

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1903.

Number 259.

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.

When the Iroquois Club of Chicago celebrated Jackson day on the 16th, with Edward M. Shepard, of New York, as its principal guest and speaker, it would have exhibited a better conception of the fitness of things political had it refrained from inviting supplementary speakers whose presence was calculated to give to the occasion the air of a "reorganization" banquet.

It may be that a politico-social club, composed of conservatives and radicals, of gold Democrats and free silver Democrats, of protection Democrats and free trade Democrats, of pro-trust Democrats and anti-trust Democrats, and of imperialist Democrats and anti-imperialist Democrats, as Judge Tuley in the opening speech at the banquet described the Iroquois Club to be—it is possible, we say, that a social club so constituted may flourish. But similarly constituted, the Democratic party cannot flourish and ought not to flourish. While these diverse elements may live in peace and harmony within the precincts of the Iroquois club, they cannot unite within a political party to direct the legislation of the country. Republicans in sentiment belong with the Republican party, not with the Democratic, no matter what social club they may choose to join.

But it would be unfair to hold Mr. Shepard and his friends of the Iroquois club responsible for the incomprehensible management of this banquet, which has created an opportunity for Republican and pluto-

Democratic papers to gloat over the affair as a step toward the "reorganization" of the Democratic party and identify him and them with the "reorganizers." Mr. Shepard is not a "reorganizer," nor is he in sympathy with the "reorganizing" movement. While he believes, with all democratic-Democrats from Mr. Bryan down, that no one should be ruled out of the party because he has at any time in the past, whether once or twice or always, voted against Democratic candidates, he also believes and declares that only those who are willing to unite upon democratic principles and policies have any proper place in the counsels of the Democratic party. This is quite the reverse of the "reorganizing" programme. Pleading the importance of party success regardless of political principle, the "reorganizers" seek to reestablish in control of the Democratic organization the same malign leadership and influences that dominated it prior to the revolution of 1896. They propose to make of it once more a supplementary Republican party, devoted to corporate interests in particular and monopoly privileges in general.

That our characterization of the Democratic "reorganizers" is not overdrawn may be seen by reference to the Brooklyn Eagle of March 2. The Eagle is an old established Democratic paper, its Democracy being of the traditional or so-called "historical" brand, which fought with the Whigs for Negro slavery as long as that crime lasted and now fights with the Republicans for a species of slavery that turns upon no distinctions of race. In 1896 and 1900 the Eagle helped the Republican party—all the while, however, pretending to be a Democratic paper; and now it represents the "reorganizing"

policy of Hill, Cleveland, Whitney, Gorman and the rest. In its issue of March 2, it outlined the "reorganizing" programme. Here is its description of the general purpose and the initial move:

Those Democrats who oppose Bryan and who advocate the reconstruction of Democracy with Bryanism expunged, are about to carry that issue into the South and West. One of the principal battlegrounds will be the State of Nebraska, where Mr. Bryan still retains, nominally at least, the control of the machinery of his party. It is proposed to crush Mr. Bryan's influence in his own State and to prevent at all costs his control of the Nebraska delegation to the next Democratic national convention.

As to the leading spirits in this "harmony" campaign, the Eagle has the following to say:

Mr. Hill's is the executive mind in the scheme of reorganization. For more than a year that skillful politician has been building up an anti-Bryan, conservative, sound money machine in the Democratic party of the East to be used as the nucleus of the general reorganization movement planned for next year. Mr. Cleveland gave countenance to the project in June, 1902, by appearing on the same platform with Mr. Hill at the Tilden club in this city. Mr. Gorman met Mr. Hill at Saratoga in September, and Mr. Olney met him in New York in January, both acquiescing in his plans. New England, New York, New Jersey and Maryland, having together ninety-three votes in the electoral college, were thus in alliance against Bryan at the moment he arrived in New York with his defiance of the Hill-Cleveland faction. In all of the combinations by which Democratic victories have been figured in the past, Maryland has been allotted safe, and New York, New Jersey and Connecticut fighting ground. Next in importance is Indiana. That state has been promised to Hill by ex-Mayor Taggart, of Indianapolis. Powerful as this combination undoubtedly is, it lacks much of control in the Democratic national convention. It is Mr. Hill's hope, if not his expectation, that most of the delegates from the South will desert Bryan's cause. To pave the way for a South-

ern alliance Mr. Hill has been in communication with prominent gold Democrats of North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri and Texas. The results are definitely known to nobody but Mr. Hill. It is asserted, however, on authority close to Mr. Hill, that every one of the States named has been pledged to support his policy of reorganization, Texas leading. To make this substantial inroad into the solid South it has been necessary to concede the vice presidential nomination to the South, assuming, to begin with, that the nominee for President will be chosen from New York.

This disclosure by the Eagle is nothing more than a semi-authoritative publication of what has for months been an open secret. So is its revelation of what the "reorganizers" platform will be if they get back into control of the party:

With the disappearance of Bryan, the question of reaffirmation of the national platforms of 1896 and 1900 will also disappear, and the Democracy will be free to proceed with reconstruction on lines acceptable to Eastern leaders and to the commercial and financial interests of the country.

By "commercial and financial interests of the country" is meant, of course, those interests that have been classified as "Morganization" interests.

That Mr. Shepard harbors no thought in common with this reactionary programme of the "reorganizers" does not depend upon his personal assurances alone. Besides his well known respect for Bryan as a Democratic leader, his speech at the Iroquois Club was in itself equivalent to a denunciation of the "reorganization" scheme. It was at the same time an unequivocal declaration of democratic principles; and it presented as extended a programme for beginning to put them into operation, as could be expected from any man of the cautious instincts, education and habits of Mr. Shepard. With an unmistakable allusion to the "reorganizers," he condemned all programmes of "adroit management" based upon the idea "that it is of little moment

what the end desired by the voter is, so long as he votes with us; or upon the idea that, lest we shall alienate some part of our support, our opinions had best be secreted until after we are in power."

And Mr. Shepard reiterated as the fundamental principle of Democracy, the doctrine of "complete equality of privileges to all men," or, as he phrased it more exactly elsewhere in his speech—

The establishment of equal rights, the abolition of special privileges, the maintenance of democratic self-government.

These may be said to be mere common place expressions in politics. So they were, only a few years ago. But they are not so now. Men have been brought to judgment recently. They have been obliged to measure the full significance of those common-places by the test of concrete issues; and since doing that the phrases fall no longer trippingly from the tongues of men who have discovered them to be vital with a present meaning which they do not accept. David B. Hill, for instance, could not utter those words in a public speech to-day without choking. If his friend Judge Parker has ever uttered them there is no report of the fact. President Roosevelt abstains from their use; and we doubt if ex-President Cleveland would relish a necessity for repeating them. The man who emphasizes those words at this period in our history is either a hypocrite or a democratic Democrat. He declares either a conviction which he knows he does not possess, or one which distinctly differentiates him from the Democratic "reorganizers"; and he does it with intention. We do not believe that Mr. Shepard is a hypocrite. He has shown no lack of candor in disagreeing either with friend or foe, when he has been in disagreement. We do believe that in using these old common places of politics he was moved by the democratic impulse that originally framed them and has recently renewed their vitality.

In suggesting a specific policy Mr. Shepard was true to the principle he had enunciated; and, with reference to the tariff question, wise in his proposal. Said he:

I should rejoice to hear the Democratic party propose—not a general revision of the tariff with all of its difficulties and complications and with all of the widespread popular belief, faulty as I believe it to be, of great masses of American business and laboring men in the protective tariff; but in the first instance a removal or reduction to a revenue basis of the duties on goods the production of which is to-day practically monopolized. Instead of dealing with the whole problem of free trade and protection, instead of introducing doubt into almost every business, the Democratic party may well deal with the few schedules in which through such practical monopoly vast fortunes have been made by taxation upon the masses of the people.

An attack upon a few items in the tariff law may seem like a small affair. But it is in the right direction; as far as it goes it is in furtherance of the fundamental principle; and, as Mr. Shepard well said, for such a campaign—

public sentiment is ready. In that campaign every argument in favor of economic freedom can be readily made clear to the American people. Its essential conservatism will readily appeal to the average American citizen, whatever he may scientifically think of free trade. Such a particular assault upon the fortress of monopoly would succeed, and promptly. And in its beneficent result the American people would find, as the English people found in the days of Sir Robert Peel, an all-sufficient reason later to support a campaign for demolition of the entire fortress. In such a campaign we should, doubtless, with a few honorable exceptions, have the hostility of every citizen who supposes his fortune to depend upon the protection of the few great schedules to be first dealt with. But after he is deprived of his own special privilege he is more than likely to join the army of equal rights in its attack upon special privileges in which he has not thus far shared. It will be said that the Democratic party ought to deal with the whole scheme of protection. It will be said that all of it is bad, and that I shall not dispute. What I affirm is that we can best deal with the phases of the question for which public sentiment is made ready by their plainly monopolistic features, and that when we shall have demonstrated the beneficence of so much tariff reform we

can then go on, and with vastly increased popular support, to deal with the remaining abuses of the system.

Some other of the concrete issues which Mr. Shepard offered are not yet well enough defined for consideration. One of these relates to trusts in so far as they arise from other causes than tariff protection. Another relates to the tendency of big trusts and big labor unions to make common cause against the liberties of the whole people. This tendency was indicated and approved by labor leaders at the Trusts conference at Chicago in 1899, and it is becoming more and more evident. Still another relates to the question of bank currency. Here Mr. Shepard is at odds both with those who would altogether divest the government of control over the currency and those who would have the government itself issue currency instead of farming out the power to regulated banks. On the question of final redemption and standards he invites a still wider opposition, for he declares for gold. In still another matter he takes issue, thoughtlessly however, as it seems to us, with those who believe in sound principles of taxation. For he seems to adopt the piratical doctrine of apportioning taxes according to the financial ability of the citizen to pay, instead of the just doctrine of apportionment according to the financial benefits the individual receives from society. But on one of the additional concrete issues which Mr. Shepard proposes, he is clearly right and sufficiently definite. We refer to the issue of imperialism, of which he says:

No wise man can fail to see that the Republican establishment of a new system of colonies held for the American republic by force of arms and at enormous cost, is but another phase of the centralization of power and disparagement of equal rights. It is for our own sake that we should not bring under the American flag any domain except as we propose to make its government genuinely American and extend to it the essential features of our Constitution—except as we shall establish there

the self-government which we claim for ourselves. . . . Our destruction of the Philippine government and our elaborate assumption of all local administrative powers will no doubt make it more difficult and tedious to solve the problem on the American basis of the consent of the governed. But to that solution I believe the Democratic party to be irrevocably committed.

Even if Shepard's Iroquois speech and his respect for Bryan's leadership were not a sufficient guarantee of his hostility to the plutocratic "reorganizers," his confirmed attitude toward David B. Hill, the chief engineer of that movement, should make the guarantee complete. Shepard is the natural adversary of Hillism in the Democratic party of New York. He, and probably only he, can defeat, or at least cripple, Hill's efforts to capture the national organization, so far as New York and some other Eastern States are concerned. Other men might be preferred because they are more aggressive in their democracy than Shepard, but any one who is too radical to rally the support of men of Shepard's type, democrats in principle but conservative in applying the principle, cannot at this time and in that place, make headway. He is the most pronounced democrat, both in principle and policy, who is capable of coping with Hill in the East. There is no alternative for democratic Democrats, therefore, but to thrust Shepard forward as the Democratic leader in the East, or suffer judgment there in favor of Hill and the rest of the "reorganizers" by default.

This does not mean that Shepard should be or would be taken up as the Democratic candidate for President. That candidate is not likely to come from the East. Yet, of all the men so far mentioned from the East, Shepard is doubtless the only one other than George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts, and Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, who would be tolerable to the radical democrats whose influence is necessary to Democratic success. But the ques-

tion of a nominee is not the principal one. So long as he is a democratic Democratic nothing more is required. If a radical and aggressive one, so much the better; but aggressive or not, the democracy of his Democracy is the sine qua non. It is democratic principles, not the ambitions of persons, that are at stake; and in the promotion of those principles the best Democratic leader east of the Alleghenies, at the present time, under all the confusing circumstances, is Edward M. Shepard; for he represents the farthest advance in democracy to which the majority of the Democratic party in that region has yet attained. With him as leader in the East (or even as the powerful but not wholly successful antagonist of Hill); with Tom L. Johnson as the leader in the middle West; with James G. Maguire and Franklin K. Lane as the leaders on the Pacific slope; and with William J. Bryan holding the South together in spite of its Whig tendencies, and exercising a crystallizing influence upon the democratic Democrats of the whole country, the end of plutocratic devilry within the Democratic party would be at hand. Though victory over the allied forces of imperialism and privilege entrenched in the Republican party might not immediately come, the democratic sun would begin to rise again and ultimate victory would not be far off. And such a victory would be worth having. It would not be a conquest of spoils; it would be a triumph of democratic principles.

Another of the labor "fakirs" of Cleveland who reported to the local Allied Trades and Labor Council against 3-cent street car fares (pp. 675, 721, 736) and in favor of the same settlement of the Cleveland traction question that the street car ring has virtually offered, has received his reward. Mr. Hanna has nominated him for vice-mayor. Whether the reward will materialize in his election remains to be seen; and sympathizers with the labor movement everywhere may well hold