

tection for wool. He says that Protection on wool doesn't protect Michigan farmers, for wool raising is one of the smallest industries of the farm; that the amount which the people of Michigan expend for wearing apparel is 50 times greater than Michigan farmers get for their entire wool product; and that the unprotected dairy products of Lenawee County alone, exceed in value all the wool grown in Michigan. As Mr. Frensdorf is the Democratic candidate for Congressman-at-Large from Michigan, his election would add another vote in the House to those against continuing the Protection fraud.



### Wagnon's Candidacy in Portland.

The Singletax candidate for tax assessor in Multnomah County, Oregon—the Portland county—is H. D. Wagnon, an old time and weariless Singletaxer of that part of the world. He was the principal promoter of the Singletax amendment which almost carried in Multnomah County four years ago, though pretty heavily defeated in the total vote of the State,\* and he is the father of the graduated Singletax amendment on which the State-wide vote is to be taken next month. The opportunities for such good work as a man like Wagnon could do in Portland as assessor, are numerous enough, as they are almost anywhere else—as they were in Houston, Texas, when Pastoriza came into municipal office, and as they were in Whatcom County, Washington, when Kaufman was elected assessor. News of H. D. Wagnon's election would make good reading from Oregon two weeks hence.



### Death of Edward B. Foote.

In the death on the 12th of Dr. Edward B. Foote of New York, progressive movements have lost one of their most loyal supporters. His devotion began with his youth; it never slackened until his death. With some of his activities The Public was not in sympathy, but Dr. Foote's truly democratic spirit which inspired them all, and was as a steady light in a dark place, could not fail to command universal respect. He served not only causes that were popular, but also and with even more intensity many that were yet in their swaddling clothes and their mangers, or in process of crucifixion. The popularity or the contempt they provoked made no difference to him. His simple test for the worthiness of a cause was its righteousness at the bar of his own judgment and conscience. Nor was he intolerant. With true charity

he accorded, in good faith to others of good faith, the rights of judgment he cherished for himself.



### THE HOME MARKET.

Among the catch phrases used by the Protectionist to enlist the sympathy of the unthinking voter, perhaps the most seductive is that of the "home market." To buy at home, to patronize home industry, to protect the home market, is to favor one's countryman rather than a stranger. Nay, it is to serve one's friend, rather than an enemy.

Yet, what is this but an attempt to transmute the love of kindred into terms of gain; and to bind trade with personal ties?



Trade is as impersonal as the law of gravity; it serves all men alike; regardless of race, nationality or kindred.

By trade, man avails himself of the other means of wealth creation. If he could not trade he would derive no benefit from any of the vast multitude of labor-saving devices and inventions. Without exchange he would forego all the advantages of the diverse soils, climates, and human talents. As a man who would deny himself the use of steam would to that extent limit his power and enjoyment over the wealth of the world, so does the man who would bar out the products of another race or clime, sacrifice to that extent his power over nature.



The idea that trade within the country is more profitable, and therefore better for the country, than trade across the frontier is one of those strange beliefs inherited from the past, when simple minds groped for excuses to believe what they wanted to believe.

"Stranger" was synonymous with "enemy"; and one should not, argued the simple-minded, confer a benefit upon one's enemy.

That the same trade benefited oneself was not to be considered, since such benefit could be had by trading with one's own countrymen.

The idea is well illustrated by the homely example so often given: "If I buy a coat in Canada, I have the coat, but Canada has the money. If I buy the coat in this country, we have the coat and the money too. Or, as put by Adam Smith, a trade at home gives two profits within the country; whereas a trade abroad gives one profit at home, and one in the other country.

\*See Public, vol. xi, pp. 250, 275, 320, 322, 358, 390, 420.

Therefore, trade at home is twice as profitable to the country as foreign trade.

Such specious reasoning can deceive none but those who wish to be deceived. The slightest attempt at analysis will discover the falsity; and these falsities have repeatedly been pointed out, from the time of Adam Smith down to this day.

Those who will not see are blind indeed.



The error underlying this "home market" idea consists in substituting a half truth for the whole.

Thus: A man in Ohio trades with a man in Vermont; result, two profits in this country. Again: A man in Ohio trades with a man in Ontario; result, one profit in this country. But there were two Americans involved in the first statement. What of the Vermont man? Cannot he trade with a man in Quebec while the Ohio man trades with the man in Ontario? And will there not then be two profits in this country, the same as though he had traded with the Ohio man?

So far as profits within the country are concerned, does it matter a particle whether the four men trade parallel with the boundry line, or across it? Will there not in any event be as many profits as there are trades? And will not the self-interest of each dictate the most advantageous bargains?

Or, consider the proposition to keep the money and also the goods in the country.

This again is but half a truth. The exchange of goods for money is not a complete trade. All real trade consists of the exchange of goods for goods.

The acceptance of money for goods is merely a convenient method of keeping accounts. The tailor, at the time he delivers the coat to the shoemaker, may not need shoes and so accepts money. The money will secure the shoes when he does need them; or it may be given to the baker for bread, and the baker may give it to the shoemaker for shoes. This is all so plain and so simple that one hesitates to state it in public print; yet it is for lack of understanding this very principle that the Protectionist is deceived into thinking it better for the country when he spends his money at home, rather than when he buys abroad.



A source of confusion in the Protectionist's mind is the idea that nations trade. It is customary to speak of trading nations, or of commerce between nations. But this is figurative.

Nations do not trade. The United States does

not buy of England; nor does England buy of the United States. Individual citizens of the United States buy of individual citizens of England. But these citizens will not buy or sell, unless it is to their advantage.

All legitimate trade is to the advantage of both parties to the trade. Hence, if the trade be to the advantage of the individual, it must also be to the advantage of the nation to which that individual belongs.

Congress may aid, or it may hinder such trade; but will any one presume to say that a body of lawmakers knows better the interest of the individual trader than the trader himself? And if it does not know better, by what right does it meddle?



What is there about an imaginary line drawn between countries that should change the very laws of nature?

Why should it be considered advantageous to this country for citizens of Vermont to trade with those of Texas or California, but not with those a mile north of them?

Should the Canadian territory lying south of the St. Lawrence river be annexed to this country, it would then, according to Protectionist philosophy, be advantageous for Vermonters to trade with its inhabitants. But those inhabitants in the annexed territory should not trade with the people north of the St. Lawrence. Alsace-Lorraine, prior to the Franco-Prussian war, traded with France with profit. After the war they were compelled to trade with Prussia.

Cuba is a country now to be feared. Our people must be Protected from her. Should she be annexed, our people would then have no Protection from her.

Many people of this country believe that Canada should be annexed. Yet the advantages of annexation could be had in all cases merely by removing the restraints to trade.



The home market has absolutely no advantages over the foreign market, merely because it is a home market. Trade is impersonal; it follows the line of greatest profit, regardless of sentiment. To attempt to keep it within the country is to forego its natural gain, and to foster the race hatreds and national prejudices that make necessary the great armaments which keep one Christian nation from destroying another Christian nation.

STOUGHTON COOLEY.