

"NOT A FRIEND"

The hostile papers report that Mr. Bryan has not a friend left in congress. His labors, covering a period of twenty years, have been in vain if a revengeful speech of one man can break all the ties that have been formed during two congressional terms and three presidential campaigns.

FORTUNATE MR. UNDERWOOD

Chairman Underwood has no cause to complain. Mr. Bryan's criticism of him has brought him at once the ardent friendship and admiration of those democrats—an influential class, too—who have fought Mr. Bryan for fifteen years. Now, if he has won the friendship of all who have been friendly to Mr. Bryan he must be the most popular man in the party.

A QUESTION OF FACT

Did Chairman Underwood, in caucus, oppose and defeat a resolution offered by Mr. Clark instructing the ways and means committee to proceed to report other bills including a bill reducing the iron and steel schedule? The Omaha World-Herald says that he did. If so, has a democrat a right to discuss his action and disapprove of it?

Second, did Congressman Kitchin urge immediate action on the iron and steel schedule, and suggest that Mr. Underwood's pecuniary investments in the iron business might give cause for criticism if reduction was delayed. The Omaha World-Herald report says he did. If so, may not a democrat outside of the caucus express an opinion on the subject? Mr. Bryan's opinion in regard to Mr. Underwood is not based on one act but on a number; if Mr. Bryan is mistaken in his estimate of Mr. Underwood he will be more than pleased to admit it when convinced. Having nothing to gain by doing injustice to any one; having no ambition to gratify except the ambition to render service to his fellowmen he can await the verdict of time on Mr. Underwood as on others from whom he has found it necessary to differ.

"THE LEADERS" DON'T LIKE HIM

Yet this fact stands out clear, that the criticism of Mr. Bryan is not based upon any fact or allegation that he is unfaithful to democratic principles, and until it can be shown that he is, all the assaults of all the party's leaders in Washington will not serve to sap the faith reposed in him by the rank and file of the party in the nation. It is always to be remembered that the leaders did not make Bryan. If the power were theirs they would have pulled him down long ago. Many of them he made by making the democratic party truly democratic and carrying to the country conviction of the party's sincerity.

The common truths of human nature are too well known for anyone to suppose that Mr. Bryan would escape assaults such as are made upon his leadership. Men who rise to be senators and chairmen of important committees in congress may not acknowledge jealousy of a man whom they well know carries an influence beside which their own is puny in comparison, but they have it nevertheless. They would not be resentful of his so-called dictatorship if they were not keenly conscious of the immense power he wields. Until that power is destroyed or greatly impaired, they will be in eclipse and consciousness of this simple fact galls and embitters them.—Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald.

IMPETUS TO HARMON BOOM

Until comparatively recently there was a general opinion that Bryan influence would determine the nomination of the democratic candidate for president next year. That feeling has been subsiding very rapidly, and now the chances are strong that the candidate will not be of the Bryan type.

The democrats of the present house, thinking fairly well of their record during the few months they have been in control, have wearied of the manner in which the Nebraskan has assumed that as a collective agency they know less about how to run their own organization than he does.

The worm has turned. And was it not the personal affair between Mr. Bryan and Mr. Underwood—the episode itself—that aroused interest to the sensation point, but the far-reaching significance of the things the episode brought to the surface.

The affair has given a great impetus to the Harmon boom, which already has overtaken and

passed the Wilson boom. Mr. Underwood has been "mentioned" and accorded some generous treatment even in the north as a strong candidate for the democrats to select as their standard bearer in 1912, but he is a Harmon man.—Chicago Record-Herald.

THE PEACE TREATIES

The United States, Great Britain and France have entered into epoch-making treaties. These treaties provide for the arbitration of differences of whatever nature that may arise between these nations. No question is reserved but every controversy is subject to arbitration.

The people of the three countries in particular and the people of all the world are to be congratulated upon this great peace movement.

Mr. Bryan has worked along these lines for many years. The Commoner of February 24, 1905, printed this editorial:

"The amendment of the treaties was not 'a step backward,' as President Roosevelt described it, and there is no reason why the friends of arbitration should be discouraged. An absolute monarch can, of course, act more quickly than an executive who is controlled by a constitution and compelled to consult a co-ordinate branch of the government, but speed is not the only thing to be considered. The framers of our government well understood the relative merits of the various forms of government and chose to risk the evils of delay in order to secure the greater safety that comes with popular government. Arbitration transfers the settlement of a question to the decision of foreign nations—and what action demands more serious consideration? To transfer to the president the power to decide such questions without consulting the senate would arouse so much opposition and cause so much uneasiness that the arbitration movement would be likely to be retarded rather than accelerated by the adoption of the president's views. One serious mistake would bring a revulsion of feeling that might jeopardize the cause of arbitration.

"It is possible, however, to provide for the impartial investigation of any international dispute, leaving the final submission to arbitration to be a matter of treaty. The president might be authorized to enter into an agreement to submit any and every international dispute to The Hague court for investigation. When the court reports upon the facts and presents the real issue between the parties, then the parties can decide intelligently whether it involves a proper question for arbitration or affects the integrity and honor of either nation. Such an investigation would, in most cases, remove misunderstanding and bring about a reconciliation and public opinion would exert a powerful influence in harmonizing any differences which might be found to exist. Such a plan would do more to promote peace than the plan embodied in the treaties submitted by the president. If such a plan had been in operation the Russian-Japanese war might have been prevented. It is quite certain that a preliminary investigation by an impartial board would have prevented most of the international wars of the last half century, and would be still more effective in the future. The president ought to be satisfied to start the investigation—leaving the arbitration treaty to be made with the concurrence of the senate after the facts are ascertained, and the senate, without any impairment of its rights and powers could delegate to the president the power to enter into any agreement that he might think proper for full and impartial investigation. Will this plan bring the president and the senate together?"

Mr. Bryan secured the indorsement of the idea by the world peace congress which was held in London, in July, 1906, and by a peace congress held in New York in 1908. The idea was also indorsed at a peace meeting held in Edinburgh in June, 1910.

CHANGING THE LAW

In 1897, when the supreme court, in the Trans-Missouri freight case, refused to put a construction upon the anti-trust law that would in effect write into that act the word "unreasonable," Mr. Justice White dissented. He upheld the railroad contention that the law should be read as though prohibiting only "undue" or "unreasonable" restraints of trade.

Again in 1898, in the Joint Traffic case, Justice White took issue with the majority of the supreme court on the same point.

Now in 1911 in the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust decisions the law is changed. White is now chief justice. The supreme court, under

Taft, has been reorganized. Chief Justice White hands down, as the opinion of the court, the views that were rejected by the supreme court in 1897 and 1898. At a stroke the rule of law that has been followed ever since the enactment of the Sherman anti-trust law is reversed, and the supreme court presumes to do what congress refused to do—put into the law the restricting word "unreasonable."—La Follette's Magazine.

FOR THE GOOSE AND FOR THE GANDER

A President was taking the Air on Pennsylvania Avenue, when he heard a Whiffling Sound behind him, and turning he beheld a Curious Thing dressed all in White and Diamonds.

"Whither away?" asked the President, whose curiosity was aroused.

"To the House to attend a meeting of the Committee on Territories," replied the White Thing.

"And is that a Bill you have in your hand?" "Yes; it is an Act entitled an Act to amend an Act repealing an Act—"

"Kindly omit the Book of Acts," said the President. "What I want to know is whereabouts is it likely to Strike the Executive Office. Am I Winner or Loser, and how much?"

"On that you will be pleased," said the White Thing, "for it changes the law as to Federal Judgeships in Alaska, Philippines and other Territories."

The President started. "What change would you make," he demanded hoarsely, "Speak, thou Fearful Guest, what change!"

"Hereafter," said the White Thing, pointing to the Bill, "You may continue to appoint judges, as you do now, but the power to remove them at will, which the present law gives you, is taken away."

"And why am I no longer allowed to Exercise the Recall?" asked the President in a Trembling Voice.

"Because you lack the Intelligence to make Removals. You have only just Brains enough to Appoint. When you have done that you are all in."

"Wait a moment" cried the President, grasping the White Toga of his Strange Companion. "Where do you come from?"

"Arizona."

"And your Name?"

"Consistency," responded the other and all his Jewels Winked.—C. D. W., in the California Outlook.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE HEART

Only those who speak from the heart and to the heart employ a universal language. Burns was a past master in the use of this language; he gave poetic expression to a sympathy that embraced the whole world; his words live because they glow with the love that makes all mankind kin.

WATCH IT GROW

Mr. Bryan has given instructions that every new subscriber shall receive The Commoner for a period of two years (which will carry it beyond the presidential election of 1912) for the sum of one dollar. Every Commoner reader is asked to secure at least one new subscriber. Many will be able to secure more than one. Everyone, however, may render some aid in this work.

The following named readers have sent in new subscribers:

Jas. Staley, Ala.; J. L. McRobie, Md.; W. F. Sekeavec, Kan.; C. A. Jerome, N. Y.; Conrad Faeth, Mo.; Robt. Kirchmann, Ill.; O. K. Olson, Minn.; Jno. Lipold, Colo.; D. Bonar, Va.; W. D. Gould, Cal.; J. W. Headden, Ga.; J. B. McGinley, Neb.; R. T. Williams, Minn.; W. W. Wells, Mo.; J. B. Storms, N. Y.; Wm. Swiman, Ill.; Harry Burke, Wash.; M. J. O'Brien, Colo.; C. W. Giering, N. Y.; C. P. Hale, W. Va.; Eli Gerber, Ind.; Dr. Howard, Ia.; Jno. T. Dow, Minn.; Lewis Ledy, Ill.; J. T. Zimmer, Ill.; Ed Shores, Kan.; J. C. Wheat, Okla.; Dan'l. Murphy, Cal.; D. B. John, Ia.; C. M. Speck, O.; D. J. Clark, Ia.; D. L. De Vane, Ariz.; L. L. Bailey, Pa.; J. C. Russell, Ore.; Nels. H. Spange, N. D.; D. McDonald, S. D.; J. Zearley, W. Va.; I. B. Newkirk, O.; W. E. Horn, Ind.; Wallace E. Groman, Pa.; J. W. Mann, Wash.; J. M. Stone, Canada.; Alfred Dicus, Colo.; T. J. Rhoades, Wash.; H. H. Allen, Okla.; J. W. Hartrock, O.; H. C. Booth, O.; P. H. Kenegan, Minn.; Jno. Myers, Ill.; B. B. Sharp, Ill.; Brown McFerlin, W. Va.; Sterling Baker, N. Y.; E. G. Stephens, Neb.; W. I. Vineyard, Tenn.; F. Krish, Ky.; G. W. Sprout, Ky.; F. Dusch, Va.; Geo. H. Ford, Md.; J. T. Cochran, Okla.; J. C. Yolton, S. D.; M. H. Wallace, R. I.; S. D. Gleason,