

the fullness of time Porto Rico can be prepared for statehood as our territories have been prepared. In the case of Cuba, we secured her independence, declaring at the time that we had no desire to annex her territory. We are now simply assisting her in the establishing of self-government. It is hardly fair to limit her attempts too strictly or to say that she shall have only one trial. If Cuba becomes a part of the American union, it ought to be with the consent of her people and with the understanding that they come in as citizens and not as subjects, and the same may be said of San Domingo or any other country that is added to ours. There is no objection to annexation when annexation is mutually desired and means the extension of our institutions, as well as our sovereignty. Expansion, where our government undergoes no change in its character, is not imperialism. Imperialism is the name applied to a government where different forms of government are employed in the governing of different parts. England, for instance, is an empire. The people of England and Scotland live under one form of government, the people of Ireland live under a different form of government, the people of Canada, Australia and New Zealand live under a third form of government, and the people of India are subjected to a government based upon a still different theory. If the Philippine islands contained but a few people and they were near to us and wanted to come in, they would present a different problem, but the islands are not a part of the western hemisphere; they are close to the continent of Asia. The people are not few, but number something like eight millions; and they are opposed to annexation. They differ from us in race characteristics and in history, and the intercourse between our country and the islands is not intimate enough to give any assurance that they could be brought into harmonious co-operation with us. It would not be wise to admit the Filipinos to citizenship and erect their community into states. Their industrial conditions are so different from ours that they could not intelligently participate in the making of our laws, and we can not intelligently make theirs.

If they are to be held at all they are to be held as colonies, and a colonial policy is entirely inconsistent with the theory of our government. Our government is based upon the doctrine that governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, and this doctrine is either true or false. If it is true, then we can not exercise a colonial policy and permanently administer over the Filipinos a government to which they object. To do so is inconsistent with our own theories, and we could not defend our colonial policy without attacking the basis upon which our own government rests. We can not afford as a people to surrender our political principles, our political axioms and our position as a world teacher in order to adopt a colonial policy.

Senator Beveridge insists that "every reason of history, nature and the character of our race supports this policy" (the policy of permanent occupation). He declares that "throughout all ages administrative people have developed and have extended their customs and their cultures by the administration of government to less developed people." He finds a second reason "in the character of our race." He alleges that "the people of our blood and we ourselves have always been restless expansionists." A third: "We must have more foreign trade."

His reasons are not sufficient. Moral principles can not be so easily ignored. It is true that history has given us many illustrious examples of nations which have extended their governments over weaker nations, but history has also shown us the final overthrow of these conquering nations which substituted might for right and ignored the claims of justice—

"For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet."

Neither is it sufficient to say that servient nations have been helped by the dominant ones. Good comes out of everything. There is no doubt that the black race brought to this country by the slave-traders has advanced far beyond what it would have done had the slave-trader been unknown, and yet, back about a century ago, our people decided that the slave trade should be prohibited. There is no doubt that the man who came up from slavery is farther advanced than his collateral relatives who remained in Africa, and yet public sentiment reached a point where slavery gave way to freedom.

It is true that there has been a good deal of the spirit of adventure in our race, and it

is true that our ancestors have done many things that we will never attempt to justify. It is doubtless true that some good has often come from things wickedly designed, but we can not justify the doing of evil that good may come, nor can we excuse a criminal act on the ground that an overruling Providence will convert our sin into a blessing. If we have any tendencies to extend our possessions by ignoring the moral law, it is better to correct such tendencies than to encourage them. The doctrine that we just can not help doing wrong "because it is natural" is not considered a sufficient defense in court, and it should not be so considered among nations merely because there is no nation great enough to punish the nation that yields to an irresistible impulse to do evil.

To be sure, it is called "destiny" when a nation does wrong, but destiny has been defined as "the dark apology for error." It is the plea of the weak, who, lacking the moral courage to withstand temptation, seek to load their sins upon the Almighty. The third reason is the real one. In presenting history and race characteristics the senator has simply fallen unconsciously into the use of terms which others have employed as a subterfuge, but in suggesting the expansion of our commerce as a reason for imperialism he is putting forth the argument which really has been most potential in the making of imperialists. But the purchase of trade with human blood, the sacrifice of rights and principles of government in order to obtain a market—what is this but putting the dollar above the man? It was Lincoln's boast in 1854 that his party believed in both the dollar and the man, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. What would he say now if he could reply to Indiana's illustrious republican senator, who justifies the bartering away of the fundamental principles of free government in order to make a market for our merchandise?

As a matter of fact, no argument is more unsubstantial than the trade argument. More than a century ago Franklin pointed out to the representatives of the English government that no one could justify the purchase of trade with blood, and that, as a matter of dollars and cents, trade purchased at the cannon's mouth was dearly bought. Our own experience proves that there is a financial loss in an attempt to extend our trade by force. We have not only been willing to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage, but we have failed to get the pottage.

The senator gives us but one side of the account; he magnifies our trade and ignores the cost to us. We are appropriating for the army and navy more than one hundred millions a year in excess of our army and navy appropriations ten years ago. Our increased expenditures far exceed our increased trade, and all of the people pay the expenses, while a few get the benefit of the trade.

THE HAYWOOD TRIAL

Now that the trial of William D. Haywood is over, The Commoner can without impropriety comment on the case. In the last issue satisfaction was expressed at the verdict, but as the acquittal was announced just as we were going to press we could do no more than record the result.

The case deserves a place among the celebrated trials of the nation, and it is not too much to say that both sides were presented with consummate care and ability. The arguments made by Senator Borah for the state, and by Clarence Darrow for the defense, could scarcely be surpassed in force and eloquence; all was done that earnestness or talent could suggest to impress the evidence upon the jury and the judge's instructions were clear and to the point. That the jury should have so speedily acquitted was a triumph which even the defense could hardly expect. When the feeling existing in Idaho is considered—a feeling causing an unconscious bias for or against the miners in the minds of honest men—it would not have been surprising if the jury had disagreed. That the opinion among the jurors was almost unanimous on the first ballot makes the vindication more noteworthy.

It must be remembered that the state not only chose the place of trial, but kidnapped the defendants in another state, and hurried them to Idaho without opportunity to contest the extradition. While the United States supreme court held the kidnapping legal the decision can not relieve the authorities of the charge of engaging in a conspiracy unworthy of state officials. But Haywood may well rejoice that he

was kidnapped for the clandestine deportation adds completeness to his triumph.

But the verdict is more than a personal victory; it is a victory for the labor organization with which Haywood was connected. It would have seriously embarrassed the labor movement if wilful murder could have been traced to labor officials. The American people will not tolerate conspiracies to commit crime and all friends of labor have reason to rejoice that a jury of disinterested men has rejected the evidence presented and declared the defendant not guilty. The trial, too, while removing the suspicion cast on Haywood by Orchard's confession will be a warning to labor leaders to avoid association with those who, like Orchard, discredit the wageearners by suggesting violence as a remedy for their grievances.

The acquittal must also be regarded as a vindication of the jury system. Here were twelve disinterested men who bound themselves by oath to do justice between the state and the accused; for nearly three months they listened to witnesses, to lawyers and to the judge, and then they retired to the jury room and, recognizing their responsibility, returned a concrete definition of justice which a nation approves. No such confidence could be reposed in a single judge as is reposed in a jury, and a judge might well shrink from the discharge of such a duty as the Haywood jury bravely performed.

A judge would have former or future trials to consider, and public opinion might have weight with him, but these men had only this case to think of and, after administering justice they retire from public view. They could act with a freedom which no judge could feel and it is this very freedom to consider each case on its merits that furnishes one of the strongest arguments in favor of the jury system.

The friends of the defendant, the friends of labor and the friends of trial by jury can find cause for rejoicing in the acquittal of William D. Haywood.

OF COURSE NOT

The Washington Post solemnly declares that Mr. Cortelyou does not hunt delegates with a brass ball. No, indeed; "far be it from such." Mr. Cortelyou has always worked a different scheme when he went out after political game. Grasping the handle of the superheated fryingpan, Mr. Cortelyou soon has enough "campaign fat in stock, and while this is sizzling hot he pours it over the caudal appendage of the game he seeks. This system has the old-fashioned plan of "putting salt on its tail" beaten to a standstill.

THE PRIMARY PLEDGE

As this copy of The Commoner may be read by some one not familiar with the details of the primary pledge plan, it is necessary to say that according to the terms of this plan every democrat is asked to pledge himself to attend all of the primaries of his party to be held between now and the next democratic national convention unless unavoidably prevented, and to secure a clear, honest and straightforward declaration of the party's position on every question upon which the voters of the party desire to speak. Those desiring to be enrolled can either write The Commoner approving the object of the organization and asking to have their names entered on the roll, or they can fill out and mail the blank pledge, which is printed on page 15.

PRAISING ROOSEVELT

Some of the democratic papers criticize Mr. Bryan for commending certain of the president's utterances and efforts, but these criticisms will not prevent an expression of appreciation of the educational work the chief executive is doing.

The president is entitled to commendation even from political opponents when he says or does anything good. One must be narrow minded indeed to refuse to do justice to an official merely because he belongs to another party. Then, too, one raises a suspicion as to his own sincerity if he loses interest in a righteous policy because some one else advocates it. But there is a good partisan reason why democrats should commend the president when he urges the adoption of democratic doctrine.

President Roosevelt advocates railroad regulation, trust prosecution, the income tax and arbitration of labor troubles. All of these were demanded by democratic platforms when republican platforms were silent on the subject. It