

the greatest state in the union, speaking in a republican convention, presenting a candidate for the highest office in the gift of the greatest republic of history, this man tells us that all this talk of peace is an idle dream; that we must still settle our destinies by our wars.

That is an insult to the Christian civilization of the world. Does this doctrine represent the ideas and the ideals of the president? Many fear it does, for of all the presidents we have ever had not one of them has possessed a tinge of his military spirit and enthusiasm. We have had great soldiers in the white house. Washington was a soldier, Jackson a soldier, Grant a soldier; but Washington and Jackson and Grant combined never had the love of power and of military display that this one man combines in his disposition.

The Americans should place in the white house a man who believes in peace, instead of a man who believes in the glory of the display of arms. Mr. Roosevelt made a speech before the cadets at West Point in which he said that a good soldier must not only be willing to fight, but anxious to fight. Death is the tragedy of human life, and he who takes human life assumes an awful responsibility, and yet to say that a good soldier must not only be willing to fight, but anxious to fight, means that a good soldier must not only willing to kill if need be, but anxious to kill, for fighting means killing. Some in the heat of passion have taken human life. The government, in the enforcement of the law, has taken human life, and men in battle array, when they fought for what they thought more important than human life, have taken human life. But what soldier that ever knew service on the battlefield believes that to be a good soldier means to carry around with you, like a concealed weapon, a desire to take human life?

The president should instruct our boys in the arts of peace, and not inspire them with a thirst for war. He should not be so fond of war that if left to decide between peaceful means that must occupy some time and brilliant exploits of war, he should select the exploits of war.

We had an example in the case of Panama, a little republic. They sent one morning from the department at Washington: "Understand that there is an uprising there." The answer came back: "Not yet; expected this afternoon." And in a few days we had a new republic, and were preparing to make a treaty with it. My friends, there was no necessity for trespassing upon the rights of those republics there; no necessity for exciting alarm among the republics of Central and South America. What if we had been dealing with a big nation instead of a little nation? Would we have done the same? Answer, if you will. If he had done that we would have been at war, and it would have been at an enormous cost. Would he have done it? How dare you say he would bully a little nation, but would not act the same toward a big nation? Let us remove, by the election of Parker and Davis, the race question, the army question, the question of imperialism, and substitute peace for war.

### The Ideal-The Real

I have had people ask me why democrats seem to be so intensely in earnest about their democracy. I have had men say, "Why, some democrats, democracy is a sort of religion." My reply is that with every democrat who knows what democracy means it is a religion, and when you hear a good democratic speech it is so much like a sermon that you can hardly tell the difference between them. And why? Because a good sermon is built upon the ten commandments, the sermon on the mount, and the eleventh commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And a good democratic speech is built upon the doctrine of human brotherhood, equal rights, and self-government. When you get down to bedrock you find that love of mankind is the basis of both, and democracy can never die while there is in democracy a love of mankind. Democracy does not go as far, sometimes, as we would like to have it go, but, my friends, we must not expect that we will have everything as we would like it. Ask a mother, as she holds in her arms her baby boy, what her desire is, and she will tell you that she desires that his heart will be so pure that it could be laid upon a pillow and not leave a stain; that his ambition will be so holy that he could whisper it in an angel's ear; and that his life will be so clean that his mother, his sister, his wife, his child, could read a record of his every thought and act without a blush. That

is the ideal that every mother has for her child. But ask her if she is going to require that perfection in him, and from her heart she will tell you no; she will say that is her desire, but that she will make him as good as she can; that she will follow his footsteps with a daily prayer; that her blessing will rest upon him wherever he goes throughout the world; and that she will hope, hope, yes, hope that when he dies the world will be better that he has lived. That is about all she can say to you. And so, my friends, if you ask me if my platform has all that I want in it, I say, no. You ask me if my candidate stands for all I would like to have him stand for, I answer no. But shall I throw away the good he promises because I can not get all that I want? By what means can I secure more than I can secure through the election of Parker and Davis? There is no other way by which I can bring to my country at this time more of good than will be brought through their election. Reformers must be patient; it is a slow work, this work of reaching humanity; it is a slow work. I remember that just about the time that they reported from the Philippine islands that the Filipinos had divided into squads and that these separate squads had hidden in the woods and formed marauding bands—just before that time I read in an encyclopedia that about a thousand years ago the Anglo-Saxons were doing the same thing. A thousand years ago! We have made progress but there is much ahead of us yet. It is only two or three hundred years ago that we were burning witches; only a few short decades since we were persecuting people for conscience sake. We are doing better now, but we are yet far from the goal. If they tell you that we have reached a point where we are so good that we can cross an ocean 7,000 miles wide in order to force upon people belonging to another branch of the Christian church the doctrines of our branch—if they tell you that, answer them that as long as in any great American city you can get a larger crowd at \$5 a ticket to see a prize fight than you can get to listen to a sermon, there is enough in this country yet to do without crossing the ocean. We must be patient.

I read a poem when I was in college, one stanza of which has clung to my memory:

Heaven is not gained by a single bound;  
We build the ladder by which we rise  
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies  
And mount to its summit round by round.

You ask me if the democratic ladder reaches to the stars? No, but as I look upward I see no ladder whose top is higher than ours. I plant my foot upon the lower round; I will climb as far as that ladder reaches and then I will pray to the God of Hosts that He may give us strength and wisdom to build it higher and higher until its top is lost in the clouds. We are doing now the best we can. While Judge Parker does not stand for all that I want, I did not stand eight years ago and four years ago for all that some people wanted who voted for me. Tell me that he is not perfect; I can prove by thousands of republican papers that the same criticism was made against the candidate who ran four years ago and eight years ago. We can not expect perfection. We can not expect to get all that we want at one time and in one struggle. A man who is living upon a farm does not raise his year's crop in one day. He plants the seed, waits till the seeds burst forth and the sprouts appear; then he cultivates, he toils industriously, and if, as the result of the whole season's labor, he is able to fill his barns with plenty he feels that he is repaid for his summer's work. We sow the seeds of thought broadcast in the political world. I have been sowing for many years. Sometimes it seems to me that the seeds have fallen on stony places, sometimes on barren ground, but I have seen evidence that some seeds have fallen in fertile soil and have grown up and brought forth an hundred fold. As I go about over the country if I can meet young men full of enthusiasm, anxious to do something for the world, and these young men tell me that at some meeting where I spoke and which they attended their hearts were quickened, their ambitions made higher and their desire for their nation's welfare increased, I feel that I have done some good. As I grow older I welcome these young men. I trust that their numbers may be increased and that victory may be hastened.

(Extract from Mr. Bryan's speech at Lawrenceburg, Ind.)

### The Situation in Nebraska

The situation in Nebraska is generally reassuring. While the republican managers claim that Mr. Roosevelt will carry the state, they are not

quite so enthusiastic in their claims concerning the state ticket.

The democrats and populists in Nebraska have united upon one of the strongest state tickets ever presented to the people.

George W. Berge, the nominee for governor, is a well known lawyer and has the confidence and respect of everyone who knows him.

For lieutenant governor, Dr. A. Townsend; for secretary of state, Rudolph E. Watzke; for treasurer, J. M. Osborn; for auditor, J. S. Canaday; for attorney general, Edward Whelan; for superintendent of public instruction, A. A. Softly; for land commissioner, A. A. Worley. All of these are well known as eminently able and reputable men.

In Nebraska, so far as the state ticket is concerned, the issue is "Popular government against corporation rule." The fusion ticket represents popular government, and should be elected. The people may depend upon it that they will obtain material relief from the evils that have surrounded their state government.

The fusion nominees for congress are as follows: First district, Hugh Lamaster; Second district, Gilbert M. Hitchcock; Third district, Pat McKillip; Fourth district, C. R. Gilbert; Fifth district, Harry Mauck; Sixth district, W. B. McNeel.

All of these gentlemen are able men, and while it is too much to hope that every one of them will be elected, it seems safe to say that nearly every one of them has a fighting show, while Mr. Hitchcock, in the Second, and Mr. McKillip, in the Third, have considerable more than a fighting show. In the Fourth district Mr. Gilbert, and in the Fifth district Mr. Mauck have excellent prospects.

The people of Nebraska have been greatly imposed upon by the corporations, and there are many reasons for believing that the people of this state have grown weary of corporation rule, and are determined to assert themselves by registering a vigorous protest against government of the many by the few.

### The Philippine Question

We have spent in the last five years \$600,000,000 trying to force an alien government upon an unwilling people, and what profit have we derived from it. We have sold \$16,000,000 of merchandise there, and if the government owned it all, and if it were all profit, it would be spending \$600,000,000 to get a chance to sell \$16,000,000; but the government does not own it, and it is not all profit. The profit is small, and what there is goes to private individuals, while the people at large bear the burden of that Philippine policy. We have had it now for six years and the republican party is not willing to announce the reasons in justification of its policy. For six years we have challenged the republicans to defend imperialism. Four years ago we declared it the paramount issue of the campaign, but the republicans refused then to meet the issue; they refuse now to meet it. When we asked them in 1900 what they were going to do with the Philippine islands, what did they say? Why, they said we cannot talk to the Filipinos while they have their guns in their hands. They said, let the Filipinos lay down their arms and then we will talk to them. Don't you remember what they said? Well, the Filipinos laid down their arms and then what did the republicans say? They said there was nothing to talk about. They would not discuss the question when there was war, because there was war, and they would not discuss it when we had peace, because the end of the war, they said, settled the question. And these republicans imagine that unless a man has a gun in his hand and has it aimed at you, he hasn't any right to demand consideration of his rights; and if he has the gun and is aiming at you, he hasn't any right then, either.

Why do the republicans refuse to discuss this question? Why don't they give us the basis of the title which they claim? How did we get the Filipinos? Did we buy them from Spain? What right has a republic to buy subjects of a Spanish king? Democrats deny the right of a republic based on the declaration of independence to buy subjects from anybody at any price. If we can buy subjects of a Spanish king at \$2.50 apiece, then we can sell them to some other king, when we can get \$5 for them, and make \$2.50 on the transaction. More than that, if we can buy Filipinos from a Spanish king, then our government can sell American citizens into subjection to a king.

Democrats deny the right of the government to sell one human being to any king or potentate on earth; and if we cannot sell Americans,