

The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, JUNE 26, 1902.

NO. 6.

THE PANAMA ROUTE

Senate Substitutes Panama for Nicaragua
In Order to Defeat the Canal Project

—The Asiatic Cholera Coming

Washington, D. C., June 23, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The canal bill has been defeated. The Spooner bill, introduced by the senior senator from Wisconsin, has been passed as a substitute and soon the canal will be built. (So they say.) But this measure, being so radically different from that passed by the lower house, will be necessarily returned to them for consideration. At this late date then, there is little probability, if even a possibility, that the bill will be considered at this session. The republicans can thus go out onto the hustings and proclaim that they have gotten the thing under way—they can shout that they have commenced upon the work proclaimed in their platform at Philadelphia. But they know that with the enormous expenditure of money in the Philippines and in other colonial possessions, that they dare not commence even a greater task in carrying out an American principle.

The canal bill was under discussion in the senate for over two weeks and finally reached a vote on Thursday last. Political parties as usual are closely drawn and with but few breaks this was carried out in the vote. Senator Jones of Arkansas voted with the majority in favor of giving the president the right to secure the Panama holdings, if possible, but failing in this, it orders him to secure the Nicaraguan route.

Quite a number of speeches were made. Senator Hanna closed the debate for the Panama adherents and was followed by Senator Morgan of Alabama, whose life's work has been to secure the digging of the canal. In fact, he has been of little use for anything else. He would prostitute his opinion on everything else, to get a vote for the canal, and while we may all agree that the canal is a good thing and a necessary thing, it in no way justifies a Morgan to lie down on everything. His final vote was 42 to 34 in favor of the Panama adherents.

This means that the president shall do all in his power to secure the holdings of the French company, who are only too willing to have a bad job taken off their hands, and to then confer with the neighboring countries to secure what might be necessary. Ecuador and several of the Central American countries must give the necessary permission, before the canal can go through the Panama route. Failing in the Panama route, the strenuous Teddy is ordered to have the canal dug through the Nicaraguan route. But as I said before, the house of representatives passed the bill providing for the Nicaraguan route, an entirely different bill, and this grave difference of opinion must be smoothed over before anything definite can be said as to whether the canal will be built. The question now, as before, is, "Will the canal be built?"

The situation on the question of Cuban reciprocity is still somewhat mixed. Seventeen republican senators whose names you published in the last issue of The Independent are still holding firm and demanding that the beet sugar interests be taken care of by the republican majority. Behind all of their bolting can be seen the master hand of both the railroads and the sugar trust. When men of the calibre—mental and moral—of Dietrich take firm stands on any position someone with brains must be behind them driving them into the corral. They are still holding out and after several caucuses both of the body of senate and of their own number are still firm. Among them are Elkins of West Virginia. In whose state there is not a single sugar beet grown.

Miss Rebecca J. Taylor has bobbed up again in both houses of congress and as I predicted in last issue that something would be doing when it was heard from again. In the senate, Edward W. Carmack of Tennessee made a characteristic speech, full of eloquence and logic demanding that there be an investigation of the civil service as it is conducted. He quoted from an interview with the strenuous Teddy construing a certain section of the civil service regulations. The language seemed to Teddy to be a slight bit ambiguous, but after Teddy got through with it, it was undoubtedly ambiguous and instead of saying what he intended to say, just reversed the situation. He had undertaken to say that anyone who should act as had Miss Taylor should be dismissed for the good of the service. But instead of saying that, he declared that anyone who was guilty of such charges should be kept for the good of the service. Well, Carmack thought that under such circumstances the clerk should not be fired for uttering her sentiments, but that she "should stay put." In the house, Mr. Shallenberger of Nebraska was called upon by the committee on civil service to contend with the administration. It was during the debate on the urgent deficiency bill that he secured the time. This is now a very busy time in congress and both parties are eagerly seeking to get material into the Record. Congressman Richardson of Tennessee, the democratic leader, had been speaking for nearly two hours and had nearly exhausted the democratic time. Nine members clamored for the remaining seven minutes, but again ability was recognized and Nebraska's representative was allowed the time. For that time he cut loose on the administration and poured clean cut argument against them. Before he had more than half concluded his speech, the time had elapsed and Uncle Joe Cannon, the republican floor leader, realizing the strength of the speech, and the ability of the young man, arose and yielded him five minutes out of his personal time. This was greeted with (Continued on Page 2)

The Foundation of American Liberty THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America:

WHEN, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;

That, whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new Government laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government and to provide new guards for their future security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world:

He has refused his Assent to Laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operations till his Assent should be obtained: and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for the exercise, the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states, for that purpose obstructing the laws for the Naturalization of Foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary Powers.

He has made judges dependent on his Will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us in times of peace, standing Armies, without the Consent of our Legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of, and superior to the Civil Power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his Assent to their acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from Punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing taxes on us without our consent:

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, altering fundamentally, the Form of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with Power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here by declaring us out of his Protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is, at this time, transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun, with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens, taken Captive on the high Seas, to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rules of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free People.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts made by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them, by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace, Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in General Congress Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do.

And for the support of this Declaration, with firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The government as now administered has become in direct antagonism with the Declaration of Independence. So much so that it can no longer be read as a feature of a Fourth of July celebration, especially by republicans, except as an ancient document that in its time was appropriate but is now inapplicable to present conditions. The very acts committed by George III, which are in this document condemned, have been committed by our government, as directed by the republican party. The judges appointed in the Philippines have been appointed in the very manner condemned by the Declaration. A multitude of new officers with enormous salaries have been created. A large standing army of foreign troops have been kept among the people there. Taxes have been imposed upon them without their consent, they have been deprived of trial by jury, we have ravaged their seas and plundered their coasts. Savage Macabees have been employed to slay the Christian inhabitants and, far worse than anything King George ever did, a general of the army has issued orders to slay all the inhabitants of a whole province above ten years of age. In all the charges brought against King George there are none that equal the acknowledged order of General Smith, or the employment of torture to obtain information. That is what the republican party has done and it is denied by no one. Furthermore, the declaration was a protest against kings and monarchs. In the 126th year after it was proclaimed the republican party sends a special ambassador to help crown a descendant of King George, against whom the declaration was made. The people still stand by the old declaration. They can hold Fourth of July celebrations without hypocrisy.

SOCIALISM—TRUSTS

Mr. DeHart Reviews the Rev. Charles H.

Vall's Book on Socialism—Good

Religion But Poor

Politics.

Socialism is a religion as well as a politics. Rev. Charles H. Vall of Jersey City, N. J., has left his pulpit and gone to preaching socialism. He has written a book of 230 pages, besides many pamphlets on the subject. He believes and teaches that labor should have the whole product of labor and capital, that capital ought to belong to Uncle Sam, that rent, interest and dividends ought to be abolished and that whatever is produced should be divided among those who produce and that nothing be given to those who do not work. This is very good religion; but is it good politics? Is it wise to be trying to get the whole product of labor and capital when it is so hard to get a small part of rent, interest and dividend by way of tax for the support of the federal government? That those who do the work of a nation should have the whole product is right theoretically, there can be no doubt; but how does it happen that those who do the work, do not own the land and the machinery of production? At the beginning those who worked owned everything. Now those who do the work own very little; yet they pay all the rent, interest and dividends, while those who do not work receive all the rent, interest and dividends. Why is this? Because monopoly has been a work. It began with monopoly of land, then it extended to monopoly of tools and machinery of production. Mr. Vall points out this, but he does not mention any practical method of labor recovering its own.

Socialists welcome the trust, not that it is good absolutely, but good relatively. Mr. Vall says: "The time was not ripe for socialism until the capitalist system had taken on its logical expression in the trust and syndicate. Until this stage no political or social upheaval could accomplish more than to upset thrones and behead monarchs. Such a revolution would accomplish nothing." "Every industry that has reached its trust stage of development is eminently ripe for appropriation by the community. It is useless to say that an enterprise cannot be managed by society when it is being managed by a group of capitalists. The board of directors—who as a rule do not own the capital invested—can as readily be made responsible to society as to the shareholders. The directors in charge at the time of transition could be retained if thought advisable, simply making them responsible to all the people instead of to the few favored stockholders. Socialism is thus seen to be practical as well as inevitable. The realization of this final stage of industrial development is nearer than many think."

The methods of the socialists are peaceful, namely, agitation and appeal to the ballot box. In 1900 they polled 124,000 votes for president out of about 14,000,000 of voters. This does not indicate that their system is popular. It shows either that the people do not comprehend the system or that they regard it as wrong. I believe that they do not know the meaning of it. It is certainly beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man. Who, for instance, can see any practicable way by which the federal government can become the owner of all the private property in the United States? It is estimated to be worth a hundred billions, i. e., a hundred thousand millions, which, at 4 per cent, would produce an annual income for the government of four thousand millions. This is the amount that the private owners are now receiving annually by way of rent, interest or dividends. It is eight times as much as the government now receives annually by way of taxes. If the government had this amount, it could abolish the present system of taxation and still have thirty-five hundred millions annually, to be divided among the people or to be used in public improvements. But who can understand this problem? It is too vast for the comprehension of the ordinary man. It is therefore useless to present it to the voters for adoption.

One of the most pressing necessities of the time is that the federal government should own the railroads. They are public highways and they received their charters from the several states. The original intention was that these highways should belong to the states at the end of a certain time. This is written in the old charters of the railroads of New Jersey. It was supposed that the stockholders would be able to reimburse themselves in fifty or a hundred years and that then the state would take the property and run the railroads for public accommodation, charging enough for freight and passengers to pay the running expenses. This has been lost sight of and nobody thinks of taking the railroads for the states, and if the people should think of it, the railroads are altogether too powerful in the legislature. Besides, every railroad in a state now is part of a railroad system in the United States, and it is necessary to take the whole system, which is a work that only the national legislature can do. How can congress take not only one railroad system, but all the railroads at once? It can be done through the power of taxation. Congress can tax the incomes of the private owners until all the shareholders would surrender their shares to the government. The income from a railroad is either dividends on the capital stock or interest on the railroad bonds. If the tax on this income should be 10 per cent, it would be equivalent to taking one-tenth of all the railroad property in the United States. This could be done, if only there were a public opinion to sup-