

the people, finding themselves without relief are likely to listen to the offer of another kind of commission regulation. People never stand still. They must go ahead, or go backward. The American people must either go on to complete freedom, or they will turn toward Socialism, democratic or plutocratic. Mr. Roosevelt's plan of state regulation of all forms of business is nothing more nor less than plutocratic socialism, and will afflict society with all the evils of paternalism.



The Democratic party can demonstrate its right to power only by boldly meeting Mr. Roosevelt's declaration, "unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization." It is not unlimited competition, but limited competition that has done the mischief. All business is shackled by legal privileges, and the enterprises so bound have been compelled to compete. Such competition must, from its very nature, lead to the evils of combinations on the one hand, and to the crushing of the weaker on the other. And the only positive and permanent relief possible must come from striking off the shackles. It is not necessary for the Democratic party, to announce at this time that it is opposed to all tariffs and other indirect taxes, and in favor of the complete exemption of all business from the burden of landlordism; but it must have this goal in mind, and it must move toward it fast enough to convince the people that it is going in that direction. s. c.



Roosevelt and the Wilson Administration.

Theodore Roosevelt's criticism of the administration's tariff policy, in his Pittsburgh speech of June 30; does not justify confidence in his judgment. It is true that this tariff policy is defective. Any tariff policy that falls short of absolute Free Trade is deserving of severe criticism and the Underwood tariff falls far short of even hailing distance of Free Trade. But Roosevelt does not criticize the Underwood law's defects but its merits. He does not advocate an improvement but the very opposite. He condemns the Underwood law for its failure to impose protective duties in behalf of certain interests. Evidently the Colonel is so little of a statesman, that he does not know that one competent to perform a useful service has no need of putting an artificial handicap on a potential competitor; while one who is himself incompetent should not be allowed to render others still more incompetent. Yet because the administration has taken the position that competent producers need no protection and incompetent ones don't

deserve any, Roosevelt criticizes it. His idea of a tariff commission to investigate and seek out the incompetents and protect them, makes him in principle, though not in degree as much a defender of Privilege as Penrose, Barnes, Root and others whom he delights in denouncing. He, too, is in favor of allowing parasitic business to continue living off of business that can stand on its own merits.



Even in attacking such vulnerable propositions as the pending anti-trust measures, Colonel Roosevelt failed to rise to his opportunity. He might well have referred to them as puerile efforts to remove an evil without touching its cause. He might have denounced them as examples of vicious legislation to the extent that they authorize governmental interference in matters that no government should interfere with, and authorize no interference where interference is needed. With the exception of the anti-injunction and labor exemption section of the Clayton bill, these bills as they stand can with little trouble be shown to be based on entirely wrong principles. Yet so little is Roosevelt able to see the real faults of these measures that in criticizing he represents them as having characteristics they do not possess. "We cannot make every man compete with every other man," he says in comment, "we cannot go back to 1850, still less to 1650." How bravely the Colonel attacks a man of straw! And the saddest part of it is that he sincerely imagines the straw to be flesh and blood.



Following the lead of his friend, George W. Perkins, Roosevelt delivers himself of the following:

Unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization. It was unlimited competition which created the great trusts, exactly as it created the sweatshop, and is chiefly responsible for child labor. The new freedom is merely the exceedingly old freedom, which permits each man to cut his neighbor's throat.

Thus Roosevelt finds two objections to his conception of the New Freedom. One is it will take us back to conditions of 1650, when our great trusts were impossible. Another is it will keep us under conditions of 1914 which have created the great trusts.



But let his statement concerning competition be analyzed. Has "unlimited competition created the great trusts"? How could there be unlimited competition with a protective tariff in operation, with

public highways in possession of private corporations, openly or secretly giving preferential rates, rebates and other favors to fortunate ones, with natural resources held by comparatively few able to give or withhold permission to use them, with patent laws making a privilege of the right to manufacture or use the most effective instruments or processes of production, and with other legislation conferring artificial advantages on some and disadvantages on others? Is this the statesman to lead us out of the wilderness, who can not see the difference between unlimited competition and a scramble among unprivileged unfortunates for the little that Privilege has not monopolized, or for the favor of Privilege's beneficiaries? But wait! Roosevelt does not actually say that unlimited competition has created trusts. He only says it has created them "exactly as it created the sweat shops and is chiefly responsible for child labor." The words "exactly as" leave room for quibbling. Sweat shops and child labor actually result from denial of opportunity to Labor by Monopoly. It is only restriction of competition that enters into creation of these evils. Strictly construed, the Colonel's statement exonerates unlimited competition. He surely knows how many are the limitations of competition which exist and so must know that unlimited competition does not exist and has not existed within his memory. Those blessed weasel words, "exactly as," leave opportunity to save the Colonel's reputation for far-seeing statesmanship.



But there is truth as well as error in much that Roosevelt has to say. It is true that "we cannot destroy real monopoly by attacking its legal forms. We must find out and take away the economic basis of monopoly." But why we must do that if competition is a bad thing the Colonel does not say. Yet in spite of his inconsistency, Roosevelt has offered a true statesmanlike suggestion. In this suggestion lies the refutation of all the charges brought against unlimited competition. Upon this truth he might have based a criticism of the administration that could not be easily brushed aside. But he clearly failed to realize its importance. Furthermore, his advocacy of a protective tariff indicates but an imperfect comprehension of the meaning of his suggestion. It is unfortunate that the leader of a party containing such excellent material as the Progressive party has not a better understanding of fundamental principles. Colonel Roosevelt may well be credited with an eager desire to bring about social justice. But the influence of his old party associations is still keeping him from clearly seeing the right way to ac-

complish that object. Should he fail to learn, then new leadership will be the Progressive party's only salvation.

S. D.



Strong Government.

Our Apostle of Force said in his Pittsburgh speech that the Democrats had failed, and always would fail, because they were afraid of a strong government. Speculation on the relative merits of plutocratic and democratic governments is unnecessary in the light of history. Nor is it necessary to go to distant shores, or to ancient times. Porfirio Diaz gave Mexico a strong government. There was never a question as to its stability. Order succeeded chaos, railroads were built, mines were opened, and there were the surface manifestations of modern civilization. Complaints of tyranny were met with the assertion that this was the only kind of government the people of Mexico could appreciate. And President Diaz was hailed as the builder of his country. Here was the ideal strong government.



But nature, though long defied, will ultimately assert herself. A time came when human nature could endure no more; and when the people of Mexico began to assert themselves the whole structure tumbled about the strong man's ears. The wonderful creation was found to be nothing more than a shell, empty and devoid of substance. The lands had been taken from the people, and the mines, railroads, and huge estates rested upon the backs of a nation of peons, taxed to the last point of endurance to support the government that had betrayed them. The strong government had grown tyrannical, because it is only by means of tyranny that such a government can express itself, and it had become corrupt, because oppression always begets corruption. President Diaz displayed to the world a nation orderly and prosperous; but when at last his own power crumbled, the world saw a nation steeped in social misery and political debauchery. The really strong government is the will of a strong people; and a people are strong, not from having things done for them by strong men, but from doing things for themselves.

S. C.



Boycotting of "Destructive" Mediums.

Copies of a letter from Henry B. Joy, president of the Packard Motor Car Company of Detroit, addressed to Marshall Cushing of New York City, under date of June 2, have been widely circulated among business men. The letter, while disclaiming