

The Nebraska Independent

Wealth Makers and Lincoln Independent Consolidated.

VOL. X.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1898.

NO. 32.

THREE BIG KICKERS

The Editor of the Independent gets Hot Under the Collar and Talks Back.

A STAY-AT-HOME'S EXCUSE

A Set of Men Who Think that all Who Disagree with Them are Traitors and Thieves.

Kenesaw "Wares"

The following communications and one other of the same character have turned up in the volume of correspondence that has poured in on the editor of the INDEPENDENT in the last few weeks. They are the only ones of that kind that have been received. The first one was accompanied by the following prefatory note:

"The enclosed communication is not written in malice, but is a view of the situation just as it is. We claim the right to be heard, and in order to awaken public interest, we sincerely ask you to kindly publish the enclosed communication. It is apparent that something must be done in order that a union of action may result among populists."

Cosad, Neb., Dec. 13, 1898.

Editor Independent:

"In your issue of December 1st, I read much of criticism of the stay-at-home populists during the recent election. As no one seems to have the courage to defend this element, I will at least defend myself, for I am one of the stay-at-home populists. There are just about 20,000 populists in this state who cannot, for the life of them, see how they can success fully stand on the party platforms at the same time and elect men to office in this party who can be a unit on all three declarations, especially when it comes to the state and national legislatures. If we are candid, sensible men, we must admit that in order to secure enactment into law of the principles enunciated in the populist platform, the legislative department of the state and nation must be a unit in favor of these demands. This can never be under the present fusion regime, for the representative of each organization deems himself bound by the platform of his own party, thus making non-representative every voter in either party who casts his ballot for his election."

"You claim in your article in the same issue stated above entitled, 'Some Plain Talk,' that every pop should be bound by the majority. Just so, but this does not justify the minority in obeying a command simply because it is declared by the majority. The article is very well taken and the result of the election in all the populist states that the minority just concluded to let the majority have their own way at the polls as they had in the fusion convention. Of course now they are kicking the minority because they refused to dance to the music of the majority. It is a fact well known to thousands of populists that the fusion deal was agreed upon for the purpose of killing the populist party. It is also a fact well known to thousands of populists that the fusion deal was agreed upon for the purpose of killing the populist party. It is also a fact that populism has steadily lost from that day to this. If you will put these facts in your hat and think soberly upon them, you will soon discover that the minority has some rights which the majority is bound to respect."

H. W. RAYNE.

"That letter is of the same character of all the others which we have been receiving on that subject. It is based upon the unsupported charge that the men with whom he disagrees are traitors and scoundrels while he, the writer, is holy and righteous. 'It is a fact well known to thousands that the fusion deal was agreed upon for the purpose of killing the populist party.' Who knows it? Where is the evidence that a majority of the populist party are tools of the money power and are trying to destroy the party—that they actually planned to destroy it? Where are those thousands of cowardly populists who have this evidence and have never given it to the public? According to this showing they are a pretty set of cowards. This writer knows something about the nomination of Bryan as our candidate. He was right in the councils of the party when it was done. It is an insult to common decency to charge that they, while acting as populists betrayed their trust and attempted to destroy the populist party. The men who were prominent in doing this had sacrificed more to build up the party than any others. They believed that if they nominated another candidate, that nine-tenths of the populists, especially in Nebraska, would vote for Bryan anyhow and that the party would be left without enough votes to get on the ticket next time. Where would the party have been then? Destroyed. If they had not done what they did under the conditions as they understood them, they would have deserved the condem-

nation of every honest man. A man may believe that they did not act wisely but when he descends to the level of accusing the majority of the populist party of such crimes as this, he puts himself outside of the pale of decent discussion. As far as this writer is concerned, he sincerely hopes that those men who believe that if they are in the minority—that if their policies are not approved by the larger part of the party—they should stay at home and not vote or should vote for a gold bug—will themselves, be honorable enough to go and herd by themselves and forever stop claiming that they are populists. Populists believe that the majority should rule. If you don't believe it get out, but when you get out, don't think that you can make the people believe that you alone are honest and all who differ with you are scoundrels.

Another of these letters comes from Kenesaw, and it also has a prefatory note as follows:

"I have heard it hinted that you would not print any letter that did not have fusion for the demo-pops and had words for everything else in it, so we will try you and see if you will publish my letter. Please correct mistakes and oblige—J. H. Hollenbeck."

Kenesaw, Neb., Dec. 12, 1898.

Editor Independent:

"I read with some surprise an article in a recent issue of your paper, written by brother Nelson of this place in which he points out what he thinks is the reason why the pops failed in their attempt to send W. V. Allen back to the senate. Well, we think that he failed to state the truth, (not that brother Nelson is not honest but looks through colored glasses.) The laboring man is confronted with a conundrum something like this: If I vote for the free coinage of silver and an increase of money, these pops say that it will raise the price of everything about a half and I am only getting a dollar and fifty cents now and it is all I can do to provide for my family and if everything else goes up, what will I then do? My wages will not be raised, for the boss told me that he was having a hard time to dispose of his wares as everybody was stocked by, and my neighbor just across the way is already offering to take my place at less pay. Besides there is a machine that has just been put on the market that does the work of several men and can be handled by a boy and I guess that I will vote to leave the prison as they are and I just read in the paper that there was a great army of unemployed already. Now brother Nelson when you explain this to your neighbor across the fence probably he will be more apt to listen to your argument. Well you may say that railroads and taxes will be the same (but we have no assurance that they will) and I answer that the laboring man is not paying very much direct tax at present, neither is he riding on the railroads to winter resorts. You offer nothing to the day laborer except catch-as-catch-can and we all realize what that means. I verily believe that if brother Nelson had a \$1,000 to spend for labor he would make it go as far as any other fellow, (if he did not, the other fellow would sell his wares cheaper and the good brother would be left stranded.)

The man who wrote that letter is not a populist at all and has no right to put his finger in this pie. That is the talk of a socialist. The populist party was the first one in this country to demand the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. If a man does not believe in that, he is not a pop at all. If a man is so ignorant as to believe that because he works for wages that he does not pay taxes or railroad freight charges, it is very doubtful whether he has sense enough to ever become a pop. When he buys a sack of flour that has been shipped from Minneapolis to Kenesaw, who does he suppose pays the freight? A man known to have such views as this writer could not be a member of any labor organization in this country, much less a pop club. Every branch of organized labor in this country has demanded the free coinage of silver and the Federation of labor now in session at Kansas City has just reiterated that demand. A man who does not know that the doubling of the price of farm products would result in the immediate improvement of farms—the building of thousands of new houses and barns and that that demand for labor would of necessity result in first employing the unemployed, and second in the increase of wages, is not fit to provide for a family.

Mr. Hollenbeck is unfortunate in one of his illustrations. The people of this state do not know that there is a manufactory of any kind of "wares" at Kenesaw, or that there is a "boss" out there who is manufacturing "wares," that he has a hard time selling them, or that a machine has been invented to be run by a boy that will take the place of some of his hired men. All that is unknown to the people who read the INDEPENDENT. Now there are some pops who are just mean enough to insinuate that that part of the letter was taken from some of the socialist tracts that the gold bugs distributed over the state just before the last election. There are some mighty mean men who are pops and therefore Mr. Hollenbeck should have been more specific and given names in-

stead of making this general statement. The third letter is so abusive that it is not fit to print. In the mind of the writer of that letter, every man who has differed with him in regard to the policy that the party has followed in the past is a "traitor," a "bribe taker," or has "been doing his best to destroy the party." A man who will write in that style is not fit for association with decent men, and most certainly such language will not be sent out to the families who read the INDEPENDENT.

NEVILLE ANSWERS

He insists That it was all the Fault of the Populist Legislature.

North Platte, Dec. 22, 1898.

Editor Independent:

In the publication of my letter last week you omitted the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Twenty-ninth senatorial districts, which together with the Thirtieth and the four legislative districts in the letter named would give Senator Allen the same majority he had in '92.

In your criticism of the letter you ask "how I would get around section 2 of article 3 of the constitution?" And to be plain spoken I would not get around it by violating it, as was twice done to prevent western Nebraska from getting a fair representation. We do not seek to violate the constitution, but to have its mandatory provisions complied with. That section provided for an enumeration of the inhabitants in 1895 as a basis for representation, but it was not had. That section commanded a reapportionment after the federal census of 1890, but that was disregarded, and now the rule of construction is advanced that a right guaranteed by the highest law in the land may be obliterated by a violation of the law in refusal of that RIGHT. Queer way to pay an obligation. It is not giving the framers of our constitution credit for very good intentions to say that they conceded certain rights due the inhabitants, yet provided if they did not take them at a particular moment they should not have them at all! Would it not be more consistent to say they believed the right of reapportionment would be given as commanded by the constitution and that the inhibition contained in the section was intended to prevent its again being regulated until another census showed a new right; or in other words, that it was to prevent two apportionments upon one census.

It is quite republican, you know, to get hold of something which does not belong to us, and then hunt for a construction of law which will enable us to keep it. I notice you say in your criticism that had we passed such a law in '97, the supreme court would have refused to execute it. If so western Nebraska would ensure the supreme court instead of the legislature. But we do not believe the supreme court would make such a decision. The constitution is intended to secure rights, not to prevent them. Does it count for nothing that Judge Samuel Maxwell said in '97 that it was lawful then to redistrict. In fact in answer to a question, he wrote an opinion covering the whole ground. Yet the legislature turned a deaf ear, and defeated the bill. I then told our brethren in the east em, it would be difficult to elect members out here this fall. Again last fall I told the populist state committee at the Jacksonian club rooms in Omaha that our candidates ought to have help; that having ten to fifteen counties to canvass the burden was too great and the voters not enthusiastic. Now, Mr. Editor, my object is to find the cause and apply a remedy. If some one will give a cause for the stay-at-home vote other than what I have given, and explain why it operated in the west end and not in the east, I will be glad to help remedy it.

WM. NEVILLE

The constitution provides for an enumeration and then says, "At no other time." It seems to the editor of the Independent that those words are pretty hard to get around. It has always been his understanding that when Judge Maxwell was asked for an opinion that he decided the other way from that stated by Judge Neville. However that may be, the thing is past remedy now. There could be no motive for a populist legislature to refuse to reapportion the state if it thought it had the right to do so, unless Judge Neville means to charge them with treason to the best interests of the party, and he certainly does not wish to do that. The thing for us to do now is to get to work and raise a campaign fund sufficient to enable us to give help in every part of the state where it is needed. It will be remembered that several weeks ago the Independent called attention to the fact that the only reason that it was possible to defeat Senator Allen when there was cast for his party a majority of nearly three thousand votes was because the legislature had refused to apportion the state as required by the constitution. That is a fact, further this deponent says so.

NOT MEN, BUT THINGS

Wather Snyder Gives His Idea of Ancient and Modern Civilizations—Rome and America

HISTORY SOUNDS AN ALARM

The Alliance Gave More Attention to Profit Than to Righteous Government.

Bread and the Theatre.

Such was Rome in the Caesarian period of Rome's history. Appetite satisfied, amusement secured and the stupid multitude was satisfied—contented. With human form and heart of beast, they were the danger element of Rome. But Rome in its beginning was not such. Deeply religious, patriotic to the last drop of blood, honorable in all relations to a brother Roman, co-operators to the last man in the nation, justice to all, safety to all, and every man intelligent in all matters of state, they make a grand picture on the lone of historical drama. No one was rich, all farms were small—the senator and the plebeian alike cultivated each his own farm. Every Roman was a valuable integer in the state—a good soldier and safe citizen. Growth was natural under such circumstances—was to be expected indeed. And that growth was powerful in vitality—durade vi—al—as grows the oak or cedar so grew the Rome of an earlier date. The fact that all Italy was all cut up into small states favored her development, but was not the cause of it. And one of these states had just as good a chance as the city on the Tiber, but naught else in Italy did it. A Regulus and Horatio were products of this planting. It shows Carlist's idea of history being philosophy speaking by example. Mark well the fact that they never mocked or dishonored their gods. True to what they knew, they were HONEST IN THEIR WORSHIP.

That constitutional defect was there is true. That senate was a privileged class—a nest egg of mischief and ruin in the future, but harmless until hatched and grown. It took hundreds of years to reveal its full power for mischief. But it came at last, and here is a herd of voting cattle—satisfied with bread and the theater. A coliseum there was, but I chabod was written over the entrance. Stone and mortar, gold and silver, art and learning, numbers and territory, but alas! manhood was gone. Rank was there, but QUALITY was gone—a huge pile of rottenness only remained. Religion a mockery, the gold insulter or laughed at, the finest of hypocrite and patron, the soldier was all that was left, the last to perish, but no longer of primitive mold—only a mercenary, and expert robber according to rule.

Every true student will begin to study this at the point where Rome first appears. If wise he will follow that history until the Goth appears. Every honest patriot and statesman will do all that man can do to keep all such ruinous elements out of our national policy, national forms of thought and actions.

That these United States at this moment need this lesson emphasized, is only too apparent to be doubted or denied. What does Mark Hanna want with so many millions if there is nothing to buy? Ah, that is the whirlpool, the cesspool, the Stygian pool, anything you please, that threatens our ship of state. There is no safety, there can never be any safety where votes and courts can be controlled by money. An alarmist, am I? Well, then all human history is an alarmist. That fact at least secures the respectability of my position. Nay, my brother, the demand of the hour is for men. Simple money-getters, cowards, self-centered bipeds, bribe-givers and bribe-takers, mediocrity with the ballot box and an honest count are not men. They are things, dangerous things, at that. More dangerous than the tiger of the jungle. A hyena only eats dead men, but these voting brutes devour the living. It was the fatal mistake of the Alliance to fall on the moral line. They gave prominence to profit. Their position was correct so far, and their cause was just. But nothing that leaves the moral and religious in abeyance has ever had a strong and enduring vitality. The wickedness of corporations—the immoral and "hell born" money-monopoly ought to have been the key note. Alliance work ought to have been a Christ-born work, and every Alliance man the soul of honor. But profit led the way and the Alliance fell into the ditch. Is it too late to rally? I am not able to answer. Can any body tell? Sure it is the hour has struck when bread and theater are the balance of power. This class can never decide any election. The United States did not need seven hundred years to teach that. Can the moral, the conscience, the religious forces be called, and if they are called, will they answer?

If the true men in all parties could be brought together into one combination, it does seem that we might be saved. But trading for office, or for profit can never save us. Every vote from constable to president ought to be a moral, conscientious, patriotic, and a Christian act. My hope is not dead, perhaps not even sick; may be only a touch of ague. If my country lifts half the world into a nobler, grander, higher life as a result of the war with Spain, my chilly symptoms would disappear instantly.

M. SNYDER.

REWARDED.

It makes no difference how vile a wretch the republicans employ, the party gets around and rewards him. For instance, Ross Hammond attempted to buy his way into congress by trying to bribe W. A. Poynter to run as a snide populist candidate, and thereby divide the fusion force, and elect Hammond. He failed, but was appointed postmaster for the dirt he tried to do. The agent he used to do this dirty work was one Tom Cook, a scavenger in political cesspools, had to be rewarded according to republican tenets, and now he is appointed deputy internal revenue collector for the island of Porto Rico. If McKinley's appointments are all in keeping with the above, it is no wonder the Dingley bill cannot furnish enough revenue.—Fremont Leader.

INSTEAD OF.

Instead of electing men to make laws for them, let the people make laws for themselves. Instead of electing men to govern them, let the people govern themselves. Instead of placing power in the hands of a few legislators, let the people keep the power in their own hands. Make this a government of the people, by the people and for the people, instead of a government of the people by irresponsible legislators, for the benefit of whoever can raise the largest corruption fund.—R. S. Thompson.

GOVERNMENT LOANS

A Man Who can Make an Argument Without Calling His Opponent a Traitor.

The following correspondence is published with the greatest pleasure. Here is one man who can differ with another without calling his opponent a "traitor" or declaring that he is determined to "destroy the populist party."

I read with much interest your editorial entitled, "Interest" in the Independent of December 1st, 1898. I think that you are exactly right in all but one point, and that point is the proposed remedy that the government should establish loaning banks and loan money at 2 or 3 per cent to all who wanted it and we could give security. You say that it would be "unjust," and the scheme advocated would give "advantage" to those who had property, because the poor who could not give security could not get a loan. And you say there is only one way to decrease the tribute to the money loaners, and that is to double the volume of money in circulation.

All right. But I want to ask you, could the government supply the demand for loans that would be asked on security without more than doubling the money volume by issuing greenbacks or legal tender notes? And wouldn't the money come sooner into circulation through such banks than it would if doubled without the loaning banks? According to the increase in circulation of money the price of produce and wages would go up. How would the poor be more benefited without these banks by waiting longer for the raising of wages? Those burdened with indebtedness would be deprived of a low rate of interest for a long time because the bankers would try to keep up the interest as long as they could. Those active and saving among the poor, after wages are raised will soon have some security and share the benefit of a cheap use of money. Those who are spendthrifts, careless or lazy, will always be in want. If you would give them a fortune, they would spend it and stay poor.

A. G. HALLBERG.

Plum Valley, Knox County, Neb

There are a great many more difficulties connected with government loans than were enumerated in the short editorial referred to by Mr. Hallberg. One of them is this: When is the loaning business to stop? If loans are to be made on property at half its valuation, by the time a few hundred million have been thus put in circulation, the value of the property would be doubled and another loan on the same property could be obtained. As the loans would increase the value of money would decrease, or what is the same thing, prices would continue to raise. Evidently the government could not go on for any length of time in that way. If it did, financial anarchy would ensue. Money would become valueless. We would come to a condition far worse than the gold standard. Mr. Hallberg will see that there must be a limit to the issue of money. Loaning to all who apply and furnish security does not put a limit to it. Like Teaspoon's brook it will go on forever. There could be no dif-

culty in getting a new issue of money in circulation. Let the government buy the telegraph system. That would put a lot of money in circulation. A purchase of the railroad system would put a lot more in circulation. Building a navy would send out a lot more. So would improving rivers and harbors. There could be no trouble on that account.

SEVERE CRITICISM

Has Who will Prove That Much of it is not Justly Deserved—A Pointer for Foynter.

Editor Independent:

Since election we have read in the reform fusion papers several articles by different correspondents in regard to the shrinkage of the fusion vote. Each man has a different reason and a different remedy except that they all agree that it was the stay at home that caused a lack of votes to elect Senator Allen which we think was caused by a combination of circumstances of which we will name two. One was that Bryan's bugle was not heard in this campaign that in the last two campaigns seemed to fill the atmosphere with enthusiasm from shore to shore. We do not under-estimate the great effort that was made by some of our great loyal men to defeat the indifferent to the danger of abuse, but their speeches were not published in the daily press and read and discussed by friend and foe until they became so aroused they could not forget the day of election and their prejudices that had been created by the selfishness of some of their own party. Another cause was the great triumph of the fusion election in Nebraska in 1896 that made some of our officers that were elected drunk with success. Instead of carrying out the reforms they advocated before election, they looked upon their certificate of election instead of being an office of public trust as a license for their own aggrandizement, and economy did not commence until it got beyond the shadow of their own door yard. Men that had denounced publicly and privately the monies used by corporations to carry elections and control previous legislatures became as docile as a hypnotized subject in the hands of a manipulator. In this stupid condition they remained until the middle of the session. They would meet on Saturday and call the roll and adjourn until the next Monday in the afternoon. They would again call the roll and adjourn until the next day. Thus one-third of the time and one-half of the session was passed and nothing done except to introduce bills and fill the state house with useless help, pensioned on the state and ride home Saturdays and back Mondays on the free passes until the public press and an indignant public opinion called a halt.

They then found the calendar filled with bills until it was like a stream dammed with floating ice, then a sifting committee was appointed who assorted out a few meritorious bills that were supposed a reform legislature would pass without delay, but there were enough frauds elected under the name of reform who joined with the republican party to defeat nearly all the bills that touched corporation interests, or would reduce state expenses. Among these were the anti-pass bills that were expected to be one of the first bills passed, but the free pass fixers had filled the pockets of the most of these reformers with the same withering curse that paralyzed every previous legislature and made them like a ball of putty to be moulded to suit their will. And not withstanding a warning was sounded through the reform press of the state that these free pass subjects must not be re-nominated there were more of them re-nominated than there were men that had tried to fulfill their promises to their constituents. The result is the defeat of the best senator that ever represented Nebraska in the United States senate.

Who is to blame? The voter who stayed at home or the influence which caused such a result. It is now said that some of these men who have been proud loons from the party are the most persistent applicants for positions at the disposal of the governor elect. We say to the governor, if you have any respect for the opinion of your friends, don't do it. Your party is not now in a humor to be imposed upon by the appointment of such men. There are some who say that the republican legislature will pass some of these reformed laws which the fusion legislature refused to pass, and thereby deprive them of some of the glory that they might have had. We would say to all such, don't worry, the republican party is not built that way. There was a time when there was an anti-monopoly element in the republican party of Nebraska, but there is none now. They are a corporation party pure and simple. You might as well expect a calf to try to stop the flow of milk it nurses from its mother as to expect the republicans to pass a law that would stop the flow of boodle from the corporations and trusts that live out of the spoils of its victims without any regard for the misery they create.

M. B. REYNOLDS.

Talmage, Neb.

A FINANCIAL PROBLEM.

Here is an arithmetical problem that is going the rounds: A is indebted to B \$5. B to C, C to D, D to E, E to F, same amount. A, B, C, D and E each have \$1 and so more, and consequently they cannot pay their debt. They put their money all together. A takes the \$5, goes to B, pays his debt and gets his receipt. B does the same to C, C to D, D to E and E to F. A, B, C, D and E are out of debt and F has his money. Who, if any one, is the loser?