

The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XIII.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, APRIL 10, 1902.

NO. 47.

THAT BRITISH MILITARY POST

Governor Heard Makes a Vigorous Protest Against British Soldiers in the State of Louisiana

Washington, D. C., April 7, 1902.—(Special Correspondence).—At last we are to have some action by the government on the shipment of British supplies to South Africa. The thought is very pleasant indeed, but will the action be strong enough to drive this British supply station from the American shores, and will the statement of affairs resulting from an investigation lead the American congress to express its sympathy for that brave and heroic people who are battling for just the same freedom from just the same oppressor that we fought? Attorney General Knox doubts the facts in the case as they are presented by Governor Heard of Louisiana, who in a formal statement to the government describes the exact condition of Port Chalmette. A great lawyer, as Knox really is, cannot help admitting that if the statement furnished by the governor of Louisiana is accurate, then the situation at Port Chalmette is a defiant breach of the obligations of neutrality. But how will the government act? Will it or will not the deliberate statement of the deliberate governor be accepted or even honestly investigated? Does the administration want to ascertain the truth and act upon it?

To this conundrum, the Washington Post admits it can give no solution. I am very sure that the neutrality obligations have been violated flagrantly for the past few months, and even though the attention of the government has been called to the true status on several occasions in an unofficial manner, nothing has been done by the federal authorities in way of investigation. It appears that the governor of Louisiana has satisfied himself of the exact condition as an eye witness, and therefore he informs the government officially that the British officers are violating the obligations of neutrality. He has taken the present that he is ready as the governor of the state whose shores are outraged, to erase the blot and meanwhile he regards the situation with extreme indignation. The New Orleans Times-Democrat, in an editorial referring to the governor's protest, says:

"Now that the period of discussion has passed and the hour for definite action has arrived, the case is no doubt that the chief magistrate of this state has in this unhappy—we shall use no severe word—incident perfectly represented the intelligence, the character and the conscience of Louisiana. Investigation has at last proved beyond the shadow of a doubt what every one here has indubitably believed for two years, namely, that the soil of Louisiana is being perverted into a means by which a powerful nation may work its merciless will upon a numerically weak, but truly heroic people. It is now known of all men that Port Chalmette is, and has been for months past, a British military camp, and that this camp is furnishing the British army in South Africa with the sinews of war."

Of course this is not the way that a diplomat should handle the case. It is an exact statement of affairs leaving the administration to do the quibbling. We have known it for a year that the British were purchasing supplies and shipping them from New Orleans, but the government, which was so friendly to the British cause in opposition to the united pro-Boer sentiment of the country's people has allowed the matter to drift placidly on. British transports, commanded by British officers, are carrying to the British army in South Africa the most important, not to say indispensable munitions of war. I cannot help quoting the Times-Democrat again for its editor puts the situation so strongly:

"Here, then, is a case that should be decided by a court of equity as well as by a court of law; and though we should deprecate any attempt by state authority to break up this British camp at Port Chalmette we ardently hope—the people of Louisiana fervently pray—that the United States government may devise some means by which the national arm may drive from this commonwealth these British soldiers who, at our very doors, are prosecuting an unrighteous war against a brave and liberty-loving people. It is clear that, but for the sanctity of law, the state of Louisiana cannot do what its people are eager to accomplish. It becomes the duty of this nation to strike a blow for liberty."

General Pearson, the Boer envoy, is in town for a few days, and called on the president who received him unofficially. Pearson has just returned from New Orleans where he has been prosecuting a libel suit against the British consul there. He has left that in order to be in Washington when the consideration of Governor Heard's proclamation was going on. All honor to Governor Heard!

The republicans in the senate are in another quandary. The committee on insular affairs has, in its report, favored practically the free coinage of silver in the Philippines. Loud and strong are the shouts of the ultra gold standardists. The house bill had provided for the gold standard, but when the matter was referred to the senate, they promptly referred it to a sub-committee composed of Senators Allison (rep.), Beveridge (rep.), and Dubois (dem.). This committee brought in a report which entirely destroyed the gold standard idea and substituted instead a provision for the establishment of a mint at Manila for the coinage of silver. Any owner of silver might take it to the mint and have it coined at the nominal price of

claimed that if congress does continue the Philippines as a silver standard country, it will be a marked weakening on the part of the republican party on the money question. The fight for the gold standard was made in 1896 and again in 1900 and it proved successful on both occasions. Why congress should decide that it is a good thing for the United States and a bad thing for the Philippines, they cannot understand. If it is right in the United States why then, they argue, is it not right for the Philippines. But there is one thing that is significant in the whole question and that is that the committee which drew up the measure did not seek the views of Secretary of the Treasury Shaw, Secretary of War Root or even Director of the Mint Roberts. Effort will be made by the extreme gold men to have the president take a hand in the affair and rescue the gold standard andromeda from the horrible fate of being kept away from the unsuspecting natives.

The senate early in the week passed the oleomargarine bill by a small majority. Senator Bailey made a magnificent speech against the provisions of the bill, basing his argument that we should not discriminate in the taxing of articles. He also argued that the measure should be left to the state authorities. It was a strong speech and one that will likely live in the annals of the senate. How a man could work himself up to the pitch to make such a speech on the subject of factory-made butter and lard, is a proposition that is hard to understand. The vote upon the question was 39 affirmative and 31 votes in the negative.

Both houses of congress are at present discussing the Chinese exclusion act as introduced in the senate by Senator Mitchell of Oregon and in the house by Representative Clark of Missouri. The argument is taking a lively turn and many good speeches are being made for the exclusion of Li. So far the lack of humor in the situation has caused much comment. But so much was used on the oleomargarine bill that the reserve supply of jokes, etc., must be thoroughly exhausted. The house also passed the sundry civil appropriation bill and heard the report of the committee on military affairs and coast defenses which makes the appropriation of \$6,562,455.

The Philippine government bill as introduced in the senate by Chairman Lodge the Philippine committee has now been made "unfinished business," which in the senate gives it the right of way. The Philippine bill will be considered this week and the discussion will probably take until the first of May, or even later. The democrats are determined that this bill will be thoroughly considered in its every aspect by congress. It has displaced the Hepburn canal bill in regular order after the earnest pleadings of those opposed to its passage. They argue that we should as soon as possible pass the Philippine government bill because we should soon give them a working government which is intended at least to have a tint of permanency. They are also arguing that whatever arrangements can be made with Columbia regarding the release of whatever claims she has against the Panama canal. They argue that we should be very careful before taking this step—and really their position seems reasonable. We certainly should know all before digging the canal.

Representative Jackson (dem., Kas.) the man who nominated James L. Norris for his position on the Democratic National campaign committee, received a letter from a man named "William Coleman" in which he was roasted for his attitude. I am informed by a member of congress to whom he showed the letter that it has worried him considerably about the interest this man "Coleman" has taken in the case. The letter charges that Jackson cannot be an anti-trust man out in Kansas and a trustee in Washington without his constituents knowing of it. Many of the members of the committee are receiving like letters from all parts of the country denouncing the attitude of the committee in placing a man like Norris on the committee. He is a thorough trust man—through and through. He and several others sold out the United States Electric Light company to the Standard Oil company and for several years has been the attorney of the American Tobacco company, the tobacco trust. His daughter is married to the son of Arthur Pue Gorman, senator-elect from Maryland, and he is the Handy Andy of the boss. He is the man who formally announced Gorman's candidacy for the presidency and was thoroughly opposed to the nomination of Bryan before the last convention. His delegation would have been entirely unseated before the last convention, had it not been for the influence of Gorman and the tears that flowed from the eyes of Norris as he "pleaded" what he had done for democracy." He was charged in a sworn statement before the committee with attempting to bribe one George Killen, a true democrat and a delegate to the convention which nominated Bryan in Chicago. He was charged in like manner by many other affidavits sworn to by other reputable men. His election to the Kansas city convention was reached only after the grossest frauds—frauds which your correspondent had the opportunity to witness—and the national committee refused to seat him on that committee after he was elected by his delegation. The charges were so strong against him that the convention at Kansas City refused to seat his delegation and allowed but one-half of them to be seated, while giving the other seats to the contesting delega-

Hero of a Hundred Fights.



Hero of a Hundred Fights.

Bearing the wounds and scars of battles won, Many years of service, every duty done, Now at last a younger officer: 'Halt! Salute! For I above you rise, Not by service but by assassin's shot. Your record counts not, 'tis all forgot. Up with hand! Quick to me salute, You old timer, civil-war galoot.'

is really opposed to trusts. If they prefer to keep him and then oppose the trusts, this should be hurled at them in every district with as much force as the "ice trust" was used against Van Wyck and Croker and as the cotton bale trust was used against Senator Jones. He is more of a trust man than all three of them.

Representative Sulzer of New York, the intrepid young leader of democracy, whose leadership is marked with great ability, has introduced a resolution in the house declaring sympathy with the Boers. Mr. Sulzer's name has been prominently mentioned as a candidate for governor of New York.

THE LIGHT WENT OUT

The Statue of Liberty Will Stand With a Tormentless Hand as a Monument of the Time When a Republic Was Changed Into an Empire

Some time ago The Independent announced the fact that the light in the torch held in the hand of the statue called "Liberty" Enlightening the World," located in the harbor of New York, had been extinguished. The government navigation board had issued a warning to mariners, giving them notice of the fact. It would seem from that, that it had a commercial use. But now it has been extinguished forever, or at least as long as the republicans shall continue in power at Washington. The extinguishment of the light is appropriate. The fact of its existence will no longer vaunt our hypocrisy. The next step should be to pull the statue down and raise one in its place that will proclaim the overthrow of the Declaration of Independence and the establishment of the doctrine of government by force instead of a government by the consent of the governed. The account of its final extinguishment as sent out from Washington was as follows:

"The house today made rapid progress with the sundry civil appropriation bill, completing 93 of the 139 pages. A proposition to provide for a light in the torch of the statue of liberty in New York harbor was defeated. Mr. Sulzer (N. Y.) offered the amendment to appropriate \$50,000 for lighting the torch of Bartholdi's statue in New York harbor. Mr. Sulzer said this light was put out on March 1. Since the statue was erected in 1885 until now, he said, the sundry civil bill always carried an appropriation for this light. He had read a poem written by an anti-imperialist on the extinguishment of the light of liberty's torch.

When Mr. Sulzer concluded Mr. Cannon congratulated him on the speech and the poem, and then asked him if he withdrew his amendment. Mr. Sulzer replied in the negative, whereupon Mr. Cannon said that the pending bill carried \$1,900,000 for lights, the expenditure of which, he said, was entirely within the discretion of the lighthouse board. Mr. Cannon said the appropriation committee had made some investigation and has ascertained that the light on the Bartholdi statue was valueless for commercial purposes.

On a rising vote the amendment was carried—43 to 33. Some New York school teachers in the gallery applauded vociferously.

its pacification is, in my opinion, the secret of the pacification of the archipelago. They never rebel in Northern Luzon because there isn't anybody there to rebel. That country was marched over and cleaned out in a most resolute manner. The good Lord in heaven only knows the number of Filipinos that were put under ground, for our soldiers took no prisoners; they kept no records; they simply swept the country, and wherever or however they came upon a Filipino they killed him. The women and children were spared, and can now be noticed in disproportionate numbers in that part of the island. But, as I gauge American sentiments, there was no real opposition to the course pursued by Funston and others in Northern Luzon, and there would not be a similar course in the rest of the archipelago.

Americans ought to ask themselves if they feel proud of a course of conduct compared to which the course of the British in the war of the revolution was humane and generous. We are trying to conquer a country to which we have no moral right and to destroy a people whose yearnings for freedom were inspired by our own Declaration of Independence. American history and the lives of American patriots and statesmen were the favorite reading of patriotic Filipinos. It is about time for the people of this country to inquire of themselves if they really wish to continue harrasing, burning and slaying in a land belonging to a race of strangers on the other side of the globe. Are we not trampling on our most cherished ideals when we adopt the policy taken by the Turks when they began to spread the gospel of Mohammed?

Not long ago Funston said that anybody who criticized the policy which is being followed in the Philippines ought to be hanged offends. A man who will express such sentiments in a man who would be tyrant if he had the power, and we can very well believe that the reported brutality of the campaigns in Northern Luzon and elsewhere occurred as charged.

Ever since the war with the natives began the reports of casualties have shown three or four times as many dead as wounded among the Filipinos, a ghastly fact which speaks for itself, because the number of wounded always is several times as great as the number of dead in ordinary battles. In his testimony before the senate committee General Hughes said that the campaign in Samar got "stiffer" each year, and that we are not conducting what could be called civilized warfare. He testified that new commanders came into the field and carried on the warfare on civilized lines, but "were allowed to get their lesson."

Mr. Stephen Bonsal, of the New York Herald, who has just returned from the islands, says in the Boston Transcript:

"During my stay in Samar the only prisoners that were made, so far as I know, were taken by Waller's command, and I heard this act criticized by the higher officers as a mistake, which they believed he would not repeat when he became better acquainted with the conditions of Samar. . . . If on their march Waller and his men shot any natives they met, their action would be fully covered by the general orders of General Smith."

WORSE THAN THE BRITISH

Funston's Campaign of Slaughter in North Luzon—The Policy of the Turks and the Creed of Mohammed

So far as can be learned from best sources of information, the campaign directed by General Funston in Northern Luzon was a carnival of slaughter. Filipinos who had the misfortune to meet with soldiers under the command of Funston and others were killed off-hand as the best means of turning them into pacifists. The New York Evening Post published an interview with a republican congressman, returned from the islands, which he visited last summer, in which he said: "But the Filipino is at heart in a state of rebellion against the United States authority, and he always will be. You never heard of any disturbance

PROGRESS AND POVERTY

An English Criticism of Mr. George's Theory of the Single Tax—What is the Answer?

It is now 31 years since the publication of Henry George's first pamphlet on the single tax. "Our Land and Land Policy" and 23 years have elapsed since Mr. George finished writing "Progress and Poverty"—no doubt one of the most widely read books on the land question ever written.

Whether Mr. George discovered the true solution to the questions of land and taxation, and the abolition of poverty, is yet uncertain. Although read and studied and believed by hundreds of thousands of intelligent, earnest and well-meaning persons both in the United States and Great Britain, the single tax is yet a tentative proposition and just what effect it might have if adopted is only a matter of speculation—something to be reasoned out, with no historical examples exactly in point to guide the investigator. The example of New Zealand is only partially applicable.

As to whom is entitled the credit for originating the single tax idea, it may be said that without doubt "Progress and Poverty" is wholly the product of Mr. George's brain; yet curiously enough substantially his entire program was carefully worked out by savants in France during the reign of Louis XIV., and later in England. However, Mr. George was wholly unacquainted with this fact until long after his book had been published.

Perhaps one of the best criticisms of "Progress and Poverty" is W. H. Mallock's "Property and Progress," a collection of articles from the pen of Mr. Mallock printed originally in the "Quarterly Review," and published in book form in 1884. Mr. Mallock writes from the English standpoint, and as Mr. George's ideas spread even more rapidly in England than in America, it is interesting to note how they are treated by an English writer. The Independent has not yet been converted to the single tax idea and will give a summary of Mr. Mallock's objections in the hope that American single taxers may be able to meet them satisfactorily.

Mr. Mallock summarizes the argument in "Progress and Poverty" as follows: (1) As the production of wealth grows greater, the share that goes to the laboring class grows less. (2) The laboring class grows, and grows as it receives them; it being wholly false that wages are drawn from capital. (3) Population does not increase faster than do the means of subsistence; and thus the current explanations of poverty are no explanations at all. (4) Poverty really is caused by the appropriation of land by individuals. (5) Poverty would be cured by the confiscation of the land by the state. These are briefly what Mr. Mallock considers the essential points in Mr. George's discussion, and he meets them as follows:

"Now, we cannot discuss this assertion at any length. We can only say, that though it is continually made, and though it is continually observed, and though it seems much to justify it, all who have studied the matter carefully are unanimous in declaring that it is wholly untrue. The poverty that underlies civilization is, no doubt, a terrible evil; it may easily develop into a dangerous one; but, so far as it is from being relatively an increasing evil, that there is every reason to believe it to be somewhat diminishing; whilst as to the middle class, the class that is being destroyed by modern progress, they are, on the contrary, its special and most evident product."

The Independent agrees with Mr. George on this point and believes that Mr. Mallock dismissed an important point in "Progress and Poverty" in an unsatisfactory manner. Agreeing with George that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer, The Independent, however, does not admit that the cause is to be found in the private ownership of land, but suggests that in their collective capacity the people have impoverished themselves by enormous gifts of property and franchises to corporations exercising some functions of government (such as railroads, national banks, etc.) and that they have been further impoverished by the colonization of these selfsame corporations.

On the second point Mr. Mallock takes up Mr. George's proposition that "wages, instead of being drawn from capital, are really drawn from the product of the labor for which they are paid," or, in other words, that wages are drawn from "contemporaneous production" of food, not "previous production." Mr. Mallock's answer is given on page 78.

"In the great San Joaquin valley there were (in 1877, owing to a total failure of the crop) many farmers without food enough to support their families until the next harvest time, let alone to support any laborers. But the rains came again in proper season, and these very farmers proceeded to hire hands to plow and to sow. For every acre here and there was a farmer who had been holding back part of his crop. As soon as the rains came, he was anxious to sell before the next harvest brought lower prices; and the grain thus held in reserve, through the machinery of exchanges and advances, passed to the use of the cultivators—set free, in effect PRODUCED, by the work done for the next crop."

To this Mr. Mallock says: "Had Mr. George expressly designed it to destroy instead of supporting his theory, he could have written nothing better adapted to his purpose. The farmers, he admits, are enabled to go on with their labor only because some other farmers have corn already ac-

THE VALUE OF 'X'

An Easy Problem for Students in Algebra Try Your Art on Judge Grosscup's Problem

Whenever the federal court attempts to lay down a rule for determining the value of corporate property and franchises, it is so involved that it cannot be followed. This was noticeable in the Nebraska maximum freight rate cases; it is true in the Chicago tax cases.

Some time ago the teachers' federation of Chicago waged a campaign for reassessment of the corporations of that city, claiming they were escaping just taxation. The circuit court issued a writ of mandamus compelling the state board of equalization to make a new assessment for 1900, which should include the value of franchises and capital stock. This was sustained by the supreme court of Illinois. Afterward seven of the public utility corporations went into the federal court and asked an injunction to prevent the collection of the taxes so levied. The decision of Judges Grosscup and Humphrey, recently handed down, is in the nature of a compromise, holding that the reassessment should go up to 60 or 70 per cent thereof, but soon as that percentage of the taxes levied is paid in a writ of injunction will issue.

The court claims that taking the market value of stocks for a taxing basis is erroneous, because market values are largely fictitious, but lays down the following rule: "The basis shall be the net earnings of the several complainants for the year ending April 1, 1900, proper allowance being made for depreciation and replacement, but not for extension, and reduced further by the additional taxes that the enforcement of this rule produces. Upon this basis the value of complainants' capital stock, including franchises and tangible property, shall be capitalized upon a ratio of 6 per cent; this equalized by a reduction of 30 per cent, and then divided into five. Upon this (capitalization) the tax shall be extended at the true rate for 1900, exclusive of interest and penalties, not to exceed 8 3/4-100 per cent, from which shall be subtracted the taxes already paid, and the balance will be the sum allowed."

It paid the corporations to go into the federal court, invoking, of course, amendment, because the decision will permit them to escape taxes on something over \$2,000,000.

The "rule" presents some curious features and a problem that will delight the hearts of those who like to do hard "figgering." Let us take a hypothetical case and see how it works:

Net earnings.....	\$ 1,000,000
Depreciation and replacement.....	100,000
Remainder.....	\$ 900,000
Additional taxes produced by this rule.....	?
Remainder.....	\$ 900,000
Capitalization at 6 per cent.....	\$15,000,000
Less 30 per cent.....	4,500,000
Remainder.....	\$10,500,000
Divided by 5.....	2,100,000
Taxes at 8 per cent.....	168,000

Now, suppose the taxes under the old plan of assessment to have been \$68,000, it would appear that the "additional" taxes that the enforcement of this rule produces" ought to be \$100,000. However, when this sum is substituted for the "?" in the problem above, an entirely different result is obtained, and the total taxes at 8 per cent amount to \$148,333, which would leave only \$81,333 of "additional taxes" after substituting this for "?" produces still another result. Perhaps some of our algebraic friends may be able to substitute "X" for the "?" and solve the problem, but the mathematical editor of The Independent hasn't been able to find the value of "X" yet. Who can solve it?

If bank clearings are an index to prosperity and some people think they are—then prosperity is waning down in Gotham. Bradstreet's report for the week ended April 3, shows a falling off of 32.6 per cent as compared to the corresponding week last year. In the cities outside of New York the decrease was only 1.1 per cent, but New York's big slump brought down the average for the whole country to 23.1 per cent decrease.

Small Farm For Sale
Forty acres adjoining town of West-ern. All under cultivation; house 24 ft. square, good well and windmill, barn, hog house, pens, etc. Complete and in good condition. A bargain. Address A. J. Storuz, Western, Neb.