

## THE MORAL ISSUE

(Continued from Page 3.)

simply a recognition of the relation that must exist in all well organized society between man, the creator of wealth, and the wealth which he creates. Lincoln, in 1859, declared that if the man and the dollar came into conflict, the man was to be preferred to the dollar.

If you think I am radical when I condemn plutocracy and plead for a democracy that will recognize man as the master and money as the servant, let me prove the moderation of my language by quoting the language of Carlisle (Thomas, not John G.). He said some sixty years ago:

"Aristocracy of feudal parchment has passed away with a mighty rushing; and now by a natural course, we arrive at aristocracy of the money-bag. It is the course through which all European societies are at this moment travelling. Apparently a baser sort of aristocracy. An infinitely baser; the basest yet known. . . . What generous heart can pretend to itself, or be hood-winked into believing, that loyalty to the money-bag is a noble loyalty? Mammon, crier the generous heart out of all ages and all countries, is the basest of known gods, even of known devils. In him what glory is there that ye should worship him? No glory discernable; not even terror; at best detestability ill matched with despicability."

The trouble with our government today is that it is too much influenced in its operations by men whose only loyalty is loyalty to the money-bags. Who will say that this is or can be a noble loyalty? And yet in this great commercial center—in the very city of New York—this worship of the money-bags has been carried as far as it has anywhere else in this country. How many prominent men have you in this city, either in the democratic party or the republican party, who are brave enough to defy the influence of the "money-bags," or

### WORMS AND CHOLERA

The Hog's most dangerous foe knocked out

Hog worms get a hog out of condition by weakening his digestion and causing a rough coat and a hacking cough, which leads into unthriftiness and cholera. If treated with the Snoddy Cholera Cure soon as first symptoms appear, the trouble will stop and hogs will get thrifty.

Mr. Geo. Kirsch, of the Kirsch Packing Co., Z. B. Job and Ed. Levis, all large hog feeders of Alton, Ill., had their hogs take cholera a few days ago, the disease starting as outlined above. As soon as the hogs began to die they began giving them the Snoddy Cholera Remedy and cured them in a few days. The latter two did not lose a hog after beginning the treatment.

Mr. J. F. Hanna, Tarkio, Mo., cured his large herd a few days ago with this treatment, and now his father-in-law, Mr. D. Rankin, at same place, is curing the cholera on three of his feeding ranches with this same treatment.

This treatment is certain death to all kinds of hog worms and cholera germ. It cures cholera after the disease has started in the herds. Any practical farmer can stop the disease and save his hogs with this remedy. It is cheap and easy to use. Hundreds of men are curing their hogs with it all the time.

Snoddy's booklet on Hog Cholera tells it all and is free for the asking. Every hog raiser should have it. If you want it, ask for it, then you will get it by return mail free. Address The Snoddy Remedy Co., Dept. 24, Alton, Ill.

place restrictions upon it? Occasionally a protest is heard from the pulpit against the business methods of Wall street. Last Sunday one of your Episcopalian clergymen said:

"Who are the heroes that are held up for the admiration of the rising generation? They are the gambling stock brokers, who, with their stock watering processes, their corners and their devious deals, are worse than the old feudal robbers. The clearest evidence that the American people are money-mad is that they will tolerate the robber king of gambling finance. These conscienceless rogues fling the whole code of honesty to the winds, defy the laws, rob men of their hard earnings, and then try to throw a sop of their ill-gotten gains to the church as 'hush money.'"

This is harsh language, so harsh that I would hesitate to employ it. And yet, is it not deserved?

Occasionally a voice is raised against some particular manifestation of commercialism, some new evidence of the degradation that it has wrought; but why are your leaders in religion, in business and in politics not grappling with the vicious principle that is responsible for the present demoralization of political life—namely, the theory that government can properly be used as the means of bringing pecuniary advantage to those who control it? "Will it pay?" has been substituted for "Is it right?" and as a consequence our legislative assemblies, city, state, and national, are becoming auction rooms in which governmental privileges are knocked down to the highest bidder. Is it strange that two senators have been indicted for selling their political influence? Is it strange that government officials, and members of congress have been interesting themselves in government contracts? Is it strange that boodle investigations are bringing to light wholesale corruption in state and municipal government? Is it strange that those who use the government as a business asset employ a part of their ill-gotten gains to purchase further legislation or further immunity? Is it strange that many obscure voters use their suffrage, the only political asset they have, as a source of pecuniary profit, when they see more prominent citizens using the government for private gain? Is it wrong for the voter to sell his vote? Certainly, but he cannot sell unless there is a purchaser and there would be no purchaser but for the fact that the government has been turned from its true and legitimate channel and made the instrument by which some enrich themselves at the expense of the rest of the people.

When great corporations, which are known to be careful and economical in their expenditures, contribute large sums for the election of certain candidates, or for the support of a particular party, can you doubt that they expect and will receive a return in the way of governmental favors?

(Here he gave several evidences of bribery and corruption.)

One evidence that our party was honestly seeking to secure justice to the masses in 1896 and in 1900 is to be found in the fact that our campaign funds were insignificant in both campaigns, although more individuals contributed than had ever contributed before. And what further evidence is needed of the corrupt bargain made by the republican party with the corporations than you have in the prompt enactment of legislation desired by the protected interests and by the financiers, and by the failure of that party to interfere with the rapacity of the trusts?

In 1892 the democratic party collected a large campaign fund from the corporations. It spent more than

\$1,000,000 in the two states of New York and Indiana. One trust contributed \$175,000, and in all the close states there was money to buy every purchaseable voter; and what was the result? The most plutocratic administration this country had ever known. We witnessed a surrender to organized and predatory wealth so abject and so complete that seven years of exile from power have not entirely removed the stain from the party. You ask why I am opposed to the reorganization of the democratic party. Because I want my party to define the rights of the people; I want it to be the fearless champion of their interests; I want it to present the moral issue involved in public questions, and to appeal to the public conscience. It is because I love my party and want it to deserve the confidence and respect of an awakened and patriotic citizenship that I am not willing to lend my influence, be it much or little, to the mortgaging of the party to the money changers. I would be glad to see those who left us in 1896 return; and those who are democratic in sentiment and in sympathy have either already returned or will return when they understand the situation; but I verily believe that if during the past seven years our leaders had spent half as much time reasoning with honest republicans as they have spent in trying to conciliate corporation democrats, our party would be very much stronger today. What we need, to give our party assurance of ultimate and substantial victory, is not concession or conciliation or compromise, but a platform so clear and strong, and candidates so democratic that the platform and candidates together will drive out of the party the mercenary representatives of Mammon whose actions belie the promises of the party, whose utterances are used to convict the party of insincerity and whose very presence profanes the temple of democracy. I beg you, republicans as well as democrats, laymen as well as ministers, to consider whether it is not time to pitch our campaigns upon a higher plane and apply moral principles to public questions.

Imperialism presents a moral issue. The main question involved in imperialism is not whether the income from the Philippine islands will equal the expenditure required for a colonial system. Such a question involves so much of mathematics that no one can measure exactly the pecuniary effect of the policy on himself or his neighbors, but the moral issue can be made so plain that all can understand it; for at the bar of conscience no plea of profit, individual or national, can justify the killing of human beings, in order to extend trade or to force a foreign government on an unwilling people. In the action of our government in the Panama case, what principle controls? Was it a jealous care for our so-called commercial interests, or a scrupulous regard for national honor and the rights of the people of Central America? The isthmian canal has been delayed years to please the trans-continental railroads. Could we not have delayed a few weeks rather than subject our government to the suspicion of coercing a little republic for our own gain?

Instead of inquiring whether a trust magnate can possibly be benevolent, or whether a trust does not sometimes reduce prices temporarily; instead of spending our time trying to discriminate between bad trusts and trusts not quite so bad, we should rather ask ourselves whether any economic advantage that a private monopoly can bring can compensate for the destruction of individual independence and individual enterprise—whether any group of men can have a moral right to dictate to the rest of the people, and stand as it were like robbers by the highway, giving their vic-

tims a choice between surrendering money and losing life.

In discussing the money question, instead of asking merely whether one standard will help one class or another, one section or another, the aim should be to adopt that system of finance which will give us the nearest approach to justice as between man and man, and this end cannot be reached by delegating this question to financiers—a class which, with occasional exceptions, has in all history thrown its powerful weight against reforms. It is not a question of gold or silver, these are but incidents. It is a question whether the money changers shall control the volume of money and the national treasury. The financiers confess themselves either hostile to the welfare of the people, or that they lack confidence in their intelligence, when they refuse to submit to the judgment of the masses of the people the financial measures which they favor.

The whole protective tariff system is built upon supposed pecuniary profit to those who vote for it. The manufacturers are to be paid for their support with higher prices, the laboring man with better wages, the wool growers with a more remunerative market for their wool, and the others who vote for high tariff are fed with the delusion that the money which goes out of their pockets through tariff taxation returns in some invisible way, bearing compound interest with it. A direct bounty, which our supreme court has called larceny, under the form of law would be much less harmful than a protective tariff, because its evils are more easily estimated. Instead of calculating whether a 42 per cent tariff will pay more

### 10c A Year.

Surprising as it may appear, the new Rocky Mountain Magazine, published monthly at Denver, Colorado will be sent an entire year solely to introduce it for 10c. Clubs of six 50c., 12 for \$1; stamps taken. Western stories and fine views of scenery. Send today address above.

### Subscribers' Advertising Department

As a real estate exchange this department has few equals and no superiors. Thousands of acres of land have changed hands because of advertising in this department. Have you land to sell? Tell 500,000 people about it by using this department. Do you want to buy land? Say so here. It will cost you 6 cents per word per insertion. Address all orders to The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.

**WANTED: THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF** every farmer in the U. S., that has a drilled case well, or contemplates having one put down. Hills & Ross Co., (well specialists,) Medina, Wisconsin

**IMPROVED FARMS IN WASHINGTON.** W. H. Proctor, Chehalis, Washington.

**FOR SALE—1/2 SECTION IMPROVED LAND** 1/4 plowed—\$23.00 per acre. Also dairy with stock, for rent to real dairyman. All in N. E. 1/4 of Kansas. Chester Thomas, Waterville, Kansas.

**ECZEMA—GUARANTEED CURE FULL** treatment postpaid 25c. E. E. Reynolds, Honesdale, Pa.

**YOU COULD SELL OLD LINE LIFE INSURANCE** if you knew how. We teach the art free of charge and pay you for your time. Desirable contracts awaiting special and general agents for the states of Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska and Kansas. Address L. care of Commoner.

**FOR SALE OR TRADE.—CENTRAL NEBRASKA**—two ranches, cheap, 1440 and 640, and farm of 320. Must be sold by March 15. Improved. For particulars address J. W. Brewster, Lincoln, Neb.

**OIL LANDS IN THE OIL BELT AT FARM** values. George Hill Independence, Kans.

**FOR SALE—PURE BRED, S. C. BUFF LEG-**horn Roosters. G. W. Cory, Kane, Ill.

**FOR SALE—OKLAHOMA FARMS AND** Ranches. Chas. Birdsall, Custer, Okla.

**WANTED—CONTRACT TO ADVERTISE** worthy article. Will travel by private conveyance from S. E. Miss. to N. E. Mont. Address Brooks, Bendale, Miss.