

The News and Observer.

VOL. XLVIII. NO. 121.

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, THURSDAY MORNING AUGUST 9, 1900.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

Leads all North Carolina Dailies in Both News and Circulation.

BRYAN ACCEPTS THE NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT

His Speech Before the Notification Committee at Indianapolis.

DISCUSSION OF THE KANSAS CITY PLATFORM

declares it is a Contest Between Democracy on the One Hand and Plutocracy on the Other.

THE POSITION OF THE TWO PARTIES CLEARLY DEFINED BY MR. BRYAN

Imperialism is the Great and Far-reaching Issue Now in the Arena of Politics.

CIVILIZING WITH THE SWORD AND MAKING MERCHANDISE OF BLOOD

Mr. Bryan Declares That He Favors Giving the Filipinos Independence and Guarding Them From Molestation From Other Nations, as He Has Done in Case of the Cubans.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee:

I shall, at an early day, and in a more formal manner, accept the nomination which you tender, and I shall at that time discuss the various questions covered by the Democratic platform. It may not be out of place, however, to submit a few observations at this time upon the general character of the contest before us, and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance in this campaign.

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between Democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other, I do not mean to say that all our opponents have deliberately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the Government, but I do assert that on the important issue of the day the Republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to elevate pecuniary considerations and ignore human rights.

In 1859 Lincoln said that the Republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. This is the proper relation which should exist between the two. Man, the handwork of God, comes first; money, the handwork of men, is of inferior importance. Man is the master, money the servant, but upon all important questions today, Republican legislation tends to make money the master and man the servant.

The maxim of Jefferson, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and the doctrine of Lincoln that this should be a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," are being disregarded and the instrumentalities of government are being used to advance the interests of those who are in a position to secure favors from the Government.

POSITION OF THE TWO PARTIES.

The Democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, economy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil, when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are respected. Democracy strives for a civilization in which every member of society will share, according to his merits.

No one has a right to expect from society more than a fair compensation for the service which he renders to society. If he secures more, it is at all expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class legislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another, the Democratic party says: "Thou shalt not!"

Against us are arrayed a comparatively small, but politically and financially powerful, number who really profit by Republican policies, but with them are associated a large number who, because of their attachment to the party name,

are giving their support to doctrines antagonistic to the former teachings of their own party. Republicans who used to advocate bimetalism, now try to convince themselves that a gold standard is good; Republicans who were formerly attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the nation's paper money; Republicans who used to boast that the Republican party was paying off the national debt, are now looking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; Republicans who formerly abhorred a trust, now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; Republicans who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the objections which are urged against a large increase in the permanent military establishment; Republicans who gloried in our indebtedness when the nation was powerfully, now look with favor upon a foreign alliance; Republicans who, three years ago condemned "forcible annexation" as immoral and even criminal, are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partisanship has already blinded many to present dangers is certain; how large a portion of the Republican party can be drawn over to the new policies remains to be seen.

REPUBLICANS DODGE THE ISSUE.

For a time Republican leaders were inclined to deny to opponents the right to criticize the Philippine policy of the Administration, but upon investigation they found that both Lincoln and Clay asserted and exercised the right to criticize a President during the progress of the Mexican war.

Instead of meeting the issue boldly and submitting a clear and positive plan for dealing with the Philippine question, the Republican convention adopted a platform, the larger part of which was devoted to boasting and self-congratulation.

In attempting to press economic questions upon the country to the exclusion of those which involve the very structure of our Government, the Republican leaders give new evidence of their abandonment of the earlier ideals of the party and of their complete subservience to pecuniary considerations.

But they shall not be permitted to evade the stupendous and far-reaching issue which they have deliberately brought into the arena of politics. When the President, supported by a practically unanimous vote of the House and Senate, entered upon a war with Spain for the purpose of aiding the struggling patriots of Cuba, the country, without regard to party, applauded. Although the Democrats recognized that the Administration would necessarily gain a political advantage from the conduct of a war which, in the very nature of the case, must soon end in a complete victory, they vied with the Republicans in the support which they gave to the President. When the war was over and the Republican leaders began to suggest the propriety of a colonial policy, opposition at once manifested itself. When the President finally laid before the Senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

RATIFICATION OF THE TREATY.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for war expenditures, and then give to the Philippines the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty.

In view of the criticism which my action aroused in some quarters I take this occasion to re-state the reasons given at that time. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Philippines than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation. Lincoln embodied an argument in the question, when he asked, "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty ratified, a clean-cut issue is presented between a Government by consent and a Government by force, and imperialists must bear the responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled. If the treaty had been rejected, the opponents of im-

perialism would have been held responsible for any international complications which might have arisen before the ratification of another treaty. But whatever differences of opinion may have existed as to the best method of opposing the colonial policy, there never was any difference as to the great importance of the question, and there is no difference now as to the course to be pursued.

The title of Spain being extinguished, we were at liberty to deal with the Philippines according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Philippines on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

If the treaty had been rejected, considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified, and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the Senate and carried out by the President, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the resolution was defeated by the vote of the Republican Vice President, and from that time to this a Republican Congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

AN EVASION OF RESPONSIBILITY.

When hostilities broke out at Manila, Republican speakers and Republican editors at once sought to lay the blame upon those who had delayed the ratification of the treaty, and during the progress of the war, the same Republicans have accused the opponents of imperialism of giving encouragement to the Filipinos. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine Islands permanently and imitate the European empires in the government of the colonies, the Republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject races to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their ability.

The Filipinos do not need any encouragement from Americans now living. Our whole history has been an encouragement, not only to the Filipinos but to all who are denied a voice in their own government. If the Republicans are prepared to censure all who have used language calculated to make Filipinos hate foreign domination, let them condemn the speech of Patrick Henry. When he uttered that passionate appeal, "Give me liberty or give me death," he expressed a sentiment which still echoes in the hearts of men. Let them censure Jefferson; of all the statesmen of history, none have used words so offensive to those who would hold their fellows in political bondage. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonies must choose between liberty and slavery. Or, if the statute of limitations has run against the sins of Henry and Jefferson and Washington, let them censure Lincoln, whose Gettysburg speech will be quoted in defense of popular government when the present advocates of force and conquest are forgotten.

Someone has said that a truth once spoken can never be recalled. It is true. It goes on and on, and no one can set a limit to the ever-widening influence. But if it were possible to obliterate every word written or spoken in defense of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, a war of conquest would still leave its legacy of perpetual hatred, for it was God himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master.

PLANTING SEEDS OF DESPOTISM.

Lincoln said that the safety of this nation was not in its fleets, its armies or its force, but in the spirit which prizes liberty and the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere; and he warned his countrymen that they could not destroy this spirit without planting the seeds of despotism at their own doors.

Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effect upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principles of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here.

Even now we are beginning to see the paralyzing influence of imperialism. Heretofore, this nation has been prompt



WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

Who Yesterday, at Indianapolis, Formally Accepted the Democratic Nomination for President of the United States.

to express its sympathy with those who were fighting for civil liberty. While our sphere of activity has been limited to the Western Hemisphere, our sympathies have not been bounded by the seas. We have felt it due to ourselves and to the world, as well as to those who were struggling for the right to govern themselves, to proclaim the interest which our people have, from the date of their own independence, felt in every contest between human rights and arbitrary power. Three-quarters of a century ago, when our nation was small, the struggle of Greece aroused our people, and Webster and Clay gave eloquent expression to the universal desire for Grecian independence.

In 1897, all parties manifested interest in the success of the Republic, but now when a war is in progress in South Africa, which must result in the extension of the monarchial idea or in the triumph of a Republic, the advocates of imperialism in this country dare not say a word in behalf of the Boers.

Sympathy for the Boers does not arise from any unfriendliness toward England; the American people are not unfriendly toward the people of any nation. This sympathy is due to the fact that, as stated in our platform, we believe in the principle of self government and reject, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy. If this nation surrenders its belief in the universal application of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, it will lose the prestige and influence which it has enjoyed among the nations as an exponent of popular government.

IMPERIALISM AND EXPANSION.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: "If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest." And again he said: "Conquest is not in our principles; it is inconsistent with our government."

The forcible annexation of territory, to be governed by arbitrary power, differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into States as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The Democratic party does not oppose expansion, when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land, which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time, enlarged the republic, and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country, and to force upon the people a government, for which there is no warrant in our constitution or in our laws. Even the argument that this earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it, and have the physical power to acquire it, cannot be invoked to justify the appropriation of the Philippine Islands by the United States. If the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there and till the soil. The white race will not live so near the equator. Other nations have tried to colonize in the same latitude. The Netherlands have controlled Java for 300 years, and yet today there are less than 60,000 people of European birth scattered among 25,000,000 natives. After a century and a half of English domination in India, less than one-twentieth of one per cent of the people of India are of English birth, and it requires an army of 70,000 British soldiers to take care of the tax collectors. Spain has asserted title to the Philippine Islands for three centuries, and yet, when our fleet entered Manila Bay, there were less than 10,000 Spaniards residing in the Philippines.

MEANING OF COLONIAL POLICY.

A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippines a few traders, a few masters and a few office-holders, and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people while they rule the natives.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a large standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will justify the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands will justify the seizure of other islands and the domination of other people, and with wars of conquest we can expect a certain, if not rapid growth of our military establishment. That a large permanent increase in our regular army is intended by the Republican leaders is not a mere matter of conjecture but a matter of fact. In his message of December 5th, 1898, the President asked for authority to increase the standing army to 100,000. In 1899 the army contained about 25,000 men. Within two years the President asked for four times that many, and a Republican House of Representatives complied with the request after the Spanish treaty had been signed and no country was at war with the United States.

If such an army is demanded when an imperial policy is contemplated, but not openly avowed, what may be expected if the people encourage the Republican party by endorsing its policy at the polls? A large standing army is not only a heavy burden to the people and, if accompanied by compulsory service, a constant source of irritation, but it is ever a menace to a republican form of government. The army is the personification of force, and militarism will inevitably change the ideals of the people and turn the thoughts of our young men from the arts of peace to the science of war. The government which relies for its defense upon its citizens is more likely to be just than one which has at call a large body of professional