

The Nebraska Independent

Lincoln, Nebraska

PRESSE BLDG., CORNER 13TH AND N STS

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

\$1.00 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE

When making remittances do not leave money with news agencies, postmasters, etc., to be forwarded by them. They frequently forget or remit a different amount than was left with them, and the subscriber fails to get proper credit.

Address all communications, and make all drafts, money orders, etc., payable to
The Nebraska Independent,
Lincoln, Neb.

Anonymous communications will not be noticed. Rejected manuscripts will not be returned.

General Roberts has not put down the war in South Africa and all the honors he received for the assumed job are ill-gotten goods.

The Chicago Tribune accounts for the decrease in the population of Omaha as announced in the census by the fact that it is the residence of Rosewater.

Roosevelt hay is not becoming to the American mules as regular diet. In the language of Kipling they prefer "English oafs."

The most patriotic and heroic people: The Boers. But our silk-stocking administration prefer the Britishers, neither heroic nor patriotic.

In answer to several correspondents The Independent replies that the Storm-month dictionary can be obtained at any book store. The publishers are Frank F. Lovel & Co., 142 Worth street, New York.

Even our sires of the revolutionary days, great as were their achievements, do not equal Botha, DeWett and Delarey. Meanwhile we are looking on and assisting the British. Gods, what has become of the spirit that animated Americans in '76?

Even the American mule is more patriotic than the Roosevelt-Hay combination. Whenever he stampedes he plays smash with the British crockery. 'Rah for the mule! Within the last month two signal Boer victories became British panics because of our mules.

Governor Taft confessed to the senate committee that it would have been better if the United States had never occupied the Philippines. The censor cut that out and the people do not know it. It would hardly do to let them know it. That is exactly what the populists have said all the time.

Lord Pauncetote's note to the powers at the breaking out of the war with Spain would make a very good precedent for President Roosevelt to act upon in regard to the Boer war. England could have no excuse to object to a note to the continental powers suggesting a united protest against its continuance.

Joe Parker and Clem Deaver made so much out of their middle-of-the-road tickets in the last campaign that the grafters are determined to get another pull on their Uncle Hanna's leg. Here in Nebraska it don't seem to work. The attempt to organize the "allied party" at Omaha last week was a most dismal failure. Uncle Hanna and Colonel Dick will not shell out much unless they can do better than that.

It is altogether probable that some of the little bankers out west who have been backing up Wall street for the past twenty years will get their eyes opened when they read the currency bill favorably reported to the house. If they want to descend from independent business men to the position of bank clerks let them go on whooping it up for the republican party. Wall street would swallow every one of them in less than ten years under the provisions of that act.

Most horrible stories are coming from the Philippines about the violation of the laws of war of both parties. A large number of American officers have been court-martialed for cruelty to prisoners. Over 500 Filipinos have been court-martialed and hung after military trials during the last year for violations of the laws of war while all the American officers have been let off with light sentences. Privates convicted for these crimes have received long imprisonment sentences, some as long as twenty years. So the bloody work goes on. The worst of it is that it will continue to go on as long as the United States remains in the islands. The thing for us to do is to get out of there. If the Filipinos want to keep on fighting after we are gone it will be no affair of ours. There is no claim made any longer that there is anything in it for us but an eternal expense and the loss every year of some thousands of young

POPULISTS AS LEADERS

There is a club in the city of Lincoln made up for the most part of professional men, many of them being lawyers and professors in the university. A majority of them are populists and Bryan democrats. Some hot discussions take place upon current matters. One of the republicans lately remarked: "How is it that while the republicans often take different sides on questions, you populists and democrats are sure to all line up solid?" He was told that the reason was that these men all had certain fundamental principles which they never forsake. When any new question arose they applied these principles and the result was that they would naturally all come to the same conclusions, while the republicans having abandoned all the fundamental principles upon which the party was founded were always at sea, without chart or compass, and no one, not even themselves, could tell where they would land when any new thing was broached.

The populist press is of the same sort. The editors get no orders from any headquarters. If they did they would pay no attention to them, yet with a rare exception, they will be found taking up new questions and discussing them with almost perfect unanimity. What is more surprising is that the general public finally come to their views. They are leaders in economic thought because they have certain fixed principles. That populists do lead no one can truthfully deny. They were the first to demand the election of senators by the people. They were the first to declare for the public ownership of city franchises and the public utilities of city life, which may seem somewhat strange for most of them were farmers. All these things are now advocated by prominent men of all parties and many others which the populists first brought to the public attention receive almost universal public approval.

When the gag rules were first adopted in the house of representatives every man who is now a populist protested and foretold the result. Years after the populists made their protest and gave their reasons, some of the republican papers that at the time were denouncing populists as lunatics are now reproducing the same arguments and among them is the Chicago Tribune which in a late edition said:

The house rules which enable a majority to gag a minority also enable a majority of the party which is in control to gag a minority of its own party. Much is said about "the oligarchy of the senate." There is a house oligarchy, small in numbers, but enjoying, thanks to the rules of that body, almost despotic power. It is intolerant of opposition from members of its own party or of the opposing party. It is averse to the full discussion of measures on the floor of the house. It prefers to "jam" them through. Had there been such an oligarchy in 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska bill would not have been debated for weeks, but would have been debated for two days.

The abuse of the rules of the house has lowered that body in the public estimation. Speaker Reed said, proudly, that the house did not debate, but legislated. Today it neither debates nor legislates. The senate does both. It is to the proceedings of the senate that men go to learn what is said in congress about public measures. It is to the senate they turn to ascertain what legislation is to be adopted. The house proposes and the senate disposes. The popular branch of the national legislature has ceased to be the popular branch. There are able and eloquent men on both sides of the house. Fifty years ago the country would have heard from such men often. It now hears from them seldom. They are the victims of a misuse of the too rigid rules of the house.

HURRAH FOR WILD CATS

The house committee on banking and currency have been cogitating for a long time and have at last brought forth a scheme of banking and currency that will turn everything financial topsy turvy if it is ever enacted into law. Every disreputable and dangerous policy that has been advocated for the last ten years seems to be incorporated in this one bill. Branch banks, redeeming silver, retirement of the greenbacks, asset currency and every other sort of financial devilry which their wild brains could evolve is "favorably reported" to the house. Of course there will be given no chance to discuss this measure. The republicans are opposed to discussion. The rules committee will bring in a rule and fix a time to vote and that will be all there is of it.

New York bankers have determined to wipe out western banks and center all financial affairs in their own ring. Branch banks will do it and so they are for branch banks. They want to go into the wild cat issue of money on assets and their tools in congress obey their orders just as jumping jacks respond to a pull of the string. What do these two-by-four congressmen know about banking and money? Did any one of them ever read a work on banking? Did any one of them ever study a work of authority on political economy? Let them flood this country with bank promises to pay if they

deem silver in gold. Let them retire the greenbacks and put bank promises to pay in their place. These congressmen think that a bank promise to pay is much better than a promise of the United States government. That is the way a mullet head reasons.

But this bill is not passed yet. It is probable that these congressmen will hear something from bankers who do not live in New York before many days. The bankers of the west have learned something about money and finance in the last few years.

The Independent says, go ahead and pass the bill. Let the \$800,000,000 of trust funds in the United States treasury be turned over to the banks at 1 per cent interest. Let the banks on that deposit inflate their credit, (they are running ten to one now) \$8,000,000,000. On that let them issue credit currency and let us all get rich on a flood of paper money. Nothing easier in the world. Hurrah for wild-catting! Be sure and vote the republican ticket. The banks are rich enough to give you all a cord of paper money. They'll have it to give if this bill passes.

THAT ISTHMIAN CANAL

A farmer writes to The Independent: "I have read your paper for five years and your judgment of the policy likely to be pursued by the republican party has always been so accurate that I have come to rely upon it without much thought or investigation. Do you remember what you have said about the action of the republicans on an isthmian canal? It has turned out just as you said it would."

It did not take much knowledge or foresight to tell what they would do. The party holds power on account of the support that is given it by the railroads. Let the railroads withdraw their support and it could easily be beaten in almost every state in the union. It follows that the party will do nothing to which the railroads are distinctly opposed. The building of a canal across the isthmus is opposed by the trans-continental railroads. It follows, as The Independent has often told Senator Morgan, that such a canal will never be built under republican auspices, as long as the leaders believe that they can hold power by the aid of the railroads.

The canal commission seems to be under railroad control. They have had an opportunity to study the question for years. They knew just as well as the general public now knows, when they made their last report recommending the Panama route that the United States could get no clear title. They knew of the international complications and the title by which the Panama company held its franchise, and knowing all that, they made a report in favor of Panama. The only result that could follow and which every one of them knew would follow, was to defeat the passage of any bill to build the canal at this term of congress.

To make certain that the Nicaragua route should not be chosen, the railroads have kept a large diplomatic force at the seat of government of Costa Rica and Nicaragua that has induced those governments to withdraw the propositions that they made concerning the right to build the canal. The men who have been engaged in this are traitors and should be prosecuted under the United States statutes which completely cover such transactions. It is as flagrant treason as was ever committed against any government, and if there was anything but a railroad government at Washington every one of them would be shot or imprisoned.

The people of the United States might as well understand now that there will never be a canal built across the isthmus while the railroads rule the republican party and that party stays in power. The roads can hold the party up to that as long as the leaders believe that they can succeed with makeshifts, prevarications and pretenses. When the prevaricating plank was adopted at the republican national convention The Independent called attention to it and said then, and it says now, that the great railroads will never allow the canal to be built as long as they control the government at Washington. It is probable that the last plan announced will be perfectly satisfactory to the mullet heads and they will support the party with as much enthusiasm as ever. It said that congress will pass a bill without any appropriation and leave the whole thing in the hands of the president.

The way to get an isthmian canal is to beat the republican party and put men in control of the government who are not dominated by the great railroad corporations.

Secretary Hay is very energetic in his protests against Russian monopolies in Manchuria, but he has never had a word to say about the hundred and one monopolies in this country. Why not apply some of this energy at home. It is now said that the secretary is worrying himself about a mining monopoly that Germany has secured in Shantung province of China. The steel trust has a mining monopoly up on the great lakes that beats that two to one, but no member of the cabinet

SUGAR BOUNTIES

European countries have been trying subsidies for the last decade or two and just as they have been forced to abandon them after having thrown the commerce of the nations into confusion, Hanna and Frye want the United States to start out on the same road to destruction. At the meeting of the several nations interested in sugar bounties recently held in Brussels, it was resolved that the whole subsidy business should be abandoned after 1903. The paying of these immense subsidies was the great factor in the depression that recently swept over Germany and they were becoming so onerous that they could no longer be endured.

There is a contravailing duty in this country on all sugar coming from nations paying a bounty and when the counties cease, the tariff to that extent in this country will be reduced. There is therefore a prospect that the price of sugar will fall one or one and one-half cents on the pound.

When the European countries resolved to go into this bounty scheme every economist in the world protested and foretold just what has happened. The bounties can no longer be paid and when they are withdrawn those countries will be thrown into another convulsion. The immense factories and farms that have been devoted to the business at the expense of the rest of the inhabitants will be in great distress, and it will take some years to restore trade to its natural channels again.

English diplomacy has had a great influence in encouraging the continental countries in this foolishness for it was all to England's profit. Sugar was so cheap in England that the coarser grades of it were fed to stock. Of late England's sugar raising colonies have been making strenuous protests and demanding aid from the home government. Bounties on sugar in Germany ruined their trade in sugar with the mother country and just at present England is very anxious to preserve the good will of her colonies. That has been one factor in the abolition of bounties.

From the very beginning of the populist party it has fought bounties and in this state it killed them. On this, as on other economic propositions, the populist party has always been right.

THE BORN THIEVES

The rich in this country as in England steal everything of value that was intended for the poor. All the great schools of England were founded by philanthropic men who intended them for those too poor for an education, but they have been taken by the rich, the lords and the dukes, and a poor boy is no longer to be found among their students. The same thing is occurring in this country. When a school gets well established and has procured costly laboratories, libraries and other helps to a finished education, the rich step in and take it all for their sons and daughters.

When Ezra Cornell founded the great university in New York he intended it for the poor. But now only the rich can obtain its benefits. Tuition has been raised to \$100 and \$150 a year. For a good room near the campus a student must pay from \$7 to \$9 per week. Besides this, a style is made for the student that he must live up to or forever feel himself an inferior. He must attend the cotillions, the junior ball, the masque and help support eight or ten "fraternities" whose houses are fitted up in the most costly style.

There are some poor students there but they feel themselves out of place. What good old uncle Ezra founded for the benefit of the poor has been stolen by the rich. They are born to steal and they follow the practice from the cradle to the grave. The born thieves are not the tramps and the kleptomaniacs. They ride in special trains, live in palaces and send their sons to Cornell.

SHIP SUBSIDIES

There was never a more indefensible attempt to convey the earnings of the common people to the pockets of a few millionaires without compensation than the ship subsidy bill. All the arguments in favor of it can be summed up under three heads:

1. It costs more to build ships in the United States than in other countries.

2. The wages of American seamen are higher and that makes the cost of operating American ships more than those belonging to foreigners.

3. Foreign governments subsidize their merchant marine and we must do likewise.

One may read the five-hour speech of Senator Frye clear through from end to end and that is the sum and substance of the whole of it. If the postulates were true, it would not be sufficient grounds for such legislation, but an examination of them will show that none of them are true.

As to the cost of building ships, the Americans have the cheapest and best material in the world. They have the most improved machinery. Actual investigation shows that the "labor cost" of ship building is less here than elsewhere. For that reason the Am-

work, some of them having orders that will keep them busy for three and four years. Ships have been built for foreigners in many instances during the last few years. Recently one was built for the German emperor and others have been built for Russia. If the American ship builders could not build them cheaper than foreigners the orders would not come here. So the first assertion that it costs more to build ships here than abroad is evidently untrue.

As to wages of seamen, the statement is ridiculous on the face of it. Ship masters hire crews at any port in the world and the American ship master is at liberty to hire them anywhere. If he prefers to hire Americans at a higher rate than foreigners can be obtained, it is for the reason that they are more efficient and that their labor in the end is the cheapest.

As to subsidies to foreign merchant marine, the statement is equally fallacious. There is no general subsidy to the merchant marine granted by any foreign government. Great Britain's payment for that purpose last year was less than \$300,000. Payments are made to the owners of a certain class of ships which are in fact a part of the British navy and were built with that end in view. They are fast cruisers subject to the naval authorities at any time.

The facts in this case are that the effort to pass this bill is for the purpose of granting to a few men, already millionaires, many millions of dollars out of the taxes collected from the people and for which no return whatever will be made. It is another gift to the rich and a further concentration of wealth in the hands of the few.

"Protecting infant industries from the pauper labor of Europe" has some very comic features. The heavy duties on works of art is for the protection of our young art industry, but every real artist in the country sends up a constant protest against it. The "artists" who favor it, are the ones that make plaster of paris casts of pigs and sheep and zinc statuary. The idea that we could create great artists who would confer honor on our country by a Dingley bill is certainly as laughable as anything that was ever seen in a comic opera. It is perfectly overwhelming. A man needs to hold his sides every time that he thinks of it.

The fight in England for liberty is essentially the same as it is in this country. In a recent speech Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the liberal leader, in speaking of South Africa, said: "The war was only a transient interlude and that after the war the great question would come. He concluded by declaring that the only solution of the South African and Irish questions would be government by assent of the governed." There may be a difference between the "assent of the governed" and the "consent of the governed," the latter being the way we express it in this country, but if there is any difference, this editor cannot see it.

The power of money over the courts never had a better exemplification than the action of the New York grand jury that held the management of the New York Central blameless for the tunnel accident and indicted a poor, raw engineer. The heads of the corporation who maintained the tunnel in spite of all agitation for an improved system, and moreover tolerated conditions of train and tunnel management which made such an accident inevitable, go scot free. That is the sort of government that plutocracy has always given the people and it never will give any other sort. If you like it go and vote the republican ticket.

The Independent has taken several "whacks" at socialism and the single tax. Doubtless every reader of the paper has noticed the very great difference in the style and character of the replies that have been made by the followers of these two cults. The single taxers all seem to be able to give a reason for the hope that is within them and to do it in a gentlemanly way. It may be that after a while they will be able to convince the editor of The Independent of the soundness of their views. But the socialists will never accomplish that fact by calling him names and declaring that he is a villain in the service of capital.

There are a good many things about Teddy that The Independent likes. His decision that his daughter should not be paraded over Europe as an American princess was sensible. His order to bring the railroad corporations under the control of law was another. His determination to keep the written treaty with the Cubans made to get them to accept the Platt amendment is still another. It is evident that if Teddy keeps doing things of this sort that the railroads and tariff grafters will drop him. Already reports come from Washington that schemes are being laid by the republican leaders to get rid of him. They say the plan is to nominate Mark Hanna and that a large number of congressmen and

JOHN P. ALTGELD

Just before closing our forms for the press, and too late for any extended comment this week on his life and distinguished public career, comes the news that John P. Altgeld, former governor of Illinois, died of apoplexy Wednesday morning at Joliet, Ill. Governor Altgeld was stricken right after the close of a speech he had made and died within a few hours afterward.

His death deprives true democracy of one of its strongest advocates in America. A man of undaunted courage in everything he undertook, absolutely fearless, his convictions were his guide in every action. In all his official and public career no man could accuse Governor Altgeld of being in the slightest degree a trimmer. He was without doubt the profoundest philosopher and most earnest student of the principles of reform and true democracy to be found in all America. His work will live after him, it is true, but in his death the cause of reform has sustained a loss incalculable.

WHO SHIRKS?

A republican paper asks: "Would Abraham Lincoln, if he were president, shirk the responsibility assumed by the United States to protect life and property in the Philippine islands?"

Would Abraham Lincoln protect life by shooting 30,000 Filipinos? Would he protect property by burning towns and devastating rice fields? Would he uphold free speech by making the reading, printing and circulation of the Declaration of Independence treason and provide for the conviction of the party upon the testimony of one witness? Say, you old hide-bound mullet head, do you really think that he would? Of course you do. You think anything that the bosses tell you to think.

WHO GOT BEATEN?

It is amusing to reflect upon the question of who really got beat in the last presidential election—the bankers or the pops. The bankers declared that the coinage of silver must be stopped and spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars to effect that purpose. The pops declared that we must have a greater volume of money and the coinage of more silver was the best way to get it under present circumstances. The administration as soon as in power went to work to carry out the pop theory and coined more silver than was ever coined in the same length of time before. As a sop to the bankers they were allowed to increase their promises to pay 10 per cent and get interest on them. It might be said that they both beat. The pops got more money and higher prices for farm products and the bankers got leave to issue more promises to pay. But that only went to grant more money and help the pops along. Taking the whole under consideration, it may be said that the pops beat the bankers at their own game.

A GOOD LAUGH

The editor of The Independent welcomes with delight anything that brings a good laugh into the work room where he toils and therefore he wants to acknowledge his obligations to the Phonograph-Press. The editor of that paper was the cause of the best laugh that this writer has enjoyed for many a day. His article on the prosecution of Meserve was excruciatingly funny from beginning to end, but the best part of it was where he found himself unable to decide whether the editor of The Independent was a gold democrat or a Mark Hanna republican. He got into that entanglement because he did not see that when writing about courts, grand juries and indictments and the word "crime" was used, it necessarily meant a statutory crime. The Independent declared that no "crime" was charged in the indictment of Meserve and the court has so held. The grand jury that brought in the indictment knew well enough that it did not. Everybody except the distinguished editor of the Phonograph-Press knew that it did not. It was no wonder that he was unable to decide whether the editor of The Independent was a gold democrat or a republican.

BE REASONABLE

Rosewater continues to give Stuefer underhand digs. Now The Independent has no sympathy with that kind of work. Look at this:

The uninvested balance in the permanent school fund has again risen to nearly \$65,000 and the treasurer repeats the shallow pretense that this money is being kept in the treasury vault. As long as the law limits the investment of these funds, as at present, it is impossible to prevent an accumulation of cash on hand. Why not be candid and include it in the exhibit of bank balances? Rosewater knows very well that if the state treasurer should report that he had deposited that \$65,000 in a bank that it would land him in the penitentiary. The supreme court has decided that a deposit in a bank is a loan, and if he loaned the permanent school fund in any other way than provided by law he would commit a crime. The Independent has never criticised the present treasurer be-

posited the permanent school fund in banks. It is a little too much to ask a man to confess in writing that he has committed a felony. The Independent has not spared Stuefer for his county bond deals. For those transactions he ought to be prosecuted. But to blame him for not pleading guilty to a felony in advance of formal charges is a little more than any decent newspaper will do.

What is any treasurer to do with the permanent school fund when the securities for their investment which the law prescribes cannot be found? The supreme court has decided that to deposit them in a bank is a felony. If the treasurer keeps them in the old iron safe in the capitol he will be guilty of criminal negligence. No bank would receive them and become responsible for safe keeping without being paid for the service. What is to be done with such funds? To say that the treasurer carries thousands of dollars around on his person is a fiction. To say that he keeps them in the old vaults at the state house is another fiction. Yet the treasurer and his bondsmen are responsible for every cent of this money. How much would any reader of the Bee ask to safely guard, night and day, \$65,000? There is reason in all things, but some men have not brains enough to find it.

The editor of The Independent has received three or four letters from men who say that they are socialists, but that they do not believe in the common ownership of everything by a long ways. They had better get together and come to some conclusion about what they do believe. If they only want the common ownership of certain things let them say so, and then let them tell us what those things are. If they believe, as their platform says, in the collective ownership of all means of production and distribution, which, if it means anything at all, means the common ownership of everything, let them stick to that. There is no indefiniteness about populist principles. Populists believe in the public ownership of a railroads, telegraphs and everything in which competition is impossible or injurious and in the private ownership of everything else. From these letters it appears that the writers believe in populist principles and not socialism at all. For a whole generation socialism has been presented by a series of able writers. What they have taught in their works must be accepted as socialism and not what any private individual may say.

It is instructive to note how the republicans everywhere use almost the exact language of the old slaveholders in defending the slavery that now exists under the American flag. Judge Taft, governor and despotic ruler of the Philippines under the republican administration, in defending the slavery that exists under his rule, when before the congressional committee was very apt in revivifying these old defenses of chattel slavery. He remarked that the slaves did not understand the advantages of liberty. That was what was heard every day at the time the republican party was organizing to overthrow slavery. Had that theory been acted upon, slavery would still be the ruling power, not in the United States alone, but in more than half of the world today. The most irritating thing about such talk is the subtlety of the hypocrisy that pretends such arguments are based upon the principles enunciated by Abraham Lincoln. Since satan tried to palm himself off for an angel of light, nothing equal to it has ever been known.

Recent changes in classification will have the effect of raising railroad rates in Nebraska from 2 to 18 and 20 cents per hundred pounds according to distance shipped. How do you like it? Mr. A. J. Gustin of Kearney, who has probably made a more careful study of freight rates than any other man in the state (aside from railroad officials) tells The Independent that by abolishing both distance and classification, a flat rate of 5 cents per hundred pounds could be made for the entire United States—so that any commodity could be shipped any distance, whether long or short, at that rate—and that the income of the railroads would not be diminished. However, the trusts would be compelled to pay much more in freight rates than they do now. For the state of Nebraska alone a flat rate of 10 cents per hundred pounds could be made.

There is fraud in every department of the dailies, even in their illustrations. The other day two Chicago dailies each had what purported to be a likeness of a great London preacher. There was about as much resemblance between them as between a Hottentot and the Venus of Milo. As the editor of The Independent was once entertained for a day or two at the residence of the celebrated Tabernacle orator, he can testify that neither of the pictures looked any more like Mr. Parker than General Funston looks like a Macabee scout when in full native dress. There is not a thing in the great dailies that a man can rely upon, from a picture to a report of a club