

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-

land and seeks to crush the Boers. In America our "colonies" and our war of conquest in the east are its first ripened fruit. Militarism, press censorship, interference with free speech, class legislation threaten to follow.

This spirit of toriyism takes two forms. There is the callous, sordid, brutal toriyism of Morgan and Merriam, Hanna and Denby, with its contempt for human life, its frank avowal that might makes right, its un-squeamish desire to trample on the weak. There is the far more dangerous toriyism of benevolence, fathered by the pulpit and indorsed by the influential and the conventionally religious in all parts of the land. This is the toriyism that wishes to control for the good of the controlled. Conscientious of their God-given superiority, its apostles would fain force their fellows to do as they in their omniscience should direct. Justice seems to play small part in this philosophy. It is founded on a perverted and very human wisdom, which an analysis resolves into that colossal error and hoary wickedness of doing evil that good may come.

It is this spirit that makes light of the slaughter of 20,000 Filipinos so that it clear the way for western enterprise and pharisaic evangelism. It is this spirit that lauds the Carnegies and Rockefellers for their donations as if in the eternal economy of the heavens it were the way in which money is expended and not the way in which it is acquired that matters. Its Lord and Lady Bountifuls at home, its bishops and college professors abroad, play directly into the hands of the land grabbers, the blood shedders and all the exponents of the other, the frank and brutal toriyism.

Happily the ideas of our American tories have not yet met with acceptance from any large number of their less prosperous countrymen. Once let these ideas prevail, once let them be accepted meekly by the masses of the people, and democracy as a national possession will become a thing of the past. The forms of republicanism may survive, but they will be empty and meaningless. The people will cease to govern and will submit to be governed. The dreams of benevolent despotism—that contradictory and imposiblle conception—will give

place to the realities of rule by a greedy and conscienceless plutocracy, and freedom will be lost.

This has in the past been the fate of republics where great estates at home and unjust wars abroad sapped the strength and destroyed the moral fiber of the people. Before it overwhelms the United States may an awakened electorate uproot the monopolistic privileges whose growth alone it is that makes assaults on democracy possible and tory theories dangerous.

FRANK C. WELLS.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

NEWS

An unauthentic report of the surrender of both Johannesburg and Pretoria was the final item last week in our narrative of the progress of the British war in South Africa. Although the daily papers were full of this report at the time of our going to press, all of them regarding it as marking the end of the war, the report soon proved to be not only unauthentic but false. Neither Johannesburg nor Pretoria had at that time (May 31) been surrendered. But both have been surrendered since.

Lord Roberts had on the 29th, as authoritatively stated in these columns last week, crossed the Vaal and, moving upon Johannesburg without either encountering much resistance or succeeding in his plans of surrounding the enemy, had occupied a suburb of that town. He intended to enter Johannesburg on the 30th, but delayed doing so at the request of the Boer commandant, in order to enable all the Boer troops to withdraw and thereby to avoid the necessity of street fighting. His entry was not made until June 1, when it was accomplished peaceably. Only three Boer guns were found in the fort. The others had been removed. From Johannesburg Lord Roberts advanced to Pretoria. No news was received from him for four days, when on the 5th he announced his occupation of that city. His dispatches indicate that severe fighting preceded the surrender, but of its extent and casualties no news has yet been received. It would appear to have been a rear guard fight. The Boers got away with everything of value to them, apparently even with the British prisoners who have been confined there.

Pretoria was surrendered on the 5th, but prior to the surrender the Boer forces had withdrawn and the Transvaal government was removed to Lydenburg, about 150 miles east of Pretoria, and somewhat north of the Pretoria and Delagoa Bay railway line. As it is now learned that the Boers have never had in the field more than 35,000 troops, it is probable that they surrendered Pretoria so much more easily than they were expected to, because they could not spare enough men from other points to defend the city, which appears to be so located as to be difficult of defense without a large force; and the indications are that notwithstanding the loss of their capital, the Boers will prolong the war interminably by guerilla tactics.

To some extent they are already doing this with success. During the current week they have been fighting Roberts's right wing, under Gen. Rundle, as far south as Senekal, which lies well to the southeast of Kroonstad, in the Orange Free State. Rundle was reported to have won a fight there on the 28th, but he suffered a loss of 45 men killed and many wounded. In the same region on the following day the Boers captured two British patrols numbering some 40 men, and on the 31st, between Kroonstad and Lindley, Col. Spragge's British regiment of Irish yeomanry was compelled to surrender to a force of Boers described by Lord Roberts to number from 2,000 to 3,000 men. Gen. Methuen had been sent to the relief of Spragge but was too late, though he drove the Boers away with their prisoners after a five-hours' running fight.

The last official list of British casualties cabled to this country brings the total losses of the war down to May 19. It is as follows:

Killed in action.....	2,355
Wounded in action.....	10,794
Missing and prisoners.....	4,555
Died of wounds.....	575
Accidental deaths.....	54
Died of disease.....	2,803
Sent home as invalids.....	10,418

Total to May 19.....31,554

On the 5th the Boer envoys, whose arrival in the United States was noted last week, came to Chicago, where they were welcomed by an overflowing mass meeting to which an admission fee of 25 cents had been charged, the proceeds over expenses to be devoted to the relief of the Boer wound-