

olis and made his way to the other coast. As soon as the cockney of Printing House square gets beyond the atmosphere of New York he begins to realize from the papers he reads that things are going on all over the world. Before that he had not known from his newspaper reading that there was any world off Manhattan island, except for vacation purposes. This observation is no Chicago provincialism, nor even a comparison of New York papers with Chicago papers. It is a comparison of New York papers with the whole interior press—Cincinnati excepted, for the Cincinnati papers publish more news that isn't worth knowing and less that is than the papers of any other large city on the continent. Of course, all papers are local; but those of New York are preeminently so. They are wearisomely local to readers unacquainted with the purely local affairs of New York. Not only do they devote themselves to local concerns, but they magnify local news to such a degree that of two men of equal education and the same order of intelligence, one of whom had kept "abreast of the times" by reading New York papers and the other by reading the papers of any other city from the Appalachian chain to the Pacific coast (Cincinnati excepted as before), the latter would have his mind in much closer touch with world affairs. To New Yorkers sojourning elsewhere the New York press is especially interesting for only one purpose—to enable them to keep up with home news. The Sycosset Casket serves the same use to former residents of Sycosset.

In a recent sermon in Chicago a Congregational minister, Rev. F. A. Noble, took an unusual view of the Sabbath commandment—

Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, etc.

This commandment is usually treated from the pulpit as one of Sabbath rest; but Mr. Noble, rightly as it seems to us, treated it as one of weekly

work. Instead of placing emphasis upon the command to rest on the seventh day, he placed it upon the command to labor six days. His subject was the walking delegate, whom he contrasted with God; God says to man: "Thou shalt labor;" the walking delegate says: "Thou shalt not labor." But Mr. Noble discreetly refrained from applying his just interpretation of the text to a social evil that is not only vastly greater than the walking delegate evil, but is accountable for it. For every one man whom the walking delegate forbids to labor, land monopoly forbids thousands. When God commanded man to labor, he furnished him the natural opportunities; but human laws have so monopolized these opportunities that even this great country of ours, capable of supplying working opportunities to hundreds of millions, is already "crowded," and men must beg for a chance to work. Out of this condition comes the walking delegate, who orders men not to work so that enough work may be left to go around. In these circumstances, isn't it a little bit like baby play to fire the labor commandment at walking delegates? They are doubtless a safe pulpit mark, because they have few friends in the church as that institution is now organized. But it takes no more courage to fire at a mark from a pulpit than in a shooting gallery. One's courage is tested by his firing at what can fire back. We should be glad to hear Mr. Noble expound his view of the labor commandment with reference to the legalized monopolization of natural laboring opportunities.

It is refreshing to discover in the editorial columns of so important a daily paper as the New York Herald a distinct recognition of the truth about the favorable balance of trade fallacy. This editorial, which appeared in the Herald of May 16, after mentioning the fact that the "excess of exports over imports is smaller than it was a twelvemonth ago," adds:

But the theory once entertained that

national prosperity consists in selling much and buying little has long since been exploded.

When this idea, now so steadily advancing, once takes possession of the public mind, the protection fetish will be unceremoniously knocked off its pedestal.

Even the Journal of Commerce now throws in a qualifying phrase when it points with pride to our excess of exports. In its issue of May 9, in the course of an extended statistical analysis of imports and exports, in which it showed that during the past 30 years "we have exported in merchandise or specie about \$131,500,000 a year more than we have imported, so far as the customhouse figures enable us to trace the course of trade," it explained:

Freights on imports, money spent abroad by travelers, profits and dividends and the movement of securities back and forth, and the large sum of money to our credit in Europe now, for lately we have certainly been sending abroad more than enough to settle all occult as well as all obvious accounts, must be invoked to make the accounts balance. No one supposes that this trade has been done at a loss; no American has sent merchandise or specie abroad without getting its equivalent.

Is it so? Has no American sent merchandise or specie abroad without getting its equivalent? What becomes, then, of the favorable balance of trade theory? An exchange of equivalents, if coincident, can leave no balance either way; if not coincident, the excessive export balance of one time must be offset by an excessive import balance at another. Consequently an exchange of equivalents is inconsistent with a continuous excess of exports, and if excessive exporting be continuous the trade cannot be one of equivalents. It is necessarily a trade in which outgo exceeds income. Yet it is a continuous excess of exports that the protectionists assure us is profitable.

The Yale Law Journal for May contains a scholarly and convincing legal argument on the Puerto Rico

tariff question by Edward B. Whitney, who was one of the assistant attorneys generals during Cleveland's last administration. Mr. Whitney very thoroughly disposes of a great deal of the imperialistic nonsense that has lately been solemnly masquerading in the magazines and newspapers as constitutional law and precedent. So far as past precedents go, he shows, after a full and discriminating examination, that their weight is against the imperialistic position and in favor of the doctrine that Puerto Rico became part of the United States, at least to the extent of acquiring the benefit of the constitutional clause regarding uniformity of taxation, as soon as the Spanish treaty was ratified. He establishes the same conclusion upon an equally profound examination into the subject as an original question. In this examination Mr. Whitney demonstrates that the constitution must extend to Puerto Rico in order to empower the American officials to act there at all, since they have no power to act anywhere except by authority of the American people as expressed in the constitution.

In concluding his paper Mr. Whitney deals with the "implied sovereignty" notion of the imperialists in a manner so comprehensive yet concise that we quote him literally. On this point he says:

There is one gross fallacy which should be noticed in closing this discussion, a fallacy which seems undisputed, and which is applied to Puerto Rico and Oceania alike. I refer to the supposition that congress and the executive can turn our republic into an imperial "world power" at their discretion because to conquer or buy the earth and rule it in subjection is an attribute of sovereignty, and because we have no smaller degree of sovereignty than the greatest of European colonizing nations. It is very true that we have every power of sovereignty in the highest degree—that we have power to establish for ourselves the colonial system of Rome or England, the domestic institutions of Spain or Russia, the religion of Thibet or Sulu. But we have not necessarily delegated those powers to our present rulers. And whatever powers we have not delegated

to them, or to the state governments, we have reserved for ourselves.

All that should be obvious enough. It is only an amplification of the well understood theory of our state and national governments that they are governments by the people. But this Jeffersonian and Lincolnian doctrine has suffered some hard knocks at the hands of the present federal administration.

DEMOCRACY.

The essence of democracy is self-respect. In exact proportion with the approach to universality of this sentiment in any country will be its approach to the ideals of democracy. Political self-respect inheres in the possession of a vote equal in weight to the vote of any other and in eligibility to every office in the nation from the highest down. In a democracy the suffrage is a right and not a privilege. Politically, therefore, the United States, barring its sex discriminations, is a democracy. No American can lose his political self-respect save by his voluntary act. When he sells his vote, or permits another to dictate how it shall be cast, or when he buys another's vote or seeks by intimidation to influence it or advocates depriving any class of citizens of their right to vote, he ceases to be a democrat and becomes politically a serf or a tyrant.

It is often said that Great Britain to-day is a more democratic country than the United States. Those who make this assertion mean that the government of Great Britain, free from the restraints of a written constitution, responds more quickly and surely to the changing currents of popular opinion than does that of America. This is a great advantage, but it does not in itself constitute democracy. Our restrictions are of our own making and can be thrown off by us whenever we get sufficiently in earnest to do so. In England the suffrage is still regarded as a privilege, and there are large classes of people on whom it has not been bestowed, while members of the other classes possess two, three and sometimes a dozen votes each. In Great Britain, too, a hereditary and absolutely irresponsible chamber can defeat the will

of the people's representatives and a hereditary monarch must be supported and deferred to. Politically the United States is a more democratic country than it is possible for Great Britain or any monarchy to be.

When we turn from political to social democracy, the advantage on our side is still more apparent. In Europe the vices of subserviency on the one side and snobbery on the other have their roots away back in feudal times, and their gradual decay is the slow growth of centuries. In America, except for the curse of negro slavery, we had the inestimable advantage of starting fair. Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues laid broad and deep a foundation of equality on which the American people have since stood. Hence, ours is still to Europe's down-trodden millions the land of the free. We hold in repugnance the stratification of classes into upper, middle and lower. We smile contemptuously at the antics of royalty. We make presidents of rail splitters and canal boys. If our millionaires try to emulate the haughty pretensions of Europe's aristocracy they are jeered at for their pains. No man orders himself lowly and obediently before his betters. He who greets another obsequiously or begs a gratuity or dons a livery may possibly have been born under the American flag, but in the act he repudiates his democratic heritage and ceases to be an American.

This is democracy. This is the spirit of our fathers. It has in the past been shared by native and foreign-born alike. It still endures, and so long as it endures, though the fabric of our political liberty may crumble, there will remain unshaken the foundation on which to rebuild.

For the preservation of this spirit, then, every believer in the republic should strive. To deny the grave danger that threatens it is idle. With the growth of wealth and monopoly an opposite spirit—the spirit of toryism—has gained ground. This is the spirit that denies the equal and natural rights of men, that believes in the rule of the few, that would impose educational restrictions on the suffrage, that would prevent popular agitation by the arm of force. It is the spirit which in England cherishes aristocratic privileges, maintains a state church, denies freedom to Ire-