

fifty millions, as some assert, or one hundred millions, as others claim.

It is now in order for Mr. Austin, of the statistical bureau in the treasury department at Washington, to explain why the United States becomes a borrower if its excessive exports are to be accounted for by regarding it as a lender. When a nation's merchandise exports are in perennial excess of its merchandise imports, when its exports of silver also largely exceed its imports of silver, when its gold imports are but slightly in excess of its gold exports—not nearly enough to make up for the excessive exports of silver alone,—and when on top of all this it is a large borrower in the world's money markets where it ought to have an abundance of drafts for sale if excessive exporting is indeed profitable, what are we to think about our much vaunted "export trade" and our enormous "favorable balance"? It begins to look more than ever as if the "favorable balance" were an "unfavorable drain."

Mr. Cleveland's secretary of the interior, Wm. F. Vilas, of Wisconsin, sends out a clarion call to the Democratic party to make hostility to protection the national political issue. Mr. Vilas says many good things on this question. He tells us, for instance, that if we would strike down the trusts, we must aim our "stroke at the root of the poisonous tree," and that Democracy offers "the highest uplifting of individuality and of every right of the individual man, peculiarly his right to hold and enjoy all the honest fruits of his industry, brains and personal achievements;" and then he declares:

The victory to be won which alone is worth winning is the overthrow of the grand central, governing conspiracy of protection. When that "crowning mercy" shall be vouchsafed, the very purification of the nation's soul by the fires of the strife will easily enable it to subdue the lesser forms in which Satan is embodied in our national life.

All this is excellent. So is much more of the same tenor. There is no

fault to find with what Mr. Vilas says. The weakness of his clarion call is in what he doesn't say. He doesn't say what he means by this thing called "protection," which he describes as "the grand, central governing conspiracy" that gives vicious vitality to the trusts. Does he mean to kill the trusts by reducing the tariff 20 per cent. or thereabouts? If that is what he means by fighting protection, it is not strange he doesn't specify. Mr. Vilas has no ambition to shine as a comedian. Does he mean to kill the trusts by abolishing the protective tariff on trust-made goods? That would truly be a good starting point for popular education on the subject of protection; but as a legislative measure wouldn't it be like taming birds by putting salt on their tails? You must first catch your trust-made goods. Or does he mean to kill the trusts by coming down to tariffs for revenue only? Surely Mr. Vilas is hardly so simple as to suppose that the trusts would not be able to distribute such a tariff so as to make it incidentally protective, and at the first favorable opportunity to get men into Congress who would restore the protective feature in its fullness. With a tariff for revenue only, protection would never cease to be an issue.

Even if the tariff were wholly abolished and we had free trade, the trust question would not be disposed of. While protection plays a large part in making the monopolies upon which trusts rest and thrive, it is not the only factor and is very far from being the central one. What about the monopolies of terminal facilities? What about the monopolies of transportation? What about the natural monopolies, such as the Mesaba iron mines and the Connellsville coal deposits? What about the almost countless acres of land of all kinds, mining land and building land and forest land as well as farming land, which are monopolized but held idle, where-by labor is made a drug in the mar-

ket? Here are obstructions to free trade which count infinitely more than tariff protection, obstructive as that is. Here are basic monopolies for trusts with which tariff protection cannot compare. Does Mr. Vilas propose an assault upon these evils when he summons the Democratic hosts to attack protection? If he does, let him say so. The Democrats have had enough of party policies expressed in weasel words and phrases.

The Richmond Times, a Democratic paper of the plutocratic breed, asks a question. We quote it:

Now, suppose in the convention of 1904 a good democratic platform is formulated and adopted in which the party commits itself to sound money, or, if you please, to the gold standard, and nominates David B. Hill or Grover Cleveland for the presidency. Under these conditions will Mr. Bryan support the ticket?

Everybody ought to be well enough acquainted with Mr. Bryan's character by this time to know that he would not remain as Hill said he did—"a Democrat still—very still,"—and that if he bolted, as Cleveland did boldly and Hill otherwise, he would not afterwards want to come back and boss the party he had helped defeat, as both Hill and Cleveland do. Should Bryan follow the example set by Hill and Cleveland, and abandon the Democratic party, he would have followers enough to be under no temptation to try to get back into it again.

Senator Hanna and his political and monopoly satellites have managed to get his home city of Cleveland into a picturesque tangle. He began by backing legal proceedings to declare unconstitutional the charter of the city which his own party had framed and under which his own party had flourished. Not until a Democratic mayor with democratic principles had got into office and proceeded to administer the law equitably against Mr. Hanna's special privileges, did that distinguished senator find it convenient to attack the constitutionality of the Republican charter of Cleveland. When

he did attack it he brought down an avalanche of a decision which invalidates every city charter in Ohio, all enacted by Republican legislatures, and all the cities of the state are in a turmoil. That it was he who did it the successful lawyer in the case now confesses, saying that Mr. Hanna's object was to knock out Tom Johnson. Out of this situation Mr. Hanna is now trying to secure a Hanna municipal code, one which will put all the cities of Ohio under the control of state boards. Meantime, however, the city of Cleveland, having under way a 3-cent fare street railway the construction of which Mr. Hanna managed to stop by an injunction resting upon a thin technicality, has taken the preliminary steps toward granting a new 3-cent fare charter which would avoid that technical objection. And now comes Mr. Hanna again—this time back of the attorney general he nominated to displace Attorney General Monett who, by refusing a bribe, had become persona non grata to the Standard Oil trust—and gets an injunction prohibiting the city council of Cleveland from granting street car franchises. He asks for this injunction on the ground that as the city charter is unconstitutional the city council is not a legal body. Senator Hanna is either playing a low hand for high stakes in a losing game, or the people of Ohio are really what he takes them for.

Rebecca J. Taylor, whose discharge from a government clerkship for political reasons was noted a few weeks ago (pp. 147, 151), has brought mandamus proceedings, based upon the civil service law, to compel her reinstatement. Whether she succeeds or not, she will at least render a public service in putting distinctly upon record the Pecksniffianism of certain vociferous civil service reformers. Miss Taylor's offense, it will be remembered, consisted in publishing a newspaper article criticizing the political policy of the administration with reference to the

Philippines. There has been no pretense that she was not an efficient and faithful clerk. The rather thin explanation that the publication of letters by clerks criticizing political policies is not a political but a clerical offense, is torn to threads by Miss Taylor in a published statement of the 21st in which she writes:

It cannot be possible that officials, such as one of the civil service commissioners, may be permitted to make public addresses in advocacy of the so-called Philippine policy and a humbler employe of the service like myself denied the right of publicly opposing that same policy. If these distinctions are to be permitted then is it not clear that an administration may practically use the whole force of civil service employes to strengthen its position of power, either by converting them into active exponents and supporters of its policies or negatively by silencing every person among them who is opposed to its policies? Surely it never was intended that a person in entering the government service of the United States should surrender his rights as a citizen, among them the right of holding and expressing political and religious opinions.

Miss Taylor's case is not a mere quarrel in connection with the routine of a Washington department. It is one of the characteristic incidents of the imperial policy, as is shown by *The New Age*, of London, one of the able democratic papers which Great Britain's policy of imperialism has brought into useful prominence. Referring to Miss Taylor's case *The New Age* says:

Here is another instance of the detestably mean and cowardly methods of imperialism. It knows its weakness; knows that its sole reliance is on the suppression of discussion, the bamboozling of the public. The imperialists pay an involuntary homage to truth by "chucking Miss Taylor out of her clerical chair into the street." They dread lest even a few articles written by Miss Taylor should upset all their abominable campaign of lies, fraud, concealment, plunder, and murder. All over the world it is the same. Imperialism must forever rest on the negation of all that differentiates man from the beasts of prey. It rests on infamies and can rest on nothing else. Its methods are devastation, murder, concentration camps, courts-martial, the "water cure," hangings and shootings in the presence of the friends of the murdered man, the killing of "everything over ten." Its instruments

are farm-burning generals, "Hell-roaring Jakes," the Morants and Handcocks of ruffianism. It dares not let a Miss Hobhouse come within a thousand miles of the scene of its crimes; it dares not let Miss Taylor criticize the means by which President Roosevelt is "helping the people of the Philippines along the difficult path leading to self-government."

Speaking of the "water-cure," by degrees the truth about that barbarism is leaking out. The latest contribution to the fuller and better public knowledge of the subject which the President and his two friends, Root and Lodge, are doing all they can to suppress, is made by Col. Stephen Groesbeck, an army officer just home from the Philippines. There is no sentiment about Groesbeck. He believes that the "water-cure" is a good thing, and makes no secret of the fact, which worries the administration, that it has been in general and extensive use by the American army in the Philippines for the purpose of extorting information from its victims and their friends. Now this is precisely as the unofficial reports from the Philippines have had it all along, and it is precisely what Roosevelt, Root and Lodge deny. A few more boasting blabbers like Groesbeck, and the administration will have to change its defense. Instead of admitting that the water-cure is inhuman but insisting that to "the honor of the army" it has not been generally practiced, the President will have to admit that it has been generally practiced but insist that to "the honor of the army" it is not inhuman.

The absurdly inadequate punishment of Gen. Smith, upon which we commented last week (p. 227), is now supplemented with that of Maj. Glenn. Although convicted of administering the water torture, Glenn's loyal companions in arms have agreed, for "the honor of the army," to fine him \$50 and give him a vacation of 30 days! In the light of this sentence and that of Gen. Smith, the anti-imperialist speeches in the