

It is known to every one familiar with our Philippine policy that the government we have established in the Philippines does not derive its powers from the consent of the governed.

The Register and Leader says:

There is no occasion now to thresh over the historic precedents, from the purchase of Louisiana down, for the course that has been pursued by this government in the Philippine islands. It is enough to know that with the single exception that statehood was not promised in the treaty with Spain, as it was when territory was acquired from France and Mexico, there has not a thing been done in the Philippines that the fathers of the republic have not established a precedent for, from Jefferson down. And what difference in the actual situation has the promise of statehood made? Indian Territory, of the Louisiana purchase, is still a territory after 100 years, and rightly so as Mr. Bryan will admit, and under the regulation of congress as fully as the island of Luzon is. New Mexico, of the acquisition from Mexico, after nearly 60 years is still a territory, and at least until the present, as Mr. Bryan must admit, rightly so, and under the regulation of congress. Congress has exercised its own judgment about conferring statehood on our American territories, without violating the Declaration of Independence. Absolutely nothing has yet occurred to indicate that independence in some form will not be conferred upon the Philippine islands as rapidly as they are capable of exercising it, and until something does occur, there is not a precedent in our whole national history to warrant Mr. Bryan's gloomy forebodings.

The Register and Leader intimates that something else must be brought to light to convince that newspaper that the republican policy is not in harmony with the principles which Lincoln championed.

It is a fact that very nearly every policy pursued by the republican party of today finds condemnation in Lincoln's speeches and writings; and this condemnation is so severe that it might seem that the words of Lincoln were written, not for the evils of his day, but, in truth, as a protest against the republican policies of the present time.

For instance, the Register and Leader says that independence is to be given to the Filipinos "as rapidly as they are capable of exercising it." That is the promise made in the republican national platform of 1900. Has the Register and Leader forgotten that in one of Abraham Lincoln's speeches there is a criticism of such pledges—a criticism so complete that one not knowing its author might believe that it was written after the republican national platform of 1900 had been framed?

"Those arguments that are made," said Abraham Lincoln, "that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow, what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always beströde the necks of the people not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument. . . . Turn it whatever way you will, whether it come from the mouth of kings as an excuse for enslaving the people of their country or from the mouth of the men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is the same old serpent."

The Register and Leader is in error when it says that "with the single exception that statehood was not promised in the treaty with Spain, as it was when territory was acquired from France and Mexico, there has not a thing been done in the Philippines that the fathers of the republic have not established a precedent for from Jefferson down."

The Register and Leader has doubtless overlooked the fact that trial by jury is a privilege

denied to the people of the Philippines, while the enjoyment of that privilege was explicitly provided for in congressional legislation relating to our earlier acquisitions.

Congress has passed laws designating the people of Porto Rico as "citizens of Porto Rico" and the people of the Philippines as "citizens of the Philippines." Can this republican paper point to any act of congress in the days of the fathers which shows that United States citizenship was denied to those who came under our authority?

Is it not true that the inhabitants of the territory acquired in the fathers' time were, if they so elected, regarded as citizens of the United States?

Did the fathers ever levy tariffs against these newly acquired territories?

Is it not true that the property thus acquired was speedily formed into territories and that no suggestion of the colonial system pertained to it?

For the purposes of this discussion it is not important that Indian Territory and New Mexico are yet territories even after the lapse of nearly a century. The important fact is that the people of these territories are citizens of the United States whose every right is protected by the constitution.

The fathers, while exercising authority over these sections, did not deny to the inhabitants thereof the privilege of becoming citizens of the government under which they were required to live and did not undertake to designate them as citizens of a mythical government.

It is one thing to delay or withhold the grant of statehood to a territory; it is quite another thing to deny to the people of a territory over which we have asserted jurisdiction the privilege of United States citizenship.

It is one thing to maintain territories, as New Mexico and the Indian territory have been maintained, and it is quite another thing to establish colonies like Porto Rico and the Philippines.

There is a marked difference between the territorial acquisition of the fathers and the imperialism of the present day.

If the editor of the Register and Leader desires to read some impressive statements defining this difference he might consult a work written by Theodore Roosevelt, now president of the United States. In "The Winning of the West," this republican editor will learn something to his advantage from the pen of the republican leader.

Cleveland's Candidacy.

Brother Watterson is sure that Cleveland wants to be a candidate again, and he takes occasion to speak very bitterly about Mr. Cleveland—more bitterly than a conservative man like the editor of The Commoner would feel disposed to speak. There is no doubt that Mr. Watterson is perfectly honest in his effort to prevent Mr. Cleveland's running. He first appealed to him, as it were on bended knees, not to be a candidate, and then when appeals seemed vain he belabored him with his oratorical and rhetorical club, or, rather, pen. He quotes from the various Cleveland papers, and seems to make a good case against Mr. Cleveland, if ambition to be a candidate for the fourth time were a crime.

The Philadelphia Record of March 25 has a column on the first page under big headlines announcing that Cleveland is being boomed by a man of the not uncommon name of Jones. Mr. Jones says: "But I find that Mr. Cleveland's popularity is almost unbounded." And Mr. Jones also says that Mr. Cleveland has "never yet refused to serve his party," and adds, "While he may have an aversion to again entering public life he will not fall us at a time when he is most needed." Well, if the reorganizers obtain control of the party, why should not Cleveland be the nominee? If the party has made a mistake in taking the people's side and in casting Mr. Cleveland aside,

why should it not take Mr. Cleveland up again if it decides to cast the people aside? It would be a great deal better to nominate Mr. Cleveland, so that the voters would know certainly what they were voting for (or against), than to nominate some other plutocrat with Cleveland's views and sentiments, but whose position is not known to the people.

Let us have a clean-cut, open fight between the democratic party and Mr. Cleveland. If Mr. Cleveland is defeated he can vote the republican ticket as usual. If he is successful in securing the nomination—well, he will doubtless support the ticket.

The Race Question.

Whether or not the president thought he was doing the colored race a favor when he invited Booker T. Washington to the White house, it is quite evident that he succeeded in doing the colored man a great deal of harm. No public man could justify himself in raising the question of social equality unless he intended to follow it up by efforts to secure that equality. The president unnecessarily injected the question into our political life, and then left the colored man to bear it alone, except insofar as he has actually embarrassed him by his efforts to put him into prominent positions in the south against the protests of the white people. It seems, however, that in the case of Mr. Vick of North Carolina "the door of hope" was not important when it interfered with the political plans of the president's supporters in that state.

If the president really believes social equality between the white and the black man a desirable thing, he ought to go farther than he has; if he does not believe it, he ought not to have gone so far. If he is actuated by a desire to help the negro by appointing him to position he might show it first by making the appointments where the race question is not acute; and, second, when he does make an appointment in the south he ought to make it for the help of the negro appointed, and not for the help of any republican candidate who may seek delegates from the south.

Government by Injunction.

A reader of The Commoner desires to know the meaning of "government by injunction." It is the name given to that process of the court by which judges, mostly federal judges, have at the request of corporations restrained the employees of the corporations from doing certain specified acts. If such acts are already prohibited by law, then the violation of the law should be punished in the ordinary way and the accused be given a trial by jury. If the acts prohibited by the court are not prohibited by statute, then the court is making criminal law, and this is not its province. A bill was introduced some years ago and passed through the senate making it unlawful for a court to punish for contempt unless the contempt was committed in the presence of the court. This bill passed the senate practically without opposition, but as soon as the corporations discovered the purpose of this bill they succeeded in defeating it in the house, and since that time it has never been able to pass either house, or, in fact, to obtain consideration.

Recipe for Harmony.

The recipe for harmony usually given by the reorganizers is as follows: Mix sixteen parts of loyal democrats with one part of unrepentant bolters and stir until all the bolters are on top. Then skim off the top with an official ladle and throw the balance away.