

a mild imperial government, nor the nearest approach to a republic its people are capable of instituting, can surely not be satisfied with a dictatorship. Should the latter be established it would doubtless be short-lived, and there would soon be another dash for the formation of a republic, in unison with the declaration that it must be that or a state of anarchy.

The alleged republic, which is on its last legs, made a great mistake at the opening of its short career. It sought recognition from the head of the Catholic church. The answer was emphatic. It practically was to the effect that the price of such recognition was that catholicism should be regarded and treated as the State religion. The republic conceded this, and therefore made an egregious blunder. A republic that discriminates between religions is a delusion and a sham. It is not a free government and cannot be properly considered as of, for and by the people.

"TYRANNY FROM BELOW."

MAX O'RELL is greatly exercised on behalf of the "upper stratum" of American society. He does not think they are getting full justice out of their democratic institutions. He has become so concerned over the abuse they are suffering at the hands of their vulgar inferiors that he turns away from their oppressors to upbraid them for cowardice in submitting to such tyranny. "They have given themselves a hundred thousand masters," says he with manifest emotion, "these folk who laugh at monarchies, and scorn the rule of a king, as if it were better to be bullied by a crowd than by an individual. In America the man who pays does not command the paid. I have already said it: I will maintain the truth of the statement that in America the paid servant rules. Tyranny from above is bad; tyranny from below is worse."

The author of this touching sentiment has got into precisely the same confusion that falls upon the mass of less brilliant European "sociologists" who have undertaken the task of saving the people of the United States from the ruinous consequences of too much liberty.

His view of the situation is all right save in the matter of standpoint. If one were making a critical inspection of a healthy and full-grown forester in the season of its vigor he would not choose to look down upon it from a balloon through a mat of foliage and lesser limbs. If he were sensible he would go to the trunk, the basis of growth and the foundation of structural strength.

M. O'Rell has been looking at our political organism through its outer branches. All that he appears to have seen at all clearly is the ephemeral ornamentations that flourish during a given period of sunshine in a state of temporary exaltation and then tumble off and are no more.

When he speaks of us as "lions ruled by bulldogs and asses," his "lions" are certain embellishments of American society whose claim upon such an appellation is that like most animals of prey, they manage to live upon what somebody else has produced. "His bulldogs and asses" are the common people who in the domain of monarchs are but the slaves of his "lions" of society. An exercise of simple personal liberty on the part of such would naturally make them appear in his eyes to be almost anything you please that is particularly repulsive. And so he characterizes their exercise of natural rights as "tyranny from below."

Seeing these but dimly through the confusion of upper ornaments of society, he not only fails to recognize them as the great trunk of the American system but has made them out as something quite outside of the social structure. Had he begun his investigations right, he would have observed that if there are any real lions in this country they are these very beings whom he calls "bulldogs and asses." They indeed rule here, but it is their government, and why should they not rule? If their authority over affluence and idleness is tyranny, those people who are thus tyrannized over can at any time adjust the wrong by coming down from the stratum of the oppressed onto that of the tyrant. Such a betterment they can secure to themselves at any time without the slightest fear of restraint. That they do not avail themselves of the superior privileges of these "bulldogs and asses" when they can help it is good evidence that the tyranny under which they suffer is a sacrifice which they endure from choice.

This system of "bulldog" rule has at least one quality to be desired, which is conspicuously wanting in M. O'Rell's scheme. It is not a monopoly. Any man may be one of the "bulldogs," but to be a "lion" after M. O'Rell's definition, he must eat the bread of some other man's labor, which all men could not do if they wanted to. The difference then, between the "tyranny from below," which M. O'Rell views with such abhorrence, and the "tyranny from above," which he thinks is to say the least less abominable, is that in the one case the bans of "tyranny" are

sought as a condition of luxury and in the other their limitations are absolute and the bearers are slaves without remedy. Further comment is not necessary on logic of this sort.

POPULATION OF KANSAS.

ACCORDING to the bulletin pertaining to population in Kansas, that State had in 1880 998,098 inhabitants, and on June 1st, 1890, 1,427,096, thus showing for the decade an increase of nearly 43 per cent.

There are in Kansas 106 counties, and six of these show decreases. In 1880 there were only ten cities showing a population each of 4000 or more, with an aggregate of 84,907. Under the present census nineteen cities show each a population of 4000 or more, with an aggregate of 223,674. This makes an increase of nine in the number of cities, and an increased percentage in population of 184.

Kansas City stands first with 38,316 inhabitants. In 1880 it had only 3200, thus showing an increase for the decade of 1,097 per cent. Topeka has a population of 31,007, Wichita 23,853, Leavenworth 19,768, Atchison 13,963, and Fort Scott 11,946. Atchison is the only city which shows a decrease since 1880. The cities which show greatest increases are Pittsburg with 973 per cent., Arkansas City with 725 per cent., Hutchinson with 463 per cent., and Wichita with 386 per cent.

CITY OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC WORKS

SOME time ago the President appointed a commission to investigate the condition of the streets and subways of Washington City, in compliance with the provision of an act of Congress to that effect. The report of the commission is a very comprehensive document and does not confine itself to Washington, nor even to American cities in general, but embraces many leading foreign cities. The President regards it in so valuable a light that he intends laying it before Congress, and will recommend that it be printed for wide distribution among municipal authorities in the United States.

The gist of the report is, that it recommends municipal ownership of streets in every sense of the word. That is, the municipality should retain the right to run street cars, to own the gas, water and electric plants which use streets for distribution. In the case of street railways the city of Paris is mentioned as being the model in this line. Paris owns all the street car systems within its limits. Every ten years