

Dodging as Usual

The Omaha Bee of July 1st contained the following editorial:

"The significant feature to us of Mr. Bryan's home-coming speech at Lincoln is the palpable effort to arouse anew the old sectional issue originally embodied in his arraignment of the east nearly twenty years ago as 'the enemy's country.' At that time, of course, Mr. Bryan was preaching his free silver crusade which appealed to the debtor parts of the country, and made the creditors believe that it meant debt scaling and repudiation. The east then, more than now, contained the creditor states, and when Mr. Bryan set out for the citadel of the so-called money power, he referred to it as an expedition into 'the enemy's country.'

"And now in his appeal to the people for his peace propaganda, Mr. Bryan depicts the Alleghanies as the dividing line separating the intolerant and prejudiced east from the open-minded wealth producers of the Mississippi valley and the west, in the evident belief that he can rally public sentiment here by holding up another bogey man from whose rapacity the people must protect themselves. Instead of dwelling on the unity of the nation, and the common interest of the entire people for the maintenance of peace, the covert suggestion sticks out that the peace-lovers are to be found west of the Alleghanies, and that the states east of the mountains are inhabited by selfish money-grabbers who want war in order to fatten upon it.

"We do not believe the pursuit of world peace is helped by injecting such a sectional issue. There may be a difference of opinion as to the best methods, as Mr. Bryan admits there is between himself and President Wilson, but we do not believe that there is any 'enemy's country' on the peace map of the United States."

Apologies are due to the Bee; Mr. Bryan would have used language that would have included the Bee among the newspapers that exhibit partisanship and intolerance if he had spoken of the press of the whole country, but he was only speaking of the newspapers of one section, and did not think it necessary to specifically mention those newspapers, scattered throughout the country, whose editors adjust their opinions to the views of the eastern papers mentioned, and, in their feeble way, imitate their errors and shortcomings. The Bee's editorial illustrates one of the tricks of the plutocratic press; it seeks to divert attention from particular offenders by pretending to believe that the criticism is aimed at all the people of one section of the country. The Bee fully understands that Mr. Bryan was speaking, not of the people of the east, but of certain newspapers published in the east. He not only specified a particular element but was careful to single out a portion of the eastern press from the rest of the press; but the Bee, copying its eastern models, attempts to make it appear that the criticism was directed not only against all the papers published in the east, but against all the people living in the east. This is an old evasion—as old as sin—and is better understood by the public than those editors think, who make it their business to defend the special interests.

Only a PORTION of the eastern press "affects a foreign accent," the rest of the eastern press are as much disgusted as the remainder of the country with sycophants, who, in order to court attentions when abroad, dishonor their country when at home.

As to the masses in the east, they are not only not included in Mr. Bryan's criticism, but they are deserving of all praise for the intelligence which they show in ignoring instructions given

by the newspapers to which Mr. Bryan referred. It is really remarkable that so large an element of the people of the east have remained loyal to democratic ideals and policies in spite of all the efforts of the plutocratic portion of the eastern press to misrepresent issues and to belittle those who represent progressive ideals. The EAST—if we take the people into consideration—is not an enemy to the ideas of the west and south, as shown by the fact that progressive ideas have been repeatedly adopted when once the voters have had an opportunity to express themselves upon them.

A brief review of the past few years will suffice to illustrate what is meant. Did not the plutocratic portion of the eastern press denounce the income tax as the sum of all villainies? And yet did not the people of the east favor an income tax when they had a chance to vote upon it? It took a long time for the west and south to secure the submission of the measure of justice to the people, but, when it was submitted, the people, without regard to section, favored it.

Did not the people of the east favor the election of senators by the people when they had a chance to vote upon it? And yet it took twenty-one years for the people of the west and south to so overcome the misrepresentations and abuse of that portion of the eastern press which represents the big corporations.

It was only a few months ago that the plutocratic element of the eastern press was denouncing the currency law then before congress; it was predicting dire disaster if the government issued the paper money provided for in the bill, or appointed the directors of the federal reserve bank. But the senators and members from the west and south, under the leadership of the president, passed the law and now we find that the law is entirely acceptable to the PEOPLE of the east and helpful to the bankers of every section.

So with the trust question. The faithful journalistic watchdogs who guard the door of every criminal trust and bark viciously whenever an attack is made upon a vested wrong—these have made day and night hideous with their noise every time any effective legislation has been attempted, but, when success has been achieved in spite of them, the people for whom they assumed to speak supported the measures and shared in the benefits conferred.

So today it is the same old gang engaged in the same old business and employing the same old tactics—the only difference is as to the particular cause which they support. The builders of battleships and the manufacturers of munitions grow fat on the policy that "prepares for war," and they will grow fatter still if they can carry preparedness to the point of provoking an international conflict. To point out these facts to the public may arouse criticism from the Bee, but the Bee speaks for the reactionary who has lost out, and not for the progressive who has triumphed.

W. J. BRYAN.

The 3,485,000 voters who cast their ballots for Mr. Taft in 1912 are all perfectly willing to forgive the 4,110,000 who voted for Roosevelt, but only on condition that the 4,110,000 come back and support things that the 3,485,000 stood for and believe in and which the 4,110,000 refused to stand for and did not believe in in 1912. Which shows just how easy a task the republican pacifists have on hand.

Some folks acted as though they were surprised when a referendum taken by the United States chamber of commerce showed a vote of four to one in favor of direct ship subsidies. They are probably the same persons who would act astonished if the beet sugar factory owners voted solidly in favor of a tariff on sugar.

Again or Yet?

A story is told of a husband or wife, no matter which, who was scolding the other when the latter went to sleep, and was still scolding when the abused member of the family awoke. This led to the inquiry, "Are you scolding again or yet?"

Mr. Bryan is reminded of this story as he reads a continuation of the abuse which he has received from the plutocratic press for more than twenty years. One can become accustomed even to abuse—so accustomed that it is expected and discounted in advance. After the election of 1896, the New York Tribune dismissed Mr. Bryan as follows:

NEW YORK TRIBUNE EDITORIAL

"The thing was conceived in iniquity and was brought forth in sin. It had its origin in a malicious conspiracy against the honor and integrity of the nation. It gained such monstrous growth as it enjoyed from an assiduous culture of the basest passions of the least worthy members of the community. It has been defeated and destroyed because right is right and God is God. Its nominal head was worthy of the cause. Nominal, because the wretched, rattlepated boy, posing in vapid vanity and mouthing resounding rottenness, was not the real leader of that league of hell. He was only a puppet in the blood-imbued hands of ———, the anarchist, and ———, the revolutionist, and other desperadoes of that stripe. But he was a willing puppet, Bryan was, willing and eager. Not one of his masters was more apt than he at lies and forgeries and blasphemies and all the nameless iniquities of that campaign against the Ten Commandments. He goes down with the cause, and must abide with it in the history of infamy. He had less provocation than Benedict Arnold, less intellectual force than Aaron Burr, less manliness and courage than Jefferson Davis. He was the rival of them all in deliberate wickedness and treason to the republic. His name belongs with theirs, neither the most brilliant nor the most hateful in the list. Good riddance to it all, to conspiracy and conspirators, and to the foul menace of repudiation and anarchy against the honor and life of the republic."

Even Mr. Watterson, so well known for kindness and gentleness, allowed himself to say, in a burst of passion:

LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL EDITORIAL

"Mr. William J. Bryan has come to Kentucky, and Kentuckians have taken his measure. He is a boy orator. He is a dishonest dodger. He is a daring adventurer. He is a political fakir. He is not of the material of which the people of the United States have ever made a president, nor is he even of the material of which any party has ever before made a candidate."

These are but samples of the refinement and self-restraint which have characterized Mr. Bryan's critics during two decades. Is it any wonder that their language has as little weight with Mr. Bryan as it does with the public?

W. J. BRYAN.

If the ballot was confined to the consumer only or the producer only the republican argument manufacturers who have started in to supply the demand for next year's campaign would have a happier task. No greater anguish of mind is conceivable than that which follows the discovery that literature intended to prove that the price of foodstuffs is higher under a democratic administration lands in the hands of the man who produces the foodstuff, unless it might be that which follows the realization that a promise that a reinstatement of the republican party will inaugurate an era of better prices accidentally falls into the hands of the man who does the paying of the prices.

All those who believe that ALL differences between nations should be settled by arbitration should write or wire the President.