

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1902.

Number 244.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The general character of President Roosevelt's message is reflected in its reference to the Philippine policy of his party. Its exalted author says of that policy that "we have not gone too far" but "we have gone to the limit." According to this veracious state paper, everything has been nicely fixed by Mr. Roosevelt's party so as to be just about right. His party seems to him to keep the middle state, leaning neither on this side nor on that. It holds affairs in perfect equilibrium.

In regard to prosperity the balance has been effected with such great delicacy of adjustment that even so much as a hostile wink might easily produce disastrous consequences. Though Mr. Roosevelt is considerate enough to admit that Republican prosperity is not the creature of law, he claims for the laws—American protective tariff laws, of course—that they have been instrumental in creating the conditions that make prosperity possible, and earnestly admonishes Congress that by unwise legislation it would be easy to destroy prosperity. A mere menace to protectionism, without so much as touching its sacred substance with hostile hand, "would produce," says the equilibrative Mr. Roosevelt, "paralysis in the business energies of the community."

This claim that protection is instrumental in making prosperity possible is certainly not over-regardful of "the limit," in view of the fact that countries which have no nicely adjusted tar-

iff protection are as prosperous as our own. And though the example of those countries did not confront Mr. Roosevelt, his own common sense ought to tell him that while legislation might check general prosperity it is only such as is restrictive that does so. Legislation that repeals restriction has the opposite effect. This may check the prosperity of the few, but only because it expands the prosperity of the many. Privilege is dependent for prosperity upon restriction; it must be protected. But productive industry suffers under restriction; it wants no protection, except against pirates. What it needs is freedom.

One thing about the President's message in its references to the tariff is highly gratifying. He asserts the fixity of the principle of protection as our national policy. This view of American politics is either true or it is not. If true, then the party to be perpetually intrusted with its conservation is Mr. Roosevelt's. If protection is our fixed principle, those Republicans are right who insist that when the tariff is altered in detail it must be altered by the friends of the principle. That leaves no room in American politics for a tariff-tinkering party. Protection is either good policy or bad, a sound principle or a vicious one. On this issue the people can divide into parties. They can be protectionists or free traders; they cannot be protectionists on one side and assistant protectionists on the other. Mr. Roosevelt leaves no room for cavilling. Protection is our permanent policy, as he proclaims; or it is not, as those who oppose his policy must maintain. His position here is highly gratifying because its tendency is to force the Democratic party to be openly and unreservedly what it is in spirit—the free trade party.

In a homily on capital and labor in his message the President says many true things. But characteristically he says them all in the abstract. In the concrete these same good things seem to have no meaning for him. For instance, he observes that "every employer, every wage worker, must be guaranteed his liberty and his right to do as he likes with his property or his labor so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others." What could be truer than that? It is a universal principle, just as Mr. Roosevelt assumes it to be, and as sound in morals as the eighth commandment, of which it is an expression. But Mr. Roosevelt, though he speaks with the air of a Moses at the foot of Sinai, doesn't believe in the sentiment, if he understands it. Either that, or else he complacently stultifies himself. For the man who understands and believes in that sentiment cannot be a protectionist without stultification. If everyone "must be guaranteed his liberty and his right to do as he likes with his property or his labor so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of his neighbor," then he must be guaranteed his liberty and his right to exchange his property or his labor as freely with a Canadian, a Mexican, a European, an African or an Asiatic as with a fellow citizen of his own. He infringes no one's rights by preferring to trade his property or his labor with another, though the other be a foreigner. Yet the purpose of protection, the principle of which Mr. Roosevelt adopts, is to prevent just that freedom in the use of property and labor. It aims not to guarantee men the right to do with their property and their labor what they like, but to compel them, on pain of forfeiture of some of their property and labor, to do what special business interests demand. The