

International Free Trade Mr. Churchill's Ideal



Bearing on International Relations," and Mr. Churchill dealt with it at some length. In the course of his speech he was several times interrupted by suffragists.

Lord Welby occupied the chair, and, in declaring the congress open, said it was fitting that the first gathering of that kind should be held in the country which originally made Free Trade the maxim and principle of its government. The Cobden Club, which had organized the congress, was proud to receive so many economists and representatives of the doctrine which they held in common. It was true that at the present moment the prospects of Free Trade throughout the world might be said to be somewhat cloudy, and that protection was advancing in very aggressive fashion. But although in the ebb and flow of public opinion the tide for the moment seemed to be set against them, Free Traders had unflinching faith in their creed and in the conviction that the cause which promoted liberty at home and friendship and peace abroad was a cause which must ultimately triumph. (Cheers.)

Mr. Churchill, who was heartily cheered on rising to speak, said that he was glad to be able to sincerely welcome on behalf of His Majesty's Government the representatives of so many countries who had gathered in support of a great international cause. It was a source of pleasure to them that this country at the present moment should be the scene of such a meeting, and hold out hands which were grasped in return to Free Traders in every other land. So far as the first subject of discussion was concerned, Great Britain, he thought, had a substantial contribution to make. When they were asked to consider Free Trade in its relation to international affairs, they in Great Britain at any rate could afford a substantial object lesson; that it was possible for a nation to pursue a Free Trade policy and yet remain prosperous and powerful. (Cheers.) They brought to this discussion in the first place the evidence of a successful experiment. During the last 60 years this country had indulged in no tariff wars; it had fallen back on no elaborate devices, or too shrewdly calculated plans for negotiation or retaliation. Yet they found their goods entering all other countries of the world on as good terms as had ever been secured by any nation through the most elaborate use of fiscal measures. (Cheers.) We did not levy discriminating duties, nor did we seek artificially to stimulate our exports. Yet we found ourselves with a rich and fertile home market, and we found ourselves able, man for man, to export to foreign countries, in spite of their tariffs, more than twice as much as had ever been achieved in the history of the world. (Applause.) In spite of the fact that we levied our customs duties on a very small number of articles, we found no difficulty in raising an enormous revenue.

At this point Mr. Winston Churchill was interrupted by a suffragist who demanded political freedom for women. She was requested to keep silence, declined, and was removed from the hall.

So far as our colonies were concerned, Mr. Churchill continued, we had found that the extending to them, without any demand or request for exclusive preference in return of all that we might justly give from this country, had secured for us loyal, prosperous and profitable colonies. (Cheers.) It had enabled us when we came to consider those great tropical or equatorial possessions and protectorates, to secure for them, and for our control over them, an immense support from public opinion all over the world, because they were thrown open freely to the commerce of mankind to buy and barter as they would. (Cheers.) Lastly, he found that without making any provision to protect our coastwise trade, without embarking upon subsidies for shipping lines, we had been fortunate enough to procure and preserve in unexampled measure the greatest share in the carrying trade of the whole world. That, he held, was a substantial contribution to the discussion of Free Trade in its international aspect. After sixty years of being "ruined" (laughter), after years of being "walled in" by hostile tariffs, of paying the taxes of all other people beside our own (laughter), we found ourselves still unrepentant, still conducting business on an unexampled and gigantic scale, and still with a shot in the locker for a rainy day. (Applause.)

But we could not close our eyes to the fact that many of the most curious delusions still claimed a large measure of popular support. They knew how numerous was that school of thought, and how powerful in every country, which believed that a balance—an adverse balance—of imports must be defrayed by an immense drain of golden sovereigns. They knew how largely spread was the opinion that there was in the world a definite, limited heap of trade for which all had to scramble, and which, when it was exhausted, left unfortunate competitors absolutely starving. They knew that the delusion that it was possible for a nation to raise its revenue at the expense of other people in lands far beyond its territorial sovereignty or control was still widely and persistently shared. How evil in their nature, how injurious in their character were all these suspicions and superstitions. (Applause.) Did they not every one of them march towards a common point of ill-will and distrust between nations of the world?

Another woman rose in the audience, and shouted: "Give us freedom; let us have freedom for women before Free Trade." There were angry cries of "Turn her out," and the interrupter was quietly removed, protesting vehemently. They believed, Mr. Churchill continued, that all these misconceptions, which were so sedulously fostered, tended only to disunion, but they could only delay the march of mankind towards a more harmonious synthesis. (Applause.) How absurd it was continually to employ the language of war and the metaphors of war, in relation to the peaceful transactions of commerce. (Hear, hear.) (Yet another woman arose and cried: "Let women have freedom; we only come here to claim the political right you are claiming." The interrupter was turned out.) Proceeding, Mr. Churchill said that whereas in war both parties lost, whoever won in commerce out of every peaceful transaction there was an advantage for both parties. (Applause.) Every transaction that took place between nations rendered a fresh transaction possible. If exchange were multiplied goodwill was increased and there was increased international security. (Hear, hear.) We were often invited to suppose that nations traded with one another as nations. That was a misconception. Individuals in different nations traded with one another, and the most severe competition which the manufacturer had to face was not the competition of the foreigner, but of his fellow countrymen. The welfare of nations must be judged relatively. It did not matter very much that a man should be able to say, "I have had a better dinner than you." What mattered was that he should be able to say, "I have had enough." (Applause.) Of all these points of view, was there a single one from which it could be said that Free Trade did not increase good will, trust, and mutual confidence between races and different peoples of the world; and was there one among the counter propositions of the protectionists which did not arrest and delay that great and noble programme? He was prepared to admit, however, that there was a certain conflict between the international and cosmopolitan conception of Free Trade and the highly nationalized, crudely nationalized—embattled—ambitions which they saw around them in the modern world. There was a difference unquestionably and it must be the part and constant duty of the Free Trader to labor to abate undue national rivalry, and to dissipate all forms of national jealousies. There was no form of international rivalry so destructive, so perilous, so crushing, and so burdensome as the interna-

tional rivalry in respect to armaments. (Cheers.) Some further interruption came at this point from another suffragist, who protested against "freedom to women." "How did she get in; that's the question?" was asked, while the interrupter was conducted outside. Mr. Churchill went on to say that the bearing of Free Trade upon international relations was expressed in one word—peace. The fundamental idea of Protection was exclusion and isolation; the fundamental idea of Free Trade was unity and interdependence. The arrangement of the Great Powers which the protectionists contemplated was that there should be a number of powerful self-contained states, producing within their own border everything necessary for peaceful industry or warfare preparation; independent of their neighbors, requiring scarcely any services and rendering but few in return, and the complete breaking up of commercial or diplomatic relations with the minimum of inconvenience. The conception of the European arrangement to which the Free Trader looked forward was a co-operative commonwealth. (Cheers.) A great combining together of all the peoples of Europe, of Christendom, ultimately of all the world, so that their affairs and interests should become inextricably interwoven, so that they

would not be able to trade apart, even if they would; a vast interdependent federation. This Free Trade policy was not only the surest, but the only road to international peace. (Applause.) As to clouded prospects, he never had been more confident than now. (Cheers.) Never more confident of the triumph in this country and in the world, of the ideas which they exalted and respected in common. With every improvement in inter-communication, with every decision of The Hague Tribunal, with every decision of the League of Nations, with every decision of the interdependence of civilized modern communities was advancing steadily and irresistibly. (Cheers.) The solidarity of the world grew stronger from year to year, and the men in all the lands had become necessary to one another. (Hear, hear.) This process of consolidation and amalgamation was going on irresistibly and without the slightest loss of national traditions, or love of national characteristics, and without hindering the culture and development of each community in itself and for itself.

What was it that preserved the peace of Europe at the present time? Ministers could do much; kings and presidents could do much—and they took every opportunity of recognizing the services of those who occupied great places had rendered to the cause of international peace. He asked their foreign friends, who were gathered there, to pardon British insular pride if they placed as the leading spirit among sovereigns in the movement King Edward VII. (Cheers.) But in spite of all the efforts which were being made—and which were growing from year to year—by individuals and sections of this country or that, he would not feel the assurance which he did of the peaceful development of international politics, if it were not for the blessed intercourse of trade and commerce binding nations together in spite of their wills very often, unconsciously and unceasingly weaving them into one solid mass. During nearly 40 years no two great, highly organized, commercial Powers had drawn the sword upon one another. Crises there had been, and quarrels and disputes, great headlines in the newspapers, long faces pulled by wisecracks, flashing teeth by fierce military and journalistic men. (Laughter and cheers.) But something always happened at the critical moment to smooth away the difficulty before it broke into actual rupture. What was that something? It was the prosaic bond of commerce, in which all civilized and commercial states were becoming involved. Sure he was of this: that thoughts of the certain impoverishment of every one, of the crash of exchanges all over the world, of the widespread ruin which would go through neutral lands, of the arrest of trade, of the collapse of credit upon which modern communities depended, all these tremendous factors imposed an effective caution and restraint upon the most reckless and intemperate of statesmen. They found that the great force of capital, the great, subtle, omnipresent influence of capital was engaged and interested through every channel in averting the opening of hostilities. And if capital was enlisted on the side of internationalism, what of labor? Was there not a similar movement on the part of the workers, was there not an assertion on the part of the toilers that they were members of one family, bearers of one burden, and that they would not allow masses of human beings to be precipitated at each other's throats in fratricidal strife. (Cheers.)

Looking to the Future

He did not think they need be afraid of the clouds which, perhaps, had gathered. They had gathered before, and had been dispersed before; and Free Trade had always emerged the stronger for every attack made upon it. They might look forward, he thought, with confidence to the days when the rivalry of nations would be confined to a struggle for just pre-eminence in the arts and sciences, in learning and in peaceful industry, when their pride would be to boast of the highest development and the widest extension of comfort and culture among the masses of the people, when customs house officers and those engaged in the purposes of warlike preparation would have followed the mammoth into a deserved extinction. When that time arrived it would be the pride of those gathered at that congress to have taken a part in the advancement of such glorious and happy conclusions, and he trusted that it would be their part in this small island to have kept the lamp of economic truth burning brightly and steadily during years of doubt and darkness and delay, feeling confident that under the mild calm rays of that lamp the time would come when all the nations of the earth would dwell together in justice and in peace. (Cheers.)

As soon as Mr. Churchill had resumed his seat two more women rose, shrieking "Votes for women." They were promptly removed.

In the course of the discussion which followed, Prince de Cassano spoke of the position of Free Trade in Italy.

An old couple in Glasgow were in a very depressed state owing to dull trade.

Thinking their son in America would help them, they wrote, stating their trouble, and that if he did not help them they would have to go to the poorhouse.

Three weeks passed, and then came a letter from their son, saying:

"Dear Mither and Faither—Just wait an' they fortnicht an' I'll come hame an' gang wi' ye. Your affectionate son."



sarily headlong impression proc what they hear outside Australia in a hasty visit Keir Hardie, for a character that much less serious himself, is found ial loyalty is me the idea of Emp all." Mr. Keir doubt, inevitably exigencies of pa they are held by Englishmen, wh against the grain with a similar in then is misleading it certainly is, it

The explanation place, the major Australia leave i ence of Australia perience was nat own political cree men (and these) tralia mainly thro of older families o for hospitality an lightenment they stances were at high judgment, going astray. B ences in young c intense; not onl fixed between so and politics, whi Finally, society, c tified with hope the country to w is antagonistic a lows that the which Englishme congenial and ho friends is seldom kindest light upo young Australia carry that comm opinions formed different point o seems to acquie which it is diffic

All such evide one fact—that the Australian feeling as despite the cleav religious belief, innum of commo ing a great major in Australia not is, in fact, only opinion is for p and clear—that keeping Australia exists of sufficien distinctively Aus lian sentiment is rather negative i that is, are dete work out her owa divided as to wha visitor who exp coaches or in tr place, Australian to exist only by world. Australian of national c ethnologists; the people, different race. But there Confine the conv casual acquainta the coach seems like a cloak. H but a Queenslan tor, or a labor m ist, with a polit own desires and Cavour's great d Italy, which I ap suggests a form of popular ideas applicable to Aus real union upon repeat, is the wh respects—if the the strain—the c resembling unice almost wholly co top notes.

What part is ern music by I answer, none at agree with Mr.

Mr. Long on the Unionist Policy



Mr. Long, M. P., was the principal guest at a dinner given by the 1900 Club at the Prince's restaurant. Mr. Chaplin, M. P., the president, occupied the chair, and proposed "The Guest of the Evening."

He said he could have no more congenial task. Mr. Long entered Parliament in 1880. He remembered remarking of their guest after hearing him make his maiden speech that he was a man who would be a great light of the Tory party—for there was no Unionist party in those days. When Lord Salisbury formed his Government in 1895 he asked him (Mr. Chaplin), as one who in his previous Government had been Minister for Agriculture, who was the best man to appoint as the new minister, and he replied, "Walter Long, of course." (Cheers.) Mr. Long was appointed to the office, and filled it with a success that was remembered to this day. From that day to this Mr. Long had pursued his political career in much higher offices with equal success in every one of them. At a moment's notice and at a most critical time he took upon himself the extremely difficult and most onerous and responsible position of secretary to the lord lieutenant of Ireland. It was an open secret that at that time he had been offered a far higher position—namely, the head of the admiralty. He was a lover of sport, and there was no member of the Unionist party at the present moment who was more personally popular than he. (Cheers.)

Mr. Long, who was warmly received, in response, after thanking the members of the club for the cordial way in which they had honored the toast, expressed his belief that the Government's misdeeds formed a much more eloquent exposition of their incapacity to govern than any statement which could be made by public speakers. (Hear, hear.) It was much more important for them to consider what was the position that the Unionist party was called upon to assume than to criticize the legislation of their opponents. We had in politics today a third party, which was industrious, assiduous in the prosecution of its aims, and by no means incompetent in the way in which it approached its labors. The Labor party was able

to present a policy which was not altogether unattractive to many people, and although it was the fashion in some quarters to laugh at it, he believed it would be wiser to face it as a reality in public life. Above all, they should face this fact—at least he believed it to be a fact—that if the two great parties in the state were found wanting in power to govern, whether from a sense of hopelessness or from a desire to try something new, the people of the country might be led in despair to turn to another and a new party, and if they were to do that, he for one believed that the future of this country would be dangerously imperilled. (Cheers.) Therefore, he held that the Unionist party must face the position as it really existed, and make up its mind whatever might be the sacrifice, to go forward to the goal they had marked out for themselves. What was that goal? In domestic legislation there was much to be done to improve the condition of the masses. (Hear, hear.) That could be done, must be done, without appeals to the cupidity and selfishness of the people themselves. If the Unionist party were going to win—and a victory meant more than a mere party triumph, it meant the whole future of this great Empire—they would do it by one method alone, and that was by realizing that the working classes were not the enemy, selfish-minded people that their opponents might lead one to suppose. (Hear, hear.) The working classes were as great Imperialists as they themselves were, and if they appealed to and placed before them the great ideals represented by the Empire, they would not shrink from supporting the efforts to carry on the work of the Empire. He believed that it was from the conviction of the importance of our Imperial destiny that the greatest colonial minister this country had ever seen initiated the policy which was now known as fiscal reform. (Cheers.) No doubt he had in mind also the necessities of this country for a greater share in the prosperity of the world in connection with her trade and industry, but the governing idea in his mind, as a study of his speeches would show, was that something must be done to bring the colonies closer to the Mother Country. (Cheers.) The problem that this country had to face—and the problem, he believed, would be solved only by the Unionist

party—was some scheme of Imperial federation which would make this country in reality a great Empire. If he were asked why it was that he had been a warm and cordial adherent of the policy of fiscal reform, he would reply in one sentence—Because he believed that the policy of preference was the first and strongest step towards Imperial federation and the great ideal for which they should all work. (Cheers.) This subject had produced some differences in their own party. He had been one of those who had said all along that these differences were to be overcome by the process of time, by persuasion, by argument, and not by force. (Hear, hear.) How wonderful had been the progress of this movement in the country in the last three years. It was a pathetic thing that the great statesman who gave utterance to the first views, at all events, in their later form, of this question should be deemed to have ill-health from taking any part in the present movement (hear, hear), but it must be to him a source of very great satisfaction to know that the seed which he had sown was already bearing fruit. (Cheers.) Why was it progressing? Was it because hope was held out that if the policy were adopted home industries would be strengthened and encouraged? No doubt that had some effect, but he believed the reason which moved men's minds more than anything else was based upon the conviction that the colonies and the Mother Country must be united, and that that was one of the ties which would unite them. (Cheers.) He did not believe that any man in this country who entertained the policy of fiscal reform or of Imperial federation would give one vote or say one word which would have the result of rendering the position of the working classes in any degree harder than it was at present. What they held was that the United Kingdom could not go on in the present changed conditions as it had gone on in the last 50 or 60 years. We must face the change which was necessary if we were to make the colonies and the Motherland really one. It was because he regarded preference as a step in that direction that he believed in it as a great reform which this country would be called upon to adopt. (Cheers.)

The health of the chairman was afterwards drunk, at the instance of Sir Joseph Lawrence.

Reviewing the History of Infantry in War



REVIEWING the book just issued by Colonel E. M. Lloyd, "The History of Infantry," the London Standard says: The subject chosen by Colonel Lloyd is so vast that when one finds it dealt with in a volume of less than

est outline, of the origin and development of the foot soldier. The anticipation is strengthened when the period reviewed is found to open with the days of the Spartan nation in arms and the chronicles of Herodotus, and that it is closed with criticisms of the Manchurian campaign of 1906. This opinion is, however, speedily dispelled by a perusal of Colonel Lloyd's work. Concisely expressed, and written in admirable style, it is a compendium of most valuable information concerning the organization, arms, equipment, and achievements of infantry from the earliest times. As a rule, the tendency with authors of historical reviews of this nature is to clog their writing with over-much quotation. The extent to which Colonel Lloyd must have been tempted in this direction can be judged by the long list of authors consulted which he appends to his book; but the excess is never indulged in, quotations are rigidly excluded unless it is necessary for illustration or emphasis, and it is never allowed to interfere with continuity of narration. To the student of national military characteristics and to all who are interested in the evolution of tactics, manoeuvre, and the development of the science

of war, Colonel Lloyd's work will afford a fund of information and prove a valuable book of reference.

The following passage from one of Bacon's Essays is, perhaps, as perfect an epitome of the History of Infantry as could be devised:

"The changes and vicissitudes in wars are many, but chiefly in three things—in the seats and stages of the war; in the weapons; and in the manner of the conduct. . . . For the conduct of the war at the first men rested upon number. They did put the wars likewise upon main force and valor. Pointing days for pitched fields and so trying it out upon an even match. And they were more ignorant in ranging and arraying their battles. After they grew to rest upon number rather competent than vast. They grew to advantages of place, cunning diversions, and the like—and they grew more skilful in the ordering of their battles. . . . In those lines we have a précis of Colonel Lloyd's review and a short statement of the facts from which he derives the most salient lesson of his book that throughout the changing ages the main principles of tactics and the essentials of military success have remained unaltered.

Alexander trusted to irresistible weight in attack. The mediaeval Frenchman relied on the valor of the individual knight. The strength of the contemporary Englishman lay in skilful archery. The Swiss achieved renown by dash

and mobility. The Spaniard by aptitude for warlike instruction. The Dutchman by stubborn courage. But whatever the nationality and age, Colonel Lloyd traces the application of the same fundamental laws, modified only by the accident of varying topography or development of weapons. Whatever the period, and whatever the nationality of the combatants, success attends discipline and training. Epaminondas was but an early exponent of the same military system and school of thought, in which, two thousand years later, Gustavus Adolphus became the first great European expert—consummate both in training troops for war and in handling them on the stricken field.

One point to be gathered from the history of infantry deserves special note. At no period of the centuries reviewed can any instance be discovered of a nation deliberately postponing its training for war until the gage of battle had been thrown down. The nearest approach to such a situation is perhaps that of Gambetta's "popular army" in 1870-71, concerning Moltke wrote: "An armed crowd is very far from being an army." The American civil war might be suggested as another instance, but it scarcely holds good owing to the unique circumstance of both sides being equally untrained.

This is but one of the reflections which are suggested by Colonel Lloyd's book. Many are the vistas which it opens up.