

THE PROTECTIONIST

A Monthly Magazine of Political Science
and Industrial Progress.

Signed articles are not to be understood as expressing the views of the editor or publishers.

VOL. XXXII.

SEPTEMBER, 1920.

No. 5

UNDER WHICH FLAG ?

From Speech of Will H. Hays at Augusta, Me.

With Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge as our candidates, we fight for the faith of the Fathers of the Republic and for perpetual freedom of the sons and daughters of America. Sometimes a picture points a principle no less than a moral. Such an one recurs to my mind. It was a cartoon published on the day after Governor Cox delivered his speech, on the editorial page of his chief newspaper supporter in New York. It depicted the candidate hauling a flag to the top of a pole.

The banner was unfamiliar to the eye, but unmistakable in its meaning. It bore no heraldic device or other symbol. There was not a sign of a stripe, not a suggestion of a star. Emblazoned upon a plain background in large letters were the words, "The League of Nations," and nothing more. It was the new motto of an old party. It symbolized surrender of American independence,—a surrender, please God, that shall never be made so long as the spirit of patriotism continues to animate the hearts of American freemen. But a more apt or more exact portrayal of the chief purpose of the Democratic party, dictated by its leaders and declared by its candidate, could not be devised.

As I looked at that striking and significant sketch, I could not but wish that I were capable of making a companion picture that should emphasize the vivid contrast between their aspirations and ours. There would be nothing novel in my illustration, nothing strange to the vision, nothing startling to the emotions. It would be a mere reproduction of that first Star Spangled Banner produced by the nimble fingers of Betsy Ross.

A companion picture, did I say? No, never. There can be no companion banner to the Stars and Stripes as a symbol of the great Republic. There shall be but the one flag. But that flag I would paint and hold for a moment to the light of heaven that all might mark the difference between the old and the new. There would be no need to hoist that banner. It was raised first on Dorchester Heights by George Washington. But a few days ago I saw it re-raised in Marion, Ohio, by Warren G. Harding. For nearly an hundred and fifty years it has floated over this free land, and never once been lowered. And at the base of the pole I would draw facing all the world if need to defend should come, the figure of a great American—an American in every fibre of his being as faithful as Washington, as humble as Lincoln, and as unafraid as Roosevelt—your leader, your candidate, and your friend.

"Under which flag?" I should never have to ask you Americans of Maine. My sole injunction would be: You hold the post of honor; you must point the way. So before you go to the polls, let your eyes rest for a moment upon the twenty-third star of the forty-eight which gleam from the background of blue. That is your star, the star of Maine, the North Star of the Union, unblemished from the time, more than a century ago, when it was added to the galaxy on our National emblem. Let it not be tarnished now. Illumine it afresh by sending forth the message that Maine continues inflexibly American and rejoices in the privilege of being the first to voice to her sister States the spirit of complete victory which surely in November will crown Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge, now leaders of the party, then leaders of the Republic.

chandise imported, and levied the duties, as the preamble of the act declares, "for the support of the government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States and the encouragement and protection of manufactures." This act was signed by George Washington, who presided over the convention which adopted the Constitution.

The policy of protection was approved by Washington, who said: "Congress have repeatedly directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

It was approved by Jefferson, who said: "Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort," and asked, "Shall we suppress the impost and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?"

It was approved by Monroe, who said, "Our manufacturers require the systematic and fostering care of the government. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials."

It was approved by Andrew Jackson, who said, "The great materials of our national defence ought to have extended to them adequate protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in fair competition with those of Europe."

Such was the policy adopted by the founders of the government and the framers of the Constitution. How rash are those who would challenge the constitutionality of protection. We owe the policy of protection to the men who drafted the Constitution. Who are the best authorities on the constitutionality of a protective tariff, Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe or James M. Cox and Woodrow Wilson?

THE TARIFF IN THE PLATFORMS.

Protection Needed for National Security and Prosperity.

By Robert Ellis Thompson, L.L.D.

It is evident that the author of neither of the two national platforms regarded the tariff as a very live issue of the present campaign. The note of passion and enthusiasm is present in their utterances on many subjects, but not on this. They do not much more than declare that the party stands still for what it has stood for the last thirty years, and is ready to fight on the old lines, if occasion calls for this.

The Republican declaration is much

less emphatic than the situation would warrant. It is an historic expression of the attitude of the party since 1861, but makes little or nothing of the experience of the recent war. From Washington to Roosevelt all our protectionist leaders have laid stress on the need of that policy to equip a nation for war.

Much of the suffering of the soldiers who fought the War for Independence was the result of the want of tents, uniforms, blankets, shoes,

weapons, ammunition and salt. The blood in their foot-prints, by which the British traced our retreating troops after the battle of Germantown, was a comment on the free trade with herself which Great Britain had forced upon her colonies. It was not lack of money to buy the things needed, but the lack of the things to purchase, which created the difficulty. Philadelphia stripped her sail-lofts and her shipping of their canvas to make tents. Twice the loyal women of the city searched their household stores for blankets for the army. In many quarters, and especially in the South, the skins of deer were made into uniforms, and the soldiers called themselves "Buckskin Rangers."

So when Washington came before Congress as President of the United States, to state his views as to the situation and needs of the country, he urged repeatedly the protection of those industries which were necessary to equip the country for war, especially the production of wool and woolens, which he declared as indispensable as gun-powder. He was inaugurated in a suit of American cloth, made by a firm in Hartford, which, for want of protection, was sold out by the sheriff in his second administration. He worked for the extension of wool-growing on his own property and by his example.

But the feeble and restricted ideas of Congresses elected mainly by farmers, prevented his policy and that of Hamilton from achieving the preparation of the country for the War of 1812-1815. There was a gen-

eral scarcity of everything that the army and the navy needed. The secretary of the navy did a good stroke of work by buying a large supply of blankets from British merchants after war had been declared! But the unpreparedness of America for war was avowed by Englishmen as a reason for attacking us, and this unpreparedness caused much suffering among the troops operating in Canada. It also endangered our peace with the Indians, to whom we had promised blankets in annual allowance. Even Jefferson, who had talked for free trade before the war, was converted by its experiences. He declared he never would purchase an article of foreign manufacture, if he could obtain one of home make which would supply his need.

The War for the Union illustrated the principle in both ways. The tariffs of 1846 and 1857, it is true, had weakened our industries, and had developed a timid and conservative spirit among our capitalists. They were much disposed to ask merely for continuance of the prevailing situation, and to deprecate an increase of duties. But the statesmen, into whose hands the control of national legislation had fallen, through the withdrawal of Southern Senators and Representatives, were more far-seeing. They prepared and passed the Morrill tariff, which President Buchanan signed in the last days of his administration. It aimed at preparing the country not only for the Civil War which was impending, but also for a possible war with some European power, or at least an interrup-

tion of supplies from Europe. The rapid response to this legislation made the country independent of Great Britain, during those four fateful years, and made the Federal Army efficient and victorious.,

The South was beaten largely because its adherence to the free trade ideals of its British friends had left it unprepared for a conflict with a manufacturing country. It proclaimed its preference for free trade in the constitution of the Confederate States. But we find Mr. Davis in his message to Congress congratulating the Confederacy upon the origination and growth of industries which were helping to equip Southern troops.

Since 1865 America has persisted in the policy which develops national preparations for the emergencies of war. In spite of partial back-sets, under the rule of a party now hostile to what its forefathers tried to effect by the tariffs of 1816, 1824, 1828, and 1832, our industrial system has grown in the power to meet our people's needs of both war and peace. In some primarily important lines, such as coal, steel and iron, we have attained the foremost place among the nations. Hence the vast importance of America in the recent struggle before as well as after we took part in the great war. Pennsylvania in particular became the foundry of the nations; and our millions of heroic soldiers were supported by muscle, science and abundance in the department of military munitions. Yet even here we had to suffer from some imperfections of our protective legis-

lation. We had not wool enough to supply all-wool overcoats to our soldiers. We had not the dye-stuffs needed to fit our woollens for civilized wear. And even our free traders had to enact protection for the dye industry.

What would we have been in 1914-1918 if we had followed the leading of those who longed for an America of farmers, cow-boys, and small traders? What could we have done for the right decision of the great issue, to which Germany and Austria had challenged the civilized world? It was an America equipped by protection for war, which threw its sword into the scale, and decided the war. It is a time for no cold or compromising attitude toward the enemies of our national policy, which has triumphed at every point, as Washington would have predicted.

The present situation of our industries may not emphasize the need of protective legislation, but the time cannot be far off when they will need it. We cannot but see that the attitude of England has changed vitally since 1914. She has lost her faith in competition as the universal solvent of industrial difficulties. She still has, in Mr. Asquith and his handful of Independent Liberals the only survivors of the once all-powerful Cobdenite school. But the old Tory party has gone back to the protectionist principles they renounced in 1852; the Labor party has professed those principles from its beginning as a party; and Mr. Lloyd George's coalition Liberals have been very thoroughly convinced that England dare not con-

tinue the "Let Alone" policy she adopted in 1846-60. They recall Adam Smith's caution that no country dare abandon its industries to the hazards of unrestricted competition; and they stand ready to extend to their "essential industries" the kind and amount of legislative favor needed for their holding their own, and extending the area of their industrial conquests. Much of this change of sentiment is due to their recent experience of what is needed to equip a nation for a great war.

As soon as Great Britain has recovered from the derangement of her currency and her exchanges, she is going to resume the struggle for the trade of the world which occupied her energies for a century past. And she is not going to wage her industrial warfare with the reserves she employed, or professed to employ, in the period 1846-1914. She is going to fight with the button off the foil. She is going to revive the colonial system of preferences so far as the Dominions of her Empire can be brought to consent to this. She is going to establish a virtual monopoly of the trade of her dependencies, such as was indicated by the prohibition of the importation of American motor-cars into India. She is going to help her export trade by bounties and favors to her steamship-lines, by consular and diplomatic advertising of British wares, and by other such means. And she is stretching every nerve to make herself independent of American supplies of cotton, petroleum, and other supplies. Her ideal now is a self-sufficing British Em-

pire, which will raise her sales to the highest figure and keep her purchases to the minimum level.

In all this she recognizes American wealth and industrial power as the chief obstacle to her success. As Dudley Baxter said seventy years ago, the rise of the United States to the rank of a great manufacturing power was what most threatened the continuance and permanence of England's commercial and industrial growth. That has now arrived, and she takes up the struggle under new conditions and with new weapons. Never was it so desirable for her to cripple great American industries by forced reduction of prices, and other means she used so freely before our industries enjoyed effective protection. She already has great advantages for this in the reductions of the tariff in Mr. Wilson's first administration, which so greatly increased our import of articles we could make at home. The disturbances of the war checked this for the time. But those reductions are still in force, and England only awaits the opportunity to make use of them as she did in 1912-1914, and to enlarge them by the aid of her friends in America. Hence the need of a Republican administration, supported by a Republican Congress, to ensure our industrial prosperity.

The Democrats avow their unreadiness to do what the country needs. They begin by the false declaration that their party stands committed historically to the policy of a tariff for revenue only. Yet their party enacted four protective tariffs, and among our notable protectionists

we enumerate such Democrats as Madison, Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, Buchanan and Randall. It was only through the alliance of our plantation lords with the loom-lords of northern England that we came to have a free trade party in America. Up to that time Americans were in substantial agreement as to the wisdom of protection.

It is true that the Democrats do not now speak of free trade, but of a tariff for revenue only. But the two things are identical. Free trade is the policy which avoids any legislation which may divert labor or capital into a channel in which they would not otherwise flow. And a tariff which puts duties at the level which will not effect such diversion is, they claim, that which secures the largest revenue. Low duties, followed by great increase of importations, secure the largest income for the government. And a tariff which aims at revenue as the chief end of such legislation, cannot but establish free trade. Its duties never will divert labor or capital into new channels, and it will make it very difficult to maintain their occupation of channels opened to them by protection.

The Democrats proceed indeed to praise the methods of regulating the tariff by a commission of competent experts. This was attempted by both Presidents Taft and Wilson, and effected very little. The reports of Mr. Taft's commission covered only wool and woolsens and cotton. It made a valuable exhibit of the difficul-

ties our employers of labor encountered in securing and retaining a sufficient staff of workers. And it showed that neither the growers of wool nor the manufacturers of woolsens were responsible for the high price of clothing, but that this was due to labor costs and distribution. Mr. Wilson's commission, which still exists, has made no serious contribution to our knowledge of these questions, though its reports contain much evidence of the value of protection.

But a tariff-for-revenue-only needs no commission. Its task is of the simplest. It only has to determine what rate of duty will do most to fill the treasury, without giving a thought to either capital or labor. No care need be taken to compose it of competent and impartial experts in such matters. Acquaintance with political economy would be pure surplusage. Half a dozen treasury clerks, equipped with a good school arithmetic, would serve the purpose as fully as would a score of the wisest economists and business men the country could furnish.

We are entering a new era of international competition, and the nation is now as unprepared for peace as it was for war. Our safety depends, as it did in 1860, on the enactment of a protective tariff law. The Democratic party reiterates its opposition to such a policy. The Republican party alone can be depended on to enforce it; and the Republican party should assume this task as its paramount duty.