# BRYAN'S GREAT OGDEN SPEECH ON NATIONAL ISSUES

**William Jennings Bryan's speech at Ogden on Tuesday evening was one of the most notable ever delivered in a Utah campaign. It was listened to by the greatest audience that ever assembled at a political meeting in that city. Since that evening The Herald has received innumerable requests for the complete publication of the speech, which is herewith given verbatim.**

**The address is more than a mere political speech. It is in reality an appeal for "National Morality," and is filled with the noblest thoughts, expressed in beautiful language, which often approaches sublimity. It deals with the national issues involved in the present campaign with candid, honest arguments that carry conviction.**

Mr. Bryan said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I esteem it a great privilege to be permitted to discuss public questions in the presence of this magnificent audience, although I feel that in coming here I am really not performing as necessary work as if I spoke in other parts of the country for here in Utah you have more than your share of men who are able to advocate and defend the principles for which I have stood. Here in this city you have a man whom I learned to love when I watched him six years ago battling with those ties which held him to a party, and finally preferring to sever them all rather than surrender what to him was dearer than party—his own convictions. And when I saw that address prepared by Mr. Cannon for the silver Republicans, and when I read that address, I saw that he reached deeper than any question of finance, and took hold of those great principles that have separated men in all the ages of the world. When I read that address prepared by him I saw that he distinguished between the aristocrat and the plutocrat on the one side, whatever he might call himself, and the democrat on the other side, whatever title he might give himself; for Jefferson said (and it was a true saying) that there are but two permanent parties in the land, and that those two parties can be found in every country under the sun, and they are the aristocratic party and the democratic party. (Applause.) A reading of that address convinced me that Frank Cannon here belonged to the democratic party, whether he called himself a silver Republican, a Populist, or a Democrat. (Applause.) And I have been glad to find that when some had weakened and turned back, that he was still true to his convictions, and still had his face toward the rising sun.

### PRAISE FOR RAWLINS.

But, my friends, you have in this state a man who has represented you with distinguished ability in the United States senate, and if I were to enter is; teach them that our government is lic questions upon which you must sit in judgment, and he were to follow on another night, without having heard what I had said, our speeches would be so similar in thought, while differing in phraseology, that you would be convinced that we had received our inspiration from the same source. And I believe we do take our inspiration from that greatest of all the statesmen in all the world's history, Thomas Jefferson. He knew the human heart and knew human government, and left as a legacy to his countrymen a richer variety of observation and political philosophy than any other man has given to the world. (Applause.) I say we draw our inspiration from the same source, and I am here tonight because I want to do what I can to secure the return of Joseph L. Rawlins to the United States senate. (Great applause.) True, in the discussion of these questions he could say to you all that I could say. And then he has for an assistant one of the ablest men that this state has produced, and I was rejoiced when I found that the Democratic convention of this state had nominated as the candidate for congress from Utah Mr. King, who deserves to stand by the side of Rawlins. (Applause.) I say that these men here, and others whom I might mention, one of whom is on the platform tonight, with Rawlins and Cannon and King and Thatcher, and all these able men who speak as the exponents of a true Democracy, that my coming here is really more for my own gratification than it is for any service that I can render you.

### A TWO-FOLD DIVISION.

But I am not willing to discuss political questions alone. I have been making political speeches for a good while, and after a careful examination of the returns I have made up my mind that many people do not like the political speeches that I make. (Laughter and applause.) I think I will go back a little further tonight than we ordinarily go at political meetings. I want to kind of back back, and get a running start at the Republicans. (Laughter and applause.) And, therefore, I think I shall vary a little from a political speech and try to say something that will please Republicans as well as Democrats; and so I have divided my speech into two parts. I will talk scripture and politics—scripture enough to please the Republicans and politics enough to satisfy the Democrats. (Great applause and laughter.)

Some months ago I had occasion to prepare an address when it was not proper to discuss themes of government, and I was somewhat at a loss for a subject about which I could talk for awhile without the danger of saying something that might hurt somebody's feelings; but I stumbled across the word "civilization," and as I thought about it, it grew upon me. As I studied it the subject became larger, and I was first amazed to find how little I knew about civilization, and, second, more than amazed to find how little other people seemed to know; for I have found no definition of that very commonplace thing that seemed to me to answer the requirements of the definition, and, therefore, I had to make one, and I am not sure that it is a good one, but it is the best that I have been able to manufacture, and it is this: That civilization is the harmonious development of the human race, politically, mentally and morally. (A voice, "Good!") The perfect civilization would be one in which every citizen was developed to the uttermost in body, in mind, and in heart; and we approach that perfect civilization in proportion as we approach that perfect and universal development of the three-fold man.

### MORALITY AND CIVILIZATION.

In studying the subject I was interested in the book written by Buckle, the English historian. He said that civilization was measured by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature. It seems plausible, and yet if you will notice he left out of consideration the moral element, and I was surprised a little later to find that he had not only omitted it intentionally, but that he had tried to justify it; and what do you suppose was his logic? He said that some great moral principles had been accepted by the people of all ages, and that, therefore, the difference between people must be measured by their intellectual differences. I say it with hesitation, but I am satisfied that Buckle is in error, and I believe his error consists in this: that he measured people by the moral principles accepted, whereas he should have measured them by the moral principles lived up to. It makes all the difference in the world whether a man merely accepts a principle, or lives it. Take the best man you ever knew and put him by the side of the worst, and take both, and you will find that both would admit the correctness of the great moral principles that underlie society. Wherein do they differ, then? One lives the principles, and you call him an upright man; the other suspends them in hours of temptation, and you send him to the penitentiary. It is a question, I say, of moral principles lived, not moral principles merely accepted; and I am satisfied from my study of history that the moral element is not only important, but paramount. I am satisfied that you cannot find an instance of a great nation that has gone down to decay but what a moral decay preceded the political downfall.

### NATION NEED NOT DIE.

I speak of it tonight because there is abroad in the land a dangerous philosophy. Men argue—I have heard them; you have—men argue that because the individual is born, grows strong, passes to a period of maturity, and at last becomes old and dies, that, therefore, nations must pass through the same stages, and at last reach the same end. I deny that there is any analogy between an individual and a nation that makes it necessary for a nation to die. (Applause.) For while the nation today is composed of individuals, in its national life it is composed rather of generations, and as one generation passes off the stage, another comes on; and unless there is some reason why a future generation should be weaker or worse than this, there is no reason why this nation should ever be weaker or worse than it is now; and I lay it down as a proposition that cannot be disputed, that there is no necessary reason why this nation should not be grander and more glorious a thousand years from now than it is now. (Applause.) And if the time ever comes when our progress ceases, when we turn downward, and at last are wrecked and ruined, leaving a warning to those that come after us, it will be because of the moral decay among our people and in our government.

### MORAL LAW FOR NATIONS.

I want to speak tonight of the measure of national greatness. I want this to be a great nation. I have great ideas about the future of this nation and its mission among the nations of the world. What is the measure of a nation's greatness? I know of no way of measuring the greatness of a nation except to apply to it the same moral principles that we apply to an individual; and to my mind one of the dangerous tendencies of the times is the tendency to limit and amend and qualify great moral principles. Take for instance, the old commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." That is the way we learned it. It is simple and plain and strong. But now there are many who make it read, "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." (Laughter and applause.) If the scale is large enough it is different, and I am not revealing any secret when I tell you that as a rule it is safer for a man to steal a million dollars in the United States than to steal a hundred. But I would not feel so badly about it if that was the only commandment that was being amended; but they are amending all of them. There is a commandment against covetousness, and we all know that if a man covets something of small value he is a sinner. But if a nation covets the government of another nation of 1,200 islands, there are people who call it destiny. There is a commandment that reads, "Thou shalt not kill." Now they say that you must not kill a man—unless he has something you want. Or, as they still say, that one man must not kill another, yet there are people who believe that 70,000,000 people can band together to kill 8,000,000, if they can extend their trade thereby. I think it is important that we shall learn now that you cannot band together enough people to enable them to do wrong with impunity. I was taught in my youth that the victim of a wrong might escape, but the perpetrator of it could not escape. I was taught that it was better for a man to suffer wrong than to do wrong, and I think it applies to a nation as well as to an individual. Do not be deceived because the punishment does not follow immediately on the crime. A man may at 50 pay the penalty for sins committed at 25, and a nation may pay the penalty for sins committed 100 years before. Let me give you an illustration: Seventy-five years before Abraham Lincoln affixed his signature to the emancipation proclamation, Thomas Jefferson was pleading for the emancipation of the slave. But they turned a deaf ear to his appeal, and because they would not listen to him we paid a terrible penalty seventy years later in a war that cost us hundreds of thousands of precious lives and hundreds of millions of money. It is true of a nation as of an individual that the harvest is according to the sowing, and if this nation has sowed the wind it will reap the whirlwind, though many seed times and harvests may pass between the sowing and the reaping.

### BIBLE AS BASIS.

So I say to you, apply to the nation as a whole those moral principles that we apply to the individual. And what is the measure of individual greatness? Well, I must go back to the Bible for a measure, and I am going back more and more, and I think maybe I ought to tell you. I need not tell the Democrats—they will guess it; but I ought to tell the Republicans—they might not guess. (Laughter.) The fact is that for many years when I discussed public questions I used to quote Democratic authority, and I thought that was sufficient; but I found that whenever I quoted a Democrat as authority the Republicans would attack the Democrat, and they kept us so busy defending the Democrats whom I quoted that I didn't have the time to do the work I wanted to do. And now I am quoting scripture more, and when the Republicans attack my authority I just let them fight it out with the Bible, for it isn't my fault if they don't like the Bible. (Great applause and laughter.)

I was a little ashamed when I first read of that quarrel amongst the disciples as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven—ashamed that in the very presence of the Master they should engage in that unseemly wrangle; but I am glad for that quarrel, for their quarrel brought out the question, and their question brought forth an answer, and that answer has given us the only true measure of greatness, when Christ says: "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Service is the measure of greatness; it always has been true; it is true today; it always will be true, that he is greatest who does the most of good. Not only is service the measure of greatness, but service is the measure of happiness. We are happy in this world, not in proportion as people do something for us, but in proportion as we do something for others. I appeal to your own experiences for verification. Look back over your lives—what days are brightest? The days that you remember, because on those days somebody did something for you? No! The days that are brightest (and they will grow brighter with the years), are the days that are glorified by some generous contribution that you have made to the sum of human happiness and the sum of human welfare. If I were going to describe a happy and successful life, I would describe it as a living spring, pouring forth constantly all that which refreshes and invigorates. If I were going to describe an unhappy and unsuccessful life, I would describe it as a stagnant pool, receiving contributions from all the land around, giving forth nothing and at last becoming the seat of disease and death.

### IN SERVICE FIND HAPPINESS.

Yes, service not only measures greatness, but it also measures happiness, and it is not only sound philosophy but sound religion. And there is consolation in it—at least I find consolation in it—for if my happiness depended on what Republicans did for me I might die in misery; but if my happiness depends on what I do for them, they cannot keep me from having a good time all my life. (Great applause.)

But even if we understand that service is the measure of greatness, it is important that we shall understand how to serve. And I became so interested in this question that I have examined carefully to find in how many ways people have tried to serve their fellows, and I have been amazed to find that in all the history of the human race but two methods have been employed: The first is the forcible method, and that has been employed the most. A man has an idea, and he thinks it is good; he tells it to his neighbors and they don't like it, and then he gets mad because his neighbors don't like his idea. He thinks it would be so much better for them if they did like it; and so he starts out with a club to make them like it. But the trouble about this rule is that it works both ways, and if you start out with a club to make your neighbors think as you do, the chances are—it will be 16 to 1—that they will start out to do the same thing; and then you will quarrel, and then you will fight, and you will spend so much time trying to coerce each other that you won't have any time left to do each other good. There is just one other means or method, and that is a Bible method: "Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." And you know, my friends, I am satisfied that there is no other means by which you can overcome evil except to substitute something better for it.

### HIGH IDEALS NEEDED.

I am not much of a farmer; I get more credit for my farming than I deserve, and my little farm has received more advertising than it is entitled to. I have sometimes thought that if I could convert my farm into soap and use the advertisements of it I would have a case of prosperity that would make a Republican envious. (Laughter and applause.) But I am farmer enough to know that if I cut down weeds they will come again; I am farmer enough to know that I can cut them down as often as I like, and that they will still grow up. But if I plant something there that has more vitality than weeds, I not only get rid of the constant cutting, but have the benefit of the crop. And so I believe that if you want to help a man you must give him a high ideal to take the place of the lower one, and that high ideal will lift him to a higher plane and give him a broader conception of his relation to his fellows. And let me pause for a moment to apply this doctrine to a question about which we have all been thinking since that terrible act that took from us our chief executive. There has been much discussion of the subject of anarchy, and many remedies have been proposed, but they have all been in the line of suppression. But I want to go beyond that and correct the spirit of anarchy, for there is no place in the United States for the doctrine of anarchy. But are you going to destroy the spirit of anarchy by suppression alone? No. The nations that have suppressed the manifestations of anarchy by severe laws have the most anarchists today.

### HOW TO DESTROY ANARCHY.

How are you going to destroy the spirit of anarchy? By education, and by education only. Teach the people that government is a necessity, for it is; teach them that our government is the best on earth, for it is. But that is not sufficient. Then it is the duty of each one to exert himself to the utmost to make the government so good that every citizen will be willing to die, if need be, to preserve that government and its blessing to his children. The government can be a great blessing or a great curse, and as the government takes from the citizen the right to redress his own wrongs, it assumes the solemn duty of protecting him from every arm uplifted for his injury; and if the government first disarms the citizen, and then leaves him helpless to be despoiled by those who act under the favoritism of government, then the citizen who has thus been despoiled is in a good position to listen to the voice of the anarchist. Yes, my friends, I believe we must overcome evil with good; and what is the greatest force for the overcoming of evil? I believe it is the example that a man sets before his fellow men. I believe the most potent influence for good on the earth today is the example of one who shows the world how to live. I believe we have overestimated the mind's part and underestimated the heart's part in human affairs; and when I say this, don't think I lack enthusiasm on the subject of education. I am an enthusiast on the subject of education. If I knew my boy would dig ditches all his life, I would want him to commence digging with the best education the country could give him. Why? Because I believe he would dig a better ditch if he was educated than if he was ignorant, and I believe he would have sense enough to demand reasonable hours and reasonable pay. (Applause.) And more than that: When the day's work was over he would have his mind as a companion, and would not have to loaf around the street to find somebody to while away the hours with. I say I am an enthusiast on the subject of education, and nothing made me more angry in the campaign of 1896 than the statement of an eminent divine that we were educating the farm boys too much; that they were getting dissatisfied with the position that God intended them to fill. I do not believe that God ever made any man wise enough to draw that line in society, to say that the children of a man on one side should be educated, and the children of the other should be kept in ignorance.

### VALUE OF EDUCATION.

I say I am an enthusiast on the subject of education; but I believe we have thought too much of what the mind has done and not enough of what the heart can do. We talk of the inventions of genius, and we are amazed to think that a man can stand by the side of a telephone instrument and by means of an electric current talk to people 10,000 miles away. But the heart that desires to live for its fellows, the heart that yearns to do some great thing, the heart that puts in operation some movement for the uplifting of the human race, will speak to the hearts that beat 10,000 years after all our hearts are still, and that is more wonderful than talking to people 10,000 miles away. I will go into a cemetery, and I find there monuments reared to the dead, and they generally vary in size and beauty in proportion to the estate left. But how few of the countless millions of the human race will ever be known 100 years after their death by any monument that marks their resting place. I am glad that the Creator in his infinite love has made it possible for the humblest citizen of all the land, if inspired by a noble purpose, if filled with a holy zezal—that he has made it possible for the humblest citizen in all the land to rear for himself a monument that will endure after all the monuments of granite have gone and have crumbled to decay. I respect the aristocracy of learning, but I thank God for the democracy of the heart that makes it possible for every human being to do something to make life worth living, that makes the world better for his having lived in it. We can measure the distance from the farthest star to the earth, but no mathematician can measure the infinite influence for good that such a man can be to his fellow men, for it reaches through this generation and on to the remotest generations of time. Now, this is the measure of individual greatness, and no one will dispute it.

### NATIONAL GREATNESS.

What is the measure of national greatness, then? If an individual is great as he shows how to live, is a nation great as it makes people die? What is your idea of a great nation? Is it that we shall go out and subjugate half-civilized people? Is it that we shall stagger through the byways and highways of the world, looking for inferior people with money enough in their pockets to excite our avarice, and not strong enough to resist our aggression? Is that your idea of a great nation—a great nation and a great destiny? My idea goes beyond it. I want this nation to influence, not the feeble races, but the strong ones; I want this nation to dominate, not the inferior races, but the superior ones; I want this nation to conquer the world, not with its armies or navies, but with its ideas; I want this nation to destroy every throne on earth, not by force or violence (Great applause)—not by force or violence, but by showing the world something better than a throne; a government resting upon the consent of the governed; strong because it is loved, and loved because it is good. That is our ideal of a government. (Great applause.)

I want this nation to solve aright the problems that confront it, and by solving them not only help our own people but help those who labor at greater disadvantage than we do. I wish that time was sufficient to enter

into a discussion of all these questions, and to present each one with elaboration; but I want, my friends, to show you some of these problems that we must solve—solve for our own benefit, and for the enlightenment of the world.

### THE GREATEST TRUTH.

I want you to apply to these problems a principle that I believe to be fundamental, a principle that you accepted as fundamental only a few years ago. I am going to find it in the Declaration of Independence, and I am not going to apologize either for finding it there. (Applause.) It is not stated at a possible thing; it is not stated as a probable thing; it is stated as a self-evident truth, that all men are created free and equal, and it is either true or false. If it is true, it is the greatest truth on the subject of government that ever fell from the lips of man; and if it is false, it is the most pernicious falsehood that was ever proclaimed amongst the nations. I believe it to be true; I believe you think it to be true, and I appeal to you to apply this great fundamental self-evident truth to the questions that are before the country at this time, and I want to call the attention of Republicans to the fact that their party leaders are not discussing great principles or great truths at this time. Why, it used to be that when a Republican made a speech he would go back to a fundamental principle; he would apply it to public questions, and he would appeal to the hearts of men and ask them to come with him and help to vindicate human rights, and to protect all in the enjoyment of these rights. But what does he say now?

### REPUBLICAN DOCTRINE.

Why, they say just let well enough alone. Don't think! Just as long as you have enough to eat, don't think. They want to degrade politics to the level of the brute. Why, it is the hog that sleeps when it is full, and only squeals when it is hungry. (Laughter and applause.) And they try to make you believe that there is a secret connection between the Republican party and the Almighty. They say that you have good times when you vote the Republican ticket, and that he smiles on you with bountiful harvests, but that he sends hot winds and blasts everything if you vote the Democratic ticket. Why, let me give you as an illustration of this argument what you hear every day from Republican leaders. They tell you that you always have good times when the Republicans are in power, and always have bad times when the Democrats are in power. Well, now, my friends, it is an insult to the intelligence of a man to assume that he doesn't know better than that. And when I hear this sweeping statement I am reminded of the man down in Tennessee who got full and started out to look for a fight, and he met a man and said to him, "I can whip any man in the city of Memphis." The man went around and left him alone. He met another man and said to him, "I can whip any man in Shelby county." He went around and left him alone. He met another man and said to him, "I can whip any man in the state of Tennessee." And the man knocked him down. He got up and wiped the blood off his nose, and said: "Shake, stranger. I took in too much territory the last time." (Great applause and laughter.) And I am going to show you that Republicans take in too much territory when they make this claim, and I shall show it to you by the facts which you know yourselves. I am not going to enter into an argument; I am simply going to give you a brief statement of the facts, and the facts will convince you.

### PANICS IN FORTY YEARS.

How long since the Republican party first came into power? Forty-two years.

How many panics have we had? Two.

When? In 1873 and 1893.

Which party was in power in 1873? The Republican party.

How long had it been in power? Twelve years.

How long did it stay in power after that? Eleven years.

Now, there you have a panic, a bad panic, with want flowing from door to door; with men out of work, hunting for work; with business prostrated and demoralized. And yet it came under a Republican administration, after twelve years of Republican rule, and eleven years before we had a chance to elect a Democratic president. Now, throw that on to the Democratic party if you can. Hold us responsible for the panic of 1873! Why do you people forget it? I can understand why a lady couldn't remember back that far, but how a man can't remember—— (Applause and laughter.)

So I have given you one instance of a panic under Republican rule, and yet you say we always have good times when the Republicans are in power, and that we always have bad times when the Democrats are in power.

When did the Democrats come in power? In 1884.

How long did they stay? Four years.

Did you have a panic? No.

Did you have business distress? No.

Did you have soup houses? No.

### DEMOCRATIC GOOD TIMES.

You had as good times as you had four years before or four years after. So there is a good illustration of it. And yet you say we always have good times when the Republicans are in power, and bad times when the Democrats are in power. Why, my friends, if we had brought the second panic, in 1893, the first one came when you couldn't blame us for it, and so that is one apiece, and modesty should lead you to say nothing about it. But what about the second panic? It came right after a Republican administration; it came after they had passed the McKinley bill, and that law was in force for a year after the panic began, as well as the Sherman law, that was not repealed until after the panic began. So that when that second panic came, it came under a gold standard law and a high tariff law. Cleveland got it from a Republican president before him, and he gave it to a Republican president after him, and for the time, indeed, he was nearer the Republican party than ours, and supported their ticket instead of ours. But, Republicans, I want you to listen. I tell you that you are cowardly to take our president away from us and use him to elect your ticket, and then refuse to bear the odium of it. (Great applause.) Now, don't you think they take in too much territory? (Laughter and applause.)

### BLAME GOD FOR BAD CROPS.

Now, those are the facts, and they are the facts that Republicans know as well as Democrats; and yet they will say that we always have good times when the Republicans are in power, and always have bad times when the Democrats are in power. Why, in 1900 we had good crops in Nebraska, and the Republicans from all over the country told us how thankful we ought to be to the Republican party for bringing us bountiful harvests that year, and they tried to amend the "Doxology" to make it read, "Praise the Republican party, from whom all blessings flow." And the next year the crops were bad. Did they blame the Republican party for it? Not a bit of it. Whom did they blame? The Lord. When the crops were good they held thanksgiving meetings and praised the Republican party; and when the crops were bad they held prayer meetings and prayed to the Lord for more rain. And why? Because they thought it wasn't fair to make the Republican party look after us for two years in succession. Is there anybody here who believes that the Republican party brings the rainfall? Why, my friends, if they could there would be a monopoly on water. You ask me how I know? Well, I know that in cities where they control the water supply they have often turned it over to a private monopoly; and if they will give a private monopoly control of the water supply of a city, what reason have you to doubt that they would give a private monopoly control of the water supply of the nation, if they could? And don't they give a private monopoly control of the gas lighting and electric lighting? Don't they allow the sugar to be monopolized? Don't they allow the salt to be monopolized? Don't they allow the steel to be monopolized? Don't they allow the tobacco to be monopolized? And if they had a spite against the Democratic party they would allow the whisky trust to control the whisky. (Laughter and applause.) Don't they allow the Anthracite Coal company to control the coal supply? I think we have reason to thank the Almighty that he has kept to himself the control of the rains and the seasons. So we don't have to thank the Republican party for the rain when it comes, or the sunshine that matures our crops.

### HOW TO AID FARMER.

But, my friends, how can the Republican party help the farmer? In two ways. It can either increase his crop, or the price he gets for it. Does it increase his crop? You know it doesn't. Does it increase the price he gets for it? We will go back to 1896 and see. In 1896 they said we had enough money; and if you laboring men will resurrect the literature they circulated amongst you, you will find that they told you to vote the Republican ticket because a dollar would buy more than it bought before; and now, when prices have risen more rapidly than the wages they tell you to vote the Republican ticket because your dollar won't buy as much as it did before.

Now, what brought better prices? More money. And from what sources did more money come? Why, the first element of increase was the money that came from Europe when we had a good crop and they had a famine. Did the Republican party bring the good crop? No. Did they bring the famine in Europe? No. Then they are not responsible for the increase that came from that source. The next source of an increase of money was the discovery of gold in the Klondike. Did they promise to discover more gold? No. Did they do it? No. Why, it was in the British possessions. Did the Republican party discover gold in the British possessions for the benefit of the United States? I would not have accused them of it until lately; but when I saw them send a representative over to England to see them put on the king's crown, I made up my mind that they would discover it anywhere. Where else did they get more money? From the coinage of the seigniorage. Did they want to do it? No. Why did they do it? Because it was put on as an amendment in order to get a bill passed that they wanted. And, let's see: In 1896 they told you that that was the kind of a dollar that we would have if we had the right kind of a ratio, and they have been there six years and they have never changed the ratio, and since 1896 they have coined more silver dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the consent of any other nation, than they have ever coined in the same length of time. They don't dare to change the ratio. (Great applause.)

### INCREASE OF CURRENCY.

Now, from what other source did they get an increase? Why, the increase in the volume of bank currency. Did they do that to help the people? No. They said the people didn't need help. They said you didn't need it. Why did they do it? Because the bankers wanted it, and they gave it to them in order that they might have more profit in the issuance of their bank notes. And they have an elastic currency—with the banks holding both ends of the elastic, so that they can stretch it or shorten it when they want to. And yet, my friends, that is the only element in the increase of the volume of money that you can trace to the Republican party and when they gave it to you they admitted that they were wrong in 1896 when they said that we had plenty of money, and that we didn't want any more. We have $500,000,000 more than we had in 1896. And if any Republican here thinks his party is vindicated, I want to ask him if he would be willing to return that $500,000,000 and go back to 1896, when we had no more money than we had then? I say the Republican party has been saved from the logic of its own position by the logic of circumstances, and instead of being grateful for that they turn around and try to destroy the very thing that rescued them. They tell us that they have enough money. Secretary Shaw is the highest Republican authority today, and he gave out an interview a while back in which he said that if you would go among the farmers and ask them how they were getting along and ask them how much money they had, and they would say they had plenty of money, and if you asked them where it was they would say in the local bank, and if you asked the local bank where it was they would say in the banks at Omaha, and if you asked the banks in Omaha where it was they would say it was in the banks at Chicago, and if you asked the banks in Chicago where it was they would say it was in the banks at New York, and if you asked the banks in New York where it was they would tell you that your $450,000,000 of it was loaned out on watered bonds and the monopolies of the east. And Mr. Shaw says, "It's all right, but I don't want anything to happen, because if anything happens the whole thing will fall down like the blocks of a child's playhouse." Now, Republicans, that is the testimony of your highest authority that you have got the farmer's money loaned four times over to run the country on, and then you don't dare to say a word, lest it fall down like the blocks of a child's playhouse. And yet, if you complain, they tell you it is none of your business; for you to go on and vote.

### CAN'T HAVE TOO MUCH MONEY.

I tell you if we opened every mint and allowed every dollar of silver that came from the mines to go to the mint and into the volume of money, we would not have too much money to furnish the people a sound and safe currency upon which to base a sound and safe financial system. And as long as you loan the same money four times over you have a boom when there is confidence, but a certain contraction the moment that confidence is lost; and that is what brings on panics in good times, to spend money that don't belong to you, and then when the times get bad you haven't the money to pay back what you have spent. And they call it a wise financial system. Why is it wise? Why do they call it wise? Because they can make more profit on a little money than they can in any other way, and it gives them control of the nation's finances.

I want to say to you that the issue of 1896 was not an issue between gold and silver. It was an issue between the money danger on the one side and the wealth producer on the other side. And that contest has gone on for thousands of years, and it will still go on, and you never can turn this over to the money chargers and expect them to take care of the masses of the people of the country.

Today they have the Fowler bank bill that they don't dare tell you about. It was introduced by a Republican; it was recommended by a Republican committee, and every Republican member of the committee voted for it, and it is set for consideration when congress meets after election in December. You never read it in a Republican paper; you never read a Republican editorial explaining it; you never have heard a speech explaining and defending it upon the stump. And yet there is that bill there that contains three distinct propositions that were never embodied in a Republican platform, and about which Republicans have never learned anything from a Republican paper.

### TREATED LIKE FILIPINOS.

Why, my friends, while the Republicans out here are talking about the Filipinos not being capable of self-government, the Republican leaders are treating them as if they were Filipinos and denying them the right to be consulted. I remember when the Elks first started up they told a story. They said the farmers would elect a man to office and the man in office would be the watchman on the tower, and the farmers would call up, "Watchman, what of the night?" and they say the only answer was, "Plow on! Plow on! Plow on!" I went down to Ohio the other day and I read an editorial in the Cleveland Leader, and it said the party would take care of them. What a blessed thing it is to be a Republican, and not have to think! Just vote, and the party will take care of you. (Laughter and applause.)

Let me tell you of this Fowler bill: It provides for an asset currency. Do you know what that is? Why, it is a bank currency, based on the assets of the bank. You deposit your money in the bank, the bank loans your money out, and then it calls that assets, and then gets new notes and loans them out on those notes. It is a double loaning of the people's money. More profit to the banks in good times, and less security to the people in bad times. Down in our state a few weeks ago they had a bank with assets, and the cashier took the assets one night after dark and went away and has not come back. What if they had an asset currency down there, with the assets gone? And yet, this, my friends, is a sample of the financial wisdom that is put forth by those who think that wisdom will die with them.

### AN ASSET CURRENCY.

And why do they want an asset currency? Why, they know that a bank currency resting on bonds will have to disappear when the bonds are paid, and as the bonds are paid off the competition to get them will raise the premium and lessen the profit to the bank, and so they think that while you are full and asleep they will just change it, and when you wake up you won't dare to say anything for fear you will bring on a panic in this country.

And what banking system does the bill provide for? A system whereby we will have a great central bank in the state of New York, with branches throughout the country; and when the system is established the branch bank will run out of business every other bank in town, for no ordinary bank can compete with a bank having fifty or one hundred millions behind it; and when the system is complete, a few men will meet behind closed doors in the city of New York and decide without appeal the terms and conditions upon which business will be done in all the villages and hamlets of the United States. Some of the small banks are getting scared. They have had meetings in Kansas City, Milwaukee and other places and protested against the currency bank. Why? Because they say it will drive all the little banks out of the country, and I said to a banker, "What's the matter with it?" He said it would drive all the other banks out. "Well," I said, "your bank is the biggest one in town; I should think it would be the branch bank." "Well, that's what they say," he said, "but we can't take chances on that, and we are against it." Now, I am going to help the small bank protect itself from the banking trust, and when he is saved all I will ask of him will be to protect the other people against all the other trusts.

### A GOLD SILVER DOLLAR.

They want to make the silver dollar redeemable in gold. You never asked for it. The silver dollar answers every purpose of business or finance; it buys what you need, and yet they want to make it from a real dollar into a dollar redeemable in gold. And when they do it they will have an endless chain $500,000,000 long. There is an old saying that if a man fools you once it is his fault; if he fools you twice it is your fault; but if he fools you three times whose fault is it? They have fooled you on the treasury notes; they have fooled you on the greenbacks. They said they were to be redeemed in gold, and then they tried the endless chain. And now they want to make the silver dollars redeemable in gold, and then you will have the endless chain again. They will demand their retirement, and when the system is complete, gold will be the only legal tender, and bank notes the only paper, and when the collapse comes the gold will go into hiding, and you will have to sell what you have at a sacrifice to get the only thing they want to make a legal tender in payment of debt. They tell you that the money question is settled, and yet half the world uses silver today, and when we drive that half to gold there isn't a nation on earth that has gold enough to furnish to people who need gold.

But pardon me, my friends, for digressing on this question so much and so long. I am glad that you have in the senate a man who stands on the Kansas City platform; a man who, like Rawlins, will stand there and protect these people from all the conspiracies of Wall street against the producing masses of the United States, and I hope you will send down to help him in the lower house that man who agrees with him on all these questions, and who has added to his desire to represent you and to protect your interests the experience that will make him a valuable member there, our candidate, Mr. King.

### PRESIDENTIAL DIGNITY.

But, my friends, I want to say a word on the tariff question. You will have to talk about that now. It looked as if you would not have to talk about it awhile back, but the president met down at Oyster Bay with five senators, and they decided that he would not say anything about the tariff question. Republicans, you said some pretty hard things about me, but I want to tell you that you never have said yet that I had to call five men into conference to find out what I would say on any subject. (Laughter and applause.) But I was very glad that Mr. Roosevelt went out to make speeches, because when I was a candidate for president and went out to make speeches they said it wasn't dignified, and it hurt my feelings, for if there is anything I am proud of, it is my dignity; and to have it said that I was not dignified, you can imagine my delight when your president went out to make stump speeches. So that he and I now bear the odium of not being dignified. They all said that he would not talk tariff, but something happened that same day.