

any in the world, but their prime interests are American, not Filipino. What they have been asking themselves is whether or not the Philippine islands are a good bargain. This is a phase of the question upon which the democratic party does not touch, yet it is the issue upon which our permanent relations with the Philippine people will eventually be established.

In trying to play the sympathetic dodge instead of getting before the American people in a practical and respectable fashion, the democratic party lost a great opportunity. If, instead of blubbering about the inhumanities of our soldiers and mauding about our government having no right under the constitution to exercise the power and dignity of a sovereign country, the democratic politicians had gone into the debates claiming that the Philippines were a bad bargain which we could not afford to hold very long, they might have gained following where the pusillanimous course which they chose to pursue only resulted in losing it.

It is given in full because it is a fair sample of the manner in which the republican papers are dodging the Philippine question themselves and misrepresenting the position of the democrats.

The Journal says it "was not timely" to discuss independence for the Filipinos. Why not? The Journal contends that "the title to these islands came to the United States in an honorable manner." It says: "To the natural title growing out of our conquest of Spain, we added the title that goes with a purchase in fee simple," and adds, "Under the usages of the world we rightfully held dominion over all the Philippine people."

Here the Journal is compelled to fall back upon "the usages of the world"—the usages of nations that deny the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence. According to "the usages of the world" England's title to the American colonies was complete and yet the revolutionary patriots disputed that title. If England, seeing that she was going to fail in her war against the colonists, had sold her title to France for twenty million dollars, would the colonists have recognized the title as valid? France could, under those circumstances, have claimed against us the same title which we claim against the Filipinos. The Commoner will give the Journal a gold dollar if it will find a single instance in history in which a civilized nation or one claiming to be civilized ever accepted the services of allies to help conquer a nation and then bought from the conquered nation a title to its allies. If the Journal finds such an instance and editorially indorses the act of the conquering nation as sound in morals and as in harmony with our principles of government the reward will be increased by the addition of a silver dollar weighing sixteen times as much as the gold dollar.

If the Journal cannot find usage to support our conduct and cannot defend the principles involved it had better fall back on the republican excuse that it is not "timely" to discuss this question.

The Journal charges that the democrats prolonged the war and "drove the patriotic press of the land into an attitude which has been mistaken for a settled conviction that we must hold the islands forever." What a miserable subterfuge! Adam's cowardice was not more shameful when he tried to escape by laying the blame upon Eve. Adam was even more manly for he admitted that he at last yielded to temptation, while the Journal stoutly contends that it was actually pushed into an erroneous position. If the Filipinos have no right to independence and are not to have it, why do we hesitate to tell them so? And if they have a right to independence and are to receive it, why not tell them and end the war? If we are going to give them that for which they are fighting, why not give it to live men who can enjoy it? Why reserve it for dead men who have no use for it?

Are we waiting to see whether it will pay? If a man finds a pocketbook with the name of the owner plainly printed on it, he is a thief at heart if he waits to count the contents before deciding

to turn it over to the one to whom it belongs. The president must favor or oppose ultimate independence or be in doubt about it. If he favors ultimate independence, how can he justify bloodshed that could be averted by a promise of independence? If he opposes it, how can he avoid the charge of deliberate fraud upon the Filipinos? To suggest independence when it is not to be given is neither candid nor honest.

But not content with dodging the question, the Journal wilfully misrepresents the democratic position. The democrats have not changed their position; they are contending today for the same policy that they have advocated from the beginning. They never contended that we should "haul down our flag and come away immediately." It is guilty of inexcusable mendacity when it speaks of "the policy of scuttle and run on which their (democratic) party made the campaign of 1900." The editor of the Journal cannot be so grossly ignorant of recent history as not to know that the democratic platform of 1900 expressly declared against a "scuttle and run" policy. The establishment of a stable government was to come first and independence afterwards, but the democrats insisted in 1900, and still insist, that it will be easy to establish a stable government when the people understand that when established it will be their government and not ours.

Imperialism is so indefensible that the republicans dare not avow their purpose to maintain a colonial policy permanently. And yet that is the purpose that must be assumed, for to involve this country in great expense, to sacrifice the lives of Americans and shed the blood of Filipinos only to give at the close that which, if given at the beginning, would have prevented war would be worse than criminal. The Journal dodges the Philippine question because it cannot defend the republican position and it misrepresents the democratic position because it cannot answer democratic arguments.

The Sentinel's Rebuke.

The Indianapolis Sentinel in an editorial, which is reproduced on another page, takes Mr. Bryan to task for criticising the failure of the Indiana convention to indorse the Kansas City platform. The Sentinel points to its support of the ticket in 1896 and 1900 as evidence that it has been loyal to the party and it asserts its friendliness to Mr. Bryan. The Commoner will not dispute the Sentinel's claim to credit for work done, nor will its profession of friendship be questioned, but however gratified we may feel for past favors we must fight the battles that are before us. No amount of service in past campaigns can excuse the Sentinel for lending its powerful influence to the reorganizers in the present contest. The Sentinel is willing to consider the money question as settled and allow the financiers to assume control of the party. This willingness to turn the party back into the hands of the Cleveland crowd may be due to a change of heart on the part of the editor, or it may be due to an error of the head—let us hope to the latter. The financiers cannot be trusted as leaders, first, because the money question is not settled, and, second, because even if it were the financiers are against the people on every other question and will betray the people at the first opportunity. Every congress has to deal with the money question in some form, and the people are receiving no aid or protection from the Sentinel. The financiers wanted gold, not because they like the yellow metal, but because they wanted money scarce and dear. They still want money scarce and dear, and if intrusted with power they will rob the people of the benefits of an increased supply of gold. Even now the Fowler bill provides for an asset currency, for branch banks and for a redeemable silver dollar. While the Indiana platform condemns this bill, the reorganizers will not discuss it and cannot be trusted to stand for anything opposed by the financiers. The Sentinel beguiles its readers with talk about the money question being dead, while the money-changers are forging new chains and plotting for further advantages. Is the editor of the Sentinel deceived? Or is he trying to deceive others? The Sentinel favors Taggart for national chairman and Taggart followed Cleveland at the Tilden club banquet and indorsed his speech. This shows the real attitude of the Sentinel. If the Sentinel can be coaxed or driven away from the money question it can by the same influence be weaned from other questions. If it cannot be trusted to fight the schemes of Wall street on the money question, it cannot be relied upon to stand firm on any other question, for the same secret, but powerful, influence is behind the trusts and imperialism.

The Sentinel speaks of Mr. Bryan's duty to

the democracy of Indiana. He appreciates the support of those who instructed for him, but he is not under obligations to those who tried to prevent his nomination by giving him a fraudulent and deceptive platform. He is indebted to the uncorrupted and unterrified democracy of Indiana and the nation, and these will not have reason to doubt his fidelity to their interests.

A Complete Remedy.

Mr. Littlefield of Maine interrupted Congressman Ball of Texas to ask: "What is the democratic remedy for trusts?" Mr. Ball at once replied: "To place all trust-made articles on the free list; to deny trusts the power of interstate transportation and the use of the mails, and to inaugurate an administration which will resort to penal statutes and not to injunctions in the prosecution of trusts." The press dispatches do not report what Mr. Littlefield thought of the reply, but it is to be hoped that he will be as free to commend the democratic remedy for the trusts as he has been to condemn the attitude of the republican party on the colonial question. Mr. Ball condensed into a sentence the anti-trust plank of the Kansas City platform. That platform criticised the republican administration for not enforcing existing laws and then advocated the free list for trust-made articles and urged a federal statute denying to monopolies the privileges of interstate commerce. These remedies cover the entire ground and yet the republicans, while pretending to oppose trusts, refuse to apply these remedies or to suggest others. Mr. Littlefield ought to profit by the information received.

Work is Needed

The timidity shown by the democrats of Indiana in state convention, and the capture by the reorganizers of the democratic machinery of Illinois emphasizes the pressing need of some effective work being done by those who want the democratic party to remain true to its trust. While the democrats who are democrats from principle have been going about their daily work with no thought of danger to their party, the democrats who are democrats for revenue only (whether it be holding office in the democratic party or the republican party) have been laying plans to capture democratic conventions for the purpose of outbidding the republicans for corporation support. The success the reorganizers have achieved in Illinois and their partial victory in Indiana should arouse all true democrats to a sense of duty. The Commoner's influence will be used to defeat the plans of the corporation element now seeking to regain control of the party. Will you not give The Commoner an opportunity to do some work for the party in your neighborhood? A few minutes of your time devoted to an extension of its circulation may be the means of preventing the party in your county from being captured by the reorganizers. The campaign offer, known as the "Lots of Five Plan," places the subscription price within the reach of all. The Commoner is selling five subscriptions for \$3.00, which is at the rate of 60 cents each. Will you not assume the responsibility of disposing of five or more of these subscription cards? Hundreds of readers of The Commoner are already assisting in this work. More than five thousand subscriptions have been received through the "Lots of Five Plan" alone.

If you believe The Commoner is doing a good work write your name and address in the coupon below and mail it to this office. Five subscription cards will be sent to you, each card good for one year's subscription to The Commoner when properly filled out and returned to this office. You can easily secure five subscriptions at 60 cents each, and thus enlarge its circle of readers and increase its influence for good.

APPLICATION FOR
"Lots of Five Subscription Cards."

PUBLISHER COMMONER: Please send me five subscription cards. I promise to use my utmost endeavor to sell these cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each when sold.

Name

Postoffice

County

State