

entitled him in public estimation to an opportunity to return with all the power and pomp and circumstance of an American conqueror and Cuban deliverer. But that might have made him formidable as a presidential candidate. So Gen. Shafter was sent to Santiago in command of the first expedition, Gen. Lee being assured that when it came to taking Havana, he should have his innings. But Havana gave up without a blow. However, a governor general of the island was needed during our temporary occupation, and who so fit as Lee? But the president preferred a fluffy martinet, Gen. Brooke, and Lee was given the governorship only of Havana province. That seemed fit enough, as far as it went, since the city of Havana had been the central scene of Lee's Cuban experiences, and as governor of the province he would of course govern the city through his subordinate, Gen. Ludlow, to whose immediate control the city was assigned. But hardly had Lee arrived in Cuba, when the city of Havana was detached from the province and Ludlow withdrawn thereby from Lee's command. In consequence, Lee is now what you might call a suburban military governor. Could shelving be more smoothly done?

It is significant of much that is hopeful that the Patria, the organ of the Cuban revolutionary party, conspicuously publishes single tax articles from the pen of J. de D. Tejada, and that the articles are reproduced in the best papers of Cuba.

It is not all plain sailing for Gov. Pingree, the republican executive of Michigan. Before the people he has his own way, for they trust him. In popular contests, consequently, he wins easily. The party corruptionists and bosses grind their teeth and swear fluently, but they give Pingree right of way when there is a referendum. It is different, though, when the legislature comes to act. There the corruptionists and bosses have an advantage over a bluff, straightforward, honest leader like Pingree. So it has

come about that the United States senator whose reelection Pingree opposed because the senator had proved to be a mere tool of the lumber ring, was forced upon the party and the state by the republican caucus. So too it came about that Pingree's measure for taxing railroad corporations equally with individual property owners was defeated last year. But Pingree is more than bluff, straightforward and honest. He is also determined, resourceful and courageous. And this winter he announces to the corporation tools of his party in the Michigan legislature that unless they pass an equal taxation measure, he will refuse to sign the appropriation bill. That would apparently be a rash remedy; but desperate cases require rash remedies. It may be inferred, besides, that Gov. Pingree knows the people of Michigan well enough to believe that they will endure temporarily the inconveniences of no appropriations for public business, so long as they realize that the legislature can avoid the inconveniences by simply making corporations pay their fair proportion of taxes. It is not probable that Pingree will be unhorsed in this tournament.

The kind of republican management in the matter of senatorships which Pingree had to meet and fight in Michigan, was like that which the republican governor of New York has made no attempt to fight. Pingree did his best to defeat Burrows, the corporation senator from Michigan; but Roosevelt did not resist if indeed he did not favor the election from New York of Depew, the corporation clerk. Aside from his reputation as an after dinner speaker, and as a declaimer of platitudes on anniversary occasions, Depew has no reputation at all except as head servant of the Vanderbilt family. Originally a Vanderbilt lobbyist at Albany when the Albany legislature was most unblushingly corrupt and the lobby consequently most powerful, he has been promoted step by step in the Vanderbilt service, until now that family, through the amiability of the repub-

lican party of New York, advance him to a seat in the United States senate—the second place in importance that they can hope to have within their gift—while he is yet chairman of the board of the Vanderbilt roads. It is as a Vanderbilt servant, not as a statesman—for he is the one and not the other—that Chauncey M. Depew enters the United States senate. His election for that place is the most impudent confession the republican party has yet made of its decadence. It is even more impudent than the selection of Mark Hanna, for he was opposed within his party and had to buy his way through.

Two British workingmen, Messrs. Thorne and Inskip, the former of the Gas Workers' Union and the latter of the Boot and Shoe Operatives, were sent as labor delegates from Great Britain to the convention of the American Federation of Labor recently held at Kansas City. They have just returned to England, and their interviews in London newspapers show their ideas of the condition of American as compared with English workingmen. Mr. Thorne says that he—

as a workingman would not choose the United States as a home.

Mr. Inskip comes to the same conclusion. Speaking with deference of his American brethren, he is nevertheless of opinion that—

the workers in England are better off than the workmen in the United States, for, while the latter may earn more in actual cash, the purchasing capacity of their wages for the necessities of life is less by comparison than the wages paid in England.

And this after years of tariff protection expressly for the benefit of American workmen. England, the one country against which our tariff barriers are especially erected, nevertheless gives her workingmen a better living than workingmen can get in protected America! As a protective measure for workingmen, the tariff would seem, then, to be a dismal failure.

To this opinion also has come the Textile Record, of Philadelphia, organ of the woven fabrics manufacturers of the United States, and a staunch protectionist. Wondering how the friends of protection will sustain their demand for continued protection in the face of the fact that American fabrics are underselling those of foreign make even in the foreign market, this protection organ asks:

If the argument shall be presented that the tariff is necessary for the maintenance of high American wages, will it be surprising if somebody steps to the front with a demonstration that wages, in many protected industries, have fallen under the Dingley tariff?

It is bad enough for protectionists that English workingmen, after visiting this country, report at home that the American workingman cannot make as good a living as the English; but when an American protection organ thus admits that the Dingley tariff, instead of raising wages has reduced them, what is a thorough-going protectionist to do? It would not sound well to advocate protection as the foster mother of trusts and monopolies. Though that is what it is, it could not be popularized by saying so. Yet what other argument will remain to the protectionist when the workingman argument fails him?

Those confiding people who imagine that the rich owners of personal property can be taxed by taxing personal property, should keep their eyes and ears open at taxing time. Many are the tricks by which personal property taxes are dodged. One of the simplest, of the pious sort, is to send as much taxable property as possible out of the jurisdiction. For instance, when personal taxpayers in New York were making their returns, the agent there of a large Chicago house, an agent who has his employers' interests more heavily upon his mind than the interests of the New York city treasury, forwarded a large sum to the home office, with this candid comment: "We send this amount, all we can spare, to avoid paying taxes on cash on hand." That sort of thing is

called "tax dodging." And in fact, it is tax dodging. But why shouldn't a man dodge a kind of tax which everybody else dodges to the fullest possible extent, and which the state has no just right to impose? In the natural order of things personal property represents the owner's own earnings. Why should they be taxed at all, while monopoly values go untaxed or only partly taxed? The personal tax dodger is really defending his property against confiscation. But the essential point just here is that while farmers, who can't dodge personal taxation, insist upon retaining that nearly obsolete method of raising public revenues, the rich owners of personal property easily escape. Personal property taxation is a trap which farmers set for city capitalists, but which catches the farmers and lets the capitalists escape.

A new paper, The Herald, has been started in Seattle, under the editorship of Samuel Archer and the business management of Hon. E. W. Way. Its object is to aid in recovering the ground which was lost politically to reform movements in Washington at the late election through the triumph at the polls of the candidates of beneficiaries of special privilege. The chief subjects which this new Washington paper intends to agitate are direct legislation, justice in taxation, and control of the liquor traffic by a state dispensary system. The political exemplars of the paper are Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln.

FAVORABLE TRADE.

No apology is required for exposing again and again the prevailing commercial fallacy about favorable balances of trade. This notion that a perpetual excess of exports enriches a nation, while a perpetual excess of imports impoverishes it, is at the bottom of nearly all the economic errors of our time, both in politics and out of it.

Let any thoughtful man once see the truth that nations are enriched not by export balances but by import balances, and not only will he cease from that moment to be a protection-

ist, but the labor question, the money question, the whole tax question, the overproduction question, in a word the entire range of economic and social problems, will be revealed to him in a newer and clearer light. Even such political questions as extra-territorial colonization will be easier of correct solution.

He who habitually thinks of a perennial export balance as favorable trade, is like men standing upon their heads with their feet in the air; he sees everything upside down. Show him that imports, not exports, represent profits, and you have his feet at once upon the ground and his head in the air, so that he sees all things right side up. If any apology were needed for our frequent recurrence to the common fallacy regarding export balances, this would be enough. A fallacy which so disturbs all right thinking in the field of business, economics and politics must be hammered at until it is flattened out.

National exports and imports are the aggregate of the goods which the individuals of a nation send abroad, on the one hand, and receive back on the other. All the goods sent out of a country by its individual citizens constitute its exports; all the goods brought into a country by its individual citizens constitute its imports. The nation itself, as a nation, neither exports nor imports. These commercial terms relate exclusively to aggregates of private transactions.

In considering, therefore, the relative advantages of a perpetual import balance and a perpetual export balance, the real subject in hand is not a question of national profits. It is a question of the aggregate of individual profits. Would the individuals of a country grow richer if the aggregate of goods going out exceeded perpetually or on the whole the aggregate of those coming in, than they would if the aggregate coming in exceeded on the whole the aggregate going out? That is the question.

This question may be more simply considered, and a more accurate result be assured, by dealing at the outset with the comparatively familiar transactions of a single individual. If he prospers by making his sales as an individual exceed his purchases as an individual, perpetually or on the