

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

#### TO WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

November 6, 1912.

For The Public.

The smoke of battle clears, and victory  
Rests on the banners of the mighty host  
That, through long years of unrequited toil,  
Has fought the fight of ancient liberty.  
But where the General, whose leadership  
Has won for us the lofty citadel?  
Shall he not now be given the highest gift  
That lies within our power to bestow?  
Shall he not now receive the sweet reward  
Of labor long and faithfully performed?  
Nay, not for him the mere emolument  
Of office; nay, a higher place be his!  
Our John the Baptist he, whose silver voice  
Still calls upon his fellows to repent,  
And in their desert lives a way to make  
Where Heaven's own King may enter in and reign.  
Our Moses he, whose hand has led us forth,  
E'en to the border of the promised land  
Of governmental truth and righteousness;  
Who stands upon the mountain-top and points  
The way to honors that he may not share.  
Our noble Captain he, content to stay  
And share the burdens of the rank and file,  
He stoops, with smile upon his face benign,  
To press the laurel on another's brow.

GERTRUDE V. JAMES.



### BRYAN'S ARGUMENT FOR FREE RAW MATERIALS.

Extracts from the Speech of William J. Bryan at  
Dallas, Texas, September 14, 1909. From  
The Commoner of September 24, 1909.

A tariff upon raw material is a hindrance to the export of the manufactured article. If the American manufacturer must compete in foreign markets with a manufacturer who has free raw material, the American manufacturer is handicapped to that extent. If he can compete now with that handicap he could compete still better without it. We cannot hope for a wide extension of our export trade without free raw material. The only way to relieve an American manufacturer of the handicap placed upon him by a tax on raw materials is to give him a rebate on imported raw material when such material is used in articles made for export; but a rebate not only contemplates the sale of the American article abroad more cheaply than at home, but it discourages the purchase of American raw material by manufacturers who export.

It has been urged that free raw material is an indirect form of protection to manufacturers. It

is true that free raw material is a benefit to the manufacturer who is engaged in exporting, but when an American manufacturer sells at home he always has a compensatory duty on the manufactured product. When a tax is imposed upon his raw material, the manufacturer is given a corresponding duty on his manufactured product, so that he transfers the tax to the consumer. It would be of no advantage to the manufacturer to give him free raw material if a corresponding reduction is made in the tariff upon the manufactured product; and such a reduction is always contemplated, whether made at the time or at some future time. . . .

When a man votes for a tariff on raw material he understands that there will be a corresponding increase in the tariff on the manufactured product, and if he votes intelligently he knows that the benefits which he gives to the producer of raw material will be collected at last from the man who uses the finished product. . . .

When a man votes for a tariff on wool for the benefit of the wool grower he votes to impose an additional tax upon those who use woollen goods, and the tax which the consumer pays because of the duty on wool is much greater than the amount which the wool grower receives.

Your Texas platform of 1896 was written upon the theory that the agricultural and pastoral interests were being discriminated against in the interest of the "rich manufacturers," but it must be remembered that the tariff which is demanded on raw materials is not demanded in the interest of all of the people of the State, but in the interest of comparatively a few of the State. Take, for instance, the duty on wool. Texas is counted one of the wool-growing States, and yet the number in the State is less than one-third of one sheep per capita. If one person in one hundred owned sheep the herds would not average more than thirty sheep for each owner.

Probably not one voter in ten owns sheep, and a large percentage of the entire number of sheep is owned by a comparatively few who own large flocks. When you put a tariff on wool, therefore, for the benefit of the wool growers, you are not taxing all the rest of the country for the benefit of Texas, but you are taxing the cotton growers of Texas, and the other citizens who do not grow wool, for the benefit of the wool growers, and you are making the people who do not raise sheep pay a great deal more to the manufacturers of woollen goods than the manufacturers pay to the wool growers because of the tax on wool. . . .

A duty which would not hurt any one would be of no benefit to anybody. If the amount each one pays out because of protection were collected back through protection the protective system would not benefit any one. It is because the masses pay, each a little, that the few can collect in large

quantities. Any attempt to make a protective tariff equitable will therefore fail. The security of the masses is to be found not in trying to get a tariff that will benefit them, but in reducing the tariff to the lowest possible point. The masses of the people must not expect to get their hands into other people's pockets; their efforts must be to keep other people's hands out of their pockets.

Another argument which I desire to present in favor of free raw material is that that tax is generally the lightest which is imposed upon the product at the most advanced stage. If the tax increases the price of the product—and it can be of no benefit to a protected industry unless it does increase the price—that increase grows every time it passes through a new stage of manufacture. Each one who handles the product exacts a profit, not only upon the original price, but upon the tariff, and the tax grows like a snowball. The consumer, therefore, finds that, other things being equal, the tax is cheapest when it is levied upon the finished product only, because it is levied but once.

From a political standpoint the strongest argument in favor of free raw material is that it will sound the death knell of the protective system by alienating a large number of people who now favor the protective system because they think they are getting a benefit from it.

During the recent session of Congress Senator Warren of Wyoming warned the Republican leaders that free raw material would be destructive of the protective system, because the people of the West would not favor tariff on manufactured products if they were not allowed a tariff upon their raw materials. He said that free raw materials would sound the death knell of protection.

A similar statement was made by the opponents of the Springer bill, providing for free wool. The representatives of the wool growers warned the manufacturers that they could not expect to retain a high tariff on woolen goods if the sheep growers were not protected. The wool growers, who are insisting upon a tariff on wool, are not doing anything to reduce the tariff on woolen goods; they understand that the protected interests must stand together; every time a new industry is brought under the protective system the number of advocates of that system is increased, and the contrary will be true whenever the tariff is taken off of raw material; the producers of raw material will then join the ranks of the tariff reformers. . . .

When we get the tariff off of wool we may expect the sheep growers to join with us in reducing the tariff on woolen manufactures, for they will no longer have a pecuniary interest in supporting a protective system. Why should any Democrat be in favor of a tariff on raw material, if such a tariff strengthens the protective system? If free raw material will strike a blow at the protective system, why should Democrats hesitate to strike the

blow? If the removal of the tax on raw materials did injustice to any particular class, an objection might be raised to the removal, but when a tax upon raw materials simply taxes all of the people for the benefit of a few of the people, it cannot be contended that the removal of the tax does injustice, for no one has a natural right to tax others for his benefit. If a man is being taxed for the benefit of others, his remedy is in removing or reducing the tax that burdens him, rather than imposing a tax upon some one else for his own benefit.

The argument that is now being made by some, that while protection is wrong, their constituents must have their share of the wrong as long as the wrong exists, would be amusing if it were not proposed in all seriousness. The principle of protection is either right or wrong. If it is right it ought to be advocated, not as an incident, but as the direct part of the law.

If the protective principle is wrong, we can hardly claim that our friends should have the benefit of it. It would be like saying that while we oppose horse stealing, still if horses were to be stolen we must have our share in the distribution. Would it not be better to say that as horse stealing is wrong, we shall do our best to prevent it? If the protective principle is wrong we should do our best to eradicate it—to attempt to extend the benefits of protection is inconsistent with the declaration that the system itself is wrong.



## "SINSE, NOT NON-SINSE."

For The Public.

Nolan met me in the square the other day, and nothing should do but I must tell whom I favored for President.

"Why, the 'Rough Rider' for sure," says I.

"Well," says he, "I think meself, that Tiddy'll be the nixt President."

"Aw, go on wid your Tiddy!" says I.

"Thin who do you mean?" says he.

"I mean the 'Rough Rider' of the Sinnit," says I. "La Follette's the man for me!"

"Sure, they knocked him out in the first round!" says he.

"Thin it's a Dimmycrat I am till he recovers," says I.

It was all right to tell that till Nolan, and I mint it; but I'm not saying that if they was to put up a good, honest Irishman for Prsident that I wouldn't vote for him. You can bet your hat I would, quick! As for little Willie Taft, niver again! Good Lord, look at the money that's been pulled out of the poor people's pockets juring his administraytion in living expinsis alone!

Speaking of graft—was I?—I've been wondering if there is such a thing in this part of the country. After breaking me neck—nearly—a dozen times,