

to govern themselves. To use plain English this is arrant humbug if it is intended to be a pledge of independence to the Filipinos. The judge says he is 'still unable to understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government while another nation may in any degree whatever control their action.' This is in criticism of the present position of the United States government in the islands, but in the very next sentence he favors promising self-government to them 'as soon as it can prudently' be granted to them. It is a matter of surprise to us that a man accustomed to deal with principles of law and justice as is, presumably, Judge Parker, should fail to see that he is guilty of complete inconsistency in these two statements. The only difference between his attitude and that of the republican party seems to be that while the former favors fitting the people of the Philippine islands for self-government with the intention that they shall ultimately enjoy it, but meanwhile makes no promises to them, Judge Parker favors making them the promise in advance. This in spite of the fact clearly established by Judge Taft and his associates, that the holding out of such a promise at this time tends to defeat the ultimate object aimed at and greatly hamper the restoration of order and the education of the people. As we have said, the thing, as Judge Parker states it, is plain humbug."

It is strange that the Journal has any difficulty in understanding Judge Parker's position because he says he favors treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans. In the war resolutions it was declared that "The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is completed, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

Did this plain pledge to the Cubans defeat the ultimate object aimed at? Did this promise hamper the restoration of order in Cuba?

In our war resolutions we declared that "the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent." If the people of Cuba "of right ought to be free and independent," why are the people of the Philippines not entitled to the same privilege?

There is no more humbug about Judge Parker's statement on this question than there was in the declaration made in the war resolution which gave assurance to the people of Cuba that no imperialistic program would be carried out.

Judge Parker on Imperialism

In his speech accepting the democratic nomination for president, Judge Parker said: "The accident of war brought the Philippines into our possession, and we are not at liberty to disregard the responsibility which thus came to us, but that responsibility will be best subserved by preparing the islanders as rapidly as possible for self-government and giving to them the assurances that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it."

There has been some criticism of this speech based upon the fact that Judge Parker used the words "self-government," rather than the word "independence."

In the same speech Judge Parker referred to the democratic platform as an "admirable" platform, and it will be remembered that that platform, referring to the Filipinos, said: "We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and, upon the suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet free and independent to work out their own destiny."

But there is no longer ground for criticising

Judge Parker on this point.

Recently John G. Milburn of Buffalo, N. Y., addressed to Judge Parker the following letter:

I have noticed in some quarters a disposition to criticise the words "self-government," used by you in connection with the future of the Philippine Islands, as meaning something less than independence; and I venture to ask you if I am not right in assuming that "self-government," as you used the phrase, is identical with independence, political and territorial?

The following is a complete reply to this letter:

Rosemount, Esopus, New York, August 22, 1904.—My Dear Milburn: You are entirely right in assuming that as I employed the phrase, "self-government," it was intended to be identical with independence, political and territorial. After noting the criticism referred to by you, I am still unable to understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government, while another nation may in any degree whatever control their action. But to take away all possible opportunity for conjecture, it shall be made clear in the letter of acceptance that I am in hearty accord with that plank in the democratic platform which advocates treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans; and I also favor making the promise to them now to take such action as soon as it can prudently be done.

Thanking you for your letter, and with best wishes for you always, I am, very sincerely yours,
ALTON B. PARKER.

Judge Parker could not have made his statement any stronger than he did in the letter to Mr. Milburn. Even in advance of his formal letter of acceptance, he stands thoroughly committed to the democratic doctrine of self-government, which, according to his explicit interpretation, means independence.

Judge Parker's position on the question of imperialism is directly in line with the Kansas City platform. That platform declared:

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not become citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not become subjects without imperiling our form of government, and we are not willing to surrender our civilization or to convert the republic into an empire; we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give to the Filipinos first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America.

In his speech of acceptance delivered at Indianapolis, the democratic nominee for president in 1900, said:

If elected I should convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as I am inaugurated and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose:

1. To establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the island of Cuba.
2. To give independence to the Filipinos, just as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans.
3. To protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba.

A European protectorate often results in the exploitation of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics, and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us.

Those who imagine that the American people have grown indifferent to the evils of imperialism have not made thoughtful survey of the situation. Judge Parker's position on that question is thor-

oughly democratic and those who are opposed to the un-American doctrines that have been foisted upon the people by the republican party may cast their votes for Alton B. Parker, convinced that he will employ all of the executive's power and influence in the effort to make our national policies responsive to Abraham Lincoln's eloquent appeal: "Return to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the Revolution."

Will You Help?

In a great educational campaign, every one may participate. Some may participate by contributions in the form of cash; others, gifted with the power of oratory, may participate by public speech, and others may take part by writing for the public prints. It is also true that an effective way of aiding in an educational campaign is by the distribution of literature, whether in the form of a speech or in the form of a newspaper devoted to certain well-defined principles.

Those who are interested in the principles advocated by The Commoner and who are unable to deliver speeches or to write articles, may find in The Commoner's special subscription offer the opportunity for aiding in the great educational campaign upon which the American people are about to enter.

The Commoner believes that the people should own the railroads. In The Commoner's opinion, public ownership of the railroads is vastly superior to railroad ownership of the public. In The Commoner's opinion, we should have an income tax, the fairest of all tax systems. Federal judges should be elected by the people to serve for a limited period. The people of every municipality should control and own their public utilities. United States senators should be chosen by popular vote. The state should own the railroads and the telegraph system. There should be direct legislation in order that the people may suggest laws for public advantage. Postmasters should be chosen, by votes of the people whom they are presumed to serve. Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. Jeffersonian democracy suggests methods whereby the American people may be relieved of the enormous impositions that are placed upon them through the great trust system.

Those who believe in these policies may contribute materially to the educational campaign if they but take advantage of The Commoner's special subscription offer. Upon the lines stated The Commoner intends to do its part in this educational campaign. This campaign will, by no means, be concluded on election day in this year of 1904. That day will but mark the beginning of a mighty effort to re-establish popular government in this nation.

Those who sympathize with The Commoner on these lines are cordially invited to assist in pushing The Commoner's special subscription offer.

According to the terms of this offer, cards, each good for one year's subscription to The Commoner, will be furnished in lots of five at the rate of \$3.00 per lot. This places the yearly subscription rate at 60 cents.

Anyone ordering these cards may sell them for \$1.00 each, thus earning a commission of \$2.00 on each lot sold, or he may sell them at the cost price and find compensation in the fact that he has contributed to the educational campaign.

These cards may be paid for when ordered, or they may be ordered and remittance made after they have been sold. A coupon is printed below for the convenience of those who desire to participate in this effort to increase The Commoner's circulation.

THE COMMONER'S SPECIAL OFFER

Application for Subscription Cards

| | |
|--|---|
| 5 | I am interested in increasing The Commoner's circulation, and desire you to send me a supply of subscription cards. I agree to use my utmost endeavor to sell the cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each, when sold. |
| 10 | |
| 15 | |
| 20 | |
| 25 | |
| 50 | Name |
| 75 | Box, or Street No. |
| 100 | P. O. State |
| Indicate the number of cards wanted by marking X opposite one of the numbers printed on end of this blank. | |

If you believe the paper is doing a work that merits encouragement, fill out the above coupon and mail it to The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.