

principle of the right of everyone to earn an honest living is sound, it is a principle that applies with no more moral force to a labor "picket" than to a land monopolist. Both interfere with the right of others to earn a living. But the land monopolist is by far the greater offender. For every man that labor "pickets" deprive of a job, land monopolists deprive millions of jobs.

An example of one of the characteristics of imperialism, censorship of the press, when it is in smooth working order and not too drastic, is afforded by Russia, that model empire, which, with fire and sword, would carry its standards of civilization and Christianity to the inferior peoples, just as we are urged to carry ours. The example we refer to is the press instructions issued by the Russian minister of the interior to guide newspapers of Russia with reference to the Chinese situation. They are given by the American Associated Press in these words:

1. No reference to the movement of Russian troops or warships.
2. Papers must bear in mind that the czar is actuated only by a desire to maintain peace and good-will among the nations.
3. No gossip about differences among the powers that would be displeasing to the government.
4. No criticism of Russian diplomacy or of military or naval strategy.
5. Editorial writers should recollect that Russia is predestined to predominate in Asia.
6. Comparisons may be made between Russian and foreign troops and seamen when unfavorable to foreigners.

In reading these instructions an American must experience a crawly feeling. Yet to such press censorizing the imperialists are bringing this country. Don't smile incredulously. The American censorship of the press in the Philippines for the past year has not been one whit less autocratic and mendacious. Nor has it been confined to military secrets. Our press censorship in the Philippines has been distinctly political. What is worse, administration republicans assert the right to make it so in perpet-

uity; for, while they insist that the Philippine islands must be American territory, they declare that the liberty safeguards of the constitution do not protect the people there. Freedom of speech and of the press, then, should Mr. McKinley's colonial policy be sustained, is to be a mere matter of the grace of the sovereign power. It is even so in Russia.

When Mr. McKinley stated that he did not believe in "imperialism" it is evident to all that he was standing upon a definition. At the time he made the statement no dictionary, with the exception of Stormonth's, had added anything to the ancient and classical meaning of the term, though the citation from Pearson: "Roman imperialism had divided the world into master and slave," was not without instruction. But Stormonth, published in 1895, contained an addition, which is worth considering even from the McKinley point of view, as follows:

Imperialism, or Caesarism, as a party name, denotes the supposed government of a ministry, or the personal government of a minister of a constitutional country, hardly within the limits of the constitution; the supposed exercise of such a power as belongs to a despotic government.

The important connection made in this prophetic sentence between "imperialism" and "Caesarism" should not be lost sight of, nor the importance of the latter definition as implied in and logically proceeding from the former. But a still more authoritative signification is to be had from one of the recently issued parts of the Oxford dictionary, the only word-book in English which may be called international in the full sense of the term. The secondary meaning of "imperialism" is there defined to be—

the principle or spirit of empire; advocacy of what are held to be imperial interests. In recent British politics, the principle or policy (1) of seeking, or at least of not refusing, an extension of the British empire in directions where trading interests and investments require the protection of the flag; and (2) of so uniting the different parts of the empire having

separate governments as to secure that for certain purposes, such as warlike defense, internal commerce, copyright, and postal communication, they shall be practically a single state.

With this goes the further and more directly applicable American definition:

In the United States, "imperialism" is similarly applied to the new policy of extending the rule of the American people over foreign countries, and of acquiring and holding distant dependencies, in the way in which colonies and dependencies are held by European states.

That is what "imperialism" is generally supposed to mean; but then everybody was supposed to know just what "plain duty" was supposed to mean. What Mr. McKinley means is probably different, with phrases concerning "confidence in the American character," "belief in an overruling Providence," and "benevolent assimilation to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln," to make it clear to the plain people.

In a recent issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal, a publication which cannot be fairly accused of having free trade sympathies, there appears an item that protectionists might reflect upon very much to their enlightenment. After reciting the fact that of the 661,669 tons of coal imported last year into Chili, only 3,200 tons were from the United States, this item observes that "we ought to furnish a very much larger proportion, but we will hardly do it unless we become buyers of ores and other products from that country." The item indicates that its writer's mind is only in the early stages of economic development. He evidently supposes that profitable commerce consists in exchanging goods with this, that and the other country, by direct trade between those countries respectively and our own; whereas it really consists in exchanging domestic goods for foreign goods, regardless of the particular country or countries to which the domestic goods may go or from which the foreign goods may come. It is immaterial, that is, whether the United States sends

coal to Chili and gets back Chilean ores and other Chilean products by direct trade, or sends the coal to any other country and through the world's network of exchanges gets back the ores or other things from many other countries. The question is one merely of economy, and the respective buyers and sellers will take care of that for themselves.

The principle of international trading is the same as that of individual training. Individuals do not prosper most by the direct trades they make—as when the hatter swaps hats with the shoemaker for shoes, or with the tailor for clothes; but by their indirect trades—as when the hatter sells hats to all buyers, and with the money, check or other certificate of barter he gets for them, buys shoes or clothes or what-not from whomsoever will serve him best in those respects. It is by that principle, also, that nations prosper most; or would, if tariff tinkers and other meddlers would leave their people alone to trade in freedom. But if the Engineering and Mining Journal writer has not advanced far enough to see this, he at any rate has got his eyes turned in this direction. In saying that if we would export to Chili we must import from Chili, he does see, however densely—like seeing men, may be, as trees walking—that importing is as vital to trade as exporting. And that is a long way in advance of the absurd notion, now embalmed in the republican platform; that excessive exporting is the only profitable commerce.

On the question of the value of customhouse statistics of trade balances in showing the prosperity of a country we beg to refer to a comparison of the American with the British statistics. The trade balance of England is what our astute statisticians call “unfavorable”—that is, it shows a continuous excess of imports. Yet the British do not appear to be troubled by it. The more it is so, the better they like it. For they under-

stand that excessive imports mean excessive profits, and that excessive exports mean excessive loss. We append a comparison of the statistics for ten years, the American figures being taken from the official “Statistical Abstract” for 1899 and the British from the “Statesman’s Year Book” for the same year:

	United States.		Great Britain.	
	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.
1890.....	\$790,282,909	\$745,311,652	£248,985,195	£277,697,585
1891.....	945,298,628	798,310,049	280,530,585	420,691,997
1892.....	872,270,993	844,916,195	247,225,150	435,441,264
1893.....	1,015,732,011	827,409,432	277,715,999	421,793,882
1894.....	1,331,050,705	964,409,422	215,452,718	404,583,178
1895.....	899,994,427	793,592,637	216,002,577	416,324,310
1896.....	793,592,637	883,520,437	226,125,249	411,033,068
1897.....	1,032,007,003	770,123,474	234,413,708	451,023,960
1898.....	1,210,231,913	616,049,054	233,580,732	470,604,138
Reduced to dollars at \$1.87 to the £1.....	\$9,062,707,046	\$7,620,630,968	£2,355,096,931	£4,300,729,446
			\$11,469,176,197	\$20,944,552,402

Comparing these totals we find that during the ten years ending with 1898 the following were the balances of trade upon the customhouse returns, respectively, of the two countries:

U. S. exports.....	\$9,062,707,046
U. S. imports.....	7,620,630,968
“Favorable” balance.....	\$1,442,077,078
British imports.....	\$20,944,552,402
British exports.....	11,469,176,197
“Unfavorable” balance.....	\$9,475,376,205

Could greater violence be done to language than to call Great Britain’s excessive income of \$9,475,376,205 during the past ten years an “unfavorable” balance? Yet that is what it must be called if the excessive outgo of the United States of \$1,442,077,078 during the same decade is to be accounted a “favorable” balance. For one is the antithesis of the other. Oh, ye protectionists who account men and nations the richer

the more they give and the poorer the more they get—go to, go to!

It is to be read in the papers of the day that the economic saving already effected by the trusts in the United States equals \$6,000,000 daily. In that form, the statement seems to imply that the people of the country are growing rich at a most rapid rate, since \$6,000,000 saved usually means \$6,000,000 earned. But in this case, unfortunately, that is exactly what the statement does not mean. The words “economic saving” signify that labor has been dispensed with. With natural opportunities for employment in other directions restricted, that kind of saving implies a heavy loss to the working people. Incidentally, too, it would mean that the producers of America have a home market of enormously less value. As the home market is averred to be worth more than any foreign market, and is certainly worth vastly more than any possible tropical market, it seems that present “economic saving” and eventual economic loss may come to much the same thing. Possibly this is one of the instances in which trade follows the flag—downward.

**DOES TRADE FOLLOW THE FLAG?**

“Does trade follow the flag” is a question opportune at a time when men under the pretext that our trade must be increased, advocate the adoption of a policy of colonization and imperialism by the United States. Leaving out the moral principles involved in imperialism, is it a factor in determining the volume of a nation’s trade? In other words, will imperialism pay?

I make the proposition that while tariff and navigation laws affect the commerce of a nation to such an extent that they may almost totally destroy it, imperialism does not affect it at all.

Several countries of Europe and especially Great Britain have many large colonies and dependencies. If trade follows the flag these countries ought to prove it.

Great Britain has been engaged for centuries in developing India and her