

doctrinaire attacks on accepted theories of government—the suggestion embodied in this precious report—savors more strongly of anarchy than anything that the avowed anarchists have recently said in public. . . . Society and organized government have nothing to fear from the open discussion of the theories of the anarchist, for when he is required to define his ideas and formulate his plan of social life in a community with no law but the will of the individual, the impracticability of the proposition readily becomes apparent even to himself; it is the attempt at forcible repression of the ideas of anarchy that has enabled it to gain such foothold as it has, and given it the character of a murderous conspiracy against life and property, against religion and order. The law should be so framed as to make every incitement to crime or immorality a crime punishable with severe penalties, but the law will defeat its own purpose and strengthen the evil it is intended to cure if it goes further than this, and makes open philosophical speculation and debate a crime. The attempts to overthrow the safeguards which the framers of the constitution placed around the right of the people to free thought and free speech, so long as there is no incitement to disorder, and no infringement of the rights of others, is in itself an offense of no inconsiderable magnitude. The Times does not permit itself to doubt that the free citizens of New York will be prompt to rebuke and defeat it.

In one of the committees of the Senate there is a resolution, introduced by Senator Bacon, which should be dug out and acted upon at once and favorably. It is intended to authorize the distribution of the Congressional Record at the rate of \$2 for the long session and \$1 for the short session. The present price is \$8 for each session, a price so high that few persons get the publication except through the personal favor of congressmen, who are entitled ex-officio to a limited number of free copies. If the price were reduced as proposed, this much sneered at but most instructive public document would be more extensively circulated and more generally read. We know of no better means of education in the politics of popular government than the Record offers. Few would care to read everything in it. Fewer would have the time. And to no one would this task be of any reasonable use. But general

familiarity with the Record, and verbal reading of its more important contents, are necessary to make an intelligent citizen. The newspaper reports of congressional proceedings are not a good substitute. If the Record were more generally read, congressional proceedings would be better understood by the people and congressional standards would consequently improve. By all means let the Record be published at popular prices.

#### THE CLIMAX OF THE PROTECTIVE SUPERSTITION.\*

At the risk of being suspected as a Greek bearing gifts, I should like to ask protectionists—those who believe in protectionism upon principle, of course, and not the trusts that seek protection merely for their own interests, and whose members greedily appropriate its benefits to their own private use—to consider very thoughtfully the probable effect of ship subsidies upon the popularity of their cherished doctrine.

Subsidies are unquestionably in line with the protective idea, for they are one of the modes of "encouraging domestic industry" by means of taxation. But they are altogether too candidly direct in method and too recklessly transparent in purpose. The masses of the people may feel their burdens, even under our indirect system of taxation; and are certain to recognize their plundering character. Is it wise, then, for sincerely philanthropic and patriotic protectionists to risk the possibilities of exposure of the essential nature of protection to which this all too candid mode of application will subject it?

For my part, I am quite willing to concede the superiority, for the purpose of protection to home industry, of subsidies paid directly out of the public treasury, over subsidies paid by consumers of domestic goods indirectly to the beneficiaries under compulsion of protective tariffs. The direct subsidy is better for many reasons.

In the first place, it is open and above board. Everybody can know

who gets it, and how much he gets. Everybody can know, also, whether those who do get it divide up fairly with their workmen, according to the true intent of the law. Of the indirect, or protective tariff subsidies, that is not true. The beneficiaries can, and in practice actually do, conceal their plunder. It comes from so many individual sources, and in ways so various and complicated, that no one can keep track of it except the beneficiaries themselves. In consequence, their workmen are systematically robbed of the share which protective laws design that they should receive. The only recourse of workmen is to strike when they suspect an unfair division, and that is very unsatisfactory all around. In this respect alone, the direct subsidy has marked advantages over the protective tariff subsidy.

Another of its relative advantages is its effect upon the public at large.

The object of both methods is to encourage domestic production. But here the tariff method operates with great and harassing awkwardness. In order to encourage the production of woolen goods, for instance, obstructions are put in the way of the importation of foreign wools. Those that are imported commercially are subjected to import taxes, which increase the price not only to the amount of the tax but also to the amount of several commercial profits upon the tax; while those that are imported by travelers cause their owners no end of annoyance, to say nothing of the expense, when they land at a home port.

All this extra cost and annoyance must be submitted to until the domestic product has been brought up to the standard of the competing foreign article. Nor does the burden fall off then. For when the domestic product reaches the foreign standard of quality and price, its protected manufacturers insist upon having the protective tariff continued, to enable them to "invade" foreign markets in the name of American enterprise, this invasion consisting in selling their goods at free trade prices abroad, while maintaining protection prices at home.

And that is not all. Sheep raisers clamor for protective tariffs on wool, to enable them to force their prod-

\*Written for and published by the American Free Trade League, Tremont Building, Boston, being No. 39 in its series of syndicate articles for 1901-02, and bearing date Feb. 17, 1902. By Louis F. Post, Editor of The Public.

uct upon the domestic woolen manufacturers, who force their product upon tailors; and tailors clamor for protective tariffs upon clothing to enable them to recoup the extra price they have to pay for cloth.

Protective tariffs are thus piled up all along the line, from the item of the growers of the raw materials to that of the last touch upon the finished product. For what? Simply to build up an infant industry and to enable it to invade foreign markets after it has been built up. Is a more wasteful method conceivable? Compare that expensive and harassing process of indirect subsidies with the direct subsidy, and note how indescribably superior the latter is.

Under the direct subsidy nobody would be annoyed by custom house officers while the infant industry was growing to maturity. The disadvantages under which the American producer labored being overcome by subsidies paid out of the public treasury, his goods would enter the domestic market at lower prices than the foreign goods. Consequently foreign goods would stay out, except to the extent that the domestic producer was unable fully to meet the home demand, which would be only in the infantile years of his industry. During that period he would be encouraged by having as much of the home market secured to him as he could supply; while home consumers would not be pestered with custom house regulations in order to procure from abroad what he could not supply, nor be burdened with excessive prices for either the foreign or the domestic article. And although the American people would have to pay the direct subsidy, they would not also have to pay profits upon it every time the subsidized goods changed hands in trade, as they must under a protective tariff.

The same advantageous difference would continue after the domestic goods had been brought to the level of the foreign standard, and the home market could be fully supplied. They could then be sold at home at a price low enough to keep out the foreign article, and, thanks to the subsidy, could also be sent abroad to undersell foreign goods in their own market.

Other reasons might be urged were space abundant. But enough has been said to show the superiority of the direct subsidy system. Whether for the purpose of building up an infant industry at home, or of enabling it to invade foreign markets after it is built up, indirect subsidies through protective tariffs are vastly inferior to direct subsidies paid out of the public treasury.

But the direct subsidy has also great disadvantages. It is simple. It is easily understood. It is manifestly for the benefit of special interests, and not for the general good. And, withal, it is certain, if overdone—a fate which attends upon all protective methods—to end speedily in an outburst of indignant ridicule. These do not sound like disadvantages; and, so far as the public is concerned, they are not. But they are serious disadvantages from the protection point of view. Such a method of encouraging domestic industry might, if once it were adopted, everlastingly discredit the whole protection theory. That is reason enough for the shyness which shrewd protectionists have heretofore exhibited toward direct subsidies for industrial encouragement.

Lately, however, the fat and greedy beneficiaries of protective tariffs, finding no longer any profit for themselves in that method of taxing Peter to enrich Paul, have been turning with favor toward the direct subsidy system. The first step, the sugar bounty, was not encouraging. It was a mistake to begin with a product like sugar. The purely private nature of this bounty was too obvious. For a beginning, shipping bounties are better. The people know but little about the modern shipping business, and they are ambitious to boast of a great mercantile navy. Subsidies for ships, therefore, do not seem so much as bounties on sugar, like private gifts, even if the chief beneficiaries of the subsidies are to be the great trust magnates of the country.

But if the system of subsidies once takes root in shipping bounties, is any one so fatuous as to believe that it will end there? Let the protective tariff system answer. Its multitudinous ramifications and the horde of beggars in all kinds of industrial ex-

ploitation clamoring for its favors, abundantly testify that there is no limit to public gifts for private benefit short of the will and ability of the giver.

Let ship owners be subsidized out of the public treasury, and a cry for similar direct subsidies will go up from every industry that cannot make the indirect subsidies of the protective tariff serve it. If ships, why not exports? European nations, now cited as examples of ship subsidizers, do subsidize some exports with a view to the commercial invasion of other countries. Shall we shrink from equipping our exporters for that kind of warfare? It has been seen how one tariff breeds another. Why shall not one subsidy breed another. There is no reason for confining subsidies to the encouragement of international trade. If it is good public policy to subsidize ships for foreign commerce, it must be good public policy to subsidize ships and railroads for domestic commerce. If it is good public policy to subsidize commodities for export, it must be good public policy to subsidize commodities for home consumption. Does any one doubt, at any rate, that these extensions of subsidies can be urged as plausibly as the ship subsidy, on grounds of public policy? If, for example, a protective tariff on wool for the protection of American sheep could be made an issue in national politics, why not a subsidy on wool, now that the protective tariff fails to protect it?

Protectionists who believe that protection is a legitimate public policy should make no mistake about the ship subsidy question. With ship subsidies for a starting point and precedent, there will be no end to the objects vociferously seeking subsidies, and no conceivable end to those getting them. But long before the possible end is reached, the whole thing will strike the American sense of humor as unspeakably ridiculous, and the subsidy system, with the protective system of which it is part, will collapse.

Since that is a consummation which free traders devoutly wish for, they might be quizzically asked why they object to this protection-destroying system of subsidies. It might be

urged that the ship subsidy should be welcomed by them as an ally. But free traders are not playing in a game. They are not opposing protection for sport. They oppose it because, whatever may be the mode of application, it is in practice destructive to wholesome industry and in principle economically false and morally pernicious.

The subsidy movement is the normal culmination of a long era of protection by tariffs. In that era a few gigantic trusts, promoted and buttressed if not caused by protection, have developed. They hold the fate of legitimate industry almost at their mercy, and threaten even the political integrity of the republic. They have perverted the intellectual standard of schools and colleges. They have polluted the moral atmosphere of churches. They have insinuated their influence into newspaper sanctums. They have dictated policies in legislative assemblies, seated their own professional servants upon the judicial bench, corrupted nominating conventions, and by trick and device diverted the course of public opinion itself. And now, glutted with pelf and drunken with power, they cynically propose to rob the public boldly, directly from the public treasury, as for a generation they have been robbing it stealthily by means of protective tariffs.

That in doing this they will cause the whole protection edifice to crumble is reasonably to be expected. But that much-desired ending of the most absurd and demoralizing superstition of economic history, is not a reason for advocating subsidies as the destructive means. This would indeed be doing evil that good might come. Much more to the honor of American intelligence and American sensitiveness to right and justice would it be for American citizenship to condemn the protective scheme with deliberation, than to leave it to the fates.

Rather than approve the shipping subsidy, though in the reasonable hope that its development would expose the absurd iniquity of protection and loosen the grasp of that superstition, all conscientious and intelligent citizens will demand that the shipping subsidy be condemned because it is one of the forms of that superstition. Free traders would

rather kill protection with the club of common sense or the sword of common justice, than help to poison it with an overdose of subsidies, however reconciled they might be to seeing it so poisoned by its friends.

#### DR. L. B. TUCKERMAN.

Outside of the medical societies, in which he was an active member, and beyond the city of Cleveland, where his medical practice was large and his personality familiar, Dr. Tuckerman's fame had but slightly extended. In Cleveland, however, his reputation as a citizen had been for years as general as it was unique. It is a reputation, too, which is more likely to spread and grow with time than to fade.

Of Dr. Tuckerman, Tom L. Johnson, now the mayor of Cleveland, is reported by the local press to have said several years ago that he regarded him as "the best citizen of Cleveland," because "he is always striving for the best interests of all the people and he has devoted his life unselfishly to the alleviation of suffering and the promotion of civic righteousness." This estimate of Tuckerman was repeated by the mayor upon learning of the doctor's sudden death, which occurred on the 5th, when he was barely 52 years of age. Nor was it an empty compliment. For in fact Dr. Tuckerman's devotion to public interests, and in no narrow or mere "patriotic" way, either, was both singular and weariless. And this devotion is to be publicly acknowledged at a meeting now being arranged upon a large scale, to be held on Sunday the 16th by progressive citizens of Cleveland.

A democrat of strong convictions, his intolerance of the undemocratic influences so long dominant in the Democratic party, made Dr. Tuckerman a populist in politics and afterward a member of the Socialist party, of which he was the candidate for school director at the time of his death. His socialism was not distinctively of the "scientific" order. It did not rest upon the materialistic philosophy nor cling to the class lines, of the socialism which is becoming in this country as in Germany the dominant type; but would have to be classified with the miscellaneous kinds,

of which there is a great variety, usually to be found outside instead of inside the Socialist party. Dr. Tuckerman was doubtless the father of the agitation for municipal ownership of public utilities in Cleveland, which has now gained such enormous headway there.

His early training in public affairs was under abolition influences in the famous Western Reserve; and to the time of his death the inspiring ideals of absolute right in human relationships, which made that movement invincible, remained his pillar of cloud by day and his pillar of fire by night. A public character developed conscientiously under the guidance of that principle, and which makes so deep an impression upon his community as Dr. Tuckerman is conceded to have made upon Cleveland, cannot but be remembered with increasing distinctness and grateful affection by everyone who may have come within the range of its influence.

#### JOHN S. MURPHY.

Another man of moral valor and civic power in his own community, is numbered this week among those whose days of fighting for the truth as it comes to them are over. The death of John S. Murphy, long the editor of the Dubuque Telegraph, and, after its consolidation with the Herald, of the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald, is announced in the issue of that paper of the 11th. Mr. Murphy was one of the leading newspaper men of Iowa, guiding the policy of a daily paper that stood in the foreground of state journalism; and in the Democratic party of the state he was a valued counselor, in convention and committee room as well as in the editorial sanctum. A democratic-Democrat, and withal a single tax advocate of clear perceptions and the intelligence as well as the courage of his convictions, his services to the Democratic party were dictated by the highest motives and distinguished by rare good judgment. On one occasion his loyalty was put to a severe test, but he stood it without flinching. Though dependent upon an editorial salary for the support of his family, he promptly laid down the editorial control of the Telegraph and sacrificed the much needed salary, rather than