

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1902.

Number 233.

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.

It is impossible at this time to measure the importance to American politics of Speaker Henderson's refusal to accept his renomination for Congress. All revolutions are precipitated, when the time is ripe, by some event of no greater magnitude in itself than this; and that a revolution within the Republican party impends, to which Henderson's declination is as the match to a powder magazine, is almost as certain as Fate.

What his motives may have been it is folly to speculate upon. He has stated them with apparent candor, and no reason appears upon the surface for suspecting his good faith. Having canvassed his district, he learned that a large proportion of his Republican constituents are hostile to his protection views. Without bad faith, therefore, in making his canvass, he could not hope to escape the humiliation of defeat; and he preferred to abandon the field with convictions undisturbed and conscience clear. Upon the face of the matter, Mr. Henderson seems to have set an excellent but extraordinary example of fidelity to principle and good faith toward constituents.

His precipitate action cannot fail, however, to advertise widely and with tremendous emphasis the condition which provoked it, and thereby accentuate "the Iowa idea" not only in his own Congressional district but over the entire country. It probably satisfies the public generally of what he was already doubtless convinced, that ex-Gov. Boies will be his successor

in Congress; and it is certain to create a stampede at the Congressional elections which may quite change the complexion of the lower House. Not that it will make clear-cut free traders of stanch protectionists. Conversions are seldom so easily effected. But it will have a marked tendency to strengthen and expand free trade sentiment among voters who have not been definitely attached to either side.

This sentiment has long been gathering volume in the Republican party, especially in the West; and now that Mr. Henderson has drawn the line sharply between Republicans who incline toward free trade, and those who, like himself, cling to the protection fetish, the cleavage is likely to become rapidly more and more impressive. One effect of his remarkable action has been to demolish the plan of campaign agreed upon between Mr. Roosevelt and the little coterie of Senators he had gathered about him at Oyster Bay. They had cozily arranged to keep the tariff question and the trust question apart, by proposing regulation of some sort as a remedy for trusts, and offering as a sop to "the Iowa idea," but wholly without reference to trusts, to make such modifications of tariff schedules from time to time as might seem wise. This agreement had hardly been effected when Mr. Henderson's declination fell upon it like a chunk of dynamite. On the one hand he thereby in effect rebuked the President and his advisers for offering to meddle with the schedules; while on the other he virtually admonished them that Republican sentiment in favor of abolishing trust-fostering tariffs is at present too strong for him to cope with in his own district and likely to be too strong to be overcome in the country at large.

It will be almost impossible now to keep the trust question and the tariff question apart. That member of the Republican Congressional committee was guilty of no exaggeration who exclaimed upon hearing of the Henderson declination: "This is an earthquake!"

The Outlook, of New York, in its issue of September 13, has brought together, in what it calls "authorized form," the speeches relating to trusts which were recently made by President Roosevelt at Providence, Boston, Fitchburg and Bangor. In doing this the Outlook has shown commendable enterprise and deserves the thanks of its readers. If we did not have all of these speeches together we might think from the earnest tone of one that surely there must be some real strenuosity in another. But reading them all together, and eliminating the sentence after sentence of what the President is candid enough himself to characterize as "perfectly trite," we find a strenuous example of strenuosity destrenuized. The whole situation is "given away" by the single fact that here are speeches on trusts and not a word in favor of reducing the tariff! This, too, even when conventions of the President's own party are seeing and proclaiming the inevitable connection of the two. President Roosevelt is not so quick as Speaker Henderson at seeing danger signals ahead.

In this same number of the Outlook a resolution of the Idaho Republican convention is quoted, as follows: "We, therefore, favor a revision of the tariff, without unreasonable delay, which will place on the free list every article and product controlled by a monopoly." And yet the President, in what purports to be a most serious discussion of trusts, ignores the discussion of the

remedy which is in the mouth even of so many Republicans. Well may the New York Evening Post say:

This is a subject on which President Roosevelt cannot persist in keeping silent. He must speak to establish his own sincerity. The charge is freely made that his speeches about restraining trusts are only declamation. . . . Unless the President is willing to rest under the suspicion that he is talking clap-trap, for political purposes, and that he has not really enlisted for a war against trusts by every legitimate weapon, he will soon take occasion to say that he agrees with those ardent supporters of his in the West who are clamorous for the removal of the tariff duties that shelter monopoly.

But Mr. Roosevelt had agreed to continue what the Post properly calls his "clap trap for political purposes," when Speaker Henderson stunned him. What he will say now, only the future can disclose. As to the trust speeches he has already made, one can think of no apter comparison for the state of his strenuosity than that of a lassoed bull.

In commenting in the Commoner upon the attitude of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland toward the silver question, as disclosed by Mr. Johnson in his speech as chairman of the Ohio convention, Mr. Bryan has very cleverly and completely laid bare the real motives of the "reorganizers" in their unqualified hostility to the Kansas City platform.

"While it is to be regretted," he writes, "that Mr. Johnson is not prepared to defend every part of the financial plank of the Kansas City platform, his frank acknowledgment of difference on the ratio will answer one good purpose: it will convince the public that the men who have made such a fuss about 16 to 1 are not sincere, for they will oppose Mr. Johnson as heartily as they would have done had he given emphatic endorsement to every word in the platform. Many have taken refuge behind the ratio, when their real objection was to some other plank in the platform." Mr. Bryan adds that "these will be unmasked by Mr. Johnson's position."

Sure enough! Mr. Bryan was right. His prediction was verified even before the public had seen it in print. The Boston Journal, a Democratic "reorganizer" of Republican affiliations, promptly declared that Johnson "would be almost as obnoxious to the conservative forces of the country as Mr. Bryan himself." Some of the Democratic "reorganizing" papers, of Democratic pretensions, found him even more obnoxious than Bryan; while the New York Times, which may be regarded as the journalistic leader of the plutocratic movement within the Democratic party, has lost no time in declaring the same war against Johnson that it has maintained against Bryan. "Between the reorganizers of the Democratic party," it belligerently announces, "and the reactionary Bryanites, with Johnson now at their head, there will be, there must be, open war."

Let it be observed that this war, which the "reorganizing" and "harmonizing" Times transfers from Bryanism to Johnsonism, is not a war against "16 to 1." It cannot be, for not only has Johnson never accepted that doctrine but he expressly declares his opposition to it. In making this hostile pronouncement, therefore, the Times, as spokesman for the "reorganizers," exposes the very insincerity with which Bryan charges them and which he predicted they would themselves expose. It is not the "16 to 1" clause of the Kansas City platform that they have been fighting all this time, under the absurd pretense that that doctrine is the root of all the political and economic evil. What in their hearts they have been arrayed against is the democratic character of the Kansas City platform in general. In some instances holding briefs for the plutocratic interests of the country, and in others deluded by those who do hold such briefs, the "reorganizers" in the Democratic party, while professing that what they want is "harmony," are ready at the drop of the hat to fight anybody and everybody

who does not fall meekly into the plutocratic procession. And of this they now stand self-convicted. No compromise would satisfy them which did not allow them to formulate the platform and name the candidates. As Johnson truly said in his convention speech, what the plutocratic leaders in both parties have feared is "not free silver but free men."

He would be a poor observer of affairs political who did not realize that the chief concern of the Democratic "reorganizers" is to prevent the nomination of a democrat as the Democratic candidate for President. They want a "conservative" Democracy; one that can divide with the Republican party the campaign contributions of the trusts; one that will contest with the Republican party for the plutocratic job in which that party has been profitably engaged; one that would be an assistant Republican party when out of power and an acceptable substitute for that party when in power. With this object in view they are looking hopefully forward to the election of Mr. Pattison as governor of Pennsylvania. Should he carry his own rock-ribbed Republican state, Pattison would be an ideal candidate, in many respects, for the "reorganizers." But Johnson is casting a bigger shadow than Pattison. He is not nearly so congenial to the plutocratic elements, but he is ever so much more acceptable to those that are genuinely democratic. Hence the bitterness toward him. Even Mark Hanna would not be so delighted were Ohio to poll her old-time Republican majority this Fall, as would that plutocratic coterie of Democrats which is composed of Grover Cleveland's intimates and to whose harmoniously belligerent sentiments the New York Times gives utterance.

These malcontents might possess themselves with patience. Johnson is not a candidate for the presidency, in the sense of pulling and pushing for the nomination. He is attending