

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 10, 1901.

Number 175.

**LOUIS F. POST, Editor.**

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The friendly solicitude of republican papers to have the democratic party rid itself of Bryan and Bryanism, would be suspicious were it not for their own positive assurances of good faith.

We are asked whether a congressman is elected for a term of two years or four. Congress consists of a senate and a house of representatives. Senators, therefore, as well as members of the lower house, are congressmen. But neither are elected for four-year terms. Senators are elected for six years and representatives for two.

Because only 6,000 votes out of a possible 35,000 were cast in Columbus, O., in a referendum vote on a bond issue question, the experiment is referred to as a failure, not only by professed enemies of the referendum, but also by such a professed, but somewhat dubious, friend as the distinguished Dr. Gladden. But why does this small vote indicate that the experiment is a failure? Assuming that the question was fairly put, so as to make voters feel that a vote would be worth while (which is far from certain), the Columbus referendum has, for this occasion, done exactly what government purifiers profess to want done. It has disfranchised the unfit.

The movement set on foot by sleeping car porters for the organization of a union, calls public attention to one of the meanest business swindles of the time. Porters are paid from \$15 to \$30 a month by the sleeping car companies. It is well understood that this is not living pay. But the por-

ters are expected to eke it out with tips from travelers, notwithstanding that the travelers are forced to pay a good round price to the company for the accommodations they get. Sleeping car tips, therefore, are in fact not tips to the porters, but tips to the company which hires them and ought to pay them.

A prominent confederate leader died at Chicago this week. Before the civil war he had been treasurer of the United States under Buchanan. In reporting his death one of the Chicago papers described him as being "unreconstructed up to the last moment of his life," saying that "he passed away an uncompromising advocate of dead doctrines, his southern heart sadly out of tune with the new times." It was unfortunate for the American federation of sovereign states that the infamous institution of slavery had at the time of the civil war become so closely identified with the democratic doctrine of state sovereignty as to give to the movement toward centralization of political power the advantage of a moral impulse. It confuses matters. But if the old confederate whose declining years were spent among the tombs of political issues refused to be reconciled because the civil war sowed seeds of empire, he was not without sympathizers in the north among men who have only recently come to understand that at Appomattox not only was an enslaved race set free, but also that a democratic-republican government was imperialized.

Mr. Gorman's democratic convention of Maryland has taken a hint in democracy from the McKinley republicans. It proclaims that—

the success of the democratic party will mean that, while we shall deal with perfect fairness in securing all

the benefits of good government and full and free opportunities for education to all classes, such action must be taken as to prevent the control of the state government from passing into the hands of those who have neither the ability nor the interest to manage public affairs wisely and well.

That Democratic proclamation with reference to American negroes is in precise harmony with the Republican policy regarding the Filipinos and Porto Ricans. The Republican party promises to secure to the latter what the Maryland democrats pledge themselves to secure to the former—"the benefits of good government." But neither intends to allow the other to participate in the process of governing. This has been the programme of tyrants since the beginning of tyranny. They always tyrannize for purposes of giving good government to "inferiors." If they themselves profit unduly, that is only incidental.

Another infamous lynching of colored people is reported—this time from Mississippi. The victims were a man, his mother and his half-sister. A white man and his wife had been murdered. These three negroes, and ten others fell under suspicion. Arrests were made, the three negroes named above being among the prisoners. A mob took the three from the jail, hanged them from the limb of a tree, and riddled their bodies with bullets. The judge and the district attorney are apologetically reported to have begged the mob to allow the law to take its course, but without avail. Neither they nor the sheriff appear to have made any strenuous effort to protect the prisoners. Yet they had before them the example of the brave Georgia sheriff who saved his prisoners and vindicated the law, even though obliged to fire into the murderous mob to do it. The officials who had the Mississippi negro sus-

pects in custody proved themselves to be as cowardly as the brutal white mob that murdered the helpless negro women.

This mob consisted, of course, of "the best people." So did the mob in Alabama, which, according to current press dispatches, has burned a negro at the stake upon accusations of rape. It was a highly respectable and intensely virtuous set of hellhounds, this Alabama mob. But no worse than the Kansas mob which indulged a few months ago in the same exciting pastime of "nigger-burning." And although the methods of these mobs are infinitely more horrible, the mobs are quite as respectable and no more vicious than the one in Tampa which has kidnaped a party of labor leaders in order to stop a strike, or the one at Fort Scott, Kan., which has ordered a temperance agitator to leave the city, or those in Evanston and Chicago which have rotten-egged Dowieite preachers. Between these and the "nigger-burning" mobs there is only a difference of degree, great as the difference is. The spirit that prompts the rotten-egging of men and women preachers of unpopular doctrines, or that drives unwelcome agitators out of a town before a mob for advocating a strike or the closing of saloons, would, if circumstances were as favorable, just as quickly hang an obnoxious negro woman and riddle her body with bullets or burn a suspected negro man and ravish their ears with his agonizing screams. It is all one spirit, capable of going to any lengths of lawlessness; and it is hellish beyond expression.

One could wish that the Boston Beacon would sometimes distinguish contentment with duty, which makes for progress, from contentment with conditions, which makes for decay. Nevertheless the Beacon is one of the many good things that come out of Boston. It is with reluctance, therefore, that we call attention to one of its sins of contentment. It actually optimizes over the treasury statistics

of excessive exports, quoting from the treasury statement of imports and exports for the last fiscal year, in this exultant tone:

The total foreign trade of the United States for the year reached the enormous and unprecedented sum of \$2,310,413,077. The exports were \$1,487,656,544, an increase of \$93,173,462 over 1900, while the imports for 1901 were \$822,756,533, a decrease of \$27,184,651 from the previous year. The excess of exports over imports exceeded that of 1900 by \$120,358,113, and is nearly \$50,000,000 greater than the highest record ever made before—that of 1898.

It is not quite conceivable that so intelligent a paper as the Beacon should really suppose that a growing excess of exports makes the country wealthier. How could an intelligent paper believe that a growing income is dearth and a growing outgo wealth? It must be that that exultant note is intended only to harmonize our foreign trade condition with the paper's policy of cheerfulness.

But there may be another explanation. We notice that the Beacon does not give the figures as to all imports and all exports, but only those that relate to merchandise. Possibly the editor, overlooking the record of gold and silver exports and imports, has imagined that our great excess of merchandise imports has been paid for in silver and gold. Or, like Mr. McKinley, he may have supposed that export balances are paid off "in pure gold." If this is the Beacon's idea, it may readily discover its mistake. We tabulate the figures for the fiscal year in question:

Excess of merchandise exports .....	\$664,900,011
Excess of silver exports...	17,901,139
	\$682,801,150
Excess of gold imports..	11,342,332
Excess of all exports.....	\$671,458,818

It may be seen, therefore, that when gold, silver and merchandise are considered together, the excess of exports is larger, instead of smaller, than when merchandise alone is considered. Evidently, then, our merchandise excess of outgo was not paid for with a gold and silver excess of

income. Gold and silver taken together did not decrease, it increased, the excess of outgo. Nor was that condition peculiar to the last fiscal year. From June 30, 1865, to June 30, 1900, the excessive exports were as follows:

Gold .....	\$374,212,885
Silver .....	587,299,039
Merchandise .....	3,575,712,702

Total exports .....\$4,537,224,626

It is, therefore, evident that the excessive merchandise exports for the last fiscal year had not been paid for with gold and silver in advance. We had exported gold and silver for 35 years. Hence, they have not been paid for with gold and silver at all. Adding together the figures of the two foregoing tables, we find that from 1865 to 1901—June 30 in each year—our trade showed in those years the following cheerful balances:

Excess of gold exports..	362,870,553
Excess of silver exports.	605,200,178
Excess of mdse exports..	4,240,612,713

Excess of total exports.\$5,208,683,444

If the Beacon thinks that our excess of merchandise has been paid for with gold and silver it would do well to revise its thinking on that score.

Possibly, however, the Beacon supposes that the excessive merchandise exports (and gold and silver exports, for they are excessive, too) are paid for by the return from abroad of American obligations and the purchase for American account of foreign obligations. In that supposition, also, as we have frequently shown (see this volume, pp. 51 and 165, and volume iii., p. 291), it would be mistaken. Of course many deductions are to be made from our total export balances—such as interest on our securities held abroad, earnings of foreign capital invested here, payment of foreign freights, tourists' expenses, remittances by immigrants to their friends abroad, etc.—but after this is done, there is still an enormous balance unaccounted for. Is it chargeable to returns of American bonds and purchases of foreign bonds? In addition