

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 4. No. 13.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 15, 1904.

Whole No. 169.

## KANSAS IS IN LINE

The democratic state convention of Kansas, recently held, came out with a ringing indorsement of the platforms of 1896 and 1900 and demanded the nomination of candidates in sympathy with those platforms. Good for Kansas! The reorganizers can find no comfort in that state. An indorsement of the Kansas City platform would have been sufficient, for that platform contains an indorsement of the Chicago platform, but the Kansas convention indorsed both. In its courageous maintenance of democratic principles the Kansas convention has set an example that other states may well follow. If the same spirit pervades the St. Louis convention we shall have an aggressive campaign in which the republicans will be upon the defensive all along the line.

While Mr. Bryan appreciates the complimentary reference made to him by the Kansas convention, he does not desire to have the harmony of any democratic convention disturbed by a resolution commendatory of him. He is not a candidate for anything, and it matters little what any convention thinks of him, but it does matter a great deal what a convention thinks of democratic principles.

## The Officeholder's Opinion.

A press dispatch from St. Louis says that "Judge L. R. Wilfley, attorney general for the Philippines," returned to his home recently, and then he is quoted as saying:

"The government of the islands or the question of possession or autonomy should not be an issue in the coming presidential campaign. I believe that the islanders should be allowed to reach, under the present form of government, a position which would qualify them for self-government. I believe that the idea advanced by many of our prominent and conscientious public men—President Eliot of Harvard, for instance—that the islands should be made free, as Cuba is, should not receive recognition in the platforms of the parties.

"The question is not, shall we keep the islands? It is, how shall we best govern them. It is not, did we do right in taking them. It is, what is the best way to uplift them? The Philippines have no place in partisan politics."

It is not strange that those who find a profit in governing the Philippine islands are opposed to giving independence to the people, but why are they unwilling to make the matter an issue and submit it to the judgment of the people? In 1900 the republicans denied that they intended imperialism; they denounced us in unmeasured terms because we accused them of contemplating imperialistic plans and methods. Even after the election of 1900 President McKinley declared that there was no thought of imperialism in the American mind. During the campaign people were told that we could not negotiate with men in arms; that the Filipinos must lay down their weapons and submit to our authority, and that then we could discuss the future with them. But as soon as they were overcome by force and strategy, they were told that there was no question to consider, that the question had been settled. Ex-Secretary

Long declared the same thing in a speech in Massachusetts, and now a returning office-holder tells us that it is not a question whether we shall keep the islands, but how we shall best govern them. That is exactly the attitude of George III. during the days of the revolution. He refused to consider the question of letting the colonies go, and that, too, upon the same grounds that the republican leaders refuse to let the Philippine islands go. George III. denied that the people were entitled to self-government or capable of it—that is the position of the republicans today, and they confess the weakness of their position when they declare that it is not an issue.

The question of imperialism has never been passed upon by the American people. Will the republicans deny that the people have a right to decide so important a question? If imperialism is right, why do the republicans run from it? If they believe that their policy is defensible, let them write in their platform a plank declaring that they favor a colonial policy in which the Filipinos shall be governed by an outside force, taxed without representation and ruled without their consent. But no, they will do as they did in 1900—deceive the people, dodge real issues, and shout "prosperity," while the corporations continue to plunder the people in return for campaign funds.

## "CALM, SUBDUED, DISCIPLINED."

Writing to the Chicago Record-Herald from Washington, Walter Wellman says: "It is a new Roosevelt we have now—a man who by self-discipline has almost made himself over and into another being. Compared with the Roosevelt who came into the White house by virtue of a decree of fate, the Roosevelt of today is a man calm, subdued, disciplined."

It must be confessed that it looks that way. The American people have not forgotten that while Mr. Roosevelt was vice president, he delivered a speech at Minneapolis in which speech he said something about shackling cunning as in the past we had shackled force. After Mr. Roosevelt entered the White house he made pretense at shackling cunning; but it was largely pretense, for soon after the United States supreme court delivered an opinion in which the Sherman anti-trust law was upheld, Mr. Roosevelt's attorney general announced that the administration did not intend to "run amuck" on the trust question.

No effort has been made to shackle cunning on the lines that are clearly laid down by the United States supreme court. The criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law remains unenforced upon the statute book, and it is becoming apparent to the people generally that the famous trust-busting administration has been "calmed, subdued, disciplined."

According to a recently published "crazy map," as it is called, the center of insanity seems to be in New England, the number of insane being nearly four times as great there in proportion to population as in the Rocky mountains. New York and Pennsylvania come next to New England in the proportion of insane persons. And yet these were the sections in which free silver was most bitterly denounced as a "craze."

## PARKER ALIAS BELMONT

The New York World, under big, black headlines, as will be seen from an extract reproduced on another page, reports that August Belmont went to Washington "representing Judge Parker's friends," and held a conference with certain democratic senators and representatives. According to the World, he returned to New York in a "jubilant mood," with messages to Hill and Murphy. Now that Mr. Joseph Pulitzer has taken charge of the publicity and advertising department of the Parker boom, we may expect to read in the World a great deal of conferences and pledges, intermingled with tables, figures and prognostications. Some weeks ago the New York Herald announced that the friends of Parker, Gorman and Olney had agreed upon August Belmont as the proper man for chairman of the democratic national committee in case the reorganizers regained control of the party, and now comes the World and informs us that Belmont has already taken charge of the Parker boom, and, as ambassador extraordinary, is negotiating for the delivery of the entire west and south. How much more evidence will it require to locate Judge Parker in the great contest between organized wealth and the masses? No better evidence of his unfitness for a democratic nomination could be given than that furnished by the selection of August Belmont as his financial agent and authorized envoy. Those who recall the Rothschild-Morgan contract entered into by Mr. Cleveland's administration, will remember that August Belmont & Co. signed the contract "on behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, London, and themselves." That contract was so obnoxious that the house of representatives refused to indorse it, and it was one of the principal items in the indictment brought by the democratic party against the Cleveland administration. When, after an heroic struggle, the democratic party repudiated the Cleveland administration and took the people's side on the money controversy, Mr. Belmont, along with other money magnates, bolted and threw his influence to the republican candidate. That he should be selected as the diplomatic representative of Judge Parker is sufficient proof that the judge's nomination would put the democratic party back in the Cleveland rut, and make the administration a co-partner with the Wall street syndicates.

Even if the party had not had its bitter experience with Mr. Cleveland it would have ample reason to avoid "a syndicated president," but with the experience of 1892 and 1896 fresh in the memory, it would be inexcusable, nay, even criminal folly, to put the destinies of the party and the country in the hands of a man mortgaged in advance to men of the Belmont type. Mr. Cleveland's servile and abject surrender to the money power not only divided the democratic party and caused the party's defeat in two presidential campaigns, but it threw away a political opportunity which, if properly utilized, would have made the democratic party invincible for a generation.

The World names a number of democratic senators as among those who conferred with Mr. Belmont in regard to the Parker campaign. The Commoner does not reproduce these names because it does not care to do injustice to any who may have been erroneously included in the list. What democrat with intelligence enough to secure a seat in the senate or house can be blind to the fact that a Belmont-Parker administration would be as disastrous to the party and to the nation as the Morgan-Cleveland administration was? If the party is to return to its wallow in the mire of plutocracy, it might just as well open