

THE ETHICS OF PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.

THE competitive aspect of Protection and Free Trade is readily seen and stated.

The manufacturer who desires to make all the money he can by the production and sale of his specialty, and who resides in a country where land is very dear, money and labor very cheap, his machinery and hired skill the best, with competition at a maximum—will necessarily be a Free Trader from purely selfish motives. Because these economic advantages would secure him competitive success against the whole world.

These are the economic conditions of industrial England to-day. She can therefore successfully compete, in her staple productions, with every other nation on the globe. Her manufacturers are the richest in the world; but the condition of hundreds of thousands of their employees is most wretched and deplorable.

The causes which produce this state of things are patent to every careful and thoughtful observer. Com-

petition among like producers gradually reduces profits and dividends to a minimum. When profits and dividends are reduced so low that the manufacturers and stock-holders are not receiving as much money on their investments as they deem it right they should have, they then impinge on the wages of their employees by reducing them 10, 15, 20 or 30 *per cent.* in conformity with their own selfish purposes. This makes the employees poorer. Competition, however, does not end here. It still goes on between the manufacturers for the home and foreign markets. When profits and dividends are again reduced so low that the manufacturers and stock-holders are dissatisfied with their rewards, they again reduce the wages of their employees, which makes them poorer than before. This process of reducing wages from time to time, under competition, gradually puts wages so low that tens of thousands of the toiling classes of the British Isles are reduced to the most abject condition conceivable. This is what Free Trade England has done for her toiling millions !

We will now put a hypothetical case for the Protectionists.

A manufacturer resides in a country where land is very cheap, wages and interest very high, competition at a maximum, and whose machinery and hired skill are as good and efficient as can be found anywhere. These economic conditions would necessarily cause him to be a

Protectionist ; because he could not successfully compete with the Free Trader under free-trade conditions. Competition, however, under Protection, would necessarily reduce profits and dividends to a minimum. When the profits and dividends were reduced so low that the income derived from manufactures did not meet the selfish requirements of the manufacturers and stockholders, they would then impinge on the wages of their employees by reducing them 10, 15 or 20 *per cent.*, agreeably to their preconceived selfish arrangements. This would necessarily make their employees that much the poorer. When competition for the home market again reduced profits and dividends to a minimum, another reduction of wages would be enforced and the employees would thereby be made still poorer. This periodic process of reducing wages, by competition under Protection, would finally culminate in reducing the wage-workers to abject penury, with moral and intellectual destitution.

These are the conditions which are rapidly befalling the wage-workers in the United States of America. In Pennsylvania, the most heavily protected State in the American Union, colliers are now working at the low figure of sixty-five cents a day, and for one-quarter or one-third of the year they are in enforced idleness. When the United States shall have had Protection as long as England has had Free Trade, her wage-workers will be in as deplorable a condition as any of England's

industrious poor. Hence there is absolutely no hope for the toiling millions under either Protection or Free Trade! Competition will ultimately grind them down to abject destitution and despair. To the philanthropic thinker this is the severest logic that ever appalled the heart of man.

Having examined Free Trade and Protection in the light of selfish competition, we are now prepared to examine them in the light of Ethics or practical Justice. Read what David A. Wells, once a Protectionist, now a Free Trader, said before the Brooklyn Revenue Reform Club, February 8, 1882.

"China is the great cotton producing and cotton consuming country of the world. A great majority of her people are clothed exclusively in cotton; and yet until within the past year there was not a power-loom or spindle at work in the whole of this vast empire. An ordinary Chinese laborer requires about eighteen yards of heavy cotton "drills" for his annual clothing, and this represents about thirty day's labor to produce, according to Chinese methods. But the production of this same quantity of cloth in the United States represents, at present, only about one day's labor, apportioned in the ratio of about one-third of a day for the production of the fibre; one third for its manufacture in New England into cloth; and one-third to cover the labor of transportation, from the place of production to the place

of manufacture, and from the place of manufacture to the point of consumption, be it China or elsewhere. It is, therefore, evident that if we could sell cottons to China, that the transaction would be in the nature of an exchange in our favor, of *thirty day's labor for one* ; to which must be further added that the Chinaman is desirous of paying for such cottons as he may buy, with tea, which he will grow for us, for a compensation of twelve to fifteen cents per day. But now comes in our Government with a policy which excludes us from this advantageous system of exchange and turns it almost all over to Great Britain ; and then, as if this was not sufficient, proposes to supplement it with a measure for diverting our labor from its present highly productive employment, into the industry of growing tea, in which to succeed, it must successfully compete with Chinamen working at twelve cents per day. And yet this plan developed into such favor on the part of Congress and the public, that the President in his message of two years ago, alluded to it as a matter worthy of all encouragement. Had the plan succeeded, which owing to fortunate circumstances it did not, the next step in order would have been to greatly increase the price of tea in the United States in order to protect the American producers against the pauper labor of China. Was any more absurd scheme ever recorded in commercial history ?”

Most truly this is an “ advantageous system of exchange.” A highway robber could not take a much

greater advantage of his neighbor than that proposed by Mr. Wells. THIRTY day's work in the production of tea, in exchange for ONE day's work in the production of cotton drills ! Viewed in the light of Justice, or Christianity, the proposition is monstrous !

This proposition of Mr. Wells is on a par with the practical application of it on the part of certain British manufacturers in their dealings with the people of Burmah. I clipped the following from the *New York Tribune*, of May 4th, 1883.

“ The trade in idols is unusually brisk in Birmingham, England. A thousand glass gods, which cost thirty-seven cents apiece and sell for four dollars, have just been sent to Burmah.”

Is that a practical application of the Christian law, “ Love thy neighbor as thyself ? ” Is it doing to others as we would that others should do to us ? Is it just ? Is it the way to establish the kingdom of righteousness on the earth ? And yet Great Britain sends Christian missionaries to the Burmese to convert them to Christianity ! Is manufacturing glass gods at thirty-seven cents apiece, and then selling them to the Burmese at four dollars apiece, the way to convert them to Christianity ? And yet this is the way that Mr. David A. Wells, an American free-trade Christian, proposes to convert Chinamen to Christianity by selling them *one* day's product of cotton drills for *thirty days* product of tea. What a stupendous sham is our so-called practical Christianity !

Now listen to the grand eloquence of Mr. Wells while he discourses on the ethics of the Protectionists. He says—

“ Did any one ever know, or hear of an American who, however much of a protectionist at home, did not consider it a privilege on visiting Europe that he was able to buy clothing and other articles of luxury, cheaper than in his own country, and who did not to the extent of his ability avail himself of his opportunity for so doing? I recollect traveling some years ago in Europe with a prominent member of the Industrial League of Pennsylvania, who had accumulated a large fortune *through an iniquitous and selfishly arranged provision of an existing tariff*, and whose expenditure for a great variety of products of foreign labor, for no other reason apparently than their comparative cheapness, was most lavish ; and whose pleasure and exultation over what he termed his bargains was so excessive as to almost border on simplicity. And from what I learned from his own lips, I doubt if any one of these numerous purchases on his return to his own country ever came under the cognizance of an American Custom House and paid duties. Now, if this man's principles had been any thing more than a selfish sham, he would have scorned to use the money which protection had brought him, for the purchase of any other merchandise than that manufactured by American operatives under protection equally well if not cheaper, and would not have taken advantage of any opportunity to increase his

abundance which he had helped by law to deny to his fellow citizens."

Now, this is what I call sublime moralizing on the selfishness of protectionists, and I deem it well merited. But can not Mr. Wells also see that the free traders, of which he is one, are equally guilty of "an iniquitous and selfishly arranged provision" of free trade? and that their philanthropy is "a selfish sham," and their Christianity too, and that they also should scorn to take the advantage of any opportunity of acquiring thirty day's product of tea in exchange for *one* day's product of cotton drills? Is it any the less iniquitous and selfish to victimize foreigners than it is to victimize Americans? Is not commercial morality as binding at the antipodes as on this side of the globe, or at home? Is it wrong to rob your fellow men here, and right to rob them there? Is not, therefore, the patriotism and philanthropy of the free traders as much an illusion and "selfish sham" as the patriotism and philanthropy of the protectionists? When we shall have learned to love our neighbors at the antipodes equally with our neighbors at home; when we shall religiously seek commercial justice and conscientiously apply it in our daily avocations, then all iniquitous and selfishly arranged provisions of protection and free trade will cease. Then will justice become an infallible power which builds for righteousness and the brotherhood of all mankind.

We are now prepared to search for the causes which

necessitated Free Trade in England, and Protection in the United States. But before we do this it is well to state the essential points of agreement and of disagreement between these two schools of economic thinkers.

The Free Trader maintains that perfect freedom to work, and to dispose of the product of one's work, when and where he pleases, without restrictive legislation, is co-equal with the right of freedom of speech, of the press, of religious opinion, of one's person, and the right to choose whomsoever he will to represent him in the councils of the State or nation. He also maintains that a tax imposed by government on the importation of foreign merchandise, except for revenue, is a pernicious and unwarrantable assumption of power, detrimental to the material prosperity of a people who may be the victims of such restrictive legislation.

He further maintains that if freedom of commerce may be legitimately restrained by law, then, by parity of reasoning, freedom of speech, of the press, of the conscience, of one's person, and the right to choose one's representative may be curtailed by law. He also alleges that a tax on imported goods is robbery to the amount of the tax, when the consumer is forced to pay it. This is simply a corollary to the principles as stated above.

He also maintains, with Bastiat, that—“Whatever two persons mutually agree to, in a matter of exchange, is just.” So much, then, for the basic principles of the free trader.

The Protectionists, *per contra*, hold the same fundamental doctrines with one main exception, viz—Infant industries, they say, like infant children, need the protecting and fostering care of paternal government ; otherwise they will certainly be annihilated by foreign competition. Let us examine this doctrine and see if it be really based on facts.

One hundred years ago, the American colonists had precisely the same kind of tools for quarrying stone, making bricks, building houses, felling trees, and sawing them into boards, as their English cousins had. They had also the same kind of farming implements, with forests right at hand, and an abundance of cheap land. They had likewise the same kind of tools for building ships, spinning yarn and weaving cloth, tanning leather, making boots and shoes, clothing, hats and caps, manufacturing furniture, horse-shoes and horse-shoe nails. There was an abundance of water power, the seashore and streams abounded in fish, the land in minerals, and the forests were filled with game.

Having these artificial and natural advantages, with inventive genius and skill, and ambitious industry, why did the colonists need a protective tariff to enable them to establish infant manufactures on a permanent basis ? Only three economic reasons can be given, viz. : Cheap land, high wages, and high interest.

In all new colonies where land can be had for little or nothing, labor commands the highest price. The reason

is that no one will work at mechanical or manufacturing industries where land is cheap, for much less wages than the market value of an average day's product of wheat or other agricultural produce. Hence mechanic's and artisan's wages are always relatively high in new countries.

The third cause which makes a protective tariff a necessity, under a selfish competitive system of commerce, is the market value of money. In all new settlements money always commands the highest rates of interest, because it is always sparse. Thirty years ago I knew men who loaned money to Illinois farmers at the rate of 35 and 40 *per cent.* interest.

Therefore, where land is cheap, money dear, and wages high, it is impossible to establish a system of manufactures against the competition of old countries where machinery has grown to a high degree of perfection, and where labor and money are cheap, and land dear. Consequently, a tariff on foreign products becomes an absolute necessity if it be desirable to establish manufactures on a permanent basis in new countries.

How, then, can Free-Traders and Protectionists become reconciled? Both are right on the fundamental principles of freedom, as I have already shown. And both are right from their respective standpoints of competitive greed. The manufacturing protectionist seeks to gain riches by compelling the consumer at home to buy goods at a price which far exceeds what a free competitive market would allow. While the free trade

manufacturer seeks riches by selling his goods at an enormous profit to the foreign consumer. This is the way England has impoverished Ireland, Germany, India and Turkey and all other countries with which she exchanges her manufactured goods for raw materials, or purely agricultural products. And the American Free Trader, now that American manufactures and skill have risen to a high degree of perfection so that in many things America can successfully compete with Great Britain, wants to follow England's cruel example. This I have already shown by what David A. Wells said before the Brooklyn Revenue Reform Club.

We are now prepared to point the causes which produced Free Trade in England.

England is the typical free-trade nation of the globe. Her commerce is on every sea and permeates every nation. All are made to pour treasure into her coffers. Her competition is dreaded by every nation on the globe. For in this she is the master of the world. Although wages in Russia, Austria, Turkey, Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, Netherlands and in Scandinavia—are less by reason of home competition, yet none of these nations can successfully compete with Great Britain in the cheapness of her staple productions. Even Americans, who boast of their manufactures, their inventive genius and their skill, also dread her competition, and have about 4,000 articles of commerce well protected against her. Why

all this anxiety and dread, and this enormous protection against England, when she pays the highest wages to her working people of any country in Europe? The answer is this: It is because her inventive genius and acquired skill enable her to produce more things of a like kind, by the same expenditure of energy and capital, than any other nation can. Therefore, she can successfully compete with and undersell every nation on the globe.

The reason that European nations dread her competition is accounted for in this way:—Competition in these countries having already reduced wages to a minimum, so that the wage-workers are well nigh reduced to absolute want and beggary, a further reduction of wages they cannot endure. It is only by the most rigid economy that the masses maintain an existence. Therefore do they necessarily dread the competition of Great Britain which inevitably reduces them to greater destitution. Hence these countries are rapidly establishing protective tariffs to counteract the competitive power of England's corporate greed.

In like manner competition operates in England, with the same dreaded certainty among her own manufacturers and wage-workers. The manufacturers of like products are constantly competing with each other; not only for the home, but also for the foreign markets. This necessarily reduces profits, dividends and wages to a minimum in England. When competition has reduced profits and dividends so low that the manufacturers and stockholders

can not gain what incomes they deem it necessary to have, they then impinge upon the wages of their employees by reducing them 10, 15 or 20 *per cent.* according to circumstances. What is thus abstracted from wages is added to profits and dividends. Competition, however, still goes on and on ; and when the profits and dividends are again wiped out by competition, another reduction of wages is made, followed, perhaps, by strikes, lockouts, arbitration, idleness, destitution, pauperism and crime. Thus England maintains her ascendancy as the supreme competing nation, because, as I have already shown, her genius and culture enable her to produce more merchandise with the same expenditure of energy and capital than any other nation can. But what is the present condition of tens of thousands of her working people? Listen to what Carlyle wrote in his " Latter Day Pamphlets."

" British industrial existence seems fast becoming one huge poison-swamp of reeking pestilence, physical and moral ; a hideous living Golgotha of souls and bodies buried alive ; such a Curtius gulf communicating with the nether deeps as the sun never saw till now. Thirty thousand outcast needle women working themselves swiftly to death ; three million paupers rotting in forced idleness, helping said needle women to die ; these are but items in the sad ledger of despair. Thirty thousand wretched women sunk in that putrefying well of abominations ; they have oozed in upon London from the universal Stygian quagmire of British industrial life ; are accumulated in the well of the concern to that extent."

Now, listen to what John Bright, one of England's free traders, said, in a recent speech to his constituents :—

“ In the city of Glasgow alone 41,000 families out of every 100,000 families live in houses having only one room. In Scotland nearly one-third of the whole people dwell in houses of only one room. In fact, looking at the past—to me it is a melancholy thing to look at—there is much of it which excites in me not astonishment only but horror. The fact is there passes before my eyes a vision of millions of families—not individuals but families—fathers, mothers, children, passing ghastly, sorrow-stricken, in never-ending procession from the cradle to the grave.”

Chambers Journal says :

“ No abjectness in any city in Europe sinks to the dismal level of rags and wretchedness observable in the fetid alleys of Edinburgh and Glasgow.”

Do not these quotations present a horrible picture of the condition of the working people of Industrial England? And yet there is not *one* British statesman, to my knowledge, who has the genius, the moral courage and eloquence to set forth, in befitting terms, the iniquitous cause of all this social horror and woe, namely—THE MONOPOLY AND SALE OF LAND.

Let us now turn, for a few moments, to the United States of America. Is it not patent to every thoughtful observer, who takes cognizance of the progress of events, that the toiling classes of the United States, the great

body of wage-workers, are rapidly becoming the inheritors of social conditions, akin to those in England, so graphically described by Carlyle and John Bright?

Do we not know that there are tens of thousands of boys and girls, under fourteen years, who are obliged to go out to daily toil to earn their own livelihood, because their parents' wages are utterly inadequate to support and educate them?

Do we not know that in all of our large cities there are thousands upon thousands of young and middle-aged women driven into the paths of prostitution and shame, because of the hardness of their lot as industrial citizens?

Do we not know that in the tenement districts of New York City, there are as many persons, male and female, young and old, crowded into single rooms as can be found in the most densely populated districts of London?

Do we not know that there are needle women who make gentlemen's and ladies' linen dusters at five and six cents a piece, furnish their own thread, and if perchance, they can make twelve dusters by working twelve hours a day, their income is but sixty cents a day, or \$3.60 per week?

Do we not know that young girls are compelled to work in loathsome tobacco establishments and homes, thirteen hours a day on the average, for the miserable pittance of fifty cents, or \$3.00 a week, and for lost time they are "docked" a cent a minute?

Do we not know that our State prisons, poor-houses and jails, are crowded with inmates taken from the ranks of labor?

Do we not know that throughout the length and breadth of the land, strikes against corporate greed have become chronic ?

Are not rents on the increase, and wages on the decrease, and competition and monopoly rampant with greed, producing misery and destitution every where ? No greater mistake was ever made by imaginative statesmen, when they oratorically proclaim the perfect freedom of American citizens, and their emancipation from unjust and unequal laws ! We are told that the United States is a free and glorious Republic, with equal opportunities for all. Glorious, I grant, in material achievements ; but *inglorious* in the methods by which these material achievements have been gained. The wealth, which is now being piled up so rapidly in the coffers of the few, is the wealth of sin ; and the ambitious greed, which is the initial incentive of these vast accumulations of wealth, is born of flagrant injustice.

Most of the protective tariffs of the United States are the product of unscrupulous avarice, since they do not now need economic protection.

Take the cotton industry as an example. In a letter to The New York Tribune, dated June 11, 1883, Mr. David A. Wells makes this statement :

“ While exporting for sale in foreign countries during the year 1882 American manufactured cottons to the value of \$13,222,979, we imported (under duties ranging from thirty-one to seventy-six per cent.) for home consumption

the products of foreign cotton manufactures to the extent of \$34,351,292."

Where did most of these exported American manufactured cotton goods, to the value of \$13,000,000 go to? Let Mr. Robert P. Porter, in his letter to the New York Tribune, dated May 24th, 1883, answer. He says:

"American exports of cotton goods reached in 1881 nearly 150,000,000 yards. It has been claimed in some quarters that the export of American cotton goods to Manchester was merely made to "raise money," but this is most explicitly denied by Mr. James Thornby, an Englishman, who visited the United States a few years ago for the express purpose of investigating the matter, and whose report seems an impartial and exceedingly intelligent one. Mr. Thornby says: "In no case have the Americans sent cloth here in order to 'raise money' upon it, nor, as has been suggested, have the exports been merely relief shipments on which a loss could be afforded in consideration of the higher prices to be obtained in the protected home markets. The goods have always been sold at such prices as left a profit to their makers, and the transactions have, in every instance, been conducted upon a purely mercantile basis."

My point is this:—When American manufacturers of cotton goods can successfully compete with Manchester in her home market, and sell at a profit, then I declare that the duties of thirty-one to seventy-six *per cent.*, imposed upon American consumers at home, is bare-faced legis-

lative robbery, and that the cotton manufacturing corporations of the United States are a body of greedy, unscrupulous men, unworthy of the respect and confidence of their fellow citizens.

When protection is pleaded and sustained for the sole purpose of enriching manufacturers to the amount of the tariff, under a competitive system, then it is high time that all such tariffs were repealed. It is a notorious fact that American watch, clock and sewing machine manufacturers sell, at a profit, their goods in Europe at half the retail price they are sold for in the United States. These facts prove that American watches, clocks and sewing machines are sold to the home consumers at a profit exceeding *one hundred per cent.* of their competitive value?

Moreover, the manufacturing statistics of the city of New York attest that the value of the products in 1880 exceeded the wages paid and the value of the materials employed, to the amount of \$201,450,022 which is more than fifty per cent. gross profit, and the average wages paid were about one dollar and twenty-five cents per day. These facts incontestably prove that the manufacturers of the City of New York can abundantly afford to pay their employees higher wages, but they never do it except when they are compelled by successful strikes. Hence New York City is a nucleus of perpetual warfare between Labor and Capital.

With these facts before us where is the use of

prating about the advantages of Protection to the toiling classes of America. Granted, that wages in the United States are one hundred per cent. higher than in Great Britain. The purchasing power of a dollar in England is from fifty to seventy-five per cent. greater than in the United States. Consequently the average condition of the wage-workers in England is nearly equal to the average condition of the wage-workers of America. Any impartial, fair-minded traveler, who has gone through the large cities of England and the United States, will attest that these statements are virtually true.

How, then, does protection protect American workmen? That it protects the manufacturers we all do know. But what of the workmen? Competition operates among like producers in the United States as it does in Great Britain; but profits are not ground down by it to so small a scale, as is shown by the enormous increase of wealth among the landlords, merchants and manufacturers during the past twenty years. On the other hand wages are gradually decreasing. The enormous immigration to the United States, of European artisans, farm-hands and laborers, produces a competition which reduces wages to a minimum, while at the same time it increases the riches of the wealthy. This is the immediate cause of all the strikes that are now and have been taking place during the past decade, and the strikes are on the increase. We may, therefore, anticipate solidier combinations of Trades Unions in the

future, whose united power will be wielded against aggressive capital ; supplemented, perhaps, by bitterness, riot and bloodshed.

Thus are we instructed alike in Republics as in Monarchies, that like causes always produce like effects. The monopoly of the land and competition, under Free Trade or protection, will ultimately reduce the wage-workers in every country to abject destitution. Nor would it avail for good if every nation were Free Trade, or every nation adopted Protection. So long as the toiling millions are prohibited from gaining free access to the soil, to the extent of their needs, there is absolutely no hope for them. Granted this natural and inalienable right, grinding poverty would cease ; and monopolies of all sorts would ultimately become an impossibility.

In the preceding papers, on Macleod and George, I have shown the precise causes of penury and destitution among the industrious poor, outside of the effects produced by transgressions of physiological law or domestic economy. Therein have I shown that man's selfishness has overridden the Law of Nature and of Justice which have ordained the pricelessness of all natural things and forces. Every rational mind may behold this law, for it inheres in the nature of things. The monopoly and sale of land are the primary cause of all the despotisms and social agony of the world. Aristocracies are based on it, and would therefore be impossible without it. Remove

this selfish iniquity from the heart of man, then co-operation would take the place of monopoly and competition. Had the Pilgrim Fathers, and their immediate descendants, been as wise as they were religious ; had they perceived the law of the pricelessness of natural things and forces, including the mental and physical forces in man ; and had they also perceived the law that WORK is the only economic quantity that is commercially exchangeable, no rational mind could doubt that the social status of the American people would be altogether different from what it now is.

Had they started a civilization with a recognition of the fact, as Moses and Isaiah did—THAT LAND SHOULD NOT BE SOLD OR MONOPOLIZED ;—they would have seen that Rent was an immoral tax. They would also have seen, what all wage-workers now experience but do not see, that those who work for wages pay the rents, the profits, the dividends, the interest on capital, and the taxes, and are, at the same time ground as between the upper and nether mill-stones of monopoly and competition. This is what we do now see, but what our Pilgrim Fathers did not see. Nor did the framers of the Declaration of Independence behold these great truths ; for had they done so, they would doubtless have given them statutory force by putting them into the Constitution, the fundamental law of the land.

What they failed to do, we *must* do sooner or later. The laws of God are supreme and must be secularized.

Wisdom must combine with religious zeal to overthrow existing evils, by planting in their stead a social system having Natural Law for a foundation, with wisdom, religion and love, the building materials,—the bricks and mortar for a new social state. One thing is certain, there must be an end of unrighteous greed or there can be no peace. We must do not as statesmen who see the light and then shrink into base conservatism, but boldly declare the will of God. Nothing short of this will help a suffering world, travailing in poverty, which is not of God but of man.

Moreover, honest toil asks not for charity, or even a magnanimous use of riches. Honest toil demands its own, believing that "*the produce of labor is the natural recompense or wages of labor.*" Nor does it require or demand a fictitious value of the things it produces, on the principle of supply and demand. For no demand can make a product or service worth *more* than the work put into it. Nor can any amount of supply make a product or service worth any *less* than the amount of work put into it. What righteous toil demands is Justice. Give labor this, then there would be no more rent ; no interest ; no increase ; and, consequently, no wasteful wars ; no unjust taxation ; no poor-houses ; no State-prisons ; no houses of ill fame ; and woman would assume her rightful prerogative in the State, and would no longer be the tool of the selfishness and tyranny of man. There would be no Customs Houses and therefore no customs dues. Free Trade .

would be universal, because the exchangeable value of all labor-products and services would be determined by the amount of work wrought into them. Justice would wield the sceptre of power. Pure, practical Christianity would then gain a foothold and become a truly regenerating force in the social state, instead of being the hypocritical and ostentatious thing it now is. The possibility of its realization would no longer be deemed a chimera, but a substantial reality of which the world at present has no adequate conception. Charity would cease to be charity, and in its stead we should have magnanimity and love emulating the Almighty in an honest, unselfish endeavor to build up the kingdom of righteousness and love into the pillars of the social state.

If you, dear Reader, do not see that these good effects would logically flow from a cessation of the monopoly and sale of land ; if you do not see that rent would be impossible where no one had more land than he could individually use ; if you do not see that profit is the effect of rent, and interest the effect of profit ; if you do not see that the wage system is the effect of land monopoly ; if you do not see that poverty among industrious wage-workers, aside from what they spend in intoxicants and pleasure, is the effect of rent, profit, interest and taxation ; and that these are based upon and caused by the monopoly and sale of land ; if you do not see that crimes of all sorts are largely the result of destitution ; if you do not see that State prisons are the effect of injustice and

avarice, backed by defensive laws which perpetuate this gigantic iniquity, viz.: *The monopoly and sale of land*; if you cannot see that the artificial, *anti-Christian* civilization in which we live, generates a festering injustice and moral rot—then I confess my inability to enlighten you.

Moreover, if you can not see that obedience to the will of God is the salvation of the nations; if you cannot see that statute law, when it shall be made to harmonize with the Revealed Law, in reference to the monopoly and sale of land, usury and increase, will help to bring peace and plenty; if you cannot see that such measures of righteousness would undermine this stupendous fabric of social injustice, called *modern civilization*, with its caste of wealth, and its caste of poverty, and remove the inherent extremes of bloated satiety on the one hand, and pinching wretchedness on the other—Then I say, there is no hope for the toiling masses of this generation. Reform becomes a forlorn hope, and the kingdom of God an unrealizable dream.

Workingmen! A word to you in particular, and I am done.

I have shown the injustice and despotism of competition. No combination of Trades Unions will ever release you from its relentless grind and tyranny. Nor will your selfishness by preventing young men and young women, from learning a trade, help you. Nor will your tyranny against "scabs" help you. Nor will your asso-

ciated efforts to gain higher wages by strikes help you, except as a means of agitation. Agitation is better, far better, than indifference and deathly stagnation. But you are powerless as against the inexorable force of universal competition. Moreover, your strikes militate against the interests of the working-women, who as a class do not strike ; because an increase of your wages lessens the purchasing power of their wages which impoverishes them to enrich you.

For more than one hundred years American working-men have struck against the grind of competition. You might as well attempt to stem the torrent of Niagara with a broom, as to imagine for one moment that your strikes will arrest the crushing power of universal competition combined with the monopoly of the land. This is a gloomy picture, I grant. It is well, however, to state the facts as they are. For hundreds of years the workingmen of Europe have struck against the tyranny of monopoly and competition, but all to no successful end.

Soberly, then, "*What are you going to do about it ?*" Will injustice to Chinamen gain justice for you ? Will the abolition of competitive convict labor gain for you the product of your toil, while outside competition grinds you to misery and despair ? Will monopoly, protected by law, yield to your appeals for justice, and the cry of your children for bread ? Money has power, and rich men will buy the votes of workingmen by the bushel when the contest at the ballot-box comes around. 'Tis

hard for the very poor and the idle to resist these powerful temptations. But woe be unto them from whom these temptations and grievances come ! Better were it for them that a mill-stone were tied about their necks and they were cast into the sea.

Will a law which ordains that eight hours shall constitute a day's work annihilate competition, put money into the hands of parents and keep the children from those death-traps, the cotton and woolen-mills, and fetid workshops of the world ? Will the prohibition of factory child-labor, under fourteen years of age, send them to school, clothe their backs, feed their stomachs or educate their hearts and brains ? Will these things stop the eternal grind of competition, or crush the power of monopoly ? Away with all such delusions ! Nothing will stop these Titanic forces except EDUCATION and the repeal of all laws which sustain Injustice.

There are innumerable rich men with grand and magnanimous hearts, who are as ignorant as the poor of the blighting causes of the poverty of the many. And there are thousands of rich men who have hearts of adamant, —proud, cold, selfish, tyrannical, cruel and unyielding. But the agitation and the education must go on. We must show the rich and the poor alike that the bottom cause of Nihilism, German Socialism, French Communism, Irish Rebellion, Labor Reform and Strikes—is THE MONOPOLY AND SALE OF LAND. No one should have or occupy any more land than he can economically

use, or than can be profitably applied in co-operative industry.

A selfish act done without regard to the rights of others is an act of injustice. Therefore do I advise repeal. This advice would be unnecessary if monopoly did not thwart legitimate competition, and if there were no fixed salaries out of all proportion to the actual service rendered. As working-men and working-women are the chief victims of competition, while the monopolists in a large measure escape it, I therefore say—**REPEAL THE LAWS.** Take away the power of the State which defends these rapacious corporations and let them stand or fall on their own merits. How long would they then remain common robbers? Just so long as they would be able, of themselves, to defend their gigantic iniquities.

How long, without defensive laws, would the monopolists of the coal mines and petroleum oil of Pennsylvania, hold iniquitous possession? How long would the land monopolists hold their vast estates? The gold monopolists, the gold mines? The stone monopolists, the quarries? The lead monopolists, the lead mines? The iron monopolists, the iron mines? The copper monopolists, the copper mines? The silver monopolists, the silver mines? And the timber monopolists, the forests of the nation? 'Tis the greed of abnormal selfishness that produces the extremes in society, and causes the downfall of nations.

Protection and Free Trade are but forms of abnormal

selfishness, and both are powerless to help you. Protection and Free Trade protect manufactures only. Strikes will not save you. The abolition of competitive State-prison labor will not save you. Laws preventing Chinese immigration will not save you. Nothing will save you except Christianity, which is practical Justice and Love, taking possession of the human heart. Nor will that spirit of selfishness, which you condemn in the successful rich and which you would so readily practice had you the chance, save you. Would you in the spirit of greed monopolize land, take rent, profit, interest, dividends or any unearned increment to the impoverishment of others? then are you no better than those whom you condemn for doing likewise.

I beseech you, then, for the sake of yourselves ; for the sake of your children and your children's children ; for the sake of justice and humanity every where, that you combine as a unit, to repeal the iniquitous laws that crush you, and at the same time persuade rich men to help you. Then will you be blessed of your children, and blessed of God in your righteous and praiseworthy endeavor.

