

THE WEEKLY PRESS FORUM.

Mr. Bryan and the Peace Treaty.

Maryville (Mo.) Forum: If the reorganizers have nothing better to offer than Clevelandism and Hillism let democracy beware.

Helena (Mon.) Independent: It is time to reciprocate and interfere with our Philippine business "in the interests of humanity."

Bolivar (Mo.) Herald: The appropriation for the army this year is one hundred million dollars. Before the republican party got in the last time it was twenty-five.

Little Falls (Minn.) Herald: "At first there was no cruelty. Then—if there was—it was "mild." Then—when it was proved that there had been cruelty—it was all right, anyway. Do you recognize the argument?"

Jordan (Minn.) Independent: The administration is making less fuss about Smith's cruelties than it made about Miles' alleged bad manners.

Greencastle (Ind.) Star Press: The people can defeat the proposed ship subsidy steal by defeating the republican candidates for congress at the next election. This is their only hope of relief.

Gladbrook (Ia.) Northern: The whole country seems to be beefing about the beef trust and railing at the railroad trust. It is now up to the government to dehorn the former and derail the latter.

Madison (Nebr.) Mail: Why not have two "heroes" on the republican ticket in 1904? Roosevelt and Funston, one the author of "Alone in Cuba" and the other "How I Kidnapped Aguinaldo."

Elizabethtown (Ky.) News: The way democratic senators are attacking the Philippine policy is almost as severe as the water cure. At least it has had the effect of making the republicans talk.

Monmouth (Ill.) Democrat: It is barely possible the republicans will have little to say about the "full dinner pail" this year. Meat is too high and the average dinner pail will be rather deficient in that respect.

Darlington (Wis.) Democrat: Do not honest republicans view with increasing uneasiness the growing tendency in their party to apologize for imperialism, condone cruelty and place legislation on sale to those who would profit by it?

Avondale (Pa.) Herald: Now that the bottom has fallen out of the "full dinner pail" and "benevolent assimilation" has proved to be a myth and a delusion, may we ask of what timber the republican party purposes building a platform in 1904?

Dillon (Mon.) Examiner: The ship-subsidy bill has been pigeonholed. It was found that republican congressmen from interior districts would have too much trouble explaining it with glittering generalities about the "restoration of our merchant marine."

Sulphur Springs (Tex.) Democrat: The reorganizers will please pardon and excuse the 6,500,000 democrats who stood to their guns and posts in 1896 and 1900 if they flatly refuse to even go out on the skirmish line in 1904 under such recreant leadership.

Mt. Gilead (O.) Register: If the people would look for relief from oppression by trusts they must call upon the democratic party. Its position on the trust question is clear and unequivocal and it means what it says. Its record is proof of that. As much cannot be said of the republican party, which has saddled the trusts and pat-tered them on the back until they have grown up to be its masters.

Emmetsburg (Ia.) Democrat: Had Weyer issued an order to kill all Cubans over ten years of age it would have taken log chains to keep under control certain Americans who are now as quiet as oysters. The sense of fairness of some people is scarcely skin deep.

Lexington (N. C.) Dispatch: When confronted with the conduct of the beef trust, the republican politicians tell working people to quit eating meat and thus force the big trust to terms. Last year it was the "full dinner pail," now they say go with an empty stomach.

Easton (Mo.) Star: Trusts and tariff revision have come to be live political issues, and elections will go as public opinion goes in these matters. It is a certainty that the sentiment of the people is against trusts and for the abolition of tariffs for trusts.

Upper Sandusky (O.) Chief: Carnegie hit the nail on the head when, in speaking of the big shipping combine, he said: "It is purely a matter of money making. There is no question of patriotism in trade. It does not care a fig for a flag. It is dividends that count."

Chicago Public: "I suppose that the Filipinos are very deceitful," remarked the imperialist, as he saluted the flag. "Oh, they are," exclaimed Lieut. Returne. "they deceive without shame. Why, I have actually seen Filipino mothers swear up and down that their grown up children were not ten years old."

Bound Brook (N. J.) Record: An undertaker's trust is the latest. The beef trust is killing people by starvation and making work for the undertakers, who are not satisfied with plenty of business and a fair profit, so they form a trust to advance prices. It is fast coming to a pass where a man can neither afford to live or die.

Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger: The organs of "benevolent assimilation"—with hydraulic attachment—are taking another tack. They are now excusing the murder of Filipinos, with death by torture, water cures, village-burning, and the other accompaniments of the Smith-Waller campaign, on the ground that "the other fellow began it."

Auburn (Nebr.) Granger: Why was it that our Philippine commission had never learned that the most atrocious, heartless and cold blooded murders were being committed on the island of Samar under orders from General Smith? Was it because the salaries of these commissioners is so small that they are unable to look after such matters?

Broken Bow (Nebr.) Beacon: The republicans are determined to retire the greenbacks and enlarge the power of the national banks. It looks like they were in a position to command the situation. While the people are enjoying a brief breathing spell, such schemes are easy and the people almost unconsciously yield themselves as victims.

Bellaire (O.) Democrat: It is possible that the Kansas City platform was not perfection, and that some of its provisions were visionary, and would have been better eliminated, but with all its imaginary defects, the most ultra of its opposers in the party are generally free to admit that its successful carrying out would not have placed this country in the imperial aristocratic course, so dangerous to a free people, upon which it is rushing, nor have left the people a trust-ridden, monopoly-burdened one, with worse to follow.

Senator Edward M. Carmack in his admirable speech delivered in the senate on April 25th and April 26th, replied to the charge that Mr. Bryan had seized upon the Philippine question in order to force an issue with the administration. On this point Mr. Carmack said:

"The distinguished senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Spooner), in his brilliant apology for the course of his party, seemed to charge that we were moving in pursuance of some hellish design, that we were actuated by pure sin and devilishness in presenting our view as to what should be the course and policy of this government in dealing with the Philippine islands. He said that we had prostituted this question to base and wicked partisan purposes.

"Mr. President, when one looks over the list of great and honored republicans who have opposed themselves with all their zeal and energy to the policy of this and the preceding administration, and when he sees that it includes every survivor of those who bore a conspicuous part in the formation and foundation of the republican party, it ought to occur to him that there is something more in this opposition than democratic wickedness and depravity; that there is something more in it than treason to the republic.

"The senator from Wisconsin said that Mr. Bryan has seized upon this question in order to force an issue with the administration. Unfortunately for the senator, the facts of history are against him. It is well known that for a long time the administration was in serious doubt and perplexity as to whether or not it should demand a cession of the Philippine islands. It was known that many leading republicans, including members of the president's own cabinet, were opposed to that policy. Every public utterance of Mr. McKinley himself had indicated a contrary intention.

"Now, sir, long before the treaty of peace was negotiated, long before the administration had resolved its own doubts and perplexities, long before a single man in the United States knew or could possibly have known what would be the policy of the administration, before the administration itself knew, Mr. Bryan had openly declared against the annexation of the Philippine islands, or the annexation, by force or otherwise, of distant territory or of territory inhabited by a people who could not be assimilated with our own.

"At that time the public utterances of Mr. McKinley and the public utterances of Mr. Bryan upon this question were in absolute accord. They both believed and had declared that the forcible annexation of a country without the consent of its people would be a crime; and if the administration had adhered to that noble sentiment as faithfully as Mr. Bryan adhered to it there would have been no issue, no conflict of opinion between them. Mr. Bryan did not seek to make, and he did not make, an issue with the administration. It was not until the administration had abandoned the position which they had occupied in common that he found himself in conflict with its views. The only basis for the charge that Mr. Bryan seized upon this question for an issue rests upon the fact, and upon that fact alone, that he refused to abandon his own declared convictions simply because a republican administration had reversed its own.

"Mr. President, I wish to read here an extract from an address delivered by Mr. Bryan at Omaha on the 14th of June, 1898. In that address he said: "To inflict upon the enemy all pos-

sible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the orient merely because our ships won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila?"

"If others turn to thoughts of aggrandizement and yield allegiance to those who clothe land covetousness in the attractive garb of "national destiny," the people of Nebraska will, if I mistake not their sentiments, plant themselves upon the disclaimer entered by congress and insist that good faith shall characterize the making of peace as it did the beginning of war. Goldsmith calls upon statesmen

"\* \* \* To judge how wide the limits stand

Between a splendid and a happy land." "If some dream of the splendors of a heterogeneous empire circling the globe, we shall be content to aid in bringing enduring happiness to a homogeneous people, consecrated to the purpose of maintaining a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

"That address, sir, was delivered on the 14th day of June, 1898, in the very same month and within a very few days of the time when Admiral Dewey sent his famous cable dispatch testifying to the capacity of the Filipinos for independence and self-government. No man at that time knew, or could have known, that the administration would adopt the very opposite policy from that which it had itself declared. What is true with respect to Mr. Bryan is true with reference to democrats in both branches of congress.

"It is not true that the democrats in the senate sought to make this a party question. The records of the senate disclose the very opposite to be the truth. They show that the democrats made every effort to remove it from party politics. If the Vest amendment to the treaty had been adopted, or if the Bacon resolution, which was defeated only by the casting vote of the vice-president, had been adopted, the question of annexation as a party issue would have died with the ratification of that treaty, would never have been named in a party platform, or heard of in a political campaign.

"The plain truth of the matter is that the republicans themselves seized upon their question and made it an issue. They believed that the people had gone mad with the rage for conquest. They believed, in the language of one of their ablest newspaper supporters, that the "taste of empire was in the mouth of the people, even as the taste of blood in the jungle."

"You sought to reap party profit and advantage from the passions of the hour, and it does not lie in your mouths to challenge the motives or the sincerity of men who, when you weakly and pusillanimously yielded, manfully and heroically breasted the storm.

"Another argument put forward by the senator is that we are actually estopped from debating this question at all. He dwells with unctious upon the fact that Mr. Bryan urged the ratification of the treaty and that a number of democratic senators voted for its ratification, and he seeks to deduce from this fact the conclusion that we are logically precluded from any further agitation of the question; that we are bound by any policy the republican party may elect to pursue. I want to ask, Mr. President, whether a single senator upon that side of the chamber attributed any such significance to a vote for ratification when that question was in debate? Was there a single leader of the republican

(Continued on Page 12.)