

## THE ILLUSTRATED BEE.

Published Weekly by The Bee Publishing Company, Bee Building, Omaha, Neb.

Price, 5c Per Copy—Per Year, \$2.00.

Entered at the Omaha Postoffice as Second Class Mail Matter.

For Advertising Rates Address Publisher.

Communications relating to photographs or articles for publication should be addressed, Editor The Illustrated Bee, Omaha.

## Pen and Picture Pointers

**J**OHAN I. KENNEDY was chosen by the republican voters of the Second Nebraska congressional district by direct vote to be their candidate, and the convention ratified that decision by making Mr. Kennedy's nomination unanimous after taking the ballot prescribed by the rules. This choice of the people at the primaries will undoubtedly be ratified at the polls by a handsome majority. Mr. Kennedy is not a "popular" man in the customary use of the term, but he is a man of the people in the best sense. He has had his own way to make in the world, and has had to work hard to achieve what he has. This work has kept him pretty busy attending to his own affairs, and has left him but little time to follow the pursuits of the "mixer." But he has proved himself capable of making friends, firm and fast, by his frank and manly ways, and his clean record in business and politics is the best of recommendations to the voters of the district. Four years ago he was on the republican ticket as one of the McKinley electors, and assisted in registering the state's choice for president that year. Other than this he has never held office, but he has always been active in politics and has always been interested in achieving republican success. Never having been identified with either of the factions into which the party has been divided at times, his nomination at present is looked upon as in the interest of harmony, and the unanimity with which the leaders have aligned themselves behind his candidacy augurs well for a triumph by the united party.

Mr. Kennedy can never be president of the United States, owing to a mistake he made in selecting his birthplace. He chose to be born in Ayrshire, Scotland, a fact that most natives of the county consider honor sufficient. The son of a farmer, he learned at hard work is, and has held enough of a sturdy Scotch character to stick to that method always, not seeking success by any short cuts. He was given a common school education in Scotland, and at the age of 19 came to America. He found employment on a farm in La Salle county, Illinois, and there earned money to pay his way through Knox college, at Galesburg. After taking the course at Knox he attended the law school at the state university of Iowa, and was graduated from that school in 1882. In December of that year he came to Omaha, and formed a law partnership under the firm name of Kennedy & Martin. This firm continued for six years. In 1888 the present firm of Kennedy & Learned was formed. Mr. Kennedy's practice has not been of a sort that would bring him much into public notice, for he has steadfastly declined to take cases of a character that excite comment, preferring the more intricate and quieter business of the law. He has won a high place at the bar, both of the county and the state, and is held in great esteem by his fellow-practitioners. Personally he is a genial, companionable man, and one who is warmly admired by all who know him.

Phelps county, Nebraska, made a record in the matter of county fairs this year by turning the usual program out of doors and giving society a real show. The women of Holdrege arranged for a floral carnival and parade that surpassed anything of the sort ever seen in that section, and which made a distinct hit as a feature of the fair. The decorated carriages were driven about the track and were loudly applauded, the artistic beauty of design and the taste exhibited in the execution being of the highest. The judges awarded the first prize for single rigs to Mrs. Palmer, who had her carriage decorated in yellow roses. Mr. Titus and Mrs. De Hart drove a single rig decorated in chrysanthemums of varied hues, and were awarded second prize. The Bee has not been apprised of the name of the winner of first prize in double rigs, but Mrs. Hanlin and Kronquist were given second. Their carriage was decorated in pink and white, and was drawn by a team of white horses.

## His Discreet Preference

"Don't you think you would have greater influence with the masses if you made more speeches?"

"No," answered Senator Sorghum, "I believe in giving anything I have to say to the press. When you make a speech you have to depend on your own grammar, but when you have your remarks printed you have a number of people to straighten it out for you."—Washington Star.

## John Bull's National Campaign

(Copyright, 1904, by William Thorp.)

**I**T IS difficult to compare a parliamentary general election in Great Britain to a presidential campaign in the United States. The spirit of the contest, the attitude of the people, the machinery employed by the contending parties, the very object striven for, are all largely, if not entirely, different.

The rank and file of the British electorate has nothing to do with the choice of the prime minister, who occupies much the same executive position as the president, although possessing less power. He is selected by the monarch, usually upon the advice of the leader or leaders of the rival political party.

If Mr. Balfour were to be defeated on an important question in the House of Commons tomorrow he would have to choose one of two alternatives. He could go to the king with the resignations of himself and his cabinet ministers, in which case he would advise the king to send for Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, or some other liberal leader, and request him to form a ministry; or he could dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country to decide the political issue by means of a general election.

When there exist two sharply defined parties, each with an acknowledged, unchallenged leader, it is easy for the defeated premier to advise the king whom to send for to replace himself. In the old days, when Salisbury and Gladstone led the conservative and liberal parties, nobody dreamed of anybody else for premier; but when Mr. Gladstone retired from public life in 1891, with his party still in power, Queen Victoria must have been puzzled as to which of his lieutenants she should ask to reconstruct and lead the ministry. There were three of them at that time with practically equal reputation and power in the party—Lord Rosebery, Sir William Vernon Harcourt and John Morley.

Morley was out of it from the start, because he manifested a strong disinclination to become premier. Mr. Gladstone at first advised the queen, as subsequent revelations have shown, to send for Sir William Harcourt. This advice was resented by her majesty, who objected to Sir William because he had taken a leading part in opposing financial grants to the royal family. She wanted to send for Lord Rosebery. Lord Salisbury, a rival leader, whom she consulted, strongly urged the choice of Harcourt, as being the more popular man; but nevertheless her majesty invited Lord Rosebery to become head of the government, and he consented to do so, after patching up a hollow truce with Harcourt.

This is not the only instance in which Queen Victoria picked out for premier a political leader who would not have been chosen by his own parliamentary party or by the general body of electors throughout the country. Anything more radically different from the American political spirit and political methods cannot well be imagined; yet this British system suits the people and works well. Nine times out of ten the defeated premier gives the best possible advice as to his successor, and the advice is taken.

If the alternative of a general election is chosen the country is not stirred up so violently from end to end as it is here in a presidential campaign, although the electioneering methods adopted are sometimes much more violent than those to which Americans are accustomed. Only the members of the House of Commons are to be chosen by the people, and the nearest equivalent to, therefore, the election of congressional representatives.

In some parts of England there is hardly more than a ripple of political excitement over a general election, because of the preponderance of power enjoyed by one or other of the political parties. The county of Kent, for example, is so overwhelmingly conservative that the liberals do not even trouble to contest most of the seats. In some parts of Scotland it is hopeless, even absurd, for a conservative to seek election; and over a wide area of Ireland the nationalist members are usually returned unopposed. Nearly all the Welsh members are liberals at every election.

None of the three great political parties—the liberals, the conservatives and the nationalists—cares to spend money in fighting hopeless constituencies. English campaign funds are miserably small in comparison with American, for the simple reason that the political issues seldom touch the business interests of the country in a vital and immediate way. The only exception is that the brewers and saloonkeepers—or "publicans," as they are called—put up a lot of money for the conservative campaign, believing that the liberals would give power to the local communities to enforce prohibition if they desired to do so.

The campaign funds, being small, are naturally conserved for fighting contests where there is a chance of winning. Forlorn hopes upon the enemy's strong holds are almost always led—and paid for—by some wealthy man who wants to "butt in" to the inner circle of his party. After he has fought two or three hopeless elections

and spent perhaps \$50,000 or \$50,000, the wire pullers of the party reward him by assigning him to some "easy seat" where there is sure to be a "walkover" for one of his political complexion. He usually repays the gift by a handsome contribution to the campaign fund ranging anywhere from \$5,000 to \$25,000.

In some cases it is possible for a wealthy man to buy a safe seat at the outset by a whopping big gift to the party funds. One of the best known of the present liberal members did so by giving the late Mr. Schudhorst, the greatest campaign manager the party ever had, a check for \$50,000 at a moment when money was sorely needed. But this is unusual. The rich and ambitious man generally has to work and wait for years, as well as put up his money.

It often happens that a comparatively poor man has far better luck. Many English constituencies resent a plutocrat, and some of them are conservative strongholds, too. I was once private secretary to a liberal candidate in a Kentish constituency. He earned his living as a barrister and journalist, and had very little money. The party had to put up nearly all the election expenses, which is contrary to the English custom, and he could not afford to subscribe to a hundred different local societies, from the Publican's league to the Home for Cats, as his conservative opponent did. Nevertheless, he pulled down the conservative majority from over 3,000 to less than 200, and would have surely won by a big margin at the next election had he not broken down with nervous exhaustion three weeks before.

His place was taken by a millionaire soap maker eager to buy a seat in Parliament. He gave the National Liberal Federation a check for \$25,000 as the price of foisting him upon what was thought to be a safe constituency. He spent on the contest every cent he dared spend without running up against the corrupt practices act; he doubled and trebled the conservative candidate's subscriptions to the local societies, and then thought that he surely must be elected. But when the poll was taken he was beaten by over 4,000 votes. A candidate's personality counts for far more than his money, and high social position is better than either in some constituencies.

The candidate who is a good sportsman has a tremendous pull. I know of one candidate who was elected in a sport-loving city of Yorkshire simply because he was one of the best amateur foot ball players in England.

The Hon. Philip Stanhope, who used to be called the "Prince Rupert of the liberals," won a forlorn hope in a rural constituency by the skill and daring with which he drove a coach and eight white horses. He didn't trouble about speech-making or canvassing the electors; he simply sat on the box of the coach, a fine figure of a man, and drove his eight white horses round the sharpest corners he could find, laughing gaily as he faced death, and gallantly saluting all the girls he passed along the road.

Who cared what Phil Stanhope's political opinions were? Probably he would have been troubled if called upon to explain them. But he could drive a coach better than any man in the country; he was a cricketer of national fame, and in his college days, not so many years before, he had thrashed a famous prizefighter. Of course, he was elected by an overwhelming majority. The fact that he was the son of an earl helped him, for it is still true that Englishmen "dearly love a lord." Curiously enough, the one political principle which he really held clearly and strongly was the desirability of abolishing the House of Lords. That appealed to the voters' sense of humor, especially as he was every inch an aristocrat in temperament.

It may be gathered from what has gone before that the general election in England is not a great national campaign in the sense that it is here, but a congeries of local fights. The central organizations of the parties do not play anything like the important part they play in this country.

The candidate is chosen by the general committee of the local party, usually called the "four hundred." A well known and popular local man is preferred, even to a statesman of national eminence, but if no such man is available the central organization sends two or three would-be candidates from London. They address the "four hundred," much like ministerial candidates preaching before the elders of a vacant church, and the one who makes the best impression is chosen.

Naturally, the man who is willing to pay the whole or the biggest share of the election expenses is selected, other things being equal. It would amaze an American politician to see how much money the candidate puts up and how little the party contributes. Leaving out of account the handful of labor members, who are paid salaries by their party, English politics is run by a few rich men who are either anxious to take part in the great game of statesmanship for its own sake, or who yearn for the social hall-mark which they think membership of the House of Commons bestows. That is why there are so few men of real distinction in that assembly,

as compared with some other parliaments. The average M. P. is not an intellectual prodigy.

The professional "spellbinder" cuts a small figure in England. There is plenty of speech making—during a campaign I knew one candidate who made an average of seven speeches a day for six weeks, and ten a day for the last week—but it is nearly all done by local volunteers and by friends of the candidate, who are sufficiently interested in his success to spend a few days or weeks in the constituency and pay their own expenses.

The conservative central organization, which always has a great deal more money to spend than the liberals have, sends a few speakers where they are most needed, but a candidate considers it rather a disgrace to have to call for them, as it reflects upon his own popularity. The liquor trade and other interests allied with the conservatives maintain supplementary corps of "spellbinders," but as those men naturally want to speak in favor of their own particular cause, which may be unpopular with the mass of the voters, most candidates would rather do without their "support."

I remember a tory M. P. who had kept his seat for many years in a town strongly in favor of "local option"—prohibition by municipal vote. He was careful to avoid the liquor question and to dwell mainly upon the preservation of the union and other appealing topics. He lost his seat at last because, despite his almost tearful protests, the central body of the liquor trade's political organization insisted on sending half a dozen of its "spellbinders" to stamp his territory. Their "support" ruined him with the voters.

The liberals draw a large number of speakers from their two principal London clubs—the National Liberal club and the Eighty club. These men never receive pay, and in most cases pay their own expenses. The Eighty club is regarded as a sort of preserve from which to draw speakers and candidates as they are needed for the good of the party.

Photographs of candidates are used to a considerable extent, but they are always printed on small cards and mailed to the voters, usually with the brief legend underneath: "Your support and interest are requested on behalf of Thomas Snooks, the liberal candidate." The huge poster and banner portraits, which play such an important part in American elections, are unknown in England.

Large quantities of leaflets, popularly known as "tracts," are sent out by the central organizations; but the bulk of the printed appeals to the electors are locally produced. The candidate and his personal friends write a good many of them, and the editor of the party newspaper usually gives his services for this purpose. He is much in demand, for he is able to work in a lot of local references that will appeal to the people.

The candidate often buys the party newspaper when he first descends on a constituency and uses it as his principal means of reaching the electors. If not, it is generally controlled by his leading supporters. Unprofitable papers are maintained for political reasons to an infinitely greater extent than they are in America.

Probably, taking England and Scotland, but not Ireland and Wales, at least 60 per cent of the electorate consists of people who have no political affiliations and can be swayed from one side to another with comparative ease. In some constituencies the percentage is much higher; in others, which have been carefully worked and organized with extraordinary care by both parties, it may not be more than 30 per cent. More depends, as a general rule, upon the personality of the candidate than upon the platform and record of his party.

Although a smaller portion of the people are political partisans and there is not so much general interest in a campaign, those who are partisans are apt to be much more violent than their American prototypes. A keenly fought election is extremely rough. Meetings are frequently broken up by main force, and it is a common incident for the candidates to be pelted with flour, rotten eggs and even stones, as they drive through the streets in carriages decorated with their colors. Everybody wears party favors, and a favorite joke is to decorate a donkey with the opposition's emblems.

At one liberal meeting in a theater, at which I was present, a rowdy conservative in the gallery was seized by the arms and legs and thrown neck and crop to the floor. His right arm and three of his ribs were broken. Next evening the conservatives broke up a liberal meeting, driving the candidate and his friends from the platform by volleys of stones and rotten vegetables. This was not an unusually violent campaign.

As soon as the votes have been counted in the town hall or other principal building of the district the "returning officer" steps out onto a balcony, followed by the candidates, the winner first. That is the first intimation of the result to the crowd in

(Continued on Page Fifteen.)