

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 11, NO. 18

Lincoln, Nebraska, May 12, 1911

Whole Number 538

## Aldrich Democrats

The following editorial is from the Richmond (Virginia) Times-Dispatch:

"We do not know what corporation has queered the Montgomery Advertiser, as honest a newspaper as will be found anywhere in the country, but it must have been 'touched' by some sinister influence or it would not venture to speak of the great Nebraskan as follows:

"Mr. Bryan, in his Commoner, strikes Senator Martin another blow, and all because the Virginian doesn't look to the Grand Master from the west for marching orders. Party toleration of the Peerless, having gone on for fifteen years, has badly turned his head. Factional strife and petty bickerings are out of place at this time, but it is vain to hope for peace so long as the Bryan vanity is permitted to assert itself."

"We think the Advertiser is entirely right, but, of course, it must pay the penalty of Mr. Bryan's distrust, because it does not agree with Mr. Bryan in his political views, and is not willing to trust the fortunes of the democratic party or of the country to his domination."

If the Advertiser has paid "the penalty of Mr. Bryan's distrust," it is because the Advertiser—like the Richmond Times-Dispatch, and like the Virginia senator for whom these papers speak—is an Aldrich democrat. Papers that seek to turn the democratic party over to the special interests pretend that Mr. Bryan is seeking to dominate the party. All Mr. Bryan asks is that the party be true to itself, to the principles for which it claims to stand and that it overcome the efforts of those who would make it the servant of the special interests. Yet the answer to Mr. Bryan's appeal on this line is that he "seeks to stir up factional strife and petty bickerings" and that his efforts are the outgrowth of "the Bryan vanity."

Such "arguments" as these have deceived democrats at various times but it is not at all likely that they will be effective today. Such appeals are of the vintage of 1904. In that year papers like the Richmond and Montgomery publications had their way and the democratic party paid the penalty. Democrats know better now.

### FREE WOOL

Press dispatches say that some of the democrats in the house are insisting upon having a tariff on wool. If there is any such protectionist sentiment among the democrats the sooner it is brought to light and combatted, the better.

If the democratic party can be scared by a few sheep growers it might as well renounce its advocacy of tariff reduction and make an alliance with the republican party. Protection is protection no matter whether it is asked for the benefit of manufacturers or for the benefit of farmers and a man who believes in protection is worse than worthless as a tariff reformer. If his heart is set on protecting somebody he will soon learn that protectionists must stand

together and then he is afraid to touch the tariff anywhere. Without free wool tariff reform will not amount to much for the spirit that would lead congress to tax all the farmers (and all other citizens) who wear woolen goods in order to give a tariff tribute to the few farmers who raise sheep will consent to other tariff exactions until tariff reform will be little more than a farce.

### THE NEBRASKA SITUATION

The readers of The Commoner will be pleased to know that the submission of the initiative and referendum has removed the liquor question from politics for the present, and from partisan politics for the future, as well, if the initiative and referendum amendment is adopted by the voters. The amendment is not as liberal in its provisions as the Oregon law, but it is workable and the best that could be secured at the hands of a wet legislature. If the liquor interests had kept their hands off the last legislature this amendment would have been submitted two years ago, the democratic party would have had credit for submitting it and the party would have won a sweeping victory last fall. However, the cause of friction is now removed and as Nebraska's democracy has been united on national issues for sixteen years the party now faces the future with confidence and is ready to take advantage of the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the party's position on national issues.

### INCOME TAX

Following is a list of states which have notified the secretary of state of their action on the income tax amendment:

Ratifications—South Carolina, February 23, 1910; Illinois, March 1, 1910; Maryland, April 8, 1910; Texas, August 17, 1910; Idaho, January 20, 1911; Oregon, January 23, 1911; Montana, February 10, 1911; Indiana, February 6, 1911; Nebraska, February 11, 1911; North Carolina, February 11, 1911; Georgia, August 3, 1910; Colorado, February 20, 1911; Washington, January 26, 1911; Iowa, February 27, 1911; Michigan, February 23, 1911; Missouri, March 16, 1911; Kansas, March 6, 1911; Maine, March 31, 1911; Tennessee, April 11, 1911.

Rejections—Rhode Island, April 29, 1900; New Hampshire, March 2, 1911; Arkansas, March 28, 1911.

At least ten states that have ratified have not yet certified their action to Washington. This is an important duty and should not be overlooked.

### A DISAPPOINTING TREATY

The first clause of the treaty with Great Britain, as foreshadowed in the Washington dispatches of the Chicago Times-Herald contains the following exception:

"PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THEY (THE DIFFERENCES TO BE SUBMITTED TO ARBITRATION) do not affect the vital interests, the independence or the honor of the two contracting states and do not concern the interests of third parties."

This exception practically nullifies the treaty—at least it reduces its value to a minimum. To except "vital interests" and "honor" leaves the door open to war whenever either party wants war. Unless they add a clause providing for the submission of ALL QUESTIONS OF EVERY NATURE FOR INVESTIGATION BEFORE ANY DECLARATION OF WAR the holding of meetings to praise the treaty will look like a farce.

### JUDGE BLAIR KNOWS

Judge A. Z. Blair, of Portsmouth, O., who fined 1,600 men in West Union County Ohio, for selling their votes and disfranchised the entire number for five years, is visiting in Denver. Speaking to a representative of the United Press, Judge Blair said: "I am in favor of the initiative, referendum and recall. I am firmly convinced that the adoption of these measures of popular government throughout the country will do more, perhaps, than any other one thing to put an end to corruption in politics, and particularly to the buying and selling of votes."

## Iowa Democrats

Iowa democrats met at Des Moines May 1, to attend the banquet given by the Jefferson Club of Iowa. It was an enthusiastic meeting. Judge A. J. Mathis of Des Moines presided. Frank A. O'Connor of Chickasaw county spoke on "The Mission of the Minority." D. B. Murphy of Elkader spoke on "Modern Application of Jeffersonian Economics." E. G. Dunn of Mason City spoke on the "Democracy of the Farm," and Judge Martin J. Wade spoke on "The Tariff." The invocation was offered by Rev. Thomas Casady.

The Jefferson Club elected John C. DeMar of Des Moines as president of the organization. He succeeded A. J. Mathis of Des Moines, who has acted as head of the club during the past year.

The other officers elected were:

Secretary, A. H. Crenshaw, Adel; treasurer, J. P. O'Malley, Perry; vice presidents, First district, N. C. Roberts, second district, M. J. Wade; Third district, Lewis Murphy; Fourth district, A. J. Anders, Fifth district, A. G. Johnson; Sixth district, S. V. Reynolds; Seventh district, S. A. Hayes; Eighth district, F. Q. Stuart; Ninth district, Frank Wallace; Tenth district, John McCarthy; Eleventh district, W. C. Whiting; executive committee, C. R. Porter, J. D. Denison; E. M. Carr, J. B. Weaver; C. D. Huston, H. Utterback, W. B. Hart, A. J. Mathis, Jerry B. Sullivan, W. C. Campbell and H. C. Evans.

The following report of the banquet is made by the Des Moines Register and Leader:

In a speech before the Jefferson Club of Iowa at the Elks' club house, William J. Bryan gloried in democratic successes in recent elections, and in the passage of democratic measures through the lower house of the congress of the United States.

With his old-time eloquence he went over again the list of principles for which he declares the democratic party has been standing for years, but which of late have been either stolen by the republicans or else accepted by them from the democrats without a murmur.

Years ago, he said, he had to look over his shoulder to see how far behind him the republican party was trailing, but now, he said, he had to hurry to keep up with the procession.

He pointed to the direct election of United States senators and the income tax as principles long contended for by the democrats and which have been practically adopted by the republicans.

He upheld the Canadian reciprocity pact, declaring that it was good as far as it went. He said it did not go far enough. He hailed it as the first step in the tearing down of the wall of protection built up by republican administrations and asserted that whether the pact was approved or sent to the scrap heap, that the start had been made and high protection was doomed.

The democratic free list bill, up for consideration in the house the coming week, was declared by him to be the greatest party strategic movement made in thirty years.

"There are republicans down there at Washington now who are sweating blood in their efforts to find a way out," said Mr. Bryan. "It will be put right up to them and it will be mighty hard for them to turn it down."

He paid particularly strong tribute to Governor Woodrow Wilson of New Jersey, praising the course he has pursued thus far in his service as chief executive of the state. He spoke a little of Speaker Champ Clark of the house, but made no mention of Governor Judson Harmon of Ohio. His references to Governor Wilson and Champ Clark were greeted with applause.

The liveliest issue Mr. Bryan hit upon during his address, however, was reciprocity, and his words were followed closely.

He said, in discussing the debate preceding the passage of the pact by the house:

"Then something happened that I did not expect. It was the opposition of the protected interests to this reciprocity bill, and when we listened to arguments made for and against it,

## CONTENTS

ALDRICH DEMOCRATS
A DISAPPOINTING TREATY
THE NEBRASKA SITUATION
IOWA'S JEFFERSON CLUB BANQUET
MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH ON "A GRAND OLD BOOK"
THE PHILIPPINES FOR THE FILIPINO—BY ERVING WINSLOW
TACTICS OF GUILT
CURRENT TOPICS
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
GOVERNOR LEE CRUCE ON OKLAHOMA'S BANKING LAW
WASHINGTON NEWS
NEWS OF THE WEEK