

# The Independent.

GEORGE W. BERGE, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Volume 18

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 26, 1905

Number 23

## Chancellor Lapses Into Sophistry

Chancellor E. Benjamin Andrews of the Nebraska university has added zest to the campaign in this state by denying that he is under any obligations to John D. Rockefeller because of the \$67,000 donation. Our respected chancellor is very adroit in shaking off obligations. One month ago he felt himself so heavily in debt to Rockefeller that he publicly defended his methods of destructive commercialism. But the chancellor is again free, and with all the joyousness of his regained liberty he shouts the glad tidings from his housetop.

Those who have decided to vote for the reform regents, Messrs. Cole and Lightner, should not be misled by the shiftiness of the chancellor. The chancellor's career has been marked by an instability of mind that causes his critics to look upon each new change of opinion with distrust. Probably the chancellor is not conscious of his inconsistencies, but that tends rather to shatter than to restore confidence in him.

The people of Nebraska will not soon forget the unfortunate series of events which led to the choice of E. Benjamin Andrews as chancellor of the state university. A sentiment of chivalry, a desire to rebuke the goldbug Tories of ninety-six, and to honor one who, it was believed, had sacrificed position to preserve his honor and independence, prompted a Nebraska board of regents to choose E. Benjamin Andrews as chancellor of the state university. A few years after the choice was made the people of this state were surprised to hear from the chancellor himself that he had suffered no martyrdom in the Brown university affair, and that, in short, the story of his great sacrifice for conscience and honor's sake, was a myth. From that time until the present the chancellor has shown a decided bias for those things which the general public considers worst in modern finance. His appeal to his book on "Wealth and Moral Law" should carry little weight. A chancellor who acknowledges an obligation one month and denies it the next month, has not that fixity of mind or character which gives moral weight to an individual's acts and beliefs.

This criticism is not made with the harsh purpose of suggesting that the chancellor is guilty of denying in public an obligation which he acknowledges in private. Indeed the chancellor has made public acknowledgment of the moral obligation he, as chancellor of a subsidized university, owes to the individual who granted the

subsidy. This in itself would indicate a peculiar mental process which is a trifle too complex for the Nebraska mind. A thing cannot at the same time be and not be, the logicians tell us. And yet the chancellor in a public speech acknowledges an obligation which he denies in a letter to a Lincoln newspaper. Between the speech and the letter only a month has elapsed. The only conclusions possible are these: either the chancellor has changed his mind and knows it, or he has changed his mind and does not know it, or he is suffering from a mental hallucination which permits him to believe that he can accept for the state university \$67,000 from an individual and defend that individual's generally condemned business methods and yet retain the freedom and independence of mind and the liberty of action and speech demanded of a state university chancellor.

To the simple, sane and unsophisticated minds of the Nebraska prairies this latter position seems untenable. The Independent greatly mistakes the sentiment of Nebraskans if they do not conclude that a real obligation exists as a result of the Rockefeller donation. That donation may never force the chancellor to do or say what he believes to be morally wrong, but the obligation exists and will have its influence in blinding his reason, if the donation is not returned to the donor in accordance with the demand of the reform forces and the pledges of the reform candidates for regents.

One of the most misleading statements in the chancellor's letter relates to the general educational board which is popularly known as "Rockefeller's educational board." The facts that the board has been incorporated and that it has at its disposal a few thousand dollars aside from Rockefeller's donation of \$10,000,000 does not change its status in the eyes of honest observers. In time the Nebraska university may be popularly known as "Rockefeller's university" if it continues to receive contributions from Mr. Rockefeller.

In February 1902 John D. Rockefeller, Jr., organized the board to which Chancellor Andrews has been appointed and this interesting young man has dictated the appointments of all the members who are to dispose of his father's millions.

The chancellor's subtle effort to befog the issue will have a tendency to convince the people that he is Nebraska's educational representative of the Standard Oil trust.

## Cant of Ninety-Six Revived to Frighten the Public Away From Reform

In his speech at Akron, O., Secretary Taft did not add to his political stature. He revived the hypocritical cry against Bryanism which was raised in ninety-six by the Depews, McCalls, Blisses, McCurdys and the other frenzied financiers who have turned out to be common lawbreakers and despoilers of widows and orphans. Huge Taft has become Tiny Taft. Here is a specimen of the old hypocrisies brought up to date:

The truth is perfectly apparent that Mr. Bryan is gradually resuming control over the democratic party and proposes to assume the aggressive in a controversy in which he hopes to array the poor against the rich, to shake the present system of private property and freedom of contract, to cripple the federal courts that are now such a bulwark in the defense of the constitutional rights of individuals, to substitute for our present system of railways, privately owned and maintained, government railways and in every way to introduce a system of paternalism leaning toward socialism which in the end would certainly paralyze the industrial and social progress of this country. This movement in favor of government ownership of public utilities, to include the commerce of railroads, is not a mere chimera; it finds its beginning in the proposition for municipal ownership of street

railways by Mayor Dunne of Chicago, and Mayor McClellan of New York and even still more in the attitude of Mr. Hearst in running against Mr. McClellan.

Behold the old, lying phrases, "poor against the rich," "shake the present system of private property," "cripple the federal courts," "paralyze the industrial and social progress of this country," etc. It is a relief to turn from the demagogic deceits of Secretary Taft to the downright utterances of President Roosevelt. Whatever mistakes the president may have made in his southern speeches he did not descend to the cheap clap-trap and red fire of his Sultanic Majesty, the imperialistic governor general of all the Philippines.

The hypocrites of ninety-six, the pilferers of the people, the barrel politicians, the campaign educators of the Hanna stripe, will take new heart of hope now that Taft has raised the old war cry in an effort to arouse the voters of Ohio against perils invented by political panderers for private profit. Is it possible that the people of Ohio can be stampeded by the cries of ninety-six now that