The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 11, NO. 40

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 13, 1911

Whole Number 560

Progressives vs. Reactionaries

The fight for the control of the next democratic convention is the old fight between the progressives and the reactionaries. The subsidized newspapers, republican and democratic, will be advising the democratic party how to win, and they will unerringly agree upon the man whom Wall street wants. They will have with them the trust magnates who secured, at the hands of the supreme court, the repeal of the criminal clause of the anti-trust law; they will have all the railroad magnates who want to control the appointment of interstate commerce commissioners and United States judges, and they will have the big financiers who want to organize a money trust to increase the profits of all the other trusts.

Progressive democrats must stand together; they should in each state unite upon the progressive candidate who is strongest in that state and then present a united front against the reactionaries. Candidates are being weighed; opinions are being formed. Before the primaries and conventions the progressives in each state should find some way of getting together. The ambitions of candidates should not be considered; men are important only as they stand for principles and as they can advance policies that are good. The Commoner will lend any assistance it can.

Plain People

The Baltimore Evening Sun says: "It would be interesting to know what demagogues mean when they talk about 'plain' people. Is there some lesser breed in our midst? Do their men wear jeans pants and their women calico dresses? Are they one-eyed, or are they binocular, like the rest of us? Would the demagogues aforesaid dare tell the people they refer to their faces that they were 'plain?' We wot not! There are no classes in the United States, and the statesman who tries to travel on that kind of humbug is going to wake up to find himself a dead politician."

If the Baltimore Evening Sun really believes that there are no classes in the United States it would learn something to its advantage if it would undertake to withdraw the special privileges enjoyed by a coterie of men in this country, putting those men on the same level with the men—otherwise known as "the plain people"—who do not enjoy those privileges.

If there are no classes in the United States, what about those people who give their daughters in marriage to titled foreigners—as an incidental to a fortune settlement—at the very time when ordinary men and women are wrestling with the problem of living?

"The plain people" are those who are willing that the government shall be operated for the public benefit and who ask of government nothing more than equality before the law.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

If the supreme court was not packed in the interest of the trusts will President Taft explain

CONTENTS

PROGRESSIVES VS. REACTIONARIES
PLAIN PEOPLE
THE SECRET OUT
MR. BRYAN AND THE PEACE
MOVEMENT
FORTY-FIVE YEARS OF SCHEDULE K—
A STORY OF DODGE AND DELAY
CARDINAL GIBBONS' PHILOSOPHY
WHAT THE INSURGENTS ARE DOING
MR. BRYAN AND PRESIDENT TAFT
ADMIRAL SCHLEY AND THE FLAG
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS

Protection is essentially and intrinsically unjust. At the very threshold of the discussion of protection just men should insist that government has no right through a statute to enable a few men to increase their wealth at the expense of the whole body of consumers. Right and justice are opposed to such a system, and it is idle for men to attempt to reason on the beneficent results of injustice. Injustice in the long run always brings evil, and men may be ever so wise in determining the good results of an unjust law, yet they overlook the fact that the results must in the very nature of things eventually bring destruction.-Franklin Pierce, member of New York bar.

how he just happened to appoint Justice Hughes,

who, in his campaign speeches, promised that

0000000000000000000000

the republican party would adopt "the rule of reason" asked for by the trusts?

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Sept. 29, 1911.—The Denver Post, Denver, Colo. Gentlemen: Answering your question, I beg to say that I am not in favor of selling the Philippine Islands to any country. I do not agree with those who believe that people can be rightfully bought or sold-the sale of the Philippine Islands would be virtually a sale of the people. The question of price is not to be considered in a matter of this kind. The democratic party in three national campaigns has declared in favor of promising independence, the promise to be fulfilled as soon as a stable government is established. The last platform added a suggestion in regard to the securing of neutralization by treaty. I believe that these platforms set forth the proper method of dealing with the Philippine question, and hope to see these platforms carried out.

I am in full sympathy with those who desire the reclamation of all the arid lands of our own country, such reclamation to be secured by the proper use of the streams and by the storage of surplus waters, but it is not necessary that we shall adopt the imperialistic idea of negotiating for the sale of people in order to secure the money necessary for the development of our own country. Very truly yours, W. J. BRYAN.

PUBLICITY! PUBLICITY!! PUBLICITY!!!

Now, that Mr. Perkins discloses the REASON for Governor Hughes' appointment to the supreme bench, will President Taft tell us upon whose recommendation Governor Hughes was appointed?

The Secret Out

Those who want to know why Governor Hughes was appointed to the supreme bench can find it in the speech made last week by Mr. Perkins, until recently a partner of J. Pierpont Morgan. Mr. Perkins says that Governor Hughes was the man put forward in 1908 to represent the republican party's position on the trust question and that Governor Hughes, in his speech at Youngstown, Ohio, construed the republican promise to amend the anti-trust law as follows: "In our progress we must avoid false steps. Ours must be THE RULE OF REASON," etc.

Mr. Perkins says: "The only vestige of keeping faith with the people on anything involved in this campaign, and as discussed in the campaign, is found in the supreme court's recent trust decisions, wherein the 'rule of reason' is applied, and in connection with this significant fact are the following sentiments of the Youngstown speech of Governor Hughes, for the past year a member of the supreme court:

"'* But in our progress we must seek to avoid false steps. Ours must be the rule of reason, clear eyed, calm, patient and steadfast; defeating the conspiracies of intrigue and escaping the pitfalls of folly. Supreme must be the sense of justice, with its recognition of our mutual dependence."

Here we have it. Governor Hughes was put forward to represent the republican party; he assured the trusts that "the rule of reason" for which they had been waiting for more than ten years would be adopted. Congress refused to keep the promise, so Governor Hughes was put on the supreme bench and helped to AMEND the LAW IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REPUBLICAN PROMISE and now President Taft, in whose interest the promise was made and who appointed Governor Hughes, says that the anti-trust law as amended by the court must not be disturbed.

Here is a chain of circumstantial evidence sufficient to convict in a criminal court, and yet some of our democratic leaders are willing to allow this gigantic conspiracy to be carried out! Can they be trusted to represent the democratic sentiment of the country?

THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Indications point to the expulsion of Senator Stephenson of Wisconsin. After his manager had testified that no account had been kept of expenditures and that he did not know for what purpose the money was used Chairman Heyburn, a stand-pat republican, announced that fraud would be assumed when no account was rendered. This comes very near being an announcement that the senator must go, The purification of politics goes on; the senate will, in a few years, be a peoples' forum.