

Odds in Wall street of 2 to 1 on Roosevelt deliver no electoral votes, but they are mighty discouraging to the silent speculator of Esopus.

Silence has grown weary listening for the reply that comes not from Esopus to Tom Watson's query, "What is Judge Parker's position on the negro question?"

Confidence in the continuance of the present administration at Washington for another four years is reflected in the confident tone that pervades all business circles in the United States.

Comparison of Republican and Democratic platforms of the last forty years emphasizes the difference between things done and things promised. One is a party of great achievements, the other of great promises.

The Democratic editors will have fun with themselves when they begin making extravagance of the national expenditures and the Jeffersonian parsimony that has plastered New York over with a debt of more than \$310,000,000.

The Democratic platform denounces protection as "robbery of the many to enrich the few." Yet experience has proved that under protection prosperity is diffused among all classes of people, while under free trade all classes suffer.

It is said that Tammany will not consider the money question irrevocably settled until the contract for the next \$50,000,000 subway is awarded to a backer of Judge Parker, who will recognize that a public subway is a political trough.

There is one truth that seems beyond the comprehension of the Democracy, that "the old order changes, yielding place to the new." Otherwise it would not try to fit the Jeffersonian Enckelockers of 1804 on the lusty American giant of 1904.

No matter how Democratic platforms may try to whitewash or sugar-coat the position of the party on the tariff question, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system, which is the principal safeguard of American industries, labor and wages.

The Democratic party never gets right on National issues, except when it tries to steal the Republican platform. After lecturing for many years that free silver at 16 to 1 was the paramount issue, it now drops the question and actually admits that the gold standard is irrevocably fixed.

Under the last Democratic administration business was paralyzed at home and the United States had a doubtful standing among nations. During the McKinley and Roosevelt administrations prosperity has been restored at home and the prestige of the nation abroad has advanced as never before.

Under the present tariff law all industries have revived and prospered, labor has been fully employed and more workmen have received good wages than ever before in the history of the country. Why take the dangerous risk of putting a party in power that would reverse this policy of prosperity?

The policy of protection has preserved the American market for the products of American manufactures and American manufacturers have made markets for the products of American farmers, and together they have established a high standard of American living and made possible the high scale of American wages.

"Sow a character and you reap a destiny" was one of the beautiful but meaningless apothegms flung into the lap of Judge Parker by Editor Knapp, of the St. Louis Republic, in introducing his Democratic brethren of the shears and paste pot to their candidate. With about equal relevancy and more wit he might have said "Plant a corpse and raise a tombstone."

The Democratic campaign managers openly tell the public they wish to conduct the campaign free from mud-slinging and personalities, but they seem to have secretly given instructions to revile and abuse the Republican candidate in every way possible. Chairman Taggart's newspaper, the Indianapolis Sentinel, is cartooning the President as a dog.

"Political empirics" well describes the species of constitutional hair-splitters who see the constitution rent in tatters every time a new condition demands the exercise of some government power not dreamed of in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. If the political empirics of 1861 had had their way there would have been no union left for their successors to weep and groan over in 1904.

Carl Schurz's appearance on the stump in Southern Illinois is another straw on the back of the double-winged Democratic mule. When he applauds Parker's gold telegram the free silver Democrats writhe; when he calls for merit in the public service there is a general exodus to the nearest free lunch counter, and when he talks about surrendering the Philippines there are groans of disapproval.

The platform on which Theodore Roosevelt stands reiterates the time-honored Republican principle in favor of fostering home industries in order that American workmen may be steadily employed and well paid. The Democratic platform is verbose and evasive, but, sifted of all its platitudes it simply reiterates the Democratic hostility to any tariff that will protect American industries.

"Let us compare candidates," said Miss Democracy to a stalwart young Republican.

"Comparisons are odious," he replied, "but since you insist, what has your candidate done that he should aspire to the presidency?"

"Nothing. He is a man of peace. Pray what has yours done?" "He has done everything that came his way with all his mind and heart and strength. He has the soul for action that would put life under the ribs of death."

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS

Indiana Senator Well-Fitted for the Vice Presidency.

HE HAS DIGNITY AND FORCE

And His Training and Experience Will Enable Him to Preside Over the Senate with Credit to the Nation—McKinley's Friend.

Washington, D. C., Sept. 10.—Every one here who is in any way connected with the government has a great amount of personal interest in the nomination of Senator Fairbanks of Indiana for second place on the Republican ticket. The Indiana Senator has a personality all his own, and his figure merely from a physical point of view is so striking he has been a marked man in Washington ever since he came here. Straight as an arrow, thin, unusually tall, with bright red cheeks, with a becoming amount of senatorial dignity, and yet with a genuine democracy which is seldom equaled by public men, the Republican candidate for the vice presidency is more than usually popular as public men go.

Aside from this, however, the people who are on the inside of public affairs in Washington know, as people of the rest of the country may not know, that Senator Fairbanks is one of the comparatively few men in public life who have actually made their impress upon the affairs of the government. In every church, every club, every village debating society, in every Congress and every Parliament, there are always a select few who do the great bulk of the work, who are men of action, who are selected by their associates to perform the things which have to be done, who have the executive gift which makes them wise in council, and whose advice and assistance are sought when great things are to be done.

Courteous and Modest. Constantly courteous, invariably kindly, always reserved, consistently modest, never seeking to put himself in the front rank, Senator Fairbanks is not usually credited by the world at large with the extraordinary influence he really possesses here in Washington. His associates in the Senate, the members of the cabinet, and those whose duty it is to execute the law have learned, however, the quiet force of the Senator from Indiana, and ever since he came here with McKinley in 1897 Senator Fairbanks has been one of the inner circle. He has grown stronger day by day until his nomination for the vice presidency was absolutely forced upon him because, in the opinion of his associates in the Senate and the party leaders generally, he was the best equipped man for the position, and was by his training and by his political association of presidential size, so that he might be ready at any time to exercise the duties of chief executive if it should become necessary.

Few people are aware of the unusual degree to which William McKinley gave his confidence to Senator Fairbanks. The two men were old friends, they represented nearly the same element in the party, and in the early months of 1897 following the bitter political battle of the previous autumn McKinley and Fairbanks were in constant touch and the President-elect began to lean upon the Senator-elect. This trust in the wisdom of the statesman from Indiana was never lessened, but as month after month went by the Indiana Senator was more and more drawn into the deepest confidences of the President.

There were trying times in Washington during the latter part of 1897 and in the early part of 1898. The United States and Spain were drifting inevitably toward war. The sentiment in this country was overwhelmingly in favor of interference in behalf of the suffering people of Cuba. The pressure for action grew daily stronger. In the public press, in Congress, in the churches, on the streets, everywhere from the Atlantic to the Pacific there was a constantly growing sentiment that the United States must put an end to the shocking conditions in Cuba.

McKinley Knew Public Sentiment. When he was elected William McKinley well knew what this public sentiment was and where it was likely to lead. No man ever lived who was more skilled in feeling the pulse of the public than the President who laid down his life at Buffalo. When he came to the White House, nevertheless, he was determined to exhaust every device known to diplomacy, short of actual warfare, to bring Spain to terms and to bring peace to Cuba. Trained in the arts of war himself, William McKinley well knew that war was not to be entered upon lightly. He was for peace from the beginning.

During the first six months of the McKinley administration the tension here in Washington was extraordinary. Public sentiment of itself might have forced a war because of the outrages continually committed by the Spaniards upon the poor people of Cuba. Then came the explosion of the Maine, which touched the spark in the magazine, and within a few weeks the people of the United States were raging with the lust of blood.

Still William McKinley stood steadfast. He knew war was nearly inevitable, but he was in a position to know also that this country, rich though it was in men and resources, was not ready for war. He was in a position to know that there were no rifles, no cannon, no clothes, no tents, no provisions of war for even the most moderate army. He had not exhausted diplomacy, and even then he knew that time was necessary to prepare the country for war. The great public which was ignorant of the real situation and which did not realize that a mistaken public policy had allowed our army to run down to a point where we were not fitted to fight even a little nation like Spain, still thundered for war and began to suspect the good faith and the bravery of a man like William McKinley.

McKinley Consulted Fairbanks. All this is history, which the world knows and which need not be recapitulated in detail. What the world does not generally know is that in the small circle of men who were daily and nightly

THE MAN WHO DARES.



A NOTABLE EXCEPTION.

Richard Olney Has Not Joined the Democratic Pessimists. Since Judge Parker and the Democratic party have chosen to make an issue of the aggressive and progressive activities of the Republican party which in the span of one generation have placed the United States in the van of the world's civilization, it may be well to recall that there is at least one Democrat who has not joined in his party's pessimistic wails.

Richard Olney, the choice of the Massachusetts Democracy for President at St. Louis, Attorney General and Secretary of State during Cleveland's second term, and author of the ringing phrase in support of the Monroe doctrine—"To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition," is a Democrat who has something stronger than diluted ass's milk in his veins.

In an article printed in the Atlantic Monthly for March, 1900, on "Growth of Our Foreign Policy," Richard Olney anticipated and confuted almost every pitiful plea for national stagnation and dishonor uttered by Judge Parker in the two instances when he has ventured to open his mouth. Where the Democratic candidate counsels that the United States shall live for and within itself alone, Mr. Olney boldly proclaimed that such a policy had "tended to belittle the national character" and has "led to a species of provincialism and to narrow views of our duties and functions as a nation."

Where Judge Parker in his unfamiliarity with the meaning of the phrase, due to his seclusion from the world at Esopus, proclaims that the United States "became a world power over a century ago," Mr. Olney, with broader knowledge of the world, says that "Historians will probably assign the abandonment of the isolation policy to the time when this country and Spain went to war over Cuba."

Nor can there be any serious question but Mr. Olney is right. And in this connection it was that Cleveland's virile Secretary of State said, "The United States has come out of its shell and ceased to be a hermit among nations, naturally and properly." He also emphasized the necessity for preparation to cope with larger responsibilities in these terms:

"It goes without saying that the United States cannot play the part in the world's affairs it has just assumed without equipping itself for the part with all the instrumentalities necessary to make its will felt, whether through pacific intercourse and negotiation or through force. We cannot assert ourselves as a power whose interests and sympathies are as wide as civilization without assuming obligations corresponding to the claim. "The equipment required for our new international role must not be discussed at any length. We must have it—the need will be forced upon us by facts the logic of which will be irresistible—and however slow to move or indisposed to face the facts, the national government must sooner or later provide for it."

There was much more to the same effect, every word ringing with sterling and enlightened appreciation of the American determination to meet the obligations of our expanding national opportunities. Without failing to recognize that the triumphs of peace are the true objective of a republic, Mr. Olney grasped the eternal truth that peace and liberty and progress can only be insured by full provision to maintain them by force.

The nation which goes about with nothing but an olive branch in its mouth—in other words, without increasing its expenditures for coast defenses, for ships and guns, for men and arms—cannot expect its voice will be heeded, in the councils of nations. Every dollar the United States is spending on its army and navy to-day is an insurance against war and national dishonor.

Parker Has Trimmed His Sails. (Philadelphia Inquirer.) When Judge Parker voted for silver in 1896 and 1900, he did not know the gold standard was going to be so popular in 1904.

WHAT IT MEANS.

The Significance of the Vermont Victory.

While it would be the sheerest folly for Republican managers to accept the Vermont victory as a certain augury of Roosevelt's election next November, or to relax in their efforts to insure that result, it cannot be denied that the 32,000 plurality is a most reassuring and significant fact. That this is so is not because a succession of statistical coincidences where a shrinkage of the Republican plurality in Vermont in September has presaged a national Democratic victory in November, but because the influences affecting the individual units in one State in this election are national in their nature and are effective throughout the republic.

If the issue in the November election were confined to the tariff question it would be impossible to infer from Vermont's 32,000 Republican plurality what would be the drift in New York, Connecticut or Indiana, because the voters of these three States study the tariff question through very different spectacles from those of the farmers of Vermont. From the day in 1861 when her late Senator Justin S. Morrill introduced the war revenue tariff measure, which bore his name in the House of Representatives, Vermont has never wavered in her support of the Republican policy of protection. Other States have wobbled, as the politicians have played upon the credulity of their industrial classes, but Vermont has stood as firm as her own everlasting hills.

But in the present campaign the Democracy has chosen to thrust its traditional clamor for free trade into the background and has arrayed itself against the American spirit of aggressive, progressive expansion, of which Theodore Roosevelt is the living embodiment.

To-day the Republicans stand for national action, advancement and life; the Democrats for national inaction, retrogression and death. The issue is between DOING and DONT.

Such an issue appeals to voters in Vermont precisely as it appeals to those of Oregon or Arkansas. The restricted local view and interest is swallowed up in the broader prospect, and men vote as Americans and not as citizens of this or that State.

To this issue Oregon last June responded "Go ahead!" and Vermont merely echoes back across the continent "Go ahead!"

Even Arkansas shows signs of waking from the lotus-eating dream of Democracy that a nation can advance without exertion and force by marking-time in front of the marble effigies of Jefferson and Jackson, who if they were alive would be marching in the ranks of action and progress.

This, then, is the significance of the Vermont election, that on the issue contained in the word "Forward!" personified, if our opponents will have it so, in Theodore Roosevelt, represented in every line of financial, industrial and diplomatic achievement, demanding increased expenditures for the army, the navy, the postal service and every department of government care of the people's interests—Vermont represents the onward trend of American thought.

This, and not the mere fact that Vermont went Republican by 32,000 votes, gives an assurance of a great Republican victory next November.

PEOPLE CAN FORGIVE ERROR

Which Is Now Practically Admitted, but Will Not Trust the Party with Power Because of the Blunder.

When an individual makes and reiterates startling statements which later on are proved to be absolutely false, his further utterances on any subject whatsoever are liable not to be taken seriously, and this is putting the case mildly. Even though the statements were uttered in honest belief as to their accuracy, the fact that they were later on proven to be wrong, furnished evidence of mental capacity to make further gross blunders from time to time.

In this respect the record of the Democratic party on the silver issue has for that party the same sinister significance that falsifications from an individual, who is found out, would have for that individual.

We may all be willing to charitably admit that in its advocacy of the great free silver error in 1896 and 1900 the Democratic party was honestly wrong. There is no patriotic American who would like to think, hint, or suggest, that Bryan was not actuated by honest and sincere belief in his cause when he uttered his famous "Cross of Gold" and "Crown of Thorns" speech in 1896, nor is there any American with optimistic faith in the honesty and patriotism of the leading public men of the United States who would want to think for a moment that Alton B. Parker, the candidate of a great political party for President of the United States, voted against his honest convictions as to what was for the good of his country when he voted for free silver in 1896, and then again voted for free silver in 1900.

Cannot Be Trusted. But while the American people will never impute dishonorable motives to the leaders of the silver cause in 1896 and 1900, yet nevertheless it will hesitate in the future to place implicit trust in those who sought to lead them into a disastrous error in those years. Had the majority of the voters of the country in 1896 and 1900 not been of better judgment than Judge Parker was during those two years the United States would have had the silver standard; all the currency of the country would have been debased to the bullion value of silver; just debts would have been scaled off over fifty per cent; the laborer, whom the Bible says is "worthy of his hire," would have been paid his wages in cheap dollars of not half the value of the honest dollars based on the gold standard; the country would have suffered unparalleled hard times; its credit would have sunk as low as that of Turkey, Venezuela, and of other nations which repudiate their just obligations.

It was for such calamity as this that the Democratic free silver error stood in 1896 and again in 1900, and Parker and Davis both times stood with this error, contributed money to further it, and, as a result, were voted for.

Now the error is practically admitted. Both Parker and Davis, while refusing to say that they now believe in the gold standard, nevertheless say that it is "irrevocably established by law"—that is when on December 18, 1890, the gold standard was established by a vote of 179 Republican yeas and only 11 Democratic yeas, against 142 Democratic nays and no Republican nays, in the House of Representatives, and by a vote of 44 Republican and 2 Gold Democratic yeas against 23 Democratic and only one Republican nay in the Senate. IT WAS SO WELL ESTABLISHED THAT PARKER AND DAVIS NOW CONSIDER IT "IRREVOCABLY ESTABLISHED."

"Silence Is Confession." The American people will be willing to forgive the Democratic record on the silver question. They will not demand humiliating verbal confessions from Democratic leaders of the fact that they were terribly wrong in 1896 and 1900. As Daniel Webster once said—"Silence is confession"—and the fact that the Democrats now want silence on the "paramount" issue of 1896 and the "tantamount" issue of 1900, is sufficient confession of past error.

But while the American people in receiving Democracy's silent confession of past error, can forgive, yet it cannot forget. It will not be in haste to put into the White House the representative of a party whose free silver principles put in jeopardy the business stability of the country. IT WILL NOT VOTE TO HONOR WITH THE HIGHEST OFFICE IN THE LAND A CANDIDATE WHO IN 1896 AND AGAIN IN 1900 VOTED FOR A POLICY THAT WOULD HAVE FINANCIALLY DISHONORED THIS COUNTRY AND MADE IT LOWER THAN TURKEY AND VENEZUELA IN INTERNATIONAL OPINION AS TO ITS CREDIT.

Show the Truth. Republicans, forecasting events from the September election in Vermont, should not allow themselves to be overconfident of results of the presidential election in November. There is no doubt as to the fact that Roosevelt will win, but he ought to be given a great vote of confidence, an outpouring of national affection and trust, aside from a mere majority of electoral votes. A rebuke is deserved for the men who so falsify facts and sentiments, so distort, pervert and invent, as to make it appear that Theodore Roosevelt is anything but the strong, thoughtful, loyal American citizen that he is. The silly bosh about "Imperialism" and "Militarism," the groundless subdub as to fancied personal dictation by their executive to the American people should be rebuked by the people in such manner as can never be forgotten. Let Republicans appear en masse at the polls in November, to show what they think of Theodore Roosevelt.

BLUNDER BY DEMOCRATS

They Nominated Candidates Who Voted for Free Silver.

PEOPLE CAN FORGIVE ERROR

Which Is Now Practically Admitted, but Will Not Trust the Party with Power Because of the Blunder.

When an individual makes and reiterates startling statements which later on are proved to be absolutely false, his further utterances on any subject whatsoever are liable not to be taken seriously, and this is putting the case mildly. Even though the statements were uttered in honest belief as to their accuracy, the fact that they were later on proven to be wrong, furnished evidence of mental capacity to make further gross blunders from time to time.

In this respect the record of the Democratic party on the silver issue has for that party the same sinister significance that falsifications from an individual, who is found out, would have for that individual.

We may all be willing to charitably admit that in its advocacy of the great free silver error in 1896 and 1900 the Democratic party was honestly wrong. There is no patriotic American who would like to think, hint, or suggest, that Bryan was not actuated by honest and sincere belief in his cause when he uttered his famous "Cross of Gold" and "Crown of Thorns" speech in 1896, nor is there any American with optimistic faith in the honesty and patriotism of the leading public men of the United States who would want to think for a moment that Alton B. Parker, the candidate of a great political party for President of the United States, voted against his honest convictions as to what was for the good of his country when he voted for free silver in 1896, and then again voted for free silver in 1900.

Cannot Be Trusted.

But while the American people will never impute dishonorable motives to the leaders of the silver cause in 1896 and 1900, yet nevertheless it will hesitate in the future to place implicit trust in those who sought to lead them into a disastrous error in those years. Had the majority of the voters of the country in 1896 and 1900 not been of better judgment than Judge Parker was during those two years the United States would have had the silver standard; all the currency of the country would have been debased to the bullion value of silver; just debts would have been scaled off over fifty per cent; the laborer, whom the Bible says is "worthy of his hire," would have been paid his wages in cheap dollars of not half the value of the honest dollars based on the gold standard; the country would have suffered unparalleled hard times; its credit would have sunk as low as that of Turkey, Venezuela, and of other nations which repudiate their just obligations.

It was for such calamity as this that the Democratic free silver error stood in 1896 and again in 1900, and Parker and Davis both times stood with this error, contributed money to further it, and, as a result, were voted for.

Now the error is practically admitted. Both Parker and Davis, while refusing to say that they now believe in the gold standard, nevertheless say that it is "irrevocably established by law"—that is when on December 18, 1890, the gold standard was established by a vote of 179 Republican yeas and only 11 Democratic yeas, against 142 Democratic nays and no Republican nays, in the House of Representatives, and by a vote of 44 Republican and 2 Gold Democratic yeas against 23 Democratic and only one Republican nay in the Senate. IT WAS SO WELL ESTABLISHED THAT PARKER AND DAVIS NOW CONSIDER IT "IRREVOCABLY ESTABLISHED."

"Silence Is Confession." The American people will be willing to forgive the Democratic record on the silver question. They will not demand humiliating verbal confessions from Democratic leaders of the fact that they were terribly wrong in 1896 and 1900. As Daniel Webster once said—"Silence is confession"—and the fact that the Democrats now want silence on the "paramount" issue of 1896 and the "tantamount" issue of 1900, is sufficient confession of past error.

But while the American people in receiving Democracy's silent confession of past error, can forgive, yet it cannot forget. It will not be in haste to put into the White House the representative of a party whose free silver principles put in jeopardy the business stability of the country. IT WILL NOT VOTE TO HONOR WITH THE HIGHEST OFFICE IN THE LAND A CANDIDATE WHO IN 1896 AND AGAIN IN 1900 VOTED FOR A POLICY THAT WOULD HAVE FINANCIALLY DISHONORED THIS COUNTRY AND MADE IT LOWER THAN TURKEY AND VENEZUELA IN INTERNATIONAL OPINION AS TO ITS CREDIT.

Show the Truth.

Republicans, forecasting events from the September election in Vermont, should not allow themselves to be overconfident of results of the presidential election in November. There is no doubt as to the fact that Roosevelt will win, but he ought to be given a great vote of confidence, an outpouring of national affection and trust, aside from a mere majority of electoral votes. A rebuke is deserved for the men who so falsify facts and sentiments, so distort, pervert and invent, as to make it appear that Theodore Roosevelt is anything but the strong, thoughtful, loyal American citizen that he is. The silly bosh about "Imperialism" and "Militarism," the groundless subdub as to fancied personal dictation by their executive to the American people should be rebuked by the people in such manner as can never be forgotten. Let Republicans appear en masse at the polls in November, to show what they think of Theodore Roosevelt.