

Custer Co. Republican

Published every Thursday at the County Seat.
D. M. A. BISHOP, Editor.
42-Office in Custer Block, Fourth Ave. '98
Entered at the postoffice at Broken Bow, Neb., as second class matter, for transmission through the U. S. mails.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:
One Year, in advance, \$1.00
THURSDAY, OCT. 5, 1899.

REPUBLICAN TICKET.

- State Ticket.**
For Judge of the Supreme Court, M. B. REESE, Of Lincoln.
For Regents, E. G. MCGILTON, Of Omaha.
Dr. W. B. ELY, Of Alinsworth.
Congressional Ticket.
For Congress, M. P. KINKAID, Of O'Neill.
Judicial Ticket.
For Judge of 13th Judicial District, F. G. HAMEL, Of Kearney.
County Ticket.
For County Treasurer, WALTER GEORGE.
For Sheriff, Capt. V. O. TALBOT.
For County Clerk, JAMES CHITTIK.
For Clerk of Dist. Court, Lieut. H. F. KENNEDY.
For County Judge, J. A. ARMOUR.
For County Superintendent, J. B. TAGGART.
For County Surveyor, F. E. VANANTWERP.
For County Coroner, Dr. H. F. DAVIES.
Supervisor Ticket.
For Supervisor of 6th District, J. F. FOXWORTHY, Of Custer.
Township Ticket.
Clerk, W. W. COWLES.
Treasurer, J. M. KIMBERLING.
Justices of the Peace, J. J. SNYDER, L. McCANDLESS.
Constables, P. M. TOWSLEY, Wm. BARKETT.
Road Overseers, Dist. No. 1, CHAS. DAVIS.
Dist. No. 2, J. B. KENOYER.
Dist. No. 3, JOHN BOYCE.
Dist. No. 4, I. N. PERSHALL.
Dist. No. 5, P. H. ARTHUR.
Dist. No. 6, G. E. CADWELL.
Dist. No. 7, C. T. WRIGHT.

VOTE FOR THEM.

"WE HAVE NOT ONE WORD TO SAY AGAINST CLARIS TALBOT OR HORACE KENNEDY. BOTH ARE NICE YOUNG MEN, AND NO DOUBT, RENDERED VALIANT SERVICES AS SOLDIERS BOTH IN THE WAR AGAINST SPAIN AND THE PHILIPPINES."—BEACON, Sept. 14, '99.

Parties personally acquainted with Fred Cummings, the pop candidate for judge say they are not surprised at the profane language Peter Rapp represented he used toward him in his affidavit last week.

Be Not Deceived.

There are a great many voters who have for years been affiliating with the pops, that are fully convinced that part of the "stables" should be cleaned, but do not see the necessity of making a clean sweep of the whole platter. Or in other words it has not occurred to them that a change in the political complexion of the county board is necessarily essential to the better government of the county. Nor has it occurred to many that it is possible to make a complete change in the board at the next election, yet both the latter propositions are true. It is with the county board that the expense of the county government, to a great extent rests. A competent board can save an expense many times where an incompetent board would not.

Judge Armour proved his loyalty to the soldier boys when it looked as if the proposition to raise sufficient funds to furnish the First Nebraska free transportation from San Francisco home, by sending his draft for \$20 to help the good cause along. It was not a large sum compared with the amount that was necessary to be raised, but it was more than any other individual in the county gave, who had no boys of their own in the regiment. His loyalty to old soldiers has always been recognized by them. On all public occasions, when a public speech was wanted at Ansley or Westerville, where he has so long resided, they never failed to call on Joe Armour. He has always been a warm friend of the American soldier as they all know and they will not forget him when he is in need of their support at the polls the 7th of next November.

Candidates For Supervisors.

The Republican party presents to the public this year three candidates for members of the board of supervisors. They are J. F. Fox-

worthy of Custer, Fred Brechbuhl, of Anselmo and Ras Anderson of Berwyn. They are men of strict integrity, honest, sober, and would if elected prove a credit to the county as well as themselves. Every one of those men can be elected this year if the proper effort is put forth. Neither of their opponents are satisfactory to their own party. In order to change the political complexion of the board another year every one of these men must be elected. To lose either will leave the majority of the board populist. No citizen who feels that a change is needed, should for any personal reason lose sight of this fact.

Murder Will Out.

That is an old saying, but in the progressive times of the present, it not infrequently proves true. For weeks the Chief and the Beacon have been maintaining that the editorial matter in the REPUBLICAN was being prepared by some political committee or some individual other than the editor, hoping thereby to discredit the effect of its articles with its readers and to shield the wholesale syndicate matter that appears from week to week in their own papers. In last week's issue they unintentionally gave themselves away and demonstrated conclusively to the reading public that a part, at least of the political matter of their papers is being prepared by one person. To prove our assertion, we only need call attention to part of one article which appeared in both the Chief and Beacon last week on their editorial pages for the first time in either. The Beacon stated that "no campaign was ever won on personal abuse or vilification," and had "these little fly specked affairs, masquerading as newspapers one-tenth the circulation they claim the whole populist county ticket would carry by 1,000 instead of the usual 500" in the Chief of the same week we find the following: "No campaign was ever won on personal abuse and vilification, and had these little fly specked affairs masquerading as newspapers one tenth the circulation they claim, Holcomb would carry Nebraska by 50,000 instead of 25,000". Further comment is unnecessary.

The populists papers are urging their candidate for county judge on the plea that he was a number of years ago admitted to the bar and has authority to practice in the county and district court. If there was anything to that claim, it would be in his favor as we believe that no one should be elected to the office of county judge unless he has a good knowledge of law. But unfortunately for Fred Cummings, the record is against him. He has been a resident of Custer county according to populist authority for fifteen or twenty years. They say he has been admitted to the bar to practice law for a number of years. Yet he has never had a case before the district court simply because he is not a lawyer and has not sufficient knowledge of law to know how to draw up a petition to get a case in court if he had a client who had been so unfortunate as to employ him. The fact that he may have been admitted to the bar eight years ago does not carry with it an evidence that he is qualified or knows anything about law. We remember that before the present law was put on the statute books, which requires an examination of the applicant, by the supreme court, the custom was for local bars to admit any one that desire the honor. Among those admitted in Custer county that had never studied law and never expected to practice were, J. B. Jones and Jas. Holland. As Fred Cummings has never had a case in court in the county it is conclusive evidence that if he was ever admitted to the bar that it was a matter of favoritism and not of merit.

A Smooth Game.

If reports that reach us are true things are not always as they seem, especially, when scheming politicians are engineering them. We had not dreamed that there was any partiality being shown by the township and special collectors

of the delinquent tax. We inferred that republicans as well as populists of high and low degree, rich or poor were to be treated alike and if he had paid his tax of previous years that all were alike to be subject to the extra expense put on by the distress officials. But it does seem, if we have been reliably informed, and our informant said he could furnish us a card to prove it, that there exceptions. There are a great many people who rested perfectly easy when they saw the notice that delinquent taxes were to be collected by distress thinking their taxes within a year or two at most had been paid. But in hundreds of instances they have been surprised when the collector called and claimed of their taxes they supposed had been paid several years ago to their township collector, with four or five years interest attached. But the exception to this is where the delinquent was a well-to-do pop, of influence in his community. In his case instead of giving the sheriff or constable a distress warrant, some kind hearted official would send him a notice that taxes of a certain year amounting to a certain sum remained unpaid and if he wished to avoid the extra cost that would be incurred by a special collector calling on him he could do so by making it convenient to call soon. Whether correct or an error, this offered the influential member a chance to have the matter set right. The scheme is to not incur the displeasure of the few ringsters of each community and thereby be able to use them to pacify the poor fellows, in their respective vicinities who were compelled to pay the money changers for their unwelcome visit. But all the "Nabobs" as their leaders are wont to term them do not any longer wear brass collars and they find it is more of a task to lead them around at will and like little papers make them jump every time, "Jack says thumbs up". Some of them at least are getting onto the smoothness of their scheme and with a whip, not of cords, but of ballots, propose on the 7th day of next November to drive the money changers out of the temple and place in their stead men who will not deal subtly with their fellows, but who will treat all alike and give the poor man with but one team and one cow an equal show with the man who numbers his cattle by the hundreds and counts his acres by the thousands.

The poor old Beacon in its contortions from week to week, in its efforts to divert the minds of the public from the growing popularity of the republican candidates, gets matters ridiculously mixed. In the issue of last week a column was devoted to an effort to establish that, "McKinley's administration, through its appointees in this county," dominated the republican nominations, and especially the nomination of Capt. Talbot for sheriff. The facts are that there were but three government appointees on the Broken Bow delegation and they were L. H. Jewett, Geo. Palmer and F. H. Young. The first two were active workers for Penn, while Mr. Young took no active part, being satisfied with either the majority might choose. As a matter of fact, there were only eight out of the twenty-seven delegates in Broken Bow township voted for Talbot on the first ballot and nine on the second, as the record shows. That may be a "demonstration of machine power," but it certainly was a weak one. Messrs. Humphrey, Reneau and Chapman, who, the Beacon implies, were government appointees, for whom the "mass of the party were but jumping-jacks," every one knows, are not and never have been government appointees. As a matter of history, the Broken Bow delegation cut but little figure in naming the candidates that were chosen. In nearly every case where there was a contest, two-thirds of the Broken Bow delegation was on the losing side. The nominee in each case secured his nomination through a majority of the county delegates, which does not look much like machine politics. The exceptions were in the nominations made by acclamation. It may be ma-

chine politics to let the majority rule, but it is so unusual a thing in populist conventions, we are not surprised that the Beacon defines it as "machine rule." Whether right or wrong, it is one of the cardinal principles of this government and the republican party, that the majority shall rule, and we are proud to be a member of such a party. Both Talbot and Penn were "slated for the nomination," if the Beacon prefers the term, as both had friends actively working for them. All regarded either equally competent and worthy, but as is always the case in conventions, both had supporters. Both had been soldiers in defense of their country's flag, and either was acceptable, and it was only a matter of determining which could best win in the contest, and this the majority alone should say. We concede with the Beacon "that no man in Custer county has better qualifications for the office of sheriff than Charley Penn. Yet we remember that no man was ever more vigorously opposed for the office of sheriff by the fusion forces, the last time he was a candidate on the republican ticket for that office.

The pop nominee at that time was a man about the age of V. C. Talbot now, possibly a year older. He had not been a soldier, but instead belonged to the crowd who took pleasure in calling Union soldiers Lincoln hirelings. Charley Penn had then been a soldier and had previously shown his competency for the office of sheriff. Yet he was slandered, denounced, and shamefully abused by the Beacon crowd and defeated. Its pretended sympathy for him as an old soldier now, comes with very poor grace. Had Talbot been defeated for the nomination, and had Penn won, then the Beacon would have given its sympathy to Talbot and denounced Penn in the most vigorous language at its command. If the Beacon has such love for the old soldier as it now pretends, why is it that with its wide influence in party circles, that there are no old soldiers occupying any of the county offices, and not one nominated for the ensuing term? Why not for once be honest and acknowledge that it is the fear of losing the sheriff's sale notices that prompts your support of the populist candidate for sheriff. It is not the fear that one man more than another will wrong the farmer. For the past nine years you have been crying "thief! thief!" and using the loan companies as your scapegoat, while the populist sheriffs have been selling thousands of homes from under the roofs of the hapless women and children, while the Beacon and other populist papers of the county have been growing fat from sheriff sales. Talk about a republican sheriff benefiting the loan companies and shylocks. The populist sheriffs of Custer county have sold more land and more homes under the hammer in the past nine years of their administration than there are populist voters in the county today. Before the Chief's flop to get a share, we have frequently seen as high as 60 sheriff sale notices in the Beacon in one month, which at the established rate of \$5 a notice, is \$300. In the nine years the pops have been in power, the sheriff sale notices have not averaged the populist newspapers of the county less than \$200 a month. The past two years the number have materially decreased, from the fact the sheriffs have sold out nearly every fellow who could not pay his mortgage. But with the hope that there may yet be a few that they may get, the Beacon continues to cry "thief! thief!" It is no wonder since the farmers have begun to get their eyes open to the fraud and deception with which you have duped them. That they are rising up in their wrath with a determination to crush you. The only surprise is that they have not been able to see it before. But in order that you may not henceforth waste your ammunition by directing your guns at A. R. Humphrey, we can assure you that he has not written an editorial for the Republican, unsigned since the county convention and has contributed but one article in

that time, and that was one clipped from some paper comparing prices of commodities in 1896 with those in 1899, which he prefaced with probably a dozen lines in substantiation of a plank of the republican platform. Last year in the campaign we granted some space to the members of the populist party who were fighting the ticker, but we did not assume responsibility for them. But as some of those same writers are today prominent in the populist ranks, we infer that their work through the columns of the REPUBLICAN was acceptable, so we have granted already some space to articles "communicated" or clipped from exchanges, in this campaign. We feel that in the near future our course will be approved, as well as the course of those who do the contributing, by promoting them to prominent positions next year, and it is for this reason we feel more inclined to let the good work go on. Editorially, we say nothing but the truth and we are ready to defend the truth as we see it at all times. So turn your batteries in the future on the REPUBLICAN and not on some individual who is not in any way connected with the paper.

Pop Logic, as Produced at their Late Meeting at Broken Bow.

- Judge Neville, the first speaker, said:
- 1st. "A man born in a state is a citizen of the state."
Are the Indians born in a state citizens of the state? Are the children of foreigners residing in the United States as ministers, consuls, visitors, etc., citizens?
 - 2d. "The constitution is not broad enough to take in the Philippine Islands."
When did it shrink? Did we not take in Louisiana, Florida, the Mexican cession, the Gadsden purchase and Alaska, all by purchase? Texas and Hawaii by annexation? All without any amendment to the constitution, why necessary now?
 - 3d. "The supreme court has decided the income tax constitutional for 100 years."
When, except as a war measure?
 - 4th. "An international agreement must be entered into with foreign nations to let us coin money."
When did the republican party ever make such a declaration?
 - 5th. "The constitution limits the number of cabinet offices."
Where do you find the above statement in the constitution?
 - 6th. "The republican want the constitution amended, so the number of cabinet offices will be unlimited."
Is the number limited now?
 - 7th. "The republicans say we have been on the gold standard since 1834."
Is it not true?
 - 8th. "Imperial wealth always wants an imperial government."
What is the meaning of imperial wealth? What distinction between imperial wealth and ordinary or plebeian wealth? Webster says: Imperial is a tuft of hair on a man's lower lip. Is this the wealth you refer to?
 - 9th. "Philippines are followers of Mohammed."
Have the Catholic priests of Spain been teaching the Koran, instead of the doctrine of "the meek and lowly Nazarine" for the last 300 or 400 years?
 - 10th. "The citizen soldier has always been sufficient."
Why have we a military academy, a naval academy, a state militia and a standing army? And why have they been maintained at the expense of the government, without objections by any political party?
 - 11th. "The republican party burned up one-half of the greenbacks."
Thirty-seven millions were destroyed during Grant's administration out of about four hundred millions circulation. Is thirty-seven million one-half of four hundred million by popocratic logic?
 - 12th. "Is the 'Quantity Theory' of money true?"
If so, where can the proof be found?
"Cyclone Davis" said:
1st. "We have reached a crisis in building this republic."
Judge Neville said in the evening

that "by international law the treaty of peace with Spain transferred the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands to us, and we were bound to establish a stable and just government there."

Has not that crisis passed, and has not the Philippine Islands become a part of our territory?

2d. "A standing army will hold down the will of the people."

Have we not always had a standing army? Did it "hold down the will of the people?"

3d. It is contrary to the principles of the constitution to force a government on an unwilling people."

Was this not the opinion of the people of the seceded states?

4th. "Cannot acquire territory except for the purpose of making slaves of its inhabitants."

Have all the people become slaves in the territories acquired by the United States since 1789?

5th. "Seventy-seven years ago the United States passed laws for killing the Chinese."

Where can that law be found?

6th. "McKinley can stop the war."

How, except by forcing the Filipinos to lay down their arms? If the Philippine Islands are a part of the territory of the United States, is it not the duty of the president to compel them to lay down their arms?

7th. "England has panperized India."
Where can one find the authority for that statement?

8th. "England fixes the prices on her bulletin board in London every morning for all the commodities of the world."

There is no uniform price for commodities. Why was this assertion made? For months the price of oats has been higher in Broken Bow than in Chicago. Is the statement true?
"Everything is sold on the price of the pauper labor of the world."
If so, why object to the Filipino labor becoming a part of the labor of the United States?

10th. "Pay our debts, and those fellows can't fix our prices."
Can any one fix a price for anything except by the consent of the seller?

11th. "The bondholder depreciates the price of money."
Can the bondholder regulate the amount of money coined or produced?

Judge Sullivan said:
1st. "The banking business was a profitable business, and was presided over by the United States."
Is not the distillery business a profitable business, and is it not presided over by the United States?

He said, "The people of the United States were entitled to the profits of the banking business."
Why are they not entitled to the profits of the liquor business? If entitled to the profits of these two business, why not to the profits of all business, and leave the unprofitable business to the people?

2d. "That all just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed."
Did the south give their consent to be governed by the United States? Did the Indians give their consent to be governed by the United States? Did the French in Louisiana give their consent to be governed by the United States? Did the Mexicans give their consent to be governed by the United States when Mexico ceded the territory embraced in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The judge must have been bidding for votes, or he must be ignorant of international law. In either case we excuse him, if he is not to blame for talking about "something" which will win votes by false reasoning.

The above propositions are all of the direct assertions that were made by these speakers, at their late harangue at Broken Bow, and upon these they based their so-called arguments. It is an undisputed principle, in logic, that if the proposition—called the premises—is untrue, the conclusion must of necessity be also untrue. Now apply this rule to the above propositions, as laid down by each speaker, and in every case the conclusions drawn from such false premises, must be erroneous.