Hill at a county fair last week, "is not a living, but free and equal opportunity with every other citizen to obtain a living." Good. And that is precisely what Tom L. Johnson says. But there is this peculiar difference in the effect. The "plutes" and "grafters" applaud Hill, but they denounce Johnson. Why? Evidently because they know that Johnson not only preaches that good democratic sentiment, but believes in it.

—

With Mr. Hill the declaration that our country owes each of its citizens "free and equal opportunity with every other citizen to obtain a living" is mere clap-trap. Let Mr. Hill himself be the judge. Taxes measured by labor values are inconsistent with that doctrine; taxes measured by the value of privileges are in furtherance of it. Which does Mr. Hill favor? Would he exempt the working farmer's improvements and tax the mine owner's mineral deposits, the city millionaire's valuable lots, and the speculative land grabbers' unused acres, or would he retain the present system? It is much to be feared that Mr. Hill's "free and equal opportunity for every citizen to make a living," which rolls so trippingly off his tongue, rolls as trippingly off his conscience.

—

An article by W. H. Allen, quoted editorially in the Chicago Record-Herald of the 31st, deals with the "favorable" balance of trade mystery. It will be recalled that Mr. McKinley said (vol iii, p. 291), in 1900, that our enormous export balance is paid for with "pure gold." Inasmuch as the treasury statistics at that time showed this to be an enormous mistake, and have continued to show the same thing,—our balance of gold imports falling below our balance of merchandise and silver exports millions upon millions of dollars,—this theory of payment has collapsed. Several others have been advanced, only to meet the same fate. At last the assertion is made, very pretentiously, that Europe has been paying off her trade debt to us by sending back to us our own stocks and bonds, and also by allowing our capitalists to invest in European securities. But now comes Mr. Allen, who, according to the Record-Herald,—

> has made up a table of the sales and purchases of shares by foreigners on the New York Stock Exchange as reported weekly in the New York Times and New York Evening Post, and he finds that for the four years, 1898-1901, the net excess of purchases over sales was 3,797,000 shares, while in 1902 alone did the sales exceed the purchases, and then by only 427,000 shares. The net showing for the five years is, therefore, that purchases were in the lead by 3,370,000 shares. As to direct sales and purchases outside the stock exchange, Mr. Allen finds, though by less exact methods, a similar tendency.

That disposes of the vague explanation that our stocks and bonds are coming back to us. On the contrary, we have an export balance of stocks and bonds as well as an export balance of merchandise and silver. Moreover, proceeds the Record-Herald, referring again to Mr. Allen—

> he presents facts to show that instead of our lending money abroad we have been most of the time heavy borrowers, and from this he infers further that we cannot have had funds idle for permanent investments in foreign countries on any large scale. These conclusions evidently make the problem as to how we are paid for our excess of exports all the harder to solve.

Not so much harder, either, if you but consider that most of our stocks represent land values—mines, railway rights of way, etc.—and that foreign holdings of American land by real estate deed instead of corporation stock, are vast. When the land rent (direct as rent and indirect as dividends) is considered, our excess of exports is pretty fully accounted for. Like Ireland, we are paying ground rent to absentees; but unlike Ireland, we are bragging of it, and fatuously regarding it as evidence of prosperity.

First Katydid—Why didn't you come before?

Second Katydid—Were you calling?

"Was I calling? Don't you see how hoarse my legs are?"—Life.

THE SERVICE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

By a very remarkable coincidence the same sweeping remark about our universities was recently made in my hearing by two men of widely differing rank and circumstance. One of them is a labor leader, a man who earns his living by manual labor and yet is a reader and thinker. The other teaches in a university, in its mechanical department, and yet is a believer in social ideals. The words of the two men were almost verbatim the same, and I am doing no violence to either in combining what they said. To put it in fewest words it was, that for the solution of our social problems there is no hope in our universities.

In the two instances the conversation was along what seemed to be entirely different lines. With the labor-leader the talk was of social problems. With the professor the talk was of spiritual problems, or, to be more accurate, it might be better to say that the professor's talk was rather of the maintenance of fine ideals in the midst of modern life.

We may hold that both of the speakers exaggerated extremely in their unqualified statement, and that they were speaking in the free way of private talk, but still it seems worth while to consider what was in their minds in making the statement. If any supposedly sensible people think this way, it is well to know the fact, and to submit to wider judgment whatever of truth or falsity may be in their criticisms.

The position of the labor leader is one with which we are all more or less familiar. He maintained that the specific teaching of the universities in economic and social questions ignores the aspiration of workingmen for better wages and a higher plane of living, that the professors may in a general way contemplate some gradual improvement, but that they do not acknowledge any radical ground for the complaints of wage-earners. His main attack, however, was directed against the general spirit which he conceived to pervade the universities. In brief he held that they are sub-

servient to the classes of privilege and monopoly. To the suggestion that they are open to young men of every class, and that as matter of fact all the large universities contain students who are poor, and are working their way, he replied that such young men are animated by purely personal ambition, and are likely to become the very worst exponents of class privilege. He said that he had known such.

The position of the professor is more surprising, especially as the opinion comes from one connected with what may be called the ultra-practical side of his institution. The conversation began by his criticism of a lecture by one of his colleagues engaged in what may be called the literary side of the institution. He was surprised that this lecture based the value of the study of language and even of history and literature upon their scientific aspect, and that the lecturer seemed to find all his satisfaction in claiming that these subjects had now become as truly scientific as chemistry or physics. There was nothing, he said, in the lecture that upheld the ethical or ideal-producing value of the study of literary subjects. He thought that the lecture was a sign of the times and reflected the prevailing spirit in universities. His attention being called to the great advance in the scientific treatment of such subjects as language, he replied that he was only objecting to the putting of this side first. The universities, he asserted, have been given over partly to purely practical aims, and even those departments which might not be considered purely practical are ashamed to stand for fine ideals, but base their value upon what looks like the practical. He said that he had great respect for his side of the university, which professedly looks toward the bread-and-butter side of things, but that he could not keep from regretting and condemning the course of those departments of literature which seem to be neglecting their great work of maintaining ideals, and to be surrendering their high opportunities to the worldly spirit of utility or to the cold intellectualism of exact science. He had, he said, nothing to say against practical knowledge or the accurate training of exact science; but these are not all. He went so far as to say that the great need of this age is enthusiasm for ideals, enthusiasm for causes that cost sacrifice, and that the universities are doing nothing, apart from their strictly scientific work, to foster enthusiasm for anything but getting on in the world.

Here, in a way, the two critics may be said to have met. Each of them charged that the universities are fostering chiefly the promotion of personal ambition, and are doing little or nothing for the promotion of higher ideals for the common good or for the progress of the social spirit that fosters a broad, rather than a narrow, democracy.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 10.

The news dispatches of last week to the effect that the Supreme Court of Ohio had granted an injunction forbidding the special election at Cleveland on the question of establishing a municipal lighting plant (p. 346) have proved to be well founded. The injunction was granted on the 1st by three judges of the Supreme Court—Shauck, Crew and Davis. It was granted upon the application of the attorney general of the State, in a suit brought by Thomas H. Hogsett, of Cleveland, the attorney of the Cleveland Gas company, who represented the Citizens' league, an organization just formed to oppose the municipal ownership proposition. Politically Mr. Hogsett is accounted a Democrat. He was city solicitor under the administration of Mayor John Farley, whom Tom L. Johnson succeeded. But he does not affiliate with the Democratic party as at present constituted in Cleveland. The injunction order was granted without notice to the city of Cleveland, and it was set for argument on the 22d—two weeks after the date for the special election. A motion to dissolve the injunction, made on the 5th, was heard by Judges Crew and Shauck and denied. Consequently the special election did not come off.

—

Mayor Johnson continued the speaking campaign in favor of the establishment of a municipal lighting plant up to the 8th, notwithstanding the injunction, his last public meeting being held on the 7th, according to the original programme. No public meetings were held by the opposition. At the last meeting but one, Mayor Johnson, as reported, laid the blame for the injunction at the door of Attorney General Sheets, and, through Sheets, at the door of Senator Hanna, who, he said, controls Sheets's actions. With some detail Mr. Johnson reviewed Mr. Sheets's record. He pointed out, among other things, that it was Sheets who had brought the ouster suit which had destroyed the federal plan in Cleveland, that it was largely through Sheets's efforts that the $20,000,000 which had been added to the tax duplicate of the Cleveland public service corporations had been removed, and the city board of tax equalization had been abolished and replaced by a board "perfectly true to Hanna." Mayor Johnson also reviewed the history of the municipal lighting movement in the city council, and attacked the "three so-called Democrats," who had voted with the Republicans to defeat it. "By getting this injunction," Mayor Johnson continued, "the corporations probably thought they would defeat the plan of securing a municipal electric lighting plant. Instead of accomplishing this they have merely made more votes for the proposition. The spectacle of treachery within the Democratic party, the spectacle of Senator Hanna and his factotem, Sheets, enjoining, through the Supreme Court, an expression of popular opinion, the spectacle of the Citizens' association, which is really only a Cleveland Electric Lighting association, posing as the champion of the people and then seeing to it that the people do not have a chance to say what they want, all these have made votes for the municipal electric light proposition, and I believe that the people will decide in its favor by an overwhelming majority. If the people decide otherwise I shall be content, for I