VOL. 4, NO. 266.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1904.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

SINCE WHEN IS SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE NOT SAUCE FOR THE GANDER?

By DANIEL DE LEON

ILLIAM Randolph Hearst is a lucky man. He may not agree with the reasoning, but that does not matter. He may even imagine that what some consider evidences of good luck are the reverse of that. Nevertheless, what he is becoming the cause of no other mortal is or has been.

It is now less than eight years ago, when all the elements of capitalism that opposed Mr. Bryan drew such a long breath of relief at his defeat that the intoxication of their gladness took the place of the intoxication of wine by blurting out the truth. Those or these anti-Bryan capitalists had been out-Bryaning Bryan on the "American racket." For every time that Bryan sought to conceal the fallacy of his economics in the dust that he raised about "true Americanism," his capitalist adversaries did the same trick twice in behalf of their false claims during the campaign. After the campaign, however, these anti-Bryan capitalists forgot their cue for a moment, and had extensive articles showing that their pockets in general, and civilization in particular, owed a tremendous debt to the foreign citizens. Why, said they, look at the States where the foreigners are fewest, South Carolina, Kansas, etc.,—all went heavily for Bryan; on the other hand, look at the States where foreigners are numerous, like Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, etc., they went thunderingly for McKinley and civilization. Indeed, the argument was made that the strength of the vote for "law, order, and civilization" could be gauged by the measure of the foreign vote—wherever this was numerous "civilization," etc., won an "overwhelming victory;" in the measure that the foreign vote declined in numerical strength, in that same measure the "overwhelmingness" of the victory was less overwhelming, until it vanished and became a defeat where the native element overshadowed the foreign into insignificance. That was then, immediately

after the Presidential election of 1896.

We now approach the Presidential election of 1904. One of the tunes to the prelude is the election of a Hearst-Bryanistic delegation by the Democratic Convention of Rhode Island. And, lo and behold, the same elements that not quite eight years ago sang the praises {of} the foreigner now turn a somersault back and decry him. The Providence *Journal* leads in the somersault, it imputes the Hearst victory to the foreign vote, and it cries "woe, woe is us!"

Is not Mr. Hearst a lucky man for being the one and only friend of Mr. Bryan who so managed things as to convict the detractors of his associate of downright false pretences? Surely that which within eight years ago was sauce for the goose can not in so short an interval have ceased to be sauce for the gander. If in 1896 the foreign vote had the distinction of saving civilization; for what reason can it in 1904 be denied the distinction?

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.

Uploaded April 2007

slpns@slp.org