

ever scored by a Liberal candidate in Mid-Norfolk." As this vote was an increase over last year on the same registry, Mr. Lester evidently made actual conversions to himself and his cause. Commenting on that phase of the matter the same paper says: "There are, we believe, barely a dozen candidates who have achieved such an increase at this election; and the fact that Mr. Lester belongs to that very small band is the best possible evidence of the convincing and converting quality of his campaign."

+ +

Tolstoy.

Among the historical events of the year just closed, was the death of Leo Tolstoy (vol. xiii, p. 1188) for whom we could choose no better time than the beginning of the year for memorial comment. As the world measures living men, Tolstoy was a failure; as the world is beginning to measure, Tolstoy was a success. The new standard is the law of social service. When a man "returns," as the Koreans say of the departed, we ask the question, What service did this man give to his fellow men? By that standard, Tolstoy gave full measure.

+

Tolstoy was more a prophecy than a prophet. He was a prophecy of the new conscience,—of the conscience as it will be when men are free, when they have political freedom and economic freedom, freedom of thought and speech and action. He believed in the reign of love in a world made just and sympathetic and free, by love. It was because of this belief that Tolstoy demanded for men in masses the political freedom to govern themselves and the economic freedom to use without hindrance the inexhaustible gifts of Nature. Knowing that an all-wise and all-benevolent Creator has given to mankind more than enough for all, he scorned the blasphemous doctrine that the many, or even a few, or one, must suffer in poverty, or that even the least must be in want while others have more than enough. Therefore he asserted and lived the gospel that also the least shall have equal access to the gifts of the Creator. Tolstoy spoke and lived for the disinherited of the earth.

+ + +

Every permanent improvement of the soil, every railway and road, every bettering of the general condition of society, every facility given for production, every stimulus supplied to consumption, raises [ground] rent. The landowner sleeps, but thrives.
—Thorold Rogers,

WHOLESALE TARIFF REVISION.

All parties being now agreed that tariff revision must soon come, the question is whether that revision should be on the wholesale plan or on the installment plan.

President Taft, with whom superficial tranquillity is a prime object, recommends slow and deliberate revision at the rate of one schedule at a time, based upon the facts to be supplied by the Tariff Board whenever that frail body is able to make its report.

Whatever effect this advice will have upon the Republicans in Congress, who are responsible for the Tariff Board, and who may feel it their duty to respect its findings, the course of the Democrats is clear. They owe no allegiance to the Tariff Board nor to the principle behind it. The idea that the relative cost of production should determine the extent of the duties is not an idea that should bind Democrats. They are charged with carrying out the mandate received from the country—from the people who are suffering from the high cost of living,—and that mandate is to do what can be done quickly to restore full competition to our commercial system and bring prices nearer to their natural level.

To do this means to overhaul not one schedule but all schedules. It is the needs of the consumer and not the convenience of the Tariff Board that should guide the policy of the Democratic Congressman.

+

That the Tariff Board may do some useful things is not to be denied. If it can succeed in "translating the tariff into English" by issuing a glossary which will enable the average consumer to know how much he is taxed on each item, and the facts showing why he is so taxed, it will have justified its existence. If it submits figures which demonstrate that in some cases the duties exceed by 500 per cent the difference in labor cost at home and abroad, it will have dealt a powerful side-blow to the present law. But such evidence will only be collateral. It does not touch the core of the question.

The core of the question is that the producer exists for the consumer and not the consumer for the producer, and that prices and not costs are of vital concern to the community.

When prices are brought down to their natural level, costs may then be easily inferred if anybody is interested in so academic a question.

+

To say that the manufacturer exists for the con-

sumer and that the latter should always have the first consideration, may sound very strange to modern degenerate ears. Our government has for a whole century made the manufacturer the object of its special care, and left the consumer to his tender mercies. The result is that our pampered manufacturers, bred up in the tradition of closed markets, and accustomed to the pocketing of unearned profits, look upon the hundred millions of American consumers much as they would upon a flock of sheep which they are at liberty to shear at will. Nor has this illusion lacked dramatic support from the attitude of the timid consumers, who have played the part of sheep only too faithfully.

But the consumers at last have revolted.

They may not know the principles of international trade, but they know when they are cold and hungry and when the dinner pail is empty. They are now in no mood to stand tamely by while the Tariff Board is calculating costs, when they know that the manufacturer has two sets of prices—one for the American consumer, and another, a lower one, for the foreigner.

They want to know why prices are not as low here as in England, seeing that with our natural resources, our unrivaled machinery, our superior business organization, and the superior skill of our workmen, the advantages of production are on our side.

+

The Democrats have now an opportunity, by sticking courageously to their principles, to serve the consumers by introducing healthy competition, and the self-reliant manufacturers by cheapening their materials. They can only lose that opportunity by supporting the dilatory tactics of the other side and causing the country to lose faith in representative government.

THOMAS SCANLON.

+ + +

DEMOCRACY EQUIPPED AND WORKING.

We are all familiar with the type of man who has aristocratic instincts. He does not believe in his heart in popular government. He believes that government should be controlled by those who are intellectually strong.

There are two peculiarities about this type of man. He prides himself on his practicality in antagonizing the visionary plans of democracy, and he is quite sure that his own intellectual stature entitles him to a place among the rulers.

There is a second type of man. He has democratic instincts. He believes that government exists to regulate common affairs, and that every human being who comes under the dominion of government has a right to a voice in its administration. He neither emphasizes nor minimizes the ignorance of the masses. He holds to the educational theory of Froebel that one should learn to do by doing, that by taking part in the administration of government men learn to administer its affairs wisely.

+

Now, why is it that some men are aristocrats and some are democrats? Why is it that boys born in the same environment, taught by the same teacher, raised under the same influence, become some of them aristocrats and some of them democrats?

I consider that it is because one type holds to the self-centered ideals of childhood, while the other grows into the intellectual ideals of manhood. To me it seems that the aristocratic ideal is sensuous and childish, while the democratic ideal is a result of education, reflection, experience and some knowledge of the basic principles of human nature.

To illustrate my point. When a child first comes into consciousness of things about him, he thinks that this planet is the center of the universe, that the sun, moon and stars are all smaller than the earth and revolve about it. But later he discovers that he has been deceived by his senses—that the earth is a minor planet, in what very likely is a minor system in the great scheme of creation.

In like manner, the child first thinks of himself as the center of things around which all else revolves. His mother is sweeter than all other mothers, his father wiser than all other fathers in the world. But he learns that again he has been deceived by his senses, that he is but a small part of the vast organism of humanity.

Now if it be true that the childish tendency is to emphasize the individual, while the adult tendency is to see in the individual only a small part of a vast social organism, is it not reasonable to regard the aristocratic ideal as that of the child, and the democratic ideal as that of the man?

+

Some such thoughts as these came to me when I listened to a speech by a mighty hunter. He was going up and down the highways of our country preaching the doctrine that honesty in office is the panacea for our national ills.

By taking this for his dominant note he made