

thing but word mongering now, alas!) is one of the saddest and most wonderful phenomenon of the general spiritual decline of our day.

In the same speech, Mr. Hoar girded at the administration for its silence on the Boer struggle and contrasted the eagerness of the republican senators to express their sympathy for Venezuela in its contention with Great Britain, with their silence on the murder of the South African republics. "Where are they now?" asked the old Massachusetts senator. "They are bound over to keep the peace; they are bound over to hold their peace, the open door and the shut mouth." And the joke of it is, as we now see it, that the door was soon after shut as well as their mouth, and the British as well as Yankees outside of it, while direct overland connection with China is made for England's inveterate enemy whom she has always been preparing to fight for the last three generations. It is the work of the wills of the gods, most assuredly, that just at the appointed hour, when Asia is dropping into Russia's grasp, as England has always dreaded its doing, Great Britain finds herself so limited with Chamberlain and Rhodes's shameful and disastrous commercialism in South Africa, plain sandbagging highway robbery in the eye of international law, that she cannot move hand or foot to resist!

It is proposed by L. A. Russell, the Cleveland lawyer, that—

American citizens get together everywhere in their home localities in mass meetings and send word direct to the citizens of Cuba and the citizens of the Philippines that we perfectly understand that our hired men at the present moment operating our governmental functions are betraying our faith toward them, and ask them to administer their own affairs as patiently as they can till we can get our affairs into such hands as will execute our intentions by respecting the independence of Cuba and the Philippines and letting them alone except in friendly intercourse and mutual helpfulness. It seems to me straight talk from us to those peoples is now necessary to save our nation from doing them more wrong

and to save ourselves and our posterity from being slaves to tyrants.

Word comes up from South America that the people of those countries are mentally disturbed by a growing conviction that the United States contemplates appropriating their countries as additional "new possessions." This is what it means to get a bad name. After our national crime with reference to the Philippines, and our unblushing national perfidy with reference to Cuba, no foreigner would believe our most solemn protestations that we are not ambitious of empire, and none would trust us again in the presence of a national temptation. This is humiliating to an American, and it is inexpressibly disappointing and saddening to those European lovers of liberty who have been accustomed to look to the United States as the exemplar of the nations. We are told that Russian exiles in Siberia, victims of an absolutism from which at the risk of fortune and life they have struggled to free their own country, were dumb with amazement and sorrow when they learned that the United States had taken the title and the place of Spain in subjugating the Filipinos. At first they refused to believe it, suspecting the story as another St. Petersburg lie invented and published for their discouragement. But time brought confirmation of the story, and they were forced to acknowledge, what the loyal officers of the tsar had long insisted upon, that the aspirations of the United States were the same as those of the oppressive land-grabbing nations of Europe. The pity of it! The shame of it!

The system of putting prisoners accused of crime into what the police significantly and aptly call the "sweat box," has been vigorously condemned by Judge Tuley, of Chicago. In the particular case, it was charged that the prisoner had been brought to the prosecuting attorney's office and questioned. Judge Tuley said of this: "I cannot countenance the

practice of the state attorney's office in sending for defendants charged with crime and interviewing them in the state's attorneys office in the absence of their attorneys." This practice is denied by the state's attorney, but it is a common practice with the police. One of the favorite methods of extorting confessions is the police "sweat box," which is a sort of European court of "first instance." The prisoner is subjected to a torturing cross examination without the advice or protection of counsel, but none of the safeguards of "courts of first instance" are thrown about him. The "sweat box" is an irresponsible and pernicious institution. Its object is not so much to expose crime and punish criminals, as to confuse prisoners and make them, innocent or guilty, convict themselves.

We have no disposition to say anything about Andrew Carnegie's munificent benefactions. On the one hand there is nothing in this philanthropic spree of a modern Dives to call for commendation; and on the other, the expenditure by any man of what society concedes to be his own fortune, is a private matter outside the pale of criticism. It is only when the question of how a millionaire ought to use his wealth is brought forward in connection with these charitable performances that the subject becomes one of public concern. Then it is of public concern only to the extent of justifying the retort that it is nobody's business but his own how any millionaire uses his wealth, provided he does not use it prejudicially to the rights of others. The vital question is not how millionaires use their wealth, but how they get it. Not how they did get it, for what has happened has happened, and by-gones should be by-gones; but how they are getting it now. Have they a hoard of goods formerly accumulated, from which they draw? Then their getting it hurts nobody. Do they earn it as they go along? Then their getting it benefits everybody. Or do they merely possess legal authority

to levy continually upon the common earnings for their own enrichment? Then their getting it is a present and continuing wrong, which is of incalculable public concern.

There is more idiotic bragging about our wonderful excess of exports. For the eight months ending with February, the excess of exports of merchandise was \$492,224,994. That means that nearly half a billion of goods have gone out of the country, over and above what were paid for by goods coming in. To the country, therefore, these figures show a loss—unless the difference has been, is now, or is to be paid, in some way or other. It has not been paid in the past, for our excess of exports has been almost continuous since 1873, and foots up an enormous total. It is not paid with gold or silver now, for during the same eight months our excess of silver exports was \$17,951,416, thus increasing the aggregate of our export balance instead of paying any part of it; and our excess of gold imports during the same period was but \$23,886,395—only \$5,934,979 more than enough to pay for the exported silver. Of the excessive merchandize exports of the past eight months, then, we have received back in gold payments less than 1¼ per cent. What has become of the rest?

Absent-minded persons searching the house over for their spectacles which all the time rest upon their foreheads, furnish material for jokers; but these absent-minded mortals, when their attention is directed to the location of the missing spectacles, instantly find them and laugh over their stupidity in not locating them sooner and without outside help. Not so with your "favorable balance of trade" man. He looks at first for the profits of his boasted favorable balance in gold importations. You may talk yourself hoarse explaining to him that an excessive outgo implies loss, and that if it is perpetual it implies perpetual loss; but he assures you that the balance

is paid in gold. Learning after many humiliating disappointments that the balance is after all not paid in gold, for there is an excessive outgo of gold also, he then looks for some other plausible explanation of his conviction that balances of outgo are profitable, instead of acknowledging the simple truth that profit lies not in outgo balances, but in income balances.

At the present time he is content with the notion that our perpetual outgo balance is favorable because it creates obligations abroad which are to be paid in gold some time or other. But he is as far afield as ever. Though we have had a continuous export balance for almost 30 years, our net foreign credits are nil. We owe more to foreigners than foreigners owe to us. American securities are dealt in on the foreign exchanges, but foreign securities are not dealt in on our exchanges. Foreigners own American land, but we own no foreign land worth mentioning. And so it goes. If the books were balanced, it would appear—and nobody disputes it—not only that we owe foreigners enormously more than they owe us, but that they own ever so much more American property than Americans own of foreign property. Yet our excess of exports since the foundation of the government runs well up into the billions. And what is more remarkable, our astute economists, as well as our rule-o'-thumb business men, point to this excess as evidence of our abounding prosperity. It is as if a debtor seeking credit should offer to prove his solvency by showing that although he is deeper in debt than ever, he has for 30 years paid out continuously more than he has received in.

Of the tendency toward cramming the heads of the common people with one-sided political opinions, there is increasing evidence. A correspondent calls our attention to an instance. The Carnegie free library of Allegheny holds itself out as a public

institution. It is therefore under obligations not to be partisan in its selections of reading matter. Acting upon this theory, our correspondent last year subscribed for *The Public* for the reading room of that library, and offered to do the same this year. But the librarian has courteously declined the offer on the ground that the reading room is congested—that, in other words, the space is too limited to admit *The Public*. Our correspondent ventured to doubt this explanation; and, haunted with a suspicion, he made a census of the reading room literature, with the result that he found only one democratic paper, the *Pittsburgh Post*, in the collection. With the exception of that daily, and regular magazines like the *Arena* and *Municipal Affairs*, he did not discover any democratic publications. He expresses his conviction, therefore, that "the democracy of *The Public* is the reason for its exclusion, and not the congestion of the reading room." Facts like these are worth collecting for the light they throw upon certain tendencies in certain paternalistic quarters.

From different sources we have been asked about Prof. Gunton and his college of economics. It seems that he is working his ideas of protection, plutocracy, and so on, into the Y. M. C. A.'s of the country, and a suspicion has arisen that he is a hired emissary of Hannaistic republicans. We have good authority for saying that Gunton is managed by nobody but Gunton; that he is one of those self-sufficient mortals who is conscious of little but his own cerebration. Prof. Gunton does a great deal of thinking. He claims, indeed, so we are reliably informed, to be a professional thinker, having so trained his mind as to be competent to wrestle mentally with any subject, whether acquainted with it or not, and promptly to see its bearings, define the information needed, weigh the information when obtained, and produce an expert con-