

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-

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.