

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 2. No. 12.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 11, 1902.

Whole No. 64

## MR. PATTERSON'S EMANCIPATION BILL.

The republican administration is greatly embarrassed by the fact that the southern democrats are demanding the emancipation of the Sulu slaves. The people south of the Mason and Dixon line remember that about forty years ago the republican party was very much opposed to slavery; they recall that the republican party has at various and sundry times since boasted of having emancipated some four millions of blacks. Now that this same republican party has raised the stars and stripes over the Sultan's domains and looks complacently upon the existence of slavery in the Philippines the southern representatives in congress are insisting that the brown men of the Pacific shall enjoy the freedom accorded to the negroes of the Gulf states. To make the issue clear and distinct Congressman Patterson of Tennessee has introduced the following bill:

H. R. 13285. A bill to abolish slavery in the Philippine archipelago, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that from and after the passage of this act there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the Philippine archipelago, or in any province or dependency now held by the United States government, or which may hereafter be acquired.

Sec. 2. That the so-called treaty or agreement made and entered into between John C. Bates, brigadier general of the United States volunteers, acting for the government, and the Sultan of the Sulu archipelago and the dates whose names appear as parties to said agreement or treaty dated August 20, 1892, be, and the same is hereby, disapproved and disaffirmed, and declared void and of no effect.

Sec. 3. That the purchase, sale, or gift of slaves in the whole of said archipelago is hereby forbidden and declared illegal, likewise the importation of any person bought or in any manner acquired in a foreign country and transported for the purpose of involuntary servitude to the Philippine archipelago.

What will the republicans do? Will they pass the Patterson bill and thus give the democrats the credit of having compelled emancipation? Or will they kill the bill and admit that imperialism has entirely revolutionized the sentiment of the party? We shall see.

### Plutocracy in Instruction.

According to the Boston Herald, "Mr. Alleyne Ireland, F. R. G. S., the English expert on tropical colonization," has been employed as an instructor in the University of Chicago. "He goes as special commissioner of the university to the far east and will devote three years to the study of the condition and government of European colonies in Asia." He is also to bring back "an entirely unbiased" report on the Philippine problem. Upon his return in 1905 he is to occupy "the chair of colonial history, politics and commerce which will be created for him at the university."

Mr. Ireland is already a writer of some prominence, his book on "Tropical Colonization" being his most important work. Attention is called to this matter because it is one of the many evidences of the studied and concerted effort on the

part of plutocracy to change public sentiment and substitute the doctrines of Europe for the doctrines of America. Here is a great university endowed by the chief stockholder in one of the greatest and most extortionate of trusts. The Standard Oil company is the most open and notorious law-breaker in the United States, beside which petty criminals who are in the penitentiary seem insignificant. It not only controls the oil business, but is reaching out for the monopoly of other branches of business, and already its New York bank exerts a potent influence on national finances. The institution endowed by this prince of trust magnates sends to England for a champion of the colonial idea, publishes the fact that he is to be sent to Asia to study the colonial problem and then is to occupy a chair and give to American students the advantage (?) of his natural bias in favor of monarchical institutions and the results of his biased investigations as to colonial government.

It is not necessary for us to wait until his return to know what his instruction will be. The whole tenor of it will be to cultivate a contempt for the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence and to inculcate a love for the doctrines of conquest and spoliation. He is to write articles for American magazines and his views will be spread broadcast as the views of a "learned" and "unbiased" man.

The readers of The Commoner are urged to bring these matters to the attention of their republican neighbors in order that the rank and file of the republican party may know of the insidious and persistent attacks which are being made upon American ideas and the fundamental principles of free government.

## JEFFERSON VS. ROOSEVELT.

At this time when the anniversary of Jefferson's birth is being celebrated it is well to note the difference between national expansion under Jefferson, and imperialism under President Roosevelt. Jefferson favored the annexation of contiguous territory, to be inhabited by American citizens and to be built into American states. Roosevelt favors the conquest of remote islands, to be inhabited by subjects and to be held as colonies, taxed without representation and governed without the consent of the governed. Jefferson's doctrine was in harmony with the Declaration of Independence and the spirit of the revolutionary fathers; Roosevelt's policy is an imitation of the policy of King George III.

A reader of The Commoner, thinking that Third Assistant Postmaster General Madden needs instruction in political doctrines, offers to subscribe for The Commoner for Mr. Madden regularly. The editor appreciates the offer and regrets to be compelled to refuse, but it was evident that it was being subscribed for because of the "doctrines advocated" and Mr. Madden is a little touchy on this point. If the aforesaid reader had subscribed for a paper for Mr. Madden and given any other reason for so doing or had he given no reason at all the paper could have been sent without any infraction of the law—such is the mysterious ruling of the postoffice department.

## MR. HILL'S ATTACK ON CHICAGO PLATFORM.

In a recent issue of The Commoner reference was made to ex-Senator Hill's article in the February Forum of 1897. On another page will be found that part of the article which deals specifically with the planks to which he objected. He begins by complaining of his defeat as temporary chairman of the convention of 1896, saying: "Fair-minded democrats who had learned to respect the time-honored usages of the party were astonished at the revolutionary proceedings of that body (the convention) in arbitrarily and unnecessarily rejecting, contrary to every democratic precedent, the selection of the national committeemen for temporary chairman." What a grievance! If the national committee had had any conception of democratic principles it would have respected the well-known wishes of the delegates and would not have tried to force upon the convention a temporary chairman whose views had been rejected at the primaries. Mr. Hill could have avoided humiliation in that convention by refusing to join with the minority in an attempt to secure control of the convention, and he has no one but himself to blame for the merited rebuke which he received. It is not very modest in him to parade his defeat as if he were entitled to more consideration than the convention itself. If it was "revolutionary" for the majority of the convention to disregard the wishes of the committee, how shall we characterize the action of the committee in disregarding the rights of the delegates? Which was entitled to superior consideration, the committee or the convention?—Mr. Hill or the democratic party?

But while his criticism of the convention for defeating him for temporary chairman shows his personal pique, that is a matter of little importance compared with those parts of his article in which he shows his partiality for the wealthy classes. He says:

It has been demonstrated many times that there is a large class of conservative people in this country, not avowed "independents" so-called, but people who while nominally belonging to some political party are disposed to regard political ties very lightly, voting first with one party and then with the other, or sometimes not voting at all, and who really constitute the balance of power, and virtually control by their action or non-action the political destinies of the nation. They are electors of intelligence, usually men of property, strictly conscientious opponents of radicalism in every form, patriotic in their purposes, and sincerely desirous of good government under whatsoever party it may be secured. They think for themselves and act for themselves quite regardless of political influence. Whichever political party disgusts, offends, or frightens this class of electors, greatly imperils its chances of success. The political barometer is largely affected by the conclusions which they may reach. It is the general conviction that the course pursued by the Chicago convention not only offended thousands of veteran democrats who had grown gray in the service of the party, but was especially obnoxious to this class of thoughtful and intelligent citizens.

Mr. Hill evidently considers himself the champion of the "electors of intelligence," who, accord-