

# The Nebraska Independent.

The Wealth Makers and Lincoln Independent Consolidated.

Rep 1831

VOL. VII.

LINCOLN, NEBR., THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1896.

NO. 46.

## PHILOSOPHY OF PARTIES

### Conditions and Elements Required for the Success of a new Party.

### A NEW PARTY CANNOT MAKE ISSUES.

### It can Only Organize and Present Issues Evolved by Surrounding Conditions.

#### Some Things to Think Over.

The paper following is the casual address delivered by Mr. Taubeneck before the Illinois people's party state central committee, at Springfield, early in 1896, and is printed in "The Little Statesman" at the request of the committee. F. J. S.

No country on earth is ruled by parties as is the United States. Ours is strictly a government by parties, and the most interesting phase of our history for the political student, is the "rise and fall" of parties. Since the formation of our government twenty-eight political parties have been organized, of which number but five have elected presidents. Most of those that failed were the forerunners of others, ice-breakers of those that finally succeeded. Since the organization of the people's party, in 1891, the question has often been asked: Why have a few parties been successful and the majority failures? Why did one succeed and others fail? I have given five years of patient study and observation to the solution of this difficult problem. The following conclusions are the result:

The organization of a new party is a most hazardous venture. There are so many elements to harmonize, and so many obstacles to overcome, that those who have practical experience in this field usually shrink from the task; political organizations are governed by laws which are immutable as those of nature. When these laws are disregarded or transgressed, defeat is inevitable. There is no chance, luck or blind fatality in the success or failure of a new party, but all depends upon a correct understanding of and the rigid adherence to these laws.

The conditions necessary to the successful organization of a new party are these:

First. Discontent, unrest, misery, distress and dissatisfaction among the masses are the basis of every political revolution. The discontent must be general, pervade nearly all classes, and have its origin in a common cause. The people, as a whole, never think until they feel, and never correct an evil so long as the burden is bearable; therefore the discontent must become intense before they leave old grooves, old parties, old associations, and align themselves under a new banner with those who have been their adversaries in the past. General discontent among the masses is the first condition and the very foundation upon which all new parties rest.

Second. This discontent and unrest must be caused, not by an act of nature, as flood, drought, famine or pestilence, but by the government, in either making bad laws or in refusing to legislate on some new issue; that is, the government must be responsible for the discontent by refusing to repeal obnoxious legislation, or by disobeying the wishes of the people to enact new laws on new questions arising out of new conditions.

Third. All existing parties must ignore the new issue and refuse to heed the voice of the people; that is, those parties already organized and recognized as political factors must turn a deaf ear to the demands of the people. A new party cannot be organized on an issue for which an old one is contending without becoming a "claim jumper." No new party can be successfully organized until the discontent becomes intense and all existing parties decline to take up the new issue.

These are the indispensable conditions necessary to the organization of a new party. No one or two are sufficient; it requires all three. When all are favorable, then the following elements are necessary to consummate the work:

First. Original thinkers—minds capable of analyzing and tracing effects and conditions to their logical conclusions; to first principles; to their final analysis; and of prescribing a remedy which will give the desired relief, and which is practical and not at variance with the present stage in the development of the race. Many new parties have been failures for the want of this element. No new party can succeed unless its demands rest on sound principles, along practical lines, and correspond with the present stage in the development of the race.

Second. Speakers and a press, to present the demands of the party to the people. Without these it cannot reach the public. This is an indispensable, but, if influenced by improper motives, the most dangerous element in the organization of a new party. Writers and speakers are the molders of public opinion and have the power to temporarily lead the people in the wrong direction as well as in the right. A distinguished senator once remarked: "This is the wind-mill element in a party, because they diffuse the thoughts and principles of a party as the wind carries over the land the vapor rising from the ocean."

Third. The cold-blooded calculator; the practical politician; the organizer who can drill, weld and cement the different elements into one mass, into a machine, so that the party may act as a unit. No

new party can be a success without the support of a portion of the practical and successful element in society. A successful party is always a practical party, because a party cannot be successful until it becomes practical.

These are the three elements necessary to consummate the work of organizing a new party when all the conditions are favorable. One cannot be substituted for another when any are lacking. Each must do that for which nature has prepared it and not intrude upon another's domain. An orator or editor is seldom more than a superficial thinker or organizer, nor is an organizer or profound thinker likely to be a success as an editor or orator.

In connection with the conditions and elements mentioned, it becomes necessary to rigidly observe and adhere to the following rules; otherwise the best effort will result in nothing:

1. The discontent and dissatisfied element in the old parties is the only building material, the only source of supply for a new party. Voters will not join a new party until they are dissatisfied with an old one. The source of supply of a new party is in proportion to the dissatisfied elements in the old parties. No new party can succeed which does not meet the demands and receive the support of these elements.

2. No new party can succeed except on the question or questions which are dividing old parties and those that add strength to them; that is, a new party must make that question which is disintegrating the old organizations the issue, the central idea, the test of party fealty. The same, the science of platform-building for new parties consists in finding out what question is dividing the old parties, and making that question the issue for the new one without any other planks except those that add strength to this one. A new party cannot succeed, therefore, which would try to make single-tax, socialism, nationalization of all public utilities, prohibition or woman suffrage an issue, when the dissatisfaction in the old parties is due to the money question, the sale of bonds and the income tax decision. This would be giving the voter "a stone when he asks for bread." The dissatisfied elements in the old parties must find in the new party that for which they are contending in an old one, unnumbered with other questions in which they do not believe; otherwise there is no inducement to leave one or join the other. No new party can be a success on any question until it divides the old parties, because otherwise there is no source of supply for building material.

3. No new party will succeed when it makes that question which is dividing the old parties the issue, and then loads its platform down with other demands in which the masses do not believe; that is, a new party cannot take up the money question, which at present is dividing the old parties, and then add single-tax, socialism, prohibition and woman suffrage and receive the support of those are contending for monetary reform in the old parties. The dissatisfied elements in the old parties will not support a new party if compelled to vote for three or four measures in which they do not believe, or which they do not understand, in order to get to get to vote for one in which they do believe. The repelling force of such a platform is greater than its attractive force. This is why the platform of a new party is seldom much stronger than its weakest plank.

4. The platform must be constructed so that all members of the party can stand on and defend it as a whole; that is, a new party will not succeed with a platform containing, say, four planks, when a portion of its members believe in the first plank only, another portion in the second only, a third portion in the third only, and a fourth portion in the last only. To illustrate the point, suppose we add to the platform of a party containing one plank with one million votes, one vote for each plank and one vote against each plank—"a house divided against itself." If we add a third plank with another million votes, we then have two planks and two million votes, one vote for each plank and one vote against each plank—"a house divided against itself." If we add a third plank with another million votes, we then have two votes against each plank and one for it. Every time we add a plank we also increase the repelling force in a party, which in time will shatter it into as many factions as there are planks. It is impossible to unite in one party those elements which from principle antagonize one another.

5. A new party can make planks, but not issues. Issues evolve out of conditions, and new parties out of issues. Ninety-nine per cent. of those who undertake the task of organizing a new party confound planks with issues. A plank is simply a declaration stating the side taken by a party on some question; while an issue is a controversy between parties, or when the public mind is focused on some question which, being affirmed by one party and denied by another, is presented to the people for a decision. The public mind is never focused on more than one great question at one time. This is why seldom more than one question becomes an issue in one campaign. Men can make planks, but God creates issues.

6. An ideal platform is one in which the issue is the great "central idea," and with no other planks except those which add strength to it. Whenever a plank repels more votes from the "central idea" than it attracts, then it has no business in the platform. That question which is dividing and disintegrating old parties must also be the "central idea" for the new one, and all others subordinate to it. No new party has ever succeeded with any other policy or with any other kind of platform.

7. If the object in a campaign is to hold the "rank and file" in line, in the place of winning new recruits, then the party should select its candidates from the ranks of the "old guard," which is an excellent policy after a party is firmly established and contains a majority of the voters. But if the object is to win new recruits, then the best men to nominate (other things being equal) are those who left the old parties last. A new re-

cruit as the candidate can bring ten voters with him where a candidate selected from the ranks of the "old guard" can bring one. The average voter is very sensitive when asked to join a new party and vote for men whom he has bitterly opposed in former campaigns. But if you give him an opportunity to vote for men who left an old party since the preceding election or at the time he did, he feels as though he was voting for one of his converts. If a new party adopts the policy of selecting its candidates from the new recruits, it will gather around its banner a large army of new workers in each succeeding campaign who have not before antagonized the dissatisfied elements in the old parties.

8. The press and speakers, as well as the candidates, who present the demands of the party to the people, cannot be too careful in guarding against anything that may arouse party prejudice and party spirit. They must constantly keep this point in mind: Ignore and remain silent on all other political questions except those which are dividing the old parties. Never offend or antagonize the source of supply—the building material for the new party. The moment a leader or speaker of a new party receives the label "crank," his influence with those not yet in the party is destroyed. Those who enthrone the "old guard" seldom make converts. The most effective speakers are those who left the old parties last, because they will receive attention, and their words will have ten times as much weight with the dissatisfied elements in the old parties as other speakers. Those editors and speakers who ridicule or abuse voters for remaining in the old parties, or attack their intelligence and patriotism, are the greatest enemies to a new party. The secret of success in conducting a campaign for a new party consists in compelling the old parties to discuss those questions only which are dividing their ranks. If they can do this, then it logically follows that every time the press and speakers of the old parties attack the new party they also attack and offend the dissatisfied elements in their own organizations and drive them away. This is turning the enemy's guns on his own ranks, and the more he fires, the more votes he will drive into the new party.

9. In a campaign between old parties there are three distinct stages. The first is educational, an appeal to reason, to the higher faculties in man. The second is an appeal to prejudice; and the third usually the two weeks preceding an election, is an appeal to the passions, to all that is left of "the wild beast in the heart man." A new party can without difficulty hold its own in the first stage, but the two last, unless well guarded, break its ranks.

10. All questions which are, or have been, issues between existing old parties, will divide and dissolve a new party into its original elements, if it injects them into the campaign or platform. These are the conditions and elements necessary and the laws which must be observed to successfully organize a new party. Everything is governed by law; political parties are no exception. No new party can succeed until some great question divides and disintegrates the old ones. When this takes place, then the secret of success for the new organization consists in making the issue that question which is dividing the old parties, and with no other planks except such as add strength.

The enemy in politics, like in war, if he understands his business, always attacks the most vulnerable point. If the new party does not present any weak points, then it logically follows that the old parties must attack its fortress—the questions which are dividing their own ranks. But if the platform of a new party advocates measures in which the dissatisfied elements in the old parties do not believe, then the old parties will not only attack the new one on its weak points, but also compel its press and speakers to offend and antagonize its source of supply—its building material. Whenever the old parties succeed in compelling a new one to antagonize those elements in the old parties to which it looks for its source of supply, it will disintegrate.

With these facts before us, what great question or questions are dividing the old parties at the present time? The money question, the sale of bonds and the income tax decision. Now (1896) for the first time since 1860 the dissatisfied elements in the old parties are sufficiently numerous to elect a president and congress, providing they can be united in one party and on one platform. The people's party is in a position to build a platform, out of the questions which are now dividing the old parties, that will receive the support of eight million voters in the United States.

St. Paul of Nebraska  
ST. PAUL, NEB., April 16, 1896.  
Boarding the Ord branch of the U. P. R. R. at Grand Island at 3:30 p. m. on the 15th inst we were whirled over the rolling prairies northward and after an hours very pleasant ride the brakeman cried out; "St. Paul change cars for Loup City and points west." We alighted from the train and proceeded to the hotel Phillips, visited at the court house and at different places in the city and after a refreshing night's rest, went out among the dear people to see what could be done in the way of adding a few more names to the roll of honor.

St. Paul is a pretty little city situated on the South Loup on an elevated table land, rising toward the setting sun; farmers report the wheat crop in this county more forward than is usual for the time of year.

The family of Levi P. Morton, governor of New York and aspirant for the presidency, sailed on April 8 on a European trip. The farmers of the west will continue to take daily trips along the furrows which bear the crops which pay the traveling expenses of the Morton family.—Silver Knight.

## MARION BUTLER'S WORK

### Vigorous Efforts to Enact the Omaha Platform into Law.

### HE KEEPS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD.

### Bills to Prohibit Gold Mortgages, to Stop the Issue of Bonds, to Limit the Veto Power, to Establish Government Telegraphs.

### Also One to Amend the Constitution and Provide an Income Tax.

All the populist senators and congressmen are keeping right in the middle of the road, doing their royal best to keep the principles of the Omaha platform before the people, and to enact them into law. Among the many really good measures introduced in Congress by them the following have been recently presented by Senator Butler of North Carolina: A bill to prevent discrimination between various kinds of legal tender money of the United States, and to maintain the equal debt paying and purchasing power thereof, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that any note, bill, bond, draft, check, exchange, contract, mortgage, public or private obligation, or pecuniary liability hereafter made or contracted, which may provide for its payment in a specific kind or kinds of legal tender money of the United States, may be paid or discharged in any kind of legal tender money of the United States, current at the time of its maturity or collection, at its face value, such stipulation or agreement to the contrary notwithstanding."

In presenting this bill Senator Butler said: "By its title it will be seen that it is a bill to maintain the equal debt paying and purchasing power of all the legal tender currency of the country. I see that the various state conventions, now being held to elect delegates to the Republican National Convention are declaring in favor of this policy, and pledging their party to give the people such a currency. Both of the old parties declare it their policy in their last national platforms, and will probably so declare again this year. In order that we may be able to turn these promises into performances before another campaign, I hope the committee on finance will report this bill promptly. We shall then be able to redeem, before their next national conventions are held, the promises which both of the old parties made, so they will not have to make these promises over again. The People's party stands ready to help either party to redeem this promise. We are ready to do it now. Gold mortgages are plastered over every town and hamlet in this country, and nearly every man today who borrows money is forced to give a gold bearing mortgage or note. No government should allow such discrimination against any of its legal tender or lawful money. It is not only an injustice to the debtor class, but it is a suicidal governmental policy. It is all wrong and no party can defend it. Both the democratic and republican parties say they are opposed to such a policy, but they have done nothing to correct it. They can correct it by passing this bill. The law as it now stands, instead of maintaining the equal debt paying and purchasing power of all lawful money actually makes gold dearer. How can the government deliberately legislate to increase the purchasing power of gold, and then insist on paying its own debts in this dear money and force private debtors to do the same. The money lender and the bond holder are the only people who are benefited by the present law. It is to the detriment of everybody else. The bill which I offer will correct the wrong."

Senator Butler also succeeded in securing the following amendment to the postoffice appropriation bill: "Provided that fifty thousand dollars of this amount to be used to defray the expense of the experiments in rural free delivery under the direction of the Post Master General, and the amount heretofore appropriated for this purpose, and still unexpended, be available for said experiment."

During the fifty second congress Hon. Tom Watson secured an amendment to the postoffice appropriation bill providing ten thousand dollars for two years to make an experiment in rural free delivery, but every Post Master General since that time has steadily refused to apply this money for that purpose on the ground that the amount was not large enough to make a practical experiment. To remove any excuse, and to secure a practical test of free rural delivery, Senator Butler presented the above amendment, which he followed with a vigorous speech demanding at least some consideration for the farmer, and gained his point by a narrow vote. He showed that free postal delivery was being experimented in small towns and villages and declared that the farming communities were entitled to similar privileges. He asked why should money be appropriated to deliver mail free to a city man who could go to the office for his mail in five minutes while the farmer who paid more than his share of taxes should be forced to go miles for his mail at a great loss of time. The twenty thousand dollars secured by Mr. Watson

and the fifty thousand dollars by Senator Butler will furnish sufficient fund to make the experiment, and without doubt establish this much desired system demanded by the Grange and Farmers Alliance, and farmers of this country will appreciate the efforts of those who brought it about.

TO LIMIT THE VETO POWER.  
The third measure proposed by Senator Butler is equally, if not more important than the others. Its aim is to limit the veto power of the President. It proposes an amendment to the Constitution providing that a majority of congress instead of two-thirds, as now, shall be sufficient to pass any measure over the veto of the President. In presenting this amendment Senator Butler said: "This veto power is one provision where the constitution, we might say, is defective. It is a relic of monarchy. When our forefathers framed the constitution they lacked just this much of being waned from English ideas. They could not foresee the tremendous patronage that would go into the hands of the President in addition to this veto power. They could not foresee, and did not intend, that this veto power should be used to kill any bill that the President did not himself like. In fact, the veto power was intended to be used very sparingly, and we have the testimony of a number of the framers of the constitution to that effect. It is an English idea, but in England the crown today does not dare veto a bill passed by parliament. It has fallen into disuse in a kingdom, but in this republic flourishes and is used more frequently each year. The people elect their representatives for both houses of congress directed to enact the will of the people into law, yet one man, not even a legislator, has the monstrous authority and power to nullify any act of congress. A bill is passed after the most careful and deliberate consideration by the representatives of the people, yet it can be vetoed and nullified by the stroke of a pen in the hand of one man. This is a dangerous power. When we consider today the tremendous patronage the President has with which he can influence legislation, in addition to the veto power to kill what is passed, it makes him almost an autocrat. It gives him more power than any crowned head of England or we might say than any monarch in Europe. We saw here in the last congress how this power and the patronage of the President were used to change the opinion of congress and to defeat the will of the people. We saw in the same congress how the veto power was used to strike down a bill that was passed by congress to coin the seigniorage. Nearly every administration since the civil war has used the veto power and the patronage of the government in the same way. This abuse and danger grows greater each year."

Last week Senator Butler introduced a bill providing for a postal telegraph and telephone system. The bill makes it the duty of the postoffice department to place a telegraph instrument or a telephone in every one of the 79,000 postoffices in America, and to reduce the rates on messages so that the receipts will be just sufficient to cover the cost of maintaining the system. In a carefully prepared argument Senator Butler showed that it was unconstitutional of the government to allow a private monopoly to use electricity, which was heaven's gift to humanity for speeding information with lightning rapidity, as it was now doing to the detriment of the postal service of the country. He also showed that the postoffice department could place a telegraph instrument and telephone in every postoffice in America and at the same time reduce the charge for messages more than one-half of the present charge and yet receive enough revenue to maintain this vast system, giving the people at every postoffice the great benefit of rapid communication by electricity. He showed that the present telegraph monopoly was making more money out of the people and giving the public a poorer service than any other monopoly on the face of the globe. Unless somebody in congress can answer his arguments congress will be forced to pass his bill or confess that they are on the side of monopoly and against the people.

and the fifty thousand dollars by Senator Butler will furnish sufficient fund to make the experiment, and without doubt establish this much desired system demanded by the Grange and Farmers Alliance, and farmers of this country will appreciate the efforts of those who brought it about.

TO LIMIT THE VETO POWER.  
The third measure proposed by Senator Butler is equally, if not more important than the others. Its aim is to limit the veto power of the President. It proposes an amendment to the Constitution providing that a majority of congress instead of two-thirds, as now, shall be sufficient to pass any measure over the veto of the President. In presenting this amendment Senator Butler said:

"This veto power is one provision where the constitution, we might say, is defective. It is a relic of monarchy. When our forefathers framed the constitution they lacked just this much of being waned from English ideas. They could not foresee the tremendous patronage that would go into the hands of the President in addition to this veto power. They could not foresee, and did not intend, that this veto power should be used to kill any bill that the President did not himself like. In fact, the veto power was intended to be used very sparingly, and we have the testimony of a number of the framers of the constitution to that effect. It is an English idea, but in England the crown today does not dare veto a bill passed by parliament. It has fallen into disuse in a kingdom, but in this republic flourishes and is used more frequently each year. The people elect their representatives for both houses of congress directed to enact the will of the people into law, yet one man, not even a legislator, has the monstrous authority and power to nullify any act of congress. A bill is passed after the most careful and deliberate consideration by the representatives of the people, yet it can be vetoed and nullified by the stroke of a pen in the hand of one man. This is a dangerous power. When we consider today the tremendous patronage the President has with which he can influence legislation, in addition to the veto power to kill what is passed, it makes him almost an autocrat. It gives him more power than any crowned head of England or we might say than any monarch in Europe. We saw here in the last congress how this power and the patronage of the President were used to change the opinion of congress and to defeat the will of the people. We saw in the same congress how the veto power was used to strike down a bill that was passed by congress to coin the seigniorage. Nearly every administration since the civil war has used the veto power and the patronage of the government in the same way. This abuse and danger grows greater each year."

Last week Senator Butler introduced a bill providing for a postal telegraph and telephone system. The bill makes it the duty of the postoffice department to place a telegraph instrument or a telephone in every one of the 79,000 postoffices in America, and to reduce the rates on messages so that the receipts will be just sufficient to cover the cost of maintaining the system. In a carefully prepared argument Senator Butler showed that it was unconstitutional of the government to allow a private monopoly to use electricity, which was heaven's gift to humanity for speeding information with lightning rapidity, as it was now doing to the detriment of the postal service of the country. He also showed that the postoffice department could place a telegraph instrument and telephone in every postoffice in America and at the same time reduce the charge for messages more than one-half of the present charge and yet receive enough revenue to maintain this vast system, giving the people at every postoffice the great benefit of rapid communication by electricity. He showed that the present telegraph monopoly was making more money out of the people and giving the public a poorer service than any other monopoly on the face of the globe. Unless somebody in congress can answer his arguments congress will be forced to pass his bill or confess that they are on the side of monopoly and against the people.

Since the recent decision of the supreme court declaring an income tax unconstitutional it is necessary to pass a constitutional amendment to wipe out this infamous decision of the supreme court. Senator Butler has introduced such an amendment. In support of it he has shown that the present method of taxation is unjust in that it raises all of the taxes by a method that is practically equal to a poll tax; that is, by a method that taxes the poorest almost as much as the richest. He showed that every state in the union, in order to equalize taxation, not only has a poll tax, but also a property tax in order that the wealth in each state may bear its just proportion of the burdens of the government. Therefore, the general government to equalize taxation must also have a system of property taxation or a system of income taxes, so that the rich who get so much larger protection from the government for their property shall pay their just share, so as to lift some of the heavy burdens from the poor and from the productive industries of the country. Senator Butler maintained that the two greatest and most vital questions in any government are: 1st: to have a just and equitable monetary system; 2d: to have a just and equitable system of taxation; and that therefore no people could be prosperous or happy, and that no government could rest on a solid foundation unless the great questions of finance and taxation were based on just and equitable principles. A larger volume of money, and an income tax are absolutely necessary to correct some of the evils from which the body politic now suffers, and to restore to the country a fair degree of prosperity.

Deliverance will never come until you stop delivering ballots for the old parties. Stop it immediately.

## DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.

### It Proclaims Populist Principles, Then Sends Delegates to Grover's National Convention.

### The democratic state convention—that is that part of the democratic party in the state of Nebraska which believes in free silver and follows Mr. Bryan—met in Funke's opera house in Lincoln, April 22, and adopted a platform declaring free silver coinage at 16 to 1 to be the issue in the national campaign and giving it unqualified indorsement; indorsing tariff for revenue only, the income tax, direct voting for senators, liberal pensions, initiative and referendum and religious liberty; condemning secret political organizations based on religious prejudices, but opposing diversion of public funds to sectarian purposes. In the evening Gov. Stone of Missouri made a straight populist speech which seemed to please the large audience immensely.

The following persons were selected as delegates to the Chicago national convention: William J. Bryan, Lincoln; C. J. Smyth, Omaha; W. H. Thompson, Grand Island; W. D. Oldham, Kearney; Frank J. Morgan, Cass county; C. S. Jones, Lancaster; John A. Creighton, Douglas; Charles H. Brown, Douglas; C. Hollenbeck, Dodge; G. A. Luikhart, Madison; C. J. Bowby, Saline; Ed. C. Biggs, Seward; D. Walsh, Red Willow; F. A. Thompson, Clay; Dr. A. T. Blackburn, Holt; J. C. Dahman, Dawes.

These democrats adopted a populist platform, as far as it went, then proceeded to make populist speeches, and then sent delegates to a national convention of a party run by Grover Cleveland, Carlisle, Brice, Gorman and Wall et al., all of which was a very strange performance.

Shall we Discuss Tariff?  
BENTON, Neb., April 14, 1896.

EDITOR INDEPENDENT—Yours of April 1, was received some time since. As my business is farming and my time fully occupied to keep both ends somewhere near together (they get farther apart in spite of all I can do) is my excuse for not answering sooner. I do not know but what I am better pleased that you did not publish my article than if you had done so. My object in writing it was not self-aggrandizement I assure you. I do think though that we have got to discuss the tariff. I know scores of people who are as silly as the man who contends he is not sick until he lays down and dies, we must get them to realize that they are sick or they will take their tariff until the country is as dead as that old door nail we have always heard about. Yours for better government,  
GEO. WATKINS.

German Populist Papers.  
WOODLAWN, April 15, 1896.

EDITOR INDEPENDENT—In answer to your inquiry about German reform papers I have to say that there are only a few of these papers in this country. Die Arbeiter Zeitung (Labor Gazette) of Chicago is a daily and gives out an eight page weekly, Der Vorbote (The Fore Runner). This is a good reform paper but socialist. Der National Reform of Milwaukee is the only real German populist paper that I know. It is a weekly of four pages well edited by Robert Schilling the well known German populist. There is another paper, Der Arme Teufel (The Poor Devil). I am not sure but I think it comes from Milwaukee too. As I am not a subscriber to this paper I can only judge from a few articles which the Vor Bote copied and those articles are a credit to the paper. Nebraska has no real German Reform paper.

The price of "Vorbote" and the National Reform is \$2 for each.  
FRED SCHWERZER.

A Happy Wedding.

Mr. F. L. Mary of the governor's office and Miss Margaret Conway were united in marriage April 22nd in the St. Theresa Pro-Cathedral. Both of the young people are widely and favorably known in this city. In consequence a very large number of prominent citizens of Lincoln and the state were present, among whom were Gov. Holcomb, Private Secretary Marrett, Adjutant General Barry, Superintendent Abbott, J. A. Edgerton, F. D. Eager and a large number of other prominent citizens and friends of the bride and groom.

The Independent and Free Silver.  
CENTRAL CITY, NEB., April 11, '96.

Your correspondent rolled into this little city on the Platte yesterday afternoon on one of the U. P.'s elegantly equipped trains. Central City, the capitol and metropolis of Merrick county, presented a very busy appearance today, her business men of all classes seemed to be quite busy looking after their customers who were numerous on this particular occasion. The free silver idea, together with the NEBRASKA INDEPENDENT, are each gaining friends in Merrick county, and the time is coming, and not far distant, when the laboring masses will join hands without regard to previous political affiliations for an equality before the law of the white metal with the yellow.  
J. M. D.

It Grows all the Time.  
CHESTER, PENN., April 2, 1896.

The Merchants and Business Men's Association of this city at its meeting tonight adopted a set of resolutions indorsing the free coinage of silver as the only means to bring the country out of the business depression now prevalent. The matter was brought up by the receipt of a Boston Merchants Association resolution indorsing a single gold standard and requesting action on the question.