

The Commoner.

Vol. I. No. 14.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 26, 1901.

\$1.00 a Year

A Bit Personal.

The Springfield, (Massachusetts) Republican, in a recent issue has this to say:

There is some speculation here and there in view of Mr. Bryan's opposition to the regular democratic candidate for mayor of St. Louis, as to what he is up to. Judging from a letter concerning the St. Louis contest which he wrote, it is a fair presumption that Mr. Bryan has determined to make the stiffest possible warfare against the reorganization of the democratic party by the Cleveland democrats. In the letter referred to he expressly stated that Wells should be defeated because his election would encourage every so-called reorganizer in the country. Mr. Bryan's course in this matter, together with his Commoner editorship and the freedom of his editorial writing, would indicate that another democratic presidential nomination is of less moment to him than the defeat of the plans of the conservatives to recapture the party. It is probable that Mr. Bryan has no expectation of being nominated again, but doubtless he intends to have something to say as to who shall be nominated and as to the principles the next convention shall adopt. An editorship is a bad place for a candidate, but an editorship is not so bad a place for naming candidates. On the whole, Mr. Bryan's present attitude is distinctly belligerent, but not necessarily belligerent in his personal behalf. His present course is entirely consistent with a determination that his principles, on the whole, shall prevail.

It is only fair that the readers of THE COMMONER should know what I am "up to," and if they will pardon me for being a little bit personal I will tell them. I have twice received at the hands of my party the highest honor it can bestow, and twice has my nomination been endorsed by our allies, the populists and silver republicans. The first nomination came from the delegates in attendance upon the three conventions, the second nomination came directly from the voters of the three parties. These honors were bestowed, not because of personal merit, or as a personal compliment, but because of my advocacy of democratic principles. I still believe in those principles, and expect to advocate them during the remainder of my life. New issues will arise from time to time but the principles set forth in the Chicago platform and in the Kansas City platform are fundamental, and can be applied to all questions.

I am not planning for another presidential nomination—if I were I would not be editing a paper; if I ever become a candidate again it will be because it seems necessary for the advancement of the principles to which I adhere, and that does not now seem probable. I shall, however, take an interest in politics for several years yet, if I live, and can be relied upon to support those who as candidates advocate democratic principles, and who can be trusted to enforce them if elected.

I have no enemies to punish. No matter

what a man may have said or done against the ticket in 1896 or in 1900, that man becomes my friend the moment he accepts democratic principles. Neither have I any disposition to reward political friends at the expense of our cause. No matter what a man may have said or done for the ticket in 1896 or in 1900, that man becomes an opponent the moment he turns against democratic principles. Political battles are fought, not in the past or in the future, but in the present. The heretofore cannot be recalled, and the hereafter cannot be anticipated, but the NOW is all important.

I shall say whatever I think ought to be said, and shall write whatever I think ought to be written. This course may not be popular, but I trust that it will aid in the restoration of Jeffersonian principles.

I shall ask no reward, because I am not working for others entirely. As a citizen I am interested in having a good government under which to live; as a father I am interested in leaving a good government to my children. If a good government can be secured it will be reward enough for all that I or any one else can do.

He Bows to Force.

The manifesto of Aguinaldo, which will be found in full on another page, will not live in history as a great state paper, neither will it be exhibited with pride by the administration. The Filipino general doubtless did the best that he could to meet the expectations of his captors, but the document lacks the earnestness and the heroic element which characterized his utterances when he urged his countrymen to begin the struggle for independence.

"The time has come, however, in which they find their advance along this path to be impeded by an irresistible force"—he says. This is the final argument in an empire. Irresistible force! In his own case he might have described the means employed to check his advance by even less complimentary terms, for it was not an irresistible force but forged letters and the treachery of some of his former friends that brought an end to his resistance. Irresistible force is a new argument for republics to advance. Government by the consent of the governed, taxation with representation and the self evident truths proclaimed in 1776 and revered until two years ago—all these have been exchanged for "irresistible force," and boasting about our superior strength is to take the place of rejoicing over the triumph of ideas.

Platt Amendment Objectionable.

The Cuban Constitutional convention, by a vote of eighteen to ten, condemned the Platt amendment to the army bill, taking special exception to clauses 3, 6 and 7. The

paragraphs specifically mentioned are the one permitting interference in the domestic affairs of Cuba, the one relating to the Isle of Pines, and the one ceding coaling stations. Later a commission was appointed to visit Washington.

Whether the administration will modify its demands remains to be seen. If it insists, it is possible that the demands will be complied with, for Cuba is in no position to enter into a physical contest with the United States. But this ought not to be a government of might. Our nation cannot afford to insist upon unjust terms merely because it can support its claims with an army, and it is a short-sighted policy to do so. The United States and Cuba must necessarily live side by side. They can be of great service to each other, or they can be a constant annoyance to each other. As it is better for two neighbors to deal fairly with each other and live friends, so it is wiser for nations to do justice to each other and dwell in peace.

To secure a seeming but only apparent advantage today, the republican party is laying the foundation for generations of discord.

Politics in Business.

When THE COMMONER was ready to take advertising, a card giving rates and terms was sent to a list of advertisers published in one of the directories. Among the answers received was one reading as follows:

"Replying to yours of the 13th, would say that we would not place an advertisement in your paper if it cost us nothing. We do not agree with the principles brought forth by Mr. Bryan during the last campaign, and do not wish to do anything that would throw encouragement or assistance in his way."

The matter is referred to for a double purpose. First, to show the readers of this paper the disadvantages under which one labors who attempts to protect the public at large from the evils of private monopoly. It will be noticed that the advertiser did not refer to the money question, which was the paramount issue of the campaign of 1896, but to the principles brought forward in the last campaign, evidently referring to the democratic platform on the trust question or on the question of imperialism. As an advertiser would hardly make such a protest against the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence—for they were the principles applied to the question of imperialism—it is probable that this corporation took offense at the effort made by the democratic party to prevent the organization of trusts. It is hardly possible that any democratic paper will be led to compromise with wrong merely because the wrong doers, or the supporters of wrong doing, threaten to withhold their patronage. But those who are in-