

# The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &  
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR

ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
JUN 11 1909

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Massachusetts  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
FRANCIS L. DU PONT, Delaware  
HERBERT QUICK, Iowa  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
MAX HIRSCH, Australia  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1909.

No. 584

Published by LOUIS F. POST

Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents

Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898 at the Post Office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

## EDITORIAL

### CONTENTS.

#### EDITORIAL:

The Opening of New Markets.....	553
Death of Theodor Barth.....	554
The Judicial Election in Chicago.....	554
The Socialist Vote in Chicago.....	554
Where Is the "Straphangers' League"?.....	555
Big Business and School Business.....	555
Unanswered Riddles for Protectionists (Daniel Kie- fer).....	556
A Lemon for American Consumers.....	557

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

The Negro Status Conference (Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....	559
--	-----

#### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The British Budget.....	561
Socialism in Germany.....	562
A Brave Man Is to Go to Siberia.....	562
Conference on the Status of the Negro.....	563
The Tariff in Congress.....	563
The Traction Question in Cleveland.....	563
News Notes.....	565
Press Opinions.....	565

#### RELATED THINGS:

To a Common Workman (M. J. Hertzberg).....	567
Where the Shoe Pinches.....	567
Protection Psychology.....	567
Protection Prices.....	568
Protectionism at Work.....	569
The Weakness and the Strength of Protection (Henry George).....	570
Making It Clear (J. W. Foley).....	573

#### BOOKS:

International Free Trade Congress.....	573
Our Foreign Markets.....	574
Books Received.....	574
Pamphlets.....	574
Periodicals.....	574

### The Opening of New Markets.

We hear much of the importance of opening new markets for American products. It is a great conception. But why foreign markets especially? Why not the home market? Within these States there are markets for American products which are far and away beyond comparison, for eagerness, with the markets of Asia or Africa or South America.

+

Protectionists have had the idea vaguely. They used to talk and write crudely about the "home market." But they want to make a home market by empowering home producers to extort high prices from home consumers, and that is not opening home markets for the general good. It is exploiting home markets for the profit of a few. But there is a way of opening home markets that would expand as they were supplied, and for the good of all.

+

Think of the vast number of families in this country who squeeze through their housekeeping with ten dollars a week. These alone would make a market to drive your average business promoter wild with joy, if in point of distance they were far enough away, and in point of civilization sufficiently barbaric, to excite his lop-sided imagination in matters of trade. And there are in addition the vast numbers who don't get even ten dollars a week to squeeze their families through with;

and other vast numbers who pull through on twelve, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five or thirty dollars a week. All these want to buy more than their present incomes permit. They are buyers potential on a larger scale, and eager at that; and all they need to make them so in fact is fairer wages for the work they do. Yet they are ignored, when they are not scorned. American business interests which squander untold sums of public and private money to open distant and feeble foreign markets, spend other untold sums to keep down the buying power of this eager and limitless market along their own country side and in their own towns and cities.

\* \*

#### Death of Theodor Barth.

This German radical, who died at Baden-Baden on the 2nd at the age of 60 years, was the son of an East Indian planter who left a fortune which enabled the son to devote his life freely to public affairs. For years he was a member of the Reichstag, losing his seat at the last election because he gave up his sure district to an associate and ran in a doubtful one himself. He was an extreme radical of the non-Socialist type, and in the Reichstag had been the leader of a democratic group. From 1883 to 1907 he was editor of *Die Nation*, the publication of which he stopped in the latter year. Last summer Mr. Barth attended the Free Trade Conference in London, where he made several speeches, all but one in English, a language in which he was as much at home as in the German. From one of these speeches we make this quotation, which, while it was intended to express the sentiment of the Socialist party in Germany, expressed also Mr. Barth's: "They know that restriction of international exchange of products of labor means restriction of the labor market, and means lower wages." For several months in the Presidential campaign of 1896, Mr. Barth traveled in the United States with Bryan.

\* \*

#### The Judicial Election in Chicago.

At the judicial election this week for Chicago and the remainder of Cook county, the victory of the Republican organization, though not nominally complete, was substantial. This political machine had set out to capture the park boards that are appointed by the judges, and it has succeeded. A majority of the judges elected are Republican, and three of them are new men who replace Democratic judges. To accomplish their

main purpose, Republican leaders demanded the election of the "whole ticket." But that was only part of the play. The election of the whole ticket was probably not expected, but the effort served its partisan purpose well enough.

\*

It is not remarkable that in this partisan contest so good a judge as Edward Osgood Brown was defeated. His flat refusal to fall in with demands of the Democratic organization that the Democratic candidates also make a partisan campaign, is quite enough to explain the slight deficiency in his vote which made him fifteenth where only fourteen were to be elected. His independence of organization orders in other respects during his incumbency doubtless contributed. That he had proved himself one of the best judges on the bench, a worthy successor of the late Judge Tuley whose complete confidence he enjoyed, went for nothing in a campaign in which organization patronage and bi-partisan bargains counted for more than judicial loyalty and intelligence. One fact that probably militated against him was his early appointment to the appellate bench. This was a just recognition of his judicial abilities, but it segregated him almost from the beginning of his career as a judge, from the army of jurors and witnesses who trail through the trial courts month by month and learn to like or respect the judges with whom they come in contact. Judge Brown's industry, his ability, and his unyielding judicial attitude, though appreciated by members of the bar, were unknown quantities to most of the 170,000 voters whose preferences decided the election. But his independence was a well known quantity to the baser elements of both parties. That he should have come so near to election in all these adverse circumstances is indicative of a large vote from independent sources.

\* \*

#### The Socialist Vote in Chicago.

At a judicial election at which hardly more than one-third of the registered vote turns out, side parties cannot be expected to furnish more than their proportion, unless there are special reasons to the contrary. But there are such reasons in the case of the Socialist party. Segregation is the underlying tactical principle of this party. It goes into one election as into another, not with reference to the particular issues, and not to win nor even to attract a floating vote. Its object is to build up through successive contests at the polls a class party or political church. Cooperation against a common enemy with any who

have not subscribed to the creed and taken the oath is anathema. Independent voting is treason. And the stay-at-home from any election, however trivial merely as an election, is a deserter on the battle field of a class war in which he has enlisted for life. Whenever such a party polls a small vote, it is significant of something more vital than an apathetic attitude toward the particular election. It is significant of political impotence. And if the number is considerably less than at previous elections—whether important ones or not, as elections—it is significant of the hopelessness of this kind of tactics. In that view of the matter the Socialist vote in Cook county at the judicial election this week is interesting. It was about the same as at the judicial election six years ago. It was about 20 per cent of the Presidential vote in 1904; and about 50 per cent of the Presidential vote of 1908, which was considerably less than half that of four years before. And it is considerably less than half, perhaps hardly more than a third, of the vote for mayor in 1907. This means, either that previous votes for Socialist candidates were contributed largely by non-Socialists, influenced by various ephemeral motives, or else that Socialists are not very different from other voters, the party creed and pledge to the contrary notwithstanding. In either interpretation, the inference is strong that socialistic progress in this country through a hide-bound party organization is not especially hopeful.

+ +

#### Where is the "Straphangers' League"?

Indignant straphangers organized in Chicago two years and a half ago, at the expense of the traction companies, anomalous as that may seem, to adopt the traction ordinances which the companies were willing, only reluctantly—oh, so reluctantly,—to accept. They won the election, did those straphangers; but now it appears, two years after their victory for the immediate abolition of straphanging, that a daily average of 88,490 surface car passengers in Chicago have to hold to the straps. This is the report of the subway bureau. The "Straphangers' League" ought to reorganize and get the traction companies to finance them some more.

+ +

#### Big Business and School Business.

There was a sequel—humorous or sad as per point of view—to the legislative victory of the Chicago school teachers (p. 531) in killing the Big Business bill for giving away school lands and creating a factory-boss school superintendency.

After this bill had come up from the House and been safely buried in the Senate (buried with a motion to non-concur in an adverse committee report securely laid away upon the table, and the time for reconsideration past), the legislature continued the session until last Thursday with a "gentleman's agreement" to do no legislative business meanwhile. The bill was dead, beyond all possibility of honorable resurrection; and John J. Sonstebly and Raymond Robins, who had superintended at the burial, came home for good and with minds at peace.

+

But Big Business—which knows not honor when policy is afoot and the clatter of "propuppy, propuppy, propuppy," rises musically to the ear,—proceeded under cover of club room shadows to "frame up" a secret scheme for resurrecting that putrid bill. Under this "frame-up" the bill was to be taken from the table on Thursday, while its vigilant adversaries were off guard, and in the hurry and confusion of "last hours of the session" was to be carried through second and third reading under suspension of the rules and with a rush. Inasmuch as one legislative day is necessary for each reading of a bill, the legislature was pledged to Big Business by this "frame up" to extend its session over into Friday; and the Senate was to railroad the bill through second reading a little before the midnight between Thursday and Friday, and through third reading a little after.

+

It was a fine "frame up," and nearly all the Big Business family of Chicago was in it. There was Mr. Steel Trust, and Monsieur the Beef Trust, and Herr Brewery Trust, and all the rest, with satellites and subordinates of the School Board, and the City Hall, and Newspaper Junction, and Governor's Alcove, and with their trust-vault boxes full of political pledges for specific performance. But Mr. Steel Trust, over anxious lest Mr. Sonstebly and Mr. Robins might reappear inopportunely at Springfield, talked pleasantly and reminiscently to the former, of the fate of the bill, as of an interesting mutual experience of the past; and Monsieur the Beef Trust confided in him a business necessity for keeping an immediate engagement in New York. These confidences impressed an otherwise unsuspecting mind; and late as was the hour on Wednesday night, Mr. Sonstebly decided to run down to Springfield just to keep an eye on the legislative cemetery against a possible attempt to rob the grave of the malodorous bill which he had helped to bury.

Boarding the last train on Wednesday night for Springfield, Mr. Sonstebly dropped into the smoking room of the Pullman before taking to his berth. And, lo! There was Monsieur the Beef Trust, who had started for New York but apparently got into the wrong train. And there was Mr. Steel Trust, who had given up the fight only an hour before, but was on his way to renew it now. And there was Herr Brewery Trust, who had been roped in for a "sure thing." And there was a Senator whose influence was depended upon as one of the joists in the "frame up." And there were School Board employes, going tamely along, under orders from the Big Business ring of the Board, to serve at the grave in scooping up the dirt with their hands. Tableau!

+

For an hour or so Mr. Sonstebly swapped irrelevant remarks in the smoking room with Mr. Steel Trust and Monsieur the Beef Trust and Herr Beer Trust, and their humble attaches. But when Big Business had tucked itself into its several Pullman berths, and was enshrouded in the spiritual calm of virtues that are not their own reward, Mr. Sonstebly made shift to send a midnight message to Raymond Robins, and both were on the ground when the legislature met on Thursday. The details for the remainder of that day would make a long story. They would supply material for a political play of absorbing interest. But it is sufficient here to explain that the "frame up" was soon in confusion. Before another day had closed, Herr Beer Trust was homeward bound, with the ignominy of defeat rankling at his heart and the shadow of shame upon his brow. Monsieur the Beef Trust had vanished—had possibly caught a later train for New York. But Mr. Steel Trust strode defiantly up and down the corridors of his own indignation, demanding to know who had struck his "Billy Paterson," and proclaiming the purpose and the power of the Big Business family to get even with the traitor when once they find him out.

+ + +

### UNANSWERED RIDDLES FOR PROTECTIONISTS.

What do Protectionists expect to prove by quoting appeals for protective tariffs from interested parties? Such appeals may show the insincerity of some who profess to be Democrats, but they prove nothing in regard to either the necessity or the justice of protective tariffs.

+

When hat manufacturers plead that it will be

unprofitable for them to continue in the hat business without a tariff, they practically declare that their business is an unnecessary burden on the American people. If the hat business cannot exist without compelling the people to pay it a sum over and above the true value of its products, it is not a benefit to the community. It is an injury.

Likewise if Southern growers of cotton, pine-apples, or oranges tell the truth in proclaiming that a protective tariff is needed for their products, they only inform the American people that the country would be better off without them.

As matter of fact some at least of the Southern protectionists have been frank enough to admit that they want the consumers of their products to be robbed. The argument of Congressman Clark of Florida was in effect, though not in plain words, that because Northern manufacturers are allowed to rob their customers it is only fair to let Southern planters do the same thing. Mr. Clark shows more contempt for the intelligence of the American people than the hat manufacturers or other Northern interests have so far shown.

+

All these pleas for protection, whether Northern or Southern, Republican or pseudo-Democratic, are false.

To believe them is to believe that the United States is so poor a country that it can produce nothing which can hold its own in an open market, on its own unsupported merits.

To believe them, is to believe that American labor is so inefficient, that it cannot produce as much in proportion to wages as the most degraded and poorest paid foreign labor.

We know better than that.

+

Let me ask a few questions for categorical answers:

First: If all tariffs were abolished, is it true or not that the country would be flooded with foreign goods?

Second: If true, would the foreigners send these goods over free, or would they want to be paid for them?

Third: If they should want to be paid, would it not be necessary to perform labor of some kind in this country to produce wealth for export to pay for those goods?

Fourth: If the answer to the third question is "yes," does it not necessarily follow that the more goods imported, the more demand there must be for American labor to produce exports? If not, why not?

Fifth: If, on the other hand, the answer to the third question is "no," where is the wealth to come from to pay for the "flood" of foreign goods?

Sixth: If pay for the goods is not forthcoming will not the "flood" cease?

Seventh: If it should not cease in spite of no pay, wouldn't the foreigners be either an unusually silly or an unusually generous lot? Wouldn't they be voluntarily enabling us to get all the things we need without working?

All the above questions following the first are framed on the supposition of an affirmative answer to the first one. Of course if this supposition is wrong, if any protectionist should unexpectedly reply to the first question in the negative, he would thereby deny the protection theory of a "flood of foreign goods."

+

Now, let me call attention to some other facts which protectionist politicians do not like to pointedly discuss.

When comparisons are made of wages paid in this country with wages paid in the same industries in Europe, protectionists compare the amounts earned for a certain time. By this method they conceal the fact that the American working man produces more, in proportion to his pay, than his European brother.

American shoe workers, for instance, may get more wages per week than English shoe workers, but they turn out so many more shoes in a week that the labor cost of a pair of shoes here is less than it is in England.

And so in many other industries.

That is one reason why many American products undersell European products in Europe and elsewhere.

Protectionists forget all about this when they speak of "protecting American industries from the cheap foreign labor clamoring for a chance to climb over the bars."

And protectionists get mixed on their own argument when they compare conditions in England and in Germany. If European labor is all that protectionists say it is, how can a protective tariff help it? From whom is it to be protected? What particular pauper labor will endanger Germany, Italy, France or Russia if they remove their protective tariffs? What pauper labor is flooding England? To be sure English protectionists have raised a howl about German goods, but German labor happens just now to be in what passes for a prosperous condition; and this cannot be on account of the German tariff, since Italy and Rus-

sia, have much higher protective tariffs, without being so benefited. May it not be because the German government has checked railroad monopoly almost entirely, and land monopoly to some extent?

+

The bad conditions in England cannot be satisfactorily explained by any but a Single Taxer.

If England had real free trade, not a poor imitation of it, she would be the most prosperous nation on earth. But her free trade is not genuine. While she has levied fewer tariff taxes than other countries, she has made up for it by levying internal taxes on industry and its products and taxing land values practically not at all. This has checked industry and stimulated land monopoly, with resulting poverty and distress.

To prevent the English people from seeing this and taxing land values, the Tory party, which, like the Republican party here, champions privilege, has raised a cry for protection. It is anything at all to keep the land from the people. Fortunately the Liberal government has met the demand with a proposition to tax land values. The proposition, though much weaker than it should be, at any rate raises the right issue and will sooner or later result in putting England on the road to the Single Tax, which, by exempting industry and taxing monopoly, produces real Free Trade.

DANIEL KIEFER.

+ + +

## A LEMON FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS.

"The lemon industry of my State will be wiped out," said Senator Flint of California to the Senate, "if you don't raise the tariff on imported lemons from a cent and a quarter a pound to a cent and a half."

And the Senate agreed.

That appeal was touching as well as effective. No one wants to wipe out the lemon industry of California. No, nor any industry of any State. But exactly what did Senator Flint mean? How could the lemon industry of California be wiped out by the lower instead of the higher tariff on imported lemons? Or, conversely, how could the lemon industry of California be fostered by the higher tariff instead of the lower?

Let us see.

+

Under the higher tariff, American dealers would have to stop selling imported lemons, or else charge a higher price for them. For, unless they did one or the other they would lose money.

American lemon consumers would therefore have to stop buying imported lemons, or else they would have to pay the higher price.

If they paid the higher price, they would be paying an indirect tax into the public treasury. Although the importers would be the first to pay this tax, doing so at the time of importation, and the dealers would reimburse them, yet the consumers would reimburse the dealers, with all intermediate costs and profits of collection added, in the higher prices finally paid for imported lemons.

Inasmuch, then, as the American price for imported lemons would be increased by the tax, which the consumer would have to pay in order to get imported lemons, producers of California lemons could take advantage of their customers. They could arbitrarily raise prices, and American consumers could not resent the extortion by transferring their custom to lemon importers.

What American lemon consumers were consequently compelled to pay in higher prices to California lemon producers, would also, like the higher price for imported lemons, be a tax upon the consumption of lemons. It would differ in one particular, however, from the import tax. Instead of enriching the public treasury, this tax would go to California lemon producers.

It follows that if the tariff on imported lemons were raised to a cent and a half a pound, California lemon producers could extort, in their prices to American lemon consumers, a premium closely approximating that amount. According to Senator Flint, this premium is necessary to their industrial salvation.

+

It would be idle in that view of the matter, to consider the fact that lemons are produced in Florida as well as in California, and to speculate upon the price-cutting possibilities of American competition. If a tariff on imported lemons is necessary to head off foreign competition so as to let the price of California lemons rise to a profitable level, wouldn't domestic competition be as destructive if it lowered that level? This, however, only in passing.

+

The essence of the matter evidently is that Senator Flint's lemon-growing constituents want the privilege of charging American lemon consumers approximately a cent and a half a pound more than the normal price level of the world's lemon market. Without that privilege he foresees the destruction of their industry.

With that privilege, however, the California lemon industry would be conserved. Aye, but how? By compelling American lemon consumers to prefer California lemons at exorbitant prices. By compelling this preference not in the world's markets, but only in the American market; and compelling it in the American market by arbitrarily increasing the prices of imported lemons through act of Congress.

In other words, the maintenance of California lemon production must be at the expense of American lemon consumers.

Then why not maintain it with bounties?

If the California lemon industry is really in danger of being wiped out, and if this is a matter of so much public concern as to require the industry to be saved by law, why save it by indirect methods? Why not meet the expense as we meet other governmental expense—as we meet the expense, for instance, of army and navy, or pay pensions to old soldiers? Why not meet it out of the public treasury?

An explanation is suggested by one of the older anecdotes of the vaudeville stage. "Here is a riddle," says one performer to another, "and I'll bet you can't guess it for it's very hard. What kind of animal is it that stands on one leg, looks like a bird, and barks like a dog?" After many head-spinning efforts to guess, the riddle is given up and the answer of the riddler comes. It is a stork. "A stork!" exclaims the other; "well, a stork does look like a bird, and it does often stand on one leg, but does a stork bark like a dog?" "Of course not," is the reply, "I only put that in to make the riddle hard to guess."

How easy the whole protection riddle would be to guess, if industries which are in danger, like the lemon industry of California, of "being wiped out" by foreign competition were "saved" by bounties directly out of the public treasury. Imagine the financial reports that showed in plain figures and forbidding sums how much the American people are paying every year for fostering tin plate factories, establishing silk mills, encouraging the steel trust, or pacifying Senator Flint's lemon-growing constituents!

When all these burdens upon the masses of the people are concealed in store prices, as the tariff conceals them, the ins and outs of protection are exceedingly difficult to understand. If they were exposed in the finance reports as pensions are, any school boy could grasp the meaning of protection as easily as he grasps the meaning of more vulgar forms of robbery.

One reason why the lemon growers of Cali-

ifornia ask for tariff aid instead of bounty aid, is because bounty aid would give them dead away. One reason why they could not get bounty aid if they asked for it, is because bounty aid would give the whole pernicious system dead away.

+

A word as to the beneficiaries of Senator Flint's lemon-tariff.

Its benefits would not in the long run accrue to lemon growers—not as lemon growers.

Lemon growers who are also lemon-growing capitalists, might benefit; but in the long run it would be as capitalists and not as workers.

And as capitalists they would benefit only in proportion to a part of their capital—that part which controls lemon-growing opportunities. They might mix this capital up with all the rest in their bookkeeping values, as if there were no difference; but it is their ownership of lemon-growing locations, and neither their ownership of tools, nor trees, nor buildings, nor plucked and boxed lemons, nor the work of cultivating and shipping, that would be benefited by Senator Flint's increase of the tariff on imported lemons.

It is in the capitalization of lemon-growing land that the story of the lemon-tariff, in so far as it affects the lemon industry favorably, will be found.

And as with lemon protection, so with every other phase of tariff favor. Temporary conditions, such as leases or contracts or patents or state of the art, may for a time give profits of protection to the worker or to the owner of machinery capital; but in the long run all the profits go to the capitalist whose capital includes the natural sources of supply and the natural sites of operation.

The whole American system of tariff protection is in this respect analogous to the old English corn laws. Through tariffs on grain, those laws enriched not the grain growers, either master or man, but the owners of English agricultural land.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE NEGRO STATUS CONFERENCE.

New York, June 2, 1909.

The general observance of the Lincoln centenary throughout the country has signalized itself as little better than an insincere lip-tribute, by virtue of its omission to recognize the significance of the one stupendous service which has conferred immortality on the name of Abraham Lincoln. Especially pitiable is the fact that in Lincoln's home of Spring-

field, within the very shadow of his tomb, and in the presence of Lincoln's own son, the miserable race prejudice and caste spirit at which he struck so powerful a blow dominated the entire celebration of his memory. Realizing the infamy of such a state of facts, a body of men and women devoted to the genuine principles of democracy organized a conference on the status of the American Negro.

The conference was held in the hall of the Charity Organization Society, in New York City, on the 31st of May and the 1st of June, two sessions and a public meeting in Cooper Union being held on the first day, and three sessions on the second. The key-note of the whole proceeding was moral earnestness. Plenty of differences of opinion developed, and the discussion at times became heated; but there was no variance in fundamental purpose. If the more radical element had some reason to complain of a tendency to refuse it recognition, it was none the less refreshing to find a number of men and women of conservative tendency willing to put themselves on record as defenders of fundamental human rights. While much must be done through other channels, it would be ungracious to cavil at this movement because it did not go as far as some had hoped. Let us look rather at what the conference actually did, than at what it failed to do.

+

On Monday morning the gathering was called to order by William English Walling, to whose indefatigable labors and excellent judgment, with the invaluable co-operation of Miss Mary W. Ovington, the success of the affair is mainly due.

The first session, unlike those which followed, was open to the general public. Dr. Ward of The Independent was in the chair. The session was given over to the subject, "Race Prejudice Viewed from a Scientific Standpoint," able papers being presented by Professor Livingston Farrand of Columbia University, and Professor Burt G. Wilder of Cornell University. Professor Farrand dealt with the psychological aspects of the question, completely annihilating the superficial arguments by which the doctrine of permanently inferior races has been upheld, and showing that science has not been able to discover the slightest data from which unchangeable race characteristics can be legitimately inferred. The observable differences in forms of mental activity among different groups of individuals, for convenience termed races, are at the very least not proved to be inherent and independent of the modifying influence of evolution. There is no scientific warrant for saying that the position of a given "race" is fixed, and that it is incapable of developing to any given extent. Professor Wilder's paper was illustrated with charts and specimens. He confined himself rigidly to the inferences to be drawn from a study of the skull and the brain, proving conclusively that the differences between the Caucasian and the African brain were totally insignificant, in comparison with the differences between the lowest human brain and the highest ape or monkey brain. From a multitude of observations, it appeared that the size of the brain represented the degree of mental development actually attained. The average Negro brain weighs a trifle less than the average

white brain; but the difference is much less than the fluctuation between normal white brains, and in divers instances the Negro brain is actually larger than that of highly developed Caucasians. Similarly, the differences in convolutions and in general complexity of structure are found to be prodigiously exaggerated, being in fact no more than may be well accounted for by the difference in history and in opportunity for cultural development; and from all analogy and scientific probability to be expected to disappear whenever a lasting equality of opportunity shall be realized. Professors Dewey and Seligman, speaking briefly from different standpoints, confirmed the conclusions already reached.

Cella Parker Woolley presided at the second session, which was attended, as were the subsequent sessions, by an audience of several hundred, the white and colored races being about equally represented. Able addresses by Dr. William Bulkley and Prof. William E. B. DuBois, of Atlanta University, the famous author of "The Souls of Black Folk," on "The Industrial and Educational Status of the Negro," introduced a lively discussion, in which it became evident that the general sentiment favored insistence on rights, rather than begging for favors. The self-respect and dignity with which the various colored speakers expressed the demand for simple justice, and the refusal to accept any form of patronage in exchange therefor, must have opened the eyes of any who had failed to understand the real attitude of the thoughtful representatives of the Negro race. Not a shade of the servility so often charged against the race as an unfailing characteristic was to be seen; nor was it replaced by noisy harangue and empty bravado. Firm resolution was the prevailing quality; and we of the white race were enabled to realize that we were welcomed as comrades in a cause of human justice, not as patrons of a people too timid and feeble to speak out boldly for itself. Over and over was it emphasized, both by white and by colored speakers, that race and caste injustice do not simply impose suffering on the oppressed race, but inflict the direst evils on the whole nation, and that the struggle for the establishment of true and untainted democracy concerns all alike.

The great Cooper Union meeting, on Monday evening, had as its presiding officer Judge Wendell P. Stafford, of the District of Columbia. Ringing speeches were made by Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, of Chicago, John E. Milholland, Professor John Spencer Bassett, formerly of the University of North Carolina, Professor W. E. B. DuBois and Rev. J. Milton Waldron; and the large audience, thoroughly aroused by clear presentations of fact and burning appeals for justice, remained until an unusually late hour.

On Tuesday morning, with Bishop Walters in the chair, the question taken up was "The Civil and Political Status of the Negro." The occasion was rendered memorable for all present, by the unvarnished tales of lynching outrages, told as calmly as the subject admitted, and with no attempt at inflammatory appeal, by Ida Wells Barnett, a Joan of Arc of her race; and the masterly exposition, by Judge A. E. Pillsbury, of Boston, of the Constitu-

tional aspects of Negro disfranchisement, and the manner in which not only are the Negroes shamefully defrauded of their elementary rights by the vilest treachery, but the white voters of the North are robbed of more than half of their voting strength, through the audacious nullification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Federal Constitution. Judge Pillsbury's address aroused the most intense interest; and a special vote was passed that the same be printed as a pamphlet for general distribution.

Mr. Oswald G. Villard presided in the afternoon, when able addresses on "The Negro and the Nation" were made by William English Walling, Joseph C. Manning and William A. Sinclair, the latter a powerful representative of the Negro race. Mr. Manning's speech, delivered with great force and fire, was of exceptional interest from the fact that he is a Southern white man whose life has been often threatened for the persistent fight he has made against injustice to the Negro and against the oligarchy which controls the political destinies of the South. A lively discussion closed the session.

The final session, Tuesday evening, was devoted to business, with Charles E. Russell in the chair. Resolutions were adopted, demanding enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and the rectification of unjust racial discriminations, the opening of the door of industrial and educational opportunities, protection to life and property, and security for civil and political rights. In response to an overwhelming demand for a permanent organization to carry on the work, it was voted to appoint a committee of forty to prepare for a second conference during the coming year, and to perfect plans for an incorporated national committee, to work effectively for the establishment in full of the civic and political rights of the Negro and to combat race prejudice.

+

This new movement will in no way conflict with the vital work carried on by the Cosmopolitan Society of America, the Niagara Movement, the Constitutional League, or any of the other existing bodies at work along different lines of warfare in behalf of equal rights and against the evil of race prejudice. It will enlist many who have held aloof from these organizations, for one reason and another, and its entrance into the field of activity for the betterment of humanity should receive the heartiest possible welcome, and the unstinted support of lovers of justice.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

+ + +

He often acts unjustly who does not do a certain thing; not only he who does a certain thing.—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

+ + +

It is not possible to distinguish between the brain of a black man and that of a white man, and I defy any person to make such a distinction with certainty. I am talking now of male Negroes and male whites, all of the North America of the present day.—Prof. Burt G. Wilder of Cornell University.

---



---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, June 8, 1909.

---

### The British Budget.

An extension of the present session of Parliament into September in consequence of the struggle over the budget (p. 540) is predicted by T. P. O'Connor, M. P., in his cable letter of the 5th as it appears in the Chicago Tribune. Mr. O'Connor describes both sides as making special preparations for this struggle. "The Tories have," he says, "divided their ranks into sub-committees, each taking a special portion of the budget for examination," and he adds: "The land tax is the cause of special fury and is imperilled by the union of the big landlords and small property holders in the towns." He finds, however, that "while the Tories are thus raising shrieks, the drastic land proposals of the budget and the resentment caused by the unwillingness of the rich to pay their share of the gigantic expenditure on dreadnoughts and other luxuries, have roused the Radical enthusiasm, and the Ministry is twice as strong to-day as before the introduction of the budget." The point in the budget which Mr. O'Connor observes to be "most attacked is the tax on unearned increment and on undeveloped land," which "is regarded by friends and foes as the thin end of the wedge of Henry Georgeism and is ferociously attacked by property holders large and small." Being "the first time any such tax has been proposed, "the fury it excites is the greater for that reason; but on the other hand, it excites equal enthusiasm among the landless reformers, and altogether is one of the popular features of the budget." On the question of the growing strength of the Ministry, Mr. O'Connor explains more fully that—there were plenty of people a few weeks ago who were convinced that the government could not outlast the present session of Parliament. It was thought Lloyd-George's budget was certain to kill them. But Lloyd-George's budget, after the first howl, which all new taxes are bound to create, has made its way into the hearts of the masses of the people, and even among some sections of the other side, the exactions of owners of house property having exhausted the patience of even the most conservative elements in English society; and though Lloyd-George has a tremendous combination against him, things are quieting down and time is fighting daily on his side.

By mail advices it appears that on the 28th, the finance bill was officially issued. This is the formal bill (p. 540) which gives definite expression to the principles outlined in the budget. It contains 74 clauses, and makes a pamphlet of 62 pages. The measure is described officially as a "Bill to Grant Certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue (including Excise), to Alter Other Duties, and to Amend the Law Relating to Customs and Inland Revenue (including Excise) and the National Debt, and to Make Other Provisions for the Financial Arrangements of the Year." It is the longest finance bill ever laid before Parliament, and is divided into nine parts, namely: (1) Duties on land values; (2) Duties on liquor licences; (3) Death duties; (4) Income tax; (5) Stamps; (6) Customs and Excise other than liquor licence duties; (7) Provisions as to payments to local authorities and to road improvement account; (8) National debt; (9) General.

↑

The clauses regarding land value taxation are in the lead and occupy a considerable part of the bill. Such of them as relate to the method of arriving at values are as follows:

The total value of land means the amount which the fee simple of the land, if sold at the time in the open market by a willing seller in its then condition, might be expected to realize.

The site value of land means the amount which the fee simple of the land, if sold at the time in the open market by a willing seller, might be expected to realize if the land were divested of any buildings, and of any other structures (including fixed or attached machinery) on, in, or under the surface, which are appurtenant to or used in connection with any such buildings, and of all growing timber, fruit trees, fruit bushes, and other things growing thereon.

For the purposes both of total value and site value, land shall be deemed to be sold free from incumbrances, but subject to any easements affecting the land, and to any covenant restricting the use of the land entered into before April 30th, 1909, where, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the restraint imposed by the covenant is reasonably necessary in the interests of the public, or in view of the character and surroundings of the neighborhood, and the opinion of the Commissioners shall in this case be final and not subject to any appeal.

The Commissioners shall allow as deductions from the site value of any land—(a) Any part of that site value which is proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners to be directly attributable to works of a permanent character executed bona fide by or on behalf of any person interested in the land for the purpose of fitting the land for use as building land or for the purpose of any business trade or industry other than agriculture; and (b) any sums which in the opinion of the Commissioners it would be necessary to expend in order to divest the land of buildings, timber, trees, or other things of which

It is to be taken to be divested for the purpose of arriving at the site value and of which it would be necessary to divest the land for the purpose of realizing the full site value; and the site value as reduced by those deductions shall be taken to be the site value.

The total value of minerals means the amount which the fee simple of the minerals if sold in the open market by a willing seller in their then condition might be expected to realize; and the capital value of minerals means the total value after allowing such deduction (if any) as the Commissioners may allow for any sums which are proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners to have been spent on boring or other operations carried out by the owner or his predecessor in title for the purpose of bringing the minerals into working, or where the minerals have been partly worked such part of those sums as is, in the opinion of the Commissioners, proportionate to the amount of minerals ungoten.

+

For purposes of valuation and revaluation—"a new Domesday" as the London Post calls it—the following provisions are made:

(1) The Commissioners shall, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, cause returns in such form and containing such particulars as the Commissioners may require to be obtained from all owners of land, declaring the total value and the site value respectively of their land as estimated in each case by the owners, that value being declared separately as respects each piece of the land which is under separate occupation, and if the owner thinks fit as respects any part of any land which is under separate occupation, and being estimated as on the 30th day of April, 1909. (2) Where land comprises minerals a separate return shall be made under this section of the value of the minerals. (3) If any owner of land is required by the Commissioners to make a return under this section and fails to make such a return within the time, not being less than thirty days specified in the return, he shall be liable to a penalty under section fifty-five of the Income Tax Act, 1842, and that section shall apply accordingly, but the penalty shall only be recoverable in the High Court. (4) Owners of agricultural land in Ireland may, if they think fit, make, but shall not be required to make, returns under this section.

If the Commissioners on examination pass these returns they will be adopted as the "original total values" and the "original site values" respectively. If they object, and the owner amends the return to their satisfaction, then also adoption takes place; but if amendment is refused or is unsatisfactory when made the Commissioners will value for themselves. Should duty become payable while these negotiations are in progress it will be assessed on the owner's return and the difference (if any) afterwards adjusted. In the year 1914 and subsequently in every five years returns will be called for in order that there may be a revaluation of undeveloped land and minerals.

#### Socialism in Germany.

A special dispatch from Berlin to the New York World, published on the 6th, reported a startling expansion of socialistic influences in the German army. "Hundreds of thousands of soldiers in the German army," said this dispatch, "most of them the young men, are socialists at heart, secretly imbued with socialistic doctrines. The German military authorities are alarmed at the socialistic campaign carried on, especially among the recruits. Captains have just received the strictest orders to keep socialist literature out of the hands of their men. Twice a week the soldiers' lockers are to be searched and all printed matter in them is to be carefully examined. All soldiers found with socialist pamphlets or leaflets will be severely punished and literature offensive to the government immediately destroyed. Equally severe are the new regulations governing beer shops, public houses and restaurants in garrison towns. Soldiers are forbidden to patronize any such establishment where Vorwaerts, the chief Socialist organ, or any journal of such stripe, is to be had or which is known as the resort of workmen inclined to socialism." On the other hand, the Socialist leaders are intensely active in spreading the knowledge of their tenets among the soldiers. An association has been formed by a leader in the Reichstag for the express purpose of reaching soldiers, particularly recruits, and dampening their military ardor. To them the agents of the association secretly supply books which describe the cruelty, folly and wickedness of war, the evil effects on the state of a huge standing army and the uselessness of a military career. Socialism is strongly tincturing not the German army alone; its doctrines are spreading through every Austrian barrack, a fact causing the Vienna government profound anxiety."

+ +

#### A Brave Man Is to Go to Siberia.

The extraordinary discovery by the Russian revolutionists last January (p. 154) that their trusted leader Azeff was in reality an *agent provocateur* of the Russian police, luring young persons of revolutionary tendencies into the perpetration of acts of violence, and then secretly denouncing them, led to interpellations of the police department as to Azeff's character and affiliations. Response was frankly made by Mr. Lopukhin, who had been director of police of the Department of the Interior. He denounced Azeff as an *agent provocateur* of the worst type. Azeff had fled, but the Government, not desiring such exposures, promptly indicted Mr. Lopukhin on charges of high treason. The denunciation of Azeff had not been Mr. Lopukhin's only offense in the eyes of official Russia. Though a Liberal in politics he had been at the head of the political police, and a conspicuous member of the inner

bureaucracy. His first break with his official circle, according to the London Nation, "had its origin in his efforts to protect the Jews from massacre. He it was who supplied his kinsman, Prince Urussoff, himself an ex-Assistant Minister, with the startling revelations divulged in the first Douma regarding the official organization of pogroms. He discovered the printing press in the Ministry of the Interior, by which police agents multiplied their incitements to massacre. He traced the share of the police and the troops in several of the massacres which occurred after the nominal grant of constitutional liberties. But his unpardonable offense was that he denounced the police official Ratchkowsky, a protegee of the late General Trepoff, and the confidential guardian of the Czar's person, as the real organizer of the Jewish massacres. For that first display of independence he lost his position as an official." His second offense also involved Ratchkowsky, for Azeff was especially in Ratchkowsky's employ. The Nation says of the trial that, though public it "was the usual perversion of justice. The defense was hardly heard, the essential documents were suppressed, and the necessary witnesses were allowed to absent themselves." Mr. Lopukhin has been condemned to five years' hard labor, and to lifelong exile thereafter in Siberia. "The verdict," says The Nation, "is one proof the more that the 'political vivisectioners,' secure in the protection of the Czar, are still supreme in Russia."

+

The London Labour Leader publishes the following table of Russia's legal assassinations during the past three and a half years:

	Sentenced.	Executed.	Shot after martial court judgment.	Shot without any trial.
1905 .....	96	32	...	376
1906 .....	773	280	518	864
1907 .....	1,432	508	158	59
1908 .....	1,835	802	...	32
January-February, 1909 .....	233	183	...	...
	4,369	1,805	676	1,331

+

**Conference on the Status of the Negro.**

The national conference at New York on the status of the American Negro (p. 540) has not been reported very elaborately in the West, and probably not in the East either; but an account of all its proceedings will be found in our Editorial Correspondence this week.

+

**The Tariff in Congress.**

Discussion of the tariff bill in the Senate (p. 537) was resumed on the 1st with a consideration of the cotton schedules. In the course of the debate Senator Lodge took occasion to deliver a

carefully prepared speech to show that the Republican party is not pledged to a revision of the tariff downward; and Senator Cummins introduced an income tax amendment providing for a tax of 2 per cent on all incomes of individuals or corporations over \$5,000 a year. A feature is included which is intended to eliminate double taxation by allowing a rebate to the individual stockholder of a corporation whose dividend assessment has been paid through the corporation itself. Mr. Lodge also attributed the recent rise in cotton goods, not to the tariff but to increase in the volume of money; and when reminded that this position is the opposite of that taken by the Republican party in the national campaign of 1896, that the mills and not the mints should be opened in order to arrest falling prices, he made no reply. Senator Gore answered Senator Lodge on the 2d. On the same day Senator La Follette began a tariff-reduction speech, which he was obliged by illness to suspend. Resolutions for day and night sessions were adopted. A personal attack upon La Follette in his absence was made at the evening session by Gallinger and Penrose. There were some exciting interchanges of personalities on the 3d. Mr. La Follette concluded his speech on the 4th, and was replied to by Mr. Aldrich in the evening. Votes on the cotton schedules on the 5th supported the finance committee by majorities of 10 or 11, thereby changing duties from ad valorem to specific. A sharp controversy on party orthodoxy relative to protection arose on the 7th between Mr. Aldrich as the Republican leader of the "standpatters," and Mr. Beveridge as one of the Republican leaders of the downward revisionists.

+

**The Traction Question in Cleveland.**

When the City Council of Cleveland met on the 1st to consider Judge Tayler's proposals for traction settlement (pp. 538, 539), the proposals were read and a resolution by Councilman Kramer was offered providing (1) that the plan be adopted, (2) that Judge Tayler be requested to formulate an ordinance, and (3) that the Goff-Johnson valuation be accepted. Mr. Andrews, for the traction company, stated that they would accept the Kramer resolution. Mayor Johnson then declared, addressing the Council, as reported in the Plain Dealer of the 2d, that—

the question of valuation was the all important point at issue. All other questions he said were of a minor nature, but in the valuation there was a difference as shown by the latest Bemis report of some \$7,000,000. The interest on this sum he said was equal to more than \$400,000 a year and would amount to a half a cent for every car ride. It meant, he declared, not 6 per cent, on the investment if the valuation is \$7,000,000 too high, but 12 per cent. "We have heard a great deal from the newspapers and from the Chamber of Commerce for haste in this

settlement," said the Mayor, "but I have still to hear from the great body of car riders. They are the great unorganized body of men who patronize the street cars. There is no cry from them for settlement in haste. I have heard not one syllable from them who are most concerned, from the people who pay the freight. This is the history of all big struggles where the unorganized face the organized. Just at the last minute, when the organized appear ready to surrender, it too often happens that the unorganized are left out. I stand here for the car riders. The settlement must be on actual and not on imaginary values. If you want to know why the railway directors are so pliant now, you have but to look at the situation. We said that we would take two months to settle. We have given them three months. Today there are two bidders for the expiring grants where before there was one. We stand here ready to take the best. They will concede only when they are threatened. The railroad board was intoxicated with the success of the referendum vote. They refused to meet with us. When they did finally agree to negotiate, Mr. Andrews said that nothing but the old valuation would be accepted. Now they are ready to arbitrate. We will get the best from them as long as there is competition and the worst of it when there is none."

City Solicitor Baker then moved for arbitration of the whole question of values. This was opposed by several Councilmen but finally carried.

+

At the evening meeting of the Council on the 2d, a resolution was offered by Councilman McKenna which reaffirmed the Council's position of 4-cent cash fare, seven tickets for 25 cents, a penny transfer and a penny rebate. The motion carried 24 to 9, the Mayor voting for it and City Solicitor Baker against it. Judge Tayler, who was present, took the vote as a direct refusal to accept his proposed compromise at 5-cent cash fare, seven tickets for 25 cents and a penny transfer without rebate. He announced his position by saying: "I can tax the Cleveland Railway with no more. This is my last word. I arrived at my conclusions without consultation with any human being. They were my own views honestly expressed. The Council has solemnly taken a different view. I leave the responsibility where it belongs." Mr. Andrews said he could see no use in continuing negotiations, but did not declare a final break.

+

Meetings were resumed on the 2d in the afternoon. At the first of these, City Solicitor Baker moved that determination of the maximum fare be postponed until it had been decided on what valuation the 6 per cent dividends are to be paid. Councilman Horner offered as a substitute motion that the Council accept all Judge Tayler's provisions. The substitute was defeated and Mr. Baker's motion carried, 17 to 5.

At a special meeting of the Council on the 4th, a settlement ordinance prepared by the City Solicitor, Mr. Baker, was submitted, granting the Cleveland Railway Company a franchise for twenty-five years, with a maximum fare of 4 cents cash, seven tickets for 25 cents, and 1-cent transfer with rebate. It provides also that in case of failure on the part of the company to comply with any award of a board of arbitration, the dividends shall fall from 6 per cent to 5 per cent, and continue at that rate until the award is obeyed. It names Judge Tayler as arbitrator to determine the actual value of the physical property of the company as of January 1, 1908, the value of the Forest City Co., of the Low Fare Co. and of the Municipal Traction Co. to be determined separately. It requires in this connection that there shall be added to the value of the physical property the present value of unexpired franchises. In this manner, it is reported, the owners of the Forest City stock are to be protected if the valuation of the Cleveland Railway property is lowered. The city is to have the right of nominating a purchaser after three years and a half. Unless the ordinance is accepted by the company within five days, it becomes null and void. The initial rate of fare proposed is 3 cents with 1 cent for transfers without rebate; and dividends are limited to 6 per cent. The ordinance was adopted section by section.

+

The traction question had taken on a serious aspect for the company when, at the Council meeting of the 2d, an ordinance was introduced by Chairman Koch of the committee on street railways, making extensions to the Herman Schmidt grant (p. 538) for Payne avenue. These extensions cover practically all the territory in which the old company's franchises expire next January. The ordinance was based upon an application by Mr. Schmidt, and both application and ordinance were referred to the street railway committee, the peace committee of the whole, and the City Solicitor. The Schmidt ordinance for Payne avenue passed its second reading. According to the Cleveland Press of Thursday, the 4th—

immediately after Wednesday's meeting Mayor Tom called in all Democratic Councilmen excepting Walz, and prepared plans for speedy action on the Schmidt 3-cent grants. If the final break comes Thursday, as is expected by both Andrews and Mayor Tom, it is probable special meetings of the council will be called to pass the Schmidt Payne-av grant and the ordinance for extensions from this line. . . . It was reported Thursday that plans had been made for taking care of the Forest City stockholders should the Schmidt 3-cent Payne-av franchise, with the extension ordinance be passed. Forest City Stockholders will be given share for share in any new company which is organized to take over the lines on which Concon grants expire next January.

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—Cholera is again reported from St. Petersburg (vol. xi, p. 638).

—The Illinois legislature adjourned finally (p. 537) on the 4th, after passing an inheritance tax bill.

—Col. Alexander McClure, for many years a prominent figure in national politics and Philadelphia journalism, died on the 6th at the age of 81.

—The home rule charter for Milwaukee (p. 114), which had previously passed the Wisconsin Senate, was adopted by the House on the 2nd by 55 to 33.

—Sheriff Shipp, of Tennessee, in contempt of the Supreme Court of the United States in connection with the lynching of a Negro whose case was then pending before this court (p. 516), was given 30 days on the first in which to make application for re-hearing.

—The Philadelphia street car strike (p. 539) was settled on the 4th by a referendum vote, 3256 to 619, accepting an offer of the company to pay 22 cents an hour with ten hours for a day's work. The "swing" system is abolished, employes are permitted to buy their uniforms in the open market, and a grievance committee of employes is to be recognized by the company.

—The Deep Waterways commission, appointed by Congress to investigate the feasibility of the scheme for a deep waterway from Chicago to New Orleans, has reported favorably on the project, the board of engineers appointed to investigate the plans having informed the commission that so far as engineering is concerned the waterway is perfectly practicable. The estimated cost of a canal fourteen feet deep from Chicago to the mouth of the Mississippi is \$190,000,000.

—At the judicial election in Cook County, Illinois, on the 7th, according to police returns, the highest vote was for Judge John Gibbons (Republican), who polled 106,709; the lowest vote that elected was for Judge Frank Baker (Democrat), who polled 79,352; the highest vote that did not elect was for Judge Edward Osgood Brown, who polled 78,272; the highest Socialist vote was for Seymour Stedman, who polled 9,328; and the total vote cast was 170,177 out of a total registration of 430,000.

—Mrs. Emily P. Collins, woman suffragist, anti-imperialist, and noble, public-spirited woman, died at the home of her daughter, Mrs. F. P. Pope, at Atlantic, Mass., April 29, in her 95th year. Mrs. Collins was an actual "daughter of the American Revolution," her father, James Parmele, having been a soldier in the Revolutionary War. She herself acted as a volunteer nurse in the Civil War. Mrs. Collins had been a subscriber to and a friend of *The Public* from its very early days.

—A national conference on Criminal Law and Criminology was held at Chicago on the 7th and 8th. The conference was divided into three sections, each organized under a chairman, to deal specifically with one of the following divisions of the general subject: 1. Penal and remedial treatment of offenders. 2. Appointment and training of officials. 3.

Criminal law and procedure. Governor Deneen delivered an address as temporary chairman, and James Hagerman was elected as permanent chairman.

—The Negro scholar, Professor Kelly Miller, of Howard University, Washington, will lecture on the 11th at 8 in the evening in the Institutional Church, 3825 Dearborn street, Chicago, on Race Loyalty. For the benefit of the Frederick Douglass Center, an admission fee of 25 cents with 35 cents for reserved seats, will be charged.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### Protection to American Labor!

From a letter by John R. Waters in the *New York Journal of Commerce* of May 8, 1909.—An American workingman out of a job strolls down to a pier, where he watches the unloading from a liner of thousands of cases, bales and barrels containing foreign merchandise, nearly all of which pays customs duties ranging from 20 to 200 per cent of its foreign market value.

He has been told that these high duties are levied so that American manufacturers may get big prices for domestic goods and be thereby enabled to pay handsome wages to their men.

He is simple enough to believe this, being apparently willing to ignore the economic law that employes do not pay any more in wages than enough to keep the operative's body and soul together, except as they are compelled by an excess of demand over supply.

There are three other facts which prove that he is being deliberately exploited, although they are also ignored by him and his leaders. They are:

1. That per diem wages in the United States are relatively higher in trades not protected by the tariff than in those that are so protected.

2. That the item of the wages of the labor in the cost of producing a ton, a bushel, a gallon, a yard, a dozen, or a gross of anything raised or made in this country is, with very few exceptions, no greater in dollars and cents than in other countries.

3. That the cost of living is the basic criterion of wages. If a man's earnings have all to be used up in keeping him and his family in comfort, he is manifestly no better off here than in another country where, although wages are lower, living is proportionately lower.

But there is one factor which is inevitably borne in upon the exploited American workingman out of a job, and that is, that the same liner whose cargo he is contemplating also brought over two or three thousand immigrants upon whom a duty of only \$4 per capita is levied and who in a week or two will be competing with him for the few jobs that may offer, and who, incidentally, by their demand for shelter, will be stiffening the rent of the tenement where he herds.

+

(*New York*) *Life*, April 8.—The discussion of the tariff bill is fit to make free-traders of us all. The present tariff, as it stands, is one of the greatest existing monuments of human selfishness. . . .

Our whole industrial system is geared to a vast body of special legislation, and is, in effect, a structure whose foundation rests on stilts. Some day it has got to get down to earth again, and meanwhile every jolt that lets it down even a single peg, is a gain.

The Civil War was fought by the South in the interest of about ten thousand considerable slave owners and their families, and against the most vital interests of all the rest of the Southern white population. Today there are tens of thousands of Americans, no doubt, whom the Dingley tariff protects and enriches; but how many millions are there whom that tariff mulcts and burdens, and they, all the time, as oblivious to it, as the poor whites were of the cost to them of the slavery they were fighting to preserve? It is "a rich man's war, and a poor man's fight" again, this fight for the tariff.

✦ ✦

#### Ship Subsidies and the Unemployed.

Voice of the Unemployed, (212 Leavenworth street, San Francisco), March 18.—Under the head, "American Flag is Vanishing from the Seas," last Sunday, one of our daily papers published a very exhaustive article describing the deplorable condition of American shipping in general, and on this Coast in particular. Pictures of rotting fleets were shown. It was also shown that the tonnage of American ships sailing out of this port had fallen off three-quarters in the last three years. It was claimed that the cause of this condition was that the government refused to subsidize American ships. In other words, the American ship owners want protection from the free competition of Japanese ships. These gentlemen are either Republicans or Democrats, and as such are constantly extolling the beauties of free competition, and are always belly-aching about "busting the trust" and going back to the good old times of free competition. Now, then, let them take their medicine. "We don't believe in paternalism or a paternal government." That has been the burden of their song when the working class have asked for government assistance. Now that they are up against Japanese free competition, they are crying for help. Let the darned old fleets rot. Let the American flag vanish from the seas. Let the ship owners go broke. Let the American sailor disappear. It is the only proper and fitting penalty to inflict upon a nation of idiots that don't know enough about the science of government to keep millions of their own citizens, anxious to work, from want and starvation in the midst of plenty. All of you business men and workmen that vote for free competition, go to the Japs. They will give you a belly-full of it, or we will lose our guess. "Go to it." Don't be pikers—be thoroughbreds.

✦ ✦

#### The British Finance Bill.

The Manchester Guardian (Lib.), May 29.—Mr. Lloyd-George has disposed of his proposals with sound strategy. The new land taxes are put first. Then follow the license duties, the death duties, and the income tax; then the duties on stamps and the miscellaneous duties on liquor, tobacco, petrol, and motor-cars. In other words, Mr. Lloyd-George has

put the most novel or the most contentious of his proposals first. The House of Commons will come to them fresh, and the country, to whom this Budget means so much, will have the case for and against them presented to its still unexhausted curiosity. Such an arrangement, convenient as it is to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is likewise the one which makes for the most searching and most instructive Parliamentary discussion. It is fitting that pride of place should be given to the land taxes, for they are the most original of Mr. Lloyd-George's proposals, and they alone introduce principles wholly novel to our fiscal system.

✦

The (London) Morning Post (Con.), May 29.—The finance bill, which was issued yesterday, probably marks the end of the Liberal party for many a year to come. Riding for a fall, they are going to get a broken neck. . . . Never before in this country—nor anywhere, we believe, in any modern state—has a body of officials been given such arbitrary power over the property of citizens as is proposed in this extraordinary bill. The extreme example is to be found, as might have been expected, in the part relating to the new land taxes. These taxes are estimated to yield altogether only £500,000 in the current year, and the attempt to estimate their subsequent yield has—in the paper lately issued from the Treasury—been frankly abandoned. Yet the part of the bill relating to them occupies nearly half the whole document, excluding the schedules; and, as if to denote its relative importance, is given the first place. . . . Everyone knows why the scheme of valuation has been embodied in the Budget, and only the wilfully blind can shut their eyes to its real object. Granted that there may be no increment of site value to tax, the valuation will, the socialists think, identify that which has been stolen from the community, and which may be recovered hereafter by means of further taxes. But these gentlemen cannot afford to take off their armor just yet. Striking at the figment of a gilded "monopoly" they have succeeded in hitting individual interests, including those represented in friendly societies and the like, which are numbered by the million, and which in their ramifications affect the nation as a whole.

✦

The (Portland) Oregon Journal (ind.), June 2.—Twenty per cent of the increase in the value of land is hereafter to be taken for public purposes by the British government. This form of taxation is of course based on the theory that population makes the increase, and that all the increased land value does not belong to the owner, but, in part, to all the people. The step in England is emphasized by a similar movement in Germany. There, the Conservative party proposed the plan, the Department of Finance has approved it, and a measure carrying it into effect is almost certain to pass the Reichstag. . . . That Christendom will presently take a more favorable view of this form of taxation is entirely probable. The value of an unimproved city block that brings a million is not created by the owner, but by the enterprise and toll of an increased population.

## RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

### TO A COMMON WORKMAN.

For The Public.

A whispered hush is on the air. You rest  
Between twain boards in unawakened ease;  
The gnarled hands quiet, and relaxed the knees;  
Even a rose-spray on your sunken breast.  
Oh miserable! But not because you bowed  
Your neck to toil in unremitted sweat;—  
Labour on all our mortal flesh is set;  
To whom is respite from his task allowed?

Yet miserable! Because your witless eyes  
Were never dazzled by a further morn,  
Some dreaming prescience of a fairer day!  
Oh, would that you had seen the reddening skies  
Wherein the sun of mankind's good is born,  
Nor fared in vain your unilluminated way!

M. J. HERTZBERG.

+ + +

### WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES.

From Collier's Weekly for June 5,

A second lieutenant in the army is a good type of the Ultimate Consumer. (Thank Congressman Henry S. Boutell of Illinois for that phrase.) He gets a fixed salary of \$1,700 yearly, roughly the same income that is received by some millions of average Americans. This personal experience of one young lieutenant, who writes from the Philippine Islands, is therefore illuminating:

When a cadet graduates from the Military Academy he will buy at least five hundred dollars' worth of equipment before entering the army as a second lieutenant. Four hundred dollars of this amount will be spent for clothing that he must have, and this clothing is made from the best English manufactured broadcloths and olive drab goods. I don't know exactly the duty on these goods, but I believe it is about forty or fifty per cent. [The writer of this letter understates the facts; the duty is roughly about ninety-six per cent.] Although protected by this tariff, no American manufacturer can produce goods of the quality suitable for officers' uniforms, and we poor devils are forced to pay almost double the price for our clothes. . . . A graduate of '07 class went to London and bought his first outfit of clothing in that city. He saved enough by buying his outfit in London to pay his way to Europe and back again. He got a complete outfit and a trip to Europe for less than I paid for the same goods in New York. He wrote our class, '08, advising us all to go to London to get our uniforms, assuring us we could save money and have the trip, too. The tariff hurt me for two hundred dollars this year, and will keep on hurting me for about the same amount each year until it is changed.

This young officer is taxed something over ten per cent on his income. Hundreds of thousands

of salaried men, cashiers, expert mechanics, doctors, and small shopkeepers, who have about the same income, if they analyzed their expenditures, and computed the tariff tax in them, as this lieutenant has done, would find that they pay an income tax of something more than ten per cent. Is this more fair, or less, than to make men with an income of \$10,000 a year or more pay a direct income tax of three per cent?

+ + +

### PROTECTION PSYCHOLOGY.

Extracts From a Leading Editorial in Harper's Weekly for May 1, 1909.

We need a good treatise on the psychology of high protection; for we cannot understand the system without some sympathetic comprehension of the high-protectionist mind. The world, according to the high-protectionist mind, is made up of two classes—the sellers and the buyers.

#### Selling Without Buying.

Blessed are the sellers, and despicable, as well as unhappy, are the buyers. It was in a moment of scorn and bitterness that Sydney Smith imagined an immense counter stretching along our coast from Machias to Key West, loaded from end to end with Yankee notions. The high-protectionist mind sees no shame in the picture. On the contrary, quite the reverse. It is close to the high-protectionist ideal, which would add, however, foreign ships continually coming in empty and going away full. So long as we sell, and the foreigner only buys, that ideal is satisfied. So far as they sell, and we buy, we are a beaten and outwitted people, shamed before the world. . . .

Our protective tariff undoubtedly hinders the entrance of European goods into this country. Our imports are large, but not so large as they would be but for the tariff. But Europe buys from us every year about one hundred million dollars' worth more than she sends us. She has got to get that hundred million dollars a year back in some way. She does get it back. But how?

#### The "Workingman" Fake.

So far as American workmen are concerned, the protective tariff is a grotesque fake, that takes from the poor to bestow upon the rich. If American labor needed protection, one way to protect it would be to restrain immigration. The protective tariff has always stimulated immigration by making it hard for European workers to sell their wares in this market. Being hindered in doing that, they come over here bodily as soon as poverty constrains them, and compete in our labor market. That is all right, but it is a proper thing for the American workman to have in mind when his employer or his Congressman tells him that the tariff protects him. . . .

High protection is good to fatten hogs and shear lambs. The American workman has been persuaded that he is the hog that protection fattens. They have fooled him. He is the lamb—one of the lambs in a great fold—that protection shears. . . .

Is anybody distributing "The Pittsburg Survey," made by "Charities" as evidence of the blessings that high protection brings to American working-men? The conditions under which a large proportion of the protected workmen of Pittsburg live, the hours they work (twelve hours a day for seven days a week for some of them), the wages they get, the accidents they suffer—all bear fearful and wonderful testimony to the value of high protection to American labor. Pittsburg is the very Paradise of protection. Its millionaires are the world's wonder. So should be its workmen, as "Charities" describes so many of them—overworked, underpaid, atrociously housed, bringing up their children to disease under conditions the most squalid and unwholesome.



**PROTECTION PRICES.**

**A Comparison of Tariff Duties Under the Present Dingley Law, the House Bill and the Senate Bill.**

President Taft, says the Cincinnati Times-Star of May 19, undertook to "learn from independent sources what effect the tariff measure pending in Congress would have on the prices that the working-man must pay for the necessary articles he is compelled to buy. To get this information, he made up a list of clothing of the cheaper grades, furniture, food supplies, coal, tinware, etc., and sent it to the Treasury department with this memorandum: 'Please give the approximate amount of duty on the following articles. (a) under the Dingley law, (b) under the Payne bill and (c) under the Senate tariff bill.' In response to the President's request, the Treasury experts have compiled a remarkable table," as follows:

Article—	Price	Duties under Dingley Law.	Duties under House Bill.	Duties under Senate Bill.
Men's suits, retailing at, each . . . . .	\$15.00	\$10.76	\$10.76	\$10.76
Men's overcoats, retailing at, each . . . . .	15.00	11.86	11.86	11.86
Men's hats, retailing at, each . . . . .	2.00	.98½	.98½	.75 5-6
Men's shoes, retailing at, per pair . . . . .	2.50	.625	.375	.375
Woolen underwear, retailing at, per garment . . . . .	1.00	.82	.82	.82
Woolen hose, retailing at, per pair . . . . .	.50	.255	.355	.355
Cotton hose, retailing at, per dozen pairs . . . . .	1.50	.825	.825	.825

Women's cloaks, retailing at, each . . . . .	15.00	9.88	9.88	9.88
Women's cotton dresses, retailing at, each . . . . .	10.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Men's skin gloves, retailing at, per pair . . . . .	1.25	.33¼	.33½	.33½
Women's skin gloves, retailing at, per pair . . . . .	2.00	.25	.33½	.25
Iron cook stoves, retailing at, each . . . . .	15.00	6.75	6.75	6.75
Heating stoves, retailing at, each . . . . .	12.00	5.40	5.40	5.40
Beds, complete with springs, retailing at, each . . . . .	8.00	3.60	3.60	3.60
Mattresses, shuck, retailing at, each . . . . .	4.00	1.80	1.80	1.80
Cotton sheets, retailing at, each . . . . .	.50	.225	.225	.225
Feather pillows, retailing at, each . . . . .	1.50	.75	.90	.90
Dressers (bureaus), retailing at, each . . . . .	10.00	3.50	3.50	3.50
Dining tables, retailing at, each . . . . .	10.00	3.50	3.50	3.50
Wooden chairs, retailing at, each . . . . .	1.00	.35	.35	.35
Porcelain dinner sets, retailing at, each . . . . .	7.00	4.20	4.20	4.20
Tin cups, retailing at, each . . . . .	.05	.02¼	.02¼	.02¼
Iron knives and forks, retailing at, per doz. . . . .	1.00	.45	.40	.45
Tin pails, retailing at, each . . . . .	.30	.135	.135	.135
Tapestry rugs, 9x12, retailing at, each . . . . .	15.00	9.36	9.36	9.36
Coal, for domestic use, retailing at, per ton . . . . .	7.00	Free	Free	Free
Kerosene, retailing at, per gallon . . . . .	.11	*	Free	Free
Hams, retailing at, per pound (weighing 10 lbs.) . . . . .	.15	.05	.04	.05
Bacon, retailing at, per pound . . . . .	.16	.05	.04	.05
Cabbages, retailing at, each . . . . .	.10	.03	.02	.03
Onions, retailing at, per bushel . . . . .	1.00	.40	.40	.40
Potatoes, retailing at, per bushel . . . . .	1.25	.25	.25	.25
Salt, retailing at, per pound . . . . .	.01	.0012	.0012	.0012
Sugar, granulated, retailing at per 100 pounds . . . . .	5.25	1.95	1.90	1.90
Wheat flour, retailing at, per 100 pounds . . . . .	3.70	.925	.925	.925
Corn meal, retailing at, per 100 pounds . . . . .	2.50	.41½	.40	.40
Gocarts, retailing at, each . . . . .	5.00	2.25	2.25	2.25
Watch movements, retailing at, each . . . . .	8.00	2.36	.70	.65
Watch cases, gold filled, retailing at, each . . . . .	7.00	2.80	2.80	2.80
Tin roofing, best quality, retailing at, per 100 square feet . . . . .	...	1.50	1.20	1.20

\*Rate of country of production.

## PROTECTIONISM AT WORK.

As Described by a Protected Manufacturer Who Is Also a Protectionist Republican.

There is a Republican manufacturer at Racine, Wisconsin, who frankly tells how protection laws are made and somewhat of how they work. He is H. E. Miles, whose standing in business circles is well vouched for. Last year (whether this year or not we are uninformed) he was vice-president and a director of the National Association of Manufacturers. He was also chairman of that association's committee on the tariff. It was in connection with his duties on this committee that Mr. Miles learned the facts which, as "a protectionist, a manufacturer and a Republican," as he describes himself, he disclosed in the September (1908) *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.* Here are some extracts:

I went with certain data to the man probably most responsible of all for the present tariff situation. Said he, "Do you think we don't know? Take Senator \_\_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_, for instance. He held up the Dingley bill till we gave him and his pals a wholly unwarranted tariff on borax worth to them over \$5,000,000 in money. We had to have his vote!" And so it is that Nevada borax, the most easily mined and the best deposits in the world, is "protected" against inferior foreign deposits, and that the retail price of borax in England is 2½ cents a pound, while in the United States it is 2½ cents plus the 5 cents duty, or 7½ cents. This Senator quickly sold the mines to an English syndicate for \$12,000,000. What he sold was incidentally the mines, and in principal part, the right to tax the American people, by act of Congress, 5 cents per pound, or 200 per cent on its borax over and above a fair price.

This man (the Congressman quoted on borax) knows that when the Dingley bill was passed, the cost of the manufacture of steel rails was \$12 per ton in Pittsburg and \$16 in England; ocean freight was, and is, about \$3.50, making \$19.50 the English cost delivered in New York, or 63 per cent above the Pittsburg cost. . . .

Not long after the passage of this bill steelmakers, guided by Wall street promoters, put about one billion dollars of water into one corporation, and partly, at least, by the powers given to them in that tariff by Congress and the President, they have transfused the wealth of the people into that watered stock, in an amount not less than \$1,000,000 per week, until it has become a most substantial property. . . .

Americans owning factories both in the United States and in Canada are buying Pittsburg steel cheaper for their Canadian factories, and are supplying foreign markets from Canadian factories formerly supplied from the United States. Leading political manipulators, sometimes called statesmen, and even protectionists, knowingly made all this possible in the name of protection to American industries and labor.

Or consider pig iron. The wage cost at the furnace of converting the raw materials there assembled into pig iron is, as stated by Mr. Schwab, 41.1

cents per ton of pig produced. Indeed, Mr. Schwab says that this covers, at the best furnace, also maintenance and overhead expenses. . . .

In utter disregard of the principle of protection, Congress, under the influence of John Dalzell and in the name of the principle thus set at naught, put a duty of \$4.00 per ton on pig iron—a duty about ten times the total wage cost of production at the furnace.

The next greatest industry after iron and steel is textiles, with an output, as I remember, of about \$800,000,000 per annum. The provisions of the textile schedule pass all belief. No industry more clearly deserves and requires protection. No industry has less need of devious and unfair rates and methods. The output of all the woolen mills of Massachusetts by a recent census, is of the yearly value of \$200,000,000. The wages in the mills total \$50,000,000, or 25 per cent of the output. Wages are there 60 per cent higher than in Great Britain, which would make the British rate 16 per cent of the output on the basis of American values. The difference in wage cost is therefore 9 per cent. It would seem that twice this 9 per cent, or 18 per cent, would be moderately protective, and three times, or 27 per cent, almost liberally protective, with some allowance possible, to the wool grower. But the rates run from 75 per cent to 165 per cent. . . .

Reference may also be made with propriety to pressed glass, which is made so cheaply in the United States that it is exported to places of foreign manufacture and there sold at better than American prices. The leaders in that industry were invited by Mr. McKinley to write their own schedules for the McKinley bill, "and to make them fair." This was, and is, quite the common practice. The committee of glass men, thus placed upon honor, put pressed glass on the free list. But it appeared in the law finally at 65 per cent duty. Evidently greedier men secured the change, and with the proof of their unfairness already before Congress. . . .

Congress might almost as well decide that there shall be no competition as to give, as it now does, to shrewd American business men rates that are practically prohibitive of imports upon billions of dollars' worth of the requirements of the people. In my own business, for instance, a protection of 15 per cent to 25 per cent is necessary, but Congress gave us, under an omnibus clause, 45 per cent. In doing this it permitted, if it did not invite us, to consolidate, and to add to our sales prices about 20 per cent and treble our profits, possibly quadruple them. At any rate the strong arm of the government will not permit of foreign competition, and so by our elimination of domestic competition, the people can be put wholly at our mercy to the extent of the excess duty. And this is what has happened with most of the necessaries of life.

In another publication by this protectionist and Republican known as the "Payne Pamphlet," we find the following appropriate addendum to the last quotation above:

"But," says Mr. Payne, "there are trusts in all countries, especially in Germany and in free trade England." Mr. Payne seems not to know that a trust in England must be as good in fact as Ameri-

can trusts are in their prospectuses. They must make their money by their economies. They must sell at the lowest prices that obtain anywhere in the world. If they get above the lowest international price, foreign competition immediately checks their advance.

In Germany, trusts do as in this country, they add all that they can to the price, and take advantage of protection, as of all other opportunities. The price of steel to the German consumer is about the same as in this country, and for the same reason—a trust. On steel plates used in ship building, however, the price in Germany is as low as anywhere in the world, even in free-trade England, and why? Because these plates are on the free list and the German trust must make the international and lowest price because of the open market. . . .

The moral side of this issue will not down. No one can speak of it without regret and unhappiness. It is a pleasure to use the clear and sober language of that most august of human tribunals, the Supreme Court of the United States: "To lay with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation."

+ + +

## THE WEAKNESS AND STRENGTH OF PROTECTION.

Excerpts on Labor and the Tariff, From Henry George's  
"Protection or Free Trade."

### I. The Weakness of Protection.

Protectionists claim that it is for the benefit of a community as a whole, of a nation considered as one man, to make it easy to send goods away and difficult to bring them in.

Let us take a community which we must perforce consider as a whole—that country, with a population of one, which the genius of Defoe has made familiar not only to English readers but to the people of all European tongues.

Robinson Crusoe, we will suppose, is still living alone on his island. Let us suppose an American protectionist is the first to break his solitude with the long-yearned-for music of human speech. Crusoe's delight we can well imagine. But now that he has been there so long he does not care to leave, the less since his visitor tells him that the island, having now been discovered, will often be visited by passing ships. Let us suppose that after having heard Crusoe's story, seen his island, enjoyed such hospitality as he could offer, told him in return of the wonderful changes in the great world, and left him books and papers, our protectionist prepares to depart, but before going seeks to offer some kindly warning of the danger Crusoe will be exposed to from the "deluge of cheap goods" that passing ships will seek to exchange for fruit and goats. Imagine him to tell Crusoe just what protectionists tell larger com-

munities, and to warn him that, unless he takes measures to make it difficult to bring these goods ashore, his industry will be entirely ruined. "In fact," we may imagine the protectionist to say, "so cheaply can all the things you require be produced abroad that unless you make it hard to land them I do not see how you will be able to employ your own industry at all."

"Will they give me all these things?" Robinson Crusoe would naturally exclaim. "Do you mean that I shall get all these things for nothing and have no work at all to do? That will suit me completely. I shall rest and read and go fishing for the fun of it. I am not anxious to work if without work I can get the things I want."

"No, I don't quite mean that," the protectionist would be forced to explain. "They will not give you such things for nothing. They will, of course, want something in return. But they will bring you so much and will take away so little that your imports will vastly exceed your exports, and it will soon be difficult for you to find employment for your labor."

"But I don't want to find employment for my labor," Crusoe would naturally reply. "I did not spend months in digging out my canoe and weeks in tanning and sewing these goat-skins because I wanted employment for my labor, but because I wanted the things. If I can get what I want with less labor, so much the better, and the more I get and the less I give in the trade you tell me I am to carry on—or, as you phrase it, the more my imports exceed my exports—the easier I can live and the richer I shall be. I am not afraid of being overwhelmed with goods. The more they bring the better it will suit me."

And so the two might part, for it is certain that no matter how long our protectionist talked the notion that his industry would be ruined by getting things with less labor than before would never frighten Crusoe.

Yet, are these arguments for protection a whit more absurd when addressed to one man living on an island than when addressed to sixty millions living on a continent? What would be true in the case of Robinson Crusoe is true in the case of Brother Jonathan. If foreigners will bring us goods cheaper than we can make them ourselves, we shall be the gainers. The more we get in imports as compared with what we have to give in exports, the better the trade for us. And since foreigners are not liberal enough to give us their productions, but will only let us have them in return for our own productions, how can they ruin our industry? The only way they could ruin our industry would be by bringing us for nothing all we want, so as to save us the necessity for work. If this were possible, ought it seem very dreadful?

### II. The Strength of Protection.

The fallacies of protection draw their real

strength from a great fact, which is to them as the earth was to the fabled Antaeus, so that they are beaten down only to spring up again. This fact is one which neither side in the controversy endeavors to explain—which free traders quietly ignore and protectionists quietly utilize; but which is of all social facts most obvious and important to the working classes—the fact that as soon, at least, as a certain stage of social development is reached, there are more laborers seeking employment than can find it—a surplus which at recurring periods of industrial depression becomes very large. Thus the opportunity of work comes to be regarded as a privilege, and work itself to be deemed in common thought a good.

Here, and not in the labored arguments which its advocates make, or in the power of the special interests which it enlists, lies the real strength of protection. Beneath all the mental habits I have spoken of as disposing men to accept the fallacies of protection lies one still more important—the habit ingrained in thought and speech of looking upon work as a boon.

Protection, as we have seen, operates to reduce the power of a community to obtain wealth—to lessen the result which a given amount of exertion can secure. It "makes more work," in the sense in which Pharaoh made more work for the Hebrew brick-makers when he refused them straw; in the sense in which the spilling of grease over her floor makes more work for the housewife, or the rain that wets his hay makes more work for the farmer.

Yet, when we prove this, what have we proved to men whose greatest anxiety is to get work; whose idea of good times is that of times when work is plentiful?

A rain that wets his hay is to the farmer clearly an injury; but is it an injury to the laborer who gets by reason of it a day's work and a day's pay that otherwise he would not have got?

The spilling of grease upon her kitchen floor may be a bad thing for the housewife; but to the scrubbing woman who is thereby enabled to earn a needed half-dollar it may be a godsend.

Or if the laborers on Pharaoh's public works had been like the laborers on modern public works, anxious only that the job might last, and if outside of them had been a mass of less fortunate laborers, pressing, struggling, begging for employment in the brick-yards—would the edict that, by reducing the productiveness of labor, made more work have really been unpopular?

Let us go back to Robinson Crusoe. In speaking of him I purposely left out Friday. Our protectionist might have talked until he was tired without convincing Crusoe that the more he got and the less he gave in his exchange with passing ships the worse off he would be. But if he had taken Friday aside, recalled to his mind how

Crusoe had sold Xury into slavery as soon as he had no further use for him, even though the poor boy had helped him escape from the Moors and had saved his life, and then had whispered into Friday's ear that the less work there was to do the less need would Crusoe have of him and the greater the danger that he might give him back to the cannibals, now that he was certain to have more congenial companions—would the idea that there might be danger in a deluge of cheap goods have seemed so ridiculous to Friday as it did to Crusoe?

Those who imagine that they can overcome the popular leaning to protection by pointing out that protective tariffs make necessary more work to obtain the same result, ignore the fact that in all civilized countries that have reached a certain stage of development the majority of the people are unable to employ themselves, and, unless they find some one to give them work, are helpless, and, hence, are accustomed to regard work as a thing to be desired in itself, and anything which makes more work as a benefit, not an injury.

Here is the rock against which "free traders" whose ideas of reform go no further than "a tariff for revenue only" waste their strength when they demonstrate that the effect of protection is to increase work without increasing wealth. And here is the reason why, as we have seen in the United States, in Canada and in Australia, the disposition to resort to protective tariffs increases as that early stage in which there is no difficulty of finding employment is passed, and the social phenomena of older countries begin to appear. . . .

### III. Explanation of the Paradox.

The paradox we have reached is one toward which all the social problems of our day converge, and had our examination been of any similar question it must have come to just such a point.

Take, for instance, the question of the effects of machinery. The opinion that finds most influential expression is that labor-saving invention, although it may sometimes cause temporary inconvenience or even hardship to a few, is ultimately beneficial to all. On the other hand, there is among workingmen a widespread belief that labor-saving machinery is injurious to them, although, since the belief does not enlist those powerful special interests that are concerned in the advocacy of protection, it has not been wrought into an elaborate system and does not get anything like the same representation in the organs of public opinion.

Now, should we subject this question to such an examination as we have given to the tariff question we should reach similar results. We should find the notion that invention ought to be restrained as incongruous as the notion that trade ought to be restrained—as incapable of being carried to its logical conclusions without resulting in

absurdity. And while the use of machinery enormously increases the production of wealth, examination would show in it nothing to cause inequality in distribution. On the contrary, we should see that the increased power given by invention inures primarily to labor, and that this gain is so diffused by exchange that the effect of an improvement which increases the power of labor in one branch of industry must be shared by labor in all other branches. Thus the direct tendency of labor-saving improvement is to augment the earnings of labor. Nor is this tendency neutralized by the fact that labor-saving inventions generally require the use of capital, since competition, when free to act, must at length bring the profits of capital used in this way to the common level. Even the monopoly of a labor-saving invention, while it can seldom be maintained for any length of time, cannot prevent a large (and generally much the largest) part of the benefits from being diffused.

From this we might conclude with certainty, that the tendency of labor-saving improvements is to benefit all, and especially to benefit the working-class, and hence might naturally attribute any distrust of their beneficial effects partly to the temporary displacements which, in a highly organized society, any change in the forms of industry must cause, and partly to the increased wants called forth by the increased ability to satisfy want.

Yet, while as a matter of theory it is clear that labor-saving inventions ought to improve the condition of all; as a matter of fact it is equally clear that they do not. . . .

In themselves free trade and labor-saving inventions do not tend to inequality of distribution. Yet it is possible that they may promote such inequality, not by virtue of anything inherent in their tendencies, but through their effect in increasing production. . . .

Let us go back to Robinson Crusoe's island, which may well serve us as an example of society in its simplest and therefore most intelligible form.

The discovery of the island which we have heretofore supposed, involving calls by other ships, would greatly increase the wealth which the labor of its population of two could obtain. But it would not follow that in the increased wealth both would gain. Friday was Crusoe's slave, and no matter how much the opening of trade with the rest of the world might increase wealth, he could only demand the wages of a slave—enough to maintain him in working ability. So long as Crusoe himself lived he would doubtless take good care of the companion of his solitude, but when in the course of time the island had fully come into the circle of civilized life, and had passed into the possession of some heir

of Crusoe's, or of some purchaser, living probably in England, and was cultivated with a view to making it yield the largest income, the gulf between the proprietor who owned it and the slave who worked upon it would not merely have enormously widened as compared with the time when Crusoe and Friday shared with substantial equality the joint produce of their labor, but the share of the slave might have become absolutely less, and his condition lower and harder.

It is not necessary to suppose positive cruelty or wanton harshness. The slaves who in the new order of things took Friday's place might have all their animal wants supplied—they might have as much to eat as Friday had, might wear better clothes, be lodged in better houses, be exempt from the fear of cannibals, and in illness have the attendance of a skilled physician. And seeing this, island "statisticians" might collate figures or devise diagrams to show how much better off these toilers were than their predecessor, who wore goat-skins, slept in a cave and lived in constant dread of being eaten, and the conclusions of these gentlemen might be paraded in all the island newspapers, with a chorus of: "Behold, in figures that cannot lie and diagrams that can be measured, how industrial progress benefits everybody, even the slave!"

But in things of which the statistician takes no account they would be worse off than Friday. Compelled to a round of dreary toil, unlightened by variety, undignified by responsibility, unstimulated by seeing results and partaking of them, their life, as compared with that of Friday, would be less that of men and more that of machines.

And the effect of such changes would be the same upon laborers such as we call free—free, that is to say, to use their own power to labor, but not free to that which is necessary to its use. If Friday, instead of setting Crusoe's foot upon his head, in token that he was thenceforward his slave, had simply acknowledged Crusoe's ownership of the island, what would have been the difference? As he could only live upon Crusoe's property on Crusoe's terms, his freedom would simply have amounted to the freedom to emigrate, to drown himself in the sea, or to give himself up to the cannibals. Men enjoying only such freedom—that is to say, the freedom to starve or emigrate as the alternative of getting some one else's permission to labor—cannot be enriched by improvements that increase the production of wealth. For they have no more power to claim any share of it than has the slave. Those who want them to work must give them what the master must give the slave if he wants him to work—enough to support life and strength; but when they can find no one who wants them to work they must starve, if they cannot beg. Grant to Crusoe ownership of the island, and Friday, the free man,

would be as much subject to his will as Friday, the slave; as incapable of claiming any share of an increased production of wealth, no matter how great it might be nor from what cause it might come.

And what would be true in the case of one man would be true of any number. Suppose ten thousand Fridays, all free men, all absolute owners of themselves, and but one Crusoe, the absolute owner of the island. So long as his ownership was acknowledged and could be enforced, would not the one be the master of the ten thousand as fully as though he were the legal owner of their flesh and blood? Since no one could use *his* island without his consent, it would follow that no one could labor, or even live, without his permission. The order, "Leave my property," would be a sentence of death.

\* \* \*

### MAKING IT CLEAR.

I like the tariff speeches, for  
The more I read of them the more  
I do not know, and thus I can  
Rely upon my Congressman.  
Upon the very slightest hint  
He gets unending leave to print,  
And when he prints a speech, you see,  
He takes and mails it out to me.

He makes it very clear just how  
If I pay more than I do now  
For socks and gloves and baby's dress,  
While I pay more, they cost me less.  
And then he shows me where I lose  
By paying somewhat less for shoes,  
For, though I pay less than before,  
My shoes, they really cost me more.

He makes it very clear to me  
That what I lose I gain, you see;  
And on such things as clothes and shoes  
I seem to gain, but really lose.  
Thus, if I buy my socks too low,  
They'll still be higher, don't you know;  
And shoes I thought were high last Fall,  
Were really low shoes after all.

You see, if I pay less for shoes  
Or hats, the maker has to lose,  
And if he loses, then, you see,  
He charges up the loss to me.  
Now, when I have to pay him more,  
He reckons profits to his score,  
And thus there is a share for me  
In all of this prosperity.

The speeches shed a radiant light  
Upon the theme and make it bright;  
I merely read them o'er and o'er  
And find more's less, and less is more;  
In buying hat or coat or vest,  
Dear's cheap, and cheap is dear at best;  
High's low, low's high, far's near, near's far,  
Light's dark, white's black—and there you are!

—J. W. Foley, in New York Times.

## BOOKS

### INTERNATIONAL FREE TRADE CONGRESS.

**Report of the Proceedings of the International Free Trade Congress.** London, August, 1908. Published by the Cobden Club, Caxton House, Westminster, S. W., London. Sold by The Public, 357 Dearborn street, Chicago. Price, postpaid, \$1.

This strongly bound volume, handsomely printed on heavy paper and in large black type, is the official report of an international congress of last year which contributed material of the highest value to a world wide question: Commerce, shall it be obstructed or unobstructed?

Among these contributions are speeches by Winston Churchill of the British Ministry, by Prime Minister Asquith, by John A. Hobson, and by the late Theodor Barth of Germany. There are also speeches or papers by John Bigelow, Harvey N. Shepard, John DeWitt Warner, Professor Sumner, Edwin D. Mead, Franklin Pierce, Louis F. Post, A. B. Farquhar, Louis Ehrich, J. Denton Hancock and Herbert Miles, and a letter from William Lloyd Garrison, all of the United States; by Yves Guyot of France; by Joseph Martin of Canada and Max Hirsch of Australia; by Professor Bastable of Dublin; and by several other students of the subject coming from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Holland and Italy, as well as Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United States and Great Britain.

A well-considered letter from Edward Bernstein, the opportunist leader in German Socialism (which appears at page 26), is peculiarly significant in its declaration that "more than at any time before is the question of free international exchange a working-class question," coupled with the statement that this is recognized by his party in Germany. Mr. Bernstein truly explains that "as long as society is divided into monopolizing capitalistic and working class respectively, who have to compete for their livelihood, no technical progress of any kind will be an unmixed blessing, and free exchange will have its drawbacks for many members or sections of the community; but the remedy lies not in the return to the erection of tariff walls and toll gates."

Theodor Barth, the German publicist of democratic faith, whose death is just reported, is represented several times in the volume. In one of his speeches (at pages 9, 10), he makes this fine contrast: "There is a modern idea of economic imperialism, the doctrine that markets are to be conquered not so much by the intrinsic qualities of the goods offered to foreign consumers, but by the force and the prestige, and, if necessary, the arms of the producing country. Protection

always has had monopoly tendencies, and monopoly is based upon force. Therefore I believe we may say, just as there is a logical cohesion between free trade and peace, there is a logical cohesion between protectionism and war."

+ + +

## OUR FOREIGN MARKETS.

**Protection's Favors to Foreigners.** By James G. Parsons. Published by the Reform Club Tariff Reform Committee, 42 Broadway, New York.

Along in the '80's it began to leak out that protected manufacturers sell goods abroad cheaper than at home. This was a commonplace to the manufacturers long before it was even suspected by the general public. The Reform Club exposed it in 1890, but protectionists denied the truth of the exposure then. It is thoroughly established now, however, and even shamefacedly admitted; and in this little volume Mr. Parsons gathers together the evidence.

Mr. Schwab has testified that American iron and steel products are regularly sold at lower prices for export than for home consumption. The head of the Nicholson file trust has admitted under examination that on the same goods his trust gets from 25 to 28 per cent more in the United States than for its exports to Germany, and that it makes money on its exports. The representative of the varnish trust admitted that they could compete in the world's markets with varnish; and told of his earlier experience with the export of American sewing machines, which went at a profit for \$19.50 abroad when they were selling here at \$65.00. And so on.

Mr. Parsons's book is a complete refutation of the protection plea that a tariff on foreign goods is necessary for the protection of American industries. The facts it produces show that American goods are sold abroad at reduced prices with a profit; from which it follows that the higher prices at home are pure plunder. Evidently this is what the protective tariff is for.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

---

—The Government of American Cities. A Program of Democracy. By Horace E. Deming. With a Reprint of the Municipal Program of the National Municipal League. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. 1909.

---

## PAMPHLETS

---

### Individual Responsibility for Social Corruption.

To those good people who hold aloof from efforts to eradicate evil from the social man, placing all em-

phasis on individual regeneration, we commend the vigorous sermon preached by the Rev. Harry White at a union service in the Congregational Church at Natick, Massachusetts. He follows the "individual regeneration" idea to its logical conclusion when he holds the buyers of Standard Oil products to a moral accountability, equally with the Standard Oil trust, for the criminality of the trust.

+ +

### Abraham Lincoln.

Moorfield Storey's address at Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, on the occasion of the Lincoln Centennial, is the kind of address that might have been expected of such an orator on such an occasion—simple, democratic, and morally inspiring. They were not assembled, he said, for Lincoln's sake, but to make their own lives better by recognizing in the record of Lincoln's life "a great moral power," and in him "the embodiment and exponent of the fundamental political truth that all men have equal rights and are entitled to equal opportunities under the law." With this sentiment for its keynote the address is devoted to Lincoln's principles in their present day applications.

---

## PERIODICALS

---

Herbert Quick's, "Virginia of the Air Lanes," has begun to develop in the July number of the *Cosmopolitan* (New York), what is apparently to be a unique lego-economic outcome of air navigation. The story thus far has been abundantly supplied with thrills.

+

Readers of Hubbard's "Phyllistine" who have become acquainted with its own side of the labor controversy in connection with which Mr. Hubbard's printing office has tumbled into the "unfair" list, may read the other side in the *American Federationist* (Washington) for June.

+

To the interesting clerical discussion over the rights and duties of ministers with reference to social or industrial questions, which recently appeared in *The Public* (pp. 269, 441, 443, 461), the Rev. Edmund A. Wasson, Ph. D., rector of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church of Newark, N. J., contributes a supplementary chapter. It appears in the May issue of "The Crown" (Newark), of which Mr. Wasson is editor. He takes ground which, while apparently different from that of any of the other disputants, seem really to be a judgment upon the essential issue which they would all probably concede. He rests his argument upon the contract between the clergyman and his church organization, which he may cancel if he wishes but must meanwhile in good faith observe.

+ + +

"Come with me," said Richard Cobden, as John Bright turned heart-stricken from a new-made grave. "There are in England women and children dying with hunger—with hunger made by the laws. Come with me, and we will not rest until we repeal those

laws." In this spirit the free trade movement waxed and grew, arousing an enthusiasm that no mere fiscal reform could have aroused. And entrenched though it was by restricted suffrage and rotten boroughs and aristocratic privilege, protection was overthrown in Great Britain.

—Henry George, in "Protection or Free Trade."

+ + +

Mrs. Mary Crowell of Byron, Ill., has won a great reputation as a raiser of high-grade hogs. Buyers

compete for her pigs. George Pratt, hog buyer for Armour & Co., is reported as saying: "On general principles I am opposed to woman suffrage, but a woman who can raise as good droves of hogs as Mrs. Crowell can is as much entitled to a vote as I am." This shows the incompleteness of the purely commercial view of the woman question which largely prevails in the financial world. A woman who can raise fine hogs is declared to be worthy to cast a ballot, but a woman who raises a family of fine children, as thousands of women are doing, is

## The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

### Terms of Subscription

Yearly .....	\$1.00
Half yearly .....	.50
Quarterly .....	.25
Single copies .....	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks .....	.10

Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders of Chicago, or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

### Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion .....	\$20.00
Half-page, each insertion .....	10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion .....	5.00
One inch, each insertion .....	1.20
Half-inch, each insertion .....	.60

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8½ inches; width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

## The Man at the Margin

Who's the Man at the Margin? He is not one man but many, and he stands at the parting of the ways. ¶ In an unnatural industrial environment, these parted ways lead on to conflicts between Labor and Capital. There is no conflict between Labor and Capital, naturally; but in practice there is a terrible conflict. What is the reason? ¶ Ask the Man at the Margin. ¶ Here are some of the things he will explain: the established order, the economic problem, land tenure, public franchises, wages, socialization of values, sporadic socialism, omnisocialism, bisocialism, equality of opportunity, individual initiative, and social solidarity. ¶ When you have interrogated the Man at the Margin you will say with Oliver R. Trowbridge, the author of "Bisocialism" (in which the Man at the Margin is the dominant character): "Behold the Man at the Margin! Let him reign!"

"Bisocialism: The Reign of the Man at the Margin," expounds economics in harmony with the methods and habits of thought of the Universities, but in the democratic spirit. It is scientific. It is rigidly logical. It is not academic merely, nor practical merely, but both academic and practical. The reasoning is convincing, the writing attractive to the end. Dealing with elementary principles with the simplicity of a primer, the book considers contemporary social and political problems on the plane of contemporary statesmanship. A book for professor, student, reformer, journalist and political leader alike, it will be read with interest and may be studied to advantage by such men of every economic and political school — Democrat, socialist, anarchist, single taxer, Republican.

The price of "Bisocialism" is one dollar, but we will supply copies for sixty cents, and without charge for postage.

THE PUBLIC Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago

not thought deserving of a vote. Which is worth more, hogs or boys and girls?—Woman's Journal.

\* \* \*

Chug-Chug!

Br-r! br-r-r!

Honk! Honk!

Gilligillug-gilligihug!

The pedestrian paused at the intersection of two busy cross streets.

He looked about. An automobile was rushing at

him from one direction, a motor-cycle from another; an auto-truck was coming from behind, and a taxicab was speedily approaching.

Zip-zip! Zing-glug!

He looked up and saw directly above him a runaway airship in rapid descent.

There was but one chance. He was standing upon a manhole cover. Quickly seizing it, he lifted the lid and jumped into the hole just in time to be run over by a subway train.—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

# Free Trade Congress.

Report of the International Free Trade Congress, held in London, in August, 1908. Speeches and Papers by Free Traders from all over the World—by the men named below, for example, and by many more:

Dr. Theodor Barth, of Germany.

Mr. Yves Guyot, of France.

Mr. Max Hirsch, of Australia.

Mr. Herbert Asquith, the Premier.

Mr. Winston Churchill, Lord Welby, Mr.

Russell Rea, Professor C. F. Bastable,

Mr. John A. Hobson and Mr. J. A.

Murray Macdonald, of Great Britain.

Mr. Harvey N. Shepard, Mr. Edwin

D. Mead, Mr. John de Witt Warner, Mr.

John Bigelow, Professor W. G. Sumner,

Mr. Franklin Pierce, President David

Starr Jordan, Mr. Louis R. Ehrich and

Mr. Louis F. Post, of the United States.

Published by the Cobden Club of London.

For sale by The Public's Book Dept.,

Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago. Cloth, 651

pages, price, postpaid, \$1.00.

## Women's Trade Union League of Chicago

PUBLIC MEETING

Sunday, June 13th, 3 P. M.

Federation Hall, 275 La Salle St.

Speaker—Mr. Raymond Robins, on "Organized Labor and Legislation."

Election of 16 Delegates to the National Conference of the Women's Trade Union League.

REFRESHMENTS

ALL WELCOME

MRS. RAYMOND ROBINS,  
President.

EMMA STEGHAGEN,  
Secretary.

## Real Estate For Sale and Exchange

EDWARD POLAK

4030 Third Ave. New York City

## NEGRO PROBLEM

Following the Color Line, An account of Negro Citizenship in the American Democracy. A complete survey of the Negro Race in America, by Ray Stannard Baker. 24 illus. from photographs. \$2.00 net, postpaid.

Special Bargain Lists Free. H. H. TIMBY, Conneaut, Ohio

## Land Values Taxation

IN

## GREAT BRITAIN

Complete Set (over 30)  
Pamphlets on the  
Question.

**60 Cents, Post Free**

To any address in the  
United States and  
Canada.

Land Values Publication Dept.

376-77, Strand

London, W. C.

Our readers are asked to mention THE PUBLIC when writing to Advertisers.  100