

The Cuban Insurrection Spreads.

The surrender of some of the more active insurgent leaders, foreshadowed last week (p. 512), seemed only to fan brighter the flame of revolution, though the insurgents were again defeated on the 30th in the Tapaste hills in Havana province. The last province to remain peaceful was Puerto Principe, and on the 1st revolt was reported from there. President Palma has rejected all proposals for arbitration, and states confidently that he expects to put down the insurrection, but doubt as to the outcome of the little war seems general.

*

An impression seems to have prevailed in Cuba that if the United States intervened in the interests of peace this country would pay for whatever property damage had resulted from the insurrection. The denial of this responsibility by "a leading American lawyer" of Havana, Major Runcie, in an interview on the 1st, has called a halt in some quarters where intervention had been desired. In the meantime the semi-official organ of the administration, *La Discusion*, on the 31st had called upon Cubans to lay down their arms in order to save the republic from intervention, saying:

Permanent intervention would be worse than death. It would be preferable if the Caribbean should engulf the pearl of the Antilles. . . . The colored race may tremble before the possibility of intervention. Americans hate and despise Negroes. Even their own Negroes, with whom they have been in contact for 200 years, are treated like dogs, lynched and hardly considered human. If it is so with Negroes of their own land and language, what would happen to the Cuban Negro. . . . Is there no other remedy except placing our necks under the yoke of Uncle Sam This war can have no other end but intervention.

* *

Bryan's Welcome Home.

The narrative of William J. Bryan's return from abroad (pp. 464, 491) and his welcome at Madison Square Garden, New York, on the 30th, appears in Editorial Correspondence in another column; and in the same correspondence his trip to New Haven and Bridgeport on the 31st is mentioned. On the 1st he took part of the time he had promised Jersey City to speak in Newark, and there with reference to the local difficulty over his speaking under the auspices of Senator Smith (see Editorial Correspondence) he said that he had not come in the personal interests or the political interests of any individual whatever. "I am here for one purpose," he said, "and I will tell you what that purpose is. Mr. Smith and those with him on the committee told me that if I would come here and speak this afternoon it would help to elect a Democrat to the United States Senate in the place of Senator Dryden and it would help to elect two Congressmen. My friends, I have to be mighty tired not to speak under such conditions; and I have to be mighty busy not to find time to do it. I am here to elect a Democrat in the place of Senator Dryden and to elect Democratic Congressmen in the place of Republican Congressmen. I don't know who the candidates may be for Senator or Congressmen; but I know this, that no man will be helped to office by my speeches unless he can show that he believes in the

things that I speak for." From Newark Mr. Bryan went on the same afternoon to Jersey City, where he filled the engagement he had made before his return from abroad. He left New York for the West on the afternoon of the 2nd, and, arriving in Detroit on the 3rd, Labor Day, he was received by the Mayor and spoke on labor questions at the fair grounds. On the morning of the 4th he reached Chicago, where he was entertained at luncheon by the Iroquois Club, before which he spoke at length with especial reference to the trusts, the tariff and the relation of monopoly to socialism. In the afternoon a reception was given Mrs. Bryan at the Auditorium Hotel under the auspices of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Henry George Association, at which hundreds of Chicago women were in attendance. The principal feature of Mr. Bryan's Chicago reception was his speech in the evening at the dinner of the Jefferson Club. Over a thousand persons sat down at the tables, and the capacity of the largest banqueting room of the Auditorium was pressed to its utmost for accommodations. Besides the diners, hundreds of auditors entered when the speaking began and stood until Mr. Bryan had uttered his last word. Mr. Bryan took advantage of this occasion, with the evident concurrence of the whole body of his audience, to express himself with studied definiteness regarding the relationship of Roger C. Sullivan (pp. 464, 481) to the Democratic party of Illinois and of the nation. This part of his speech he had prepared in writing and he read strictly from the manuscript. It was a reiteration and elaboration of his previous statements with regard to Mr. Sullivan, the essential part being as follows:

I do not want my friends to be deceived by the resolution that was adopted at the State convention. I do not regard it as a compliment to be indorsed for the Presidency by a convention which indorses Mr. Sullivan. I told them in advance that I did not want such an indorsement and I repudiate it. If my nomination for office depended upon that indorsement I would not accept it. Mr. Sullivan is not my friend, although he pretended to be. If he had been he would not have allowed me to be indorsed if he could have prevented it. Instead of opposing me like a man he attempted to link his name with mine and thus secure an indorsement for himself. I object to him as a political associate. Let me suggest that every candidate running for office who wants the people to have confidence in him should announce that he is opposed to Mr. Sullivan's methods, that he repudiates his leadership and will oppose his re-election. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that no man running on the Democratic ticket in Illinois is entitled to the support of Democrats in this crisis who either stands with Mr. Sullivan or is afraid to oppose him. Mr. Sullivan asphyxiated the State convention, but I do not think that he can asphyxiate the voters of this State. Do you ask me whether a candidate can advance his chances for election by repudiating Sullivan and the State committee which he controls or which at least sympathizes with him? I can not answer, but I deny that any candidate has the right to make his action depend upon expediency. I will express as an opinion that the man who opposes Sullivan boldly will be stronger with the people than the man who either indorses him or remains silent. The honesty of the party's purpose is shown not merely by its platform or the speeches of its candidates and supporters, but by the character of the men to whom are intrusted the part of management. What is the objection to Mr. Sullivan? He is a high official in a franchise-holding corporation seeking favors at the hands of the government. He is familiar with all the methods used