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 institutions. 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.

chances of Mr. Taft, who had not, however, like Cass with Van Buren, played him false on a previous occasion and caused him to fail of a nomination which he thought he carried in his "vest pocket." In 1844, Cass and his Northwestern Democrats, it will be remembered, entered into a "deal" with certain Southern leaders to defeat Van Buren, who had a large majority of the delegates to the Democratic national convention which nominated Polk.

But a more interesting parallel appears when we compare Roosevelt with Douglas, whose scheme of settling the slavery problem in the Territories was one which evaded the issue, and promised a peaceful solution which could not be a solution at all, and which therefore naturally drew to Douglas both ardent pro-slavery men like Henry A. Wise, Governor of Virginia, and anti-slavery men like Horace Greeley.

Roosevelt's trust solution attracts ardent monopolists of the Perkins type, and fine-spirited humanitarians like Miss Jane Addams.

Douglas, however, brought about the final overthrow of the great party of slavery, and made certain the election of Lincoln, whose work, aided by the foolhardy moves of the pro-slavery men, resulted in the downfall of the power which at that time was as great a menace to democracy as is that of the trusts today.

At Milwaukee, Roosevelt said in the last paragraph of his speech: "I have said nothing that I could not substantiate and nothing I ought not to have said—nothing that, looking back I wouldn't say again. I am all right."

This ought to be a great consolation to him; few of the rest of us could say as much—none, I fear, if we thought we faced death.

The only similar instance I can find in history is that of Philip II, when he said to his confessor a few days before his death:* "If I have ever committed an act of injustice, it was unwittingly, or because I was deceived in the circumstances. In all my life, I have never consciously wronged any man."

The confessor of the great Catholic prince said that Philip found much pleasure in contemplating his career of perfect rectitude.

These unconscious testimonials of great men tell us more about their real characters and purposes than the most elaborate speeches and programs.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

*Motley's History of the United Netherlands, Vol. III, 474.

THE SILENCE OF GREAT CONCLUSIONS.

Mahomet, the camel-driver came in from the night and the desert to say things very quietly to his family, in his tent, which began a new religion and moved great armies, in the end, from Arabia to the borders of Italy and France.

Loyola, an Iberian of the old Basque provinces—a vastly quiet man, a wonderful worker, and a most interesting man, perhaps by racial stock a son of lost Atlantis,—Loyola created his great Order of Jesuits in the same astonishing and all-powerful spirit of mute consecration.

Now, whenever any man of worth is impressed with a great need, a great thought, a great emotion, he locks it fast, he holds it in, he becomes in the language of the politicians "difficult to place." When one finds that many persons are passing through this experience, and are locking up their conclusions, one may be certain that things will ultimately happen.

All over this country the one most curious element politically is the extent to which the currents are out of sight. There are new forces; there is a new sort of quiet resolve to get results; there is a vast, slow ground swell. Thus it happens that none of the politicians in any of the parties can get a line on the way that the plain people are going to vote this year. But those of us who move among the plain people, work with them, belong to them, and understand the way in which they struggle towards great conclusions (which they cannot put into words, but which they can vote for now and then)—are sure of one thing, that more men than ever before are humbly trying this year to think in terms of social science.

Men are asking themselves, "How shall one so vote as to best help his fellows everywhere?" Against this earnestness the ordinary campaign arguments fall very flat; spell-binders cannot work their old charms; party lines are no longer authoritative. Under such circumstances the mystery and the power of the secret ballot are intensified beyond measure. This is one of the epochal years in which the plain voters are going to surprise a great many people.

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.

"The sthraw vote seems to show——" Mr. Hennessy began.

"Ye can't take annythin' so sthrong as American pollyticks through a sthraw vote," said Mr. Dooley.—F. P. Dunne in Chicago Tribune of Oct. 27.