

# WAS IT A TRIUMPH OF INTELLIGENCE, MORALITY AND PATRIOTISM?

It is interesting to read some of the interviews, speeches and editorials delivered in behalf of the republican party during the 1896 campaign in the light of recent developments. Nearly every one of the men conspicuous in recent day exposures, were quoted by the republican newspapers in behalf of republican victory and it was invariably on the plea that the national honor must be preserved.

Remembering that the republican campaign fund in 1896 was—as unmistakably shown by recent disclosures—largely made up of misappropriated trust funds, it is interesting to read some of the things written by newspaper editors with respect to the republican victory.

The Chicago Record-Herald, then known as the Times-Herald, said: "The great conservative patriotic sentiment of the country has responded with mighty power. The bulwarks of law and order in this republic are impregnable. Popular government is not a failure. It was a famous victory."

The Philadelphia Public Ledger said: "Men were inspired by the highest ideals of patriotism to put aside partisanship and, in this great crisis in their country's history, to put party behind them, to put country to the fore, and keep it there invulnerably entrenched in public virtue and patriotism. The momentous contest brought together at the polls men of thought and conscience from all parties, of all shades of political opinion, to contend together for the safe guarding of the honor of the nation, the upholding of observance of the law, the defense of the political freedom of the judiciary, the social indivisibility of the American people; no classes, no masses."

The New York World said: "It is a triumph of morality and patriotism. Democratic votes, guided by conscience and independence, gave to the magnificent column in favor of sound money, law, order and national authority, these states all of which voted for the democratic candidate in 1892: Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia. Never before has there been such a test of democratic conscience and courage."

The New York Tribune said: "There are some movements so base, some causes so depraved, that neither victory can justify them nor defeat entitle them to commiseration. Such a cause was that which was vanquished yesterday, by the favor of God and the ballots of the American people. While it was active and menacing, it was unsparingly denounced and revealed as what it was, in all its hideous deformity. Now that it is crushed out of the very semblance of being, there is no reason why such judgment of it should be revised. 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 rattle-pated 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 Altgeld, the anarchist, and Debs, 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 least 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. The people have dismissed it with no uncertain tones. Hereafter let there be whatever controversies men may please about the tariff, about the currency, about the Monroe doctrine, and all the rest. But let there never again be a proposition to repeal the moral law, to garble the constitution, and to replace the stars and stripes with the red flag of anarchy. On those other topics honest men may honestly differ, in full loyalty to the republic. On these latter there is no room for two opinions, save in the minds of traitors, knaves and fools."

The Louisville Courier-Journal said: "Thank God for the triumph, and thank God for the travail, too. For without the trial such a triumph could not have been and until such a triumph was achieved by our people we could never have been sure of one of the pillars of our governmental fabric, because it had never been tested."

The Washington Star said: "It is the brightest chapter in the history of the American press and it will never be surpassed."

The comments of European papers were printed conspicuously by the republican newspapers in this country. The London Times said: "The American people have earned the congratulations of the whole world. They have vindicated the character of the republic for honesty and dignity, and for contempt for demagogic arts."

The London Standard said: "The hopelessly ignorant and savagely covetous waifs and strays of American civilization voted for Bryan, but the bulk of the solid sense, business integrity,

and social stability sided with McKinley. The nation is to be congratulated."

The London Pall Mall Gazette said: "The decision is accepted with universal consent in this country as being emphatically to the credit of the American electorate."

The Paris des Debats said: "The result has delivered America from a great peril."

How the views of men do change!

It is not difficult these days to learn from the columns of the Chicago Record-Herald that the "bulwarks of law and order in this republic" are not "impregnable" if left in charge of the men who provided the republican party with its campaign funds in 1896.

Even the staid old Public Ledger of Philadelphia does not now contend that the "conscience" of all America was concentrated for republican victory. From the columns of the Public Ledger one may learn that "the honor of the nation," etc., is not entirely safe in the hands of the men through whose money and influence the republican victory in 1896 was made possible.

The columns of the New York World disclose that the result in 1896 was not, after all, such "a triumph of morality and patriotism" as the World once professed to believe.

The Washington Star, just now indulging in bitter criticism of the republican administration, shows in its editorial columns, as well as in its news reports, that it is not so cock-sure that the republican victory proved "the brightest chapter."

The Louisville Courier-Journal seems not so grateful for the "triumph" or for the "travail" as it once was.

The New York Tribune is just now printing some wonderfully dignified editorials with respect to the "cause" to which it gave such ungracious farewell in 1896. The news columns of the Tribune have in recent days proved that whatever there was in the campaign of 1896 involving "an attack upon the honor and integrity of the nation;" whatever there was of "conspiracy," of "anarchy against the honor and life of the republic;" whatever there was of "the proposition to repeal the moral law, to garble the constitution, and to replace the stars and stripes with the red flag of anarchy"—these propositions were written indelibly upon the hearts of the men who misappropriated money for the use and benefit of the republican party in order that private monopoly might be perpetuated, while greed and avarice ran riot.

And what of these European newspapers? These same European papers, which congratulated the American people upon the "vindication of the character of the republic for honesty and dignity," upon the "business integrity," and upon the "delivery of America from a great peril," now bitterly speak of the greed and inhumanity of these whilom "defenders of national honor."

## DISPATCHES FROM MR. BRYAN

An Associated Press dispatch under date of Berlin, June 13, follows:

"William J. Bryan, who was in Berlin today, expressed the opinion that the next presidential election in the United States will turn on the trust question.

"Being asked about the prospect of the passage of reciprocity treaties, Mr. Bryan said he is in favor of a general reduction of tariff duties, in which case reciprocal treaties with foreign countries would be superfluous.

"The democratic leader expressed surprise on learning of the adoption by democratic state conventions of resolutions favoring his nomination for the presidency in 1908.

"This is so sudden," he said, with a laugh. "This is the first announcement of the news to me. I have been off the main caravan route for some time and have been absorbed in what I have been seeing and doing."

"Mr. Bryan had been moving so rapidly since he left Vienna on Friday that letters and telegrams for him did not reach him until today. As to the possibility of his nomination he had little to say, declaring it is too early to speak of that question.

"He made the recent revelations regarding conditions in the meat packing industry the text for a sermon against the evils of private monopoly.

"The beef trust is not different in character

and methods from other trusts," he said. "The inevitable tendency of a private monopoly is to increase the price of a product and to lower its quality. Why should any one expect anything else from a trust than the lowering of quality when a monopoly is established?"

"Observe I have used the words private monopoly, not public. In a private monopoly a private interest is set up against those of the whole people. Quite a different principle comes into operation when the interest of all is alone in view."

"Alluding to the subject of the political requirements of the day, he said:

"Before leaving home I tried to distinguish between democracy and what can properly be called socialism. Democracy recognizes competition as legitimate and tries to protect the competitive principle from attack. Socialism sees competition as an evil to be eliminated by public ownership and operation of all means of production and distribution.

"While this distinction between democracy and socialism should not be overlooked, the democratic platform must be one of progress and reform, and not merely of opposition to republican policies or socialistic ideas.

"In our fight for the absolute elimination of private monopolies and for the regulation of corporations in general it is necessary that the party shall be free from any suspicion of alliance with the corporate interests that have been dominating American politics.

"To this end campaign contributions must

be limited to those who desire to advance the public interest. I trust that public sentiment will require all parties to keep their books open so that hereafter no party will be under private obligations to shield corporate offenders."

"Herman Ridder of the New York Staats-Zeitung and Mr. Bryan had a long talk today on the political situation in the United States. Mr. Bryan will leave here for St. Petersburg tomorrow and from there will visit Sweden and Norway. He will arrive in England early in July and will then visit France, Italy and Switzerland. He expects to sail on the steamship Princess Irene from Gibraltar on August 20, and to arrive in New York on August 29. Mr. Bryan has accepted an invitation to make a speech in London at the American celebration of the Fourth of July."

Under date of St. Petersburg, June 14, the Associated Press says: "William J. Bryan was an interested spectator of the proceedings in the lower house of parliament today. During the agrarian debate, which was continued throughout the morning session, he occupied a seat in the diplomatic box as the guest of Ambassador Meyer and during the recess Mr. Bryan discussed the situation with some of the leaders of the house who appeared anxious to explain their views to the distinguished American.

"Among others Mr. Bryan talked with, was M. Alladin, leader of the peasant workmen group, which is now called the group of toil and is the most radical element in parliament."