

The Commoner.

employed as an argument by republican orators and newspapers in every locality where there was a substantial silver element in the party is one of the best-known facts of the campaign of 1896. That it influenced a sufficient number of votes in the close states of the middle west and the Pacific slope to be decisive in McKinley's favor is so extremely probable as fairly to justify the declaration that he owed his first election to the promise to promote the free coinage of silver by international agreement. That there never was the slightest purpose on the part of the republican leaders to carry out that pledge in good faith was even then apparent to those who fully realized the extent to which the republican party was dominated by the great moneyed interests of the country. It has since been proved with a certainty that amounts to a mathematical demonstration."

"What does a pledge 'to promote' a certain thing mean? Clearly to use all proper efforts to bring about the end in view. Such a pledge is not satisfied by a single attempt, but the party promising to promote must keep on trying until it becomes evident that all effort in that direction is bound to be fruitless. This is the principle that would govern in private affairs, and it is one that should commend itself to every right-thinking person. Still less is the moral obligation of such a pledge removed by a single effort, not made in good faith, and never intended to succeed.

"If anything in our political history is perfectly clear, then is it clear that the sending of the Wolcott commission to Europe was a farce and a fraud—a mere perfunctory and colorable carrying out of a campaign pledge made to catch votes, and for no other purpose. It was so regarded in Europe, and Senator Wolcott's statement in the senate virtually laying the blame of failure at the door of Secretary Gage showed plainly that the chairman of the commission had reached the same conclusion himself.

"And this conclusion was a just one; for while the Wolcott commission was laboring to convince England and France that the United States government earnestly desired a return to bimetallism on the basis of the free coinage of both gold and silver at an agreed ratio, the chief financial officer of the government was making gold standard speeches to boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and other associations of business men in various parts of the country. Not only this, but he actually formulated a gold standard bill, which was laid before the cabinet and approved. More important still, before the Wolcott commission had fairly completed its labors, the president sent a special message to congress urging legislation along the lines of the plan of the Indianapolis monetary convention, which, as everybody knows, was for the gold standard without reservation.

"With the return of the Wolcott commission, the administration assumed that its duty under the pledge to promote bimetallism had been performed, and proceeded to 'commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard' by procuring the enactment of a measure which, besides greatly enlarging the privileges and profits of the national banks, in effect reduces the silver dollar to the grade of a greenback by making it redeemable in gold. It is this 'faithful performance' of a solemn pledge by which Mr. McKinley was twice elected president that Mr. Chandler refers to with stinging irony in the closing paragraph of his letter.

"This, be it remembered, is not a democratic onslaught. The charge of bad faith comes from an ironclad republican, who was almost one of the founders of the party; a man who was fighting its battles when the most of its latter day champions were either in their cradles or not yet born. When such

a man publicly declares that the fraudulent use of six words has twice in succession elected Mr. McKinley president of the United States it presents a startling fact for the consideration of the American people—a fact that cannot and should not be blinked by the fortuitous return of a prosperity with which the republican party had no more to do than it has with the ebbing and flowing of the tides."

A Stigma Upon National Honor.

The Chicago Record-Herald is rapidly approaching the copperhead column. In a recent issue this republican newspaper had an editorial entitled: "Cuba Swallows Dependency." The Record-Herald said:

"At last the Cuban constitutional convention has accepted the Platt amendment, which robs Cuba of the pretense of being an independent and sovereign state. It was what is known throughout America as a ground-hog case. The amendment, which was a direct violation of our national promise of independence to Cuba, was forced down the Cuban throats with the threat that unless it was swallowed verbatim et literatim there would be no withdrawal of the American army of occupation.

"The very fact that the United States made the inclusion of the Platt amendment in the Cuban constitution a condition precedent to the withdrawal of its troops wrote travesty across the face of that constitution as the fundamental law of a people who 'are and of right ought to be free and independent.'

"We are now the paramount power in Cuba by the act of the Cuban convention under duress.

"As The Independent says, this coercion of Cuba into acceptance of the Platt amendment 'puts a stain upon the honor of the United States which cannot be effaced by Cuba's unwilling submission.'

"The suzerainty of Cuba under all the circumstances of pretense, perfidy and compulsion is a stigma upon the honor and good faith of the United States which will yet return to plague our politicians."

Trade Relations With Cuba.

Senator Aldrich of Connecticut, whom so high a republican authority as William E. Curtis of the Chicago Record-Herald refers to as "the representative of the sugar trust," recently called upon the president to protest against reciprocal trade relations between the United States and Cuba. Senator Aldrich insisted that Cuba must occupy the same relation to the United States as any other foreign power, and that her products must be subject to the Dingley tariff law.

Unquestionably so far as concerns the Dingley tariff law Senator Aldrich is correct. It is strange, however, that this senator was among those who supported the Platt amendment and who insisted that the United States had the authority to frame the constitutional law for a country which he now insists to be extremely "foreign."

The question of reciprocal trade relations between the United States and Cuba is one that should be determined on common sense lines. So long as ours is a high tariff policy with reciprocity possibilities under certain conditions, it would seem the part of wisdom to determine whether it was not to our interest to encourage these reciprocal trade relations.

If we insist upon such a high tariff rate as to practically prohibit the importation of sugra

and other Cuban products, what will we do when it comes to exporting to Cuba our own products and particularly our manufactures?

As soon as Cuba takes on the form of a nation vast improvements will be made there. Undoubtedly there will be an enormous demand for manufactured articles from the United States as well as for many of our other products.

The word "reciprocal" explains itself. If we refuse favors to Cuba, we have no right to expect favors from Cuba. It may be, however, that Senator Aldrich intends that on our part Cuba shall be denied any approach to free trade with the United States, and that then some ingenious plan will be devised whereby, under the authorities of a world power, we may insist upon Cuba giving free entry to our products and our manufactures.

If the administration insists upon accommodating the sugar trust at the expense of the rest of the country it will be confronted with the largest problem that has yet arisen in the Cuban situation. The administration has well nigh exhausted the list of plausible excuses in its impositions upon the people of Cuba, and it would find it difficult to devise an apology for a decree that the United States would make tariff rules, not only for the United States, but also for the little republic on the south.

The Star-Spangled Banner.

(FRANCIS SCOTT KEY.)

O, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's last gleaming?
Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watch'd were so gallantly streaming;
And the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there,
O, say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and home of the brave?
On the shore, dimly seen through the mists of the deep,
Where the foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes,
What is that which the breeze, o'er the towering steep,
As it fitfully blows, half conceals, half discloses?
Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam,
In full glory reflected now shines on the stream.
'Tis the star-spangled banner! O, long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!
And where is that band who so vauntingly swore
That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion
A home and a country should leave us no more?
Their blood has wash'd out their foul footsteps' pollution.
No refuge could save the hireling and slave
From the terror of death and the gloom of the grave.
And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!
O, thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation;
Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, for our cause it is just,
And this be our motto, "In God is our trust."
And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

What Does
A Pledge
Imply?

Strange
Methods of
Promotion.

Faithful
Performance
Indeed.

From an
Ironclad
Republican.