

vent the capture of our markets by foreign goods, if thereby the general welfare will be promoted, as it is to prevent the capture of our flag by a foreign enemy. It has the same duty to protect its people against unlimited importations, if thereby we are enabled to produce for ourselves, as it has to prevent the general issue of bank notes in order that the integrity of our currency may be preserved.

The latter parallel, that about bank currency, is so weak that Gov. Cummins must have been at a loss for a comparison. But there is no mistaking the import of his declaration that the government ought "to protect its people against unlimited importations." But what people ever needed such protection. If there is anything that any man can fully protect himself against, without the aid of government, it is against being supplied with more goods than he wants. Let him stop paying and the goods will stop coming. But that, of course, is not quite what Gov. Cummins means, although it is a fair inference from his words. What he means is that it is the duty of government to protect some of its people from loss of sales through the inclination of others of its people to buy elsewhere. In other words, he means that it is the duty of government to tax its buying people for the benefit of its selling people. And this is indeed the essence of protectionism. All the talk about "capturing our markets," as if it were the same thing as "capturing our flag," is unadulterated buncombe.

Who can "capture our markets" if our buyers will not buy of them? And what can induce our buyers to buy of foreign sellers unless the foreign seller serves them better than the home seller? Let the home seller give our buyers the best value for their money, and no foreign seller can capture our markets. But if he does not give them the best value for their money, the government cannot prevent the foreign seller's capturing our market except by sinking his goods in the sea or forbidding our buyers to buy of him.

Protectionism adopts the latter method. It puts a tax upon the foreign seller's cheaper or better goods, so as to make them cost more than the home seller's dearer or poorer goods. Thus the buyer is forced to pay more for what he gets than it is fairly worth. And that is described as "protecting our people" and "defending our markets" from capture! In truth, it is protecting our sellers against our buyers, and turning our markets into fighting arenas for our buyers and our sellers, with the power of government all the time on the side of the seller.

Apropos of the assaults upon the single tax theory by Mr. Herick in the Ohio campaign, the following statement of a Baltimore manufacturer is suggestive: "It is absurd," said he, "for Mr. Herick to say the single tax is impracticable. Taxes in Baltimore are about \$7,000,000 a year, while more than \$14,000,000 are paid by the citizens of Baltimore in ground rents alone. These ground rents, instead of going into the public treasury to be used for public purposes, as nine-tenths would under the single tax regime, now go all into private pockets." It is curious that it should be impracticable to collect common incomes for public use, but quite practicable to collect them for private use. Bewildering is the magic of "graft."

*In recently describing the autocratic municipal government of the District of Columbia (p. 386), we spoke of it as being governed by the President and a committee of Congress. That is what it amounts to. The method in detail, however, is explained by Frederick L. Siddons, a prominent lawyer of Washington, who writes:

Congress, under its constitutional grant of exclusive legislative power over the District, created for its government, nearly thirty years ago, a municipal corporation, the chief administrative officers of which are three Commissioners, two civilians, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and one army officer detailed from

the Engineer Corps. These men, constituting a Board, are charged with the administration of municipal affairs. Congress is the local Common Council and Board of Alderman. Under their rule, autocratic rule, as the President of the Board, Henry B. F. Macfarland, loves to call it, public spirit and civic pride have about departed from the inhabitants of the District. It is a government for favorites. The rich and the influential citizen has it all his own way. Gross inequalities in the matter of taxation are one of the striking incidents of this government by the "best citizens," as Macfarland continued to call it until this Summer, when a defalcation in the Auditing Department revealed a delightful disregard of the most ordinary safeguards, and several smaller-sized scandals dampened the ardor of one of the "best citizens," and for some months he has not piped his little tune. Fortunately the tide of public resentment against our municipal monstrosity is rising, slowly perhaps, but still rising, and one of these days, many of us hope and believe, will see the end of this paradox in local government.

It is fortunate for the national administration, which is trying so hard to re-elect Senator Hanna in Ohio, that the opposition press is weak. Think of the ill-smelling scandals in the post office department, to say nothing of the war department, and consider the wretched disclosures of the ship building trust, one of the "business interests" the Republican party has been conserving. A Democratic administration one-tenth as rotten within and without as the present Republican administration would be driven into political bankruptcy before the next national convention.

PEACE IN THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

In an article entitled "The Prospects of Industrial Peace," in *Colliers' Weekly* for August 22, Mr. Charles P. Neill, the assistant recorder of the Anthracite Arbitration commission appointed by President Roosevelt, began and ended his discussion of the subject by a denial that industrial peace is, or can ever be, a possibility. "The world of industry is not naturally a world of peace and amity," he declares, but is and will ever remain a world of clashing interests, of antagonism and of strife.

Mr. Neill claims that his conclusion is not pessimistic because it is based upon "facts."

His fundamental "fact" is "the nature of things."

If Mr. Neill's knowledge of the "nature of things" is true, we must no doubt join the ranks of those who believe as he, and accept his conclusion.

Let us inquire into the truth of his knowledge of the nature of things, and into the validity of his facts.

He asserts:

1. "Labor and capital are each alike pitiably helpless without the co-operation of the other. They are mutually and equally dependent upon one another for opportunity to engage in productive enterprise."

It follows that their interests are to this extent harmonious, and not antagonistic. Nevertheless—

2 There is absolutely nothing in the nature of things to furnish a just basis for the measure of the individual labor value, in co-operative enterprise.

It follows that labor can never get a fair proportion of the results, and labor and capital must, therefore, always be at strife for the largest share.

3. The interest of the consuming class is in the nature of things antagonistic to that of the producing class, and vice versa.

4. Competition is natural and inevitable. But competition is industrial warfare; it is a deadly tool which consumers delight to see producers use among themselves, and producers rejoice to see in use among consumers. It has, therefore, no ethical value.

It follows that the world of industry cannot in the nature of things be a world of peace and amity.

5. Human nature being what it is—every man's hand against every other man's—the world of industry cannot in the nature of things be a world of peace and amity.

6. These facts admitted, our only hope is a moral revolution—a change in human nature itself.

Does Mr. Neill truly understand the nature of things, when he supposes it to be a fact that labor and

capital are each pitiably helpless without the co-operation of the other—that they are mutually and equally dependent upon one another for opportunity to be productive?

It is indeed true that capital is in this helpless condition with reference to labor. Without labor it wastes. Capital has no power of volition or of motion; it can do nothing of itself. The capitalist, as far as he is a capitalist and nothing more, is in the same helpless condition.

Labor, on the other hand, has within itself, the power of self-activity and self-employment. Given land (the third factor in all production), and labor becomes with that co-operation the maker of all wealth, and so of all capital, and need own no dependence upon capital. For, in the true nature of things, the producer cannot be dependent upon the things he produces for the opportunity to engage in productive enterprise.

In the true nature of things that which labor is dependent upon, in order to use its productive power, is the natural opportunity—Land.

With every productive effort which labor puts forth it makes capital.

Capital is brought into existence by labor; capital is made productive only by labor.

There is, therefore, no such dependence of labor upon capital as Mr. Neill supposes.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he supposes that there is nothing in the nature of things to furnish a just basis for the measure of the individual labor value, in co-operative enterprises?

Has he any better ground for this assertion than that to the best of his knowledge and belief no such standard has yet been discovered?

Of course nothing can be a fact to the consciousness of any of us, that has not come within our individual knowledge. Yet we reasonably infer from things which have come within our knowledge that others which have not may yet be possible.

Standards of just measure have been found for many things as intangible as the labor value which constitutes a fractional

part of co-operative enterprises. They have been found for gases, liquids, heat, light, and electricity in every manner of combination, and for the weight and pressure upon the different parts of complex machinery; for almost everything, indeed, that the human mind has set itself to the task of finding. Without danger, therefore, of being the victim of that too "optimistic faith" which Mr. Neill so fears, we might infer that a standard could be found for the just measure of individual labor, in whatever combination it might occur.

And this standard has indeed been discovered, and by the same methods that have been adopted for ascertaining other standards.

The method is the simple one of addition and subtraction—of including and of eliminating.

Wherever labor has been free to withdraw itself from or to put itself into a co-operative enterprise, it has never been impossible for any man who has desired the co-operation of another man's labor service, to ascertain the just value of that labor service in the co-operative enterprise.

But labor is never really free to withdraw itself where the capitalist is also the monopolizer of nature's resources and where the laborer must therefore starve if he does not co-operate. Hence the test has only been possible where natural opportunities have been free.

But in the nature of things natural opportunities should be free; for no man has made them and no man should own them.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he assumes that it is possible to divide the world of industry into a producing class and a consuming class?

Outside the true industrial world we may, indeed, make such a division—in the mixed world of industry and idleness. But in the true world of industry, every man is both a producer and a consumer; and the division into two contending factions, with hostile interests, can no more be made without destroying the industrial world itself, than the child which was brought to test the wisdom of Solomon could have been cut asunder without destroying its life.

In this world of industry every man does, by his production and his power over his product, both satisfy the wants of other men and make an effective demand upon other men to satisfy his own wants. And every man in this same world does, by his consumption and by the obligation which he assumes through his consumption, both make an effective demand upon other men to satisfy his wants and place himself under the necessity to produce something to satisfy the wants of those whose products he consumes.

Because in this world of industry every man is in the nature of things both producer and consumer, it is impossible in the nature of things that there should be strife between producers and consumers.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he sees no ethical value in competition? Competition is strife for justice in exchange. It is an effort to effect an equation between services—a balance and harmony of interests. Its function is to bring out true value and the measure of value. If it is allowed freedom it can only result in peace. For where free exchange is permitted no one need compromise. Or, if we prefer the expression, "sane compromise" will be that adjustment by which all are equally benefited, and the claim of justice fully satisfied. Otherwise there need be no exchange nor bitterness.

It is true that in this world of industry competition, or strife for justice in exchange, is unremitting. It is for this very reason, however, not an unfriendly world, or a world of hostile interests, but a world in which the tendency is toward peace, because toward justice.

But this ethical value in true competition is denied by Mr. Neill and apprehended but by a few others, because in the industrial world of the present time competition is not true, because not free. One party in the strife—the monopolist of natural opportunities—enjoys an advantage which makes the competition "jug-handled," as it has been happily termed. Though posing as in the contest, the monopolist of natural opportunities is not a competitor

at all. He takes no part in the race. But the prize is his before the race is begun; and the race is the laborer's alone.

This is unethical; but this is not competition.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he holds human nature responsible for the lack of peace? Does not every schoolboy know that human nature naturally takes to commerce? And has not commerce been the great peacemaker of the world?

And what is at the base of all people's making of things? If it is primarily the effort at self-expression and self-satisfaction, and therefore not wholly free from selfishness, yet is it not in large measure also the desire to serve or to please others?

What manufacturer, what agriculturist, what laborer on bridges or tunnels, what operator in any of the countless industries of our modern industrial life does the things which he does solely for himself? The man who should insist upon making things for himself alone would be the man who would never trade. Such a man can scarcely be found even among savages.

We have no need for a "moral millenium," as Mr. Neill supposes, to supplant selfishness as a "ruling motive" in men's lives. Human nature is far less selfish, in the narrow sense of the term, than we are taught to believe it is, even under conditions so unfavorable to its best manifestations as are those of the present time.

It is not a moral revolution that we need, but an intellectual awakening. We have no need to pray to God to make over again, and make better, the thing he has made and pronounced "good." We need only to gain a truer knowledge of our own nature and of the nature of things outside of ourselves, in order to discover the harmony of adaptation which, in the nature of things, is and must be between man and man, and between man and his environment.

Yet like that other nature outside of man, human nature has long been made the stalking horse behind which we have sought to conceal our inability to solve those problems which, while we have been in a stage of develop-

ment unequal to their solution, have appeared to us insoluble.

If now we have found the nature of things to be other than Mr. Neill has apprehended it to be—if, indeed, it is as it was pronounced at the outset, good, we shall not look as he does to a change in the nature of things, or to a moral revolution in man, to bring peace. We shall not rely upon prayer to God to do the work for us. We shall look to our own growth in knowledge and in power, through our own activity.

If we have found,

1. That labor's dependence is upon land; that capital's dependence is upon labor's free access to land;

2. That laborers need only free and equal access to natural opportunities to learn the value of their labor service, and to be in a position to command that value as against any who would usurp it;

3. If we have found that the consumer and producer being everywhere and always one and the same man, in the world of industry, cannot be at war with himself;

4. If we have found that competition is the natural agent of justice in exchange, and so the natural agent of peace; that its function is to bring out and to measure true Value.

If we have found that we have misinterpreted the true nature of competition, through not having seen it, but only something which seemed to resemble it, in operation.

If we have found that in the darkness of our intellectual night, which ignorance of the right use of land has made, we have allowed the real enemy of both labor and capital—the monopolizer of natural opportunities—to withdraw from the field, and that labor has thus been left to struggle with labor, not in healthy and friendly competition each to produce their best, but as deadly enemies to destroy each other, and that the monopolizer of natural opportunities has returned to the field only to reap the spoils;

5. If we have found that in the nature of things man's best friend is man; that it is no more necessary that human nature should be changed in order that we shall

have industrial peace than it is that it should be changed in order that babies should refrain from crying when they have pins stuck into them. That, at least, if human nature is to be changed we can't change it; but that we can change those conditions which call out its protests.

If we have learned these things, we shall not believe that peace in the industrial world is an impossibility, a "Utopian dream." But we shall know that we may realize it at any moment, when we agree to destroy that enemy of free competition and of the freedom of man—Monopoly of Nature's Resources.

This can be done with perfect justice to all, and, therefore, with injury to none, through taxation of land values, and exemption from all other taxation.

LIZZIE NYE NORTHROP.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Toledo, O., Oct. 13.—The unqualified endorsement of Johnson and Clarke by Mayor Jones, of this city, and the fusion of the Nonpartisan and the Democratic tickets in this county insure a solid county delegation to the legislature in favor of home rule and of Clarke for United States Senator. The uprising of the citizens of Toledo some weeks ago to prevent the extension of a public-service corporation franchise, in the face of Mayor Jones's veto, has aroused a local sentiment in favor of home rule which will be irresistible at the polls this year.

But even if the Democrats hold every senatorial and representative district they now have, and carry this county's entire delegation, they will still need thirteen additional districts now held by the Republicans. Three representative districts can be carried by a change of one vote in a hundred from the Republican to the Democratic ticket. Two senatorial districts can be carried by a change of two votes in a hundred. Three representative districts and one senatorial district can be carried by a change of three votes in a hundred. Five representative districts can be carried by a change of four in each hundred votes. As it has been the policy of the Democratic managers to concentrate their efforts in these close legislative districts, and as their meetings are better attended and more enthusiasm is manifested than in any other campaign of recent years, they feel quite confident that the close districts will be carried.

John H. Clarke says he has participated in all the principal campaigns of the last twenty years, but never has he seen the same interest manifested as he

finds everywhere he goes this year. Mayor Johnson says he finds the interest increasing from week to week, and that all indications point to a decisive victory.

D. S. LUTHER.

Pittsburg, Pa., October 11.—The closing of "a busy life with its fluctuations and its vast concerns" in this city recently occasioned more than ordinary notice. Here the dead man's name had been for a generation a household word, and because of his commanding position in the business world and at one time a leader in the councils of the dominant political party, tributes of respect and esteem from many sources seemingly gave expression to that "one touch of nature" which is said to make the whole world akin.

Having been the head of a great steel corporation, the younger generation of "captains of industry" had found in this patriarch a counselor and guide in the ever increasing complexity of commercial life. The career of the dead was held up as an example to be emulated by the American youth by those teachers of the gospel of "success," who with florid eloquence pointed to the pathway ever open to all and which leads to a gilded goal.

The career of the late steel king differed little from any of those beneficiaries of special privilege who have amassed colossal fortunes in our republic. Beginning many years ago with a single furnace, the dead man left a private fortune, as certified by his published will, of \$60,000,000, while furnaces and mills and coal and ore lands belonging to the vast steel plant are held, by the surviving family and partners, at a valuation of \$80,000,000.

The accumulation of property seems not to have changed the naturally benevolent character of this modern Croesus. It is said of him that he gave largely to the poor and without ostentation; that to his army of employes he was considerate, merciful, and just. What the world terms triumphs were his in many forms; the evening of his life was bright with the glow of abundant possessions, and at the ripe age of nearly four score years, in the hour of planning the observance of the anniversary of his wedded life, with all the delight of happy anticipation, Death came and whispered low.

Among the many messages of condolence received by the family one stands apart by reason of its sender and because of its suggestively worded conclusion. From his castle home in the Highlands of Scotland Andrew Carnegie sent words of sympathy to the widow, assuring her that "While we had been competitors, your husband and I were friends always," closing with a quotation from a speech delivered by Edmund Burke, at Bristol, in

1782: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

If the rich man to whose death reference has been made placed the acquisition of material things above all else, measured by the standard of eternal life he had, indeed, grasped at shadows. It is known that great economic truths were held by him to be but vagaries of disordered minds. For many years he had been one of the strongest advocates of the "highest protection to the American workingman," and his arguments in printed form against the "dangers" of free trade and his pleas for the extreme protective tariff system are among the archives of his political party, while during the presidential campaign of 1884 he became prominent as chairman of the national Republican executive committee.

It is undoubtedly true, as Mr. Carnegie said, that the dead steel master and himself, while competitors, were always friends, for between these two in practically monopolizing the steel and iron industry, and enriched at the expense of the American people, there was neither room nor occasion for personal antagonism.

As a world-wide figure, posing as simply a trustee of vast resources Mr. Carnegie is a Nimrod in the pursuit of shadows. The toilers at Homestead build, but they do not enter in. Through the agency of their trustee they have filled hall and sanctuary with melody, yet to their humble homes and dreary lives no music comes.

Mr. Carnegie sets aside a million or more for a palace of peace at The Hague, and almost simultaneously with this announcement is printed in leaded type and black headlines of display an item detailing the arrival in this city, en route to the Homestead mills, upon a car specially constructed for the purpose of its transportation, one of the largest castings ever made, to be a part of machinery for the manufacture of enginery of war—to mangle and kill the children of God.

A noble impulse was that which animated this pseudo-philanthropist when he so largely endowed the Tuskegee institute, for the destiny of the freedman is the same as that of the Caucasian, but Mr. Carnegie cannot see that beyond the dark shadows of violated law, for the members of an emancipated race whom he seeks to further uplift, new shackles are even now being formed which ultimately will bind with greater cruelty than those of a Legree. The dispatches from the Southland and the West within a few weeks have told of the acquisition by Pittsburg and other capitalists of thousands of acres of land underlaid with coal and iron ore. What, then, will confront the graduate of Mr. Washington's school as he steps out