

The Nebraska Independent

Lincoln, Nebraska.

PRESSE BLDG., CORNER 13th AND N STS.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.
FOURTEENTH YEAR.

\$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.

The "powers" did a huge amount of looting in China in the ordinary way that victorious armies have when invading a foreign country, but the diplomats provided for more looting in their own slick way than the armies ever did. The Chinese indemnity was made payable in gold, and then the governments went to work to further depress the price of silver. As Chinese money is all silver, every time the price of silver goes down a cent on the ounce the indemnity is vastly increased without any invading army.

When the bicycle first came into general use pedestrians had to run the risk of their lives every time they crossed a street frequented by the "scorcher." A few good-sized fines and the general contempt of the whole people after a good many had been killed and maimed brought the idiots under control. Now the same difficulty has arisen with the automobiles. The class of simpletons who are engaged in endangering the lives of the people with machines are the rich. There should be no mercy shown them.

"For Democrats: How to Treat the Trusts and How to Win in 1904." is the title of a neat little book, 81 pages, 12 mo., from the pen of John Haggerty, published by the Abbey Press, 114 Fifth avenue, New York city. Mr. Haggerty believes that the democratic anti-trust plank defeated Mr. Bryan in 1900. "The democratic plan frightened the trust workers at the last presidential election, and as they held the balance of power in the three great states where trusts are most in evidence, they ran McKinley in, although I believe that most of them wanted to vote for Bryan." Mr. Haggerty's ideas do not differ materially from those of H. Gaylord Wilshire, whose slogan is, "Let the nation own the trusts," but for the democratic platform of 1904. Mr. Haggerty suggests that direct legislation be made the principal plank, promising to give the people a referendum on the questions of what shall be done with the Philippines, the trusts, and other live questions.

The Crowder report concerning the British post at Chalmette at this writing is still safely locked up in the president's desk, but the Louisiana legislature has had something to say on the subject. It unanimously passed a concurrent resolution approving "most heartily" Governor Heard's letter to President Roosevelt protesting against the use of Louisiana waters and soil as a military base of supply by the British government in its war against the Boers. The governor also "is urged to take any such further steps conformable to law, as in his judgment may be necessary to establish and maintain in this state obedience to the law of nations and respect for the treaties of the United States." If the colonel's report had been satisfactory to the administration there is no doubt but that it would have been printed a long time ago. The suppression of news is one of the chief characteristics of the republican policy.

Our correspondent, H. W. Risley, in his Washington letter this week comments upon the fact that there are 227 lawyers in the present house of representatives, and shows why the lawyer succeeds as a politician where the newspaper man fails. Mr. Risley's argument is good. The lawyer is usually a conservative, rarely a radical—and the newspaper man who is not a radical is usually not much of anything. The pioneers, either in settlement of a country, political movements, or anything else, are seldom the ones who are given the opportunity to carry into effect or enjoy the improvements or reforms they advocate. But there is no denying the fact that a legal training is a great help to the man who fills a public office, be it administrative, legislative, or judicial. The fact that there are so many lawyers in the house is proof of several things: that the lawyer is considered best fitted for the duties of legislator, and that he is usually a hustler for votes in the campaign. On the face of things it would seem that the lawyer has more than his share, but it will probably be so as long as there are laws to make, to administer and to interpret. Nearly every president had a legal training.

A WORD TO WAGE WORKERS

That there is a conflict coming on between capital and labor more fierce and determined than any of the past is believed to be certain by many of the sociologists and economists. The organization of trusts in every department of industry with no disposition on the part of the party in power to check or control them, and the recognized existence of that partisan insanity that influences the mass of the people to vote for a party name regardless of the principles or tendency of the organization bearing the name, makes the coming of such a conflict inevitable.

Hundreds of thousands of wage-workers will go on a strike and suffer privations indescribable in a fight against the oppression of a trust and when election day comes will go to the polls and vote to give that trust and others like it control of the government. They will do that when they know that the organization that they are voting for will use the army against them, will establish and maintain courts that will issue injunctions, depriving them of any or all of the rights embodied in the first thirteen amendments to the constitution, will imprison them for months in bullpens as has been done out in the western mining districts, or shoot them down in the public highways as in Pennsylvania.

The fact of the existence of this partisan insanity should be taken note of by the brighter minds among the labor leaders. These leaders are not all demagogues and fakirs as the press of the political party they support constantly declares. There are patriotic men among them—men of good thinking capacity. The reason that they do not have greater control, is that most of them have not had the opportunity to ground themselves in the fundamental principles of political economy and government. The reading of the beautiful dreams of Bellamy does not give the virile strength of intellect to fight such men as run the coal, steel or standard oil trusts. It takes a different sort of education to qualify a man to enter a battle like that.

Toward the close of the seventeenth century and at the beginning of the eighteenth, a few great thinkers and scholars through their works taught the active minds engaged in commerce the real principles of the wealth of nations. Adam Smith, Ricardo and other writers for the first time brought within reach of the creators and manipulators of wealth the fundamental principles. The first to make use of this knowledge for their own enrichment was the house of Rothschilds. Something over a half a century later, the "captains of industry" in this country began to comprehend and make use of them. Meantime labor was befogged with the old ideas and bound to political organizations by the insanity of party fealty. What labor needs to enable it to fight for its rights is not impractical dreamers, but men who clearly understand the laws that govern the production and creation of wealth—men who think clearly and who are not influenced or overcome with political psychological waves created by a mental maelstrom, engendered by political leaders for the express purpose of bewildering and befogging them.

It would be millions in the pockets of members of organized labor if they would take a small portion of the fund expended for other purposes and expend it in sending four or five of their brightest men to some university to take a course in political economy and sociology and then put them at the head of their forces to fight the trusts. Then there would be a fight that would make the fur fly.

The instincts of the labor leaders are right, but they lack the special training to make them effective antagonists against the trained political economists which capitalism brings into the field to fight its battles. Suppose that when Edward Atkinson brought out his stove, which was to do the cooking for a workman's family for a cent a day and the other economists of that kind were publishing articles telling how laborers could live on three cents a day, that the labor leaders had had some economist of equal training to have met, not only with the justifiable denunciation that was used, but with a complete economic and unanswerable argument showing the folly of such a system. What a world of difference there would have been in the situation of the wage-earners today. Suppose that they had replied to Mr. Atkinson and the other hired economists of capitalism: Your system will stop consumption. The wage-workers are the consumers of the products of the manufacturing. Reduce their consumption to six or eight cents a day and nine-tenths of the manufacturing will close their doors within a year. You talk about the smoke from the factory chimneys. In that day the skies will not be darkened with the clouds from burning coal any more. The roar of the machinery will stop. Neither capitalist nor wage-worker will get any more returns from the factories. You have destroyed consumption and production must also stop, for there would no longer be a market for your goods. Mr. Atkinson,

your theories would, if put in practice, bring disaster upon the whole human race. They would make a howling wilderness of this great and beautiful country. In the wreck and ruin the adoption of your principles would produce, you and your kind would be involved as well as the wage-worker.

An argument along that line and many others that a trained economist could have made would have driven Atkinson and his confreres from the field, while denunciations employed by the labor leaders had little or no effect.

Labor leaders should get into their hands weapons with which they can do something more than irritate and annoy. They should be so armed that they can drive the enemy from the field. After getting hold of the fundamental principles, it would not be long until they could control the government and bring its mighty power to bear upon the conditions of which they complain.

ANSWER THE QUESTION

Let every American citizen ask himself if the war in the Philippines has been any benefit to him. Has he been made any happier for it? Has his toll been made the least lighter for it? Has any inspiration come to him to make his life better? If he answers honestly, he will answer no. That will be true of every man who has not received an office on account of the war or made money from army contracts. On the contrary, let him ask what he has suffered on account of the war. Ten thousand young men have lost their lives in the Philippines and that many American homes have been made sorrowful and desolate. Every man has had to contribute money to the support of the war and is that much the loser. Why is it then that there is a single man in all these United States who favors the continuance of the war?

The war on the Filipinos was started and has been carried on without asking the people whether they favored it or not. It was inaugurated by a few republican politicians at Washington. Congress was never consulted and never declared a war on the Filipinos. It was done by a commission appointed by a republican president to make a treaty of peace with Spain and that treaty was ratified by a senate that was not chosen by a vote of the people and all of whom were elected before there ever was a thought of a war with Spain.

The war is continued by the men who started it because of the political patronage that it furnishes. By means of it fat places are given to the friends and adherents of the few families who control the republican party. Service in some of the colonial offices for three or four years makes a man independently rich for the salaries attached to them are enormous.

But why should you desire its continuance? Do you expect to get an office or a big army contract? What sort of a reason can you give for voting to continue this war of conquest? Is it because your father voted the republican ticket?

WHO ATTACKS THE ARMY?

The republican gag, "attacking the army," has been pretty much worn out before the campaign has begun. The question is: "Who is attacking the army?" All the witnesses who have given evidence concerning the employment of torture have been members of the army. The general criticisms of the army have been made by two regular army officers, Major Gardner and Captain Grant. No democrat or populist has testified against the army. When one of these members of the army, officers or enlisted men, gives testimony concerning the inhuman manner of carrying on the war in the Philippines, then the imperialist, with rage in his eye, turns upon the opposition in congress and shouts: "You are attacking the army," when not a man among them has given any testimony against the army at all. When some democrat or populist appears before the Philippine committee and gives testimony against the army, then Lodge and his confreres will have some ground for shouting: "You are attacking the army." Until then they had better pay attention to the only witnesses who have borne testimony against the army. The beginning of the whole thing was the remark of the lieutenant general in command of the army to the effect that the war was being waged with severity. All the testimony since has come from the honorable men of the army.

The republicans appointed the investigating committee. They issued all the subpoenas. They brought to Washington every witness. They are responsible for all that has resulted. It has been so disastrous to them that, viewing their own work, they seem to have lost their heads entirely and accuse their opponents of doing something that they have had no part in at all. If any set of men has "attacked the army," it is the Philippine investigation committee of the United States senate, and that is a body appointed by a republican senate.

POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Political psychology would be an interesting study. There should be a chair established in every university to teach it. It is one of the practical things that should be included in the modern curriculum. Let the philosophers get at it and tell why it is that a man who has never attracted any attention when nominated for office all at once becomes a hero to be worshipped, honored and lauded by tens of thousands of people, the most of whom never saw him and who know nothing about him. Why do the masses watch every word he says as if it were law and the gospel? How is it that a psychological wave is created affecting the minds of thousands, influencing them to spend their money and their time to go out and shout for him? How such a wave is started, its growth, its climax and its sudden subsidence would be a study well worth the time of any scholar.

Personally, what difference does it make to 999 men out of every 1,000 whether Mr. Jones or Mr. Brown is governor? There are many chances to one that the man who has shouted and worked for Mr. Brown or Mr. Jones will never see the man after he is elected, and whichever wins, it will not affect the life of the voter. He will still have to plow and sow, stand behind the counter or work in his shop just as before, yet this psychological wave will so affect tens of thousands that they cannot sleep nights and they will imagine, and for the nonce really believe, that if their candidate is not elected that the state will be ruined, men will lose their farms and merchants will become bankrupt. Such was the state of mind of thousands upon thousands of republicans when the populists elected a governor the first time. They firmly believed that the farms of Nebraska, being mortgaged, eastern creditors would swoop down on the state and sell it out at auction and that these fertile prairies would become a howling wilderness. The agony they suffered was terrible.

Each individual is of course more or less affected by the sort of state government we have and perhaps more by a good or bad national government. While the fusion government was in control of the state, the debt was decreased over \$600,000, and the first two years of republican government will increase it by about the same amount. That, of course, affects every man in the state. What he must pay in increased taxes will have to be earned and handed over to the tax collector, instead of being kept in his own pocket to add to happiness and comfort. This matter seems, however, to have little effect upon the men who are under the influence of a political craze. The psychological effect is aside from this. It is a wave that sweeps men from their mental foundations and starts them whirling around in a vortex, disconnected from the ideas that usually control their conduct. It drives them into a madness that leads them to believe that the populists are bent on bringing destruction upon the whole community. They denounce them as scoundrels, idiots, traitors. Yet strange as it may seem, these populists are their neighbors. They meet them in a friendly way. Buy from and sell to them. Exchange neighborly courtesies. Often belong to the same church with them, and yet when this psychological influence is upon them, they think of populists as being little short of demons in human form.

The psychologist who will examine this question in a scientific fashion, collect his facts and draw his conclusions after the manner of inductive philosophy will do mankind a service. It is in fact a part of the science of sociology and has wide influence upon the relations of men. If Dr. Ross should give attention to this matter, he would doubtless evolve something that would be of vast interest to mankind.

COME ON WITH YOUR SHOOTING

The catch phrases of the imperialists are more senseless than any ever employed before. "We have outgrown the Declaration of Independence." Can justice and truth ever be outgrown? If we have outgrown the Declaration of Independence, then it never was true, and our whole government was founded on a lie, and the men who founded it were liars. If men who denounce the course which has been followed in the Philippines are "traitors" and "copperheads," then Lincoln was a copperhead. He said that a people that denied liberty to others did not deserve it for themselves. The epithet, "Your friend Aguinaldo," which has been so often used on the floor of congress, is the hissing and spitting of a viper, not the statement of men who honestly defend a political policy. Those who oppose imperialism are not personally interested in Aguinaldo, and the men who use the hissing phrase know that they are not, but are anxious to preserve the liberty that the founders of this republic bequeathed to us. They still remember the words engraved on the old liberty bell: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto ALL the inhabitants thereof."

"To criticize the army is treason." No matter if it kills the innocent and helpless. The army must not be criticized.

That is to say that the army can do no wrong, which is a thousand times more infamous than the old doctrine that the king can do no wrong. Men who dare to criticize the army should be shot, say the Funstons. Never in the darkest days of the darkest ages was there a more infamous doctrine promulgated. Yet the great republican organs give support to such damning statements. All the men who fought for liberty and free speech in the revolutionary war are dead. Some of those who fought for these things in the civil war are still living and they are ready to die for them now. There are millions of others in these United States who have never bowed the knee to Baal and never will. Come on with your shooting.

CABINET DESPOTISM

Secretary Root plays despot with a nonchalance that no cabinet ministry in all Europe dare imitate. A statement of the cost of the Philippine war has been demanded of him by congress and he refuses to make it. Such an act as that would cause a revolution in any European government. The English house of commons asked for a statement of the cost of the South African and Chinese wars and it was made within a very few days. The frivolous excuse of Root that he had kept no separate accounts of the wars we have been waging, first in Cuba and Porto Rico, then in China and the Philippines, was accepted as perfectly satisfactory by a trucking majority in the house. The war in the Philippines has cost the people of this country some hundreds of millions. The men who pay the money out of their hard earnings have a right to know the exact amount. But Secretary Root refuses to give them the information. To any protest against such despotic action the reply is made: "Well, what are you going to do about it?"

HE WON'T DO IT

The British taxpayer has one satisfaction that is denied to the American citizen who has to furnish the money to pay the cost of foreign wars. The chancellor of the exchequer, without any hesitancy, tells the Britisher exactly what each of his foreign wars costs him. Not only does the chancellor do that, but he also gives an explicit statement that any working man can read and understand, of the cost of the home government, just what the income of the government is and how much the deficit amounts to. The last statement shows that the cost of the war in South Africa up to the first of March of this year was \$796,870,000, while the estimated expenses for the current year will bring these figures to \$1,114,870,000. The cost of the China campaign will add \$30,000,000 more to this total. To pay the war bills of the year and also meet a deficit in the ordinary expenditures the ordinary revenue would have had to be increased by \$80,000,000. The treasury will receive for the four years of the war up to March, 1903, \$269,000,000 from taxes, leaving \$775,000,000 to be obtained by adding it to the national debt, which will be a charge for years.

It is no wonder that the English are anxious to patch up some sort of a peace in South Africa. If we could only get a like specific statement from our government of the cost of the war in the Philippines it might cause even some of the imperialists to have a sober thought or two. But Secretary Root will not make any such statement and what are you going to do about it?

"LOYALTY TO THE ARMY"

The cry of "loyalty to the army" has in it the very quintessence of absolutism. It was never heard in the United States until a few days ago. The question is not whether there is loyalty to the army, but the more important one: "Is the army loyal to the principles of this government?" Men are sworn to support and defend the constitution. They have never been called upon to take an oath to support and defend the army. That American citizens should be required to do that is one of the advanced steps of imperialism. That demand has developed within a very short time. It belongs to the order of things that was established by the supreme court when it tore the constitution in shreds and established imperialism in its stead. It has been expected by every man who has been watching the trend of events. Imperialism is based upon the army and the very nature of things it must demand "loyalty to the army" instead of loyalty to the principles of free government.

The fiercest "attack on the army" during last week was made by President Roosevelt. In a letter to Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts, the president said: "In reference to these cruelties I agree with every word in your address. No provocation, however great, can be accepted as an excuse for misuse of the necessary severity of war, and, above all, not for torture of any kind or shape. I have directed that court-martials be held under conditions which will give me the right of review." No democrat or populist has made any such an "attack on the army" as that.

ARMY OFFICERS

It is the inspirations of liberty or influence of despotism that makes the difference in the record of army officers. In Cuba, the army officers, and they are the same sort of men who were sent to the Philippines, have organized a system of hospitals and charities; they have inaugurated a new system of custom houses and a new revenue service; they have organized and trained a native police called the rural guard; they have so cleaned and drained the cities that, instead of being among the most pestilential, they are now among the healthiest in the world. Yellow fever, which formerly menaced every southern port on our Atlantic and gulf coastline, has been driven from Havana. A public school system of nearly 4,000 schools, aside from higher institutions of learning, has been successfully started and maintained.

In the Philippines, officers of the same race, education and early training, have desolated whole provinces, formed reconcentrado camps, left a howling wilderness in their track, resorted to torture, the destruction of private property and the general murder of the inhabitants of at least two provinces. The former were under instructions to restore liberty and the latter to establish a despotism. The result is what every patriot has said always was and always will be. "A nation cannot long endure half slave and half free." "Those who deny liberty to others cannot long maintain it for themselves." Our own liberties are more seriously threatened than those of the Filipinos. When the whole of the army has had its turn in setting up despotism and returns to the United States, what effect will that have on this government. Already one of the returned generals has declared that such men as Senator Hoar ought to be shot and if they had been caught in the Philippines they would have been. No United States army officer ever talked in that strain until after he had been employed by a republican administration in setting up despotism in Asia.

SENATOR HOAR'S SPEECH

The speech of Senator Hoar upon the Philippine bill will undoubtedly be the most marked feature of all this session of congress. He has without passion clothed in the most elegant English the arguments and facts of the case against the imperialists. There is not a point made that cannot be duplicated in the writing that has appeared in these columns, but beginning at the very commencement of the abandonment of the Declaration of Independence he sums up the whole course of the government in language so pathetic and strong that it will be a powerful factor in the coming campaign. It is an arraignment of the doctrine of government by force that will be read by lovers of liberty when every member of the senate will be moldering in their graves. There will be millions of copies of the speech printed and circulated during the next few months. It should be placed in the hands of every republican voter.

The speech is a terrific arraignment of the cruelty, inhumanity and despotism of the imperial policy. The calmness of the speaker gives to his words a tremendous effect. What is inexpressible to most men is the fact that while Senator Hoar knows that if the republican party is successful in the coming campaign that this policy which he arraigns before the world as the embodiment of all the cruelties of the past and makes insecure even the liberties of the people of the United States, yet he will go back to Massachusetts and do all that is within his power to keep the republican party in power and thus perpetuate the horrible crimes which he denounces. Could a more evident demonstration be made of the power of partisanship? Let every populist thank God that he is not afflicted with such a baneful infatuation.

SENATOR JOHN P. JONES

It is said in Washington that Senator John P. Jones has announced that he will retire at the end of his present term and not seek a re-election. He will probably be succeeded by Congressman Newlands. During the height of the silver agitation a dozen years ago Mr. Jones delivered a speech in the senate nearly as extraordinary in its scholarly presentation of the money question as in its length, and this speech was distributed on application from the country by tens of thousands. It became the chief work of reference for the talkers on the silver side.

When the McKinley administration went to coining more silver than was ever coined before, Senator Jones went back into the republican party. He was always a protectionist and while not fully agreeing with the new imperial policy of the republican party he made no opposition to it. These transactions have thrown him out of sympathy with his state and as he is nearly seventy years old, he thinks it best to retire without a struggle. His great speech of 1893 is not a discussion of the silver question only, but a work on political economy, covering every phase of the money question except that of credits, which is referred to in an appendix, being part of a speech he delivered at the Brussels conference. It will take its place as a standard work and endure for all time. It was the result of twenty years of hard study, assisted by two secretaries of vast learning, and involved the collection of perhaps the finest private library on the subject of political economy in the world. Senator Jones was a millionaire, having made a fortune in the Comstock lode, and he never spared money in the purchase of books or in the payment of learned and expert assistants. For many years he paid his secretaries more than he received as salary as a United States senator, and they were known as the hardest worked men in the whole city of Washington.

OBSERVERS AND THINKERS

There are two classes of men who take interest in public affairs. One class, understanding the fundamental and unrepeatable laws of political economy, put their reason to work and can forecast with certainty the economic effect of certain policies. The other class have only skill in describing those effects, being a sort of economic historians, as it were. The former are thinkers and the latter merely observers. Of late the "observers" have been recording the result of their observations and some of them are extremely accurate reproductions of what populists said would follow the unchecked organization of trusts. A writer discussing the decrease in the number of young men who can obtain a college education after mentioning the lengthening of the college course, says:

"A still more potent cause, however, and one which ought to have suggested itself to anyone giving this subject the most superficial attention, is the unfortunate condition which has prevailed in the business world for at least a decade."

The hirelings of the trust have no possible chance of a college education. This same writer tells of one young man who entered the service of one of them at \$4.50 per week six years ago and after faithful and efficient service for more than half a decade now gets \$6.50. He went into this service with high expectations of rapid promotion, but there is under the present system no hope for him. In regard to this the same writer remarks:

"More serious than the inability to obtain a college training is the far more important question. How are young men working for \$8.50 a week going to establish homes? This is the all-important question for social economists, for practically it becomes one of morals. A nation can live without college-bred men, but not without homes."

If the trusts are fostered and encouraged as the republican party and the republican press have been doing, the American family will certainly to a large extent disappear. When all the inhabitants except the magnates become hirelings of the trusts, the foundation of the home is gone. The "observer" above quoted has been taking note of that fact, but he is only reproducing in a very literal way what the "thinkers" said nearly a decade ago. He has perhaps been aiding by his vote to bring about the condition of things which he deplors. The Morganization of all industries goes on with astonishing rapidity and the condition of trust hirelings spreads wider and wider.

GOT WHAT THEY WANTED

The best lawyers look upon Judge Grosscup's decision in the beef trust case as the most tremendous stretch of the power of federal judges ever attempted. It is in fact the assumption of authority by the federal courts of the power to fix the price of beef in the United States. The only way of enforcing the injunction will be to bring the managers before the court for contempt for charging too much or too little for beef. There is not a trust in all the land but would be willing to let the federal judges fix the price of all its products. That is what has come of President Roosevelt's attack on the beef trust by way of injunction. The Independent had no faith in it from the beginning. It was simply a political move of doubtful utility to the republican party. There will be no serious attempt made to curb the rapacity of trusts while the republican party remains in power. The only way to down the trusts is to down the republican party.

A prosecution of the beef trust under the criminal law, a trial before a jury, a conviction if the proof sustained the charge and imprisonment in the penitentiary of the big millionaire moguls would have meant something. This injunction performance was a shallow political trick and has ended in establishing a more offensive despotism than the one which it was pretended to attack. The way to attack the trusts in the courts was so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err therein. The attack was such a farce that the trust put up no defense. They accepted an injunction just as the railroads did in a similar case. It was what the trusts wanted, and as has always been the case under republican rule, the trust got what it wanted.