

**IT IS THE MONEY.** The parade of the fact that the leaders of fusion in Nebraska have, by the efforts of Coin Harvey, emissary of silver mine and bullion owners, raised fourteen thousand five hundred and thirty five dollars and seventy-five cents from the idolators of 16 to 1 in the state of Nebraska for the purpose of purging the ballot boxes of plutocracy, shows what real religious reform means.

Bryan, Allen, Holcomb and their cohorts hate "the money power" when used to defeat their ambitions. But they acknowledge, adore and utilize the money power when it can be secured and exerted for their exaltation. "It is the money and not the honor," they seem to think, which will attract voters to their support. Do they reason from introspection? Is such reasoning founded on the fact that their pure and unselfish leader sought his first office in Nebraska with the avowal that he wanted it for the money and not for the honor?

**UNIMPEACHABLE EVIDENCE.** There are many varieties of evidence. Record evidence is of the highest and most effective character.

THE CONSERVATIVE publishes the compacted and epitomized record of a farmer near Nebraska City who for forty years has been pointing out with a plow the way to make a fortune from the responsively fertile soil which hereabouts blesses the husbandman.

Mr. John Roddy is known and respected as one of the pioneer plowmen of Otoe county. Read his experiences in this issue of THE CONSERVATIVE. Read his success in the real estate records at the court house which show how soon intelligent industry can mass out of farming—under the gold standard—a most magnificent estate.

Which testimony will the thoughtful man accept and believe? That given by John Roddy which shows how prosperity may be evoked from the soil by the plow, or that of such men as Bill Allen, Bill Bryan and Bill Dech whose vaporings are to the effect that farming has not paid, can not pay and never will pay under the gold standard in Nebraska or anywhere else?

**PARTY DISCIPLINE.** During the campaign of 1896 the free silver zealots who had managed and dominated the Chicago convention, which nominated Bryan and Sewall, were strident and vehement in denouncing as bolters, miscreants and traitors all men who had formerly maintained the principles of Jacksonian democracy but then refused to recognize Bryanarchy, its fictions, vagaries and candidates.

The gold standard democrats were denounced as rebels against party discipline, rebels against regularity of

nominations. And did not the same men who howled for party discipline and lauded regularity proceed, after the national convention adjourned, to withdraw democratic electors in several states who had been regularly nominated, in the state democratic conventions, and place on the ticket in their stead the names of populists?

Was it regularity and strict observance of party discipline to take down democratic nominees and put up in their places populist nominees?

A leadership of democracy which makes all irregularities that favor its designs and ambitions regular and all adherence to principles treachery is not a safe nor an honest leadership. A leadership which, in Nebraska, withdraws regularly nominated democrats from a congressional race to help secure the election of a populist—as in the case of Harrison and Neville—is not calculated to build up a democracy.

What sort of democratic candidate for the presidency is the man who deliberately downs a democratic candidate for congress in order to exalt a populist, who, for his own success as a leader of democracy, is willing to defeat democrats and recognize only populists? Did Americans ever before witness the candidate of a national party seeking the presidency through the dissolution of that party in states and its sacrificial disintegration in counties? Is this leadership, which has brought down a majority of thirty-four thousand against republicans in Nebraska seven years ago to less than three thousand in 1898, a glittering success in the defense of principles or does it smack and smell of only personal profits?

**AFTER BATTLE.** On page 627 of "The First Battle"—a book published as "a story of the campaign of 1896" by W. J. Bryan—may be found the following deductions from the election of McKinley:

"The election indicates that the people desire to experiment with the gold standard for four years more. If at the end of four years they desire to continue the experiment, they can do so; if, however, they then desire to make a change, they have a right to make it."

The gold standard "experiment" seems to have been satisfactory if one may believe the reports of clearing houses and banks, the statistics of agriculture, the published prices for the products of industry and the enormous and unprecedented exports from the United States to Europe.

Nevertheless the American people have Colonel Bryan's consent to change the single for a double standard. "They have a right to make it—they can do so!" Will the American people avail themselves of the permission thus kindly granted and give up the gold standard?

**WASHINGTON AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST.** In a letter to John Jay, dated August 1, 1786, George Washington said:

"I am told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking; thence to acting is often but a single step. But how irrevocable and tremendous! What a triumph for our enemies! What a triumph for the advocates of despotism to find that we are incapable of governing ourselves, and that systems founded on the basis of equal liberty are merely ideal and fallacies? Would to God that wise measures may be taken in time to avert the consequences we have but too much reason to apprehend."

President McKinley should read Washington more and hear jingoism less!

**INTOLERABLE.** At the civic conference in Chicago Colonel Bryan eloquently proclaimed that:

"Monopoly in private hands is indefensible from any standpoint and intolerable. I do not divide monopolies. There can be no good monopoly in private hands until the Almighty sends us angels to preside over us."

And yet everybody knows that there are "monopolies in private hands" placed there by God himself. "Blind Tom," the phenomenal piano player, had a monopoly which was innate. No other untaught negro or white person could compete with him in reproducing intricate and difficult symphonies from memory. Blind Tom, a poor and almost witless African, at sixteen years of age, had a complete, perfect and entrenched monopoly in music of a particular kind, which was in such demand that for an evening five hundred to twenty-five hundred dollars was paid for its rehearsal.

God gave this monopoly to Blind Tom and whether Colonel Bryan thinks it "intolerable" or otherwise, God needs no defense from Bryanarchy.

There is a certain magnetic manner and power of oratory which "in private hands" has become a natural monopoly and whether "the Almighty sends us angels to preside over us" or not, now bids fair to perpetuate itself as long as 16 to 1 and the free coinage of silver are watch-words in American politics.

**PLUCK.** The man who is just and firm to his purpose will not be shaken from his fixed resolutions, either by the misdirecting ardor of his fellow citizens or by the threats of imperialism. Moral courage is required if a man would serve his countrymen effectively. To think well and act with courage is the best service one can give his country.