

COST OF IMPERIALISM

Ten Millions Demanded for Coast Defences and "Our Insular Possessions"

When we annexed Hawaii, and later Porto Rico and the Philippines, our cock-sure imperialists everywhere welcomed their inclusion within our territory as being so many strong outposts in the national defense. Hawaii was to ward off the fleets of Japan from San Francisco—since no squadron would dare to sail by it—just as Porto Rico was in some mysterious way to defend our southern coasts against all attack. The Philippines, too, were to be a great source of military strength to us. Everybody admitted this except a few warped anti-imperialists and "little Americans," who took the ground that such territorial outposts would necessitate great fleets and vastly expensive fortifications for defense. But their point of view is now fully confirmed by the chief of engineers, General George L. Gillespie, in his annual report published lately. There are, he says, not only harbors in the Philippines, in Hawaii, in Porto Rico, and the new naval stations in Cuba to be fortified, but we must spend millions upon Guam, upon our Samoan island, and upon the many coaling stations, large and small, which we have been gradually establishing all over the world. As a small beginning, General Gillespie asks only 2½ millions of dollars for insular defenses in addition to 8 millions for our home defenses. He also advocates a general board to apportion the millions to be squandered in this way upon our insular possessions, similar to the Endicott board, in following the recommendations of which we have already spent hundreds of millions at home. Of all methods of wasting public money which have yet been devised, this fortifying of harbors we do not need seems to us pre-eminent by reason of its utter wantonness and folly.

Bishop Huntington of New York calls the Wall street promoters "pagans." The Independent must insist that that ecclesiastical term is not nearly so accurate as the ones used by this paper for the last three or four years. The Independent has always called them "pirates," "thieves," and "robbers," and that is just what they are.

Labor Crystals

Editor Independent: At the risk of being again "side-tracked" for want of "availability," or because of the terseness of the question, I desire to point out your error in the denial that land and labor are the only prime factors in production and that the term "stored up labor," or "crystallized labor," is not so much of an economic aphorism as you are prone to imagine.

If a person earns \$2 a day working in or upon the ground and consumes but one, laying the other dollar by, the dollar so laid by is, in legitimate choice of expression, "stored up" or "crystallized labor," because of its being the result of labor applied to land and it does not become capital until it is used or set apart for use in the production of other wealth, nor is it any stretch of imagination of the socialist to say that that dollar when paid out for a hoe with which to aid the labor of his hand and by which greater wealth is produced is still, as a hoe, the result of labor first exerted by the bare hand and is also capital because it is an aid, or in use, for the production of other wealth. If this was the only error of socialism we single taxers would at once join hands with them. In this the socialist is absolutely right.

Not so, however, in your statement that all three factors, land, labor, and capital, are always necessary and always enter into production of all forms of wealth. Here are two cases in point, of which there are many more:

A little girl went to the sand hills and picked two quarts of wild sand hill plums in her apron and sold them for 10c—what capital was employed? Again, while aboard ship lying off Portugal, a nude Portuguese, diving for shells for the passengers, brought up one for which I gave her \$1—what capital entered in this exploit?

If you will kindly answer these propositions, showing the employment of capital, there are many of your readers who will be glad of having learned something.

E. C. CLARK.

Syracuse, Neb.

(The veiled sneer in Mr. Clark's communication, skillfully conveyed by use of quotation marks, need not be noticed further than to say to him and all other impatient ones, who seem to think their every communication ought to appear immediately, that the editors of The Independent try to accord every contributor fair treatment.

The Independent is aware that Mr. Clark has a national reputation as a writer on the single tax, but that is no reason why all his communications should be printed, to the exclusion of worthy articles from the pens of others who, regardless of reputation, have the rare quality of common sense and a fair command of the English language. In a word, the editors are straining every nerve to make The Independent worthy of a large circulation; they accord liberal space to contributors—but have not yet abdicated, and have no intention of doing so.

Mr. Clark's "two cases in point" present no difficulty. Why did the girl use her apron in the production of the sand hill plums? And why wasn't the apron just as much capital in that case as a tin pan would have been? The naked Portuguese maiden certainly made use of the ship on which Mr. Clark was aboard, as a starting point for her dive probably, and certainly as a place to market the "labor crystals" formed as the result of applying Portuguese energy to Father Neptune's dominions. Her production of shells was not completed without the use of capital. It is immaterial that the ownership of that capital was not vested in her. Doubtless the captain accepted the entertainment in lieu of rent or profit—not the "economic" sort that Mr. Clark wants gathered up for communal use.

The Independent does not object to the metaphor of "crystallized labor" except where an attempt is made to call the "labor crystals" "value" or the source or foundation or basis of value. If one wants to indulge in figures of speech and refers to a chair, for example, as "stored labor" or "crystallized labor," no harm is done; but if he then proceeds to give the impression that the "value" of the chair is identical with the "stored up labor" or "crystals," then The Independent does object, because it involves the absurdity of "value" being "intrinsic" or within the thing containing the "labor crystals."

The same reasoning by which Mr. Clark arrives at the conclusion that "capital" is nothing but "labor" could be used with equal or greater force in proving capital to be nothing more than a different manifestation of "land." As a matter of fact, all three—land, labor-power, and capital—in varying proportions must be present in the production of wealth; and as the ownership of each factor may be in a different person, we have rent, wages and interest to reckon with. Mr. Clark would have interest and wages identical; but it is just as easy to regard rent and interest as identical.—Associate Editor.)

Once again the talk begins about this great Anglo-Saxon race. A year or two ago it was pushed in the interest of imperialism to an extent that became disgusting. It was hoped that the thing had had its day, died, and that we should hear no more of it. But Gorman has tried to resurrect it and all the hired ignoramuses of the imperial and negrophobia sort, who write, are hard at work along that line. If some of these writers would stop to think for a moment they would be driven to the conclusion that the greatest living forces in the literature of today are all outside of the Anglo-Saxon and English-speaking races. Among Anglo-Saxons there are no Tolstois, Ibsens, Sienkiewicz or Maeterlincks.

Senator Hoar Inconsistent

Editor Independent: At a banquet given in Boston, October 5, 1903, by the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston to the Honorable Artillery Company of London (a banquet which the press stated cost \$63,000 and whose preparation and arrangement consumed eight months of time), Senator Hoar is reported as saying, in part:

"When you go back to old mother England, tell her that her boys are contented and happy and growing. Give her our best love. Tell her we think of her with nothing but friendliness and good will."

And again:

"We mourn with you for the loss of your gracious queen, alike the type of gentlest womanhood and the most illustrious sovereign in history. We look to you with confident anticipation and desire for a long and happy reign of her successor."

One hesitates as to the fit characterization of such utterances. But, if there is unwillingness to admit that they are the remarks of a man in his dotage (which is the most charitable view possible), the senator must be regarded as a reckless flatterer.

The senator is a well informed man, but, with regard to his reference to the late British queen as the most illustrious sovereign in history, the senator knows as well as the writer that

her failure to contribute any appreciable portion of the wealth of the richest woman in the world to education, industry, or charity, in a country whose pauper list is perhaps the greatest of any nation, together with her lack of initiative or serious practical interest in any important social or political reform, and her failure to protest against any of the political crimes which continued to stain the British escutcheon during her reign, render Victoria utterly unfit to rank among the great or truly good sovereigns of history.

And when the senator confidently anticipates a long and happy reign for Victoria's successor, he anticipates what he knows to be an impossibility, for he knows that the reign of a notorious gambler and profligate, though it may be long, cannot be happy, either for himself or for the people whom he officially disgraces.

But the senator's offense is not wholly a personal one. When he says, "Tell her we think of her with nothing but friendliness and good will," does he forget the atrocities of Cromwell in Ireland? Does he forget the opium trade forced on China by English battleships? Does he forget the live coolies blown from the mouth of British cannon in India? Does he forget the destruction of the Boer republics? Does the senator have nothing but friendliness and good will for a nation capable of a long line of such infamies?

Does not the senator remember who was our antagonist in the revolutionary war? Does he not remember who fought us in the war of 1812? Does he not remember what nation it was that first recognized the southern confederacy? Is he not aware that the great preponderance of evidence indicates that at the outbreak of the Spanish war it was our "friend" England that attempted to form a diplomatic coalition against the United States? Does he imagine for a moment that England's present alleged friendship for America is anything but purely selfish? Does he not know that if England believed she could gain commercially by it, and dared to do it, she would today seize upon the slightest pretext to turn and rend us?

The senator knows that his reckless talk of friendship and good will for England has a direct tendency to extenuate, in the American mind, those crimes against the political rights of man which have made England notorious for three hundred years? He knows that such talk distinctly operates to encourage the present-day imperialistic practices and tendencies of this republic.

In his Boston speech, Senator Hoar presented himself in an unworthy, not to say un-American light; and it is hoped by all who have admired his noble advocacy of Irish home rule, Boer independence, and Philippine self-government, that he will not repeat his inconsistent and demoralizing Boston performance.

JOHN SAMPSON.

Washington, D. C.

Full of Information

Editor Independent: Find a dollar enclosed and will even up for current year as soon as the means enables to do so. I can't get along without The Independent. I get ten times more "sound" information from it than all the other papers combined.

JOHN GUTHERLESS.

North Platte, Neb.

The Presidential "I Am"

The opinion that Roosevelt has of himself in comparison with all the presidents who have preceded him may be gathered from his books. He says of Jefferson: "He was constitutionally unable to put a proper value on truthfulness," and Jefferson "was perhaps the most incapable executive that ever filled the presidential chair." He called President Tyler "a politician of monumental littleness." Pope was "the very smallest president." "Monroe was as much of a failure as his predecessors and a harsher criticism could not be passed upon him." Van Buren and Buchanan were "dough-faces" and "fit representatives of the sordid and odious political organizations of New York and Pennsylvania," while Oliver Ellsworth, one of the early chief justices, "should be branded with infamy." And General Scott was "a wholly absurd and flatulent personage." When their present presidential idol talked that way about the men eminent in American history, The Independent is puzzled to know on what ground some readers of this paper base their complaints concerning the criticisms that are sometimes made of republicans and republican policies in its columns.

Mention The Independent.

Socialist Books

Editor Independent: You asked a leading question when you inquired from whence comes the money to pay for the "hundreds of costly books on socialism that are being constantly put forth?" A glance at the list of new books mentioned every week in the book reviews will show several—and sometimes many—socialistic, or ultra socialist by the well-known book publishing firms. But you will never see one work of the individualistic school nor a solitary attack upon the fallacies of socialism. The great capitalistic publishing firms will not consider works of that character. But a socialistic work has the call. Again, you will note a socialist column once a week in daily and weekly papers, "paid for" at the rate of \$1 per week. But you will not be permitted to expose the rank humbug on the same terms. The whole trend of events is toward the magnifying of the socialist proposition, thus presenting it as the solution. But it will not stand analysis for five minutes. Millionaire Wilshire has time and again refused my criticisms of socialism. The Appeal to Reason "lost" my manuscript; but they did not ask me to write again. I was strongly impressed with socialism in 1886—about the time Dr. Aveling with one of his wives came to Chicago on a lecture tour. But I had to give up socialism because it could not stand analysis. I am still looking for a socialist paper that dares print two columns from my pen.

H. J. WIBEL.

Riverside, Cal.

Live Stock Insurance

Why insure live stock for fire and lightning only, when you can get insurance that will cover death from any cause. Three-fourths of the money paid out for fire and lightning insurance of live stock is money wasted for the simple fact that three-fourths of the stock dies from causes other than fire and lightning, and for which such insurance is no good.

The Phoenix Mutual Live Stock Insurance Co. insures live stock against death resulting from fire, lightning, tornado, disease, or accident; in fact, from all causes where due care has been taken to save life and nothing done to endanger it. Good, reliable agents wanted in every township. For full particulars write or call on The Phoenix Mutual Live Stock Ins. Co., 116 So. 10th st., Lincoln, Neb.

Mr. Drooley on Ancient and Modern Literature

"Ye see, Hinessey, in the ole days there was, first of all, the im'rors; na-amin' anny wan iv the im'rors at random, we na-a-me the on'y wan we raymber, which is Julius Caesar. Now Julius Caesar was not on'y a fine im'ror and fighter, but he was a fitry man battin' in the first division. He wr-r-ote a bunch iv ixcellent and valyble, though teejus school books still in use. This, iv course, wud tind to fill with elation the breasts iv them that feel it their p'athryotic jooty to knock the prisint and boost the dead past; howiver, the answer is aisy to find. In this day iv civilyzation and the Mafia, in this land iv the free and home iv the lynchin' bee (get next to them little digs, Hinessey) we have no effete im'rors, but we have a presidint—me ole friend, Tiddy Rosenfelt—that's got ole Julius beat at the post in book wr-r-itin' as well as fightin' and im'rin'. Julius says, says he, 'All Gaul, says he, 'all Gaul is divided into three parts,' he says; and Tiddy goes him siv'ral better, sayin', 'All gall is divided,' says he, 'Into wan part,' he says, 'and I've got a clinch on that!' says he. No, the Gallie wars was outdone at San Joon Hill, and the book about 'em's been beat to death in thirty-seven volumes. So much fr' ye'r la-a-din' min.'—Charlton Andrews in The Reader Magazine for November.

The Springfield Republican thinks that the treatment of the Bennett will case by the newspapers, and especially by the gold democratic newspapers of New Haven, is "suspicious." That paper printed in some four columns the full text of Lawyer Stoddard's speech attacking Mr. Bryan in court, while it printed only half a column of Bryan's reply, and hardly a line of the arguments in his defense.

HOMESEEKERS EXCURSIONS

via the : : :
ROCK ISLAND SYSTEM

to Oklahoma and Texas points at greatly reduced rates, October 20 and November 3 and 17. The Rock Island is the only line running through cars from Nebraska to Oklahoma and Texas points. Call or write for illustrated papers and full information.

F. H. BARNES, C. P. A.,
1045 O st., Lincoln, Neb.