

"CALLING NAMES."

"I cannot account for it," said a Chinese general, called to book for an apparently needless defeat in the Tonquin war; "we made the most hideous faces and uttered terrifying cries, but the enemy bore down on us like bees in a swarm, and we were swept away." This seems amusing, gauged by our standards of warfare, yet Chinese methods are in constant use by champions of unsound ideas in this heart of Western civilization. They do not literally contort their features and pierce the air with shrieks, but they do what amounts to the same thing, when they invent a name of derision for their opponents and try to kill them with it; nevertheless, American history fails to record the case where a man or a party representing a good cause was ever driven from the field by such means. When Washington was president, his political foes tried to destroy his influence by styling him in mockery the "stepfather of his people." The name "democrat" when first used as a party title, carried with it a taint of reproach because of the association in the popular mind of sans-culottism with democracy; and Jefferson, now idolized in the democratic system of ancestor-worship, scorned the word, insisting that he belonged to the republican party, which then stood for nearly everything a good republican now abhors.

By Jackson's time, however, the republicans had become democrats in name as well as in fact, and not long afterwards they were quarreling among themselves with a bitterness hardly equalled in the party warfare of a few years before. This feeling reached its most intense stage in New York, when the name "barnburners" was applied in contempt to the "free-soil democrats" who followed Silas Wright, because, like the farmer in the story who burned his barn down to rid it of vermin, they were willing to sacrifice their party to their principles. The collapse of the American party was due not at all to the nickname "know-nothing," applied to it on account of its oath-bound secrecy, but to the fact that any kind of mystery and mummery in connection with politics on the larger scale is repugnant to the common sense of our people. During the civil war, the Northern sympathizers with secession and slavery came to grief on account of their unhappy alliance, not because the term "copperhead" was applied to them; a snake may not be a widely popular symbol, yet the coiled rattlesnake flag of the revolution carried inspiration with it, and the flag raised over the first American warship commanded by Paul Jones had a serpent stretched across the thirteen bars. The "black republicans" and "rail-splitters" of 1860 would have

gone down before the "little giants" if there had been anything in nicknames, just as "Prince Hal" Genet and "Thunderbolt" Norton of the Tweed ring might have passed, ten years later, for better citizens than "Whispering Sam" Tilden, the ring's inveterate enemy.

About 1879 both the great parties were ripe for another factional split. The democrats made theirs memorable in New York by throwing away the state with the Kelly bolt. The republicans, the same year nominated Cornell for governor. Conkling was then at the height of his power, and Cornell, as his friend, was objectionable to a large and important minority of the party. They did not feel well enough organized for a general revolt, but a little band of resolute young men took their political fortunes in their hands, and led a forlorn hope of protest at the polls. Because they advised the sympathizers with their movement to erase Cornell's name from the head of the party ticket, they earned the designation of the "young scratchers" and the "hen party." They could scarcely get a hearing in any newspaper in the state, much less command editorial support. Thanks to the democratic defection, they did not defeat Cornell; but they cut enough votes from his total to leave him nearly 17,000 behind the republican candidate for lieutenant-governor. The breaches opened that year grew steadily wider. The Tilden democrats in 1880 were outmaneuvered in the national convention, and Hancock, a good citizen, but a weak candidate, was nominated for president. The republicans, taking heart of hope from this, bridged over their difficulties for the time being, and won the election with Garfield; but at the first clash over patronage, apart went the two factions once more. The Conkling contingent fell back upon a warfare of names. They were "stalwart" republicans, their foes were "halfbreeds" or "featherheads." This quarrel cost the republicans the presidency in 1884, but when the party was reorganized, it was found that the stalwarts had disappeared, while the despised halfbreeds filled the center of the foreground.

It was the campaign of 1884, by the way, which raised up a new political group, composed of republicans, who, for conscientious reasons, could not vote for Blaine, yet were not ready to throw themselves into the democratic party without reserve. The republican campaigners hated them for stepping out of the ranks at this critical stage, and dubbed them "dudes and Pharisees;" the old-school democrats, who dreaded the influence they might exert upon Mr. Cleveland if he were elected president, but did not care to go to the length of offending them, styled them, half-jocularly, "mugwumps." The independents did not seem at all disturbed. They had a purpose in view, and, as long as they accomplished it, they were willing not

only to endure these nicknames but to adopt them as titles of honor.

The Spanish war and its legacy in the Philippines have brought out another crop of denunciatory titles. On the one side, "annexationist" and "expansionist" have generally made way for "imperialist," none of these being necessarily a term of reproach in the sense of having anything derisive in it. On the other side, names which show great bitterness are used, "traitor," "little American," and "tory" being prime favorites. Commander Dyer of the cruiser Baltimore adds to these the epithet "goody goodies." Anybody renders himself liable to one of these designations if he declines to support a policy which he believes unconstitutional and destructive of the safeguards of American liberty. But what of it? A good cause can be no more destroyed by hurling bad names at it, than a wicked one can be redeemed by smothering it in incense.—New York Evening Post.

CONSISTENT.

The lunatics who manage the organ of discontent at Omaha and preach the doctrine of their own importance at the ratio of sixteen to one when compared to the Omaha Daily Bee have scare head-lines in their issue of July 12, thus:

"CRISIS FOR OMAHA

"GREATER AMERICA HAS AN EMPTY TREASURY AS A RESULT OF ROSEWATER'S CURSEDNESS."

If the emptiness of a treasury can be evolved from the will of Rosewater one must conclude either that Rosewater is bigger or the World-Herald smaller than that organ of Bryanarchy has portrayed.

How could a "crisis for Omaha" be evolved out of an editor and newspaper small as Rosewater and the Bee are depicted by the daily exponent of calamity, Coin Harvey and Bryan?

THE CONSERVATIVE is not partial to the Bee, but it recognizes its force and ability as an advocate of the best interests of Omaha and the state whenever it divests itself of personal and political bias.

A North Carolina correspondent of the Baltimore Sun makes the positive statement that Senator Butler (Pop.) will advocate in the two papers controlled by him the adoption of the constitutional amendment limiting negro suffrage.

"If Alger does not repudiate the Pingree partnership," The Minneapolis Journal (rep.) says, "it will be taken by some people, at least, that he is willing to submit his chief, while still remaining in his service, to insult and disparagement by the potato-raiser of Michigan. The only pleasing promise of the situation is the probability of Alger's early retirement from the cabinet."