

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 2. No. 18.

Lincoln, Nebraska, May 23, 1902.

Whole No. 70.

Mothers Have Earned a Rest.

As summer approaches preparation should be made for a summer vacation. It is a matter of regret that so many are not able to take such a vacation, and a matter of still deeper regret that the vacation, when taken, often goes to the member of the family who least needs it, while those who have best earned it, have no relief from the daily routine of life.

As a rule, the wife needs a vacation more than the husband, for her life is more monotonous and is less relieved by social intercourse. The wife who does her own work, in whole or in part, finds work to occupy her time from the rising hour to the hour of retirement, and it is of a character that wears upon her by constant and unvarying repetition. The wife of the laborer, the country merchant, the professional man of moderate means, and even more, the wife of the farmer—these need more change and rest than they usually secure.

While The Commoner is published primarily for the discussion of questions affecting government, sociology, and political economy, it seeks to serve the interests of the family in every useful way, and it urges upon its readers the importance of a reasonable summer vacation. While it is endeavoring to secure conditions that will permit an increasing proportion to enjoy the luxury of refreshing rest, it reminds its readers that even under present conditions many shorten their lives by working more continuously than is absolutely necessary. A summer vacation need not entail a great amount of expenditure. A short period, even a week, of absolute relief from the daily round of daily work and care is like an oasis. It not only strengthens a person for a longer service, but makes the service more pleasant. It usually would require but a little sacrifice on the part of the husband and children to enable the wife and mother to secure this respite. Sons and daughters often throw away every year in useless expenditure enough money to pay for the mother's outing, and certainly they would find more pleasure in seeing her freshened and invigorated than they can find in spending the sum upon themselves. In return for the great care that the mother gives and the constant sacrifice that she makes from the time the child is born until it reaches the grave, she ought to be able to count upon a consideration that is too often withheld. This would be a good year to inaugurate the change.

Boys—and girls, too—try it and see how much happiness you will get out of a little sacrifice made for mother's sake.

Hysteria.

Colonel Woodruff, counsel for General Smith, declared that the court-martial proceedings against Smith were called "in deference to noisy public sentiment, fostered for unknown and ignoble purposes until hysteria was produced."

That is the characteristic republican answer. Every protest that is made against inhumanity, every appeal in behalf of good principles, every criticism of dishonest methods, every con-

demnation of torture—all these things are the result of "hysteria!"

The only self-possessed, sensible people in the world today, the only people whose opinions are entitled to weight, are those who unhesitatingly take their stand beside class interests, who uphold impositions practiced by the strong upon the weak, who commend the trust system as the essential element of progress and prosperity, who approve the killing of boys over ten years of age and the order to transform a territory into a howling wilderness, who commend torture as a means to force men to betray their comrades in arms!

All others are "hysterical."

TRY THE AMERICAN WAY

Jacob Schurman, formerly president of the Philippine commission, in an article in the Independent, says:

"What, I ask, do you want in the Philippines? More particularly, why in any part of Luzon and the Visayan islands are you making a howling wilderness and killing children over ten years of age? It will be said that these are the unhappy incidents of war, which is always a stern affair, very different from the holiday-making into which civilians would turn it. Be it so. Why, then, are we making war? Here are 6,500,000 fellow Christians of ours—the only Christian nation in Asia—as highly civilized as most of the people of Central and South America. What do we want of them? We have never told them.

"Thank God, there is a more excellent way. Drop coercion and try conciliation. Give the Filipinos what they want, not what you think is good for them. Regard them not as Sioux or Apache Indians, but as Christianized and civilized brown men, ranking with the Japanese."

The Chicago Record-Herald recently demanded that the Moros in the Philippines be conciliated; but if any republican paper has insisted upon conciliation for the Christian Filipinos, we have failed to observe it.

Mr. Schurman's suggestion is directly in line with the Kansas City platform which promised an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America.

And why is not this the proper plan? Why is it not the part of wisdom to substitute conciliation for brutality? Why is it not the part which a civilized people should play in their dealings with their fellow beings?

American citizens who have become restless under this policy of imperialism have been told to depend upon the republican party for a wise solution of the problem; and the Filipinos have been asked to depend upon the generosity of the republican party to give them "all the liberty they are capable of enjoying."

But the Filipinos want independence and it is to the interests of this country, both in the discharge of its duty in the presence of the principles upon which it was founded and in accordance with practical considerations, that this government make an explicit pledge to the Filipinos that we will treat them as we promised to treat the Cubans.

Mr. Schurman is correct when he says "there is a more excellent way" of dealing with these people than under the policy which we have adopted. It is the American way; and this government cannot hope to be relieved of its embarrassments until it solves the Philippine problem along American lines, in accordance with the suggestion made by Mr. Schurman and in harmony with the pledges made by the democrats in the Kansas City platform.

The President And the King.

In a speech delivered at the banquet given to Whitelaw Reid at New York on the evening of May 14, Senator Chauncey M. Depew undertook to justify the appointment of a special delegation to represent the United States at the coronation ceremonies of King Edward VII.

Senator Depew seemed to be particularly desirous of providing an answer to the claim that inasmuch as the British ambassador, regularly stationed at Washington, was the only representative which the king of England had at the inaugural ceremonies of the president of the United States, the American ambassador, regularly stationed at King Edward's court, provided sufficient representation for the United States at the crowning of a king. In other words, it was held that representation that would suffice for a monarchy at the inaugural ceremonies of a president would suffice for a republic at the coronation ceremonies of a king.

Evidently in reply to this suggestion, Senator Depew said:

"So long as the people of other countries leave their sovereignty in the hands of their sovereign his accession becomes a matter of national and international significance. The people of the United States took the sovereignty of their king to themselves. The president is only their agent, checked by congress and the supreme court. The inauguration of a president, therefore, marks no change of sovereignty."

In other words, in Mr. Depew's view, the inauguration of a president is an insignificant affair compared with the crowning of a king.

Now, as a matter of fact, the powers of the king of England are insignificant compared with the powers of the president. In truth, the king of England long ago ceased to be anything but a figurehead, something before which the English people could bow and scrape—a living thing in the presence of which they could pay tribute to the monarchical notion.

While King Edward will be formally crowned on June 26, it is true that for more than a year he has been king. When Queen Victoria died and the office passed to her son, there was not the slightest change in the policies of the British government. A change in the policies of the British government takes place when the ministry is changed. One king could die every week and another king take his place and the only disturbance it would create would be the rustle and bustle of the flunkies to pay tribute at the feet of the new found royalty.

Common politeness is necessary between civilized governments and the democrat will claim that this essential is fully complied with when his government is represented at the coronation ceremonies of the king by similar representation which the king has at the inaugural ceremonies of our president; and the democrat will protest against any extraordinary representation which might place this government in the attitude of being over-zealous to pay homage to a system of government that is essentially hostile to our own system of government.

But when a republican like Senator Depew