

**SOUND CURRENCY.** THE CONSERVATIVE publishes this week a number of special articles discussing the issues of the campaign from the standpoint of gold democrats, anti-imperialists and German-Americans. These three classes of voters represent the independent vote of the country. All three believe first of all in a sound currency. If in 1896 a fifty cent dollar was inimical to the sound business interests of the country, it is no less a menace today. If the 16 to 1 candidate was dangerous then he is just as dangerous now. His platform is the same, the only difference being that it is kept from view by the screen of "imperialism." Hence the duty of all good citizens, who believe in sound currency, who believe in maintaining the dignity and integrity of our courts, who believe in an intelligent and efficient civil service, is to oppose the sophistries of populism as they did four years ago. The question of imperialism is removed from the campaign for the reason that both presidential candidates favored obtaining sovereignty to the Philippines and thus endorsed the acquisition of territory by purchase rather than consent.

**FOUR YEARS AGO.** In accepting the democratic nomination for the presidency in 1896, Mr. Bryan said, "Now let me ask you to consider the paramount issue of this campaign, the money question." In his later discussions, he made many direful prophecies of the calamity that would result from a continuation of the gold standard. Every one of these predictions proved untrue. In every avenue of trade, prosperity exists. Interest, the reward for capital, has steadily declined, while wages, the reward for labor, have been advanced, and all this has been brought about under the iniquitous gold standard. With such unmistakable evidences of prosperity, a campaign of calamity for 1900, was unpromising. Hence the necessity for a new paramount issue. The peerless prophet of disaster was equal to the emergency and cleverly substituted the paramount of "imperialism" for the discredited paramount of 1896.

In accepting the democratic nomination for the presidency, he lightly dismissed the money question as a "mere economic question" and devoted his entire address to "imperialism." His speech was moderate in tone and free from anything that would tend to arouse apprehension in the minds of conservative voters. A few weeks later, he accepted a nomination from the populists, and discussed to a considerable extent the financial question, endorsed all the sophistries of populism, the initiative and referendum, government control and ownership of railroads

and telegraphs and other propositions essentially socialistic.

What was Mr. Bryan's object in so varying his style of address? In the first instance his purpose was to appeal to the calm, sober judgment of intelligent, thinking people by creating the impression that 16 to 1 was not involved in the campaign. In his plea to populists he sought to cater to the radical element, hence his endorsement of everything "radicalism" demands. In the event of his election, if he is honest to those to whom he appealed in his address to democrats, he must construe his triumph not as a vindication of 16 to 1 but as a rebuke to "imperialism." On the other hand, if he is honest to his populist adherents he must regard his election as a triumph of the populist "paramount," socialistic legislation. Hence if he is honest with one he must be dishonest with the other. Will it be safe for either populists or anti-imperialists to aid in the election of Bryan when the dangers they would avoid and the good they would accomplish depend upon the political dishonesty of the candidate?

Expansion is an accomplished fact, the responsibility for which belongs to

**Imperialism.** Mr. Bryan as well as Mr. McKinley.

The question is how to best adjust ourselves to the new conditions. Mr. McKinley and Mr. Bryan are pledged to the establishment of a stable government in the Philippines. Mr. McKinley has placed the establishment of this government in the hands of a commission, the head of which is one of the strongest jurists in the country, who was originally opposed to the acquisition of the Philippines. Ultimate independence for the Filipinos is possible under the plan of either, as soon as the American congress sees fit to grant it. Is not the establishment of this stable government as secure for the Filipinos if entrusted to the commission headed by Judge Taft, who opposed the purchase of the Philippines, as if left to Bryan who advocated their purchase? When independence is granted under the former regime it would be absolute and unconditional while with the other it would be nominal under an American protectorate. One would end our interest in and responsibility for the government of the islands with the guaranty of independence while the other would make our responsibility perpetual. Is not the maintenance of temporary sovereignty to be preferred to perpetual responsibility, minus the right to control? If we thus become sponsor for a republic in the Philippines, would there not be the same obligation for us to become responsible for every half-baked republic that may be established in the old world? Could we do anything that would more endanger our peace and security than

this wholesale extension of our international obligations? Would we not thus become perpetually involved in all the strife and dissension of the eastern hemisphere? Is it possible to conceive of a policy that would necessitate a greater military armament or a larger standing army than this proposition to become god-father to the world? Yet this is the way Mr. Bryan would avoid "militarism" and "imperialism."

**TWIN PRODIGIES.** Nebraska is great in production. All the cereals flourish in her fertile soil and the fruits of her orchards are superb in coloring, size and lusciousness. Nebraska hogs are highest priced in all swine markets and the "export cattle" from this tree-planting state are yearned for in London and Paris by all the rich gourmands of those beef-devouring centers. All commodities made in Nebraska from raw products therein produced are taken with alacrity and voracity throughout the markets of the globe.

Nebraska beet sugar is superb. Grand Island and Norfolk have been made acquainted with all the world by its manufacture.

By thousands of tons of quail oats and superfine flour of Indian maize the Nebraska City Cereal Mills have called the attention of cultivated consumers of corn meal and oat meal all the world over to the clean, wholesome and toothsome nutriment which the phosphates of Nebraska soil evolve. And the Argo starch is in all the markets from London to Hong Kong proclaiming the productivity of Nebraska soil, capital, pluck and honest dealing. But in addition to all these gross and materialistic triumphs

the state has produced a pair of twin orators, twin statesmen, twin emotionalists. They are named Bryan and Thurston. The former became famous as the advocate of the silver mine and bullion owners combine in 1892. He was allegedly then the paid attorney of a tremendous trust, the purpose of which was to enhance the price of silver by legislation. The scheme which Bryan and his coparceners advanced was to make United States mints freely coin silver in quantities without end into 412½ grain silver dollars. Thus by law Bryan proposed to raise silver bullion to double the price which the relation of supply to demand would place upon it. This prominent prodigy, this young Napoleon in statecraft continued the attorney and advocate of the silver trust in Congress and out of Congress and by it was made a candidate for the presidency in 1896, and for it and by it and in the interests of silver again nominated in 1900 for that high office. And no populist, no fusionist, no vagarist of all the varieties of