
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

THREE COMING ISSUES.

BY AUSTIN BIERBOWER, LL.D., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

THE trite prediction that our political parties will soon give way to others, occasionally threatens fulfilment. Issues disappear or become indistinct, or else the classes become confused, as now, when the radical element, once Republican, has become Democratic. The masses will not long vote on dead issues or be content with trifling ones.

Some fundamental differences, however, divide them, which, being founded in human nature, are perennial; and voters will struggle to get in their natural place on them, so that, while there must be new combinations, they will proceed on principles long recognized. The next subjects of cleavage promise to be moral.

New parties come from old ones, and new issues from principles in preceding ones. A party can no more die than can a State without leaving its parts in a new one, or spring from nothing any more than a civilization can. The present organizations must give birth to future ones, and transmit many features; so that a resemblance will exist between the Republican and one of the new parties and between the Democratic and the other; and Republicans will mostly go to one, and Democrats to the other, as their principles will do. The Federal thus passed into the Whig and the Whig into the Republican party, and the successive opponents of these into the successive phases of the Democratic party. While some issues have been added and principles enlarged, until there is

now little difference between the two, there has yet been a continuity from the beginning on each side, which must continue. Political parties hate revolutions as much as do States, and men rarely forsake their affiliations where a passion is enlisted.

Our chief unsettled problems indicate as the next issues Intemperance, Clericalism, and Alienism.

These cannot be much longer suppressed, however desirable. The first is taking shape in many States and exciting extraordinary interest, while the others are being hastened by the vast immigration from lands where the Clerical issue is prominent. And when men can so divide as to be on one side or the other of a coherent set of principles, their organizations will follow. Great bodies are now on one side of one question, and on the opposite side of a corresponding one, so that, as controlling groups, they are not fitted for partisans. A minuter adjustment to principle is needed to bring them into practical politics; and the tendency is to this, the bulk of Republicans taking one side of all these questions — the hostile — and the bulk of Democrats the other — the friendly — so that, following their antecedents, the Republicans are arraying themselves against the classes named, and the Democrats favoring them. And so, the two future parties will be the anti-party and the pro-party of these interests, that is, the anti-liquor, anti-clerical, and anti-alien party on the one side and the pro-liquor, pro-clerical, and pro-alien party on the other. These groups all cohere naturally, and can each be espoused under one idea and one policy without any gross contradiction. They harmonize, too, with the balance of the principles of the respective parties, which, though less prominent than hitherto, will be handed down as by-play between them. For, along with the new Republican policy touching intemperance, clericalism, and alienism, will be continued, as not yet settled, the old Republi-

can policy on the negro, the South, the tariff, centralization, expensive improvements, and aggressive legislation generally; and along with the new Democratic policy on the opposite side of the new subjects named, will be an opposing policy on these old subjects.

These groups proceed each on a great idea, the first, or Republican group, on the idea of equality, and the latter, or Democratic group, on the idea of liberty, which ideas respectively must give direction and unity to the two parties of the future as they have to those of the past. The Republican party, idealizing equality, wants the whole of the people to be equal, and the Democratic party, idealizing liberty, wants the people to be wholly free, the respective platforms of the two parties being mainly the expression of these several ideals. In the interest of equality the Republicans have opposed slavery, disfranchisement, and all special disabilities upon the blacks; whereas the Democrats, in the interests of liberty, have wanted men free to regulate such matters without Federal interference, its leading principle being free men, free States, and free trade, or personal liberty, local liberty, and business liberty. While the Republicans, in order to make men perfectly equal, would sacrifice a part of the rights of all, the Democrats, in order to make men perfectly free, would sacrifice all the rights of a part. The Republican party has, therefore, in the interest of equality, imposed many burdens on the States, restraining the people from discriminations; while the Democrats have fought for State rights with a view to take away individual rights (from some people). The Republicans have, in the interest of equality, effected the Amendments, the Reconstruction Acts, the Enforcement Laws, the Civil Rights Guarantees, and various Interstate Commerce and Railroad Regulations; while the Democrats have opposed all these in the interest of

liberty (of the States or whites). The Republicans have loudly and everywhere proclaimed, No slavery, No disfranchisement, No distinction in political rights, No difference in religious rights, and they have been willing to impose almost any disabilities on themselves or others, provided they be imposed on all alike; while the Democrats have insisted on differences in political and religious rights, provided some men are left free to do as they please. They have thus not only defended slavery, disfranchisement, and other discriminations between whites and blacks, and between Americans and Chinese, but have insisted on special privileges and exemptions for certain religious bodies, and for German, Irish, and other classes, as we shall see.

For these reasons, and others which will later appear, the principles of the Republican party have been formed around the idea of equality, and those of the Democratic party around the idea of liberty: and with their antecedents in this regard the future parties must be clustered around the same ideas respectively. They represent two distinct processes of thought, which are inevitable among great numbers — the logical and the intuitional — the former being the method of the Germanic peoples, and the latter of the Romanic and Celtic, or of the Northern and Southern peoples respectively, who will in the main constitute our parties, as they have hitherto done. For the Republican party, with the principles and methods of conceiving them mentioned, have always and will always embrace in the main the Germanic population of Saxons who have migrated from England and Scotland — notably the Puritans — and the emigrants from Germany and Scandinavia, together with their descendants; while the Democratic party has always and will always embrace in the main the Romanic population of the Normans, who migrated from the Royalists of

England to Virginia and the South, together with the Huguenots, the French of Canada and Louisiana, the Spaniards of New Mexico and California, and lately, the Italians and others from Southern Europe. The differences between the parties are, therefore, not only historical and psychological, but ethnical as well, and can be wiped out only with the intermingling of the races and exchange of ideas.

Observing these distinctions, then, we expect in the future to find the Republican party, or what will correspond to it, composed, as hitherto (though with more exceptions), of the elements named — the Puritanic element, who favor severe laws and penalties on vices, who antagonize not only the remaining inequalities of the blacks, but also the liquor traffic and polygamy, and who champion the public schools against a sectarian diversion of funds, and in general further Americanize our institutions; while the Democratic party, as heretofore, will be composed of the opposite elements — who favor the liquor traffic, champion the cause of foreigners, and demand special privileges for certain churches or their schools. It will in the same spirit still embrace those who want disabilities on the blacks and who would not disturb the Mormons in their polygamy, leaving these matters solely to the States.

We shall consider, then, these several classes and the issues likely to be raised by them.

The temperance question cannot always be kept out of the general mind. The class is large and permanent to which it appeals, and it is always liable to emerge when there is no other great issue, and always liable to be crowded back when there is. In entering, therefore, into a period of issue-less politics, we may expect it to assume great proportions. The moral classes must have a great issue of some kind, and temperance is about the only one that is permanently in sight. They will

not be content to play the part in politics taken in the days of slavery, and the Civil War, unless they have some subject of like dimensions, and the fact that they have had great issues till now will not let them be satisfied with small ones hereafter. But as slavery is abolished, the Union restored, and the grosser inequalities of the blacks are removed, or at least no longer openly championed, these classes have for years been hunting an issue. Intemperance is the greatest evil now remaining among men. Its calamities are obvious and may be seized upon by all classes. The figures in which they are estimated run up into colossal proportions. Every family has a sorrow founded on drunkenness, and every voter an experience of the effects which it is proposed to cure. Intemperance is an evil ranking with slavery, war, or anything that has yet been a national issue. The principle on which it is antagonized — prohibition — is easily comprehended. The defense which can be made is easily overcome by theoretical moralists, who largely compose the moral classes in politics. It is easy to formulate principles and devise catchwords on the subject. Passions may be excited over it and indignation aroused. Women and children can be enlisted to enforce its claims. It touches many interests at once — moral, financial, and social. An appeal to men's pockets, hearts, and consciences is possible, so that it has all the requisites of sensation and contagion. The mere fact that it is not practicable is no objection to it with the impracticable class, who can hope against much evidence and look far ahead and still be satisfied. Frequent defeat does not discourage them, and past failure is no lesson to them. They can become prohibitionists against all reason and continue such against all experience. They are a class strong in literature who have boundless faith in abstract principles, and are not discouraged by practical difficulties. They belong to an unbroken line from

the beginning of history, of anti-corruptionists, anti-combatants, anti-slavery men, and anti-injustice champions, who fight with an ever-renewing hope, and look for a millennium which does not disappoint them if it does not come. This class will always have something to urge in politics, as in other departments of benevolence. Philanthropy which actuates them makes issues out of every subject which afflicts the race, and so cannot pass by intemperance.

There would be no hope of success in the direction of prohibition if it fought alone, any more than there would be for a single soldier fighting against an army; but, joined with the forces named, which may be pooled with it, it is powerful. The training which the members of one of our parties had as anti-slavery and equal-rights champions qualifies them not only to fight for temperance, but to weave it as an issue with the other moral measures which as Republicans they want to promote. These reforms all require the same type of mind to espouse and to agitate, and if their advocates can generally get in one party, it will be large enough and enthusiastic enough to control it; and the question with the moral classes is to get all these elements on one side. And while the temperance advocates, and in fact all who, with an excess of theoretical thinking, have an exclusive specialty in politics, are too impractical to coöperate in great numbers or to adhere to a party (even if a small one), they may at any time, through the lack of other issues, or through the moral element tending toward them, succeed by joining forces. The capacity of every party for blundering is limited, and sometime they may make a mistake and succeed.

A strong defense may indeed be made against such a party. The saloon-keepers are a practical body with abundant means and numberless workers. Their places of business are con-

venient for political meetings, and their good fellowship as drinkers keeps them together as voters. Not being above dirty work, they have a special qualification for ward politics. Beer and whiskey being the sinews of war, they can tap a barrel on their own premises as effective as that of the millionaire candidate. Their incomes being endangered in the issues as are those of no other class, they can afford to be liberal with both their money and their whiskey in self-defense. They are defended by a party whose antecedents have always tolerated their business and by a whole army of drunkards whose pleasures are imperiled by a change.

They have also much theoretical reason to urge. They argue with the appearance of liberty on their side. They insist, with almost axiomatic force, that prohibition is sumptuary legislation; that the State should interfere as little as possible with private affairs; that the principal demand for intoxicants is by moderate drinkers; that excess, which is the only evil, is not inevitable or generally probable; that a little drinking may even be beneficial, and should not be denied to all because misused by a part; that there are many medical and mechanical uses for intoxicants not practically distinguishable at law from beverages; that the drinker alone should be held accountable for his drunkenness, and not another class; that the world has always used intoxicants, so that there is no experience for total abstinence; that, as all other nations tolerate drinking, our customs under prohibition would be in isolation; that, as our populace is constantly fed from wine-and-beer-drinking countries, we should be in a perpetual conflict with foreign customs, and that, as wine is becoming a most profitable product on our Pacific slope, and whiskey in all corn-growing States, prohibition would be a blow at our industry.

Added to these reasons, the liquor interests are rendered

further defensible by the division of temperance workers, some favoring prohibition, some local option, some high license, and some moral suasion only; and there is no practical reconciliation of their views. The Prohibitionists act from a principle that tolerates no milder measures, namely, from the assumption that both drinking, selling drink, and permitting its sale are wrong *per se;* and, as principle admits of no exceptions, it seems as great a sin to be moderate in its application as to be moderate in drinking. There cannot, therefore, be any hearty coöperation among the friends of temperance, but at best only a mutual toleration. As the Prohibitionists will not yield their principles, the advocates of high license will not consent to attempt the impractical. There are degrees in intoxicants, moreover, which shade off from almost pure alcohol to mild beer and cider, which are nearly harmless, so that none can draw a clear line of distinction between beverages and formulate a rule of abstinence acceptable to all temperance men. Any principle adopted is likely to proscribe tobacco, tea, or coffee, or else let in something really dangerous. Temperance, moreover, has been so long before the people that it is trite as an issue, and being known to attract every year a few votes only, the people as a whole, who have voted regardless of it, will not all take it up at once, though all must some time consider it.

Another subject capable of developing into vital importance, which cannot be much longer kept out of politics, is certain forms of clericalism. With the vast increase of migration from the Latin and other countries where there has long been a passionate division on this subject, the religious conditions of our country are changed, and we no longer all agree on the principle of religious indifference in the State. And it is easy to say how the people will divide on this issue. The anteced-

ents of the two parties and the groups of interest which they respectively represent indicate that the Republican party will antagonize all special favors to any church, and even a recognition of men's religious affiliations, and that the Democratic party, or its successor, will champion some consideration of these. The Republicans will do this in the interest of equality and the Democrats in the interest of liberty. Since Catholics, for example, will not be reconciled to all our institutions, notably the public-school system, the question arises, Shall we ignore them or especially provide for them? The Republicans, who insist that all men regardless of their religion shall be treated alike, will take the position that Catholics, like others, should be allowed simply to come into the schools or not, as they deem best, but that they should not be made a class by themselves, recognized by law as having special privileges, so that we should in no event modify the schools to suit their peculiarities. The Democrats, on the other hand, will claim that, as Catholics will not use our schools, we should note the fact, and either give them part of the school money for church schools or exempt them from taxation for common schools.

The same question will arise over asylums and other benevolent institutions. As Catholics will not use those provided by the State, at least to the same extent that others do, should they nevertheless pay for them, or should they be allowed their proportion of the tax to provide institutions of their own? As the question involves much money and many salaried positions, this class will not readily abandon it. The matter has come before the people in many States where several denominations already get appropriations for their church institutions; and a yearly application is made to the legislatures and city councils for money for religious purposes. This is a harassing problem, and candidates are beginning to be voted for on this

issue. The clergy and church societies which control many votes know that they can get promises for almost anything from politicians for these votes, so that the clerical question in some form already enters our campaigns. The Democratic party is recognized as the Catholic party and the Republican party as the non-Catholic party, the former containing most Catholics and the latter most of their opponents; and, as this question gains recognition, the lines will be more strongly drawn. Though all would keep religious prejudices out of politics, it cannot be done without abandoning our principle of universal equality. When a single utterance offensive to a sect — "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" — could turn a presidential election, as it did some years ago, the issue is in a fair way to become an open one.

As the Catholic interests turn mainly on education, the question in time will be whether we shall have public schools at all if we cannot divide them among the sects, as in England. Catholics will not always submit to pay school tax when they do not use the schools, and it is only a matter of when they shall be strong enough to relieve themselves. To educate Catholic children without religion radically antagonizes their church policy, as declared by a recent plenary council. Their faith must be taught with their grammar, and taught by those professing it. To educate them as Catholics is more important than to preach to them as such, Catholic schools being more effective than Catholic churches. Unless the youth are trained to this religion, they will be lost to it, as an unbiased education makes no strong sectarians of any kind. Catholics will not abandon their separate education, which mainly feeds their church and conserves their population. To do so would be suicidal; and they are not, like Prohibitionists, too good to be successful.

Every other nation has its clerical issues, and we are an anomaly as an exception. In every Catholic country there is a clerical party, and in every Protestant country a Catholic element demanding something for their church. History for fifteen hundred years is full of conflicts over "the rights of the Church." In the last generation every great nation has had its Catholic controversies.

Germany for thirty years had an almost perpetual quarrel with the Pope. This touched nearly every department of Government — public education, civil appointments, official discipline, and army exemptions. The Clericals are a recognized faction in both the Imperial Parliament and the several Landtags (or State Legislatures). The Jesuits, Redemptorists, and other Catholic orders were expelled for political intrigues, and the Clerical question furnished one of the chief agitations in the Empire. Bismarck had as many diplomatic battles with the church as with any other power, and his name was as much hated by Catholics as by French, Austrians, or Danes.

France too has a permanent Clerical party and permanent budget of Catholic questions; and, even since the separation of church and state, these are by no means ended. The Jesuits were expelled from that country, their schools closed, and Catholic institutions modified, for political reasons. The church is openly allied to one of the pretenders, and the Bourbon and the Catholic cause are deemed almost identical. The Ultramontanes constitute a faction in politics as well as in religion; in short, Catholic questions have never been out of agitation in France.

In Italy the main political question has long concerned the church. The Clericals alone threaten the stability of the Government; and, as it is a question of the Pope's temporal

power, it concerns nothing less than a division of the Kingdom. Ministries have hopelessly wrangled over the disposition of church property, and elections have turned on Clerical rights in the schools. Other nations are appealed to against Italy, and half the diplomacy of that Kingdom is aimed at thwarting the designs of the church.

In England there has been a perennial Catholic question, and the Empire's greatest trouble to-day is fed mainly by religious passion. The Irish question, mixed with the school question, is practically insoluble on account of this.

In the smaller countries it is similar. Belgium's chief problem now is the authority of the church in the schools. The Liberal party is known, as in other countries, as the Anti-clerical party, and the Conservative party as the Catholic party. Russia and Spain both have pending Catholic questions of great magnitude. Mexico and the South American States have not only their clerical parties, but their present (or recent) Catholic controversies. The Jesuits have been expelled from Mexico and several South American States, and the Liberal question everywhere is whether the people shall be free from Catholic legislation or whether the Government will still grant this religion special privileges.

As the Catholic Church has, therefore, a controversy with every other power, and Catholics so largely enter politics as Catholics, may we not expect it to be so here, especially with our increasing immigration from Southern Europe? There are the same reasons for it, though in less degree. While there is a separation of church and state, the separation is not complete; and while the Constitution prohibits an established religion and guarantees religious liberty, room is left on many subjects for religious legislation. Though there can be no established religion under our Constitution, the Government

can give aid to any religion. It appoints chaplains, and supplies services, in the army and elsewhere. These the Catholics, like the Protestants, seek to control. It makes appropriations for religious schools and charitable institutions. It lately apportioned the Indians in certain matters to the several sects; and Catholics, like Protestants, contended for them, as they do now for orphans and other State wards. In spite of the Constitution, there are thus many ways of getting money and favors from the general Government and still more from the States and municipalities, which greatly aid the church; and to get these the Catholic Church skilfully works as for one of its greatest interests. Some States can now appropriate unlimited amounts for sectarian purposes, can divide the school funds or provide for separate instruction, as in Minnesota, can send its paupers and insane to religious asylums, can pay religious hospitals and retreats for doing work for the State, can appoint priests, like other clergymen, as chaplains, teachers, and instructors, can send its wards to convents for instruction or restraint, and in many other ways support Catholic institutions, as it can those of other churches; and the Catholics having more of these institutions make greater demands on the public treasuries. And, though the church works quietly for such ends, so as not to rouse opposition, it will accept an open issue rather than give up its purpose. The Republican party, embracing most Protestants, will not much longer consent to this division of public moneys, and the Democratic party, to get the Catholic vote, will champion it; so that in time there will be a trial of strength on the issue. While the Republicans, in the interest of universal equality, will demand that there be no distinctions in religion or religious persons, the Democrats, in the interest of liberty, will demand that the States and cities be left free to regulate the matter.

There are special reasons why the two parties should take these relative positions. Besides the main fact that the Democratic party is committed to the principle of inequality, or at least not prejudiced against it, it contains most foreigners, particularly Irish, Italians, and Poles, who are Catholics, and who, therefore, by their religion, are also committed to inequality. It does not need, accordingly, to "sell out" to the Catholics in order to espouse their cause, but may do so on principle. Catholicism cannot be Republican. The equality of all men is the principle which it most denies. It has many grades in its hierarchy. It recognizes for many classes a divine right to rule, — for the Church, for the Pope, for the Clergy. It teaches the correlative obedience of other classes, — the duties of submission to leaders and superiors. All this harmonizes with the Democratic principle of inequality as found in its recent defense of slavery, disfranchisement, and the various distinctions in civil rights. The foreigners, especially from Catholic countries, have been long trained in these distinctions between men — between king and people, between nobility and commonalty, between titled and untitled, between clergy and laity, and between one class and another generally; which distinctions are worked out in all their thoughts and are part of their principles and customs. And so it will be impossible to get such persons in large numbers into the Republican party, which proclaims equal rights for all, and antagonizes every recognition by the Government of their religious differences. They go rather to the party which would govern them according to their differences — differences of States, of nationalities, of race, and of faith; that would distinguish in politics not only between white and black and between American and Chinese, but between Northerner and Southerner, between American and Irishman, and between native- and foreign-born;

that would keep men banded according to their nativity, and work for the Irish or German vote. Foreigners, I say, especially Catholics, would go to such a party rather than to the Republican, which knows no North or South, no German or American, no Irishman or native, but wants our people all Americans, and labors for a greater homogeneity of men and laws throughout the country, and which, to this end, would, by placing in the Federal Government many interests now left to the States, wipe out (by general laws) all inequalities of race, color, nationality, and religion in one universally equal and everywhere sovereign nation.

For this reason, then, and for the one I shall mention in the next paragraph, we may expect Catholics to flock, as a body, to the Democratic party or its successor, as they have hitherto done. It is their only means of consolidating for their church claims. The Democratic party will become the Clerical party, the Conservative party, and the Inequality party, as distinguished from the Equal Rights, or Liberal party. It will absorb the elements that make the "reactionary" party in all European countries, and which will always have a place in every country.

In view of this Catholic constituency of the Democratic party, and of the fact that Catholics are mostly foreigners, and in view of the further fact that the liquor element in politics is mainly foreign, as well as Democratic, another issue between the coming parties will be between natives and foreigners; in which issue the Republican party, or its successor, will champion the former, and the Democratic the latter. Foreigners can generally be united on one group of interests which the Republican elements already incline to antagonize, and the Democratic elements to defend. Here, then, are the

conditions of great political combinations, with distinct principles and aims on each side; and such conditions rarely meet without generating corresponding organizations.

The Republicans in dealing with foreigners deprecate their un-American sympathies and tendencies, and demand that we Americanize everything foreign; in which demand they assume that our present religious and social customs are peculiarly American, especially those touching equality, temperance, public schools, and the complete secularization of Government, to all of which foreigners and Democrats are, on principle, opposed. Protesting against the recognition of foreign-born citizens as foreigners, and against appealing to their sentiments as Irish, Germans, or Italians, the Republicans will insist on dropping the Old World from our politics, and destroying the influence of foreign organizations in our campaigns. They would have foreigners fuse with Americans, conform to our ways, and make one society with us; while the Democratic party, on the other hand, will continue, as hitherto, to cherish the interests of foreigners, as the Republican party does those of negroes. It will organize them as foreigners and have them coöperate as such; it will vote them as foreigners; and the foreign societies will be the strongholds of Democratic politicians. It will exhibit an interest in the political questions of the countries from which they came, particularly of Ireland. It will protect the German's beer and the Irishman's whiskey against prohibition Republicans. It will defend the Sunday theaters and beer gardens against Puritanic proscription, and protect the venders of intoxicants against the penal statutes. These, being supposed to be foreign interests, will be defended by the same class, which is already pledged to defend them on the ground of personal liberty.

In view of this natural relation of the parties, the Germans

may quit the Republican for the Democratic party, or its successor. The other foreigners are substantially all Democrats now on account of the considerations named; and the Germans are an anomaly in the Republican ranks. They have hitherto, with the Scandinavians (also a Germanic people), been Republicans against their foreign interests, and mainly because of their race characteristics; in which, as stated, they are one with the Puritans or Anglo-Saxon population which constitutes the Republican strength; and while it is a question whether their race or their ancestral habitat shall dominate them, the Germans have their external interests mainly with the Dmocrats. Those from South Germany, who are mostly Catholics, will be Democratic on account of their hostility to universal equality, to secularization in policies, and to the public schools; while all Germans will incline to Democracy on account of its drinking and Sunday claims. The general sympathy of the Democratic party for foreigners, moreover, will attract them as foreigners. For these reasons the Germans will be more largely Democratic, and so make one party with foreigners generally, who are rapidly getting on one side. It was so in the Know-nothing controversy, which, in a modified form, will be revived. The fight against foreign ideas, foreign customs, foreign goods, foreign religion, and foreign morals cannot be fought by the Republicans without antagonizing German sympathies. The whole group of foreign interests must go together or stay together. They cannot be severed in the fight.

A party can become stable only when its natural elements are all on the same side; and the elements named seem in each case to form a group which naturally coheres, and is calculated to make a homogeneous organization. As so combined, each class will have one set of principles, one sympathy, and one aim. The Germans are now self-antagonized by having their

race characteristics and their national customs on opposite sides. Though the former has carried them into the Republican party, the latter would draw them to the Democratic party. The internals and the externals of the Germans are at war, and there is a strife between their nature and their circumstances, with the chances in favor of their circumstances.

One intensely practical matter that will precipitate this issue and, while specially emphasizing the Americanism of the Republican party, invite the opposition of foreigners, is the fact that our territory is fast filling up, so that immigration must be checked. The Republicans, in the interest of the natives, will urge that, as there are too many men, America should be kept for Americans; while the Democrats, in the interest of the foreign-born population, will favor a policy more friendly to their kindred at home. Republicans, enlisting the workingmen, who feel the competition of an overcrowded labor market, will demand something to protect American labor, as they do to protect American manufacturers; and, not recognizing the race distinctions which the Democrats do, they will use the same arguments against the Irish and Germans which the latter do against the Chinese and Africans. Since employers can, during a strike, get foreign workmen to break the market, thus destroying the American laborers' support, the latter will insist that the special encouragement hitherto given to immigration shall cease — that to this end a longer residence shall be required for voting; that offices and land shall be restricted to full citizenship and that other discriminations shall be made in favor of actual citizens. The idea that this country is the asylum for the oppressed of all lands must be modified as the country fills up and there is no more asylum room. Whereas immigration was once necessary for our prosperity, the arrest of it becomes equally so when we have

enough, and when, instead of more men, the demand is for more land. We are already estimating our resources and calculating the time of their possible exhaustion. We cannot be as liberal as when we had a vast unoccupied area and unworked mines, and our best economists are trying to devise means of preserving our resources instead of exploiting them.