

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1902.

Number 221.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

"The stuffed prophet" is what the New York Sun used to call Grover Cleveland. This wasn't very nice, but then the Sun never was over nice. And it was long ago cordially forgiven by Mr. Cleveland's friends for that epithet, because it invented epithets so much nastier for Mr. Bryan. We repeat the Sun's irreverent characterization of Mr. Cleveland as a "stuffed prophet" because it is so forcibly suggested by that gentleman's speech of the 19th at the Tilden club banquet in New York.

The Tilden club has been established to "harmonize" and "reorganize" the Democratic party along plutocratic lines. Quite appropriately, therefore, it takes the name of a millionaire bourbon Democrat of a former generation, who made his millions by railroad "wrecking," and to whom the Democratic party is indebted for nothing of which it has any special reason to be proud. He introduced the "gum shoe" campaign, with its "whispers," its "literary bureaus," and its "barrels," and, having been exposed in his efforts to bribe returning-boards, was outwitted in a sly scheme to secure the presidency by a combination of 8 to 7, which his equally callous but more astute adversaries deftly turned into a combination of 7 to 8. An excellent patron saint of the plutocratic "reorganizers" is Samuel J. Tilden.

No less sensitive to the proprieties with reference to "harmony" than to "reorganization" was the Tilden club on the occasion of this banquet at which Mr. Cleveland spoke. The kind of "harmony" to which the "re-

organizers" aspire is what existed between the lion and the lamb when they lay down in peace together, the lamb inside. These gentlemen have regarded the party as disorganized because they have lost control of it. They therefore wish to reorganize by regaining control. That is what "reorganization" means and it is all it means. So, in spreading a national "harmony" banquet, to which Democratic leaders from all sections were invited, the Tilden club "reorganizers" chose two Eastern men for the speakers—one because he is an ex-President and the other because he is a local candidate for President—and pasted a courtplaster over the mouth of every other guest, however distinguished. Their anxiety for "harmony" was manifestly intense. They went even so far as to invite Mr. Bryan to be their guest. But in their fidelity to the proprieties of the "harmonious" occasion they carefully refrained from inviting him to be a speaker. Their delicacy was truly sublime—though not usually called delicacy.

Here was a banquet nominally designed to harmonize the discordant elements of the party. An ex-President whom the party had three times nominated for President and twice elected, yet who bolted the nomination and publicly scorned the person of his successor as leader of the party, was invited to speak. Another invited speaker was the presidential favorite of such "reorganizers" and "harmonizers" as William C. Whitney of the Standard Oil trust. He had greeted the party's presidential nomination of 1896 with the remark that he was "still a Democrat—very still," and had acted accordingly. Both speakers were not only selected from the disgruntled minority group of the party, and with reference to the

tastes of the plutocratic element, but from the same locality. But Mr. Bryan, the greatest member of the party outside of the "reorganizing" wing (which modestly claims a monopoly of the great), and the presidential candidate of the party who in 1896 and 1900 polled larger popular votes than any of his predecessors, Cleveland included, and withal an "able and eloquent Democratic orator," as Mr. Hill took occasion to describe him, was ostentatiously invited to attend and as ostentatiously given to understand that he would be expected to be seen and not heard. This is precisely the kind of "harmony" banquet to which the Democrats of the Democratic party are invited by the "reorganizers," not only at Tilden clubs, but in the organization itself and at the polls. They are expected to be seen and not heard.

But to get back to Mr. Cleveland's speech. It was a characteristic production—all democratic "stuffing" and no democratic meat, a speech in the last stages, pathologically speaking, of fatty degeneration of its democracy. While it reads like a Democratic speech, examination shows that the substance of democracy is not there, but only the patter. With the substitution of Republican for Democratic epithets, Republican for Democratic names, and the omission of the wails over defeat, this speech would answer just as well for a Republican meeting as for a Democratic banquet. There is only one paragraph about which there could possibly be any doubt of that, and we quote it in full:

Democracy has already in store the doctrines for which it fights its successful battles; and it will have them in store as long as the people are kept from their own, and just as long as their rights and interests are sacri-

ficed by favoritism in government care, by inequality in government burdens, by the encouragement of huge industrial aggregations that throttle individual enterprise, by the reckless waste of public money, and by the greatest of all injuries, as it underlies nearly all others, a system of tariff taxation whose robbing exactions are far beyond the needs of economical and legitimate government expenditure, which purchases support by appeals to sordidness and greed, and which continually corrupts the public conscience.

But wouldn't even that paragraph pass as a moderately good Republican speech if the first word were changed and the Democrats were the "ins" instead of the "outs"? Try it and see. The only part that might need toning down would be the three or four lines that mention tariff taxation; and that part wouldn't need it if the Gorman Democrats were in power and the speech were being delivered by a Babcock Republican.

About the wails over defeat, however, a word should be said regarding the facts. This word cannot be repeated too often. Mr. Cleveland implies, evidently with intention, that the Democratic defeats of 1896 and 1900 were due to the Chicago platform and the nomination of Bryan. His memory is short. Every political observer who recalls the dark days of 1894, 1895 and 1896, before the Chicago platform was formulated or Bryan thought of as a candidate, knows that the Democratic party was doomed to disaster by Cleveland's administration and leadership. Never mind the blame; we are speaking of the fact. Cleveland had been elected President in 1892 with a Democratic Congress at his back. In the lower House there were 219 Democrats, making a clear majority of 41. Two years later this Democratic majority was swept away. Only 93 Democrats were elected, and the Republicans controlled the new House by a clear majority of 74. Mr. Cleveland takes occasion to say that in Tilden's day "and afterwards Northern Democratic states were not rare curiosities." He implies that "Bryanism" has made them so. But in

fact they became so at the congressional elections of 1894, two years ahead of "Bryanism." In that year not one Northern State, not a solitary one, elected a majority of Democrats in its delegation to Congress; although the delegations of Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Wyoming and Wisconsin had Democratic majorities in 1892. From California there was only 1 Democrat in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Illinois, none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Indiana none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Iowa, none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from Kansas none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from Massachusetts 1 in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Michigan none in 1894, where there had been 5 in 1892; from Minnesota none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from Nebraska none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from New Jersey, none in 1894 where there had been 6 in 1892; from New York 5 in 1894, where there had been 20 in 1892; from Ohio 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Pennsylvania 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Rhode Island none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from West Virginia none in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Wisconsin none in 1894, where there had been 6 in 1892; and from Wyoming none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892. Even the Southern state of Tennessee had only 6 in a delegation of 10 in 1894, while Missouri had only 4 in a delegation of 15. The Senate, too, was changed from Democratic to Republican. In the Congress which followed the elections of 1894 there were only 39 Democratic Senators to 42 Republicans; whereas in the Congress following the elections of 1892 there had been 44 Democratic Senators to only 36 Republicans. Things Democratic grew steadily worse, until in the spring of 1896 the Democratic nomination for President went a-begging. Excepting the impossible Hill, none of the old "availables" nor the new "possibili-

ties" wanted it. Utter defeat for the Democratic party was regarded as inevitable by the leaders on both sides. Even if all this was not Mr. Cleveland's fault it was a result of his administration and the signal for his "banishment."

Such was the hopeless condition of the party when the Chicago platform and Bryan were unexpectedly put forward to save it from dropping out of the political arena or into a scarcely concealed alliance with the Republicans. At once its prospects revived, and in spite of Cleveland's going over to McKinley's support, it continued to regain strength. Under the circumstances success was impossible. But the heaviest load it had to carry through it all, was not "free silver," nor "Bryanism" of any kind, but the unpopularity of the Cleveland administration. Outside of financial circles that was the tune which the Republican orators sung, and that, together with Hanna's corruption fund, was the cause of Bryan's defeat. Bryan had not only to ward off Cleveland's blows upon his flank; he had also to carry Cleveland's heavy record upon his back. Yet see the result. The popular vote for Bryan in 1896 was larger than that for Cleveland in 1892 by 946,007. His proportion of the total vote was 46.7 per cent., whereas Cleveland's in 1892 was only 46.08—Bryan's being larger by two-thirds of 1 per cent. In harmony with this result was the change in the Democratic representation in Congress. From a total of only 93 elected in the last Cleveland year (1894) the Democratic representation was raised in the first Bryan year (1896) to 130, and the Republican majority reduced from 74 to 24; while in the second Bryan year (1900), the Democratic representation was raised to 153 and the Republican majority reduced to 20. And although it might still be said, in Mr. Cleveland's phrase, that Northern Democratic states were "rare curiosities," they had at any rate regained some of the representation which during his administra-

tion they absolutely lost. The number of Democrats in the California delegation was increased from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896, though both were lost in 1900; that of the Illinois delegation from none in 1894 to 5 in 1896, and 11 in 1900; that of the Indiana delegation from none in 1894 to 4 in 1896 and the gain held in 1900; that of Kansas from none in 1894 to 1 in 1900; that of Massachusetts from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896 and 3 in 1900; that of Michigan from none in 1894 to 1 in 1896, which, however, was lost in 1900; that of New York from 5 in 1894 to 6 in 1896 and 12 in 1900; that of Ohio from 2 in 1894 to 6 in 1896, but reduced to 4 in 1900; that of Nebraska from none in 1894 to 2 in 1900; and that of New Jersey from none in 1894 and 1896 to 2 in 1900; while the Democratic delegation from the Southern state of Tennessee rose from 6 in 1894 to 8 in 1896, remaining at 8 in 1900, and that from Missouri from 4 in 1894 to 12 in 1896 and 13 in 1900. Under these circumstances Mr. Cleveland crowds the line of delicacy very close when he implies that the Democratic defeats since Tilden's day are chargeable to Bryan's leadership.

The speech of David B. Hill on the occasion of this Tilden club "harmony" banquet, is not open to the criticism that it all ran to "fat." Hill did say things. And the things he said were Democratic in substance as well as verbiage. One of them is especially worth quoting, because it puts into compact form a sentiment which needs just now to get emphatic expression. Referring to the Republican trick of confusing the government with the party in power as if they were the same, and taking President Roosevelt's Decoration Day speech as his text, Mr. Hill mentioned that speech as—

the partisan address of President Roosevelt, delivered on Decoration day, in violation of the proprieties of the occasion, wherein he purposely or inadvertently confused the well recognized distinctions which exist between the administration and the government, between the army and the gov-

ernment and between all the other officials of the government and the government itself, and assumed to question the loyalty of those who have ventured to criticize the cruel acts of a few officers of the army, who, if semi-official reports are correct, have undoubtedly disgraced the uniform they wear. This confusion of the state itself with the ruler thereof, is not new in history. It was Louis XIV. who once made the same mistake when he assumed to be France and uttered the famous declaration: "I am the state"—a remark which might have lost him his head in later times of less despotism; and President Roosevelt, in another sense, seems to have already lost his head when he forgets that this country differs from both ancient and modern France in that it is not a crime to criticize the army, or the President, or any other servant or servants of the people; and he needs to be reminded that this is a government of law—a government under a written constitution, wherein the right of every citizen freely to express his sentiments upon administrative questions is expressly guaranteed—and that loyalty to the government does not consist in loyalty to individuals or to the policies of those who happen to hold official positions. Loyalty to this government consists in attachment to our free institutions—in faithful observance of constitutional provisions, in respect for its flag as the emblem of civil liberty, in support of the authorities of the United States against the attacks of our foreign or domestic foes; but it does not consist in ostentatious professions of "intense Americanism," nor in indifference to the preservation or spread of republican forms of government everywhere, nor in suppressing free speech, nor in conquering the free people of other and distant lands who desire to govern themselves. . . .

That is the best democracy that David B. Hill has ever uttered, and he should have credit for it.

On another matter also Mr. Hill was more than usually radical and definite. While condemning trusts he demanded "free trade in all articles controlled by trusts," and said:

Everybody of discernment and intelligence must recognize the folly of the maintenance of a system of tariff taxation which enables manufacturers enjoying a monopoly of governmental favoritism here to undersell foreign manufacturers in the latter's own country and at the same time compel the people of this country to pay a larger price for the manufactured articles which they purchase in their

home markets than American manufacturers themselves are willing to accept from foreign purchasers in foreign lands. . . . The whole system of governmental favoritism, whereby the constitutional power to tax for the purpose of providing revenue for the needs of the federal treasury is improperly used for the purpose of building up one man's business at the expense of another's, by discriminating in favor of one industry as against another, is a vicious system which has long afflicted the country and which has grown more and more intolerable with years and against which Democracy has ever protested. It is utterly indefensible upon any just and proper principle of government. There is no justification for the exercise of the power of legislation to make millionaires out of one class of people and paupers of another. . . . If the policy of protection is to continue in whole or in part to be tolerated by the country it might be well to consider whether it were not better that its evils should not be attempted to be mitigated by piecemeal or popgun legislation, but that our efforts should be reserved until the country has become so surfeited with its monstrous injustice that it is prepared to destroy the whole citadel of protection and to return to a constitutional and just system of taxation for the purposes of revenue only.

If David B. Hill were a man to be trusted, that utterance could be accepted as the strongest and most satisfactory in the direction of free trade which can yet be hoped for. But to know Hill's record is to distrust his professions. He has always been a "peanut politician," with no political principles that he could not throw off or put on as seemed to him from time to time expedient. From such a leader the Democratic party may most devoutly pray deliverance. It were better for the party to suffer defeat at the election in 1904 as in 1896 and in 1900, than to suffer it after the election, as in 1892.

In responding to the challenge of the "harmony" banqueters to whom Cleveland and Hill spoke at New York, Mr. Bryan makes an indictment which is criticized for dealing in personalities. That is a weak evasion. Indictments always deal in personalities. The question is not whether Mr. Bryan's indictment is personal but whether it is true. Let no one who hopes to see the Demo-