Custer County Republican

D. M. AMSBERRY, EDITOR & PUBLISHER

BROKEN BOW, NEBRASKA

Almost anybody would agree to take J. Pierpont Morgan's assets and pay his debts.

Now, if Miss Van Vorst had been a dinosaur one set of brains might have headed off the other.

Why should John Mitchell want money or additional glory? A 5-cent cigar has been named after him.

It appears that Mrs. Patrick Campbell was born in America. She needn't expect much when she comes here after this.

As to Mrs. Russell Sage's remarks on eschewing social life, Uncle Russell may be depended upon for a resounding amen.

A New York man made $1,500,000 in six weeks speculating in cotton. No mention is made of the large number of men who didn't.

King Edward probably honestly wonders how in the world Parliament could ever be opened if he were not on hand in his fur-trimmed blanket.

A poet named Vrhlichy has been elected a member of the Austrian House of Peers. If his poetry is anything like his name he must belong to the Browning school.

The case of the New York man who was killed by his wife and his bones fed to the hens is rather extraordinary. It is not often that a husband is henpecked after death.

"Now that Dr. Loeb of Chicago has discovered a cure for St. Vitus' dance," suggests the Kansas City Star, "let him cast about for some remedy for the cake walk." This might necessitate an entire change of the pigments in the blood.

The exposure of the turf investment frauds came before the American newspapers have finished expressing their amazement at the gullibility of the French as revealed by the Humbert swindle. No nation has a monopoly of the "easy mark."

There is no royal road to wealth, any more than to learning. However, the desire which lurks in the average human breast to make a fortune will continue to induce foolish people to risk their money on schemes that promise to save them from the necessity of earning their daily bread, and such lessons as that of the St. Louis failure will only serve to act as a temporary brake on the train load of gamblers running down grade on the road to ruin.

Fifty thousand reformed drunkards, according to Gen. Booth, are marching in the ranks of the Salvation Army. Forty-five thousand young women through its influence have been reclaimed to lives of rectitude and happiness. The work has been done economically, and many who have been helped have subsequently paid into the treasury more than was spent upon their reclamation. Human waste, as well as that of the industrial world, can be utilized, and the wisest philanthropy works toward that end.

Religious services held in absolute darkness are an experiment begun a few weeks ago in London. The purpose was not novelty or notoriety, but a desire to answer the objection raised by poorly dressed people against going to any place where their shabby clothes made them feel uncomfortable. The experiment was made at St. James', in Clerkenwell. A large sheet was hung across the eastern end of the church, and upon this the words and music of the hymns, the prayers and responses were thrown by a lime-light lantern. If the attention of the congregation was not concentrated on the service the fault could not be attributed to any desire to study the fashions.

While Miss Marie Van Vorst is to be commended for her noble stand in favor of matrimony—and we hope Miss Marie will soon exhibit the courage of her convictions—she is a little too severe on the maidens of various ages who have not yielded to the scriptural injunction. Nor can we accept her statement that "the fact remains that the world's celebrated women have all married," if by that she would argue that marriage was the promotion of their influence and accomplishment. It is a fact that it is rather natural for women to marry—Elizabeth proving a notable exception—but it is far from a fact that great women have been made great merely by the marriage connection. Indeed, the reverse is more likely to be true, and a woman who has accomplished, or is likely to accomplish, much is very often stunted by the marriage tie. Let us marry by all means, the more the merrier and the oftener the better, but don't take up the absurd notion that marriage is the likeliest path to greatness. Let us be fair to the old maids.

A writer in London Health has observed that there is nothing distinctive about the American face, as there is about all the rest of the groups of Caucasian faces. It has no individuality. The English face, the Jew face, the German face, the French face, the Italian face, the Irish face, are all distinctive types that may be distinguished at a glance. Each of these has something about it that calls up a definite picture in the mind. But the American face has no strong characteristic to differentiate it from other faces of superior races, though it is peculiar in some ways. It is peculiar in its cosmopolitanism. It is peculiar in one sense a composite face. It is international, for here and there one may find the traces which suggest a relation to this, that or the other face. It may be a line or a ligament bequeathed by an early English ancestry or something suggestive of Teutonic origin or a sharp suggestion of the Frenchman's face or the Irishman's face or the Italian's or the Scotchman's. But when one must deal with the American abstractly, one can scarcely call up the American face. Uncle Sam, with his striped trousers, his sharply cut coat, his plug hat, his whiskers, and his bland, good-natured countenance, is a happy conception, yet he may never hope to portray the matchless and indescribable cosmopolitanism of the American face. But if the American face has no distinctive features, it has distinctive strength. It is a composite of the best in all peoples. It is a blending of the lights and shadows in the faces of men who have come from all parts of the world to conquer and who have conquered. Intolerance of oppression, longing for liberty, political and industrial resolve, effort, energy, success—all these are written and rewritten upon the American face, by the best and bravest children of every land under the sun. From the American face are obliterated all the provincial narrowness and weaknesses that make the other faces distinctive. In it is combined the strength of them all.

The criminal statistics for the year 1902 are not encouraging. They show that all forms of human abnormality are decidedly on the increase in this country relative to the increase of population. The most remarkable fact connected with the year's record is the sudden and pronounced change of the proportion between men and women suicides. For a long time the proportion was about five males to one female, but last year's record sent the old rule sky high, the figures being, male suicides, 5,082; females, 3,149. It also appears, says the Chicago Examiner, that there is a large increase in juvenile crimes. As compared with the records of former years, the story of 1902 is alarmingly full of the crime of boys and girls between the ages of 12 and 17. A something which the statisticians are pleased to call "diseased precociousness" is making criminals among the young people at a rate that is appalling, with the further result that they are killing themselves, adult fashion, in quite unprecedented numbers. The old question of the city versus the country and the influence of city life upon morals is mightily intensified by last year's statistics. Dr. Arthur MacDonald of the Bureau of Education in his recent report to Congress shows that the victims of alcohol and suicide are more than twice as numerous in the cities as they are in the rural regions. For New York the figures are for deaths per 1,000,000 by alcoholism. State 80, New York City 219; Illinois 48, Chicago 87; Pennsylvania 38, Philadelphia 92; Massachusetts 72, Boston 180. The figures for these four States and cities as regards suicide show about the same result. It appears that the percentage of suicides in the cities, as compared with the country, is abnormally large, showing that in the great centers of human congestion the forces that demoralize are much more active than they are away from those points. The causes of this unenviable condition of things are not far to seek. The haste of civilization is, perhaps, the main cause. There is an abnormal strain on the nervous system which deranges it and so throws the whole human machinery out of gear. We are obliged to think and act so quickly and to keep up the thinking and acting so persistently, that the phosphorus of the brain is prematurely used up and the result is nervous prostration, failure, suicide. Again, the emphasized gregariousness of modern civilization, bringing people close together in great numbers, excites the passions, enhances selfishness, sharpens the spirit of competition, and to the same extent deadens the sympathies, and in this way cheapens human life and leads to crime. But after all the picture, dark as it is, is not without its streaks of light. Crime may be on the increase, but it is a matter of genuine congratulation that the people in this country and in all countries are morally sound, in love with life, and doing all that they can to make it beautiful for every son and daughter of Adam.

A Notoriety Seeker.

Reuben—Jason's furever plottin' tew git his name in the country paper.

Silas—So?

Reuben—Yaas, between times when thar hain't a new baby up t' his house he paints his barn or su'thin'.—Philadelphia Press.

Abe Lincoln used to tell a story of a steamboat that had such a big whistle that, after whistling for a landing, it had to tie up for an hour, in order to get up enough steam to run its engines. A better story was told a few years ago by an Atchison brakeman. The Missouri Pacific had a dinkey switch engine in the Atchison yards that shook the earth with its whistle. "If that whistle could be jacked up," a brakeman said, "and a locomotive built under it, what a great switch engine it would make!"

In visiting places of interest in a large city don't overlook the pawnshops.

President Roosevelt's Speech in Chicago

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: To-day I wish to speak to you, not merely about the Monroe doctrine, but about our entire position in the western hemisphere—a position so peculiar and predominant that out of it has grown the acceptance of the Monroe doctrine as a cardinal feature of our foreign policy—and in particular I wish to point out what has been done during the lifetime of the last Congress to make good our position in accordance with this historic policy.

Ever since the time when we definitely extended our boundaries westward to the Pacific and southward to the gulf, since the time when the old Spanish and Portuguese colonies to the south of us asserted their independence, our nation has insisted that because of its primacy in strength among the nations of the western hemisphere it has certain duties and responsibilities which oblige it to take a leading part thereon. We hold that our interests in this hemisphere are greater than those of any European power possibly can be and that our duty to ourselves and to the weaker republics who are our neighbors requires us to see that none of the great military powers from across the seas shall encroach upon the territory of the American republics or acquire control thereover.

This policy, therefore, not only forbids us to acquiesce in such territorial acquisition, but also causes us to object to the acquirement of a control which would in its effect be equal to territorial aggrandizement. That is why the United States has steadily believed that the construction of the great isthmian canal, the building of which is to stand as the greatest material feat of the twentieth century—greater than any similar feat in any preceding century—should be done by no foreign nation, but by ourselves. The canal must of necessity go through the territory of one of our smaller sister republics. We have been scrupulously careful to abstain from perpetrating any wrong upon any of these republics in this matter. We do not wish to interfere with their rights in the least, but, while carefully safeguarding them, to build the canal ourselves under provisions which will enable us, if necessary, to police and protect it and to guarantee its neutrality, we being the sole guarantor. Our intention was steadfast; we desired action taken so that the canal could always be used by us in time of peace and war alike and in time of war could never be used to our detriment by any nation which was hostile to us. Such action, by the circumstances surrounding it, was necessarily for the benefit and not the detriment of the adjacent American republics.

Success in New Treaty.

After considerably more than half of a century these objects have been exactly fulfilled by the legislation and treaties of the last two years. Two years ago we were no further advanced toward the construction of the isthmian canal on our terms than we had during the preceding eighty years. By the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, ratified in December, 1901, an old treaty with Great Britain, which had been held to stand in the way, was abrogated and it was agreed that the canal should be constructed under the auspices of the government of the United States and that this government should have the exclusive right to regulate and manage it, becoming the sole guarantor of its neutrality.

It was expressly stipulated, furthermore, that this guaranty of neutrality should not prevent the United States from taking any measures which it found necessary in order to secure by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order. Immediately following this treaty Congress passed a law under which the President was authorized to endeavor to secure a treaty for acquiring the right to finish the construction of and to operate the Panama canal, which had already been begun in the territory of Colombia by a French company. The rights of this company were accordingly obtained and a treaty negotiated with the republic of Colombia. This treaty has just been ratified by the Senate. It reserves all of Colombia's rights, while guaranteeing all of our own and those of neutral nations and specifically permits us to take any and all measures for the defense of the canal and for the preservation of our interests, whenever in our judgment an exigency may arise which calls for action on our part.

In other words, these two treaties and the legislation to carry them out have resulted in our obtaining on exactly the terms we desired the rights and privileges which we had so long sought in vain. These treaties are among the most important that we have ever negotiated in their effects upon the future welfare of this country and mark a memorable triumph of American diplomacy—one of those fortunate triumphs, moreover, which redounds to the benefit of the entire world.

The Trouble in Venezuela.

About the same time trouble arose in connection with the republic of Venezuela because of certain wrongs alleged to have been committed and debts overdue by this republic to citizens of various foreign powers, notably England, Germany and Italy. After failure to reach an agreement these powers began a blockade of the Venezuelan coast and a condition of quasi-war ensued. The concern of our government was, of course, not to interfere needlessly in any quarrel so far as it did not touch our interests or our honor and not to take the attitude of protecting from coercion any power unless we were willing to espouse the quarrel of that power, but to keep an attitude of watchful vigilance and see that there was no infringement of the Monroe doctrine; no acquirement of territorial rights by a European power at the expense of a weak sister republic, whether this acquisition might take the shape of an outright and avowed seizure of territory or of the exercise of control which would in effect be equivalent to such seizure.

This attitude was expressed in the two following published memoranda, the first being the letter addressed by the Secretary of State to the German ambassador, the second the conversation with the Secretary of State reported by the British ambassador:

"Department of State, Washington, Dec. 16, 1901.—His Excellency Dr. Von Holleben, etc.: Dear Excellency—I inclose a memorandum by way of reply to that which you did me the honor to leave with me on Saturday and am, as ever, faithfully yours, JOHN HAY.

"Memorandum—The President in his message of the 3d of December, 1901, used the following language:

"'The Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil. It is in no wise intended as hostile to any nation in the old world.'

"The President further said:

"'This doctrine has nothing to do with the commercial relations of any American power save that it in truth allows each of them to form such as it desires. * * * We do not guarantee any State against punishment if it misconducts itself, provided that punishment does not take the form of the acquisition of territory by any non-American power.'

"His excellency the German ambassador on his recent return from Berlin conveyed personally to the President the assurance of the German Emperor that his majesty's government had no purpose or intention to make even the smallest acquisition of territory on the South American continent or the islands adjacent. This voluntary and friendly declaration was afterward repeated to the Secretary of State and was received by the President and the people of the United States in the frank and cordial spirit in which it was offered. In the memorandum of the 11th of December his excellency the German ambassador repeats these assurances, as follows: 'We declare especially that under no circumstances do we consider in our proceedings the acquisition or the permanent occupation of Venezuelan territory.'

"In the said memorandum of the 11th of December the German government informs the United States that it has certain just claims for money and for damages wrongfully withheld from German subjects by the government of Venezuela and that it proposes to take certain coercive measures described in the memorandum to enforce the payment of these just claims.

"The President of the United States, appreciating the courtesy of the German government in making him acquainted with the state of affairs referred to and not regarding himself as called upon to enter into the consideration of the claims in question, believes that no measures will be taken in this matter by the agents of the German government which are not in accordance with the well-known purpose, above set forth, of his majesty the German Emperor."

Sir Michael Herbert to the Marquis of Lansdowne:

"Washington, Nov. 13, 1902.—I communicated to Mr. Hay this morning the substance of your lordship's telegram of the 11th inst.

"His excellency stated in reply that the United States government, although they regretted that European powers should use force against Central and South American countries, could not object to their taking steps to obtain redress for injuries suffered by their subjects, provided that no acquisition of territory was contemplated."

Monroe Doctrine Respected.

Both powers assured us in explicit terms that there was not the slightest intention on their part to violate the principles of the Monroe doctrine, and this assurance was kept with an honorable good faith which merits full acknowledgement on our part. At the same time the existence of hostilities in a region so near our own borders was fraught with such possibilities of danger in the future that it was obviously no less our duty to ourselves than our duty to humanity to endeavor to put an end to that. Accordingly, by an offer of our good services in a spirit of frank friendliness to all the parties concerned, a spirit in which they quickly and cordially responded, we secured a resumption of peace—the contending parties agreeing that the matters which they could not settle among themselves should be referred to The Hague tribunal for settlement. The United States had most fortunately already been able to set an example to other nations by utilizing the great possibilities for good contained in The Hague tribunal, a question at issue between ourselves and the republic of Mexico being the first submitted to the international court of arbitration.

The terms which we have secured as those under which the isthmian canal is to be built and the course of events in the Venezuela matter have shown not merely the ever growing influence of the United States in the western hemisphere, but also, I think I may safely say, have exemplified the firm purpose of the United States that its growth and influence and power shall redound not to the harm, but to the benefit of our sister republics whose strength is less. Our growth, therefore, is beneficial to human kind in general. We do not intend to assume any position which can give just offense to our neighbors. Our adherence to the rule of human right is not merely profession. The history of our dealings with Cuba shows that we reduce it to performance.

The Monroe doctrine is not international law, and though I think one day it may become such, this is not necessary as long as it remains a cardinal feature of our foreign policy and as long as we possess both the will and the strength to make it effective. This last point, my fellow citizens, is all important, and is one which as a people we can never afford to forget. I believe in the Monroe doctrine with all my heart and soul; I am convinced that the immense majority of our fellow citizens so believe in it; but I would infinitely prefer to see us abandon it than to see us put forward and bluster about it and yet fail to build up the efficient fighting strength which in the last resort can alone make it respected by any strong foreign power whose interest it may ever happen to be to violate it.

Must "Carry a Big Stick."

Boasting and blustering are as objectionable among nations as among individuals and the public men of a great nation owe it to their sense of national self-respect to speak courteously of foreign powers, just as a brave and self-respecting man treats all around him courteously. But though to boast is bad and causelessly to insult another worse, yet worse than all is it to be guilty of boasting, even without insult, and when called to the proof to be unable to make such boasting good. There is a homely old adage which runs: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far." If the American nation will speak softly and yet build and keep at a pitch of the highest training a thoroughly efficient navy, the Monroe doctrine will go far. I ask you to think over this. If you do you will come to the conclusion that it is mere plain common sense, so obviously sound that only the blind can fail to see its truth and only the weakest and most irresolute can fail to desire to put it into force.

Well, in the last two years, I am happy to say, we have taken long strides in advance as regards our navy. The last Congress, in addition to smaller vessels, provided nine of those formidable fighting ships upon which the real efficiency of any navy in war ultimately depends. It provided, moreover, for the necessary addition of officers and enlisted men to make the ships worth having. Meanwhile the Navy Department has seen to it that our ships have been constantly exercised at sea, with the great guns and in maneuvers, so that their efficiency as fighting units, both individually and when acting together, has been steadily improved. Remember that all of this is necessary. A warship is a huge bit of mechanism, well-nigh as delicate and complicated as it is formidable. It takes years to build it. It takes years to teach the officers and men how to handle it to good advantage. It is an absolute impossibility to improvise a navy at the outset of war.

No recent war between any two nations has lasted as long as it takes to build a battleship and it is just as impossible to improvise the officers or the crews as to improvise the navy.

To lay up a battleship and only send it afloat at the outset of a war with a raw crew and untried officers would be not merely a folly, but a crime, for it would invite both disaster and disgrace. The navy which so quickly decided in our favor the war in 1898 had been built and made efficient during the preceding fifteen years. The ships that triumphed off Manila and Santiago had been built under previous administrations with money appropriated by previous Congresses. The officers and the men did their duty so well because they had always been trained to it by long sea service.

All honor to the gallant officers and gallant men who actually did the fighting, but remember, too, to honor the public men, the shipwrights and steelworkers, the owners of the ship yards and armor plants, to whose united foresight and exertion we owe it that in 1898 we had craft so good, guns so excellent and American seamen of so high a type in the conning towers, in the gun turrets and in the engine rooms.

Navy Guarantees Peace.

It is too late to prepare for war when war has come, and if we only prepare sufficiently no war will ever come. We wish a powerful and efficient navy not for purposes of war, but as the surest guaranty of peace. If we have such a navy—if we keep on building it up—we may rest assured that there is but the smallest chance that trouble will ever come to this nation, and we may likewise rest assured that no foreign power will ever quarrel with us about the Monroe doctrine.

CAPACITY OF THE LOCOMOTIVE

Comparisons of the Lifetime of Engines Here and in England.

An expert on railway affairs has recently said that on English railways it had been found most economical that locomotives should go through the shops every two years, and that there engines were built with a view to longer service than in America. It has only been the last two years that American roads generally have taxed the capacity of the locomotive manufacturers to the utmost, replenishing their worn-out engines and providing new ones to meet the demands of the increasing volume of business. The economies of the '90s led many roads to overtax their motive power. Comparing the average life of an engine, this expert says that one English company had stated the average lifetime of a boiler, on a basis of 300,000 miles, to be, passenger engines, nine years; freight engines, fourteen years; switching engines, seventeen years, and branch passenger engines, sixteen years.

He did not agree with this, claiming that passenger express engines in England last twenty-five years, freight twenty-six years, local passenger twenty-five years, and freight engines twenty-seven years. The mileage of express engines from his data varied from 700,000 to 1,000,000 miles, freight engines from 500,000 to 800,000 miles. Comparing this with American experience, he claims that the aim of Americans is to continue the life of a locomotive fifteen years, getting the utmost out of it during that time, and then throwing it on the scrap heap, if it could not be sold to some smaller road. The average lifetime of engines on six American roads, as stated in this connection, has been demonstrated to be: Express engines, eighteen years; freight engines, sixteen years; local passenger, nineteen years. He finds under this claim that all classes of American engines make a higher mileage than the English, the range being between one to two million miles. The average lifetime of the boiler varies slightly in the two countries. In America engines are taken to the shops for overhauling on the average from every years and a quarter to a year and a half, as compared with two years in England.—New York Evening Post.

Solomonic Wisdom.

Bojax—"Brown's a thrifty genius."

Tomdix—"Well, let 'im come."

Bojax—"He appropriates other people's stumbling-blocks and uses them for stepping-stones."

Pertinent Query.

"Really, Mr. Jones, I am very sorry to hear that you buried your mother."

"What would you have me do with her?"—Michigan Wrinkle.

Nearly all the sand paper in use is made with powdered glass.

In France there are 4,000,000 acres devoted to the culture of the grape.

Pupils in the public schools of Austria are compelled to learn English.

A single grain of gold after having been converted into gold leaf, will cover forty-eight square inches.

Fifty German warships and one torpedo boat have already been fitted with the apparatus of wireless telegraphy.

They "Waited" and "Saw."

Warren's Corners, N. Y., April 20.—"Wait and see—you're better now, of course, but the cure won't last."

This was what the doctors said to Mr. A. B. Smith of this place. These doctors had been treating him for years and he got no better. They thought that nothing could permanently cure him. He says:

"My kidneys seemed to be so large that there wasn't room for them, and at times it seemed as if ten thousand needles were running through them. I could not sleep on my left side for years, the pain was so great in that position. I had to get up many times to urinate and my urine was sometimes clear and white as spring water, and again it would be highly colored and would stain my linen. The pain across my back was awful. I was ravenously hungry all the time.

"After I had taken Dodd's Kidney Pills for four days my kidneys pained me so bad I could hardly sit down. On the morning of the fifth day I felt some better, and the improvement continued till I was completely cured."

"As this was months ago and I am still feeling splendid, I know that my cure was permanent and genuine."

His satanic majesty expects to pave several miles of new streets this year.

A ton of cork occupies a space of one hundred and fifty cubic feet; a ton of gold is compressed in the space of two cubic feet.

Some men know just enough to make fools of themselves.

No Maud, dear; a person who has been stung by a bee doesn't necessarily have to suffer from hives.

The sandblast has been successfully applied to the cleansing of ships' bottoms. An ironclad was recently dry docked in an English seaport, and, by means of compressed air, sand was forced against the sides of the vessel, cleaning and polishing the iron and steel until they became almost as bright as silver.