

of the nation, are men who debauch city councils or legislatures in order to defeat laws for the just protection of men and women; and, profiting by it, become generous contributors to or maintainers of the institutions presided over by the intellectual sissies who are too incompetent, too ignorant, or too cowardly to tell the truth."

+

Of course Judge Lindsey should not have made that disclosure "even if it was true." It was so pessimistic of him, don't you know? It exhibited so little confidence in human nature, can't you see? It could do no good, to be sure; and only tended to destroy the simple confidence of the young in great and good men who, however they get their fortunes, do keep out of jail you must admit, and do spend them so generously for objects that everybody applauds.

+

Nevertheless we sympathize with Judge Lindsey. We honor his righteous wrath at those whited sepulchers of men whose iniquities he exposed, and their lily-livered apologists for whom he showed so much wholesome contempt. If he had said, "Damn!" and said it in italics, and repeated it in capital letters, still we should sympathize with him and honor him. And we may remind both him and the gentle critics he might have offended with a word that has unfortunately been debased to profane uses, that he would have had the best of Christian authority for its use in that connection. There was One who in similar circumstances a long time ago, said "Damn!" with just that emphasis and in precisely that spirit.

+

For do we not read: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, 'If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.' Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents! Ye generation of vipers! How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

That "Favorable Balance" of Trade.

Among their many fallacies which protectionists have dropped as the fight for free trade has gone on, is the notion that a country is enriched by excessive exports. The phrase "favorable balance of trade" (vol. ii, no. 94, p. 5; vol. iii, p. 291; vol. iv, pp. 51, 165; vol. v, pp. 484, 499, 769, 795; vol. viii, p. 852; vol. x, pp. 459, 867, 987; vol. xi, pp. 531, 821; vol. xii, p. 627), which was once used descriptively, now means—at least, this is the confession of the Chicago Tribune on the 19th—"little more than that exports exceed imports."

+

As the Tribune somewhat loosely explains, it no longer means, as it did to President McKinley, that "one country [the exporting country] is draining other countries [importing countries] of the precious metals." As the Tribune also explains, inadequately however, the excess of our own country's exports, now aggregating in round figures \$7,000,000,000 since President McKinley's first inauguration, is balanced off in part with interest payments on foreign capital invested here, in part with partial repayments of those investments, and in part with ocean freights paid by us to foreign vessel owners. The Tribune might have added other items, such as the expenses of American tourists abroad. But complete enumeration is not necessary. The fact is, and the Tribune's explanation admits it, that a "favorable balance" (meaning that exports exceed imports) implies that the country with the "favorable balance" is not draining other countries of their gold, but is itself being drained of the products of its labor.

+

That we owe the interest on foreign debts and ought to pay the debts themselves, makes no difference to the point at issue, which is not whether we owe the excessive exports, but whether the payments fill our pockets or empty them. That we should pay the freight, even to wicked foreigners who sail the seas to serve mankind, makes no difference either,—not to the point at issue. The evident fact, now tacitly conceded by most protectionists and confessed by the Chicago Tribune, is that an excess of exports implies a drain of the exporting country.

+

And this is a drain in a much more substantial sense than the Tribune's confession discloses. For there is, indeed, a sense in which it may be said that a country is enriched by interest payments; circumstances sometimes make it more profitable

to pay interest and retain borrowed capital than to cancel debts. There is a sense also in which it may be said that a country is enriched by the repayment of debts; circumstances sometimes make it more profitable to cancel debts and save interest than to remain in debt at the expense of interest. There is also a sense in which it may be said that a country is enriched by the payment of freights to foreigners; circumstances sometimes make it more profitable for a country to devote its industries to the making of commodities, leaving to others their transportation abroad. It may even be said, and in a very true sense, that foreign traveling enriches the home country of the travelers. But in no sense and under no circumstances, can it be truly said that a country is enriched by the payment to foreigners of ground rents for its own area.

+

Yet the item of ground rents for American land makes up by far the largest part of the \$7,000,000,000 of "favorable balance" which this country boasts of having piled up since it inaugurated President McKinley twelve years ago. The ground rents of American farms owned abroad, the ground rents of American building lots owned abroad, the royalties of American mines owned abroad, interests in the rights of way of American railroads owned abroad, interests in the rights of way of pipe lines owned abroad, interests in the rights of way of street car lines owned abroad—this whole great class of titles to American land, from warrantee deeds to stock certificates—all these go into the account of our excessive exports. And as these interests grow with our growth, the excess of exports will grow also. This item is a drain in every sense of the word. It is the annual price of absentee landlordism; and exports to absentee landlords, whenever and wherever they are recognized as such, have always and everywhere been acknowledged to be a drain upon the exporting country. They are of the nature of tribute from vassal to suzerain.

+ +

An Ambassadorial Novelty.

In the selection of Charles R. Crane of Chicago for minister to China, Mr. Taft has made an innovation—more of an innovation, perhaps, than he is aware of. It is the first diplomatic appointment of this grade which can be regarded as distinctively commercial in the better sense of that term. Mr. Crane is not a professional diplomat, nor a lawyer, nor a party politician. His qualifications are those of a business man of interna-

tional interests, observation, study and experience. This in itself makes the appointment almost a novelty. If nothing further were considered, the McCormick appointment, of course, might be mentioned as a precedent; but the McCormick appointment lacked the element of good citizenship. It was nothing but a concession to Big Business in politics. In the Crane appointment, however, the element of Big Business, while not a minus quantity, is a minor one. For Mr. Crane is neither conspicuous in nor sympathetic with Big Business. He puts good citizenship above business interests, and within the limitations of unyielding business environments and a conservative training, he is a radical democrat. His appointment to this post is not only a diplomatic novelty, but one which we could hope might become a precedent for others like it.

+ +

"Charter-Afraid-of-the-People."

San Francisco has recently held an election on the question of reconstructing and operating as a municipal road a street railway line the franchise for which has expired. Under the charter of that city it requires a two-thirds majority to acquire a public utility. Of the 22,258 votes cast at the election, which was held only two days after an election on several other questions, 14,403 votes were in the affirmative and 7,805 in the negative. The question was thus lost by 436 votes, and another election will probably be held. That "afraid-of-the-people" provision of the San Francisco charter, which demands a two-thirds majority of the votes in order that the people may bond themselves for a public utility, is in strong contrast with the power of public utility franchise corporations to bond the people. The majority of a dozen non-resident directors of a San Francisco public utility corporation can bond the people of that city for millions, and the people have nothing to say about it. But if the people wish to bond themselves for a public utility, two out of every three voters must vote for the bonds.

+ +

Instigating Destruction by Dynamite.

"Five dollars' worth of dynamite placed under the corner stone of that Chicago University divinity school would be about the best thing that could happen for the young men of this country." Emma Goldman? Not at all. If Emma Goldman had said anything half as wicked in its suggestiveness, the newspapers and the pulpits would hiss and scream, and she would be on the way to a penitentiary. No, it was not Emma Goldman