

Herald, covering the story of the national election on Wednesday morning, shocked the readers of that newspaper. In bold and glaring letters were the words the mob used 2,000 years ago: "Not this man, but Barabbas."

The inference was plain. The comparison was between Jesus, the Christ, and W. J. Bryan; between William McKinley and Barabbas, the bandit; between the sovereign voters of America and the frenzied mob. Taken clear outside of its religious bearing, the headline was an insult to the minds and consciences of the American people. What wild devotee penned those lines. The Examiner does not know, neither does it care. They were there, blazoned to the thousands who read, and they read a condemnation by the people whose sentence cannot lightly be evaded.

The Examiner protests against making a Christ out of William Jennings Bryan. It protests against making a bandit and law breaker out of William McKinley. It protests against making a mob out of the law abiding, peace-loving and intelligent American citizenship. It protests against any attempt to refuse consideration of the truth and reasonableness of defeat, and the evasion of admission that honesty and adherence to principle are the forceful facts which the American people demand.

Bryan a Christ! What blasphemy and unutterable sacrilege! He who pandered to the prejudices of the mob, who sought to array rich against poor and poor against rich, who went among the harlots, publicans and sinners of Tammany led by Croker, not for influencing to higher, better life, but for gaining their assistance to make him a political ascendant. Yet it is only fair to say that no one would condemn such a mad comparison so quickly as Bryan himself. His personal piety and purity of life must rebel against such sacrilege. Whatever fault he may have executed in recognizing Croker does not militate against our belief in his honest religious belief. That he made men mad with enthusiasm cannot be accounted against him, however unwise his words and actions leading to such worship may have been.

Neither can the editor or the publisher of the World-Herald be censured. Doubtless they were ignorant of the publication. Yet why should it have been permitted to appear a second time? The World-Herald owes an apology to the decent citizenship of this country for those lines. For Bryan's sake, for the sake of honest admiration that thousands hold for Mr. McKinley—as pure a man as Bryan, and as good—for the sake of its own self-respect, this apology should not be delayed.—The Examiner.

**EXPLAINS MORTON INCIDENT.**

Senator Jones said that one of the unfortunate incidents of the campaign had been a misunderstanding, through which he had severely criticised J. Sterling Morton. The senator made the following statement with regard to the affair:

"A telegram from Nebraska City, published in the Chicago newspapers, stated that the Hon. J. Sterling Morton would publish a letter of Mr. Bryan, using the words, 'The letter is as follows:' Then followed a letter which I supposed was complete. I did not see the letter published in THE CONSERVATIVE, Mr. Morton's paper.

"Within a few days the letter was again published, and it then appeared that a material part had been left out in the former publication. Supposing that the dispatch was accurate, I believed that Mr. Morton had published a mutilated letter as a complete letter, and I used harsh language toward Mr. Morton as a consequence of this conviction.

"A copy of THE CONSERVATIVE has been sent me since, and I see by it that in the first publication Mr. Morton published the entire letter without mutilation, that my criticisms of him were therefore unjust and not well founded. I regret this exceedingly, as I dislike to do any man injustice, and I make this statement in justice to him as well as to myself, and give it out in the same way that I gave out the criticism of him, hoping that if I have done him any injury by the former publication that this will correct it."—Chicago Daily News.

**WOULD NOT HEAR ADVICE.**

A certain well-known member of the democratic state central committee of Nebraska duplicates the charge that was first sprung by members of the national committee that the knife of treachery was thrust into William Jennings Bryan in this state and was twisted around several times.

This charge is not surprising, in view of the fact that Bryan ran several thousand votes behind Poynter, and also ran behind pretty nearly everybody else on the whole gamut of the fusion ticket from governor to assessor. But it possesses increased interest from the fact that the individual managers in this state viewed this treachery with equanimity.

**Would Run Campaign Himself.**

This feeling toward Bryan on the part of some of the fusion management dates back to the Kansas City convention and has grown because of the stubborn insistence of Bryan to run the campaign as it suited himself, and not as his committees advised. Because of this some of the managers of the fusion party in this state have been almost hostile to Bryan. They but represented the feeling of a portion of the rank and file—a fact indicated by the election returns.

Among the many democratic politicians who visited Bryan in Lincoln just prior to the Kansas City convention for

no other purpose than to persuade him to drop the money question as an issue were many prominent fusion Nebraskans. Chairman Hall of the state central committee was one of these. Bryan refused to listen to them, as he did to the others, and that started the resentment against him that developed later in the campaign.

**Would Not Stop Talking.**

Later a number of democratic managers were just as unsuccessful in an attempt to dissuade Bryan from making his eastern tour of the country. They advised him to speak but four or five times during the campaign, and to deliver then as carefully prepared addresses as that which he delivered at Indianapolis.

But Bryan would make the stumping trip. Some of these advisers are now saying: "I told you so," and point out some of Bryan's utterances which have been generally regarded as having been decidedly injurious to his cause.

This criticism is in decided contrast to the feeling among fusionists four years ago. Bryan emerged from the battle of 1896 a somewhat dilapidated idol, but still an idol as far as this state was concerned. Today the managers of his parties in this state are blaming Bryan himself for his overwhelming defeat.—Omaha News.

**A CORRECTION.**

A friend of Mr. Morton calls the attention of the News to the fact, as he states it, that the Bryan letters recently printed in various newspapers were not letters written by Mr. Bryan to Mr. Morton, but were letters to various populists and others. In commenting upon the matter the News took occasion, acting on the belief that Mr. Morton had given them out, to animadvert upon the man whose political rancor would allow him to violate the seal of confidence placed on all correspondence between gentlemen. The fact that the letters were printed in Chicago newspapers as coming from Nebraska City led the News into the error of believing they were given out by Mr. Morton, especially as he had previously given out one letter from Mr. Bryan to himself. His friend says they were not, and that they had previously been printed in state papers, having been secured by a special correspondent who had been digging around the state.—Lincoln Evening News.

**QUESTIONS FOR BRYANARCHISTS.**

The Philadelphia Record, (Ind. dem.) suggests the pertinent interrogation, "What one of the republican leaders contributed so much to republican victory as did Richard Croker?" THE CONSERVATIVE makes another query: "What republican contributed so much to the success of that party as did William Jennings Bryan?"