

[illegible]

It had been announced that on this occasion Col. Tillman would answer the charges of Senator Charles McNamara Gonzales, of The State newspaper, and there was more interest attached to his speech than to any other of the day. During the last session of the senate Tillman, as the presiding officer, made a ruling on the subject of the privilege that was not satisfactory to the body and the members of the senate were reversed by the committee on rules. Tillman in private communication with the members of the senate and with the reporters stated that he had telegraphed the facts to Speaker Henderson and Senator Frye, presidents of the United States senate, and that both of them had sustained him. Tillman also issued in the morning a statement explaining his reasons for making the ruling and the senate members and parliamentarians were not all agreed on the questions at issue, but that he had been forced to make the ruling.

vered by the committee on rules. Tillman in private communication with members of the senate and newspaper reporters, stated that he had magnified the facts to Speaker Henderson and Senator Fry, president of the United States senate, and that both of these had sustained him. Tillman also inserted in the Senate Journal a statement explaining his reasons for making the ruling in which he stated that the parliamentarians were not all agreed on the question of the constitutionality of the act, and that he had been sustained by the two historic

parliamentarians in the country, giving the impression that it was Senator Frye and Speaker Henderson who had instigated the attack on the Journal. He was not satisfied with Tillman's statement and wrote to Senator Frye and Speaker Henderson and received replies from them. Frye and Henderson they had sent Tillman were directly opposite to what he had stated them to be.

Tillman in his speech did not reply to this specific charge, but dodged it very adroitly. He charged that Conkling in his speech had said that he had not quoted Tillman's personal statement in the Senate Journal, which gave him grounds for making the rolling back charge. He said that he had no statement from the Journal, which had nothing whatever to do with Editor

Gonzales charge that Tillman had inserted a falsehood in that statement and had uttered from his chair as presiding officer of the senate an untruth in regard to the Frye and Henderson telegrams: 'This man Gonzales is actuated by spite and malice,' he exclaimed, dramatically. 'He is a modern Iahmaelite, whose hand is against every man and every man's hand is against him. Only a few days ago he made a vile attack on the Hon. E. O. Watson, a

consecrated minister of the Methodist church, and had assailed the entire Methodist conference of South Carolina and the entire state of South Carolina from Columbia. And since he has done that, why I don't suppose I can be surprised at his attack on me. The only explanation I can give for his enmity toward me is that I bear the name that I do.' Col. Tillman evidently forgot that his father, the late Col. John B. Tillman, was a man much more loyal or devoted friend than this same Editor Gonzales.

"This part of his speech was adroit and well timed, and the most skillful ploy, but did not deceive anybody. I did not answer, or attempt to answer, Editor Gonzales' specific charges about the Klan and the Klan telegrams and, as such, his speech was

It is a fact that the editor of *The State* was a friend of George D. Tillman, the father of the present candidate, from the time he first met him, in the campaign of 1876, until his death; and a further fact that George D. Tillman was his friend, and so continued during the bittered-out Reconstruction struggle of 1890-95. And we may add, moreover, that no one knows this better than "Jim" Tillman, and that when he attributes our opposition to him to the name he bears he falsifies the acknowledged friendship and attitude for the friendship and support we gave his father, James H. Tillman, was more nearly related to our friend

This evasion at Donald's is perhaps the best device that could be employed to create a false impression of truth for all that. It may deceive those who have not read the evidence, but it will merely disgust those who have read it and still remember it. Let us refresh

The "articles" of three and one-half columns" of which Tillman's complaint was printed in *The State* of March 24. With the publication of the article, the action it was confined absolutely to the written and printed records of the case, which need not be repeated in this space to prevent fully and clearly the chain of evidence.

"Exhibit II" was taken from a legislative report the circumstances under which Lieut. Gov. Tillman, as president of the senate, had been asked to indefinitely postpone was not debatable.

"Exhibit IV" showed from a legislative report that Lieut. Gov. Tillman attempted to sustain this decision by reading from Jefferson's Manual.

"Exhibit V" showed from a legislative report that the senate adopted a resolution requesting the committee on

postpone indefinitely was debatable. "Exhibit D" showed by a legislative report that the committee on rules reported that motion to be debatable and that the report of the committee on rules showed that Lieut. Gov. Tillman placed in the senate journal the statement that "since making the ruling" the chair had "inquired of the two highest ranking members of the ruling committee the correctness of the same" and was "much gratified to learn that it is" was "sustained by them," adding that "the interpretation placed on the rule by the committee on rules" was "correctly observed, however much at variance it may be with parliamentary law." This

exhibit further showed that on the night of Feb. 12 Lieut. Gov. Tillman declared that during the day "he had wired Senator Frye, president of the United States senate, and to speaker Henderson of the house of representatives, stating the question and asking their decision, and that both of them had sustained his ruling."

"Exhibit L" and "Exhibit F" gave letters from the editor of The State to President Frye and Speaker Henderson asking for information concerning Tillman's action.

"Exhibit G" and "Exhibit H" were letters from President Frye and Speaker Henderson quoting their telegrams to Lieut. Gov. Tillman, which telegrams were directly contrary to what he had represented them to be.

"Exhibit I" gave the report of the committee on rules signed by Senator Hakey, its chairman, which report agreed entirely with the conclusions of President Frye and Speaker Henderson as telegraphed to Lieut. Gov. Tillman. It also contained a press report of the Lieutenant governor's insulting words when the committee offered the

[illegible][illegible]

in the senate at  
before that body  
to be done, and has  
in order that he may  
position of the  
in Columbus of this  
any saying that he  
soon after the  
Tilman came up  
the new stand in  
the senate replied that he  
rejoined that he  
not only said it  
"Senator Mr. Gun-  
was some foule  
is an infernal lie

[illegible]

prove that Editor DeCamp had not lied him a liar at Ostney, thus putting Mr. Norment in a position of discrediting himself. Editor DeCamp had noted the several charges of lying, that he surmised himself at Chesterfield when he first faced the charges, when he was first faced by the charges of the "Ladies' Association" guard buttons, and then, when coerced by Mr. Heyward, brazenly declared that he had referred to his brother's brother. He must have gamboled mentally on the silence of Mr. Heyward as he did on that of Mr. Norment. A man who has made such desperate shifts as these is only "on the run."

(August 21h, 1902)

Nothing But Profits Needed.

The other day the Gaffney Ledger declared that it had the "best authority" for stating that Mr. Heyward had been nominated for governor, "with the understanding" that the "Ladies' Association" funds belonging to the Ladies' Protective Association of Edelfield-70 (attributed to the "Ladies' Association")



reply to the foregoing, "read a telegram from Mrs. Victoria Evans, president Edgely Monument association, saying Col. Tillman had paid \$50 collected for the monument fund and a personal subscription of \$25—total \$75." The announcement is said to have been greeted with "cheers and applause."

Some people, no doubt, on reading the Bennettville report jumped to the conclusion that Editor DeCamp of the Gaffney Ledger had written without knowledge and that James H. Tillman had vindicated himself—so delusive are appearances sometimes, so easy is it for an artful dodger, trained to that sort of thing, to double on his trail.

But this is not the end of the monument matter; the last word concerning it will not be spoken for some time to come. Since Tillman has admitted the necessity for his meeting the charge that he appropriated to his own use money given him in trust for the erection of a monument to the Confederate dead it becomes both the right and the duty of the public to require that the vindication shall be real and complete, not delusive. He has undertaken to prove his innocence—now let the Democratic press of the State insist that he shall complete the job!

There are reasons why this telegram read at Bennettville is not at all conclusive of the innocence of James H. Tillman—and when we state these reasons the public will agree with us and demand "proofs" that prove something.

Twenty-one months ago the editor of The State was appealed to for assistance in making James H. Tillman, then just elected lieutenant governor, disgorge moneys said to have been collected by him for the Confederate monument in Edgelyfield. The appeal came from one who had the right to make it. Inquiry brought out the statement that Tillman had claimed to collect from members of the legislature at the session of the previous winter subscriptions for the monument which he had not turned over to the association, and that he had actually collected from William C. Whitney—presumably in the previous spring or winter—\$50, which sum also he had never paid over. It was declared that while Tillman admitted collecting the money he had failed to respond to repeated appeals from an officer of the association for a settlement. In these circumstances the editor of The State was asked for his advice in the matter, as the money was sorely needed.

It does not matter what advice he gave. It does matter, however, that he was urged to make such references in The State to Tillman's retention of this money as would compel him to disgorge it. He replied that he would willingly take the responsibility of doing so if permitted to give his authority. His informant shrank from having her name published, but gave carte blanche as to everything else.

That was during Fair week in 1900. With this information in our possession, coming from one thoroughly to be trusted but whose name we could not print, we have waited nearly two years while this man became a candidate for governor and made his campaign largely on abuse of The State and its editor. Nothing but the reluctance of a lady to have her name, even in the most righteous cause, paraded before the public stood between James H. Tillman and the scorn of every honest man in South Carolina, but that name was not volunteered and we could not use it in The State without permission. Our acquaintance with this matter is sufficient to explain the attitude of The State toward James H. Tillman even before he made his evil record at the last session of the legislature.

Now, however, that a reputable paper, the Gaffney Ledger, owned and edited by a responsible citizen, Mr. J. H. DeCamp, has formally made this charge against Tillman and he has conceded it to require explanation we can at least insist upon an explanation that will explain. All that is needed is an authentic statement in writing from the lady who was president of the Ladies' Monument association of Edgelyfield during the year 1900 that James H. Tillman promptly paid over to the association all moneys collected by him previous to the close of that year for the construction of the Confederate monument at Edgelyfield. Such a statement ought to be easy to obtain if Tillman be innocent—if he be guilty he cannot obtain it, and his failure to do so will be proof of his guilt. That is a simple proposition.

It is hardly necessary to set forth to an intelligent public that the former president of the association is not the lady who now certifies to receiving money from James H. Tillman. We think it will be found that the administration of the present officer began long after November, 1900, at which time the grievance of the association against Tillman was related to us as an old one. It is easy enough to account for the payment by Tillman of this money, or some of it, within the last few months, after the events of the last winter had shown him that his record would be dissected if he ran for governor. But in the opinion of no honest person would such restitution, made with such a motive, be held to absolve him from the original crime charged against him and not yet disproved.

The money, according to our information, was overdue nearly two years ago. When was it paid? We invite proof of the date. And we further invite proof that the Whitney and legislative subscriptions were turned over to the Edgelyfield Monument association within six months after they came into the hands of James H. Tillman and had been pleaded for to complete the monument. We will cheerfully print any authentic evidence.

(August 9, 1902)

#### "Dictation" and "Persecution"

We had not thought it needful to make in these columns the statement of so simple and self-evident a truth as that The State is not trying to "dictate" to the voters of South Carolina how they shall vote for governor when it sets before them facts showing the character of one of the candidates—at a couple of days ago a friend, visiting The State office and hearing something that had just been written by the editor to a correspondent "he seemed under the impression that The State was supporting Mr. Heyward for governor and attacking James H. Tillman in his interest, urged that this letter be printed for general information. We did not do that, but shall instead express with greater fullness the views and facts there written.

There are five candidates for the office of governor. We have championed none, and have attacked the record of but one. There are six candidates for the office of United States senator. We have championed none, and, in spite of strong personal provocation from one, have refrained from attacking the public and private record of even this individual. Is this "dictation"? If so, what does it "dictate"? Here we have 11 candidates for two high offices, and The State urges support of none and prints facts adverse to the character of one only. Where is the "dictation"? We have not asked the Democrats of South Carolina to vote for anybody—nor even to vote against any man. If we had urged them to do the one thing or the other it would not have been "dictation" but merely such advice as any man, much less any newspaper having the public welfare and the public honor at heart, was privileged to give. We have not, however, even urged that the voters should defeat "Jim" Tillman. That is a matter for them to determine for themselves after learning his record and his character. It was our right and our duty to inform them of his unfitness, and this is what we have done. If they choose to vote for a man who

cannot be trusted, who is sure to disgrace and injure them, that is their affair. They have, nevertheless, the right to know what he is before voting for or against him. How else are they to know, in view of the tacit agreement of the candidates to be "very parliamentary" towards each other, except through the press?

There are candidates for governor who are fit for the office and some who are unfit; it would be an easy matter to choose a good senator from the candidates offering for that position, and it would not be impossible to select a bad one. Certain of these candidates have records more or less shady and shabby—but they are politicians of long standing, with records known to the public and needing—at this time, certainly—no advertisement. We may assume, then, that the public hold enough knowledge of them to vote with clear eyes. But it is not so with James H. Tillman; his public record has been very brief, and his private record has not been generally known because he has not long been under study by the people. It was the lack of knowledge concerning him that permitted him to be nominated for lieutenant governor two years ago. After he had abused the confidence thus reposed in him, had disgraced his office and had had the effrontery to ask "promotion" on his "merits" it was time to let the Democratic voters of South Carolina know what manner of man he was.

Is it "dictation" to furnish needed information to the public? If so, every newspaper, every journal of whatever kind, is dictatorial in its policy, for its business is to inform its readers of things they should know. But in fact they no more dictate when they supply the news they are paid to supply and the opinions that are sought with the news than the United States weather service dictates to Providence what the climatic conditions shall be when it announces that yesterday, the barometer was low and that today, in the opinion of the bureau, there will be rain.

So much for that. Now let us consider the other branch of the accusation—that The State is attacking "Jim" Tillman to elect one of the other candidates for governor.

The first point we wish to bring out is that if we had had such a design we would have put a member of The State's staff to reporting the meetings. Instead of this, we are relying upon a representative of the Charleston News and Courier for all our news of the State candidates, while The News and Courier relies upon a representative of The State for its reports of the senatorial canvass. This arrangement being made to avoid unnecessary duplication of expense, we print just what is sent to our Charleston contemporary; whom no one will accuse of taking a stand for or against any candidate in the race. Mr. Norment, the correspondent, has been several times referred to by Tillman as accurate and reliable—indeed according to the Laurens Advertiser, he said at that place that Mr. Norment's reports were the only accurate ones made of the campaign meetings. They have seemed to us far more than fair, even generous, to this candidate, but we have made no point about that. Clearly, the pulling down of one candidate and building up of another is not done for The State in its campaign reports.

As it is not to be found in the reports nor in the editorials, where is championship of a candidate exhibited by The State? The answer is that it is not exhibited anywhere or in any way. Any one of several candidates we could name would be acceptable to this newspaper as governor, and the same can be said of the aspirants for United States senator. The men who make this newspaper exercise the rights of free opinion and free action, and probably they will divide their work and their votes among different candidates—we do know that there will be a division in votes on the governorship in the editorial department. The only thing this newspaper desires is the election of men to every office who will give good and faithful service to the State and will brighten its reputation instead of marring it.

Coming now to James H. Tillman himself and his plea of "persecution," let us consider the facts.

Although we had in our possession all manner of proof of his bad character we do not remember having once passed a criticism upon him during and on account of his service as presiding officer of the senate. Disreputable as he was in private life and insolent as he was to his superiors in the senate, we held our hand, for, not being a clean person, he was an unpleasant one to handle. Like his legislative colleagues, we would have been disposed to pass over any ordinary misconduct on his part. But when, in defiance of his record, he became an open candidate for the governorship, we deemed it a duty to give to the public what the senators already possessed—evidence of the fraud he had committed upon the records of that body.

That was five or six months ago. We printed the documents in the case and some press comments made upon it, then we suspended criticism and for months his name was not mentioned in The State? Was that "persecution"? Had he been able to vindicate himself or had he wished to settle the affair outside of the primary campaign he would have answered the indictment as soon as made and before the campaign opened the whole matter would have been threshed out. But he coolly closed his lips, made no pretense of defense or justification through the press, whose columns stood wide open to him, and waited for months until the campaign tour began. Why? Why did he rest for one day longer, than necessary under the brand of dishonor? The answer is obvious. It was because he purposed to make political capital out of his own shame, to leave the issue of his guilt or innocence unsettled until he could get the chance to harrow up the voters with the cry of "persecution" and revivify in his interest and in the name of his uncle, Senator Tillman, the factional feeling which the senator himself says has passed away and should not be revived.

"Persecution"? "Abuse"? We were letting him severely alone after the campaign fairly set in and were disposed to let the issue go to the people without further argument when he began a series of attacks against the editor of The State, vilifying him as far as he could in the absence of any concrete charge, and persistent and flagrantly falsifying the record in doing so. We cannot be "persecuted" by a character like "Jim" Tillman, but he has from the beginning of the campaign done his best to make his blackguardly attentions rise to the point of "persecution." By his brazen and persistent falsification of the cases brought against him he has challenged the revelations we have been constrained to make.

All along he has shown his purpose to make votes out of the scandals involving him, to traffic in the shameful notoriety he had secured and to gain the aid of his uncle's old supporters by proclaiming himself "persecuted" by The State. He has actually had the effrontery to talk about Senator Tillman's tears under such "abuse" as his nephew is experiencing—when it is a fact known to many that he was working against his uncle and with his strongest opponents at a time that Senator Tillman declared to be the crisis in the life of the "Reform" party. There are some facts about this anti-Uncle Ben work of his that he would not enjoy having brought out now that he is trying to revive factional feeling and march to victory under the aegis of the senator's coat tails.

The man is beaten—of that we are certain. But it would be a shame to South Carolina if he should receive votes enough to get into the second race. We are satisfied that he cannot do this if the voters of South Carolina are made to know half of what is to be known about him. It will depend upon the press whether he shall have the compliment of a large vote at the expense of South Carolina. We have done our part in presenting the evidence. The responsibility now passes to journals against which he cannot raise even the suspicion of political persecution.