

Hill at a county fair last week, "is not a living, but free and equal opportunity with every other citizen to obtain a living." Good. And that is precisely what Tom L. Johnson says. But there is this peculiar difference in the effect. The "plutes" and "grafters" applaud Hill, but they denounce Johnson. Why? Evidently because they know that Johnson not only preaches that good democratic sentiment, but believes in it.

With Mr. Hill the declaration that our country owes each of its citizens "free and equal opportunity with every other citizen to obtain a living" is mere clap-trap. Let Mr. Hill himself be the judge. Taxes measured by labor values are inconsistent with that doctrine; taxes measured by the value of privileges are in furtherance of it. Which does Mr. Hill favor? Would he exempt the working farmer's improvements and tax the mine owner's mineral deposits, the city millionaire's valuable lots, and the speculative land grabbers' unused acres, or would he retain the present system? It is much to be feared that Mr. Hill's "free and equal opportunity for every citizen to make a living," which rolls so trippingly off his tongue, rolls as trippingly off his conscience.

An article by W. H. Allen, quoted editorially in the Chicago Record-Herald of the 31st, deals with the "favorable" balance of trade mystery. It will be recalled that Mr. McKinley said (vol iii, p. 291), in 1900, that our enormous export balance is paid for with "pure gold." Inasmuch as the treasury statistics at that time showed this to be an enormous mistake, and have continued to show the same thing,—our balance of gold imports falling below our balance of merchandise and silver exports millions upon millions of dollars,—this theory of payment has collapsed. Several others have been advanced, only to meet the same fate. At last the assertion is made, very

pretentiously, that Europe has been paying off her trade debt to us by sending back to us our own stocks and bonds, and also by allowing our capitalists to invest in European securities. But now comes Mr. Allen, who, according to the Record-Herald,—

has made up a table of the sales and purchases of shares by foreigners on the New York Stock Exchange as reported weekly in the New York Times and New York Evening Post, and he finds that for the four years, 1898-1901, the net excess of purchases over sales was 3,797,000 shares, while in 1902 alone did the sales exceed the purchases, and then by only 427,000 shares. The net showing for the five years is, therefore, that purchases were in the lead by 3,370,000 shares. As to direct sales and purchases outside the stock exchange, Mr. Allen finds, though by less exact methods, a similar tendency.

That disposes of the vague explanation that our stocks and bonds are coming back to us. On the contrary, we have an export balance of stocks and bonds as well as an export balance of merchandise and silver. Moreover, proceeds the Record-Herald, referring again to Mr. Allen—

he presents facts to show that instead of our lending money abroad we have been most of the time heavy borrowers, and from this he infers further that we cannot have had funds idle for permanent investments in foreign countries on any large scale. These conclusions evidently make the problem as to how we are paid for our excess of exports all the harder to solve.

Not so much harder, either, if you but consider that most of our stocks represent land values—mines, railway rights of way, etc.—and that foreign holdings of American land by real estate deed instead of corporation stock, are vast. When the land rent (direct as rent and indirect as dividends) is considered, our excess of exports is pretty fully accounted for. Like Ireland, we are paying ground rent to absentees; but unlike Ireland, we are bragging of it, and fatuously regarding it as evidence of prosperity.

First Katydid—Why didn't you come before?

Second Katydid—Were you calling?
"Was I calling? Don't you see how hoarse my legs are?"—Life.

THE SERVICE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

By a very remarkable coincidence the same sweeping remark about our universities was recently made in my hearing by two men of widely differing rank and circumstance. One of them is a labor leader, a man who earns his living by manual labor and yet is a reader and thinker. The other teaches in a university, in its mechanical department, and yet is a believer in social ideals. The words of the two men were almost verbatim the same, and I am doing no violence to either in combining what they said. To put it in fewest words it was, that for the solution of our social problems there is no hope in our universities.

In the two instances the conversation was along what seemed to be entirely different lines. With the labor-leader the talk was of social problems. With the professor the talk was of spiritual problems, or, to be more accurate, it might be better to say that the professor's talk was rather of the maintenance of fine ideals in the midst of modern life.

We may hold that both of the speakers exaggerated extremely in their unqualified statement, and that they were speaking in the free way of private talk, but still it seems worth while to consider what was in their minds in making the statement. If any supposedly sensible people think this way, it is well to know the fact, and to submit to wider judgment whatever of truth or falsity may be in their criticisms.

The position of the labor leader is one with which we are all more or less familiar. He maintained that the specific teaching of the universities in economic and social questions ignores the aspiration of workingmen for better wages and a higher plane of living, that the professors may in a general way contemplate some gradual improvement, but that they do not acknowledge any radical ground for the complaints of wage-earners. His main attack, however, was directed against the general spirit which he conceived to pervade the universities. In brief he held that they are sub-