

THE DEMOCRATS MUST GO NATIVE!

BY JOHN HEMPHILL

THE present and increasing strife among the aspirants to the privilege of putting Mr. Hoover, next year, to the test of gnawing those chicken bones that three years ago he promised to keep on the back of the stoves in all of our two-car garage homes—this combat will unfortunately becloud, but it must not be permitted to obscure, the clear and essential obligation which rests upon the Democratic party. A sound, courageous and unequivocal platform is imperative. Of infinitely more importance than the scramble among the candidates is the necessity to vigorously and vehemently rededicate the party of Thomas Jefferson to its original creed, with due emphasis upon the doctrine of States' Rights. This is the Democrats' obligation of honor and heritage; it is likewise their privilege and opportunity. At one and the same time a strong and sound Jeffersonian platform will redeem with honor and reward with expediency. If the party dares to temporize or compromise with its inherited basic creed, now more than at any time within the past seventy years coming into its own, finally and rightfully, it will earn defeat and humiliation greater than it has ever suffered, even though its standard-bearer be an ideal one. But if it is faithful to its historic position, a justly deserved success is inevitable.

America does not need two Republican parties—one is plenty. The Democratic party must go native. It must return to its

early moorings, or a very large percentage of the voters of the United States, already dissatisfied with Republican centralization and the tendency toward empire, will likewise be disappointed in the Democratic party, and so seek salvation through the medium of other parties, some of which are sure to be unsound and dangerous to a constitutional Republic.

Yet every day and in every way, instead of waxing stronger and bolder, many of the Democratic leaders are growing more and more timid. As Mr. Hoover's leadership and the Republican party in general decay and disintegrate these Democratic leaders, fearful lest something be done that will impair the success that now seems almost assured, are inclined to shrink from the obvious and imperative duty, to the party and to the country, of a clear and courageous declaration of Jeffersonian Democracy. This cowardice seems to be almost the only thing working for Mr. Hoover and his reelection.

The leaders of the party in the South are reported to be reconciled to the choice of a nominee who is known to be wet, but they will not tolerate, it is said, a States' Rights declaration returning the police power involved in the regulation of intoxicating liquors where it belongs, to its only safe and sane repository—the several separate units of the sovereign States. They say they need a spineless, straddling platform for local consumption. Oh, shades of John C. Calhoun, harken unto that!

To avoid the logical consequences of the Democratic doctrine they and some Northern Democrats are attempting to set up other issues. Of course, there are other issues. But they are not controlling, and they will not even be important if this essential issue of States' Rights is to be cowardly avoided. For it is the keystone into which all the other issues dovetail.

The tax increase, the almost unbearable cost of government, offers a splendid example of the manner in which these other issues weave themselves into the pattern of States' Rights. The reason for the excessive cost of government is simply excessive government. We have too much centralization, too much bureaucracy, too much paternalism, too much interference, all of which is costly. The obvious cure is decentralization. Government is conducted more cheaply and more responsibly and responsively if Home Rule is emphasized.

Still another link is added to the chain, still another pressing issue dovetails into States' Rights, when we consider the present deplorable condition of economic maladjustment. Centralization, bureaucracy, the tax burden, governmental interference (as in gambling in wheat futures), unfair and uneconomic tariffs, and all the other things that have come to us with the Republican denial of States' Rights have played their part in bringing on the present depression. And the wastage of national Prohibition has increased both taxation and economic distress.

II

The four most urgent political issues of the day unquestionably are Prohibition, the tax burden, industrial maladjustment, and the tariff. Faithful adherence to the doctrine of States' Rights would work an absolute, and probably the only, cure for

the Prohibition muddle; it would work a substantial relief from the tax burden; and less obviously, but as surely in the end, it would relieve our industrial difficulties. Simplicity and economy in government, along with a tariff of reason instead of ruin, could accomplish a great deal toward relieving periods of depression and unemployment.

In their effort to avoid the Prohibition issue, some Democratic leaders argue that the depression should be the principal issue of the campaign. That is waving the bloody shirt inside out. That is the full dinner pail argument in reverse. And it is just as unfair and contemptible to bring it forward thus as it has been for Republicans to do the same thing in their own way, for lo, these seventy years. Of course, it is but human to rub a little turpentine into the wound of an opponent, and there naturally will be a lot of talk about Mr. Hoover's guaranty of permanent prosperity. But the depression in and of itself is not a political issue, and it would be just as unfair, just as contemptible and sordid, to try to make it one as were the practices of the Republicans who in the decades past attempted to associate hard times with Democratic administrations, that they might discredit their opponents and the sooner return to a theoretical full dinner pail, and the actual overflowing money bags of protectionists protecting politicians that politicians might protect protectionists.

It is true that there are certain political issues, such as the tariff and international relationships, that underlie this depression and economic maladjustment. Such basic things deserve and should have attention in the platform and the campaign. But no attempt should be made to make depression a major issue. Hundreds of thousands of votes will gravitate to the Democratic party in 1932 because of unrest and unem-

ployment. That natural flow should suffice. It would be unconscionable to attempt to augment it by ballyhoo.

What other issues are there comparable to the essentially basic one of States' Rights? What others have to do with the entire scheme of government? True, there is a growing demand to regulate more stringently the public utilities. But much of this propaganda comes from charlatans and self-seeking politicians; the truth of the matter is that the regulations are adequate now, if honestly and conscientiously enforced. Few people want to pass through another trust-busting period, such as that which ruined the railroads. There was some reason for it in Roosevelt's day because of the lack of regulations. But there is no need to be upset with that again, for we have all the regulations we need, and more beside. There is some doubt as to whether or not we are required to pay too much for electricity and gas. There can be no doubt that we pay too much for beer and wine. We spend a considerable portion of our resources trying to enforce a law to the defeat of which we devote a large part of our remaining means. America's boast of business efficiency has been laid low by America's hypocrisy and sentimentality. Compared to Prohibition the utility issue is, if not a myth, then a midget.

Nor does Senator La Follette contribute any vital issues when he suggests Federal aid for unemployed and provision for maternity aid. With the United States government failing to do what it has undertaken in Prohibition enforcement, it should not be ambitious to extend Federal paternalism to the unemployed and to mothers.

Nor does Senator Walsh contribute any vital issue when he suggests legislation providing for a five-day week. Business,

not government, must work out that problem. Premature meddling by law will only confuse things. The government should not enter this field until a proper exercise of police power requires it, and, when that happens, it should be done by the States, not by the nation.

Nor does Senator Hastings contribute anything, unless it be humor, when he argues that the issue of the coming campaign will be "education," which, so he explains, means that the people should be taught to appreciate Mr. Hoover!

III

So what have we for the issues of 1932? What have we for the Democratic platform? We have the same things that we had in 1840, when, for the first time, the Democratic party adopted a platform at Baltimore. The first two paragraphs of that document were as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That the Federal government is one of limited powers, derived solely from the Constitution, and the grants of power shown therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the government, and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers.

2. *Resolved*, That the Constitution does not confer upon the general government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

These two paragraphs are just as valid, just as sound, and just as compelling today as they were in 1840. More so in fact, for recently we have been faithless to this sound advice and have accordingly brought about a degree of chaos and corruption which can be cured only by a speedy return to the founders' principles. To republish these words in 1932 would be ideal. Little else would need to be covered, and we could avoid the silly habit that politi-

cal parties have fallen into of indulging in long, prolix, evasive and meaningless literary meanderings about the landscape, from Alaska to Armenia. Brevity, clarity and straightforwardness would tend to persuade the people that at last a political party was actually standing firmly and courageously for its principles, instead of attempting to catch a net by spreading a general confusion of bait.

The Democratic platform of 1840 contained 529 words and said something. The Democratic platform of 1924 ran to nearly 6000 words and said very little. A brief, clear and courageous declaration upon the vital and urgent issues, eliminating all platitudes, rhetorical evasions and lengthy argumentations, would command attention and respect from Maine to California.

There is no more need for a lengthy discussion of Republican corruption, as was indulged in in the 1924 platform, than there is for a recitation of the shocking facts of Prohibition corruption, hypocrisy and degradation. Everybody knows about both. There is no need to decry the practice of polygamy, which, according to the Prohibition platform of 1884, the Republican party was winking a jaded eye at. There is no need to declare in favor of peace on earth, as did the La Follette platform of 1924. There is nothing to be gained from lengthy dissertations upon "economy in government" and "orderly government" as in the Republican platform following President Harding's death. Nor is there any profit in tiresome outbursts upon matters as to which no civilized person would dissent, such as being fair to Mexico, Ireland, Armenia, Porto Rico, Alaska, the Philippines, Hawaii, Asiatic immigrants and various new nations, thus taking the risk of offending by omission England, France and Germany, as was done by the Democrats in 1920.

There is another failing of Democratic platforms. It is the "we denounce," "we condemn," "we deplore" complex. If a majority of the all too numerous paragraphs commence with these words and indulge in lengthy carping criticisms of opponents, the net result is that an atmosphere of defeatism permeates the entire document, and that which is affirmative is not retained in the memory of the reader. If broadsides at the enemy are in order, and they were never more so than today, let them be fired somewhere else. With the platform itself kept concise, such critical comments might be embodied, if the Republican state of health is not so low as to make playfulness brutality, in a resolution offering the perpetual prosperity gives a platform for their own use. Many things suggest themselves for such a platform. The following planks would no doubt be acceptable to Claudius Huston, if he can be found:

1. The Republican party declares that the office of President should be filled by a business man and engineer, and that every American family should at all times have a chicken on the fire and two cars in the garage.
2. The Republican party prides itself upon the useful discovery of housing the Cabinet in a roundhouse, so that the business recovery may always be seen just around the corner.
3. The Republican party's interest in foreign lands has been demonstrated by our driving, with our gigantic tariff barriers, the erstwhile protectionist manufacturer, who no longer contributes to us, out of our country to other lands, where foreign laborers may be employed with profit to him and American laborers may be thus protected against over-exertion.
4. The Republican party takes just pride in the fact that our Attorney-General declared it within the law to manufacture intoxicating liquors within the home before the Supreme Court declared it to be a crime to buy a cork at the store.

5. The Republican party takes just pride in the fact that it defeated the laws of supply and demand by gambling in wheat futures and by holding the wage scale intact by presidential manifesto when all else was deflated. It is promised that the party will soon overcome the law of gravitation.

6. The Republican party is pleased to announce that Mrs. Willebrandt's employment by the California wine-makers will not impair her interest in or usefulness to great Christian agents such as the Republican party, Bishop Cannon, and their allies.

7. The Republican party declares that the success or failure of the Noble Experiment cannot be judged accurately until it has grown whiskers and has been drawn about the walls of Troy.

IV

Clearly, the time is upon us to deflate political platforms. Likewise, the time has come when neglect or compromise with the sound doctrine of States' Rights will be suicidal for the Democratic party.

Since 1800 the party has accepted the responsibility of being the spokesman for and custodian of the decentralization theory of government, and since its first platform of ninety years ago its faith has been republished every four years. But the platforms of 1920, 1924 and 1928, although still containing broad and vague assurances of fidelity to this creed, neglected to apply it in connection with the Eighteenth Amendment and Prohibition. This inconsistency, this failure to square the declared theory with existing facts, was occasioned by political expediency and cowardice, both of which are qualities that deter public confidence. The party ceases to be a useful instrumentality of government if it fails or is unable to apply its theories to facts. A hundred and thirty years of work will go for naught, twenty national platforms will become meaning-

less words, and millions of followers and believers will find themselves betrayed if the party again fails to do the needful and courageous thing of applying the doctrine of States' Rights to national Prohibition, the open sore in our body politic.

If such a miserable neglect of duty, such a cowardly betrayal occurs, it will be brought about by reason of the fact that certain aspirants for high office have found it expedient to be timid. If the platform is straddling or evasive these self-seeking individuals must stand responsible for the party's treachery to its creed and its failure to grasp its opportunity. Every one of the contenders must think logically and with fidelity to party principles. Such of them as fail to announce the conclusion which must follow application of the theory to the facts will be richly entitled to the defeat that will follow inevitably. The defeat of such individuals who oppose a clear and courageous platform declaration at the convention will be the best possible insurance against defeat of the party at the election.

Soon or late the nation is going to require of some party a faithful and courageous adherence to the Jeffersonian concept of constitutional democracy. It is now the proud possession of the Democratic party, but if Democrats neglect it or forsake it, they will lose it, and in the losing they will be ruined and some new party will be made. It was fortunate for the party that it had a courageous candidate in 1928, for it then had a spineless platform declaration on this vivid and vital issue. That bold man saved the day for the party; saved it from the shame of cowardice and hypocrisy and infidelity to its principles. But it cannot happen again so fortuitously. The party platform itself must be clear and bold this time, and hereafter until the troublesome question of regulating intoxicants is returned to the

States for their control and management. Complete courage is essential; anything short of it will be ruinous.

The people of the United States will not stand by another four years while the Democrats ponder further as to whether or not they wish to be faithful to their ancient and honorable creed of Jeffersonianism. No, the very essence of the party professions of a century and a half will be stolen from them while they blink their eyes if they attempt that. The people are too thoroughly aroused to put up with dilatory tactics of local political expediency when the very peace and security of the country are in jeopardy. The folly of national Prohibition has been established as a fact. Its fallacy has been proved in practice. The hideous price the country pays in money and order precludes any

further delay in returning to sanity. The burden of the error is too great to long endure. Patriotic people are impatient to undo the mistake and to progress to better things. So naturally such courageous Republicans as Senator Morrow of New Jersey are going to insist that in 1932 the party of Jefferson must either be faithful to his sound and ancient creed or reconciled to losing it. It is a case of shoot or give up the gun.

The individual contenders for the presidential nomination are relatively unimportant as compared to the platform. It will be a most sacrificial and historically inexplicable act if the Democratic party fails in 1932 to lead the nation away from the corruption and chaos of Federal usurpation and back to the honesty and sanity of true constitutional democracy.

THE ARTS AND SCIENCES

Engineering

THE BROOKLYN BRIDGE

BY LEWIS MUMFORD

THE writer on bridges in the new Encyclopedia Britannica passes over the Brooklyn Bridge with a single reference, and dwells on the relatively lesser achievements that followed it. It is almost fifty years since the Brooklyn Bridge was opened, and however this monument may look to the Britannica writer, it is still perhaps not only the most satisfactory object of Nineteenth Century engineering in America, but one of the best that can be shown anywhere. Our ignorance of the life and work of the men who created it is worthy of a nation that lets the inventor of the airplane languish in neglect in Dayton whilst it salutes with endless adulation the first Boy Scout who flew the Atlantic.

The Brooklyn Bridge was the conception and achievement of two men: John A. Roebling and his son Washington, loyally supported by a corps of workers whose dangers and difficulties they intimately shared. In order to understand the monument itself, one must know a little of the characters and personalities that stood behind it.

John Augustus Roebling was born in Mühlhausen, in Saxony, in 1806. He received his degree as an engineer at the Royal Polytechnic School in Berlin, after having studied architecture, bridge construction, and hydraulics: according to another biographical memoir, he studied philosophy with Hegel, "who avowed

that Roebling was his favorite pupil." After spending three years obligatory service with the state, as Superintendent of Public Works in Westphalia, he emigrated to the United States in 1831. He had \$3000 in capital, and with a few fellow immigrants he founded the village of Saxonburg, about twenty-five miles from Pittsburgh. Here Washington Roebling was born in 1837.

Those were the days when canal-boats made their way through the Alleghenies by means of long overhill portages, the whole boat being pulled up the steep incline. The ordinary Kentucky hemp rope used in such hauls frayed too quickly, and Roebling, whose first job was that of assistant engineer on the slack water navigation of Beaver river, invented the steel wire rope to take the place of the weak hemp, and set up a cable manufacturing plant. He had first seen a chain suspension bridge on a student tramp at Bamberg, and suspension bridges formed the subject of his graduation thesis in Berlin. He presently invented a suspension aqueduct to make the portage of a canal over a river, and using cable instead of chains, he built it in record time. Another step brought him to the design of the first cable suspension bridge, at Pittsburgh in 1846. In 1849 Roebling removed his wire-rope factory to Trenton, N. J. He was the architect of his own plant; he designed every piece of machinery in it. Like many other early industrialists—such as Robert Gair, the paper box manufacturer, for instance—he was a man of iron regularity