

A Washington dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald says: "Rathbone declines a pardon, being determined to establish his innocence." How does it happen that Rathbone has "declined" a pardon? Is Senator Hanna authorized to tender pardons under this administration? Or has Rathbone been offered a pardon in a private way?

He  
"Declines"  
a Pardon.

The revelations concerning cruelties practiced in the Philippines prove, not that we are worse than other people, but that human nature is too frail to be trusted with the use of arbitrary power. An irresponsible government will certainly result in atrocities. Man is not strong enough to withstand the temptation to misuse power and therefore constitutional restrictions are necessary for the protection of the weak and for the maintenance of civilized government.

Use of  
Arbitrary  
Power.

The Kansas City Journal, republican, referring to the demand made by "senators of the Carmack stripe" that certain Filipino leaders and others be called for the purpose of testifying before the senate Philippine committee, asks: "What good would it do?" One thing it would do would be to throw a little more light on the situation in the Philippines. It would aid in providing the American people with the truth; and the truth, concerning the Philippines, is what the people, at this moment, are most anxious to know.

"What Good  
Would  
it do?"

The "lots of five" plan announced last week whereby five yearly subscriptions to The Commoner may be secured for \$3, has met with a very encouraging reception. The general circulation of The Commoner is rapidly increasing, and it is desired to extend the circulation of this paper into every precinct in the United States. Democrats everywhere to whom the doctrines supported by The Commoner are acceptable are asked to assist in the effort to extend The Commoner's sphere of influence. Particulars concerning this plan may be found in another column.

Lots  
of Five  
Plan.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, republican, says: "By annexation Cuba can secure free commerce with the United States, its best market both for exports and imports; the door of prosperity and of stability stands open." The Globe-Democrat must mean that Cuba might secure these privileges under annexation if the republican party were driven from power. Certainly, even under annexation, the Cubans could find no reason to believe that they would be accorded at the hands of the republican leaders privileges equal with other sections of the United States. The experience which the people of "our new possessions" have had under the republican administration will not justify the Cubans in entertaining any such hope as is held out to them by this republican paper.

Privileges  
Under  
Annexation.

The Chicago Tribune, republican, in its issue of May 6, says: "Unless there should be a change of front on the part of United States Attorney Bethea and Special Counsel Day, there will be no criminal prosecutions of the packers alleged to be members of the beef trust. It is now the plan of the federal prosecutors to proceed with a full investigation of the charges against the packers by means of their injunction proceedings. The statement has been made a number of times recently that

Why  
Avoid This  
Weapon?

the federal grand jury, which meets on May 13, will direct its attention to such an investigation. Nothing of the kind is contemplated by the government attorneys." Now, if the administration is really determined to make war upon the trust system, why has it decided that there will be no criminal prosecution commenced against the members of the beef combine? We have been told frequently that there is great difficulty in obtaining effective weapons to use against the trust system. The federal anti-trust law, however, provides a very effective weapon in the shape of criminal prosecution. Why has the administration decided not to make use of this weapon?

The Chicago Chronicle says: "The way is open for the election of a democratic president in 1904. All that is needed is a candidate acceptable to all democrats, a platform constructed on old democratic lines and united democratic action at the polls."

This  
is  
"Harmony."

In the same article the Chronicle also says that any candidate who would be regarded "as a representative of Bryanism would be defeated by a greater majority than distinguished Mr. Bryan's defeat at either election when he was a candidate." "Bryanism" is the personal way in which papers like the Chicago Chronicle refer to the principles of the Kansas City platform. While the Chronicle pleads for "harmony," and says that "all that is needed is a candidate acceptable to all democrats, a platform constructed on old democratic lines, and united democratic action at the polls," the same paper serves notice that any candidate who would be acceptable to the advocates of the Kansas City platform would be defeated. This is a fair representation of the "harmony" which the reorganizers seek.

The treaty of May 8, 1871, between Great Britain and the United States provides that a neutral government is bound "not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other,

or for the purpose of renewal or augmentation of military supplies, of arms, or the recruitment of men." That treaty also provides that a neutral government must "exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters and as to all persons within its jurisdiction to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties." It will be difficult for the average man to understand why the British camp near New Orleans, with its shipment of horses and mules and its practical recruitment of men, is not a violation of the law of neutrality as defined in the treaty of 1871. If the expeditions that are sent from United States ports, which expeditions are set on foot by this British military camp, are not "military expeditions," then it would be difficult to find a name for them.

Several years ago Bishop Potter said: "The question is not what we shall do with the Philippines, but what they will do to us." The New York World provides some interesting observations as to what the Philippines have already done

What  
They Have  
"Done."

to us. The order to kill and burn, to kill all over ten, to make Samar a howling wilderness, and tyranny and conquest are some of the things pointed out by the World that the Philippines have done to us. The World then says: "It is not exaggeration to say that we have killed more of the natives in three years than the Spaniards had killed in thirty, and have practiced cruelties that never before disgraced our warfare. But this is not all. The Philippines have caused our government to suspend the constitution in the presence of our flag. They have made us re-

puhate and trample upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence. They have led us to re-enact the odious alien and sedition laws. Compared with these insidious, demoralizing and deplorable results, affecting the very essence of democracy and contravening the genius of our institutions, the mere money loss of \$350,000,000 is as nothing. What the Philippines have done to us is to inoculate our republican system with the virus of military colonialism in its most despotic and destructive form."

Referring to the charges made by Governor Gardener of the Philippines, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald says. "Gardener is not well liked among the republicans here. Their view of him is that he is a socialist, a 'crank,' a dreamer, a visionary, a quarrelsome fellow who got into friction with army officers in his province and proceeded to 'get even' by making general charges against them. They profess not to be afraid of his story, but they are opposed to giving him what they say he is evidently playing for, a chance to exploit himself and win notoriety and take the center of the stage. They say they don't want to encourage men of that stamp into 'playing to the galleries.'" Now, if the republicans are not afraid of Governor Gardener's story, if he is all that republican senators say he is, why not give him the chance to expose himself? The possibility that one individual might win notoriety is of no moment compared with the importance of providing the American people with the truth concerning affairs in the Philippine islands. Every day the mask that has been so long and so successfully worn by the republican party drops a little lower.

The republican state convention of Illinois nominated Congressman Albert J. Hopkins to succeed Senator William E. Mason. Senator Mason declares that he will make a fight in the legislature, and while he expresses some confidence in the result, it can hardly be doubted that Mr. Mason will be retired to private life. Recently the public has not heard much from Senator Mason with relation to his views on the question of imperialism. At one time Mr. Mason made a very strong fight against the colonial policy, but recently he has shown a disposition toward repentance, and yet he seems to have sinned away his days of grace. Senator Mason would have done far better for himself had he consistently maintained his opposition to un-American policies. Perhaps he would have been defeated, but he would have retired with the consciousness that he had exerted his best efforts to keep this government in line with its traditions. There will be a marked difference between the standing of William E. Mason, defeated after he showed a disposition to compromise with the enemies of American principles, and William E. Mason had he been defeated simply because he maintained consistent opposition to the republican party's assault upon the constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

"Tuitionary annex" is a new phrase, coined by General MacArthur to take the place of "conquered territory." This is following republican precedent closely. From "criminal aggression" to "benevolent assimilation" was a short step, and from "starvation camps" to "camps of sanitation and instruction" was still shorter.

The cost of the Philippine war for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, was \$1.86 per head for the entire population of the United States. Our increased exports to the islands amount to 5 cents per head for the entire population of the United States. This is the "magnificent commercial opportunity" afforded by the retention of the islands.

Mason  
in  
Defeat.