

SCHOOL APPORTIONMENT

Smallest December Distribution In Years
 —"Redemption Comes High, but we Must Have It"

Willis J. Abbott, the gifted editor of The Pilgrim, says that "the one fool, blind in his own conceit, is the hard-headed, practical business man—blind to the teachings of history." Evidently Mr. Abbott has an intimate acquaintance with the republican mullet heads who went to the polls this year, and the populist and democratic pouters who stayed away. The teachings of history show that republican state officials always have been and now continue to be wholly incompetent to manage the state's business in a business manner. Yet so peculiarly constituted is the mind of these hard-headed business men—the "yellow-dog" supporting republicans, and the populists who want infallible officials made of fallible men, and the democrats who are jealous of Bryan—that they are willing to suffer almost any loss if they may be entertained by a sham fight over the whisky question.

Following upon the heels of a republican victory in Nebraska came the news of a "restoration" of freight rates—a polite term for genteel highway robbery by raising them, just as "liquidation" is good form when speaking of the failure of a bank and the consequent robbery of its creditors, the depositors. The next we hear is that the Dorgans and the state board are beginning in a mild way to do a little "plugging to size" in coal contracts. And then comes the news that the December, 1902, school apportionment is eighty thousand dollars less than it was a year ago, and \$83,000 less than the average December apportionment made under fusion administration. That would pay the salaries of a hundred teachers for a whole year at \$830 each; and the amount, if even paid to the teachers, must be raised by local taxation in the various school districts.

The apportionment just announced is \$236,252.68—or more than \$56,000 smaller than the smallest December apportionment ever made by the fusionists. It is made up of the following items:

APPORTIONMENT, DEC., 1902.	
State tax	\$ 67,775.48
Interest on school and saline lands sold	36,001.06
Interest on school and saline lands leased	46,751.10
Interest on U. S. bonds....	300.00
Interest on county bonds..	65,887.78
Int. on school dist. bonds..	863.11
Interest on state warrants.	17,006.82
From fish and game license.	1,666.00
Embalmer's balance	1.33

Total

Suppose we make a little comparison and see what it has cost the envious, the pouters, and the followers of "yellow dogs" to indulge their propensities.

The following shows the four December apportionments made under fusion administration:

FUSION.	
December, 1897.....	\$377,365.90
December, 1898.....	300,816.63
December, 1899.....	292,883.59
December, 1900.....	307,830.54

Total

Average

REPUBLICAN.	
December, 1901.....	\$316,813.59
December, 1902.....	236,252.68

Total

Average

The average republican December apportionment is more than \$43,000 smaller than those made by the fusionists. December apportionments are as a rule smaller than those made in May, but it is not out of the way to say that for the entire year round, the schools of Nebraska will receive between \$50,000 and \$80,000 less money from republican state administration than they did receive under fusion government.

Perhaps it's worth eighty thousand dollars for the privilege of helping Bud Lindsey, Tom Darnell, Elmer Stephenson, "Rev." J. B. Carns, "Cap." Billingsley, et al., form a coalition whereby the beer-haters, beer guzzlers and beer-slingers unite in electing a prohibition-high license-Gothenberg system governor. But it's a little tough on those who wanted higher railroad taxes, higher school apportionments, and lower freight rates.

Historical Society

The Independent acknowledges receipt of volumes No. IV. and V., second series, proceedings and collections of the Nebraska State Historical Society. Volume IV. is entitled, "Forty

Years of Nebraska," a monograph from the pen of Hon. Thomas Weston Tipton, who was United States senator for Nebraska, 1867-1875. It covers the history of Nebraska, gleaned largely from official sources, from 1855 down to 1894, and brings into review fifty officials, "eight territorial governors, six delegates in congress, ten state governors, eight United States senators, and eighteen members of the house of representatives." It is a book of 570 pages and will be a valuable addition to the library of any Nebraskan at all interested in the history of his state. Volume V. covers the historical papers and addresses delivered at the society's annual meetings down to that of 1900.

Cass county is rich enough to stand it—but how do her people like it? They used to get seven and eight thousand dollars of school money twice a year. The lowest they ever received from the fusionists was \$6,026.68 in December, 1899. This December it drops down to \$4,795.69; that is \$1,230.99 it cost them for the fun of helping elect a republican state ticket.

Why Condemn Them?

A reader of The Independent, living in Nance county, writes the editor "not for publication" that he went to the polls this fall "more as a matter of habit than any interest in the result." That he has been in the populist movement from the beginning. That the chairman of the populist county central committee said the main issue was the railroad tax question. And our friend continues:

"If that was true, why condemn men for staying at home, when the main issue is to increase the railroad taxes while they, the railroads, still have the power to get back at you \$2 for every one of additional tax?" First, because the man who takes no interest in politics is a dangerous citizen—so said hundreds of years ago by Thucydides. Second, because the man who takes no interest in the question of taxation is equally as dangerous a citizen. Third, because it is not true that the railroads have power to "get back at you \$2 for every one of additional tax." They have increased freight rates, because the traffic will bear it—or, rather expect to raise them shortly—with the prospect of no additional tax. Freight rates would go no higher than they now are, or shortly will be, even if railroad taxes should be increased half a million dollars next year—which they won't be—and the other taxpayers will have to make up what the railroads are released from paying.

"I fully appreciate your spirit in public affairs," continues our reader, "but let me say that it is my firm belief that it is only the most fleeting and trivial good that can be done for the welfare of the masses so long as they are deprived of their natural rights of common ownership in land. Our Omaha platform declared for this doctrine and yet we have as a party paid no attention to it. You say in your paper that you are not for the single tax. How then do you propose to carry out the plank in the Omaha platform that declares that the land and all the natural sources of wealth belong to all the people?"

Like the man who quoted the scriptural saying: "Let him that stole steal"—leaving off the very necessary words, "no more," our brother does not give the Omaha plank in its entirety. It reads as follows:

"The land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of the people and should not be MONOPOLIZED for SPECULATIVE purposes, and alien ownership of land should be prohibited. All land now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs and all lands now owned by aliens should be reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlers only."

Not a word about the common ownership of land. Not a word against private ownership, except that it should be forbidden to aliens, and to corporations, except for their actual needs. Not a word about the single tax; but on the contrary a specific demand for a graduated income tax.

The single tax is not a populist idea, but populists are friendly to the single taxers because both agree upon the diagnosis of present conditions; they agree upon the money question and many others. But populists demand the public ownership and operation of the railroads, while the single taxers would have public ownership of the right of way and let any man run a train who could afford the expense of putting one on the public railroad.

However, questions of national policy only indirectly affect the election of state officers—and The Independent

is unable to see why the election of republicans will further the cause of the single taxers. The logic of our friend's contention would bring us to exemption of all railroad property from taxation, and no man who has studied the question believes our freight rates would be any the lighter for such exemption. On the contrary, the dividends to eastern and European stockholders of Nebraska railroads would be increased to the extent of the taxes exempted.

REPUBLICAN HYPNOTISM

Mr. Freiday Gives His Idea Regarding the Stay-at-Home Voters

Editor Independent: I see by papers over the state that a good many farmers are called "corn-field canaries," stay-at-homes, etc., but after due consideration I find it comes from our democratic side of the house. Now, I would like to ask our democratic friends, Why all this slurring? This has been the case from our friend, C. D. Casper from David, for a number of times in the years past.

Our friends from the democratic side should remember that we are not democrats, or a lot of stay-at-homes are not democrats, but formerly republicans, greenbackers, and anti-monopolists, with a few democrats thrown in. Our friend thinks we should whoop it up. For what? For democrats? No, I guess not—and that is the opinion of a good many that I have talked with.

We see that we have no organization. We feel we have no place to go to, and so of course we stay at home. I think this is the last year for hundreds of us, and if it had not been for a good state ticket before the people, I think hundreds of us would have stayed at home this season. When the populists fused with the democrats, that day was the downfall of the pop party. We could feel it, see it, and hear it everywhere. Our populists who would argue politics with anyone that came along, would talk no more after the fusion. We felt beat, ashamed, crestfallen. After all our hard work we saw we were lost, for was it not so with the old greenbackers? But their organization was not a failure entirely, for it had its effect for a time, and we see the pop fusion had its benefits so far for the present.

They call us stay-at-homes and corn-field canaries. Well, my democratic friends, if we have nothing more to vote for than we had the last year or two, there will be droves of stay-at-home "cattle" as some of them dub us—and canaries, whole flocks of us. Of course we can't blame some of these old mossbacks, much as they are past conviction. As my father used to tell me, when a man has passed the 50-year milestone, he is past conviction.

Now, I for my part don't want any more name "democrat," for it is like the republican—it has only the name left, but its principles have vanished years ago. Also as long as the name democrat is attached to a new party it gives these old political bosses a show to still get their pull. But a new name and a new organization makes a mixture of different classes—different men—and so for a few years we have a clean organization until politicians get hold of it—and that is in about twelve years, as all previous history has shown us and as any observant man has seen for himself.

F. E. FREIDAY.

Rising City, Neb.
 (The Independent is glad to publish Mr. Freiday's explanation of the stay-at-home vote, even if it cannot applaud the reasons given by him. Curiously enough it shows the psychological effect of suggestion, or, to put it in the plain English of Ayer the advertising expert, "Keeping everlastingly at it brings success." In season and out, ever since the days when the democrats endorsed the nomination of Holcomb for governor, the republican papers have been full of sympathy for the populists and deplored the fact that the populist organization had been swallowed by the democrats. According to republican papers the populists could feel and see and hear everywhere (in republican papers, of course) that the downfall of the "pop" party had been accomplished by fusion. Now, Mr. Freiday and hundreds of his fellow stay-at-homes "feel and see and hear" the same thing as keenly as though it were original and not the result of republican suggestion. Republican papers said, "The pops are beat, ashamed, crestfallen;" and now Mr. Freiday says the same thing. Republican papers announced that the populist organization had gone to pieces, and now Mr. Freiday reiterates the story in spite of the fact that Chairman Weber and Secretary Farris did as thorough work as was ever done by a populist state committee. That they were not successful signifies nothing, except that they had to combat the effect of re-

publican hypnotism upon their own party members.

It is a curious mental condition which will invite the votes of democrats for a populist nominated solely by the people's independent party, and believe it a grand and noble work; and then turn right around and seek to deny democrats the right to vote for a populist; because, forsooth, he has been nominated by the democratic party as well as the people's independent. It is a curious mental condition which will permit men to vote for Honest John Powers for governor in 1890, and believe they were doing a patriotic act in soliciting democrats to vote for him, and which in 1902 will cause these same men to stay at home and refuse to vote for Honest John Powers for secretary of state because the whole body of democratic voters had signified their intention of voting for him by nominating him as their candidate. It is a good study for the psychologist.—Ed. Ind.)

What Might Have Been

Editor Independent: I acknowledge your paper a fearless exponent, but to what purpose is another matter. I was a populist and never had any use for a fusionist—and you will acknowledge failure of it now. Take my state, Wisconsin, as a sample. Democrats adopted part of our platform; republicans some more. Now the democrats have purged their party of populism and gone back to the old grooves. So now we do not know where we are at. The two old parties are so split that they can virtually accomplish nothing.

But if we had maintained our organization we would have been a good which monopoly would respect, more than a brigade of rough riders. This year I was obliged to vote republican ticket or become a socialist. I chose the latter and am now working in the Appeal to Reason army and am doing grand work, considering a late start. We made quite a show at the polls and would have had more votes than the democrats if the populists had turned out.

The only way I now see to curb monopoly is a big socialist vote—an opportunity the people's party lost by fusing. My reason for it is that with two or three million of independent populists or socialist votes, Wall street would not dare cause a panic because they would not know where the mullet heads would jump.

However, I shall not talk reason to editors, because they want to know it all. But we will leave that as it is. Your educational cards are in good hands. I am town treasurer and will have a chance to see the boys before many moons. I was a close reader of the National Economist from its first number until McCune sold out. I am yours for the right, even if we have different ways of seeing it.

JOHN HANSEN.

Suring, Wis.

(Editors do not claim to "know it all," but they make an effort to find out as much as they can—at least some of them do. The failure to carry an election does not mean the failure of the principles involved or of the party policies used in attempting to carry an election. Had Bryan been elected in 1896, thousands of populists who now cry against co-operation (there never was "fusion") would probably today be telling the wonderful benefits of it.

What might have been accomplished by absolutely independent action is a matter of guess work. No one knows. The prohibition party is a good example of what independent action amounts to. Beginning with less than 6,000 votes in 1872 it had grown to over 264,000 in twenty years. In 1896 the split reduced the total to 132,000 for Levering and less than 14,000 for Bentley. In 1900 the party had nearly 209,000. It has been through thirty years of independent party action and accomplished less than the people's party has in six years of fusion, or co-operation as the action really is.—Ed. Ind.)

Those K. C. & O. Bonds

Dan Corcoran in the York Democrat is still talking about those K. C. & O. bonds given about fifteen years ago to that road by six townships in York county (\$60,000 in all) and urging that some action be taken to recover damages from that road or the Q, inasmuch as the consideration has failed. That is to say, the bonds were given to secure a road that would compete with the Q, and now that the Q has absorbed its competitor, the townships have a cause of action for damages.

What is the matter, Dan? Have the Sedgwicks so hypnotized the people of York county that you can't get some taxpayer with grit enough to begin the action? Or are the county attorney and township officials at fault? However, keep hammering away—you will get somebody to move bye and bye.