

telle compared with the consequences thereof, the harvest that will grow from his sowing.

He has made a leading people. The people of Cleveland and their children will prove his case, execute his plans, and be what he has tried himself to be—the creator of the City on a Hill.

And that view is not only comforting, it is democratic.

LINCOLN STEFFENS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE POLITICAL MELTING POT.

Sioux City, Ia., Sept. 27.

To my mind the present "insurgent" or "progressive" movement in the Republican party is fraught with greater promise for the future than any development of American politics since the Civil War. Iowa is the storm center of this awakening; but it has radiated until "insurgency" is now the accepted political gospel in all the prairie States.

+

To one who has lived where the high protective idea is accepted as a matter of course, it is refreshing to come into this section and hear men who would fight at the first challenge of their loyalty to Republican principles, condemning in intelligent fashion, and with measured and moderate phrase, the iniquities of a tariff bill enacted by their own party—a bill that differs not a whit in principle, and very little in detail, from half a dozen bills which the same party has passed before.

When seven Republican Senators voted against the Aldrich-Taft bill, they represented a sentiment that was and is practically unanimous among their Republican constituents. One has but to live among these Republicans awhile to appreciate the magnitude of President Taft's self-assumed task of reading the insurgent Senators and their adherents out of the Republican party.

The worst luck which could befall the President would be the success of this "reading out" movement which he began in his speech at Winona. Success would simply mean the wrecking of the Republican party in the nation; for the Republicans can't elect a President without the electoral votes of Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Wisconsin, Indiana and Nebraska. Mr. Taft's effort to make acceptance of the Aldrich bill a test of party fealty, seems fatuous in the extreme.

+

As yet this insurgent movement is largely a groping in the dark. To use a slang phrase, these insurgents "don't know where they're going, but they're on their way." They still claim to be protectionists. They resent with indignation the "standpatters'" charge that they are free traders. The term "free trader," now as always, is a bugaboo to them.

But they have begun to question the sanctity of the schedules; they acknowledge without blinking that tariff legislation, enacted by their own party

this year and in past years, has fostered monopoly; they admit that the leaders of the dominant faction of their party are mere creatures of predatory interests, which are fattening at the expense of the American consumer.

Most important of all, your western "insurgent" knows at last that the American manufacturer, as a rule, produces his article more cheaply, per unit of production, than any other manufacturer in the world. It has taken a long time for the average voter to realize that relative cost of production is not to be determined by comparison of day's wages in different countries; but the genus Iowan has waked up to it now, and boldly challenges the claim of the big manufacturer that he needs protection "for the sake of American labor."

And so, while these "insurgents" still assert their belief in the protective principle, they would not grant protection to well-established industries, but only to industries that are in fact "infant industries." This, of course, is not the free trade position; it is the real principle of the American fathers of protection, but it is far removed from the gospel of Republicanism as preached by Nelson W. Aldrich.

+

There are two most decidedly hopeful features of this situation, to my way of thinking. The first is the fact that this questioning of the schedules is practically unanimous with the rank and file; the second is that the votes of this rank and file are absolutely essential to the future control of the nation by the Republican party.

It is only necessary to point out that once the rank and file begin to question and doubt on the subject of protection, the battle is half won, and protection is doomed. Your "standpatter" comprehends this. Hence his alarming cry of "treason" at the first sign of wavering. Protection is one of those things upon which, after candid investigation, there is not the slightest room for honest difference of opinion, and now that the middle West has begun to investigate, it is only necessary to await the result in patience.

+

On the second point, it is apparent that one of two things will happen; either the element in control of the Republican party will concede on the tariff question, or ultimately these States will turn the Republican party out of power. They hold the balance of power in the nation—no question about that.

Moderate concessions at first would probably hold them, for the time being, to their Republican allegiance; but as knowledge of how they are being "grafted" by protected interests increases, and feeling intensifies, they will demand more and more as the consideration for voting the Republican ticket.

Incidentally, it may be pointed out, they have no industry, great or small, which they are interested in having "protected." Protective duties on agricultural products are a joke to these people; they were openly flouted on the floor of the senate by Senators Cummins and Nelson.

It is the history of the world that the Bourbon won't concede much. Because of that trait, the organization of a new party, beginning here in the

middle West, is one of the tolerably certain things of the future—unless, of course, the “insurgents” should be able to wrest control of the Republican party from the Bourbon element, which does not seem likely. In Iowa there is much latent sentiment for a new party now, and the spectacle of another Congress controlled by vested interests will do much to intensify that sentiment.

+

One thing is certain beyond peradventure of a doubt: it is mere idle folly to hope or expect that the “insurgent Republicans” can be cajoled or exasperated into voting the Democratic ticket. Democratic politicians who imagine that this “insurgent” movement can be made to inure to the benefit of their party are building fragile castles in the air, which will come tumbling down about their ears with the first opportunity to test their theory. Permit the writer to say that he has voted the Democratic ticket all his life, and consequently is not airing any individual prejudice against that party.

Hostility to the Democratic party is bred in the bone of the average middle Westerner. Tradition, sentiment and prejudice combine to keep him from voting the Democratic ticket. Moreover, the record of the Democrats on tariff and kindred questions involving vested interests is too untrustworthy to attract the independent voter. Your Iowan can't see what he can gain by deserting Aldrich to fall into the arms of “Joe” Bailey and “Gum Shoe Bill” Stone—and, speaking candidly as a Democrat, I can't see it either.

+

No; if the potency of the middle West in the Electoral College is not strong enough to convert the Republican party into a low-tariff or a no-tariff party, and wrest the control of that organization from the plunderbund, then the logic of the situation demands a new party, and such a party will be evolved here in the middle West. This is not prophecy. It is knowledge acquired by conversing with the man in the street.

The leaven is working now; and the new party, when born, will be a party that will unite the followers of Cummins and La Follette and of Bryan and Gore, and which will force reactionaries of both old parties into a single organization of their own. Taft's embracing of Aldrich, Cannon, Tawney and Ballinger is hastening the day.

+

One word in conclusion. I have spoken of this “insurgent” sentiment as though it were practically unanimous—pervading the entire rank and file. I wish to be understood as meaning just that. The practical unanimity of this sentiment is the amazing thing about it. It is a thing which Eastern politicians—notably the President—haven't the slightest conception of. If the President had understood it, he would not have delivered himself as he did at Winona.

This “insurgent” movement has passed the mere insurrectionary stage; it has attained the dignity of a revolution.

D. K. L.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, September 28, 1909.

British Politics.

Balfour, the Tory leader in British politics and former Prime Minister, is reported to have definitely thrown down the Protection gauntlet in a keynote speech at Birmingham on the 22d. According to the news dispatches, he said that—

the Budget with its dangerous tendency towards slipshod communism had raised the most important issue for many years, and the nation now is to decide whether it would enter the upward, hopeful, forward movement for tariff reform [protection] or take the first, though in no wise the short step, on the downward track which leads to bottomless confusion and socialistic legislation.

The meeting, which was a Unionist or Chamberlain meeting, adopted a resolution declaring the Unionist party's loyalty to Balfour's leadership and saying:

Recognizing that the financial proposals of the Government are intended to postpone indefinitely the policy of tariff reform [protection], this meeting declares its determined adherence to that policy as a necessary means of increasing employment at home and strengthening the Empire at large.

+

Several weeks are yet to elapse—perhaps about three—before the Budget gets to the House of Lords. The Commons still have it under consideration, and on the 24th, on the whisky tax, the Liberal majorities ran down as low as 13. “These approaches to defeat,” cables T. P. O'Connor in the Chicago Tribune of the 26th, “were caused by Irish opposition to placing an additional burden to the whisky tax, whisky being not only the national beverage in Ireland, but one of the few remaining industries.” The general opinion seems now to be that no matter what course the House of Lords takes, the general elections will be on in a few months.

+

We get by mail the full report of the speech (p. 896) at Glasgow on the 10th of Lord Rosebery, formerly a Liberal prime minister. At its close there was loud and prolonged cheering. The type of audience may be inferred from the leaders at the meeting: Mr. William Lorimer (of the North