

ence to the rent payers as individuals. Since they would have to pay the rent anyhow, it does not immediately concern them individually that it goes ultimately to a man in London, instead of going to a man in New York. Yet the country at large is poorer. That is, there is less wealth in the country if that wealth becomes an export to London without an equivalent import, than there would be if it remained here. This is true likewise if the excessive export be for the purpose of paying tourists' expenses. The tourists have their enjoyment for their expenditure, but the aggregate of wealth in their country is thereby lessened. It is also true of wealth shipped abroad for dividends and interest on stocks and bonds. The individuals who pay the dividends and interest to foreigners are no poorer as individuals than if they paid them to their compatriots; but there is consequently less wealth in the country. And so of all shipments of wealth abroad for which no return shipments of wealth are made. Individuals may be no worse off as such and directly, but the country is thereby drained of wealth.

With characteristic pithiness, Mr. Bryan describes the inner motive of opponents of imperialism who refuse to support the democratic ticket because of the silver plank in the platform, when he says that they prefer a gold standard empire to a bimetallic republic. And he pays to anti-imperialists generally the compliment of believing them to be intelligently patriotic when he adds:

When the test comes I believe that those who adhere to the doctrine that governments derive their just powers not from superior force but from consent of the governed will support our ticket even though they do not indorse the silver plank. A large majority of the democrats believe that a restoration of bimetallicism would prove a blessing, but the anti-imperialists who dispute this will admit that any evils that might arise from bimetallicism could be corrected more easily than the evils which would follow from the deliberate indorsement of militarism and imperialism.

Some voters who, for economic reasons opposed Bryan four years ago, are in doubt as to the course they ought to follow this year. The problem should not be difficult. If they believe in plutocracy, they should vote for McKinley, regardless of any particular issue. If they believe in democracy they should vote for Bryan. Not that Bryan is altogether democratic, nor that McKinley is altogether plutocratic. But Bryan represents the democratic tendency, while McKinley represents the plutocratic tendency; and tendencies are in these times all that anyone can vote for or against. There are political periods when the voter can help along a particular reform by voting for the party that advocates it and against the party that has opposed or betrayed it. But when broad principles are manifestly at stake in party contests no one can by his vote adjust the details of government to his liking. A vote for or against civil service reform, for instance, or for or against a certain ratio in the coinage of gold and silver, counts for nothing at such times. All that the voter can do then is to strengthen one of two great tendencies, and weaken the other. He can this year strengthen the tendency toward plutocracy or the tendency away from it. He can do nothing more. It was the same four years ago, and those who voted for McKinley then have got a taste of imperialism, which is one of the phases of plutocracy.

If it is true, as some of the administration papers are claiming, that the gold standard law enacted last spring is not an honest gold standard law, but that it could be circumvented by a hostile secretary of the treasury, the laugh is on the gold standard democrats. They were assured by Mr. Hanna's party, and they went about assuring others, that the wicked Bryan couldn't possibly disturb their gold fetish for years to come, because Mr. McKinley had put it into a glass case with a time-lock attachment. It must be heartrending to learn now that they were buncoed.

But Mr. McKinley offers to give them a sure-enough gold standard law next time if they will indorse his imperial policy. It is a bargain, a splendid bargain. A yellow dollar for the privilege of turning the republic into an empire! What assurance is there, though, that if Mr. McKinley be given his empire-building authority he will make a more honest gold standard law next time than the last?

We do not wholly agree with the criticisms of Senator Hoar upon his decision to support President McKinley. By this we refer to the man and not to his reasons. Worse reasons could hardly be put together. But as to Mr. Hoar himself, he has grown up in the republican party, and naturally shrinks from severing his relations by an act so supreme as opposing its unanimous choice for the presidency. Some men can do such things. All men cannot. It would be the harder for Mr. Hoar because his alternative is to support a party which in the days of its power was the champion of chattel slavery. Many of us can see that this is not now the party it once was. We know it to be a new liberty party, as truly a new party as if it had been organized yesterday. But all men who love liberty, especially those who went through the antislavery fight with the democratic party as completely dominated by the slave power as the republican party is dominated to-day by the ugly spirit of imperialism, cannot see this change so plainly, and Mr. Hoar is one of them. We sympathize while disagreeing with him. It is to be hoped, however, that though he support McKinley for the presidency he will not allow his partisanship to silence him in this vital conflict for republic or empire.

Attention is called by the Nation to the growing necessity of relegating national conventions to the political lumber room. They have become vast mass meetings which do not and cannot act as deliberate assemblies. In the same connection the old system of nominating presidents by congress-