

towards the reduction of tariffs, and a consequent sense of the inter-dependence of nations. That generous feeling has given place to international jealousies which find expression universally in unprecedented armaments, and, almost universally, in tariff restrictions on foreign trade.

A tendency so general must have its origin rather in feeling than in reason. That the primary meaning of protection is hostility to the foreigner, is shown by the facts that Free Trade is the rule within the confines, however wide, of every Government; that many nations are eager to extend by conquest their Free Trade areas; that protection has so often followed wars; and that the lowering of interstate tariffs is everywhere regarded as a friendly act by which both parties gain. Clearly, economic theory plays but a subordinate part in the adoption of Protective tariffs.

The unworthy and erroneous idea that one nation gains by another's loss, blinds men to the fact that Protection is not less a national than an international wrong. A nation which tries to confer on a few men the sole right to supply its market, is decreeing a servitude to the vast body of its citizens in defiance of their just claims to equal laws and equal protection. Private privilege masquerades as national interest; and in so far as the system succeeds, it cripples the revenue which was its pretext.

A policy which has for its frank purpose the frustration of what has been done to bring the nations nearer together, demands the strongest justification on grounds of expediency. Such justification, we, who belong to this Protective country, declare to be entirely lacking. From experience we affirm that progress in our own country has been in spite of *Protection*; that its burden falls most heavily on those least able to bear it; that by its deliberate disregard of the fact that plenty can only be had at its maximum by international co-operation, it diminishes national capital and profit, narrows the home market, tends to unemployment, depresses wages, and places the Protective country at a disadvantage in the markets of the world; and that the system which confounds with national wealth the gains of the privileged trader, ends in setting up a tyranny which makes a mockery of the popular franchise.

So long as people believe that political independence means industrial severance, they will believe that the prosperity of one nation injures that of another, and that in commerce the interests not of competing capitalists only but of whole nations are hostile; and so long there will be room for perpetual apprehension of war. The moral bearing of Protection in matters international, is unmistakable. International co-operation for the promotion of Protection is not supposable.

Thus we have, on the one side, a great and beneficent principle, wholly necessary to the progress of the race; on the other, a mere policy of questionable material efficacy, but of unquestionably evil moral influence on international relations. The rising power of such a policy is of grave concern to all, and for our country we hereby promulgate the appeal of the International Free Trade League to the Free Traders and the friends of Peace in every country, whether as organizations or as individuals, to join

them in a systematic effort to show that the interests of the nations of the world do not and cannot conflict, and that each will find the surest guarantee of its own prosperity in encouraging the prosperity of all others.

This address and appeal is signed on behalf of the Executive Council of the International Free Trade League, by the Council for the United States of America as follows: Charles Francis Adams, Boston, Mass.; Louis R. Ehrich, New York, N. Y.; A. B. Farquhar, York, Pa.; James Denton Hancock, Venango Co., Pa.; Byron W. Holt, New York, N. Y.; David Starr Jordan, Palo Alto, Cal.; Alfred Bishop Mason, New York; John J. Murphy, New York; Jesse F. Orton, New York, and George Haven Putnam, New York. It is issued from No. 26 Beaver street, New York City, under date of October 13, 1910.

* *

Roosevelt in Politics.

After his Southern speaking tour (p. 970), ex-President Roosevelt campaigned for Senator Beveridge in Indiana, and on the 14th at Elmira, N. Y., began the campaign for his ticket in his home State (p. 944). He made several speeches in Western New York on that day. The report of a friendly paper, the *Chicago Record Herald*, says of his reception there, that—

the crowds in the early part of the day were not large and there was little cheering. Later in the day the crowds grew larger and there was more enthusiasm.

From hostile sources—we quote from the *Chicago Inter Ocean's* report from Elmira—three-fourths of his "tour in southwestern New York opening the State campaign was a decided frost." At Elmira, continues this report—

he was greeted by two audiences that taxed the capacity of the two theaters, but outside of these hearers there was no crowd in the streets nor any excitement attendant upon his visit. The greeting extended the boss of the Saratoga convention was in striking contrast to the welcome that has been extended him throughout the country. Cheering was only noticeable by the fact that there was no cheering. Sometimes a perfunctory yell would greet his appearance. Sometimes there would be a faint clapping of hands as he bowed his departure. Enthusiasm was totally lacking outside of this city and here it was only mild enthusiasm.

* *

Municipal Government by Commission in Massachusetts.

The Des Moines plan has been adopted in Lynn, Mass. At a special election there on the 11th the question of a new city charter was voted on. The threefold alternative presented to the voter was (1) the old charter, with mayor and double chamber government; (2) a new charter, with mayor and a single chamber; (3) a new charter with all