

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Vol. 4, No. 41.

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 28, 1904.

Whole Number 197

## ...A WORD WITH DEMOCRATS...

Every man is responsible for his influence, be it small or great. Every democrat who votes for Parker votes to defeat Roosevelt. Every democrat who does not vote for Parker contributes toward the election of Roosevelt. On every question upon which Judge Parker's position is open to criticism, President Roosevelt's position is worse; where they differ, as they do on many important questions, Parker is right and Roosevelt is wrong.

Roosevelt favors a high tariff; Parker favors tariff reform. Roosevelt favors a standing army of 60,000 at the minimum; Parker favors a reduction of the army.

Roosevelt has brought the race issue into national politics; Parker would remove the race issue from politics.

Roosevelt stands for a colonial policy; Parker favors independence for the Filipinos and would make the promise now.

Roosevelt took into the white house a spirit of war; Judge Parker would substitute for it a spirit of peace.

Four years more of Roosevelt would make economic and industrial reforms more difficult; Judge Parker's election would clear the way for economic issues. Let no democrat, by voting against Parker or by refusing to vote, take upon himself responsibility for four years more of Rooseveltism.

### Silver Democrats Vindicated

While the money question is not an issue in the present campaign, both Parker and Roosevelt being for gold, the silver democrats can insist that their position has been vindicated and that the question has decreased in importance only because an unexpected increase in the volume of money has raised prices and brought in part what bimetallicism would have brought in a larger measure. The present situation can be illustrated as follows: Suppose the democrats of a city believed the water supply to be insufficient, pointed to a lake nearby, called silver lake, and proposed that an additional supply be brought from that source. Suppose the republicans objected on the ground that the water supply was sufficient and carried the election. Then suppose a spring burst forth in the center of the city supplying half as much water as the city used before; and suppose that all the people rejoiced in the additional supply and profited by it—who would say that the republicans were vindicated? To be consistent republicans would have to favor plugging up the spring and returning to the quantity in use before the spring appeared.

This describes what has happened in the financial world. The democrats contended that more money was needed and pointed to the silver reservoir as the only available source from which to draw money. The republicans insisted that we had money enough but soon after the election new gold mines were found and from that and other sources the volume of money has been increased until we now have about 50 per cent more than we had in 1896 and everybody is glad. Who have been vindicated, those who said we needed more money or those who said we had enough and now boast of the unexpected increase? To be consistent the republicans ought to propose to retire the increase and go back to the amount we had in 1896. The money question will again receive attention when the demand for money overtakes the supply, but the quantitative theory has triumphed.

### The "Big Stick"

The republicans who favor the "big stick" policy are in the habit of posing as friends of peace, but they contend that the best way to promote peace is to have a big navy. The fallacy of such an argument ought to be evident to any one who is willing to give the matter a moment's thought. If each nation is trying to have a bigger navy than its neighbor the likelihood of conflict is increased rather than lessened—not to speak of the enormous expense. A large navy is impossible unless a fighting spirit is cultivated and a fighting spirit always leads to a row. To test this

suppose we repeal the law against carrying concealed weapons and encourage every person to go heavily armed—would that policy tend to promote peace and good order in a community? Experience everywhere proves that carrying weapons tends to increase the number of shooting scrapes and the principle applies to nations as well as to individuals. With a small army and a small navy this nation won the place of primacy among the nations. Under Judge Parker it would aspire to the position of peace-maker among all the nations; under President Roosevelt it aspires to be a peace-maker among the conquering empires.

### The Panama Incident

If one desires to estimate the possible dangers to which we are exposed because of President Roosevelt's military enthusiasm he has only to consider the Panama incident. One morning the department wired to our representative at Panama: "Understand there is an insurrection there." The answer came back: "Not yet. Expected this afternoon." And within a few days a seceding republic was recognized and our influence was thrown against the parent republic, Colombia. Why? Because little Panama had a canal in her pocket that we wanted. This nation that spent four years bringing seceding states back into the union, recognized a seceding section of Colombia with inexcusable haste! If it had seen England, Germany or France, instead of little Colombia, we would now be engaged in a bloody and expensive war. But, it may be said, that the president would not deal that way with a large nation. Then shame on a president who would bully a little republic like Colombia and treat it as he would not treat a big European government!

### John W. Kern

John W. Kern, democratic nominee for governor of Indiana, is making a vigorous campaign. No Indianan is better known in the Hoosier state than the democratic nominee for governor. Men of all parties have confidence in his ability and integrity. He has rendered great service to his party and to his country in the past, and in the office of governor he will be able not only to serve the people of his own state, but he will be able to make material contribution to the progress of reform in national affairs. It is to be hoped that the people of Indiana will see to it that not only Mr. Kern is elected to the office of governor, but that the entire democratic ticket will be elected, in order that Mr. Kern will be surrounded by men who are pledged to the same ideals, so that they may help to make his administration a success and not bend their energies toward making it a failure.

### A Change in the Nation's Ideals

Is it possible that republican voters cannot see that we are slowly undergoing a change in our nation's ideals. It used to be that we agreed as to what the ideal was. Ten years ago if you would ask a man anywhere, republican or democrat, what his idea was of this nation's position, and the method by which it influenced the world, he would have turned to the Bible and read you that sentence: "So live that others seeing your good works may be constrained to glorify your Father." And he would have said that it was the mission of this nation to so administer the benefits of free government and civil liberty that people everywhere, inspired by our example, would imitate us. That was the ideal a few years ago. And it required no great navy, no great army, to support it. What is the new ideal? Ask the president for some maxim that we can use to the world in showing what our future policy is to be, and he will answer: "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." Can you see any difference between these two ideals? There is all the difference between light and darkness.

The man who presented President Roosevelt's name in the Republican convention paid a glowing tribute to war. He said that war must still settle the destinies of nations. He said that you might strike from all your hymn books every national anthem, that you might sing the praises of the quiet life, but that out in the darkness would still be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, upturned face. He said that men might prophesy and women pray, but that peace would never come to abide forever on this earth until the dreams of childhood became the charts to guide the destinies of man. He said events were numberless and mighty, and that we could not tell which wire ran around the earth; that we might be basking in the sunshine of peace today and tomorrow writhing in the tolls of war. He said the thing to do was to keep great figures at the front. He said if the force was great the power to resist it must be granite and iron.

We doubt if anyone can find in all the speeches made in this country before such a eulogy of war. We are told in the Old Testament that the Messiah was coming, and among other things he would be called the Prince of Peace. And when he came the announcement was made, not to the soldiers in battle array, but to shepherds who kept their flocks by night; and it was not a call to arms, but "Peace on earth; good will to man."

For two thousand years that gospel of peace has grown. For that gospel of peace millions have gladly given their lives. For that gospel of peace thousands have crossed oceans and buried themselves during their life among unknown peoples, even savage tribes. For nearly twenty centuries this gospel of peace has been the growing hope of the world. And now the ex-governor of