

in Cuba; there, too, it must remain. if Mr. McKinley's stump speeches are to be accepted as indications of Mr. Hanna's campaign policy.

It is true that in his last message to congress, President McKinley himself proposed to haul down the American flag in Cuba, as soon as stable self-government should have been established there. More than that, both he and congress solemnly pledged this nation to the world when the war with Spain began, that though the flag might be raised in Cuba, to relieve the people from the dominion of Spain, it should be hauled down when that dominion ceased. We are distinctly and solemnly pledged against Cuban conquest. But in Mr. Hanna's code of public morals, of which Candidate McKinley is a diligent student, solemn national pledges are trifling things. Even the utterances of President McKinley himself, in the message on which the ink is hardly dry, are brushed aside by Candidate McKinley, when Mr. Hanna blows the bugle for the next presidential campaign. Having planted the flag in both hemispheres, we are now challenged by the Hanna candidate to haul it down if we dare. Upon the basis of that spurious patriotism, Mr. McKinley enters the lists for reelection.

The Outlook, which has certainly not been over-zealous in opposing the evident drift of the American government toward imperialism, has this to say for itself:

We have yet to read any editorial, speech, or platform which proposes to abandon the American ideal of growth for the European ideal of colonial conquest. We have yet to see any sign anywhere in American life of a desire to take a share in the possible division of the territories of eastern peoples or the extension of the American frontier by the sword. If this spirit ever should appear in America, The Outlook will be found in the front of the battle against it.

If the Outlook is no keener at detecting the presence of evil spirits than its foregoing confession would imply,

we fear that the spirit of imperialism will have become incarnate before our contemporary suspects its appearance. What is the meaning of the American demand for the cession of Porto Rico and the Philippines, when only relinquishment of sovereignty is required in the case of Cuba, if it doesn't mean that we are extending our frontiers by the sword? The battle against imperialism is likely to be fought and over before the judicious Outlook discovers that it has a front to get into.

There is at present a wonderful resemblance between English and American politics. In both, imperialism has become an absorbing subject. Though the English policy has been in a sense imperialistic for much more than a century, it is only recently that imperialism has become a burning political question with the English in the same sense in which it has so suddenly become that kind of question with us. What American victories over Spain have done for us, the Sirdar's victories in the Nile valley have done for the English. And the circumstances as well as the result are strikingly similar.

When England had in 1882 suppressed the Egyptian insurrection of Arabi Pasha, an English army of occupation was left in the country for the purpose of protecting the khedive and restoring order. The idea of annexing Egypt was scouted then, and even such feeble demands for a protectorate as found voice in England at the time were silenced by authoritative declarations that as soon as a stable government had been established in Egypt the English troops would be withdrawn. But the dervish insurrection which soon afterward broke out in the Soudan occupied the attention of the English army in Egypt, and continued to do so until last autumn. Gen. Kitchener then overwhelmed the dervish forces, captured their strongholds upon the Nile, advanced to Fashoda, and laid the foundation for a British claim to

the backbone of the African continent from Alexandria to Capetown. This performance excited the jingo spirit in England beyond measure. And although the ministry was evasive as to its intentions, there was soon no room left to doubt that England had settled in Egypt to stay. The pledge to retire upon the establishment of order was no longer regarded as binding. The Spectator, a leading Tory paper, frankly scolded the party leaders for not declaring openly in parliament that the English "intended to stop in Egypt."

While England was thus coming under the spell of the lust of conquest, so also, in much the same manner, was the United States, only with the Philippine archipelago and the West Indian islands, instead of Egypt, for the object of its greed. As England had undertaken in the interest of humanity to restore order in Egypt, so we had undertaken in the interest of humanity to expel the cruel Spaniard from Cuba. As England had pledged herself to withdraw from Egypt upon the restoration of order, so we had pledged ourselves to withdraw from Cuba upon the expulsion of the Spaniard. As England, with eyes rolled toward heaven had assured the world that she was not bent upon conquest, so we with hand upon heart proclaimed that conquest was the one thing which by our code of morality would be criminal aggression. But as the brilliant victories of Kitchener stirred the patriotic cupidity of the English and pointed as with the finger of destiny to Egypt as legitimate British soil, even so did the brilliant victories of our arms make us forget our pledges along with our principles, and give us that impulse toward imperialistic conquest which is now the great agitating factor in both English and American politics.

Nor is the resemblance between English and American politics confined to the question of imperialistic conquest. It relates also to the con-

dition of the political parties. The democratic party of the United States has long resembled the liberal party of England, just as the republican party of the United States has long resembled the English tory party. But this resemblance is now closer than ever before. As the republican party is in our country distinctively the party of imperialistic conquest, so is the tory party in England. The tories as a party are bent upon taking permanent possession of Egypt, precisely as the republicans as a party are bent upon taking permanent possession of Porto Rico, the Philippines and Cuba—or as their spokesmen express it, upon never allowing the flag to be hauled down from any place over which it has once been raised. Then, on the other hand, the liberals and the democrats are alike as parties, not only in the general trend of their views, but also because they are the party of opposition, and are therefore cursed with influential members whose real sympathies and interests are with the other side. There is still another point of resemblance. The English liberals, like the American democrats, comprise a great variety of schools of home reform. In the present transition stage this is the cause of much disheartening discord; but as the parties readjust themselves to the new political conditions, it will be a source of party strength and national advantage. In England as in the United States the day is not far distant, when the broader and more comprehensive of these clashing reforms will give character to the liberal party of England and to the democratic party in the United States, and, producing new party alignments, will introduce an era in politics to the culmination of which we may well look forward with hope.

The indications of such an era in England are already strong. The liberal party is without a leader and without a platform. Imperialism has shaken it badly. But it is pulling itself together in encouraging fashion. Some idea of the drift may be ob-

tained from a tentative program proposed for the party by the London Daily Chronicle, a paper which, while not attached to either party, fairly represents a large body of liberal sentiment. In this program there are 12 propositions, among them being two of exceptional significance. One declares "for placing under the control of the municipalities all those services necessary to their expansion and to the health and well being of the people;" the other demands that the public "divert to the service of state or municipality those funds which are due not to individual but to general effort."

The second of these propositions will be recognized as an unqualified adoption of the program of Henry George. It is an interesting fact in this connection that long before his death, and continually thereafter until he died, George predicted that as soon as the Irish question had been disposed of, the land question would come to the front in English politics. The Irish question has now been disposed of. In the tentative program for the liberals mentioned above, the Daily Chronicle, while proposing a pledge to continue to insist upon the right of self-government for the Irish, proposes at the same time to declare independence of the Irish political alliance. And Mr. Asquith, who was home secretary under the last liberal government, leaves the Irish question wholly out of the liberal program which he outlined in a recent speech. Not only did he leave the Irish question out, but in verification of Henry George's prophecy he put the land question in. Mr. Asquith laid stress upon three social and economic propositions. One of these related to the compensation of workmen for injuries to limb or health received in the course of their employment, and another to the improvement of the condition of the aged poor. The third and principal proposition was a demand for the taxation of land values.

That "the single tax," as we should call Mr. Asquith's proposition in this

country, has effected secure lodgment in the liberal party's policy, is indicated by other things than the programs suggested by the Daily Chronicle and Mr. Asquith's speech. In commenting upon that speech the Manchester Guardian, the best and strongest if not the leading liberal paper of England, spoke in these unmistakable terms:

The taxation of ground values offers many difficulties of detail; but, from Mill onwards, economists have recognized the injustice and impolicy of allowing so large a measure of the wealth created by municipal energy and the industry of the community to pass in the form of enhanced ground rents into the hands of land owners without calling upon this class for any proportionate return. The system is unjust because it throws upon the occupiers, those who live and work in a town, the whole cost of the improvements through which it grows and thrives, while the result of this thriving and growth is that in a few years the occupier has to pay so much the more for the privilege of living in the place. Thus the occupier pays twice over, while the ground landlord makes no return for the increased value of his land. This is the injustice of the system. Its impolicy is that by imposing too heavy a burden on the rate payers it cripples municipal administration and deprives a progressively minded community of the sinews of war. We are glad to find Mr. Asquith following Lord Ripon in urging this matter upon the attention of the Liberals.

One of the most effective agencies, perhaps, in fostering the English sentiment to which the Manchester Guardian thus gives expression, has been the Financial Reform Association of Liverpool—the leading free trade body of England. Americans are in the habit of regarding the Cobden club as the organized representative of English free trade; but that is a mistake. The Cobden club never comprehended the depth or breadth of the English free trade movement. And as to the Anti-Corn Law league, under which the free trade fight was begun, that had dissolved before even customs protection had been abolished. Soon after the Anti-Corn Law league dis-

solved, the Financial Reform association was formed at Liverpool for the purpose of carrying out the work of the league to its logical and radical conclusion. This was in 1848, and the association has just issued from its headquarters, 18 Hackens Hey, Liverpool, a neat historical brochure in celebration of its fifty years of work. From this "Fifty Years' Retrospect," as it is entitled, it appears that Robertson Gladstone, brother of the great premier, was the first president of the association. Its expressed objects from the beginning were "Economic Government, Just Taxation, and Perfect Freedom of Trade." Richard Cobden was naturally a patron of the association. Naturally, also, the association early began an agitation for land value taxation, as a necessary condition of "just taxation" and "perfect freedom of trade." The first act in that direction was taken in 1856, while Mr. Gladstone was still the president. It consisted of an attack upon the exemptions of unused land. Following that lead the association is a consistent advocate of the abolition of taxes on production and the imposition of all taxes upon ground values. Edmund K. Muspratt, J. P. Co.C., has been the president of the association since 1873, and J. W. S. Callie is the secretary.

Some correspondent of the Home Market Club, the famous protection organization of Boston, has obtained by letter from Albert Clarke, the secretary, a reply to our contention that excessive exports are unfavorable instead of favorable; and we are asked to discuss it. We must decline. It would be unfair to Mr. Clarke to discuss an argument which was not intended for publication, and evidently does not fairly represent his controversial powers. The letter contains one illustration, however, to which we may not unfairly call attention. It is the common argument that excessive exports must be favorable to a nation because they are to an individual. As Mr. Clarke puts it: "A man who sells more than he buys grows rich." But the very

reverse of this is true. A man who sells more than he buys grows poor.

Let us illustrate. Here is a country boy who with a thread and a crooked pin catches a quantity of trout in the stream by his father's house. Some visitor in the neighborhood buys the trout and gives the boy in exchange for them an order on the village store for a dollar's worth of any kind of goods he wants. He has now exported his trout, one dollar's worth, and imported nothing. If his transactions stopped there, he would be no better off than before he caught the trout. But, conscious of the fact that an excess of exports is unfavorable, he delivers the order at the store in exchange for peanuts, which he brings home. Upon getting them home, a neighbor offers him \$1.25 for them. Accepting the offer, he takes the neighbor's order upon the store keeper and exchanging it for more peanuts, for which another neighbor would pay \$1.50 rather than go for them to the village himself, the boy balances his exports and imports. How do they stand?

Exports.		Imports.	
Trout.....	\$1 00	Peanuts.....	\$1 25
Peanuts.....	1 25	Peanuts....	1 50
Total....	\$2 25	Total.....	\$2 75
Excess of imports, or profit, \$0.50.			

What that boy's excess of imports means to him—and they stand for his profit—precisely that does every merchant's excess of imports mean to him, and every nation's mean to its people. Our exports only enable us to import. The mere act of exporting is in itself of no benefit to us. Unless we import what is worth more to us than our exports we are the worse off. It is the excess in value to us of what we buy, over the value to us of what we sell, that enriches us.

Reverse the above illustration and see if it does not prove that an excess of exports means not profit but loss. While the boy is bringing home his first purchase of peanuts, let us suppose that he loses some of them on the way. It would make no difference whether they fell into the gutter,

whether a rascally boy robbed him of them, or whether he gave them away at the suggestion of some practical joker, who had assured him that the more he exported and the less he imported the better off he would be—or, as Mr. Clarke puts it, that "a man who sells more than he buys grows rich." The important fact would be that the boy had brought home peanuts worth less than \$1, in exchange for the dollar order that had been given him for his trout. Let us suppose that when he gets his peanuts home they are worth 75 cents to the neighbor who buys them of him. Then this neighbor would give him an order for 75 cents, instead of for \$1.25, as in the previous illustration; and the boy would exchange that order for more peanuts, which, upon his getting them home, are so reduced in quantity—by the gutter, the rascally boy or the practical joker—that they are worth only 60 cents. Now let him balance his exports and imports, and here is how the account would stand:

Exports.		Imports.	
Trout.....	\$1 00	Peanuts.....	\$0 75
Peanuts.....	0 75	Peanuts.....	0 60
Total.....	\$1 75	Total.....	\$1 35
Excess of exports, or loss, \$0.40.			

No well-informed person would think of accusing the Engineering and Mining Journal, published at New York, of being in the slightest degree prejudiced against American plutocracy. It is well known as a journal which is entirely satisfied with American economic conditions as they are. We make this explanation by way of introducing a comparison of American with German wages in coal mines, which the Engineering and Mining Journal made in its issue of October 8, 1898.

The comparison will astonish a good many people, as it did the Engineering and Mining Journal itself. Premising that it is generally assumed that mining wages in America are on a higher level than in Europe, the Journal says that "the mining rate per day is higher, but the average