

# Why?

I. The Times champions the election of Charles Evans Hughes because he is a great jurist, a great statesman, a great orator, a great patriotic American, and the captain and leader of the Republican party—the grandest organization of freemen that the world has ever known.

II. The Times supports the Republican party because its history is the history of the growth, the greatness and the freedom of our nation; because its purposes are patriotic; because, while it opposes class legislation against capital, it is the best and truest friend that labor ever had; because its restoration to power will, when the European conflict ceases, keep the furnaces glowing, and the spindles humming, and the land filled with the music of contented and well-paid toil.

III. The Times favors the Republican party because under its wise guidance star after star has been added to our flag, factory after factory has been added to our resources, billions have been added to our wealth, city after city has been developed from villages, the land has been laced with a network of iron rails, and the grand diapason of free labor has been made to sound throughout this great nation.

IV. The Times favors the Republican party because, under its inspiration, these United States, once a collection of wrangling and discordant commonwealths, once shamed with slavery and decrepit with the disease of secession, have become a country where no slave's presence dishonors labor, where no freeman's utterances are choked by the hand of power, where no man doffs his hat to another except through the courtesy of equals, where education is free, where manhood is respected, and where toil is protected.

V. The Times favors the Republican party because, under its patriotic rule, the United States has become a nation whose name is now proudly spoken in the singular and not in the plural number; whose credit rules at the head of the world's finances; whose policies gave land to the landless, work to the industrious, freedom to the slave, and armies and treasure for the preservation of the nation whose existence was imperiled by the Democratic party.

VI. The Times favors the Republican party because, under its guidance, the United States has become the greatest, freest and most prosperous nation under the light of the sun.

Macaulay said that "history is philosophy teaching by example." May we not profitably study the lesson of our own history during the last half-century? It is true that the issues of fifty years ago are as live questions politically dead; but, on the other hand, they are as dead questions politically alive. The Times does not claim that the Democratic party, if in power, would retrograde so far as to put the northern and southern armies again in the field, in order that Secretary Baker might order a Union general to follow up a new Joseph E. Johnson for the purpose of catching him in order to surrender to him, nor that Woodrow Wilson might command a Union general to tunnel into Appomattox in order to surrender to a new Lee. But though the issues of the Civil War are dead, it is not yet time to forget what was the attitude upon those issues of the parties which now ask the confidence and support of the American people.

What has been the attitude of the Democratic party for sixty years? Has it ever favored a fair or noble policy?

The Democratic doctrine in 1860 was that there was no difference between slave property and other property, and that under the United States Constitution, as construed by the Dred Scott decision, a slaveholder had a right to take his slaves into the Territories and be protected in their possession by Federal power. Many southern statesmen went further and claimed a similar right in the States. Senator Toombs said that the time was coming when he could call a roll of his slaves at the foot of the Bunker Hill monument. The time had arrived in 1856 when slavery, aggressive by that very necessity of its nature which demanded expansion as a condition precedent of continued existence, sought to make slave States out of Kansas and Nebraska Territories.

The Republican party did not propose to interfere with slavery where it existed as the creature of local law, but utterly denied that it was national or entitled to protection or recognition from the Nation outside of State boundaries, except merely to aid the return of fugitive slaves. The southern Democrats attempted to force their atrocious doctrines upon the Nation. They mistook the temper of the people of the free States. They might have continued to insult those people and belittle their united power, as they had done for years, but when they fired upon the Flag of the Union at Sumter, they played with northern fire, and the Republican masses, aided by loyal Democrats, united in the defense of their country.

What was the attitude of the Democratic party of the North three years after the beginning of the war? What Democrat can recall it now without the blush of shame mantling his cheeks? Let the waters of Lethe flow over it!

What was the attitude of the Republican party when the war drums ceased to throb and victory perched upon the Nation's banner?

Republican statesmen legislated to meet the conditions. They had no thought of vengeance and no wish to oppress the vanquished. They desired only to remove the ravages of war from the fair face of the South, to open her ports to commerce, to restore her great marts to thrift, her fields to opulence, her people to prosperity and contentment, her sons to representation, to citizenship, to equality in the councils and place in the government of the Nation. They effected this by the war amendments to the Constitution, each one of which was fought by the Democratic party, and each one of which contributed to the recuperation of the South and the peace and safety of the Nation.

The Democratic party is now, as it has ever been, a party of retrogression. It opposes Preparedness, Protection and Prosperity because the Republican party favors them. Its purpose is to build up that which Republicanism has torn down, to tear down that which Republicanism has built up, to undo that which Republicanism has achieved, to achieve that which Republicanism has refused. If some scientist were to successfully demonstrate that by retrogressive chemical action man could be remitted backward through quadruped, bird, reptile and fish until he should become a polyp, clinging in glutinous unconsciousness to a Devonian rock—that scientist would take high rank in Democratic councils.

What Republican but rejoices in the history of his party? That history was written not alone on fields whose surface men's feet shook like thunder and whose turf was their last pillow. It was written on fields where weary feet followed the plow and in shops where strong arms hammered the forges to furnish food and shelter for the wives and children of the absent soldier. It was written where trembling fingers wrote the checks that Capital gave to Country. It was written in the hospitals where patriotic women nursed the wounded. By the midnight watch-fire and amid the roar of battle, wherever the heart of the Nation throbbed, wherever the sword of the Nation gleamed, there, upon the parchment of the eternal ages the Republican party wrote its title to rule the land which it saved!