

fornians much to think about in the next few years.



### An Electoral Curiosity.

The agitation for disfranchisement of citizens for not voting, ought to be catalogued as a curiosity. Isn't disfranchising a man for disfranchising himself a little like hanging a man for committing suicide?



### Conservation.

Some spellbinders make the welkin ring with what they don't know about "conservation." A favorite "stunt" of theirs is to pronounce the "conservation of *natural* resources" as less important than the "conservation of *human* resources." Since human resources cannot be conserved if natural resources are not conserved, what's the use of such talk? As well say at once that the planet out of which man must get his food is less important to man than food.



## THE STRENGTH AND THE WEAKNESS OF PROTECTION.

There seems to be a fixed and abiding belief on the part of many people that a protective tariff builds up a country, raises wages, and elevates the standard of living. Nay, they go so far as to say that the nation enjoys prosperity, or suffers adversity, just to the degree that the Republican party gains or loses power.

It matters not that wages in this country were high before that party was born; or that the country was prosperous prior to the enactment of the high tariff. It cuts no figure that the conditions of labor are hard in other countries enjoying Protective tariffs, or that wages are higher in Free-trade England than in Protection France and Germany. Nor does it matter that the great panic of 1873 occurred while the Republican party was in control of the government, and the financial disaster of 1907 found the same party in power. Despite the fact that of the three panics that have occurred in this country since the advent of the high tariff, two have been under Republican and one under Democratic auspices, men—and men, too, who are intelligent upon other matters—gravely charge hard times to Democratic Free-trade, and good times to Republican Protection.

Wherein lies the vitality of the protective tariff? What is it that, in spite of its crudities, its absurdities, and its injustices, keeps it before the people as a successful political issue?

Are not the Free-traders themselves to blame in some measure for their lack of success in attacking Protectionism? Have they not by their faintheartedness and their lack of self-conviction led the Protectionist to interpret the strength of his own position by the mildness of the assault?

In a word, has not the discussion been confined too much to schedules and percentages? Has it not too much ignored rights and equities?

The Protectionist is bold and impetuous. He bluntly declares thus and so, and offers as proof the condition of the country.

His opponent meets the charge with a compilation of statistics that few read and fewer understand.

The average man is not gifted in the niceties of logic. He reasons broadly, and he feels deeply. Ask him to vote on election day, and he will consider his own convenience. But call upon him to bear arms against a common foe, and he will lay down his life for his country. Does not this indicate that the line of attack should be through an appeal to the altruistic, rather than to the egoistic nature?



It is well to demonstrate the material advantages of freedom of trade, for there can be no objection to a man's enjoying the fruits of his own rectitude; yet, since the demonstration must be made in the face of ignorance and prejudice, it may well be doubted if it would not be easier to reach the understanding by an immediate appeal to the conscience.

Men might have argued and disputed for centuries upon the economic advantages of free labor over slave labor, and the slave would have remained in servitude. It was the appeal to man's conscience, to his inherent sense of justice, that swept away chattel slavery.

And is there not a moral phase to the tariff question? Does it not involve a consideration of natural rights? And will it not be found in the last analysis that a restraint of trade is an abridgment of liberty?



The modern world has come definitely to recognize man's right to his own person. This embraces something more than a mere material possession. It involves the right to do whatever he pleases, so long as he infringes not the same right of his fellows.

Economically considered, this means that man shall not only possess his own body, but all that he may create. The fruits of his hands are his to keep, to sell, or to give away. To take from him

the fruits of his labor is to deprive him of a natural and inalienable right. This is the very essence of liberty. It is this that man has fought for during the past ages, and now prizes as his most precious possession.

But modern society has become very complex.

Man is now surrounded by such intricate laws and customs that it is not always easy to see their true relations, nor to realize their real effect. Thus it has come about that designing persons have been able to make inroads upon individual liberty in such a way that the victims are not aware that their rights have been invaded. To right the wrong, therefore, it is necessary to appeal to the sense of justice.



And where can be found a clearer case than that of a Protective tariff?

Its very purpose is to keep out cheaper goods from abroad, and by so doing to enable the home producer to charge a higher price. This means, in simple terms, that a man who has raised wheat, and who could get a coat abroad for ten bushels, must pay fifteen bushels for a coat made in this country. Is not that depriving the wheat grower of five bushels against his will, and without any return? The government may take part of his wheat in payment of service rendered him; that raises another issue. But by what right does it take from him these five bushels, and give them to a coat maker?

The fact that it is done avowedly for the good of the wheatgrower begs the question. The master could claim that he held the slave for his own good; that he clothed, fed and housed him, and set him in the way of civilization. Any tyrant, indeed, could claim that he was protecting his subjects from evils they would otherwise bring upon themselves.

The essential part of liberty lies in the fact that each man shall determine for himself what is for his own good.

Should a number of citizens think it better to buy at home than abroad, it is their right to practice that belief. They may form themselves into a society pledged to use only home-made goods. But they have no right, no matter what their number, to compel others to join them.

So long as one man wishes to exchange the fruits of his labor with a foreigner, it is his right to do so.



The state's invasion of private affairs has not only deranged business, but it has corrupted the conscience of the people, and endangered free in-

stitutions. The highest civic duty today is to abolish Privilege; and the Protective tariff is the first that lies in the way.

STOUGHTON COOLEY.



## HISTORICAL PARALLELS IN POLITICS.

Peculiar interest attaches to the present campaign because of the historical parallels which it has pressed upon us.



Wilson's speech to the Chicago press association in September, as also an earlier one at Springfield, Massachusetts, suggests again and again Lincoln's great speech of October 4, 1854, in which he says of the Southern people: "They are just what we would be in their situation. If slavery did not exist among them they would not introduce it. . . . I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself."\*

Wilson says in very much the same tone and in the same clear and eloquent language, that the great masters of industry who have done so much to undermine the institutions of their country must be handled with the utmost caution and judgment, but with unrelenting firmness, lest the remedy which we apply at this belated day result in injury to us all and in the entrenching of the very evil powers which we would destroy.

Upon reading those Wilson addresses, one turns involuntarily to Lincoln's speeches for the parallel.

Others, less kindly disposed toward the Governor of New Jersey than some of the rest of us have been, may be quoted as saying, after Wilson's Lincoln day speech in Chicago last winter: "Somehow the man reminds me of Lincoln, both in his language and in his intellectual method; his candidacy is too good a thing for our methods, we can not expect such a man to receive the nomination from either of our conventions." This was said by a famous historical scholar and writer who has always, but once, voted the Republican ticket but who is now a Wilson man.



When Roosevelt broke with the Republican Party, many of us thought at once of the Van Buren secession from the old Democratic Party in 1848. This secession defeated Lewis Cass and helped the anti-slavery Democrats of the North to break away from their life-long political moorings; and it was a forerunner of the enthusiastic Fremont campaign. Roosevelt has destroyed the

\*Miss Tarbell's *Life of Lincoln*, Vol. I, page 283.