

**PAT.** In his home return speech at Lincoln the other day the peerless son of toil, the incessant and constant contractor and expander of the muscles which move the cover of his conserved wisdom, Col. Bryan, said:

"I want to warn those who toil that whenever in this country we begin to neglect the principles of self-government, the poor will be the first to suffer."

And as no one objected, Col. Bryan uttered his "warn" and everybody present who knew how nearly to perpetual motion Col. Bryan had, for ten or twelve years, been working his mouth as a mint, making candidature into coin, felt that they would never for a moment again "neglect the principles of self-government." The colonel did not analyze these principles nor explain them. He merely talked. However, "the poor," for whom the colonel always has many words and a deluge of tears, will begin at once not to "neglect the principles of self-government."

**NEVER.** Col. Bryan declared to Cato Sells and Cato declared to the Kansas City convention that unless the doctrine of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 was accepted, ratified, reaffirmed, and re-consecrated, that he, the Colonel, would not run for the presidency. Upon that declaration the convention, two-thirds of which had been instructed for the peerless, said in a silver resolution, that which Bryan demanded it should say—that without which he would not and could not accept candidature. After that the peerless Bryan declared silver a secondary and imperialism a paramount issue.

He did not decline to run for the presidency if imperialism was not made an issue.

He did decline if silver was not made an issue. And now he declares imperialism a bigger question than the silver question without which he declined candidature.

## NAMES.

Harper's Weekly is exploiting a new word, by which it is sought to designate the species of obsession concerning the person of W. J. Bryan, which prevails among certain of our fellow-citizens. "Bryanitis" is the word, and it is modeled after a class of names which the doctors apply to inflammations of various sorts.

THE CONSERVATIVE, however, does not consider it so good a word as Bryanarchy. For, as gastritis is inflammation of the stomach, so Bryanitis should be inflammation of the Bryan; and while Mr. Bryan may well be infected with something of the septicemic order, as he insists on bearing a four-year

old corpse about with him, we doubt if it is this condition to which Harper's Weekly alludes. Its editors have in mind rather the disordered intellects of Mr. Bryan's adherents.

This is better described as Bryanarchy, which is furthermore strictly accurate from the etymological point of view, since Mr. Bryan is distinctly the *archos* or head man, of all who follow his banner; omitting (as indecorous and inappropriate) the secondary meaning of the word *archos*, we find him their monarch, who must open his mouth before a dog of them dare bark; the architect of their platform, their patriarch, their archangel. "Bryanarchy", therefore, very well describes their condition, and it has the further advantage of containing the word anarchy, thus giving a timely reminder of the state to which unlimited application of Mr. Bryan's notions of finance and government would reduce our commonwealth.

THE CONSERVATIVE will, therefore, adhere to "Bryanarchy" in preference to "Bryanitis."

"Archos" means the backside, or fundamental, and the Bee's picture of farmer Bryan is therefore, an excellent oriflamme for the Bryanarchists in their campaign.

## TWO LEADERS.

Many democrats must look back longingly to the old Cleveland days. Between 1884 and 1892 the drift was strongly to the democratic party. The intelligent and conservative people of the country had the utmost confidence in Mr. Cleveland, and in the party that was wise enough to accept his leadership. His championship of civil service reform, tariff reform and sound money drew to him thousands of men from the republican party who felt that their party was becoming more and more the party of privilege. Young men from the colleges were glad to enroll themselves in the party led by Mr. Cleveland.

During the years of the Cleveland leadership many republican states were carried by the democrats. In Massachusetts, William E. Russell was three times elected governor, and even when the republicans carried the state it was by greatly reduced pluralities. And it seemed as though it would be possible to strengthen the democrat party to such an extent that it might even become dominant in that state. In Ohio the republican plurality for Mr. Harrison in 1892 was only 1,072—one electoral vote, indeed, going to Mr. Cleveland. Iowa elected a democratic governor, Mr. Boies, in 1891, and in 1892 the republican plurality for the electoral ticket was only 23,428. It was 65,552 in 1890. Illinois went democratic in 1890 and 1892. In Michigan the republican pluralities were small—for that state—during the Cleveland era, that for Mr.

Blaine being only 3,308. Wisconsin was carried by the democrats in 1890 and 1892. In Indiana Mr. Cleveland was successful in 1884 and 1892, while in 1888 Mr. Harrison's plurality was only 2,348.

But a change came after Mr. Cleveland's second term. The free silver theory took possession of the democratic party. Instead of standing by the man who had led it so well, it took up with the populists and cheap money people. When it did that the tide in its direction was not merely arrested, but turned the other way. New England again became solidly republican. Massachusetts gave Mr. McKinley a plurality of 173,265. The republican pluralities in Ohio have been tremendous. Iowa has become stronger in the republican faith than ever. It gave McKinley a plurality of 65,552 as against 19,773 for Blaine, and 23,428 for Harrison. In Illinois there have been, since 1892, three republican pluralities of more than 100,000, that for McKinley being 142,498. Since 1894 there has been no republican plurality in Michigan less than 50,000; McKinley carried the state by 56,868, while Wisconsin gave him a plurality of 102,612. Indiana has never been so solidly republican as during the predominance of Bryanism. The republican pluralities of 1894, 1896 and 1898 were, respectively, 44,673, 18,181 and 17,518.

More than this, the republicans have made inroads in the south. They carried Delaware and Maryland in 1896, and got twelve out of thirteen electoral votes in Kentucky. Cleveland's plurality of 50,715 in Virginia in 1892 shrank to 19,341 for Bryan in 1896. West Virginia, which had not been carried by the republicans since 1872, has been carried at every election since 1892, giving McKinley a plurality of 11,487. Almost more important than this invasion of the south by the republicans, is their capture of the ever-faithful New Jersey. The republicans carried it in 1872, but this was the last time up to 1896, when it gave the republicans a plurality of 87,692. It seems to us that the lesson is plain. The democrats have simply affronted the intelligence and conservatism of the country, and they have done this by abandoning their old principles. It is the fashion to speak of Mr. Bryan as "the peerless leader." He has been peerless in leading the democratic party to defeat and ruin. We do not believe that it will recover its strength till it repudiates him and his doctrines. We know what has happened in the past. We know that the majority of people have shown that they had no sympathy with Bryanism. And the contrast between the Cleveland influence and the Bryan influence certainly seems to show that, at least from a party point of view, the former was wholly beneficial, while the latter is entirely pernicious.—Indianapolis News.