

THE PROTECTIONIST

A Monthly Magazine of Political Science
and Industrial Progress.

Signed articles are not to be understood as expressing the views of the editor or publishers.

VOL. XXXII.

MAY, 1920

No. 1

PROTECTION FOR HOME INDUSTRIES AND THE HOME MARKET.

In the early days New England was interested in agriculture and in shipping. Its moneyed men had large investments in ships engaged in the overseas trade, and strong objections were raised in New England to high duties on manufactured goods because the shipping interests felt that they would decrease their cargoes. Then there came a period when New England money sought investment in manufacturing enterprises, and New England became a strong advocate of protective duties. Today manufacturing establishments have reached such a size that they feel that foreign markets are necessary to absorb the surplus product of the plant, and demands have been made for free raw materials used in manufacturing. The shoe manufacturers were among the first to adopt this position. They demanded free hides in order that they might extend their foreign trade. Today many of our most prominent wool manufacturers are demanding free wool to enable them to meet the products of foreign manufacturers on more equal terms in the foreign markets.

The Home Market Club has consistently maintained that the advantages of the protective policy should

be available to all American industries, agricultural as well as manufacturing, and we have steadily pointed out that the only great American industry that has declined since the Civil War has been our merchant marine, and that this decline was due to the fact that our shipping enjoyed no protection on the part of our laws. Our ships were compelled to meet the competition of foreign shipping which was manned and maintained at a cost much less than the cost of running an American ship. Necessarily the American ships were driven from the sea.

We have continued to point out that the American market is far more valuable to American business men than the foreign market, and have insisted upon the need of protective duties to safeguard our labor and our industries. England was a protective tariff nation until it felt strong enough to meet world-wide competition on equal terms, and then it adopted, in 1846, a modified system of free trade, although it persistently maintained some form of protection for its merchant marine.

There are men in this country who claim that the United States has now become strong and powerful enough

ENGLAND'S AIM—TO BE THE WORKSHOP OF THE WORLD.

An Old Fallacy Revamped and Again Rejected.

By Robert Ellis Thompson, LL. D.

The remarkable book by Mr. Keynes of Cambridge University, "The Economic Results of the War," is so strong in its statistics and its conclusions, that one is surprised to find from its introductory chapter how much behind the times its author is in his views of political economy. After all that John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, William R. Greg, William T. Thornton, and above all, Henry C. Carey, have written to banish the old economic ghosts, "Pressure of Population upon Subsistence," "Diminishing Returns from the Soil," and "The Wage Fund," these still go spooking through the pages of a man thoroughly up to date on many points.

His account of the condition of Europe and America in the decade preceding the war is made to turn upon Malthusianism and its related fallacies. If the war had not come there would have been, none the less, a battle for very existence between the stronger and weaker countries and classes. And indeed the war has averted nothing, so that we may look forward to an economic chaos growing out of the lack of adaptation of this planet to the needs of the race created to occupy and use it.

One must never forget Walter Bagehot's saying that "English Political Economy is Political Economy made for England." It has the look of an impartial and abstract study of the whole world, or even all the

possible worlds. Ricardo writes page after page without a reference to anything that ever occurred in this world. But his conclusions generally amount to a justification of what England has done or is doing; a proof that her most arbitrary acts are but the working out of natural laws. So the Malthusian law of population and the Ricardian theory of Rent justify the existence of the greatest abundance and the deepest want alongside each other as "natural, and if natural, entirely right and proper."

The supposal of "diminishing returns from the soil," sums up the false theories of land and population, and furnishes exactly the vindication of her national policy which England needs. Stated exactly, it runs: "After a limit easily reached, the application of more labor to the soil meets with a diminishing return," so that a country which has a dense population will do well to divert the labor of its people from agriculture to what has been called "the more profitable industries," and especially to manufactures. This covers the English situation, and is supposed to vindicate her economic policy.

Be it noted that this diminished return occurs "after a limit easily reached." There are of course situations in which labor may be wasted on an area too small for profitable cultivation. If a man

chose to devote all his strength to the tillage of a square yard of ground, he certainly would be wasting his time. But this is not the case in view, for that is a limit which never is reached in any country under heaven.

It is the case of England which is in view. "The United Kingdom" has a population of 373 to the square mile, while Belgium has 653 and the Netherlands 494. The "pressure of population upon subsistence" must be greatest in Belgium, and that especially in the more northern or Flemish provinces, as those provinces are mainly agricultural, the manufactures lying in the more southern or Walloon provinces. The soil of Flemish Belgium was originally the poorest in western Europe, being partly peat-bog and partly gravel-bank. Yet Flemish Belgium not only feeds its 1600 to the square mile, but exports food to southern England. And its farmers, working on six to eight acres of land, save more of their earnings than do the English.

Let us suppose that Great Britain were cultivated as Belgium is, by small farmers generally owning their land, would she need to import food to feed her people either in war or in peace? Without taking another acre under cultivation, she could grow wheat enough to feed them all and for export. And an official report made in 1873 to the House of Lords stated that thousands of acres lay unused, being not even parks and groves, but sheer waste.

Why this waste? In the closing years of the eighteenth century England formed the purpose to become

"the workshop of the world,"—to carry on those "more profitable industries" for which she has gathered her labor into the big manufacturing cities, and has set her mind upon cheapening production to the point at which no other country could compete with her.

She definitely abandoned the ambition to feed her people from her own harvests, when she repealed the Corn Laws in 1846, and threw open her wheat market to all the world. The unsophisticated Englishman mourned to see the "grass growing on both sides of the railroads," as he rushed through land which once bore the finest wheat harvests in western Europe. "Where are your wheat-fields?" I asked a farmer cousin of mine in northern Lancashire. "There is not one in all this countryside," he replied. "If I grew wheat it would cost me as much to send it to Liverpool as it costs your Minnesota farmer to send it there."

Under the peril of starvation, and "with Famine in the offing," England used many sorts of encouragement to increase her wheat-crop in the years of the war. To some extent she succeeded, but the whole of that harvest would not have saved the people, if the German submarines had gone on sinking her ships of commerce, and if the war had lasted another year. But with the return of peace she throws aside the lessons of the war. She is bracing herself to reassert her commanding position as "the workshop of the world." "If there be one thing more than another which this country is determined upon it is that it shall not be beaten in the commercial race

by the United States," says Sir E. H. Williams in The British Weekly.

It may be objected that the law of "diminishing returns from the soil" is found at work in our own country, and that in many places the soil bears distinctly less than in its native condition. That is true enough of those parts of America where what an eminent scientific man calls "land-butcery" prevails instead of farming. When a so-called "farmer" gets possession of a piece of land and sets himself to see how much he can extract from the soil without a thought of posterity or of the land's continual usefulness, then the farm will lose its productive power. There is a great deal of this to be seen in our Middle West. The immense fertility of the great wheat belt has been almost destroyed by such "land-butcery," and those who achieved this are pressing up into Canada to finish it. It is the same with corn-land. When I came back from the West in 1866 and told some Philadelphians that I had seen a man stand up in his stirrups and try to reach the tassel on a corn-stalk, I was charged with dealing in "travellers' tales." But the Kansas exhibition eight years later showed that I was not. I am told, however, that on some parts of that black prairie soil stalks as tall as that still grow, but with no ears! That is the outcome of taking the nitrates and other elements out of the soil-year after year, and putting nothing back.

The Germans of Pennsylvania do not farm that way. Some years ago I had to ride on the trolley from Allentown to Kutztown, through a valley which had been under cultivation

for a century and a half. The wheat grew so thick that it seemed impossible to thrust a pencil between the stalks. The clover looked like a dense carpet that one might walk on. And yet even their farming leaves much room for improvement. A manufacturer from our city spent a summer holiday among them, studying their methods and their merits. As he was leaving he sent them a letter through one of our best weekly newspapers, the substance of which was: "If I conducted my factory as you manage your farms, I should be bankrupt in three months." He especially blamed their waste of valuable material which might have been used to enrich the soil. They were depending too much upon growing after-crops of clover, and plowing this down with lime.

This wasteful farming has been much encouraged by the harvests being exported to a great distance, when its home consumption by a population engaged in other industries would have supplied many things to enrich the soil. *Mr.

*Prof. Thompson's reference to Henry C. Carey's statement of the value to a farming community of a home market for farm produce reminds the Editor of The Protectionist of the following letter received twenty-seven years ago from Edward Everett Hale:

LEND A HAND
Monthly

A Record of Progress
Edward E. Hale, D.D., Editor in Chief
3 Hamilton Place,
Boston, Mar. 6, 1868.

My Dear Sir:

I have read the March number of The Bulletin [now The Protectionist] with great pleasure. I always read it through, and I learn a great deal from it.

What you say at the end of the first page ought to be driven in. And I think you may like to copy a part of my letter on "Oppressed Farmers" on page 9—of Tom Torrey's Tariff Talks—which I send with this.

I wrote this after a visit to an old worn out and half deserted town as I knew it 50 years ago, which I found in 1868 cheerful, rich and happy, as a farming town, simply because of manufactures 10 or 12 miles away.

Yours truly,
(Signed) EDW. E. HALE.

Henry C. Carey used to say that the farmer who grew food for the home market was constantly improving a valuable instrument, while he who farmed for distant consumers was as constantly injuring and breaking it.

The protective policy, which has brought the artisan into neighborhood with the farmer, makes good farming possible. It enables exchanges between the two classes on terms advantageous to both, by effecting the transformation of food and raw materials into finished products at points in the neighborhood of both, and thus saving to both the costs of transportation. It keeps down the profits of the middle-man by making it possible for consumers to go past that class, and deal directly with the producers. And, as Adam Smith pointed out, it enables a far quicker overturn of capital than does commerce between distant points.

It will be remembered that my Philadelphian manufacturer contrasted farm methods with factory methods. Just there lay the secret of Belgian success. That Fleming district had been the leading centre of

manufactures in northern Europe, from the rise of towns in the later middle ages until James Watts' steam-engine entered the field of industry. So the venerable towns of that region — Antwerp, Bruges, Lisle, Ypres, Delfft, etc., lost their manufactures through having no cheap access to coal, and the region went back to farming. But they carried into their farming the habits of thrift, accuracy and alert intelligence they had learned in the workshop and lifted their naturally barren soil to the highest degree of productivity. Hence, fields in which no weed may grow; cattle in the stalls far beyond what England or any other rival can show; big farms bought up at high prices to distribute among small cultivators. For the rest see "The Rural Economy of Belgium," by Prof. Laveleye.

Why cannot England, with her far better soil, repeat that wonder? She will when the decay of her manufactures obliges her workers to change shops for farms, and get out of their heads the notion that life is unendurable apart from the music-hall and the moving pictures.

SOCIALISM, THE DEADLY ENEMY OF CHRISTIANITY.

By Josiah Fenton.

The fact that a few radical clergymen have become identified with the Socialist movement is not infrequently presented as conclusive evidence that Socialism and Christianity are in harmony with one another, when it simply means that a few individual preachers have not found Socialism inconsistent with their particular idea of "Christian-

ity," but a study of this movement and its mission compels one to agree with the assertion that a clergyman who can reconcile the doctrines of Christianity with those of Socialism has considerable to learn about one of the two—either he is a bad Christian or a bad Socialist.

One of the ministers who became a Socialist is George D. Herron. At