

THE NEW FEELING ABOUT THE  
TARIFF.

Several defences of the Payne-Aldrich tariff have appeared within the past few days, almost as if concerted. Senator Hale praised highly the new law in a speech in the Senate, declaring that there had been an unconscionable and wholly unjustifiable amount of "barking and howling" about it. Then there was the Wisconsin convention of high-tariff Republicans. They resolved solemnly that the new high tariff was just the kind of thing they liked. And on Saturday, the Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune* set forth an array of figures to show how the Payne-Aldrich tariff has been "persistently maligned." As a matter of fact, he wrote, it is proving a fairly good revenue-producer. For the nine months ending with April 30, it brought \$252,000,000 into the Treasury from customs duties, or nearly \$40,000,000 more than the Dingley tariff yielded in the like period of 1908. Furthermore, the average rate of duty collected has been 41.73, whereas under the Dingley law it was 42.41. Thus the promised revision downwards is achieved: it amounts to nearly seven-tenths of one per cent. What could be a more complete demonstration of the fact that we ought all to rise up and call the new tariff blessed?

Such defences are, we believe, put forward in good faith. There is every reason to think that the Administration and the old-style Republican leaders regard the argument as entirely sound. From their standpoint, the critics are naturally thought of as querulous or partisan. If the Payne bill can be proved to be no worse than the McKinley bill or the Dingley bill, and, in truth, a shade better than either, why all this continuous complaint? The party and the country acquiesced in the former high-tariff laws, and did not long keep angry over the way in which they were framed, and who will give the reason for so great a difference to-day? It is in genuine perplexity and with real pain that such questions are asked by those bred in the old school of tariff-making.

What the old school fails to perceive is that a new sensitiveness on this subject has taken possession of the nation. It was expressed by Gifford Pinchot in his speech at St. Paul on Saturday, when he alluded to the tariff as an example of the way in which special interests

had been allowed to write the acts of Congress. He specified the indefensible woollen schedule—even President Taft admits that there is no defence for it, except the necessity of yielding to *force majeure*—and the cotton duties raised utterly without excuse, and the trick by which the rate on structural steel was increased, with other offences, including the sugar duties. These are the things which, with the belief that the tariff has helped to drive up the cost of living, have made millions of people angry; and they feel that they do well to be angry and propose to keep on being so and to vent their resentment in their votes, at the first opportunity. To men in such a state of mind, it is not of the slightest use to say that the tariff is doing well as a revenue-getter. That is entirely beside the point. Nor is it of any avail to show by a nice handling of the figures that duties have been, on the average, reduced by a hair. This is not at all the question that is troubling the complainants. What they object to is the evidence that interested citizens and corporations were too strong for the President and for Congress, and were able to write their own schedules into the tariff. This grievance cannot be removed by statistics of revenue or comparisons of the rates of duty carried out to four figures of decimals.

The new feeling about the tariff seems highly unreasonable to the old politicians moving about in a world not realized. "Why," they say in their exasperation, "the tariff has always been made in this way, and why do you begin kicking about it now? You say that you can't stand having people get what they want by 'seeing Aldrich,' but they used to 'see' McKinley and Dingley in just the same way, and you never thought of howling about it then. We can't understand your sudden spasm of virtue." Well, this was also the state of mind of men who couldn't understand the popular outcry against railway rebates. Those, too, were an old story; favored shippers had always got them. What was the use of protesting? But the time came when public sentiment would no longer tolerate that practice. Similarly with the exploitation of the public domain by private interests: that, also, had gone on for years virtually unchecked. It was fairly buttressed with arguments from the antiquity of the abuse. Yet it has had to give way:

its fortress has been carried by assault. And in the same way it is absolutely foolish for defenders of the tariff to sally forth and say that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary of such methods as were followed by Aldrich. Man's memory is making new dates very rapidly in the United States; and the old fashion of creating tariffs in the dark by secret bargains will soon seem as far away as the Flood.

ROOSEVELT IN EUROPE.

The close of Mr. Roosevelt's European tour pricks the mind with the question: Why was it so extraordinarily successful? Begin by making every allowance. Grant that much of the favor shown to Roosevelt was really an evidence of friendliness to the United States, with which all Europe so evidently desires to be on good terms. Concede that the "publicity" department of his travels was carefully attended to, the press being used with all his old skill. In comparing his European reception with Grant's do not leave out of the account the immense changes in international knowledge and international advertising which have taken place since the day of the silent General. Subtract these and all the other items you can think of from the total, and it still remains so large as to challenge explanation while exciting wonder.

No one at all acquainted with the facts can deny the genuineness and spontaneity of the interest which Europe took in Mr. Roosevelt. His fame had preceded him. We may doubt if he added anything to it by means of his journey, except as the vividness of a personality is always heightened by the chance to visualize it. That may explain in part the crowding of Italians and Frenchmen and the others to see the man of whom they had heard so much, and with whose portrait they were so familiar. But with every abatement made, the tribute paid to Mr. Roosevelt by the rulers and people of Europe is something wholly unparalleled. It constitutes by itself a remarkable event which Americans are bound to try to understand—and this not in a spirit of national vainglory, but solely in the endeavor to estimate at their true significance the political ideas which sway the masses of mankind, and with which we shall have to reckon in all our future striving.

Many partial explanations of the European manifestations over Roosevelt lie ready to hand. His dæmonic energy and versatility are qualities which captivate the common imagination everywhere. Then, too, there was an inevitable idealization of the public career of the man, on the part of those who had simply beheld it looming gigantically across the ocean, and who had not had occasion to scrutinize it from near by. It was easy, for example, for an orator in Europe to hail Mr. Roosevelt as the "conqueror of corruption." Such words would stick in the throat of an American familiar with the ex-President's desire that the arch-corruptionist, Ad-dicks, should be elected to the United States Senate from Delaware, or with his private and "practical" arrangements with Harriman to raise money in order to debauch the voters of New York. In Europe, the run of the people know nothing about any of these flaws in the marble; so they are free to take the statue as one ideally perfect. They believe in Mr. Roosevelt's uncommon civic courage; they think of him as one who took his political life in his hands and dashed against rich monopolists; they delight to regard him as a public man of shining honesty and of unrivalled chivalry. It is thus in part an ideal Roosevelt—and we all of us have an ideal Roosevelt tucked away somewhere—whom Europe has been acclaiming; but we cannot bewail or begrudge the glamour of distance which has made this so easy. If there is truth in the saying that the verdict of foreigners on a public man anticipates the judgment of his countrymen in the future, there is matter in this European triumph of Roosevelt which we cannot afford to ignore.

The chief reason for saying so lies in the chief reason for Europe's having so risen to Mr. Roosevelt. This can be got at only by those who have stopped to analyze the emotions of the throngs who pressed upon him. To those thus attentive, it is clear that Mr. Roosevelt was hailed as the champion of the masses against the classes, of the poor against the rich. To thousands and tens of thousands in Europe, this American typifies what they vaguely call the social revolution. In him they think they hear the voice of the struggling common man uttering protests and warnings to the wealthy. That is the final secret of the

great stir of popular admiration for Roosevelt in Europe. He bulks there a large-limbed Goth ready to strike down every form of privilege. He himself seemed to be aware of this, or to respond as an orator does to the sentiments of his audience, in avowing himself, on more than one occasion, a thorough "radical." He has never done that at home. Here he has always chosen to figure as the great mediator between capital and labor, between wealth and poverty, between conservatism and radicalism. But in Europe he instinctively perceived the sign in which he was thought to conquer and declared himself, without mincing words, Theodore Roosevelt the Radical. There is no doubt in our mind that in this he accurately grasped the real cause of the enthusiasm for him on the part of the common people in Europe. They think of him as a fearless and powerful ruler who seizes plutocrats by the throat and compels them to disgorge. He has become a sort of transfigured leader and representative of social and political struggle. That is the thing which made Italian laboring men run after him madly, though they could not understand a word he said, which drew to him even the *blasé* crowd in Paris, which caused the German Social-Democrat to feel that in Roosevelt he had a brother at heart. This is something that goes further and means more than official or academic honors; it is deep answering to deep in the discontent and aspiration of our time. What the European masses see in Roosevelt and hope to get from him, is certain to be more and more in the mind of the American masses, too; so that if he enters public life again we may reasonably look to see him adopt much more radical policies than any that have been associated with his name before. Thus Europe's chorus in praise of Roosevelt is a distinct notification to his fellow-citizens of what they have to expect.

#### FINLAND AND RUSSIA.

The cry of "Finis Finlandiæ" with which the most notorious reactionary leader in the Russian Duma greeted the passage of the anti-Finland bill may still be belied by the future. But the exultation of the Russian reactionaries does serve to demonstrate how futile it is, for Russia's apologists in the matter of Finland to labor at making out a case for the Czar's Government. Even if

this bill aiming at the suppression of Finnish liberties were, in the eyes of the Czar's Ministers, just and necessary, the yell of triumph with which it was hailed by the former leader of the Black Hundred would be enough to condemn it. It is Russia's misfortune, and at the same time her just penalty, that the forces of misgovernment and reaction within her may seize even upon the good intention and turn it to base uses. It has been Russia's complaint that her motives are misunderstood in the outside world, which refuses to give the Empire credit for good faith in whatever it may attempt. But how, in this present case of Finland, for instance, is it possible to listen to M. Stolypin's assurances of honest intent when above them sounds the "Finis Finlandiæ" of the men who are enemies to all liberty and all progress? The terms conservatism and nationalism are respectable in every country except Russia. There conservatism has spelt dark reaction, and nationalism has meant the persecution of every minor race within the Empire.

Not that the law against Finland's liberties passed by the Duma on Friday is in any way open to the suspicion of being wise, necessary, or justified. Nor has opinion, even in Government circles, been unanimously in its favor. So important a member of the Russian Cabinet as M. Kokovtsoff, Minister of Finance, has sharply criticised the bill and the policy which it embodies. M. Kokovtsoff has argued that Finnish autonomy has its guarantees in the Fundamental Laws of the Empire and has been confirmed in turn by every Emperor since Alexander I. The bill provides that, in matters of joint imperial interest, the Russian Parliament shall be competent to legislate for Finland, and to that end Finland shall send five representatives to the Russian Duma and one representative to the Council of Empire. Such meagre representation, argued M. Kokovtsoff, would not only leave Finnish interests virtually undefended, but would add to the legislative burdens of the Duma, which is now in danger of being swamped by the mass of accumulated legislation. It is absurd, therefore, to complain, as the anti-Finland leaders invariably do, that the cause of the Finns is strong only among foreign professors, legists, sentimentalists, and anti-Russian agitators. Within