

also receive and receipt for any monies sent to him.

Dr. B. L. Paine, F. M. Hall, M. J. Waugh, Henry B. Ward, A. Ross Hill, J. I. Wyer, L. A. Sherman, Lawrence Fossler, Lewis Gregory, John H. Humpe, N. K. Griggs, S. H. Burnham, Alexander Berger.

F. M. HALL, Chairman.

J. I. Wyer, Secretary.

FIRST NAT'L BANK, Lincoln,  
Treasurer and Depository.

Nebraskans generally are proud of our state university; proud of its chancellor and professors; proud of its students. The national government has not been niggardly in its help—although one might wish that more land had been given to endow educational institutions and less to build up a railroad oligarchy. The legislatures of Nebraska have as a rule given to the university with less high-gling than is customary in making appropriations. Have we reached the point where it is necessary to seek the aid of a more powerful tax-collector? Is it possible that a state—which has been advertised far and wide as so wonderfully prosperous that it can buy \$200,000 of Massachusetts bonds—is nevertheless so poor that it must beg two-thirds of a building?

Have the sick and poor of Lincoln so increased under Rooseveltian prosperity that university organizations alone require a hundred-thousand dollar building in which shins may be toasted while the condition of the freezing and starving poor may be discussed?

Easter services were held in something less than forty different places in Lincoln last Sunday—are university students barred from participating in the services at any of these places?

"Receptions, interviews, social gatherings and meetings of all sorts"—"not inconsistent with the spirit of its foundation" are doubtless a valuable aid to university progress. But what sort of a meeting would be "inconsistent?" Would "the spirit of its foundation" be violated if some fine day at one of those meetings "of all sorts," the speaker should take occasion to denounce Standard Oil methods?

The whole question brings vividly to mind the vigorous language of Dr. John Bascom of Williams college in his address before the Minnesota teachers' meeting, and later in his debate with The Outlook.

"Is the president of a college—usually the chief figure in such a transaction—at liberty to solicit or to receive the gifts of a millionaire whose money is known to have been wrongfully secured?" inquires Dr. Bascom. "Such an act seems to me to be censurable and mischievous. My critic thinks, with equal decision, the reverse. The question is one of immediate moment.

"The first affirmation by which the criticism is made good is that such gifts cannot be rejected without first establishing a standard of business morality, and that there is much variety in these standards. This state of things, instead of being a reason why the head of an educational institution may be without a standard of business morality to guide his own action and influence the action of others, is the chief reason why he should carefully frame and constantly defend such a standard. It is not our calling to give guidance where no guidance is needed, but where it is needed. We frame principles for the very purpose of correction.

"The second supporting consideration is that, if such a standard is set up, it is impossible to apply it in specific cases. It is impossible for boards of trustees to determine whether wealth offered for public use has been righteously earned. But the question is, whether money that is known to be unrighteously acquired is to be solicited and accepted. The way in which the wealth of the Standard Oil company has been gained is notorious. Articles, books, the reports of congressional committees for thirty years, have made it so. No intelligent man can plead ignorance. If I should say to my class, 'Monopoly is in itself a great wrong and can only be established in connection with many other wrongs,' and one of the students should ask, 'How about the Standard Oil company?' and I should respond, 'I know nothing about the Standard Oil company,' I should escape the suspicion of being a fool only by the suspicion of being a rascal. The answer is the same as that given before. It is the duty of the man who guides instruction to frame standards and to give them correct, concrete application. This is his function. It is a novel principle in morals that, as one does not know all things, he need give himself no trouble to know anything; that because one does not see distinctly the obstacle on the horizon, he may stumble over the stone under his feet.

"The question is easily settled. The

proper time to express an opinion is before the gift is completed, while there is still freedom of action on both sides. Say to Mr. Rockefeller—and to the public, as the transaction is a public one—I utterly repudiate your methods, and then see how large a gift will be received. If a president should say at an annual meeting of alumni, 'The college has secured another large sum from Mr. Rockefeller, but as there is a general feeling against his methods of business, I must improve the occasion to remark that the Standard Oil company is a heartless monopoly and that its officers have done more to debauch business morality than all the thieves behind prison bars.' The alumni would look in all directions for an exit from the cruel dilemma put upon them, searching for it with as much eagerness and jostling as men manifest in escaping from a burning theatre. Mum is the word, the best word, and the only proper word, in such transactions.

"Let us cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather prove them. Certainly these precepts should meet with some recognition in a divinity school and in a Christian college, so-called."

Dr. Bascom's criticism was aimed at privately owned colleges where sectarian instruction is given, but it applies with no less force to a state institution. In fact there is even less reason why a state university should accept largesse from grand seigniors of the Rockefeller type. Another cent added to the price of gasoline and kerosene would soon collect the "Temple Fund" from the pockets of Nebraska people. Do we need an adjunct to our new revenue law?—Charles Q. De France.

## CALLING NAMES

Mr. Theobald Continues His Criticism—  
Accuses Capt. Ashby of Plagiarism

Editor Independent: When I penned my letter to you of 30th March, the latest issue of The Independent which I had seen was that of the 12th of March. Had I had your issue of the 19th before me (since received) I would hardly have deferred so much, as I did, to Mr. Ashby's treatment of Value. For now I perceive not only that his argument is confused and disingenuous, it is egotistical and discourteous. Allow me to select some of the epithets which he bestows upon those economists and other writers on money, with whom he finds himself unable to agree. Here they are: Jackasses; semi-idiots, sacrilegious, imposters called professors of political economy (especially including Aristotle); charlatans; parrots; ignorant; peurile; childish; infantine; priests of chaos. And here is his opinion of himself: He alone has "labored enough to devote the necessary labor and wearing toil required to wrench from the jaws of chaos a real knowledge of the thing called Value; no one of them (the writers on money) ever labored enough to discover that which when pointed out is patent to all"—namely, that (according to his view) money was invented in order to levy taxes!

Without stopping to examine this discovery, which Mr. Ashby, with so much labor, has wrenched from the jaws of chaos, I submit that a writer in his frame of mind is not so fully qualified as he might be, for discussing the intricate questions which form the subjects of his essay. Political economy has engaged the attention of the most profound thinkers whom the world has ever produced. Plato, Aristotle, Paulus, Badaeus, Copernicus, Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, Hume, Neckar, Ricardo, Thornton, McCulloch, Bastiat, Mill, and Herbert Spencer, are only a few of the vast number of illustrious persons who have written on value and money. To call such men jackasses, semi-idiots, charlatans and priests of chaos, cannot hurt them, nor their reputations; it can only hurt him who throws such stones; and it has hurt Mr. Ashby so much in my estimation that I shall say now of him what courtesy restrained me from saying too plainly in my previous letter, namely, that the only portions of his otherwise incoherent and wholly mistaken essay, are those which he has filched, without acknowledgement, from one of the very class of writers whom he treats with such lofty contumely.

Mr. Ashby says that "none of them (the writers on money) ever delved into the dark quarries and with drill and dynamite blasted out the truth that the thing properly called money is not a coin, but a (legal) device"—that is to say, no one ever made this discovery until Mr. Ashby did. The fact is that he took it bodily from Alexander Del Mar's "Science of Mon-

ey," and now wishes his readers to believe that the discovery was his own. Del Mar did not blast it out; he discovered it in the monetary history of Greece and Rome; he did not find it necessary to explore dark quarries, with or without dynamite, but the laws of the ancient republics. There he found it and without more ado he put it straightway into print for the consideration of modern students.

Mr. Ashby's view, that money is an "institution" (of law), a "device," a "mechanism," is not the only thing taken from Del Mar; even the phraseology is copied. The very words will be found in his works on Money and, so far as my reading goes, in no other works. Chapter IV. of Del Mar's "Science of Money" is even headed "Money is a Mechanism."

Of course it may be a mere coincidence that Mr. Ashby should have worked out the same idea; but, as I said last week, he never worked it out of his own premises: for it has no relation to them. The inference that he plagiarized it, is therefore very strong. Add to this that the phraseology is identical; and the plea of a coincidence will fall rather flat.

As for Mr. Ashby's contention that money was "not created for any other purpose" than making tax levies, though I consider the assertion of no consequence, one way or the other, I would recommend him, before making it again, to study that very Aristotle whom he affects to so much despise. The Stagyrile was twenty-two centuries nearer to the creation of money than is Mr. Ashby; and he evidently knew something about its origin. His account of the matter can hardly be destitute of interest; and may afford a new impulse to the Titanic labors of the latter.

The economical theories which divide the political parties of today are to some extent the result of differences which arise from the meanings attached to economical terms; and no one is competent to discuss them who is not at once thoroughly versed in history and a master of style. In neither of these respects do Mr. Ashby's writings commend themselves to my admiration. On the contrary, Mr. Del Mar's familiarity with history appears in every page; while as to style, his periods are both graceful and impressive. Nowhere in his works, for I have studied them all with great attention, is there to be found the slightest trace of egotism, or the least discourtesy towards those from whom he differs. If you would afford your readers a treat, you should reprint his chapter IV. on "Money is a Mechanism," or else chapter VI. contra Mac-Leod, to the bottom of page 78. There is no calling of names there; yet Mac-Leod's theories are handled with a severity that might furnish a model for Mr. Ashby; especially when he is writing for journals as widely read as The Independent of Lincoln, Neb.

JAMES THEOBALD (Populist).

Hackensack, N. J.  
(This phase of Mr. Theobald's criticism, the associate editor does not care to discuss at this time, further than to say that Mr. Theobald, in one instance at least, has singled out a word and assumed that Captain Ashby applied it to the economists. On the other hand, it is a fact that calling names is not argument; yet there are times when it seems necessary in order to arouse sufficient interest. Readers of The Independent will await with interest the trial of Captain Ashby for plagiarism. He has been accused. Let him defend.—Associate Editor.)

## THE MEAT GOLIATH

When a Pigmy Fights a Giant the Contest  
May Excite Admiration but it  
is not War

While Teddy is telling the people of the west how his brilliant attorney general got an injunction against the meat trust, Mr. Edward Upham Adams in his inimitable way is explaining how that octopus spreads out its tentacles and gathers in the independent retail meat dealers. The following is from a recent article by Mr. Adams:

"Rawson, the butcher, has failed," declared Postmaster Jenkins, taking a chair opposite Colonel Monroe and bowing respectfully to Judge Sawyer. "Flannagan just told me he saw the sign up on the door of the Independent Market. This is a bad thing for Lincolnville. George Rawson's a good fellow and made a great fight, but the meat trust was too strong for him. I gave him all my trade. Flannagan says he heard Rawson's liabilities were \$10,000."

Mr. Jenkins lifted his eyes cautiously and glanced at Lincolnville's banker.

"Mr. Rawson's liabilities are nearly \$20,000," Judge Sawyer said, after a pause. "The matter was adjusted this afternoon. The meat trust, as you term

the rival company, purchases the Independent Market. Rawson has pledged his property and hopes to meet the claims of his creditors. The new owners will open the market under another name and have decided to retain Mr. Rawson as manager."

"Thus endeth the last chapter in the history of competitive markets in Lincolnville," observed Colonel Monroe, "it is less than a month ago, Jenkins, since you reminded me that competition is the life of trade. You had just purchased from Rawson a choice cut of sirloin at ten cents a pound, much less than the actual cost of the beef. It was fun for you, but financial death to poor Rawson. Neighboring towns have long been in the clutch of the enemy, but Lincolnville has had in Rawson a David who dared wage battle with the meat Goliath. He had thousands; it had millions. The contest was magnificent while it lasted, but it was not war. Rawson had no chance from the start. For three months we have reveled in cheap chops, steaks and roasts. Now we shall pay a war indemnity to the victor."

"I shall be surprised if the meat trust exacts exorbitant prices," said Judge Sawyer, whose face bore a troubled look. "While they are victors and have the trade at their mercy, prudence and business policy should dictate moderation. There is a point beyond which no successful syndicate dare go."

"I'm sure I don't know where that point is," retorted the colonel, with some warmth. "The patience of the American people is as a fathomless well. The coal trust and the oil trust can find no bottom. We are whipped and know not what way to turn. You practically say as much when you admit that your only hope is that the victorious meat trust will loot us with moderation. If the history of this trust be any guide you are leaning on a reed. It has taken them two years to suppress competition in Lincolnville and has cost them thousands of dollars. Does a dog chase a rabbit for exercise? By the way, Jenkins, you said the other day that the men who owned the railroad had a right to charge any rate they pleased. I suppose you have no objection to the men who own the meat selling it at any price they can get."

"There are good trusts and bad trusts," said Postmaster Jenkins, who could offer nothing else.

"Yes, and there are fools and—other kinds of fools," added Colonel Monroe with unusual bitterness. "I suppose a good trust is one which, having reduced the people to atject submission, treats them with lenity, and a bad trust is one which indulges in the natural proclivities of all tyrants."

The later speeches of the president show that he is going to "stand pat" and the strenuous one will hereafter keep quiet and let "well enough alone."

Don't You Think It

# Worth a Postal

To Get Well?

When you write that postal, I will gladly send my help.

I will mail you an order—good at any drug store—for six bottles Dr. Shoop's Restorative. You may take it a month on trial. If it succeeds, the cost is \$5.50. If it fails, I will pay the druggist myself—and your mere word shall decide it.

I do that for every sick one who writes me, and I have for twelve years. I have found that the sick are honest, and I have proved that I can cure nearly all.

Only one patient in each forty decides that the test has failed. The others pay gladly—pay because they are cured.

There are 39 chances in 40 that I can cure you, and I alone am the loser if I can't. Let me try.

I have spent a lifetime in learning how to strengthen weak inside nerves. My Restorative brings back that power which alone operates the vital organs. I treat a weak organ as I would a weak engine, by giving it the power to act. My way always succeeds, save when a cause like cancer makes a cure impossible. And most of these chronic diseases cannot be cured without it.

You'll know this when you read my book.

Simply state which book you want, and address Dr. Shoop, P. O. Box 940 Racine, Wis.

BOOK NO. 1 ON DYSPEPSIA  
BOOK NO. 2 ON THE HEART  
BOOK NO. 3 ON THE KIDNEYS  
BOOK NO. 4 FOR WOMEN  
BOOK NO. 5 FOR MEN  
BOOK NO. 6 ON RHEUMATISM

Mild cases, not chronic, are often cured by one or two bottles, druggists.