

THE OMAHA SUNDAY BEE

OMAHA, SUNDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 22, 1916—32 PAGES—FIVE SECTIONS.

SINGLE COPY FIVE CENTS.

AUSTRIAN PREMIER SHOT AND KILLED BY A PUBLISHER

Count Stuerghk Is Attacked While Dining at a Hotel in Vienna and Instantly Slain.

THREE BULLETS ARE FIRED

Prominent Figure in Political Affairs of Dual Monarchy for Years.

DETAILS OF CASE LACKING

Berlin, Oct. 21.—(By Wireless to Sayville.)—Count Carl Stuerghk, Austrian premier, was shot and killed today while dining, by the editor of a Vienna newspaper named Adler, says the Overseas News Agency.

London, Oct. 21.—The premier of Austria has been shot.

Reuter's Amsterdam correspondent says the premier, Count Karl Stuerghk, was shot today by the publisher of a Vienna newspaper named Adler, according to a telegram received at Amsterdam from Berlin.

Vienna, Via London, Oct. 21.—The Austrian premier, Count Stuerghk, who was assassinated while at dinner today by Ludwig Adler, a publisher, was shot three times. Count Stuerghk was dining at a hotel when the publisher attacked him. Three shots were fired, all of which took effect, the premier dying instantly.

Count Stuerghk has been a prominent figure in Austrian political affairs for years. He was minister of public works in the cabinet formed in 1909, at the retirement of which in October, 1911, he was asked to form a new ministry.

The count was born in 1859 at Graz, was educated at the University of Graz and entered the service of the state in 1881. He began his parliamentary career on March 12, 1891, when he was elected to the Reichsrath. In 1899 he became a ministerial director in the department of which he afterwards became the head. In the interval he was out of office for a time, resigning after the fall of the Windsche-Graetz cabinet.

Crisis Unavoidable. Telegraphing from Vienna a few days ago, a correspondent of the Vossische Zeitung of Berlin said a ministerial crisis in Austria was considered unavoidable. The dispatch did not specify the reasons and little information has reached this country in regards to the current Austrian political conditions, although there have been many dispatches in regard to the political strife in Hungary. The Austrian parliament has not been in session since before the war.

One of the few occasions on which the count's name has figured in the American news during the war was in August of last year, when he was interviewed by an American correspondent. He was quoted as having said that although some of the Teutonic expansionists favored extreme terms, he was sure the German government and influential citizens would hold to moderate demands, thus hastening the end of hostilities.

Sloan Points Out Unsoundness of Democratic Tariff

York, Neb., Oct. 21.—(Special)—Congressman Sloan addressed a good-sized audience at the courthouse Thursday evening. After relating some of his own activities he discussed the tariff, with special reference to the farmers of Nebraska. He said in part:

"In recent legislation, the party in power has admitted the unsoundness of its tariff-for-revenue-only policy in the following particulars:

"1. Increasing the protective tariff on dyestuffs.

"2. Reimposing the protective tariff on sugar. This, however, had pressure from the south.

"3. Establishing a tariff commission in the place of the republican tariff commission, which they had killed.

"4. The so-called anti-dumping clause, which proposes to punish importers who send goods into this country so cheap as to break our market. The tariff remedy in that particular is doubling the rate of duty. This would make a practically prohibitive duty upon tobacco, rice, peanuts and Angora goat hair, but on corn, wheat, eggs, cattle, meat and other northwestern products, being on the free list, doubling the duty, or doubling nothing, would not be much of a remedy."

The Weather

For Nebraska—Cloudy. Temperatures at Omaha Yesterday. U. S. Hour.

N S E T L F D

Comparative Local Record.

1916. 1915. 1914. 1913.

Highest yesterday..... 87° 75° 68° 20°

Lowest yesterday..... 43° 61° 62° 29°

Mean temperature..... 60° 60° 60° 60°

Temperature and precipitation departures from normal.

Normal temperature..... 52°

Deficiency for the day..... 22°

Total excess since March 1..... 24°

Normal precipitation..... .87 inch

Deficiency for the day..... .97 inch

Total rainfall since March 1..... 14.51 inches

Deficiency for cor. period..... 1.27 inches

Deficiency for cor. period, 1914..... 2.20 inches

T indicates trace of precipitation.

Judge Advocate General Rules United States in State of War

No Formal Declaration, But Crowder Says Condition Exists Just Same.

NAVAL OFFICERS SO HOLD

New York, Oct. 21.—(Special Telegram)—Judge Advocate General Crowder, United States army, has rendered a formal decision, holding that the United States is at war.

A decision was made necessary in dealing with numerous incidents connected with the punitive expedition of United States troops into Mexico, the nature of these incidents, various offenses committed by United States soldiers, demanding that the judge advocate general's office should define the status of the Mexican campaign.

In the decision, the judge advocate general quotes the definition of war in Vattel's Law of Nations as being that state of affairs in which we prosecute our rights by force.

The decision has been carefully withheld from publicity, and there is resentment on the part of administration that it has reached the public at this time, for it destroys the plea that "he kept us out of war."

That naval officers (not officials of the Navy department) believe war actually and legally exists between the United States and a faction in Santo Domingo is made evident by an official letter to the Navy department from Major General George Barnett, commanding the United States marine corps, officially commanding the coolness and daring displayed by Captain Leroy N. Taylor for courageously driving a motor ambulance through the fire-swept zones and exposing himself to enemy fire while succoring the wounded.

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States troops in Mexico, by reason of the fact that the United States is prosecuting its right by force.

The decision states:

"It is thus apparent that under the law there need be no formal declaration of war, but that under the definition of Vattel a state of war exists, so far as concerns the operations of the United States