

The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., APRIL 2, 1903.

No. 45.

THE TARIFF FOLLY

Mr. Van Vorhis Points Out the Folly of Trying to Resurrect Tweedledee and Tweedledum

Editor Independent: If the Clark County Citizen or others, who express themselves in the same way in this state, mean that a man can be a scoundrel in politics and, at the same time, honest in business and a Christian in morals, then I must admit that they are right when they say I "fail to see how it can be." I have no contempt for sincerely held and honest opinions. I can trust my affairs to an honest man, who does not see things as I do, with much less anxiety than to a dishonest one, no difference what are his professions. This government can be trusted in the hands of ignorant, but honest men with more hope for the future than it can in the hands of dishonest schemers, who have held to the party name for the sake of regularity while, secretly or openly, they worked for its defeat.

When a man declares his contempt politically for certain men in his party, I have a right to suppose that he regards their motives and actions as mean and vile, because that is what is implied by the word "contempt." In politics no man is dishonest and treacherous for the purpose of advancing the best interests of his country or his party. Dishonesty and treachery in politics are distinctively personal and selfish.

I know very well that the editor of the Citizen, and others in this state, were in full agreement with the Chicago and the Kansas City platforms on the money question, and I am all the more surprised when there appears to be a desire, in order to placate the dishonest and treacherous element in the democratic party, that has persisted in remaining with the party and, under cover of party loyalty, has in two national campaigns betrayed it, to drop out of all appeals to democrats all mention of the financial question and put in its place the tariff question. This is exactly what the treacherous crowd, headed by Cleveland, Hill, Gorman and others of their ilk, wants the party to do. There are papers and individuals, who have not heretofore appeared to be with this crowd, that now seem anxious to assure them that they are re-organized and ready to accede to the wishes of the traitors. They try to compromise with their own loyalty to both principle and party by running up the flag, for president, of some one, who, like Hearst, was false to the platforms, if he was true to the party.

When the ticket was defeated in 1900, with eager haste in the next issue of the Chicago American, he repudiated the Kansas City platform on the financial question. He, too, wanted to substitute the tariff question.

For a number of years prior to 1896, I occupied a position as an official of the American protective league, and had an opportunity from the inside to study the purposes of that organization on the one side and the free trade league of Boston on the other. I was forced to the conclusion that the purpose of neither was patriotic, but that it was trade advantages which furnished the motive of both; that, while there were men following each of these organizations who appeared to be unconscious of the fact, the same financial and commercial influences were behind both exerting their ingenuity and power to keep up a sham fight that public attention might be kept away from their real purposes.

Has it been forgotten, or was it overlooked at the time, how the Cleveland-Hill-Gorman crowd and the republican leaders acted, when both the Wilson bill and the Dingley bill were under consideration? All sincere contest between "protection" and "free trade" was lost sight of in shaping these acts to suit the selfish interests represented in the east by the two organizations.

It is folly, worse than folly, to attempt now to take up this question as a leading issue and to abandon the financial question, when the strongest opposition to the democratic doctrine of "tariff for revenue only" comes naturally, and must continue to come, from the combination of New York and other eastern national banks. I want these Indiana editors to remember that the national banks today hold about \$150,000,000 of deposit loans made to them by the treasury de-

partment. The government is furnishing them this great sum without interest. It has been taken out of the pockets of the people, in large part by duties on imports. The amount collected has been greater than required by at least this amount, and has enabled the secretary of the treasury to rapidly increase the deposit loans to national banks since 1896. These deposits now amount to a forced loan. The secretary dare not materially decrease it. If he should do so, it would cause a most disastrous financial panic.

A reduction of the duties on imports would not only stop the increase of deposit loans, but it would take from these banks what they have. It is absurd to talk about the tariff question as an issue until the power of this financial combination is broken. There will be no reduction of duties on imports until the financial question is settled.

These Indiana editors ought to know another thing. Bimetallism is a correct economic policy, but it is not the financial question. It is an incident to a principle that must continue to exist even if silver and gold were to cease to exist. The financial question involves the policy of delegating the prerogatives of government to individuals and corporations.

I shall not dispute as to what the tariff laws foster. I recognize the injustice of the laws now on the statute books. But I do insist that the effort to make a leading issue out of the question is the same old deception. Who are they that are trying to substitute it for the financial question? Every one of those who thought the financial question of so much importance, and every other declaration of the Chicago and the Kansas City platforms of so little importance, that they preferred to have the republican party succeed. The tariff did not trouble them much then. Why are they so anxious about it now? It is not because they are so much interested in getting the tariff question up, but because they are more interested in getting the financial question down and out. It is insincere and dishonest when they pretend to believe that the tariff question, the trust question, or any other possible question in our politics is more important than the question that involves the surrender of the prerogative of government to issue money to the control of banks.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.
Indianapolis, Ind.

MAJORITY RULE A WINNER

Missouri Legislature Submits Constitutional Amendment

Washington, D. C., March 28, 1903. (Special to The Independent, from the National Federation for Majority Rule.)—The Missouri legislature, as the result of a long and hard fight by organized labor, the Missouri direct legislation league, and other forces for popular government, has consented to give the people of the state an opportunity to vote upon the question of taking to themselves an increase of power through (1) the extension of the people's veto, by means of the optional referendum, and (2) a direct initiative. This initiative applies to the state constitution, statutory law and municipal regulations, while the people's veto applies to all bills passed by the legislature, except urgency measures, the usual appropriation acts, and bills where there is a two-thirds vote; also to ordinances passed by common councils and other municipal bodies.

Missouri is the fifth state to vote on the adoption of this system. The vote will be taken at the next general election—November, 1904.

The first state in this country to adopt the system was South Dakota in 1898, the popular vote being some 3 to 2 in favor of the system.

Two years later the people of Utah adopted the system by a larger majority, nearly 2 to 1.

The third state was Oregon. The vote, taken last June, was 11 to 1.

The fourth state, Illinois. In November of last year the question was voted upon under a statute which empowers the people to vote upon any question of public policy where a sufficient number petition for it. The question of whether the legislature should or should not submit a constitutional amendment for the referendum and the initiative was answered

in the affirmative by a 5 to 1 vote, and in some of the republican counties it was as high as 12 to 1. Very little campaigning was done on the question.

In Missouri, the fifth state to vote upon the adoption of majority rule, the senate submitted the question by a unanimous vote, while in the house the only opposition was by the republicans who declared that the amendment proposed makes it too difficult for the people to use the veto and direct initiative. The Missouri leaders, however, will accept the amendment, and use the improved system for striking out the excessive requirements. Without doubt the vote of the people on the adoption of the system as submitted will be practically unanimous. The history above quoted shows that there is a rapidly growing sentiment for majority rule.

The Oil King's Soliloquy.

Ye eighty millions, ye toil
For me, the King of Oil,
For me,
D'ye see,
ME, who've by large genius won
My thousand of millions.

Yes, a king am I by-right,
By divine right of might,
And ye,
Who see
Me as I sit on my throne,
Think wicked I have grown.

That I worker-folk oppress,
And the widow distress;
But no!
Tho' so
I oft raise the price of oil,
'Tis to educate who toil.

To uplift them, to inspire,
To drag them from the mire,
Wherein
Their sin
Hath ground them down so long,
A brutish, grov-ling throng.

Ye are weak, ye common herd,
Impotent in act and word;
Hence I
By my
Supreme executive will
Control billions, which still,

If it were not for me,
Deep in the earth would be;
So then,
Ye, when
Ye, commons, shall be in need,
Appeal to me—I'll heed

And answer, save, being king,
Ye seem to ask a thing,
Which I
In my
Wisdom shall deem the best
To withhold; for ye rest,

And be ye not unruly,
If seems I tax unduly,
For ye,
May be,
Through your base ignorance, see
Heavy, where light to me.

A cent a gallon is small—
Some thirty millions all—
But then
Go ten
To the university—
Twenty only to me.

Thus, base-born, it is for best,
I am with riches blest,
For He,
Through me,
Works out all things for the good,
When ye nor would nor could.

A king then, a king I am,
Supreme king of Uncle Sam,
And ME
Ye see,
Envy they and fear—great, small,
President, senators, ALL.

B. O. DUGGAN.
So. Pittsburg, Tenn.

Estes G. Rathbone, the Mark Hanna criminal who robbed the Cuban mails and was convicted and got out through political influence, has been bringing charges against General Wood, but the war department refused to entertain them. When Rathbone was arrested The Independent said that he would never serve a sentence for the crime, as he was a Mark Hanna pet.

L. A. Doane, R. F. D. 6, Mauston, Wis.: I consider I get fully as much or more enlightening news from one issue of The Independent than from a week or six issues of the Chicago daily I take.

A LIVING WAGE

Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow's Sermon on the Parable of the Good Samaritan

"We need a modern version of the parable of the good Samaritan." This was the contention of Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., in preaching on the subject of "A Living Wage." Continuing, the pastor said:

We do not mean that the parable of the Good Samaritan can be improved upon. It is a priceless treasure, just as it stands. Who would wish to add or subtract a word?

But we need to interpret this parable in the light of the changed conditions of modern life.

The teaching of the parable is that no religion is genuine which does not move men to compassion for the sufferers of humanity.

Look at the priest and the Levite. What counterfeits they were. In simple words that will never die we have the hardness of these clerics contrasted with the warm-hearted Samaritan. What sharpens the contrast is the fact that the Samaritan was a heretic. He was not of the Orthodox faith. His name was a reproach. So much the worse for these teachers in Israel that they should have been put to shame by the humane acts of such a man.

The moral is apparent. It matters not what religious label a man may wear. Does his religion touch his heart? Does it manifest itself in acts of justice and love? That is the final test.

Now apply the test to modern conditions. We would all be quite willing to go to the rescue of a man who had fallen among thieves. But we never have a chance. That kind of suffering does not exist today. Most of us never have had and never will have such an experience as befell the Samaritan on the Jericho road.

Men seldom fall a victim to thieves today. But they suffer in other ways. If we do not see to relieve such sufferings as we find among us, we bear witness that our religion is as heartless as that of the priest and the Levite.

Doubtless it was a common thing in that country for men to suffer violence at the hands of lawless bands. This would be good reason for using that particular illustration

But if Jesus were to repeat that parable today, it is inconceivable that he would use the same illustration. He would select some common kind of suffering among us and he would declare that if our religion did not prompt us to go to the relief of that suffering it would be worse than no religion.

You see the man who fell among thieves was the victim of a lawless act. In our country the laws are fairly well enforced so that the victims of lawless acts are very few. But those among us who fall a victim to the cruel operation of unjust laws and are thus despoiled by lawful acts, their name is legion. To make the application of this parable to our modern life perfectly apparent we must substitute, for the victim, a man who is robbed by due process of law.

Unquestionably there are multitudes who, although not robbed outright, are, by due process of law, deprived even of a living wage, so that they suffer continually. The government under which they live is such that they are virtually doomed to a life of hard labor, for which they do not receive enough to permit them to live in bodily comfort or moral health.

What claims our sympathy today is not an occasional victim of outlaws. But there are millions of men and women whose wages are so small and whose work is so hard that their bodies are broken, their minds darkened and their spirits crushed. What about these victims of social wrong? Are you indifferent to this, or does your heart ache for a change that will bring a more abundant life to these toiling millions? I take it that this is the supreme test of the genuineness of religion in our day.

But is this the condition of those who labor so hard after all? Have we not exaggerated the matter? Let us see.

The treasury department of the federal government recently made an investigation into the wages received by the factory workers of this country. The investigation included 500-