

belief now generally felt in Europe that continental nations were unfit to colonize. The west of Africa, including even the Free State of Congo, lapsed naturally to the British crown, and the duke had the pleasure of living to see realized the dream of which he is father and had been, at Highbury and at Birmingham, for so many years the constant exponent.

In February, 1932, the presidential election in the United States began to turn definitely upon what was known as "the unity question;" both parties were in favor of amalgamation with the British empire, but a sharp line of difference existed between the parties. The republicans, having trade interests mainly in view, struggled for a complete absorption into the scheme of federation, were willing to accept a governor from England (if possible a peer), and demanded no more than representatives in the house of commons and the privy council; while the democrats, true to the sectarian and particularist traditions of their party, insisted upon the maintenance of congress at Washington and even clung with old-world idealism to the name of republic. Every one knows how this was decided in the following autumn by an overwhelming majority in favor of Mr. Yallerby, the republican nominee, and from that date the English people presented legally, as they had so long presented morally, a united front to the world.

Events followed quickly upon this foregone conclusion, and it was in the next year that Lord Harmsworth brought in his bill since known as the "foreign shipping bill," though called at the time "an act for preserving the security of trade," which forbade any ship carrying flags other than British to engage in over-sea commerce, and thus restricted the dwindling trade of continental nations to coastwise traffic and internal navigation. Small as was the issue from the practical standpoint, this bill which, from their point of view, was considered to be tyrannical and offensive, was at once challenged by the Europeans; the ambassadors who, by a curious anachronism, were still maintained at the court of St. James's, did all in their power to modify the terms of our demand, but never was a nation more united, and when it was found that the main thesis of the bill would be presented unchanged, especially after Lord Harmsworth's great speech in Upper Clacton, rebellion broke out on the part of the continental peoples against our authority.

The battle was not so easily decided as many of the rasher spirits at first

maintained it would be, and at the beginning of the war not a few minor reverses attended the Anglo-Saxon arms. The fatal policy of landing troops and attempting to fight with soldiers led to more than one minor disaster, and it looked as if the struggle would proceed indefinitely, when the popular voice forced the government to a measure more in consonance with the national tradition. The word went round that England should disdain to fight any battles save at sea, large mobs insisted upon this policy, with a simplicity of diction and a clearness of object hitherto unknown in the collective action of an ill-educated majority. More than one leading spirit arose from the popular ranks of society who was found capable of voicing the national demand, and the phrases, "Remember the Maine," "Do not speak to the man at the helm," "Le pont est interdit aux voyageurs de deuxieme classe," and similar nautical epigrams of pregnant menace were printed in large type across the headlines of the newspapers. The sluggish government was at length overcome, and the arguments so ably maintained a generation before by Capt. Mahan were cheerfully but effectually listened to. A declaration was issued that Great Britain would fight her battles only at sea.

The effect was immediate. The foreigners disbanded their armies, sent out their fleets ill commanded and in many cases under-manned, chose the most impracticable ports for their points of issue, and in more than one instance even deprived their ships of all their heavy guns before sailing. The three fleets which concentrated upon the united foreign squadrons in the neighborhood of Ushant gained a signal and complete victory, and the war was at an end. During its progress there had been found some men exceptionally daring, who maintained that the lurking discontent on the continent could never be effectually relieved until our military forces had achieved a final victory over theirs. These men were rather exceptional, but they had studied history to some purpose, and knew that the firmest friends of an imperial power were those who had been taught by some severe lessons the folly of resistance. Nations beaten at sea are lost upon land. Our soldiers hitherto but ill-successful became invincible, and the issue of a short campaign proved the accuracy of the imperialist motto. It was only by the exercise of a wise and prudent forethought which excluded from the empire the Latin races and included only

the vigorous Teutonic stock that the empire was not overburdened with too willing but useless subjects, a consumption which arrived in time to close the weary eyes of the aged Kipling.

But now that complete unity had been obtained, and when something of the nature of the old Roman empire, though without its paganism and cruelty, (and without its stain of avarice), had been imposed upon civilization a new danger threatened the general peace of the world. The Salvation Army. * * * * * —The London Speaker of April 21.

CAUSES OF TRUSTS.

The very foundation principle of the trust combinations is restriction. Probably on the theory that fire must always be fought with fire, every effort thus far made by legislatures, to destroy the power of the so-called trusts, has been in the form of still further restrictions. One restriction is piled upon another, and still a third upon both; and in this way it is somehow hoped that liberty will be established by multiplying restraints upon liberty. The commerce and trade of the country are tied up with chains by the trust monopolies; and then congress and the legislatures seek to nullify the effect of these chains by chaining the chains. It is seriously proposed to restore free competition by prohibiting trust combinations from entering into competition. Laws have been passed for the avowed purpose of preventing combinations which control two-thirds of the production of any article from selling their goods in competition with the producers of the remaining third. It is no cause for wonder that all the so-called anti-trust laws have resulted in ignominious failure, and that the number of trust combinations never increased so rapidly as since these laws were enacted.

There is but one remedy for slavery, and that is liberty. There is but one remedy for monopoly, and that is to set free those currents which have been restrained by monopoly. No combination can ever be permanently successful unless it is founded upon some monopoly of natural resources. In very rare cases such a monopoly is founded upon the extraordinary genius of one or two men. For this there is, and ought to be, no remedy. Nature makes it impossible that such a monopoly of genius should last more than a few years; and during that period its benefits will far outweigh all its disadvantages. Genius may have an occasional monopoly; but no one can long have a monopoly

in genius. Nature is sure to produce a rival genius, who does in another way that which the first genius did in his own peculiar way. This was strikingly illustrated in the history of the steel manufacture. Bessemer having invented one immensely valuable and cheap process for making steel, Siemens followed with another method, and Gilchrist and Thomas with still another.

The great monopolies of this country owe their existence to special unjust privileges, conferred upon them by a course of legislation, which the people of the United States adopted of their own free will, and which are still maintained by the votes of the very people who most loudly declaim against monopolies. Foremost among these are the tariff laws, the internal revenue laws and the patent laws. We shall briefly consider these in the order of the least important.

Taking first the patent laws, which avowedly concede a monopoly for the term of 17 years, for good and solid reasons in each case, we have only to say that they afford a striking illustration of the dangers attendant upon any legalized monopoly, however meritorious. This is shown by a comparatively recent scandal with regard to a pretended conflict of claims in the patent office. Two opposing claims were secretly purchased by one corporation, which afterwards employed attorneys on both sides to keep up the sham contest for many years, resulting in a practical monopoly of a single invention for 30 years, instead of 17. By similar manipulations, other valuable inventions are monopolized for a much longer time than the law intends, while many others are simply locked up and kept out of public use entirely. The patent laws need a thorough revision; all in the direction of greater liberty. As we do not propose to discuss the details on this occasion we confine ourselves to saying that these laws should be so amended as to make it impossible for any monopoly to last under it for more than 17 years from the date of the application for a patent, and so as to permit the use by everybody of all patented inventions upon reasonable terms; or, in some other way, patents should be prevented from supporting any monopoly for a longer period than the precise term prescribed upon the face of the statute.

The internal revenue laws, by the restrictions with which they surround the manufacture of liquors and tobacco, afford some great advantages to monopolies. As it is our object in this article not to specify any particular monopoly now existing, we prefer to

illustrate the point by reference to the match manufacture, in the days when there was an internal revenue tax of one cent a box. It is well known that the result of that tax was to destroy immediately all independent manufacturers, and to concentrate the business in the hands of two or three great corporations. When that tax was repealed in 1883, these monopolies fell of their own weight, and it was many years before they could be reconstructed. The present great combinations in the match manufacture are to be found in other laws encouraging monopoly, which are still maintained.

The tariff is the most fertile source of American monopolies. During the last 30 or 40 years hardly an instance has been known in which an American monopoly has been denied any part of the benefits which it has demanded in the enactment of tariff laws. In 1890 and 1897, this rule was without any known exception. In 1894 there were but few exceptions. Tariffs are always made up by the very parties who are interested in preventing foreign competition and securing for themselves a monopoly of the domestic trade.

It is simply absurd to make any effort to prohibit or to regulate trusts and combinations, while their causes are left untouched. If the American people shrink from competition with other nations of the earth, and deem themselves justified in preventing such competition by force, they have no moral right to complain if American capitalists take advantage of the laws which prevent foreign competition, to make of them instruments to prevent domestic competition also. Neither have Americans, who believe in preventing foreign competition by force, any moral right to complain of capitalists who prevent domestic competition by fraud. The one is just as moral, or immoral, as the other.

And thus we come, at last, to the fundamental remedy which is needed. The fundamental cause of American monopolies is to be found in the lack of honesty, justice, business courage and love of fair dealing, which is unfortunately characteristic of a vast majority of the human race, not excepting the people in the United States of America. Whenever a majority of the American people demand simple justice, neither more nor less, for themselves, all these questions will be speedily settled, and trusts will dissolve like snow in summer. For any man who demands and receives exact justice for himself, and no more, necessarily concedes precisely as much to

every one else; and if no man received any more than justice, every man would receive justice. No right can be taken away from any one man, without conferring more than his right upon another. It is as impossible to give more than justice to all men at once as it is to cut off a section of the air and destroy it, leaving a blank.

The inconsistency of any man who demands that competition shall be free, when it works in his favor, but shall be prohibited when it works against him is obvious. But it is not so obvious to the ordinary mind that it is equally absurd to insist upon freedom of competition within the borders of the United States, while excluding competition from without. Nevertheless, the exclusion of competition is quite as unjust and injurious in the one case as in the other: and the demand for freedom of competition at home, while denying freedom of competition from abroad, is absurd and suicidal. The laws of nature cannot be persuaded to work only half-way. No man can take poison and yet enjoy good health. No man can enslave another, yet remain entirely free himself. Neither can any man or nation draw an artificial line and say: "Within these boundaries, competition shall be perfectly free; but outside of these boundaries, there shall be no competition at all."

The remedy, and the only remedy, for the evils of domestic monopolies is the repeal of all laws which pretend to give to any man, rich or poor, American or European, any protection against natural competition, any artificial monopoly of natural resources or any advantage which is not thrown open, on equal terms, to all human beings.

Who would be freemen, must set all men free.

—Thomas G. Shearman, New York, April 5, 1900.

The only "expansion" we need is expansion of access to our own unbounded natural opportunities. That will produce more "commerce" in a single year than would "trade" with the Philippines in a century. — San Francisco Star.

While I was in the wood alone by myself a-gathering of nuts, the forester popped through the bushes upon me, and asking me what I did there, I answered: "Gathering nuts." "Gathering nuts," said he; "how dare you say so?" "Yes," said I. "Why not? Would you question a monkey or a squirrel about such a business?" "I tell you," said he, "this wood is not com-