

are to be the magic words by which presidents are made?

Bryanism, united with Crokerism, is the plain, undisguised issue before the American people.

Quibbling. Mr. Bryan has sought to cloak his designs and purposes by evasive answers to questions as to the means he will employ to wreck national credit and destroy the basis of present prosperity. He quibbles over nothing. He is pledged to do it. It is not worth while to talk about the means he will employ. If an incendiary should threaten to burn your house you would not debate with him about the way in which he expected to start the fire but would do your best to see that he did not get a chance. Mr. Bryan has threatened to destroy the gold standard. Use the same good sense in dealing with him.

He has also sought to decoy voters by denouncing, with almost seeming sincerity, the iniquity of "imperialism."

Imperialism. By imperialism he means the acquisition and present control of the Philippines by this government, a condition for which no man in this country is more responsible than he. When the suggestion was first made that we assume a part in the affairs of the Orient THE CONSERVATIVE opposed it. When the treaty of peace with Spain came before the senate of the United States, THE CONSERVATIVE opposed its ratification for the reason that it contained a provision whereby we acquired sovereignty to the islands of the Philippines. THE CONSERVATIVE was not alone in this opposition. Many senators of the United States, of both political parties, seriously questioned the wisdom and propriety of the acquisition by this government of remote territory. So strong was this feeling that the defeat of the treaty was assured and an amendment agreed upon whereby we would relinquish our responsibilities in the Philippines. But unhappily for the consummation of this arrangement, Mr. Bryan thrust his personality into the debate and urged immediate ratification of the treaty as it was written, without amendment. He used the influence of his personality and the strength of his position, as leader of the party opposed to the republicans, to force seventeen democratic senators into line, and ratified the treaty, thereby defeating all efforts to amend. As the one responsible for the ratification of the treaty, Mr. Bryan must assume the responsibility for all that treaty contained. He must assume the responsibility for the payment of \$20,000,000 to Spain for sovereignty to the Philippines and all the complications resulting from our attempt to maintain that sovereignty. According to the constitution of the United States a treaty once ratified becomes the supreme law of the land. This treaty made the president of the

United States responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the Philippines. In the case of rebellion or insurrection he must suppress it and, if necessary, use the army and navy of the United States to do so. This responsibility will cling to the president until congress takes it away by making other arrangements for the government of the Filipinos, either by recognizing their independence or disposing of the islands to foreign powers. It should not be forgotten that the granting of Philippine independence is a congressional right, and not a privilege of the president. Neither Mr. Bryan nor Mr. McKinley, alone, will be able to effect the slightest change in the relations existing between the Filipinos and the people of the United States.

Mr. Bryan has announced, as a part of his Philippine program, that he would recommend to congress the granting

Bryan's Policy. of independence to the Filipinos under an American protectorate. He proposes that we become responsible to the nations of the world for the government of this primitive people and at the same time resign all right of control over them. He proposes that we permit the people of the Philippines to do what they will and we will guarantee to protect them. Is it possible to conceive of a policy that would necessitate the use of a larger army; that would mean more embarrassing entanglements than this proposition of wholesale responsibility and no control? As long as our responsibilities remain in the Philippines there should remain also the right of control.

Why then should anyone who opposes imperialism as a matter of principle, rather than mere party expediency, favor the election of Mr. Bryan, either from the standpoint of his past record upon this question or the plan of government he proposes for the Filipinos? THE CONSERVATIVE believes that the people of the Philippine islands will enjoy as large a measure of civil liberty under the government to be devised by the commission headed by Judge Taft as they would if Tammany methods of administration were extended to them.

BRYAN SHIES. Mr. Bryan had about concluded his speech at Washington Park last week when one of his audience very impertinently and suggestively held up a silver dollar. The incident called forth the following speechlet from Mr. Croker's candidate:

"I notice a gentleman over there held up a silver dollar and he evidently wants to know something about silver, and I will remind him that his desire to hear something about money and nothing about human rights illustrates the sordid level on which the republican party is fighting this campaign."

Can this be the same Bryan who thus

answered an interruption in 1896, while speaking at Syracuse, New York:

"In this campaign for the first time in the history of this government, a great party proposes to surrender the right of self-government and invest in foreign legislative bodies the power to legislate for the people of the United States. If they ask us, 'what about other questions,' we tell them that so long as the right of self-government is endangered there is no other question."

If Bryan spoke the truth then, if, in the money question, was involved the right of self government for the

Not True. American people, the same issue must be at stake in determining the money question this year. Is not then the question of self government or human rights for the American people of infinitely greater importance to them than the question of self government or human rights for any other people? The election in 1896 turned against Mr. Bryan. If his political diagnosis was correct, the American people then "surrendered the right of self government." If this be true; if in 1896 we lost the right to govern ourselves, how can we again lose that which we lost then? But in the meantime is any American citizen conscious of the loss of any of his political rights? Has a single liberty or privilege, previously enjoyed, been taken from him? Is he aware of the slightest change in his status as a citizen of this great republic? If not, self government was not surrendered and was not at issue in determining the money question four years ago. Since Mr. Bryan used falsehood and deception to mislead the voters in 1896 ought he to be trusted now? Ought he to be taken seriously when he again declares that human rights and self government will be lost to the American people if they do not elect him president?

VOTE. The most effective and sure way of injuring Nebraska workingmen is to destroy the industries which employ them. A vote for the Croker-Bryan ticket is a vote to uphold the action of Bryan in attempting to close the starch factory at Nebraske City and throw several hundred men out of employment. What has been attempted at Nebraska City will be tried elsewhere in this state and throughout the country in the event of the success of the fusion combine.

WOE. If the scriptures shall be fulfilled and if it shall be meted out unto evil doers as it is written, what a world of woe is in store for the false prophet of 1896! For it is written "woe unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirits and have seen nothing."