

The Nebraska Independent

Wealth Makers and Lincoln Independent Consolidated.

VOL. X.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1899.

NO. 37.

THE AMERICAN TRUSTS

The Consumer Charged the Highest Price—the Laborer Paid the Lowest.

POSSESSION OF THE LAND

An Insatiable Stomach Devouring all Wealth is Located in the East.

Tax the Trusts.

Hazen S. Pingree, ex-mayor of Detroit, upon taking office as governor of Michigan for a second term this month attacked the trusts in characteristically vigorous fashion. His utterances have attracted more than ordinary attention because they come from a republican party man who has been repeatedly successful at the polls despite the opposition of party leaders in his city and state, and because he criticizes the attitude of the republican national administration toward the trusts.

Governor Pingree reviews at length the crystallizing tendencies in American industries, especially in those branches relating to transportation and communication. Toleration might be more complacent, he thinks, if the same process had not invaded other branches than these "with the power of a glacier and the rapidity of a torrent." One can scarcely make a purchase in which the price is not dictated by a combination over which the merchant you deal with has no control. Newspapers combining to cheapen the cost of collecting the news, because a trust called the Associated Press, which, under the control of a few men, is able to distort truth and poison the fountain of popular information.

The arguments put forth to defend the system, as the result of an inevitable tendency of general conditions over which there is no human power of control, Mr. Pingree calls "pretenses" and "hollow shams."

"While the trusts have neither souls nor hearts, they are ruled by men, not angels; men, too, who, in their greed toward the consumer, and their heartlessness toward the laborer, are freed altogether from the personal responsibility which, in spite of himself, controls and modifies the selfishness of the individual manufacturer and employer."

"While the process of concentration has worked itself out to completion, the law which governs both prices and wages will assert itself with irresistible force. The consumer will be charged the highest price that can be squeezed out of him; the laborer will be paid the lowest wages upon which he can keep life enough in his body to perform his daily tasks. This result has not yet been quite accomplished, but it is as sure as that night follows day, as certain as the law of human selfishness."

"Having accumulated all other agencies for the production of wealth, the possession of the land may be easily secured."

Mr. Pingree maintains that the question is not alone one of cost of production:

"The question of distribution of profits is of vastly more importance. When a thousand men make ten million dollars, the money is scattered and the wants of a thousand families are to be gratified, and others are making a profit in catering to their wants; but when one man accumulates this amount, there is but one family whose wants are to be supplied, but one family to look to for the consumption of labor, and the other 999 become laborers themselves."

Another vice of this system is said to lie in the danger of a "new sectionalism more dangerous than which led to the war of the rebellion."

"The insatiable stomach which is devouring all wealth is located in the east. There all the greatest heads of syndicates, no matter where they originated, sooner or later make their homes. To that point is drawn all the profits of these enormous concentrated industries, and little by little the remainder of the country is drained of its wealth with no hope of recovering it. When a true master has accumulated his millions he sighs for the distinction of metropolitan life. He builds a palace in New York, and possibly another in Washington. To the former or some other center in the east all the profits of the industries of the nation are poured in a colossal and overflowing stream, and there is thence dished out again and again to the rest of the country barely enough to pay for raw materials and keep life in impoverished labor. It is only a question of time, and not so very long a time either, when the east will have sopped up, as with a sponge, the whole surplus wealth of this nation. What discontent, what jealousy may we not then expect to grow in the hearts of the population of other sections, possibly to precipitate another civil war?"

Governor Pingree makes an anti-trust argument out of the protective tariff principle as follows:

"I have always been a loyal republican. I am a republican still. But, I prefer to believe that the republican-

ism of Abraham Lincoln is superior to that of more modern type.

"The party of Lincoln was not organized merely to enfranchise the black race, but to preserve the liberties, the dignity of manhood of every citizen of whatsoever race or color.

"Aside from the principles on which it conducted the war for the preservation of the union, the policy to which it has been most devoted was that of the protective tariff. This policy has always been defended, not merely as affording living prices for American products in the domestic market, but above and beyond all as securing protection to American labor and American manufacture, and adding to the dignity and independence of the American artisan and farmer.

"We sought to keep out of our market the cheap products of foreign labor, which was so poorly paid, lest our own labor should in time, by being compelled to compete with such labor be degraded to its level. We have by this means built up a manufacturing interest greater than that of any other nation on earth. We passed to the first rank in this respect during the years just passed, during which Great Britain, our only rival, was pushed to the second place.

"We are now confronted by these in-

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SENATE IN 1901

The Oft Repeated Falshood that it will Certainly be Gold Standard, Refuted.

The gold standard papers continue to assert that the senate is safe for gold until 1905. There is not a word of truth in this statement, as these men well know. One-third of the senate is elected every two years, and they have no more assurance of electing one-third of that body at the next congressional election than they have of electing a majority of congress, which latter they themselves look upon as extremely doubtful. That is the reason why they insist that they are sure to have the senate. Senator Jones, chairman of the national committee of the democratic party, makes the following analysis of the situation:

"Upon the passage of what is known as the Teller resolution, of January 28, 1898, there was a majority of fifteen votes in the senate in its favor. This may reasonably be accepted as a test vote on the silver question. A gold man has since been elected from Oregon to fill a vacancy, which reduces our majority now to fourteen. Of those who voted in favor of that proposition at that time, seven senators will probably be succeeded March 4, next, by senators opposed to the unlimited coinage of silver—namely, Senators Allen (Neb.), Mitchell (Wis.), Murphy (N. Y.), Roach (N. D.), Smith (N. J.), Turpie (Ind.), and White (Cal.). This will leave the two sides equal, and the deciding vote will be in the hands of the vice president. This condition of things hardly warrants the triumphant claim of the gold men that they have captured the senate and will hold it for years to come.

FORECASTS FOR 1901.

"This year an unusual proportion of bimetalists who come from the close states have had their terms to expire. In 1900, however, all this will be evened up by a larger portion of gold men retiring who come from close states. What is likely to be the condition of the senate in 1901 can be easily seen.

"The terms of thirty senators expire at that time. Of these thirty eleven who are now friendly to silver may safely be counted as absolutely certain to be succeeded by silver men. These senators come from the following states: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. The following states may be expected to elect gold men to succeed gold men at that time: Maine, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

New Hampshire is now represented by a silver man, whose term will expire in 1901. Much will depend in that state upon the personal popularity of the present senator, Mr. Chandler, but if he should be succeeded by a gold man, Louisiana and Kentucky, now represented by gold men, are certain to send two bimetalists in their stead, leaving the advantage so far with the silver men.

"In two states—South Dakota and Delaware—where we now have silver senators, there will be contests, and the most that can be claimed by the gold men is that we are not positively certain to hold these seats, while the following states, now represented by gold men, can certainly not be claimed as sure to return solid gold delegations—namely: Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, West Virginia and Wyoming.

"From all this it is perfectly safe to assert without fear of contradiction, that if the bimetalist succeed in electing the president in 1900 they will unquestionably have a clear working majority in the United States senate."

In the list of the seven silver senators given above who will be retired on the fourth of next March, there are four straddle bugs, who were deserted because of their wobbling political career, and all of whom voted for the repeal of the Sherman act, namely: Mitchell of Wisconsin, Murphy of New York, Smith of New Jersey and Turpie of Indiana. The cause of bimetalism is a gainer by their retirement to private life. When Mills of Texas gets home to stay there, which he will soon do, the last of the gang of democratic traitors who went off with Cleveland will have got his just political reward.

A REPUBLICAN WISEACRE

He Says That the House of Rothschilds has Nothing to do with our Finances.

A certain wiseacre of a republican editor up in the northern part of the state wants to know why the pops are always howling about Rothschilds when he has no more to do with the financial affairs of the United States than the man in the moon. If the said editor will take a glance at the following contract, which is a copy of the one on file at Washington with only the legal perflage left out, he may learn whether Rothschilds has anything to do with American financial affairs or not.

This agreement entered into this 8th day of February, 1895, between the secretary of the treasury of the United States, of the first part, and Messrs. August Belmont & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, of London, England, and themselves, and Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co., of London, and themselves, parties of the second part. Witnesseth: * * * * * and the secretary of the treasury now deems that an emergency exists in which the public in-

gift of the people's money to this foreign banking syndicate of over \$10,000,000. It was partly paid back with enormous contributions to Mark Hanna's corruption fund.

Republican Financier Convicted.

The old Alliance men will remember what a time we had when Dorsey was running for congress and how he was parading over the district claiming all financial knowledge that was known to man, and denouncing the pops as anarchists, socialists and communists. They will also remember that the Ponca bank with which he was connected failed, that an investigation showed that it was a regular thieves den and the officers indicted. After years of long drawn out litigation, Dorsey's brother was convicted the other day of the rankest kind of fraud. A motion for a new trial was immediately made, so we are not anywhere near the end of it yet. More years of litigation are to follow. There is something about these courts that no pop can find out.



FIRST NEBRASKA ENTERING MANILA.

The above is from a photograph of the Nebraska regiment approaching the city of Manila, August 13, 1898. The regiment moved for about a mile along the beach in water waist deep, a part of the distance in the open and a part under the protection of the stone wall along the water's front. The Spaniards were firing in that direction, but their aim was too high to be effective. By this movement the Nebraska regiment entered the main part of the city, and went into their proper advance of any other regiment. One company of the Eighteenth Inf., U. S. Regulars, were the only American troops that entered the city before the Nebraska regiment.

The illustration shows the center of the regiment, Company H of Nelson and Company C of Beatrice. The first battalion, headed by Company D of Lincoln, was in the lead.

It is authoritatively stated that Admiral Dewey, standing on the deck of the flagship Olympia, when he saw the American troops advancing along this beach, turned to his aide, who was by his side, with the question: "Do you see those troops advancing along the beach?" A pause, and the admiral added: "That is what I call bravery."

A BITTER INDICTMENT

What the Federation of Labor and the Trade Unions Think of Socialism.

The socialism of the social labor party is in fact communism. The demand in their platform for the collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution is a demand for the common ownership of all property. Mr. Sam L. Leffingwell in the January number of the American Federationist, which is the official organ of the trade unions of the United States, has a very able article on socialism. He gives a fair summary of the various bodies who call themselves socialists and defines the differences in their creeds. Speaking of the social labor party of this country, which this paper has been criticizing and which seems to have ten or fifteen fellows in this state he says:

Now, what does the pseudo reform offer for the betterment of the condition of this honest, conservative class of peaceable workmen, who are slowly but surely working out their own destiny? Simply to break up their organization; tear down the fabric of their ultimate redemption from long years of oppressed conditions, and which it has taken other long years to bring to its present satisfactory establishment, and to substitute in its place the visionary scheme of a wild and reckless propaganda—untraceable, infeasible, impracticable—theoretical almost to an extent of idiosyncrasy: held forth in the language of a "co-operative commonwealth." The party advocating this "rainbow" of promise for suffering labor calls itself the "Socialist Labor party," and is going far ahead even of the efforts of the social democrats of despotic Germany. It is not only revolutionary in its methods of destruction of constitutional landmarks; it would not only have every man who works to surrender his products to the co-operative enjoyment of the commonwealth, so that even those who did not work would share the benefits of the co-operation of consumption; it not only stands on the highway of progress armed with a message of "stand and deliver!" but would destroy and obliterate all forms of political, religious and social, to rear instead a dynasty of recklessness and abandon, nothing in the names of anarchy and dissolution.

Speaking further of this theory he says:

It tends to extreme radicalism in a doctrine of private calling for the abolition of all private property, by force or violence, if necessary, and the absolute

control by the community in all matters pertaining to labor, religion, social relations, etc., developing into a phase of extreme socialism, shading into anarchy. Many of its advocates would abolish marriage and the family relations.

If any class of our citizens have a pre-eminent right to speak plainly upon this subject it is the membership of labor organizations. The INDEPENDENT has always defended organized labor and it feels more like doing it now, after reading this article and after the action taken by the national body at St. Louis than it ever did before. Very many warnings were given to this editor when he felt called upon to state the difference between populism and socialism and it was said that the paper would lose many subscribers. So far it has lost two.

Mr. Leffingwell winds up his article as follows:

It is this class of fugitives from just censure in other lands, who, if they do not applaud, have words of encouragement for the crazy outthroats who assassinate helpless men and women, to fulfill a sworn agreement with their fellows, because of some imaginary ill likely to happen; it is this class of men who are working for the disruption of trades unionism in all lands, that there may be a wider field for propagandism; and who, when the opportunity offers, break into the decent society of trade councils and strive, with honeyed words and well-rounded phrases, to inject the vileness of their purpose into measures being framed for the advancement, elevation and salvation of the honest laboring masses of the country.

That is what organized labor thinks of socialism and the INDEPENDENT says that the indictment is well written.

HE APOLOGISES.

The editor of the Dakota Ruralist remarks as follows:

"We probably owe the editor of the INDEPENDENT an apology for intimating that he was not up-to-date on socialism, for he now states that he has read over 300 socialist books, including Karl Marx, and takes in six socialist papers, including the Dakota Ruralist.

After exhausting this mine of information he attempts to establish the distinction between socialism and populism, and says:

"The very base of socialism is the destruction of the private ownership of property. It is voiced in their platform in the following words: 'We demand the public or collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution.' That is not populism. Populism demands the public ownership of public utilities."

This includes a serious error. He declares the base of socialism is the destruction of private property, which is not true. The socialist would abolish private ownership in the means of production but protect the individual in the ownership of his share of the product."

Here is a theory never heard of before. No such a thing can be found in any work of authority on socialism either in this country or in Europe. By what possible plan can the whole production of all the people in the United States be divided equally among the 70,000,000 inhabitants of these states so that each one will own and control that portion? Will each one own individually his share of all the wheat, corn, calico, combs, tooth brushes, pictures, calves, sheep, buttons, race horses, books, drugs, dolls, babies, pianos, quinine, ribbons, brinks, wagons, locomotives, plows, canary birds, steamships, chickens and more than a million other things that are annually produced in this country? If he is not to get an individual ownership in kind, how is the thing to be fixed anyhow? Karl Marx, Herr Baebel and all the others of that kind have dreamed some strange dreams, but never anything like this. It would give any ordinary man the jim jams to contemplate it for half an hour.

OUR NEW MINISTER

Mr. Choate is polished, witty, and eminently respectable in appearance. He is good enough personally, but in what he represents he is everything that is bad.

He is a corporation lawyer, who has never never known a scruple in advancing the interests of his clients, many of them public enemies, engaged in active hostilities against the welfare of the commonwealth. His appointment is precisely what might have been expected of a republican administration.

No man, decent or indecent, is honored by the republican organization for services to the republic. All that can be expected is a greater or less degree of merit in somebody that ought to be included in any case. Whatever else may be said of the recipient of the republican honors—whether he be noble, bright, witty, and genial, or dull, commonplace, solemn, and churchy—it is certain that he will be a faithful servant of the corporations and trusts. That is the essence of modern republicanism. All the rest are incidents.—The Journal of New York.

Persons thinking of buying a sewing machine should look at our ad, which appears in the columns of this paper. We can furnish you with plenty of references.

WHAT IS FIAT MONEY

Men not Born with a Knowledge of Economics, it is a Science that Must be Learned

MILLIONS OF GOLD FIAT

The Old and Fundamental Principles of Populism Must be Pushed to the Front

Gold Dollars Worth 90 Cents.

Editor Independent:

I have been thinking for the last couple of weeks that I would write you an article on the subject of fiat money. To begin to write on this subject is, I realize, going back to the first principles of the populist party. If I mistake not the first principles of the party have not been talked enough. It has become of late that the party has drifted to the subject of talking of suitable candidates. The idea of talking of a suitable candidate for an office is all right, but should not be taken too far. A man with one idea can never make a success in statesmanship. I do not infer that the party has drifted to one idea, but this would be on that inclination. Certainly we have not talked the original principles of the party enough. If we were to drop the foundation of the party entirely and conduct a campaign on the theory of the old party, where would we be? We would be left.

What are the principles of the populist party? That is, the foundation of the party? Isn't one of the principles the theory that if the circulating medium of the country be increased or decreased, that increased or decreased will affect prices? It may be inferred that the average republican knows all of that, but we do not think so. How many years ago was it that two-thirds of the populist party did not know that fact? The money question is not a thing that a man knows naturally from birth or by instinct; it is a question that can only be learned by the hardest study. Will we then object if we were to go back to the first principles of the party? If it is one of the bare facts of populism, that if a man does understand the true nature and use of money, that there is no use to talk "free coinage" to him. But there is a principle about money that the populist party has almost ceased to speak of, and that is the fiat value money. I do not say that the populist party has abandoned the idea of fiat money, but it has been such a strong point in populism that it seemed that there was no use of talking it.

We have grown too much into the idea that every man, both populists, democrat and republican believe that a scientific fiat paper money would be the best. It is not the case. The well informed populist knows that. The silver democrat has a faint idea of it, and the rank and file of the republican party have such a faint glimmer of the light that they do not believe it to be true. Now to prove this we refer to the democratic platform. They, though they be for silver, demand that paper money be redeemed. What is the use to say "redeemed" to the well informed populist? This idea that money should have, as the republicans say, "an intrinsic value" must be overcome, and it cannot be overcome except that the populist party keep up its old teachings. Now the republicans keep right on teaching the very opposite principle by upholding the idea that the dollar must contain a certain amount of material, and that material must be worth a dollar. This he calls intrinsic value. And more than that he is always demanding what he calls "sound money." I would like to ask if this isn't the very opposite of the populist teaching, namely the fiat value of money? We must not forget these first principles. It seems that the republicans have set up the argument that we must have a dollar that will go to Europe and will be worth just as much there as it is in the United States. They state that to take the gold dollar to Europe and melt it down in the form of gold bullion, that that dollar, though a dollar no more, would be worth a hundred cents. This they have said in defense of the gold standard, and in opposition to the idea of fiat money. They say you may take the paper dollar to Europe and it is not worth the paper it is written on. They say that we must have a dollar that will go abroad, and insist that the gold dollar is the only dollar that can get across the ocean and be worth its face value after it gets there.

Now these arguments must be refuted. They have been, but it has been by saying that such a doctrine as the idea of a dollar that will go abroad is foolishness and a dollar that will go abroad is no better than a dollar that will stay at home. But what is the gold dollar when it goes abroad? I have heard populists say that it was bullion. If you were to take a hundred thousand dollars to Europe and after you get there, think it would you melt it down and trade it as you would a new car or horse? That is, I am speaking of silver money. No you would not. You would bring it back to the United States and it would still be worth a hundred thousand dollars. But suppose while you were in Europe you

(Continued on Eighth Page.)