The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 7. No. 30.

Lincoln, Nebraska, August 9, 1907. Whole Number 342.

CONTENTS

GOVERNING DEPENDENCIES GOOD FOR LANDIS FORAKER'S CHALLENGE THE HAYWOOD TRIAL PRAISING ROOSEVELT HOPKINS ON DINGLEY RATES A BILLION DOLLAR ASSET "THE SOURCE OF BRYANISM" WATERLOGGED STOCK WASHINGTON LETTER COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS HOME DEPARTMENT WHETHER COMMON OR NOT NEWS OF THE WEEK

GOOD FOR LANDIS

Judge Kenesaw M. Landis is a conspicuous figure at this moment—conspicuous because, in a proceeding pending in his court, he had the courage to impose the extreme penalty against history's greatest pirate on the sea of commerce.

It is true that fines are not adequate to meet the situation for the reason that the criminals can often afford to pay the fines for the privilege of continuing the violation of law. Some have expressed the hope that Judge Landis would not impose the maximum fine because they feared the oil trust would merely increase the price to the consumers and make them pay the enormous fines even as they have been required to pay the "generous" contributions made by Mr. Rockefeller to educational funds. But Judge Landis had nothing to do with that theory and it is well he imposed the maximum figure.

It is more than likely that the oil trust will shift the burden to the consumers, but this will only aid in the crystalization of that public sentiment that will be expressed so forcefully that men in authority will cease to trifle with the violations of anti-trust laws and will vigorously enforce that criminal law which provides for the imprisonment of the arrogant monopolist even as the common rogue is imprisoned.

Good for Landis. And new let us havejust as a beginning-a few prosecutions under the criminal clause of he Sherman anti-trust law.

0000

FORAKER'S CHALLENGE

On another page will be found Senator Foraker's challenge to Secretary Taft. This would indicate war between the senator and secretary. As a result of the senator's opposition six members of the state committee voted against the endorsement of Secretary Taft, the vote standing fifteen to six.

While democrats can not sympathize with Mr. Foraker's standpat views on the tariff question they can heartily approve of his demand upon Mr. Taft for a clear statement of his position. The people are entitled to know how much tariff reform he favors, when he wants to begin and how far he wants to go. Will he meet the issue presented by Senator Foraker or will he dodge?

There are several other questions that Senator Foraker might have presented but the tariff question will give him plenty to think of for the present.

0000 KNOX AND PRITCHARD

No one has mentioned Judge Pritchard yet as republican candidate for president. would "Knox and Pritchard" sound?



A PECULIAR POSITION FOR A REFORMER

Governing Dependencies

It will not be necessary to discuss the illustrations given by Senator Beveridge except insofar as those illustrations are pertinent to the subject under consideration, and that subject is imperialism. Few republicans have shown the courage that Senator Beveridge has in meeting the issue presented; most of them evade it. While the Filipinos were in arms they excused themselves from discussing the subject on the ground that they could not talk to people who had guns in their hands. When the Filipinos laid down their arms, these same persons declared that the matter was settled and that there was nothing to discuss. Even Senator Beveridge seems a little timid about taking hold of the real principle involved, and, so far as we know it is the only question of which he has shown any fear whatever. He says: "So we see by practical examination of actual conditions in the Philippines, Porto Rico, Cuba and £an Domingo that there not only is not, but never has been, an issue of imperialism, if by that term is meant the doing of something that we ought not to do. On the contrary, if by imperialism is meant the general policy of permanently holding and administering government in these various possessions, that, as we have pointed out, is so far in the future that it is not a subject for immediate or even early settlement." At no other question does he shy so, and if the question scares him, what a specter it must be to the republican politicians who are less frank and candid in the statement of their opinion.

But, plucking up courage, he expresses his willingness to join issue "on a general policy of permanent occupation of these islands-Ha-

waii, the Philippines, Porto Rico now; Cuba, if she again tries self-government, again fails and we are again compelled to intervene; and San Domingo-when the years demonstrate to us and the world that we can not get out of it if we would and ought not to get out if we could."

Here we have the bald proposition that colonialism is to be a permanent thing; that we are to hold what we now have, take Cuba if she makes one more effort at self-government and fails, and later San Domingo "if," and he clearly intimates that the failure of self-government in both Cuba and San Domingo is to be not only expected, but even desired.

Before taking up colonialism as it presents itself in the case of the Philippines, let us consider for a moment Hawaii, Porto Rico and Cuba. In Hawaii a republic had been instituted and annexation asked for. There is some question about the extent of the uprising upon which the republic was built and about the disinterestedness of our nation's conduct, but as the people of Hawaii are apparently satisfied to be citizens of the United States, and as the islands are too small to support an independent government and too near to us for us to permit them to fall into the hands of a foreign government, the question presented is quite different from that presented by the Philippines. We can deal with Hawaii according to American principles and within the limits of our constitution. The same may be said of Porto Rico. The people of Porto Rico welcomed annexation, and they are so few in numbers that we can admit them to citizenship and give the island representation in congress without dan jer to our government. In