

LET THE LIGHT BE TURNED ON THE PULITZER INVESTMENTS

In its issue of January 10, The Commoner referred to: "The New York World and the special interests it represents."

On January 10 Mr. Bryan received the following telegram:

"New York, January 10.—Hon. W. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Neb.: Always eager to print all the news the World respectfully invites and urges you to furnish it with the list of special interests you say in The Commoner it represents. Any answer you may send is prepaid."
"WORLD."

This was answered by the following telegram:

"January 11, 1908.—New York World, New York City, N. Y.: Your telegram asking me to name the special interests your paper represents received. I understand Mr. Joseph Pulitzer is practically sole owner of the World and as railroad regulation and the elimination of private monopolies are pending issues I can answer your inquiry more fully if the World will state editorially what pecuniary interest, if any, Mr. Pulitzer or the World has in railroad stocks or bonds and what in corporations commonly known as trusts."

"W. J. BRYAN."

Although the World had intimated that it would print Mr. Bryan's reply, his telegram dated January 11 seems to have been lost in the World's editorial rooms. At all events the World did not make it public.

On February 4 while Mr. Bryan was in New York City the editor of the World sent to him a reporter to ask several questions and Mr. Bryan consented to make a statement provided his statement were printed in full.

Following are extracts from that statement:

Mr. Bryan: "And now you may add a question from me: The World telegraphed me and asked me to name the special interests which it represented. I answered, asking the World to state editorially what financial interest, if any, Mr. Pulitzer of the World had in the stocks and bonds of railroads or in the corporations generally known as trusts. This information would enable me to answer its question more fully. The question had not been answered when I left home. When the World advises the democratic party the party ought to be in a position to know just what pecuniary interests the World or its owner has in the questions which the World discusses."

World Reporter: "Would ownership of railroad stocks or bonds disqualify any one from advising on public questions?"

Mr. Bryan: "His ownership of stocks and bonds of railroads or predatory corporations would not disqualify him for discussing questions, but if the public knows just what his financial interests are, it can better judge what weight to give to his editorials."

In its issue of February 6 the World plainly dodges the question submitted by Mr. Bryan and, reiterating a number of questions as to what states Mr. Bryan expects to carry in the event of his nomination, seeks to dispose of Mr. Bryan's suggestions concerning the investments of the New York World owner with this editorial statement:

"Mr. Bryan's opinion of the World is always interesting. The columns of the World are always open to him for the expression of his views on any subject, whether it be the management of this newspaper, or 'the map of Bryanism,' or any of the issues of a presidential contest. But in the midst of a campaign involving a question of democratic life or death we can not stop to bandy personalities with even so eminent and distinguished an opponent as he. In the eloquent words of Mr. Bryan's speech at Chicago in 1896 which won him the democratic nomination for president: 'We object to bringing this question down to the level of persons. The individual is but an atom; he is born, he acts, he dies; but principles are eternal, and this has been a contest over a principle.'"

Mr. Bryan's statement concerning the relative unimportance of persons is just as true now as it was in 1896. Mr. Bryan well under-

stands that the bitter attacks made upon him by the New York World are not due to any personal illwill entertained for him by any one in authority in the World's office. Indeed in The Commoner editorial to which the World took exception this statement was made:

"The New York World is not a democratic paper. Its advice to democrats can not be relied upon. Its proprietor, nor its editors, has not the slightest reason for personal unfriendliness toward Mr. Bryan. Their antipathy to the editor of The Commoner lies deeper than anything of a personal character can go. The purpose of the World and the men who follow its leadership is not to build up the democratic party nor to advance the public interests; it is rather to see to it that as a result of the election of 1908 the democratic party shall not become the medium through which a long suffering people shall find relief."

When it was intimated that the New York World was more concerned in the special interests than in the democratic party the World demanded to know what special interests the World spoke for. And then when Mr. Bryan replied that the public would be in better position to say where the heart of the New York World is if its owner would explain to the public the location of the World's treasure the World says that it "CAN NOT STOP TO BANDY PERSONALITIES" with Mr. Bryan!

This is not a question of personalities. The World assumes to give advice to the democratic party and to the American people as to the character of the policies they shall adopt and the sort of men they shall select for the administration of public affairs. The people to whom the World tenders advice have the right to be informed concerning the motives of Mr. Pulitzer's great newspaper. It has long been a mystery to many people who have admired the excellent work which the New York World has done against certain cliques bent upon the exploitation of local government in New York City and state why the World has been so sensitive whenever effective railroad regulation was proposed and so strangely indifferent to great public evils involving certain other great concerns.

In the absence of personal ill-will toward Mr. Bryan on the part of the World—as claimed by the World and admitted by Mr. Bryan—how may we account for the World's persistent misrepresentation of Mr. Bryan and its vindictive assaults upon him? Grant all that the World claims for itself in the way of devotion to the public interests and it must be admitted that the same high purpose that prompted it to rush to the defense of the public would restrain it from indulging in deliberate misrepresentation of an individual.

The mystery may be solved when the World shows the extent of its owner's financial interest in the great concerns from whose impositions the American people are seeking relief.

If the owner of the World expects the American people to accept the advice which his paper is now giving in such abundance, if he expects the people to regard the World's present day activity in democratic circles as being due to its owner's extraordinary stock of patriotism, let Mr. Pulitzer show the people that so far as concerns investments in corporations that are to be regulated Mr. Pulitzer—the man who fixes the World's policy—is free from that pecuniary interest which, in common knowledge of human conduct, might reasonably be presumed to have a controlling effect upon his attitude.

"Publicity! Publicity! Publicity!" That has for years been the Pulitzer cry. Let the light be turned upon the Pulitzer investments.

THIS IS TOO MUCH, TOO MUCH!

In the discharge of its obligations to the special interests in which its proprietor has his money invested the New York World has compiled a number of its anti-Bryan editorials into a pamphlet. To this pamphlet the World gives the pleasing title, "Twelve Years of Demagoguery and Defeat." The following paragraph is taken from one of the pamphlet's articles addressed to Mr. Bryan:

"In 1904, with Judge Parker as the candidate, but with you still the actual leader of

the party, every populist state, every doubtful state and several democratic states were carried by Mr. Roosevelt."

When the World seeks to hold Mr. Bryan's leadership responsible for the result in 1904 when Mr. Pulitzer of the New York World mapped out the party's policy one is reminded of the story of the Iowa bank cashier.

The bank had been wrecked by this official and not a penny remained in the vault or to the institution's credit anywhere. The directors held a meeting which was addressed by the cashier who said: "Gentlemen, I regret this situation and to show you how badly I feel I would, if it would do any good, be willing that my body be cut into little pieces and distributed among you."

One director, very hard of hearing, leaned toward his seat neighbor and asked: "What did he say?"

The neighbor repeated the cashier's remark.

The deaf director settling himself in his chair, heaved a sigh, and said: "Well, if that plan be adopted then I speak for the gail."



THAT "MAP OF BRYANISM"

While Mr. Bryan was in New York the New York World sent a representative to him to show him the World's "map of Bryanism," which is arranged for the purpose of making it appear that what the World calls "Bryanism" has brought disaster to the democratic party. As a result of this interview with Mr. Bryan the World prints the following dialogue between Mr. Bryan and the reporter:

"Have you seen the World's 'map of Bryanism?'"

"I have seen it," replied Mr. Bryan, "but have not had time to examine it. The map, however, is absolutely worthless and gives conclusive proof of the deliberate, intentional and malicious dishonesty of the man who prepared it and the paper that published it. It begins with 1892 and omits the congressional election of 1894. In that election of 1894, which was held while Mr. Cleveland was president and while the World had some influence as an adviser in the party, the republican majority on the congressional candidates was larger than it was in either 1896 or 1900, and the republican majority in congress was larger as a result of that election than it was as a result of 1896 and 1900. Now an honest man would not overlook that election in preparing a map. The fact that it is overlooked is conclusive proof that the map was prepared for the purpose of deceiving the readers of the World. The World will not accuse me of being the leader of the democratic party at that time, and yet the party suffered a more disastrous defeat than it suffered in either of the campaigns in which I was a candidate."

"I noticed in this morning's World that it accounts for defeat in 1904 by saying: 'In 1904, with Judge Parker as a candidate, but with you—meaning Mr. Bryan—still actual leader of the party every populist state, every doubtful state, and several democratic states were carried by Mr. Roosevelt.'"

"Now, is it fair to charge up the defeat of 1904 to my leadership when the party allowed the World to select the candidate that year, and give him its boisterous advice each day during the campaign? And if I was the leader in 1904, in spite of the fact that the World selected the candidate, how can the World prevent my being the leader this year, even if it is allowed to select the candidate again? How can I get out of the responsibility of leadership if I could not escape after I was boldly repudiated, according to the World, in 1904? If the World wants to be fair, why doesn't it publish a map of the country showing the party vote in 1894 and another map showing the vote in 1904, and thus inform the public that the party fared better in 1896 and in 1900 than in either the congressional campaign before I ran or the national campaign after I ran?"

"There is an honest way of fighting political battles, but the World prefers the dishonest way. If it wants to find a reason for the defeat of Judge Parker, why doesn't it say that the World contributed to his defeat and received money from the republican campaign committee for doing so? At least, I assume that the advertising space that the World sold to the national committee the Sunday before the elections was paid for and was not gratuitously given by the World to the republican party as the World's contribution."

"Don't you believe that many of your followers failed to vote for Judge Parker because