

his last utterance in the midst of the petroleum-fed flames, that he was innocent. Fears are expressed by the governor that this lynching will make it necessary to revive capital punishment in Kansas. Curiously enough, however, it is the negro victim, whose guilt is in doubt, that the governor has in mind, and not the white assassins who boast of burning him. Their crime seems to be taken for granted as at worst an excusable outburst of passion. Yet if anything might make one wish to revive capital punishment, it would be the fiendish act of that mob.

In an address at Boston condemning "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith took occasion to say that "as a boy he was brought up among the slaves" and that he loved his "old mammy" and hugged and kissed her as if she were white." This remark was intended, apparently, to illustrate the love that existed between the black slaves and their white masters. Mr. Smith was, of course, only a child when he hugged and kissed his "old mammy." He doubtless stopped that as he grew older. But the point of the illustration is that even though grown-up whites did not express affection for their slaves by kissing them, as the children did, they expressed it as pronouncedly in other ways. This idea of brotherly love is wholly false. Emotions that manifest themselves in expressions of personal affection toward men and women whose rights are at the same time and by the same person denied, is not brotherly love. There is nothing to distinguish it from similar manifestations toward horses, dogs, cats and doll babies. Justice is the distinguishing attribute of love. This might not be worth saying apropos of Mr. Smith's remark about the love of masters for their slaves, for that is an old story. But old stories are constantly coming up in new forms. The new form of this story is the emotional love that some rich people now express for the im-

poverished victims of plundering institutions which they themselves persistently defend. Such love is like that of the—

considerate crocodile,
Which lay on the banks of the river Nile.
He swallowed a fish with a face of woe,
While his tears flowed fast to the stream below.
"I am mourning," he said, "the untimely fate
Of the dear little fish which I just now ate."

Justice Harlan's son is not the only supreme court justice's son who has come into the full blaze of the light of President McKinley's favor upon the eve of the decision by the supreme court of the question of the constitutionality of Mr. McKinley's colonial policy. Not only has Mr. McKinley appointed the son of Justice Harlan as attorney general of Puerto Rico, but he has favored a son of Justice McKenna with swift and pleasant military promotion. It must not be assumed that in passing upon the Puerto Rico cases either justice will be influenced by the president's partiality. It ought to be assumed that neither of the young men will cast suspicion upon his father's integrity in case the decision of the court proves to be what Mr. McKinley wants, by accepting the appointment. These considerations are entirely apart from Mr. McKinley's motives in making the appointments. What those motives were we make no guess. We do not charge that the appointments were made for the purpose of influencing the court, though it would look that way to the traditional "man up a tree." We go no further than to repeat and endorse the sentiment of the Chicago Times-Herald, a thorough-going republican paper, which, in its issue of the 9th, editorially commented in these words:

Across the undimmed mirror of the supreme court has passed the breath of a suggestion of personal influence from the executive.

The supreme court cannot afford to have even "the breath of a suggestion

of personal influence from the executive" pass across its "undimmed mirror," and Senator Pettigrew is to be commended for obstructing confirmation of young Harlan's appointment on the ground that under the circumstances it is indecent.

In an editorial article on socialism, notable rather for dislike of the term than for an understanding of its significance, the Chicago Chronicle gives perfect expression to the true principle of democracy. We could wish that it understood the plain meaning of its own definition, and that it might be depended upon at all times to champion the principle as well in its practical applications as in the abstract. We quote:

Democracy insists upon a return to first principles, leaving the individual unhampered by laws devised in the interest of others, and withholding from him the benefits of any law intended to give him an advantage over another.

If the democratic party would adopt that principle in good faith and support it with vigor in all its bearings, the Chronicle would soon have no further occasion to worry about socialism.

Before forming an opinion with reference to the barbarity charged by the reports to the account of the Boer general, De Wet, in having flogged three British peace envoys and shot one of them off-hand, it will be wise to follow Winston Churchill's example, and doubt the reports until they are confirmed. Mr. Churchill declares that the act does not tally with his personal knowledge of De Wet. It certainly does not tally with the humane conduct which has characterized the Boers throughout the war. Yet the tory papers of London, without waiting for confirmation of the reports, are raising a great din about it. They probably hope in this way to minimize the barbarity of Lord Roberts's war upon non-combatants—his burning of farm houses and savage destruction of great districts of improved country and his Weyler-

izing of women and children. Should it turn out that Gen. De Wet has been guilty of inhumanity in the instance of the peace envoys, his friends will have for him at least the poor excuse that inhuman methods of warfare were begun not by his side but by the British. And with reference to the implication that he has committed one of the greatest offenses known to the laws of war, maltreatment of peace envoys from the enemy, it is to be observed that the peace envoys in question were not envoys from the enemy. Lord Kitchener did not send them as his own representatives. They were a Boers' committee which he encouraged to go to De Wet on behalf of a mass meeting at Pretoria to urge De Wet's troops to lay down their arms. They were, in a word, what the British, had the situation been reversed, would call traitors.

A correspondent asks how we account for the continuous increase of the American export balance. He acknowledges that this cannot by itself imply increasing national profit, seeing, as all sensible men must, that profit, whether individual or national, depends upon import balances and not upon export balances—upon excessive income, that is, and not upon excessive outgo. But he doubts whether the draft upon the United States for rents, trust dividends, and other unprofitable exporting is great enough to account for the enormous and astonishingly increasing excess of exports reported by the treasury department. Our correspondent's doubt is well founded. The excess is not wholly due to unprofitable exporting. False figures enter very largely into the statistical excess of exports. We do not mean that the figures are falsified by the treasury department, but that it is done by exporters and importers.

By the falsifications of importers, the statistics of imports are reduced. Since importers pay import duties calculated on the value

of their goods at the place of purchase abroad, they make undervaluations in order to lessen the duties. On the other hand, by the falsifications of exporters, the statistics of exports are increased. Export statistics are gathered from exporters' invoices. As there are no export duties exporters are without incentive to undervalue. But they have a strong incentive to overvalue. An American manufacturer, for instance, sells a certain quantity of his product in the American market for, say, \$1,000. But in foreign markets, in order to compete, he must sell for, say, \$750. He is enabled to charge high prices on his home sales, by the protective tariff; but not on his foreign sales. It is important, however, in connection with his home trade, that he should conceal the fact that his home prices are higher than his foreign prices. So he invoices his foreign sale at \$1,000 instead of \$750, and secretly allows his foreign customer a 25 per cent. discount. If now he is paid by the foreign purchaser in full, the transaction figures in the treasury statistics as exports \$1,000, and imports \$750. The discount does not appear. Consequently these statistics show \$250 excess of exports. Yet there is in fact no excess either way. That illustration is not an uncommon instance. So extensive are such importing transactions, and so rapidly are they increasing, that the statistical falsifications they embody account in no small degree for our marvelously expanding "favorable" balance of trade. It is well known that a great variety of American tariff-protected goods are sold abroad at large discounts upon the home price. This is part of the business of protected trusts. And these exportations are doubtless invoiced at the high American prices. The discount is a matter of private bookkeeping only, and is not deducted from the exportation statistics. If these overvaluations were deducted from the statistics of exports, and the undervaluations were added to the statistics of imports, the "favorable"

balance would be enormously reduced.

But the whole balance of exports is not accounted for by statistical falsifications. A vast quantity of exports does go out from this country for which nothing ever has been or ever will be imported. To that extent the wealth of the country suffers a real and not a merely nominal loss. For instance, it was recently reported from New York, that the year had closed with the payment in corporate dividends alone of \$150,000,000, a large share of which would go abroad. In the same connection it was explained, though with what degree of veracity we are unable to say, that Queen Victoria has an annual income from American investments of \$400,000; that the prince of Wales holds American investments to the amount of \$500,000; that the emperor of Germany draws \$150,000 annually from American investments; that the Russian tsar draws \$500,000 annually from American investments; that the royal family of Spain draws \$100,000 annually from American investments; and that the royal houses of Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Holland, Japan and Greece each have substantial annual incomes from American investments. This country has no income, either present or prospective, for that outgo. And there never has been any income. Investments were originally made, to be sure; and that implies excessive imports in the past. But the treasury statistics give no proof of such imports. We ceased to be an importing nation in 1873. Since that time we have exported enough, over and above current imports (gold, silver, and merchandise all included), to pay off all our previous excess of imports with hundreds of millions over. Foreign investments, therefore, have been returned; and whatever we send to foreigners now in excess of what we get from them is a drain upon our national resources. It is like interest payments to an old creditor long after the prin-