity which everybody shares."

PARALLELISM IN PARTY POLITICS.

There is always a certain amount of fascination in measuring our own progress by that of others, whether in political growth or any other; and the element of provincialism which as a people we have never outgrown in America leads us, perhaps, to be more prone than other nations to such comparisons. Of late years there has been a strong tendency among students of political life to determine just where we do stand, by an examination of the landmarks set in other climes and often under such totally varying conditions that the resemblance can at best be said to be fanciful. Most natural of all is the attempt to find common springs of action among that closely allied branch of the so-called Anglo-Saxon race which composes the government of Great Britain, an attempt for which more excuse than usual exists in the partly accidental coincidence of fundamental causes

to which British and American politics have been subject during the generation that is now on the scene of action in both countries.

Under the influence of these causes, the conclusion is often jumped at just now that the British Liberals have always been substantially identical with American Democrats, and governed by the same general impulses and tending in the same direction, which the conservative school of thought confidently predicts is now in the line of a rapid extinction of Liberalism, the broad principle taken as embodied by the respective parties in the two nations. A conspicuous instance of this reasoning appeared in a recent clever article in the Atlantic, which argued that Liberalism has passed through the cycle of natural law from beginning to decay, and is now doomed to disappear and be succeeded by a strenuous triumph of the imperialism of the day; which by a queer inversion of ideas and in defiance of all the patent facts of its genesis and nature is expected to bring about an equality of conditions on the denial of which it is essentially based; the secret to this contradictory conclusion lying in the half-concealed socialistic convictions of the author, which lead him to look for material gain to individuals only through their subjection to some powerful organization that can work out for them benefits which they are unable otherwise to obtain.

If indeed it is true that the work of Liberalism is over, it is a sad thing for civilization; for it is liberalism in one form or another which has been the motive force of all civilization, and progress without liberalism would be a contradiction of terms. That, so far as the forms of government are concerned, no great further advance is to be looked for is perhaps true; yet it is a law of nature that nothing can stand still, and that if we do not move forward we must more or less gradually fall back. The progress of the future must doubtless be more on economic than on purely political lines; and it is on such lines that British Liberalism has slowly evolved from the whigism of Palmerston which was concerned chiefly with completing the work of securing political liberty

that had begun with the overthrow of the Stuarts, to the radicalism of Morley which is groping out toward the establishment of economic equality. For what we know as imperialism is at bottom an effort to intensify the inequality which already exists, by extending the power of the wealthy minority to whom the fruits of imperialism invariably accrue. As we glance back over British history of the past century, we can see how steadily the current of liberalism has set toward improving the condition of the masses of men, first as to political and then as to economic essentials. Steadily, in spite of its setbacks, and in the face of these, it is not hard to dream of the spirit of Gladstone, which in its experience has overlapped part of both the earlier and the later period, refreshing itself with the exhortation sung by our own poet:

Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate,
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

With us the change from political to economic issues really began when the marvelous development took place of our natural resources that occurred in the late sixties. The opening up then of our coal and oil fields and forests, of gold and silver and iron and copper mines, first gave to some men a power of commanding the labor of others which has gone on since with ever cumulating force, until now as a nation we are enormously richer, while as individuals the vast majority of us are really poorer. Not that there has been any great increase of "saved capital," as is so often gratuitously assumed. To quote once more from Longfellow:

Nothing that is can pause or stay,

What now is bud must soon be leaf,
What now is leaf will soon decay.

For Nature's law prescribes that all things are constantly going through a process of transmutation; and our most permanent works begin to pass away as soon as created, while the great mass of our products have a life that is scarcely more than ephemeral. It is an old truism that mankind lives from hand to mouth, and if all men were suddenly to cease working, it would be startling to see how quickly they would starve. We do not store or