

# The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., MARCH 19, 1903.

No. 43.

## THE QUALITY OF HARMONY

**Mr. Van Vorhis Insists That Democratic Harmony Cannot be Secured by Ignoring the Money Question**

Editor Independent: One who did not know the able editor of the Clark County Citizen might conclude that there was a certain poverty of intellect in the editorial department of the Citizen, when it does not find something to say in an answer that is not assertions based on assumptions that ought to be known to be untrue. Of course, when it is desired to straddle a question, and present a smiling face of approval to antagonistic elements in the party, it must not be expected to be entirely consistent or candid.

The Citizen expressed its "contempt for the traitors of 1896 and 1900," but qualifies its contempt by the phrase "in a political sense." How contempt in a political sense differs from contempt in any other sense I do not know, unless by "political" is meant Pickwickian. This much is certain, that it was the financial question that furnished the motive for the treachery. The traitors to whom he refers must have believed that this was the only "democratic principle" worth considering.

If I understand the Citizen, it proposes to drop this question to get these traitors to "harmonize." Because I say the question is too important to be dropped, and because I say that there is a large number of voters in its party—and over two millions outside of it—who are not willing to pay such a price for such a quality of harmony, it asserts that I believe the "demand for bimetalism is the only democratic principle." The trouble with my friend Brayfield is that he does not distinguish between a principle and a mere incident to a principle. As an "old-fashioned democrat" (whatever he may mean by that), he does not distinguish between "democrat" as a party name and democratic as principles of government. No party under any name has a patent upon democratic principles. Many republicans are as firm believers in the wisdom of applying democratic principles to this government as any of those who name themselves "democrat." Many such republicans have not yet fully realized that their party has abandoned some of, if not all, the most important democratic principles taught by Jefferson, that were the very basis of its organization.

The trouble with the Citizen is, that it wants to be in harmony with certain men in its party who have done the very same thing, and who in 1896 and 1900 preferred the success of the republican party, without democratic principles, but with a financial plank that suited them, instead of trying to get rid of this undemocratic element and trying to draw to its party, from all parties, all those who believe in a democratic form of government.

Now, the Citizen wants "all sorts of people" to help elect the candidate of its party. Does it mean by this that it wants party success, principles or no principles?

It pretends to be disturbed about my tariff views, and says that I do not "take kindly to the doctrine of tariff for revenue only." While I am not much concerned about the tariff question from any point of view, this is an attempt to put me in a false attitude that is unworthy my friend Brayfield. If there is any really dead question in our politics today, it is the question of "protection and free trade." This contest has, for many years, been a humbug more to throw dust in the eyes of the masses than for anything else. But I have no objections to repeating, for the benefit of my friend, what I have said from the rostrum hundreds of times since 1896; that the republican party has, by its own acts, forced the country to a situation in which tariff for protection is an impossibility, and in which the only rational and honest application of duties on imports must be for revenue and for nothing else. The application of duties on imports for any other purpose is a public injustice that is equivalent to robbery of our consuming masses.

The Citizen may call me a republican if it desires, but, if there is any principle for which Mr Bryan stands that I do not approve, it has escaped

my attention. If the Citizen is disposed to classify me as a republican, I will consider it a favor if he will qualify by calling me a Lincoln republican. I am certainly not a Hanna republican. Or, if he desires to call me a democrat, I insist that he cannot express correctly the situation as it is, unless he prefixes the name of Bryan, and calls me a Bryan democrat. I am most certainly not a "Cleveland democrat." In the political situation as it now stands, Lincoln republican and Bryan democrat are complete and perfect political synonyms.

I am sorry if I did anything to prevent the Citizen from publishing my letter to him, but I had no means of knowing how long it would take to find space, and thought I had waited long enough. If the Citizen had acknowledged receipt and expressed his intention to publish, I should not have published elsewhere.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.

Indianapolis, Ind.

## BIGELOW'S SERMON

**"Render Unto Caesar the Things Which are Caesar's"**

The Independent has made arrangements to receive each week an abridgement of the sermons preached by the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati. If other preachers had as clear a conception of economic questions and were as fearless in their utterances as is Mr. Bigelow, it would not take long to arouse the people to the point where they would correct the crying evils of our times. Text: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's."

It would be too much to affirm that Jesus, when he uttered these words, intended to do more than to disclaim any intention to incite people to insurrection against the Roman rulers.

But if Jesus had had a perfect knowledge of modern civilization, and if he had aimed to reduce to a single sentence the advice most needed at this time, he could not have improved upon the words of our text.

What is the greatest menace to republican institutions? What is it that threatens the life of our civilization? Ninety-nine out of a hundred would give the same answer. Too great wealth in the hands of the few.

Recently a train, loaded with people, was arrested in its course, and ordered to return a distance of some twelve miles, meanwhile holding another train upon a side track, merely to satisfy the whim of the wife of a Vanderbilt.

Thus by line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, there a little, men are learning that there has already arisen in this country a privileged class, and that between the privileges of this class and the liberties of the many there is an irrepressible conflict.

But how have we come to this? There can be but one answer. We have not rendered unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's. There are powers which should have been retained and exercised by the government in trust for all the people. These powers we have allowed to pass into the hands of private individuals. The monopoly privileges which belonged to Caesar, that is to the people, we have by special patents or franchises or acts of legislature, conferred upon the Vanderbilts and their kind.

Thus we have fostered the growth of uncrowned kings who are levying tribute upon this nation, in comparison with which the tribute of King George was as nothing.

The Standard Oil company is paying an annual dividend of 80 per cent upon all its watered stock. The enormity of that extortion and the patience with which we endure it are enough to make George III. green with envy.

This extortion would stop tomorrow if people were agreed on the proper method of stopping it as thoroughly as they are agreed that it ought in some way to be stopped.

These extortions continue, not because people have lost their love of liberty, but because the agitation of these questions has not as yet crystallized into definite and effective ideas for dealing with this new form of tyranny.

We hear proposals for limiting, by law, the amount of wealth a private

citizen may accumulate. That is like the proposal of an Indiana legislator to make the circumference of a circle exactly equal to three times its diameter.

We shall have no relief, on the contrary, matters will continue to grow worse, until we take from these people, not their freedom to accumulate without limit, but the governmental powers which they have been allowed to grasp and by which communal wealth is diverted into their private pockets.

Delaware has recently chosen a United States senator. Delaware? Hardly. After the Delaware legislature had gone through the form of electing Mr. Allee, Mr. Addicks said:

"It gratifies me to make one of my best friends, J. Frank Allee, United States senator."

Where did Mr. Addicks get the millions with which he corrupted the state of Delaware and made his friend senator?

He got these millions in Boston. He got them in the form of dividends upon watered gas stocks. Virtually the Boston common council has been issuing to this man franchises conferring upon him a monopoly of the business of supplying the city with gas, and also giving him the legal privilege to charge more than the gas is worth.

The people of Boston have been contributing to a corruption fund to be used to debauch legislatures in Delaware. If you trace that corruption to its source you must go back to the Boston council. Nay, you must go back to the ignorance and indifference of the people of Boston. Stop issuing to these men the legal privilege to appropriate to themselves the people's money, and they will not have the millions with which to buy seats in the United States senate.

In the little city of Lancaster, O., the attention of the visitor is at once drawn to a magnificent stone building, which in its elegance and costliness overshadows everything in the town. This is a public building, erected with the profits of the municipal gas plant. It is the pride of the city. It is the property of all the people.

Is not that better than erecting castles for a few franchise barons?

Render unto the people the things which are the people's.

## The G. O. P. Religion

1. We believe in the old war taxes to prevent trade with Europe, and the new war taxes to force trade with Asia.

2. We believe in excluding uneducated Europeans, who wish to enter our territory, and including uneducated Asiatics, who wish to keep out.

3. We believe in home rule for Ireland, but alien rule for the Spanish islands.

4. We believe that whites and blacks have a right to govern themselves, but not browns governing themselves.

5. We believe in the Monroe doctrine, which forbids Europe in interfering with self-government in America, and Venezuela, but permits America to interfere with self-government in Asia.

6. We believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed in America, but contempt for self-government in the Philippine archipelago.

7. We believe that taxation without representation is tyranny when applied to America, but philanthropy when applied by us to other nations.

8. We believe that forcible annexation is "criminal aggression," but that payment to non-owners of twenty million of dollars makes it "benevolent assimilation."

9. We believe that militarism and foreign broils strengthens despotism, abroad, and republicanism at home.

10. We believe that American policies have made little America, but European policies will make a greater America.

11. We believe in smashing the trusts, but in letting the friends of the trusts do the smashing.

12. We believe in settling the coal strike by arbitration, but by the coal operators being the arbitrators; and, further, we are opposed to the coining of silver at 16 to 1 by the democrats, but we believe it is a good thing to bring on prosperity when done by us.

## THE NEGRO PROBLEM

**Mr. DeHart Discusses the Race Question—Give the Black a Chance**

Editor Independent: The south seems determined to elect another republican president—and to do it in 1904. For twenty-five years the south has been quiet about the negro. But now if the president invites Booker T. Washington to dinner there is a great outcry; or, if he appoints a negro for an insignificant postoffice, there is another outcry. For a quarter of a century the south has been burning negroes whenever it suited her purpose, and the north has said little about it. The people of the north are willing to let the south alone as long as they stay on their own territory; but when they come north and tell the president that he must not invite a negro to dinner simply because he is a negro, and that he must not appoint a negro to office simply because he is a negro, then it becomes a matter of national politics and the north has a word to say.

The president appointed Dr. Crum, a negro, collector of the port of Charleston; and lo! another great outcry. The appointment hangs fire in the senate, and it is supposed that every senator from the southern states is opposed to confirmation of the appointment. The southern senators are opposed to the negro, simply because he is black, and not on account of his unfitness for the office. This ought to make every northern senator in favor of him. There are so few northern democratic senators that they are not worth speaking of. Some of the southern states are sending republican senators; Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, West Virginia, for instance. There are more republican senators from the south than democratic senators from the north.

There are sixteen southern states, counting West Virginia as one, which give the democratic party about 32 senators, or about one-third, leaving about two-thirds to the republicans. This shows that the democrats cannot defeat the nomination of Dr. Crum, without aid from the republicans. Can it be possible that the republicans would unite with the democrats on such an issue?

The blacks were freed from the bondage of slavery by the civil war. The 13th amendment to the constitution of the United States guaranteed their freedom. The 14th amendment made them citizens; and it was supposed that the 15th amendment would give them the right to vote on all questions, the same as the whites.

The 13th amendment declared that, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

The 14th amendment declared that, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside."

The 15th amendment declared that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

It was supposed that these amendments would give the negroes the right to vote, but it seems that they do not. The republicans made these amendments, and they are under obligations to see that they are enforced according to their letter and spirit.

For a quarter of a century the negro question has been a local matter. In 1876 there was a question as to who was elected president, Hayes or Tilden. Nobody was elected by the people. For the purpose of deciding the matter, congress created a commission. This commission could not be created without southern help; and the south helped, with the understanding that if Hayes was declared elected he was to remove the army from the southern states and allow the south to manage her state governments in her own way. Hayes was declared elected and the army was removed, and, since that time, the whites became the ruling class; the negroes having no right which white men are obliged to respect. The people of the south vote the democratic ticket in national elections, not that they care so much for the democratic party, as a national organization, but it is a choice