BRYAN'S MANAGER, JONES, ON "IGNORANT FOREIGNERS"

He Said that "Ignorant Foreigners" Comprised Fully One Half of the Number of Votes Received by McKinley.

Deliberate Assertion of Democratic National Chairman Jas. K. Jones, that "He Believed Devoutly that Bryan Had Been Elected and Was Swindled Out of the Presidency."

"He Believed that in 1900 the Bimetallic Forces Would Win a Great Victory—His Declaration That the Principles of 1896 Are Absolutely Essential to the Welfare of the Country."

(Extracts from the address of United States Senator James K. Jones, chairman of the Democratic national committee, before the Legislature of Arkansas.)

Bryan's manager, J. K. Jones, said:

"Hundreds of thousands of ignorant foreigners, who were here taking bread out of the mouths of honest labor, voted at the last election at the dictation of McKinley's supporters. These foreigners comprised fully one-half of the number of votes received by McKinley."

These are the words of the man who conducted the Democratic campaign in 1896. The same man is the present chairman of the Democratic national committee. He owes his position to the wish of Mr. Bryan.

The language quoted above was used in a speech. It is no remembered scrap of idle conversation. It was uttered in no heat of discussion. It was a deliberate expression.

"Hundreds of thousands of ignorant foreigners," said Chairman James K. Jones of the Democratic national committee, "who came here taking bread out of the mouths of honest labor, voted at the last election at the dictation of McKinley's supporters. These foreigners comprised fully one-half the number of votes received by McKinley."

And then on this basis that the Republican party owed success in 1896 to "ignorant foreigners," Chairman Jones proceeded to hold out the hope of success in 1900.

"Can there be any doubt," he asked, "as to which shall prevail, the six and one-half millions of intelligent Bryan voters or the three and one-half millions 'ignorant foreigners' who voted for McKinley?"

It will seem to sensible people almost incredible that the chairman of the Democratic national committee could make such statements in a public speech. But the Honorable Jas. K. Jones did it.

More than two months after the election of 1896 he uttered the assertion quoted.

The occasion was no less serious than an address before the Legislature of Arkansas. Senator Jones had just been elected to his third term in the United States Senate. On the 20th of January, 1897, the Senator appeared before an informal joint session of his State Legislature at the capitol in Little Rock. He returned his thanks to the people of Arkansas through their representatives, the Legislature, and then he proceeded to discuss the defeat of Bryan, speaking as the chairman of the Democratic national committee and the head of the management of the Democratic campaign. He said that he "believed devoutly that Bryan had been elected and was swindled out of the presidency."

He declared his belief "that in 1900 the bimetallic forces would win great victory." This still makes 16 to 1 the paramount issue.

He reasserted his conviction "that the principles he spoke for were absolutely essential to the welfare of the country." That is 16 to 1.

The Senator spoke for over an hour. Running through his speech were two principal thoughts. One was this idea, that Republican success had been achieved through the "ignorant foreigners," a result which the Senator resented in the name of the native Southern population which was "more American."

The other central idea with the Senator was the injustice of the unequal distribution of wealth. Upon this he dwelt with almost the emphasis which he gave to the "ignorant foreigners."

"What has been the cause of this great struggle?" the Senator asked. "The people are as honest and as industrious as they ever were. What, then, was the matter? The last census report shows that the wealth of the country was $65,000,000,000, or about $5,000 to each family of five members." The Senator quoted figures to show the inequality in the distribution of wealth. "Why was Massachusetts so much better off than Arkansas? Were they more industrious and more deserving?" He considered that the Southern people rank fully up to, if not ahead of, the people in the balance of the country. The Southern people are more completely Anglo-Saxon than those of the other States and therefore more American.

At this point the chairman of the Democratic national committee made one of the most remarkable of this series of startling statements for Arkansas consumption. He illustrated his assertion that the Southern people are "more American" than the rest of the country, in this way:

"It took the people of the combined North and East four years to conquer the Southern people, and the latter had built for them a pension list that was appalling."

The Senator's speech bristled with assertions intended to incite the spirit of class prejudice. He said:

"Millionaires and paupers grow on the same bush. When you make a millionaire you make dozens of paupers."

The men who advocated the gold standard the Senator described as "no better than a vile thief."

The argument by which he led up to this conclusion is interesting. The Senator said that in 1865 the national debt "amounted to $2,820,839,000." He showed "how many bales of cotton would have paid this debt then and how many now." Then he proceeded:

"The men who took the bonds then gave greenbacks worth about 50c in gold. Now they are paid in gold, thus doubling the burden upon the people. While 18,000,000 bales of cotton would have paid the debt when it was contracted, it would take 30,000,000 bales now to pay it, without interest." Senator Jones said "that he who undertook to make the people pay more than they had contracted to pay was no better than a vile thief."

"The rich Northern States," the Senator said, "yet after this sort of a contest Bryan received more than a million votes in excess of what Cleveland received in 1892. He believed devoutly that Bryan had been elected and was swindled out of the presidency. He told how the railroads, the banks and the bondholders arrayed against Bryan with a campaign fund the like of which was never before seen in this country, and which was used lavishly. Business men were intimidated by the threats of the money power. The Senator said, with great pride, he would never forget the liberal responses from the people of Arkansas to the Democratic campaign fund."

Predicting that the Republican party would drop the idea of the gold standard and endeavor to bring about bimetallism, the Senator said "the McKinleyites saw the handwriting on the wall."

"What has become of the promised prosperity?" the Senator asked.

"Mr. McKinley seems to be advancing, but the prosperity is not coming with him." Senator Jones said "the goldites had been put on notice." He believed "that in 1900 the bimetallic forces would win a great victory. Rising prices always bring prosperity, declining prices adversity. The repeal of the Sherman act had been followed by a decline of 10 per cent in prices. The cause of it was the striking down of one-half of the metallic money of the world." Senator Jones concluded by asserting his belief "that the principles he spoke for were absolutely essential to the welfare of the country."

In the midst of the enunciation of such views as these the Senator accounted for the election of the Republican ticket by declaring:

"HUNDERDS OF THOUSANDS OF IGNORANT FOREIGNERS, WHO ARE HERE TAKING THE BREAD OUT OF THE MOUTHS OF HONEST LABOR, VOTED AT THE LAST ELECTION AT THE DICTATION OF M'KINLEY'S SUPPORTERS. THESE FOREIGNERS COMPRISED ONE-HALF OF THE NUMBER OF VOTES RECEIVED BY M'KINLEY."

On the day after delivery the Senator's speech was reported in Arkansas Gazette, the principal Democratic paper of the State and the organ of the Democratic party. From that report, the accuracy of which has never been questioned by the Senator, the above is taken.

JONES ABUSES FOREIGN VOTERS

DEMOCRATS UNFIT TO GOVERN.

Why Ex-Senator W. A. Peffer Is Supporting McKinley.

In a published letter issued at Topeka, Kan., ex-U. S. Senator Peffer of that State says one of the principal reasons why he leaves the Demo-Populist party is that it is not fit to govern the country. His exact words are:

"The Democratic party is not fit to govern this country under modern conditions of universal freedom. Look back upon the second administration of President Cleveland. Upward of $250,000,000 in United States bonds were sold without special authority of Congress to procure gold for the redemption reserve. Most of the bonds were sold to or through syndicates of speculators at enormous profits.

"The Republicans were wiser. The war with Spain made large expenditures necessary; Congress authorized the borrowing of money, and $200,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds were sold to our own people in sums of $25 to $500. This is the fourth year of the McKinley administration, and not one dollar of gold has been bought or borrowed. The treasury now holds nearly, if not quite, $450,000,000 in gold coin and bullion, and there is plenty of money in the country for the transaction of the people's business."

On the Philippine question Mr. Peffer says: "The insurrection of Aguinaldo and his followers must be completely and permanently suppressed before civil government can be permanently established. In the meantime the President is exerting every effort to preserve order and protect all peaceably disposed persons.

"As before stated when one sovereign power cedes territory to another, the allegiance of the inhabitants is transferred to the new sovereign. 'The same act which transfers their country transfers the allegiance of those who remain in it.' That is the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the American Insurance Company vs. Canter, 1 Peters, 511.

"Our national title to the Philippines is as good in law as the titles we hold for our homes; and the allegiance of the Filipinos to the United States is due the same as that of the people of Alaska or Hawaii or New Mexico, Arizona or Oklahoma.

"A commission of able and conscientious men, headed by Judge Taft of Ohio, an eminent jurist, is now at work in the Philippines, opening the way for free government and collecting information for the use of Congress when that body takes up the work of determining the 'civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants,' as provided in the treaty.

"We got into the Philippines as an incident of war. We are holding them because, after due deliberation, the American people concluded that that was the best thing to do for the Filipinos and for ourselves."

BRYAN'S THEORIES AND PRACTICES.

Shouting About the Consent of the Governed.

Bryan's Utterances Wholly Inconsistent with the Practice of Democrats, Who Have Invariably Suppressed the Colored Vote

The verification of theory is practice, the test of sincerity is conduct. When a person or a party preaches one thing and practices another, there is no excuse for being deceived as to his honesty. Four years ago when Mr. Bryan captured the Chicago convention by his eloquent "cross and crown" speech on the free coinage of silver, there was plenty of room for doubting the soundness or even the sanity of his proposition, but it was difficult to question his sincerity or the sincerity of the party which nominated him. However had their logic, their theory accorded with their practice. The party as then organized, so far as it had the power had practiced what it was then preaching.

The Southern States are the backbone and body of the Democratic party in practice. They are the States where the party is most completely devoted to Mr. Bryan and his doctrine, and they are also the States where the party is and has always been in most supreme control. It is in these States, therefore, that we must look for the practice verifying party principles. These States were the home of the greenback movement, of the wildcat banks, and they were and are the hotbed of free silver; therefore in advocating 16 to 1, Government paper money and the overthrow of the national banks, Mr. Bryan is entirely consistent with the practice of his party as at present organized.

In his speech accepting the nomination for President, at Indianapolis, however, he preaches a new gospel for Democracy. It is not money and banking this time, but it is "Liberty," the "consent of the governed," and "equal political rights," regardless of race, etc. Here are a few extracts. How do these professions accord with Democratic practice, where its control is supreme?

THEORY.	PRACTICE.
"It was God Himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He has never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master."	Then why does Mr. Bryan's party resort to force and fraud to disfranchise the colored "race" in this country?
"We cannot repudiate the principles of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here."	Nor can we "repudiate" the principle of self-government in the South, without weakening that principle throughout the republic.
"A republic can have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed."	Yet Mr. Bryan's party has made millions of citizens into "subjects," practicing government by force without the "consent of the governed."
"The Democratic party disputes this doctrine (of 'vassalage') and denounces it as repugnant to both the letter and spirit of our organized law."	While "the Democratic party disputes this doctrine" in words it is enforcing it in practice in a quarter of the States of the Union.
"If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it is impossible to secure title to people either by force or purchase."	Very true, but in what States where Mr. Bryan's party has power to prevent it do "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?" When and where did it try to practice this precept?
"Men may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals, but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join in it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a right."	Then Mr. Bryan's party is an organized fraud, for its supremacy in many States has been obtained by doing "in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals." Its "right" to rule is "created" by force.
"Rights never conflict; duties never clash. Can it be our duty to usurp political rights which belong to others?"	Of course not. Yet Mr. Bryan's party is "usurping political rights" of hundreds of thousands of American citizens.
"There are degrees of proficiency in the art of self-government, but it is a reflection upon the Creator to say that He denied to any people the capacity of self-government."	True, the "Creator" never "denied to any people the capacity of self-government," but despots and Democrats always have.
"Once admit that some people are capable of self-government and others are not, and that the capable people have a right to seize upon and govern the incapable, and you make force—brute force—the only foundation of government and invite the reign of the despot."	While Mr. Bryan was saying this his party was using fraud, force and legislation to deprive a whole race of their political rights, and establishing "the reign of the despot" in this country.
"Would we tread in the paths of tyranny, Nor reckon the tyrant's cost? Who taketh another's liberty, His Freedom is also lost. Would we win as the strong has ever won Make ready to pay the debt, For the God who reigned over Babylon Is the God who is reigning yet."	Yes; and the South, which has been afflicted by Democratic rule, is paying "the tyrant's cost" in poverty, disorder and social insecurity. In taking the liberty of others it has sacrificed its own progress. Verily, "the God who reigned over Babylon Is the God who is reigning yet."
"If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency."	How true this is of the practice of Mr. Bryan's party for thirty years. It persists by fair means and foul in illegally governing nearly six millions of people "without their consent," and it "dare not educate them lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and mock us for our inconsistency."

A very brief glance at Mr. Bryan's eloquent utterances and the thirty years' practice of his party conclusively demonstrates one of two things: either that Mr. Bryan is insincere and is merely using these "liberty phrases" to catch votes where political rights are more advanced than in the Democratic States, or else he does not represent the Democratic party at all. The party's practice for a generation speaks infinitely louder than Mr. Bryan's words. What the party has always done and is now doing, it may be relied upon to do if elected to power. Until the States where Mr. Bryan's party reigns supreme show some intention of practicing these "golden precepts," their declaration in national platforms and candidates' speeches, may properly be taken as only so much material for political deception.

It is not a question of whether the enfranchisement of the negro was a wise or unwise policy, but it is a question of common political honesty. If the party believes, as its practice shows, that the negroes are an inferior race and cannot with safety to our institutions be admitted to political rights, to proclaim the doctrine that the "Creator never denied to any race of people the capacity of self-government," is obvious hypocrisy.

Some of the Democrats in the South, who are more frank and honest than Mr. Bryan, are already repudiating any pretense of seriously living up to his ethereal political declarations. The Macon, Ga., Telegraph, for instance, frankly declares its unwillingness to take Mr. Bryan seriously in this "consent of the governed" talk and says:

"It is all sweet and nice enough to indulge on Fourth of July occasions in the generalities about the 'consent of the governed,' about 'inalienable rights,' about the equality of all men at birth, and so forth, just as our forefathers did who owned slaves and who robbed the Indians of their land, but it is another matter when you try to apply it to the Negro, the Indian, the Kanaka and the Filipino. We of the South are contending for our own, and we are going to have it. The Negro has nothing that we want that was not taken from us by force and given to him. He has no land, he has no birthright, no heritage—nothing but a right to help govern which was given wrongfully to him. When we take the ballot from him we leave him in a far better condition than he found himself when he came among us as a result of Yankee thrift and speculation."

The Macon Telegraph, with real Southern frankness, tells the simple truth about the Democratic position on this subject. Its statement is supported by both the theory and practice of the party wherever it is in power. Moreover the Democratic party has never been dishonest enough to pretend to believe in the political enfranchisement of the inferior races, and Mr. Bryan's sudden admiration of Lincoln and advocacy of Garrisonian principles is a personal flight in political oratory, which has no relation to the past practice or future intention of the present Democratic party. If Mr. Bryan should be elected the offices would be filled and the Government conducted by people who, like the Macon Telegraph, jeer at these "equality phrases" as empty generalities. They evidently regard these utterances as so much verbal bait for new votes in the "enemy's country." But here Mr. Bryan's cunning is not as wise as the Telegraph's frankness. Honesty is always respected and such cheap cunning as Mr. Bryan's Indianapolis speech reveals will fail to deceive. The American citizens are not ignorant Filipinos, they are too well informed on the policy and practice of the Democracy on this subject to be caught by Mr. Bryan's rhetorical if not hypocritical phrases. The name of "Lincoln" and "political liberty" are too sacred to be flippantly used in such a cause. The American people have some sense of the fitness of things.

HALUCINATIONS, HOBGOBLINS.

Senator Stewart Tells What Ails the Nebraska Colonel.

Senator Stewart of Nevada, the stalwart silver leader, will vote and work for McKinley this year. He is tired of Bryan and Bryanism and here is why he has left the Popocrat fold:

"Mr. Bryan's unparalleled campaign for the principles of the Chicago platform and his insistence on the adoption of that platform at Kansas City," said Senator Stewart, "induced the people to suppose the campaign of 1900 would be conducted on the issues of 1896. In this way they were mistaken. An hallucination induced Bryan to make war on an army of ghosts and hobgoblins, which a diseased brain created. His instinct, which has formerly led him to consider realities, departed. He sought his closet in pursuit of phantoms, and strung together ten thousand words, which he gave to the public at Indianapolis. He omitted all mention of the issues of 1896 and summarized the paramount issue of the present campaign in a pledge to the Tagal Guerrillas."

Whatever the direct result of Senator Stewart's secession from the fusion alliance in Nevada, the rapid spread of the Western revolt against Col. Bryan's Indianapolis program introduces an element of doubt into the canvass in Nevada, Colorado, Montana, Idaho and Utah which was wholly lacking four years ago. Put on the defensive in one and all these former strongholds by an attempted change of issues, and gaining no material strength elsewhere by the sudden about face of his acceptance speech, it is easy to see the stamp of genuine inspiration on Mr. Stewart's prophecy that the Nebraska leader's present "anti-imperialistic" canvass is doomed to defeat.

Nevada silverites, what are left of them, are bothered about the determination of Senator Stewart to support the policy of the administration. Surveyor General Kelly says: "I think Jones will go next," and Sam Davis, the acrobatic humorist who conducts the Carson Appeal, is State controller and engages in various occupations, meanwhile expresses his ideas in the one sentence: "The Appeal will blister Stewart."

FACTS ABOUT THAT "BRITISH ALLIANCE."

Investigation by Father Malone, the American Priest.

Lord Salisbury's Diplomatic Plans—President McKinley's Independent Policy—Our Course Regarding China Tells the Story.

Rev. Thomas H. Malone of Denver writes from London his information and opinion on the relations between the United States and Great Britain. The letter is the more significant because four years ago Father Malone's sympathies were strongly with the free silver cause and his influence was cast on the side of Bryan. For some time this widely known priest has been abroad and his facilities for judging of what are the actual relations between the two governments have been exceptionally good. The letter is addressed to Mr. R. C. Kerens, the Missouri member of the Republican national committee. Father Malone writes:

"Mr. McKinley's attitude during the present crisis in China must be sorely disappointing to such men as Hon. Bourke Cockran and others who have a special object in making it appear that the President has really if not nominally entered into an alliance with England.

"Mr. Cockran and those who think with him are well aware that if the popular mind can be led to believe Mr. McKinley's administration is committed to the fortunes of England the Irish and Germans of the country would resent his attitude to the extent of throwing their votes against him at the polls.

"But in considering this question one should be actuated by higher motives than partisan advantage, for the welfare of our country, regardless of party, must depend upon the patriotic impulses of the people.

"I, too, would resent any alliance between the United States and England, but I would equally resent the charge that such an alliance exists until it shall have been proven beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Now, what are the facts in the case as demonstrated by recent developments? The Chinese troubles, which at the present writing are in a most acute stage, furnish the key to the position of the United States Government in so far at least as any alleged alliance with England is concerned.

"Mr. Hay's note to the powers sets forth clearly the President's policy, and, looking at it from this side of the ocean, I confess that it seems to disarm the critics who for the past year have been profligate in charging undue sympathy for England on the part of our Government.

"From the English point of view this policy, it is frankly admitted here in London, has been keenly disappointing. It was assuredly the desire and intention of the British Government to so use the United States and Japan as to conserve its own interests at home and abroad. This would readily have been done by throwing these two countries between China and Russia so as to thwart and weaken the latter, and thus gain a timely advantage over the allied powers.

"Indeed I speak advisedly when I say that it was confidently hoped that Mr. McKinley, in consideration of England's attitude during the Spanish-American war, would readily acquiesce in Lord Salisbury's well-laid plans for action in China and allow our Government to be pushed to the front and thus shield the British Government in an hour of trying need. Had the President consented to commit the United States to a policy of joint action with the powers England would have been highly elated, for in that case we would soon find ourselves in open opposition to Russia, and, while nominally protecting American lives and interests, we would in reality be fighting the battles of the British Empire.

"But Mr. McKinley's more prudent course, as outlined in Mr. Hay's note, has not been received with cordial good will in England, whose position may be inferred from a paragraph in to-day's Globe which expresses amazement that the United States will suffer the whole campaign to be rendered abortive in order to gratify what it is pleased to call 'the cold and calculating designs of Russia.'

"One feels from the atmosphere that the United States Government is in no mood for an alliance of any kind with England. That 'Barkis is willin'' on this side of the ocean there is no shadow of doubt.

"Hence, looking at the President's policy from the point of view afforded in England, I am convinced that he meant what he said at the dinner of the Ohio Society in New York when he affirmed that his policy was both to avoid entangling alliances with as well as hostility to any other nation. And I am moreover convinced that the British Empire is receiving neither encouragement nor sympathy at this time from the Government at Washington.

"THOMAS H. MALONE.

"London, England."

WHY CORN PRICES ARE HIGHER.

Republican Policy Has Enabled the Workers to Eat More.

In 1896 there was a record-breaking crop of corn, amounting to 2,283,875,165 bushels. The highest price, however, corn reached that year in Chicago was 30⅝ cents per bushel, during the month of April. During no other month did the price touch 30 cents. In September, at the height of the Bryan boom, it got as low as 19½ cents, and through the rest of 1896 it did not touch higher than 25½ cents, the record for the second half of the year being made shortly after the announcement of McKinley's election.

In 1899 there was the largest crop of corn since 1896, it amounting to 2,078,143,933 bushels, which was 205,731,232 bushels, or about 9 per cent under the crop of 1896. The Chicago price of corn, however, during the whole of 1899 did not touch below 30 cents a bushel, which was only ½ cent a bushel below the high record price of 1896. For six months of the year it did not get below 32½ cents a bushel. After Sept. 1 the range was between 31¼ and 35 cents a bushel, which was over 10 cents a bushel better, or from 25 to 30 per cent better, than the range for the same period in 1896. That the farmers in 1899 could get from one-quarter to one-third better prices for their corn than in 1896, with only about one-tenth less corn to sell, shows how greatly they benefited by the broadened markets the Republican policy of filling the city workman's dinner pail had given them. The spokesmen of the Democratic party contend that the present prosperity has come from the large crops of the last four years, and is not due in any measure to Republican policies. In 1896, however, with a record-breaking bumper crop of corn there were hard times, not prosperity, in the corn belt. In 1899, with a 10 per cent less corn crop than in 1896, there was prosperity heaped down and running over.