

position to the American conquest, and potent enough to put an end to the war.

In answer to a criticism by Bolton Hall, the Challenge, of Los Angeles, an aggressive and breezy socialist paper, undertakes to explain the American export balance in harmony with the theory that it is favorable. This export balance is offset, says the Challenge, by a solvent credit. That is, if we understand the assertion, foreign countries owe this country to the amount at least of our export balance. We should be glad to have our California contemporary produce some evidence in support of that assertion. That America has recently bought a few millions of foreign bonds, as the Challenge also asserts, is true; but it has bought nothing like \$486,290,015, the export balance for the first eight months of the present fiscal year, to say nothing of the export balance of some \$3,000,000,000 which has been heaped up since the foundation of the government. Neither is there any evidence that it has a solvent credit of any other kind for anything like either sum. Our stock exchanges are virtually bare of foreign securities, yet American securities are regularly dealt in upon foreign exchanges. Our land is extensively owned abroad, yet but little foreign land is owned here. It would seem, therefore, that a general liquidation of international interests would bring us out not with a credit but heavily in debt, notwithstanding our much-vaunted accumulation of export balances. If this inference is faulty, we shall be obliged to the Challenge, or to anyone else, for a statement of facts or a reference to proof that may reasonably discredit it.

There is a familiar trick of parliamentary tactics which plays upon the disposition of good natured and thoughtless folks—"optimists" they would call themselves—to vote always in the affirmative. Whenever the tricky tactician's side of a question is presented in negative form, he

maneuvers to get it into affirmative form by moving an amendment which presents substantially the same issue. For example: It is moved that ten dollars be appropriated to such and such a purpose. This presents an affirmation to which the tactician is opposed. He knows, however, that there are "optimists" who will vote for it just because they instinctively vote in the affirmative whenever they don't know what else to do. So he moves an amendment that such and such a purpose be excluded from the list of appropriations. As the amendment is voted on before the main question he thereby secures the support of all the "optimists" present. In this there is a moral.

The happy-go-lucky species of "optimist" who falls into that parliamentary trap makes the welkin ring in these days with his admonitions about the president's policy of imperialism. We are warned against the pessimism of opposing that policy. A favorite maxim of these optimists is this: "Affirmation is life; negation is death." That maxim deserves attention. The first important thing about it is the fact that it is true. The second is the fact that happy-go-lucky optimists make this truth their falsehood. They cling to "the letter which killeth," utterly forgetting "the spirit which giveth life."

While it is true that affirmation of essence is life and that negation of essence is death, it is not necessarily true that affirmation in form is life or that negation in form is death. For truth may be stated in negative form and error may be stated in affirmative form. When error is so stated, affirmation of essence is of necessity formally negative. For illustration, the republican party in its origin was in form a party of negation. It had but two doctrines, and both were what would now be slangily called "antis." They were "anti-slavery" and "anti-polygamy." Yet the republican party was then essentially not a party of negation, but a party of

affirmation. It was the party of life though it held the negative side of the issue of the day; and the democratic party, though it held the affirmative side, was then the party of death. This instance should teach happy-go-lucky optimists how important it is to get at the essence of things and not be satisfied with word-juggling. After a little intelligent reflection they might conclude that there is more wholesome affirmation in many negative forms than they had supposed.

By word-juggling, all the opposition to falsity and evil that has given life to the world could be condemned as hopelessly pessimistic—as negations implying death. By this juggling error could always be transformed into truth, if mere verbal affirmation is truth. Suppose one should assert that there is a personal devil superior to God. If that were affirmation, would negation be death? Would it be deadly negation to deny the affirmation that the earth is larger than the sun, or that a dog is a man, or that theft is righteous? Clearly not. What here purport to be affirmations of truth are in fact affirmations of error. For that reason they are in their essence negations. To negative them is, therefore, not negation; in spite of its negative form it is essentially affirmation. This is true of the whole brood of negations in affirmative forms that are generally identified as McKinleyism, or Hannaism, or plutocracy or imperialism. Imperialism is not affirmation because it has an affirmative form. When power goes wrong it always assumes affirmative forms. Neither is anti-imperialism negation because it has a negative form. Resistance to wrong must of necessity be negative in its forms. The question in this as in all issues of affirmation and negation is not what the form may be, but what the essence is. If imperialism is essentially right, then opposition to it is negation and consequently death. But if it is essentially wrong, yet advances in affirmative forms, then opposition to it

is affirmation and consequently life. Before condemning negations which consist in opposing things as wrong, we must first be sure that those things are not wrong. Opposition to wrong things is not negation, but affirmation; it is not pessimism, but optimism.

With its change of ownership on the 1st, the Chicago Evening Post appeared in a new and more acceptable form. It has reduced the size and increased the number of its pages, so as to approximate the book form of newspaper. All it needs now is to improve its printing and its politics.

THE EXALTATION OF A SPY.

By a curious coincidence the episode in Gen. Funston's career which has won for him an appointment as brigadier general in the regular army, is announced concurrently with a report from London of the discovery of the diary of Maj. Andre.

Readers of American history are familiar with Andre's exploit, and its tragic ending. He was a British officer who had in disguise crossed the line between the British and the continental armies, upon a secret errand from the British general at New York to Gen. Arnold, the American commandant at West Point. When almost within hail of the British sentries, on his return from this daring errand, Andre was arrested by three young countrymen, who found upon him papers that revealed a plot for the treacherous surrender of West Point, the key to the American position. Arnold was to be rewarded for his treason with a high commission in the British army, which he did in fact receive. Doubtless Andre would have been promoted for his dashing and dangerous part in the treacherous adventure, but his unhappy fate was already sealed. Having acted a lie by coming to the American lines in disguise, this British soldier was by the laws of war a spy; and, pursuant to the laws of war, Gen. Washington had him hanged. Even the British approved Washington's act, so plain was it that Andre's deception had degraded him to the level of that species of military criminal whom the army

that uses him, not less than the army upon which he practices his deceptions, most cordially despises.

Maj. Andre's exploit is recalled by Funston's, though the two are not altogether alike. They differ primarily in the fact that Andre was a spy against us, while Funston was a spy for us. In details, also, there are differences, but they are in Andre's favor. Andre became a spy to perfect negotiations with a treacherous commandant for the surrender of an enemy's post; Funston became one to seize the person of a faithful and patriotic leader of the enemy. Andre's lie consisted in doffing his British uniform and clothing himself in civilian's dress; Funston's consisted in pretending to be a prisoner of war, whereas, in fact, he was leading into the enemy's camp a band of Filipino soldiers, turned traitors to their cause—a job lot of Benedict Arnolds. Andre's passports were genuine; Funston's were forgeries. Caught in his lie, Andre was hanged; successful in his, Funston has been raised to the high grade of brigadier general in the regular army. But notwithstanding these differences, it is impossible to see in Funston's adventure anything that distinguishes it essentially from Andre's. It does not lift him the slightest degree above the low level of a successful spy.

A similar though less despicable service, rendered to the Confederacy during the civil war, is reported to have been sternly repudiated and its advantages promptly relinquished by Gen. Robert E. Lee. The story is published by James N. Miller, of Leavenworth, Kan. We cannot vouch for its truth; but it is told circumstantially, and in the light of Lee's well known character it has every appearance of being true. What is imputed to him he would doubtless have done in the circumstances described. We give the story in Mr. Miller's own words in full:

During the latter part of the civil war a company of confederate soldiers dashed into Cumberland, Md., one night and captured Gens. Crook and Kelly, taking them from their beds at a hotel. It was a deed of daring bravery, well planned and ably executed. But when Gen. Robert E. Lee heard of it he ordered the prisoners

sent back to our lines, saying he did not approve of this style of warfare. He did not consider it honorable. Admitting all the reckless bravery of Gen. Funston's exploit in capturing Aguinaldo, in what respect did it differ from that of the capture of these union generals? The story of the recent capture says: "They were now so weak that it was necessary to send to Aguinaldo's camp for food. Aguinaldo dispatched supplies and directed that the American prisoners be kindly treated." After having their lives thus preserved, they were enabled to march on and meet their preserver under an assumed guise, and by false pretense capture him at a time when he was unarmed. Perhaps Gen. Lee was wrong in his notion of military honor.

Gen. Lee was certainly nice in his ideas of military honor in that case. Very nice, indeed, according to the MacArthur standards. According to any military standards, probably, he was extremely nice. He might have availed himself of the advantages which this case of kidnaping gave him, without incurring censure. But, then, Gen. Lee was a gentleman in a very profound sense. He could not, however, have rewarded his kidnapers with military honors without evoking severe censure from all professional military men. To have done that would have been to defy military ethics.

This must be considered in weighing the objections of regular army officers to Funston's elevation to a high and conventionally honorable place among them. Their objections are attributed to personal jealousy and class feeling; and, indeed, those motives may actuate them. But without assigning motives so mean, their attitude is quite explicable. Gen. Corbin explained it when he said: "The capture of Aguinaldo was the work of a scout, and I don't think scouts ought to be made brigadier generals." For "scout" read "spy"—a scout who enters the enemy's lines in disguise is a spy—and you have an idea of the military view of the matter. Secretary Root gave a pointer in the same direction. Though not a military man, Mr. Root possesses at any rate the military quality of being a gentleman; and the suggestion of turning successful spies into brigadier generals made his gorge rise. He is reported