

The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XII.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, MARCH 21, 1901.

NO. 43.

WE CAN'T HAVE BOTH

If We Establish Militarism, a Great Standing Army and Big Navy, We Can't Have International Amity and Internal Improvements

Washington, D. C., March 1, 1901.—It was an open secret in Washington for weeks that England's response to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty would be deferred until congress had adjourned.

The administration sympathized with England's attitude and was extremely sorry that the senate could not be made to recognize the unwritten Anglo-American alliance—which always means that we allow England to get the best end of every negotiation.

The senate, however, held out for a treaty which would permit us to defend and fortify our Nicaraguan canal when built.

England's refusal to accept the amended Hay-Pauncefote treaty if made before the adjournment of congress, would have been followed by decisive action, formerly announcing the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which never should have been entered into.

This action is likely to be taken anyway, when congress convenes next winter, but the administration prefers to defer action as long as possible, hoping some loophole will be presented which can be used to improve the treaty.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

There is another reason why the republicans wanted action delayed on the treaty. Ratifying the treaty meant an appropriation for building the Nicaragua canal.

That is the kind of a patriotic administration the people voted for last fall.

THE RAILROAD POWER

Communities Come to Fear the Frown of the Railroad Managers More Than They Fear the Frown of God.

The whole nation has been watching what a couple of railroads can do to a legislature ever since the senatorial contest began at Lincoln. What they can do, and have done to whole communities is not so universally known.

But the question whether railroads shall continue to exercise sovereign powers without supervision or control looms up as one of the most vital and pressing questions of the near future.

The Omaha Commercial club has been inviting discussion of the question. That is the famous body that unanimously declared that if Holcomb was elected governor and the pops came into power, this state would be ruined.

There is room, he said, for but one railroad party, "but there is room for a party which will insist that the railroads obey the law, keep within proper bounds, respect the rights of the people and keep their hands off the throat of government.

The only party fitted to occupy that room is the democratic party. Those who would stifle its voice when it should speak out against railroad domination, do not understand its mission.

If it be true to its traditions and the principles of its founders, it must take a definite position with respect to the railroad question, and that should be, "justice to railroads as well as to farmers and merchants, and death to corporation domination in the state of Nebraska."

Below is a letter received from a woman, whose son, Lieut. M. W. of the signal service, was killed in the Philippine islands.

The heart-broken mother states in terms most positive that she would rather have her only son in Paradise than serving in the army of the United States engaged in the most unholy war.

This lady, as she states herself, "is of a family whose record dates back over eight hundred years, with men of rank and influence among them—from a family that in colonial days cast their fortunes with the colonies against the crown and left estates behind them to do it.

I dislike notoriety, but if my letter will help your country, you are at liberty to publish it." The letter was written to a representative Filipino who was at Washington and was as follows:

Norwich, N. Y., Feb. 9, 1901.—Senor Fontela: I sent one to Senator Mason of Illinois and one to Senator Berry of Arkansas and I sent the letter with pity and pleading—but I doubt if either had any effect.

I am only a woman who loves her country and feels deeply the present disgrace and wrong done to the Filipinos.

I enclose you a newspaper clipping which will tell you all about how this war has hurt me—for that Lieut. W. mentioned as killed was my son.

With my last letter to him I sent a copy of Senator Hoar's speech in favor of the Philippine question and begged my son to come out of the army. He entered the army at an early age—in the signal service—and served several years.

But when he again entered it and was ordered to those islands neither he, nor I, thought it was for war on them. He thought it was to help them to their independence and it is impossible for me to forgive the men, who have brought about all this woe.

I despise McKinley just as I despise any man who perverts his position to serve his purse or person. Our country is worse off than yours—for we are doing wrong to your people and suffering wrong—but our land be saved.

My heart is broken and I presume yours is also. Do I blame the poor Filipino who fired the shot? No! I do not! I blame McKinley! I despise him. God received my son into Paradise—better than in our army in these days. Men and nations do not prosper and if you get your liberty and a free government, you will find that your people will grow corrupt.

I pray God for your land. My precious boy is near me as I write it—nearer—far nearer. When the sea with its miles flashed between and I feel that he forgives the Filipino who fired the shot that set him free. Most truly yours, J. S. W.

Later it was shown that a band of about 300 natives were out to capture the wagon train, but why they took my son instead is something I do not understand.

In another letter she says: "I am in the news of my son's death was flashed across to us on the 4th day of last October and though every one has been very kind to me, yet your words of full understanding of what it is all to me, have been a comfort such as nothing anyone else could have spoken or written. More than 23 years ago everyone died that loved me and I was left with a little son—but hard as it is—if I must choose I would rather be where he is today, in Paradise, than to be in the army of the United States doing the wicked work of McKinley."

The conduct of the administration toward your people is dastardly and shameful and I pray God to atone you all for it. Many a Filipino mother has wept in agony above their murdered sons and my heart has grown more to them since my loss. I am, most truly, your friend, J. S. W.

With respect to the charge by railroad men that the rates fixed in the Weber bill were outrageously low, Mr. Smyth said those rates were substantially the same as the rates fixed by the state board of transportation a year ago.

The board invited the railroads to join with them in investigating the reasonableness of those rates. But the railroads refused to do so and instead secured from the federal court an injunction restraining the board from making the investigation.

Then, Mr. Smyth said, was the time for the railroads to show that the rates were unreasonable, if they believed they could show them to be so, but having taken the course they did take, it seemed to him quite clear that they could not prove the rates to be unreasonable.

In conclusion, he insisted that the republican party was the railroad party of the state; that it no longer had any pretense of representing the interests of the people where they conflict with the interests of the railroads.

McCABE'S SAINT

He Signs Appropriation Bills on Sunday and Thereby Throws Doubt on Their Legality.

President McKinley's action in approving appropriation bills on Sunday, March 3, has had all official Washington in a fret lest the laws should be declared void.

A declaration of the illegality of such laws by the attorney general would require an extra session of congress to reappropriate more than \$300,000,000 to keep the wheels of government running during the next fiscal year.

The acts which the president approved on Sunday and which are involved in the question discussed are the following:

Postoffice approp. law...\$123,782,688 75
Naval approp. law... 78,653,973 75
Sundry civil law... 62,553,108 21
Legislative, executive and judicial law... 24,600,753 86
General deficiency law... 14,340,574 94
Indian approp. law... 9,596,231 09
St. Louis exposition law 5,250,000 00

Total\$318,777,320 59

CAPTURED TEXAS

The Corporations Seem to Have Got as Complete Control in Texas as They Have in Nebraska.

The Texas legislature continues to make laws by the thousands. It is overwhelmingly democratic, but it has repudiated about every principle set forth in the Kansas City platform.

It began by inviting Dave Hill out there to make an address. Then it sat down on all of Governor Hogg's plans to restrain the greed of the railroad corporations.

It has been going from bad to worse. The other day it surrendered, horse, foot and dragons, in open daylight to the railroad corporations.

That was a little to much for some of the Bryan democrats. Judge W. W. Dillard gathered up his private papers, cleaned out his desk and announced his departure from the legislature.

Judge Dillard opposed the passage of the bill allowing railways outside the state to lease Texas railways not over 115 miles in length. The bill passed.

Today Judge Dillard said: "I am going home. This legislature is controlled by the railway lobby, and I have lost more self-respect since I came here than I will ever regain."

He has been to the theatre, where I paid my money, and I have seen the boxes full of legislators who were guests of the railway lawyers. I will go to my people and tell them what I have seen and heard, and will ask them what they want me to do.

I have my resignation written out and am ready to send it to the governor. I am not a lobbyist and have put the gag rule on the house and that no legislation can be considered even, much less passed, without their consent.

MONUMENTAL LIARS

A Specimen of the Falsehood Constantly Appearing in the Great Plutocratic Dailies.

Among all the lying newspapers in America, Chicago has an average lot. No one can believe anything that he sees in a Chicago daily.

As an example of their mendacious falsehoods it will only be necessary to notice a story that every one of them published about a riot in the village of Highwood, occurring upon pay-day for the soldiers at Ft. Sheridan.

The Chicago Record and all the rest were similar, was as follows: "Highwood is a military camp today. Martial law was proclaimed last night by Colonel Bowman, commanding at Ft. Sheridan, who sent two companies of infantry to protect the residents of the peaceful suburb, not from a foreign foe or from rioting people of the town, but from soldiers of the fort."

In addition to the infantry twenty-five special deputies under Marshal Gordon guard the town. "Colonel Bowman's action was the result of a reign of terror started early last evening and kept up for several hours by drunken soldiers. Stores and saloons were sacked, citizens knocked down and the soldiers, as is the custom of most of them, have been busy ever since getting rid of their money."

"The trouble was started last evening by Corporals O'Brien and Stayd. They went into a Highwood restaurant and ordered supper for two. Both men had been drinking and were in a quarrelsome mood. They picked a fight with the proprietor and his employees and then proceeded to 'clean out' the place. They shot at the lights and smashed the windows. Several of their comrades heard the noise and joined them in wrecking the place."

"Corporal Jack O'Brien, Corporal John Stayd, Fifth infantry, Charles McCullough, Henry Rixon, W. J. Moses and Fred Adelberg, recruits, are now in the hospital laid up by their injuries, and numbers of other soldiers fill the guard house, while many villagers nurse painful cuts and bruises."

One and several, collectively and individually, are falsehoods. In plain, everyday, colloquial Anglo-Saxon they are lies, without basis of any kind whatever, and the men who wrote them are a pack of liars.

(1) There was no declaration of "martial law" in Highwood and "two companies of soldiers" were sent to the town to protect it, nor for any other purpose. A patrol of possibly twelve men passed through the streets, but this is a common occurrence and in no way indicated any special disorder.

(2) There was no "rioting," no buildings were injured—neither stores nor saloons. During the night a tailor's shop was burglarized, but

HEART RENDING

A Noble Woman, Descendant of Many Generations of Patriots, Denounces McKinley.

Below is a letter received from a woman, whose son, Lieut. M. W. of the signal service, was killed in the Philippine islands.

The heart-broken mother states in terms most positive that she would rather have her only son in Paradise than serving in the army of the United States engaged in the most unholy war.

This lady, as she states herself, "is of a family whose record dates back over eight hundred years, with men of rank and influence among them—from a family that in colonial days cast their fortunes with the colonies against the crown and left estates behind them to do it.

I dislike notoriety, but if my letter will help your country, you are at liberty to publish it." The letter was written to a representative Filipino who was at Washington and was as follows:

Norwich, N. Y., Feb. 9, 1901.—Senor Fontela: I sent one to Senator Mason of Illinois and one to Senator Berry of Arkansas and I sent the letter with pity and pleading—but I doubt if either had any effect.

I am only a woman who loves her country and feels deeply the present disgrace and wrong done to the Filipinos.

I enclose you a newspaper clipping which will tell you all about how this war has hurt me—for that Lieut. W. mentioned as killed was my son.

With my last letter to him I sent a copy of Senator Hoar's speech in favor of the Philippine question and begged my son to come out of the army. He entered the army at an early age—in the signal service—and served several years.

But when he again entered it and was ordered to those islands neither he, nor I, thought it was for war on them. He thought it was to help them to their independence and it is impossible for me to forgive the men, who have brought about all this woe.

I despise McKinley just as I despise any man who perverts his position to serve his purse or person. Our country is worse off than yours—for we are doing wrong to your people and suffering wrong—but our land be saved.

My heart is broken and I presume yours is also. Do I blame the poor Filipino who fired the shot? No! I do not! I blame McKinley! I despise him. God received my son into Paradise—better than in our army in these days. Men and nations do not prosper and if you get your liberty and a free government, you will find that your people will grow corrupt.

I pray God for your land. My precious boy is near me as I write it—nearer—far nearer. When the sea with its miles flashed between and I feel that he forgives the Filipino who fired the shot that set him free. Most truly yours, J. S. W.

Later it was shown that a band of about 300 natives were out to capture the wagon train, but why they took my son instead is something I do not understand.

In another letter she says: "I am in the news of my son's death was flashed across to us on the 4th day of last October and though every one has been very kind to me, yet your words of full understanding of what it is all to me, have been a comfort such as nothing anyone else could have spoken or written. More than 23 years ago everyone died that loved me and I was left with a little son—but hard as it is—if I must choose I would rather be where he is today, in Paradise, than to be in the army of the United States doing the wicked work of McKinley."

The conduct of the administration toward your people is dastardly and shameful and I pray God to atone you all for it. Many a Filipino mother has wept in agony above their murdered sons and my heart has grown more to them since my loss. I am, most truly, your friend, J. S. W.

With respect to the charge by railroad men that the rates fixed in the Weber bill were outrageously low, Mr. Smyth said those rates were substantially the same as the rates fixed by the state board of transportation a year ago.

The board invited the railroads to join with them in investigating the reasonableness of those rates. But the railroads refused to do so and instead secured from the federal court an injunction restraining the board from making the investigation.

Then, Mr. Smyth said, was the time for the railroads to show that the rates were unreasonable, if they believed they could show them to be so, but having taken the course they did take, it seemed to him quite clear that they could not prove the rates to be unreasonable.

In conclusion, he insisted that the republican party was the railroad party of the state; that it no longer had any pretense of representing the interests of the people where they conflict with the interests of the railroads.

There is room, he said, for but one railroad party, "but there is room for a party which will insist that the railroads obey the law, keep within proper bounds, respect the rights of the people and keep their hands off the throat of government.

The only party fitted to occupy that room is the democratic party. Those who would stifle its voice when it should speak out against railroad domination, do not understand its mission.

If it be true to its traditions and the principles of its founders, it must take a definite position with respect to the railroad question, and that should be, "justice to railroads as well as to farmers and merchants, and death to corporation domination in the state of Nebraska."

Below is a letter received from a woman, whose son, Lieut. M. W. of the signal service, was killed in the Philippine islands.

The heart-broken mother states in terms most positive that she would rather have her only son in Paradise than serving in the army of the United States engaged in the most unholy war.

This lady, as she states herself, "is of a family whose record dates back over eight hundred years, with men of rank and influence among them—from a family that in colonial days cast their fortunes with the colonies against the crown and left estates behind them to do it.

POPULIST ECONOMICS

While the Sociological Principles Announced at Omaha are now Forging Forward, Populist Money Theories Are No Less Certain of Triumph.

For years The Independent has tried to clear the discussion of political economy engaged in by the people of the senseless terms in common use. The employment of those terms only confused thought and landed the orators in an impenetrable fog.

The democratic orators were afraid to drop them. They imagined if they did that they would be called populists or socialists, and they continued to use the double-back-slash handshakes that were furnished them by the enemies.

The Independent appealed in vain to the orators to stop their use. It pointed out time and again that "value" could not be "measured" and that the term "measure of value" was nonsense.

Most of them after a while stopped talking about "intrinsic value," but they were not to be deterred. They continued to use those senseless terms. It is a relief to see that Gen. A. J. Warner, who was the head of the bimetallic league, has at last obtained the courage to take the populist stand and argue the money question from the premises which were the foundation of populist political economy.

In a recent paper he says: "Intrinsic value has been pronounced by a distinguished economist the 'bane of economic science.' Out of this has grown three or four other terms equally pernicious. If we could eliminate from the money question the terms, 'intrinsic value,' 'standard of value,' 'single standard,' 'double standard,' 'measure of value,' 'unit of value,' and 'gold standard,' which so many suppose to be fixed and invariable, is constantly undergoing variation. It varies with the supply and demand for gold. It is varied by the issue of other money on top of gold. Who would contend that if the production of gold should run up to five hundred million a year, as it may do, that the value of gold would not be changed? Such a production of gold would in a little time change the value of every piece of gold in the world. Our gold friends might then conclude that the wrong metal had been demonetized. We would still, however, have a gold valuation. Substitute for 'gold standard' or for 'single standard' and 'double standard,' 'gold money' and 'bimetallic money,' or a 'gold valuation' or a 'bimetallic valuation,' and we would have terms that would express things as they are. Again, money is not a 'medium of exchange.' Perhaps no three words in economic science have led to more confusion than these three. Goods are not sold for other goods. Goods are sold for money, and money is bought with goods. In other words, money is one term in every exchange, and not merely a go-between in exchanging goods for goods. We sell for money, we buy with money. There can be no confusion of such terms and correct definitions are substituted for meaningless and misleading phrases."

But to come back to the question of money supply. Civilization is built upon equities based upon stable monetary conditions, and these conditions depend upon a stable and regular money supply. How, then, shall money be supplied and on what principle regulated so as to secure the conditions upon which the equities of all transactions depend? The one controlling purpose should be to secure the nearest possible approach to stable price levels. Stable price levels insure safe business conditions.

Any attempt to discuss the money question on any other theory leads only into darkness. With metallic money, the regulation is automatic, that is, it depends upon production. It is not automatic in the sense of any nice adjustment of supply to needs for money. Sometimes the supply is

ENGLISH WHISKEY TRUST

It Was What Downed Gladstone and Turned the Course of Empire—They Make Peers of Whiskey Men and Give Them Seats in the House of Lords.

A series of public meetings, or rather, conferences, have just been held in Manchester, in which Lord Peel, lately speaker of the house of commons, took a deciding part for the purpose of devising and deciding upon some course of action to be taken with the view of compelling the conservative government to show a little more interest than it has lately been showing in the work of temperance reform, writes Justin McCarthy in the Independent.

Lord Peel, since he released himself from the laborious duties of the speaker's office, has been devoting himself unwearily to the conservation and the promotion of legislative measures to combat the increase of drunkenness throughout these islands. Some few years ago Lord Peel presided as chairman of a royal commission which was appointed to make inquiry into the whole subject. The commission could not agree upon any plan of legislation, and, in fact, the majority of its members were opposed to all legislation which could by any possibility be made effective in dealing with this growing evil.

I am only repeating what was openly said at the time, that the majority of the commission were made up of men who were more or less under the influence of the great capitalists by whom the country is supplied with intoxicating drink.

I do not believe that any of the great commercial and industrial trusts of which you complain so much in the United States can possibly have more influence than is exercised here in England by the brewers of beer and the distillers of whiskey. A great brewer of beer or a great distiller of whiskey is certain in England to be raised to the peerage. I could name several men who are members of the house of lords at present who have acquired their titles merely because they or their fathers were successful manufacturers of intoxicating liquors, and, having acquired vast fortunes by that industry, made lavish public expenditure of money in the patronage of popular charities, and thus advertised themselves as public benefactors.

The liquor trade is an organization of immense importance in all parliamentary contests, for the public-house keeper is in the vast majority of cases a mere dependent on the brewer or the distiller, and has to bestow his vote according to the direction given to him by his master. Now, the powerful brewers and distillers are generally on the Tory side of politics, and the present government has, therefore, a good deal to thank them for. The late liberal government owed its overthrow mainly to the earnest efforts of Sir William Harcourt to introduce a scheme of legislation which would have interfered with the profits of the liquor trade.

Lord Peel, who, as I have said, was president of the commission to inquire into the whole subject, drew up with his own hand a minority report, as it was called—a report embodying the views and recommendations of those members of the commission who thought with him. There was nothing extravagant or even immoderate, there was nothing impracticable or fanciful in the recommendations of Lord Peel. He is not a fanatical teetotaler; he is, in fact, not a teetotaler at all, and is not the man to indulge in any hope of making everybody sober by act of parliament, but he is a man of earnest purpose, of great intellect and of comprehensive practical knowledge.

Any attempt to discuss the money question on any other theory leads only into darkness. With metallic money, the regulation is automatic, that is, it depends upon production. It is not automatic in the sense of any nice adjustment of supply to needs for money. Sometimes the supply is

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

Miss Brideson: "What is your idea of the ideal lover?"
Miss Yellowleaf: "The one who marries."—April Smart Set.

"I CAN SEE KRUGER"

Ex-President Harrison was opposed to McKinley Policy on nearly every point.

A. L. Mason, a lawyer and personal friend, in telling of his last call on General Harrison, a few days before his last illness, said:

"We conversed on a variety of subjects. I had just finished reading his article on the Beer war and called him by saying that when he should go across the next time he would not be an acceptable guest at the English

court. He answered with great quickness: 'I can go to see Kruger.' 'He talked for a time about the Presbyterian creed. He was the chairman of the committee on revision. He took up the Cuban question. His point on this was that we had placed ourselves in a position before the world where our sincerity in dealing with Cuba could justly be questioned. He was emphasizing his former statement that the moral law bound the honor of nations as well as of individuals.' 'His reference to the Philippines and Porto Rican matters expressed surprise that the supreme court of the United States had not yet handed down its decision.' 'Later the conversation turned on trusts. He said he had very definite ideas on the regulation of trusts, and believed that the problem was one which was fairly within the reach of legislation that would commend itself to the common sense of all good people. He quoted at length, from memory, from the articles of incorporation of the steel trust and expressed a belief that that corporation should not be admitted to do business in any state unless it carried on its principal business in the state where it was organized and was an actual and bona fide corporation of that state, not only in law, but in fact.' 'He remarked that money of the great trust combination organized under the laws of New Jersey transacted no business in that state and were not intended to transact any business there. Of the general conversation these are the things that come to my memory.'"