

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1903.

Number 289.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

There are three classes of mind—the conservative, the radical, and the lickspittle. The latter usually antagonizes the radical; not because it is conservative, but because radicalism offers few prizes and no comforts to its devotees.

Senator Hanna is an acrobat of transcendent agility. Surely it is not base flattery to say this of a man who can unsparingly denounce the Democratic party for bringing on the hard times in 1893, and then in the same speech praise without stint Grover Cleveland, who was then at the head of that party.

Now that a new group of spots has been discovered on the sun, the prosperity question in Republican newspaper offices will be very much complicated. How can the editors be sure, when this Republican prosperity folds its tent and steals away, whether to blame the sun spots, the labor unions, or Tom Johnson's campaign in Ohio.

The author of the "Bonnie Briar Bush," the Rev. John Watson (Ian Maclaren), predicts the "greatest religious revival since the days when Rome succumbed to the teachings of Christ in the first century." He says the world is on the eve of it. But suppose this religious revival should come. Would it not come now as aforetime, in no halo of glory attracting the better classes, but only as a babe of poverty born in a manger, and a strange man preaching strange doctrines and consorting

with the lower classes? Does the Rev. Mr. Watson suppose he will recognize the revival if it comes in that way? The priests of nineteen hundred years ago did not.

In a public address early this month John D. Rockefeller told his audience that the personal comfort religion had been to him was such that he "sometimes felt like going upon the lecture platform and telling people about it." Mr. Rockefeller could interest the public much more by telling them about the personal comfort he has derived from ruining men in order to establish the Standard Oil trust. Such a lecture might not be without its religious bearings, either.

That Tom L. Johnson has frightened the Republican leaders to the point of desperation is plain enough; and if the intensity of their fears is evidence of the drift of things in Ohio, Johnson must be making headway against their enormous majority there. Senator Hanna's billingsgate vocabulary has been called into play, always a sign that he is scared, and Secretary Shaw, of President Roosevelt's cabinet, has taken the Ohio stump with a mouthful of well-cooked statistics. It is evident that Hanna now realizes he is no match for Johnson in a political contest. From the freedom with which he uses poker terms, however, it would appear that he might make a better showing in the "great American game."

The traction-ring press makes much of the defeat of municipal ownership in San Francisco at the special election on the 8th. They say that the San Francisco voters defeated it, and that the result proves that the people of San Francisco are not yet ready for it. This is untrue. The voters did not

defeat municipal ownership; it was defeated by the legislature, which made a one-third vote sufficient to kill the measure. In other words, it gave to municipal-ownership voters the usual one vote each, but to traction-ring voters it gave two votes each. Nor does the result prove that the people of San Francisco are not ready for municipal ownership, as is asserted. Quite the contrary. Only 10,745 voted against it, while 14,480 voted for it. When 57 per cent. of the voters on any measure vote for it, ordinary candor does not permit it to be said that the voters are opposed to it.

William Randolph Hearst has employed, to boom him through the American newspaper press for the Democratic nomination for President, the distinguished and veteran Republican editor, Murat Halstead, of Cincinnati. The first of Mr. Halstead's articles was released for publication on the 14th, the second on the 15th, the third on the 16th, and the fourth on the 17th. The first is devoted to Mr. Halstead's own interesting experiences in politics, and the second deals generally with the political situation. It is the third that makes the first disclosure of the Hearst boom. The fourth enlarges upon its possibilities. These articles are furnished by Mr. Halstead to the papers of the country for use as "copy" without pay. They are presented in Mr. Halstead's name, for the declared purpose of inviting—

the attention of the country to the fact of the perilous problems before us, among them a phenomenal Presidential campaign at hand, and to awaken to impending dangers the form of socialism that consents to orderly methods and is capable of charity, to stand against that which rushes into anarchy.

When "government by injunction" came into vogue in the United States, under the foster-

ing care of Federal judges, predictions were made that it would yet be extended so as to operate as a press censorship. The idea was hooted, but now the step has been taken. A judge in Cincinnati has just granted an injunction which forbids the publication by a labor paper of a list of "unfair" business places. If an injunction can be used for that purpose, it can be used for any other object of press censorship; and every newspaper is thus placed at the mercy of any autocrat of the bench. For injunctions of this kind make the judge who grants them, at once legislator, judge and jury. He is absolute. The only remedy is to abolish "government by injunction," and that is what the Democratic party of Ohio is pledged to do. If the "injunctioned" workmen of Cincinnati wish to protest effectively against this judicial lawlessness, they may do so on the 3d of November. Should Hamilton county give 30,000 majority against Tom L. Johnson, as the Hanna party predict, that majority would be regarded as an endorsement of this new advance in the art of "government by injunction." Isn't it time for workmen to do more sensible voting before election, and less futile howling afterwards?

The protection movement in Great Britain, which Chamberlain is leading and Balfour is following, draws its strength from the fact that free importing alone is not free trade. Importing into England has been practically free for two generations; but exporting out of England is met in all directions with tariff walls. Thus, while British producers are obstructed in foreign markets, foreign producers freely enter British markets and undersell British producers there. The British producer so affected thereupon appeals loudly to the patriotic spirit; and forthwith those millions of Great Britain whom Carlyle denominated as "mostly fools," rush to the rescue of British industries. If British producers could enter foreign markets

as freely as foreign producers enter British markets, the patriotic spirit would not respond to those appeals.

There is truly an appearance of good sense in the contention of British protectionists that Great Britain cannot keep her markets open to foreign imports if foreign markets are to remain closed against her exports. It sounds wise, even to free traders, to say that although free trade is good, one-sided free trade is impracticable. Yet the plain truth is that one-sided free trade, while far inferior to all-around free trade, is better than all-around protection. There are two sides to every trade—the seller's side and the buyer's side. Consequently, if foreign sellers do take away a British market from British sellers, British buyers are gainers, even if British sellers are losers. The gain as well as the loss is at home. But with free trade, even one-sided free trade, the gain is greater than the loss.

It is conceivable, of course, but sanely speaking it is unthinkable, that the foreigner might undersell in British markets until no markets were left for British producers. But how, then, would the foreign seller get his pay. Buyers must sell as well as buy, and unless they produce things they have nothing to sell. The free trade of England may pinch some kinds of British production—that, for instance, in which Mr. Chamberlain is engaged,—but it cannot harm British production in general, without making the British market a profitless one for foreigners. Even one-sided free trade is better for the country that maintains it than retaliatory tariffs can possibly be.

This has been proved by the experience of Great Britain herself. London is the market of the world; London is the clearing house of the world; London is the capital of the world. It is toward London that the wealth of the world flows. All this is because the English policy of free

trade has thrown down the bars to the commerce of the world. Considered as a whole, as a unit, the people of England have been enriched by free trade, one-sided though it has been. Only when we come to investigate individual conditions do we disclose British poverty—the poverty of England's working classes. Awful indeed it is, though no worse than individual poverty in our own highly protected country. But the poverty of England is not attributable to free trade.

If free trade, which has enriched England as a nation, has failed to enrich her working people, it is not because free trade is prejudicial to labor; nor is it because the free trade of England is one-sided, protection prevailing everywhere else; it is because the principle of free trade in England stops at the seaports. Internal free trade is unknown in England. Instead of the blessings of internal free trade, she is cursed with the blight of landlordism, which is a phase of protectionism. This is the reason the riches that free trade has brought so lavishly into England have not enriched her free working classes. They are grabbed by her protected leisure classes.

In harmony with the Chamberlain-Balfour argument for abandoning free trade in England is that of Gov. Cummins, of Iowa, Republican candidate for reelection, who recently (p. 404) committed his party to the astounding doctrine that "the chief purpose of government is to prevent natural consequences and to restrain the operation of natural law." It was with refreshing bluntness that Gov. Cummins put the protection theory, which prevails in the United States and is being now expounded in England by Chamberlain and Balfour, when he argued in his speech at Des Moines at the opening of the Republican campaign last month, that—

Free commerce is no more sacred than freebooting or free killing. The government is under as high obligation to pre-