

The Nebraska Independent
Lincoln, Nebraska

PRESSE BLDG. CORNER 15TH AND N STS

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

\$1.00 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE

When making remittances do not leave money with news agencies, postmasters, etc. to be forwarded by them. They frequently forget or remit a different amount than was left with them, and the subscriber fails to get proper credit. Address all communications, and make all drafts money orders, etc. payable to The Nebraska Independent, Lincoln, Neb.

Anonymous communications will not be noticed. Rejected manuscripts will not be returned.

The Hill crowd couldn't answer Bryan's arguments, but they could hiss and kick his picture.

The tariff on wool is 10 cents a pound, and wool sells for 8 cents. Does the foreigner still pay the tax?

Bartley says he will stay in Lincoln. Lincoln always was a much more healthy place for embezzlers than Holt county.

The latest news is to the effect that the Bryan democrats of Ohio are going right ahead to put a third ticket in the field.

The populist governor would neither parole nor pardon Bartley, although there was \$25,000 ready cash, but the republican governor did.

The Wayne Republican doesn't think that "Bolin, bull fights and Bartley reads right." But that is what is written in the books and it cannot be erased.

A magazine writer says that the great dailies "express life in all the phases and tendencies of the race." If that is true, may the Lord have mercy on the race.

The parole of the Younger brothers does not mean a mitigation of their sentence by any means. They are compelled to reside in Minnesota while their lives last.

The governor of Nebraska has officially endorsed the Omaha bull fights by honoring one of those affairs with his presence, accompanied by his staff. —Sioux Falls Press.

Last year it was said and often repeated that if the republican ticket was elected, Bartley would be turned loose and time has proven the assertion true.—Stanton Register.

The people of Nebraska can now sympathize with McKinley's governor of Guam and appreciate the difficulties that he met when he undertook to make the natives wear clothes.

Who paid for the railroad tickets that Clem Deaver distributed all over the state during the last campaign? There are some other fellows who could tell things beside Bartley.

The way to a snug fortune accumulated in a few years is embezzlement. That beats speculation on the board of trade ten to one. It is a sure thing as long as the "redeemers" remain in power.

A Lincoln gentleman wants to know why The Independent does not ask the Blair Pilot how much it got for publishing that article demanding the pardon of Bartley. It wouldn't do any good if it did. The Blair Pilot would not tell.

The populist state committee will meet at the Grand hotel in Lincoln, August 7, at 1 p. m. If the weather is so that men can travel there will be a full attendance. The future of the populist party never looked so bright as it does at the present time.

The preachers look on the excessive heat and drought with a great deal of complacency. They say that it is the first time that they have ever been able to get the republicans to pray. Now the governor leads off and all the rest will follow.

The editor of The Independent, as everybody knows, has been growing younger and bolder for the last five years, but when the thermometer persisted in registering from 100 to 105 degrees for over a month all over the country, he gave up the idea of ever becoming sanctified.

A great deal of vituperation is directed at Clem Deaver, but what about Wharton Barker? One was no worse than the other. Had it not been for that old fraud, the populists would have had a strong organization in Pennsylvania today, and around it the people could have rallied in fighting Quay. That is just what Wharton Barker didn't want.

THE STEEL TRUST

The plan that the Morgan "steel" trust thieves have adopted to enable them to pay dividends on stock watered six hundred per cent, shows that the American citizen pays the tax this time without any show of concealment. It costs nearly \$12 a ton to carry American steel billets to a British port and thence by rail to an inland British city.

The United States Steel corporation is now, according to London advices, delivering them to British buyers in the Black Country, back of Birmingham, paying all freight charges, at \$25 per ton, \$3 per ton less than the lowest market price for British-made billets.

The price charged by the United States Steel corporation for its billets to American buyers at Pittsburg is from \$24 to \$25 per ton. This proves conclusively that the Steel trust is making a profit of at least \$10 a ton on every ton of steel billets sold in this country over and above the profit which satisfies it on its sales in Great Britain—for of course the trust is not constantly seeking foreign trade at a loss. And still the Steel trust magnates are not ready to give up that \$7.84 per ton duty on foreign-made steel billets.

There is no possible way for any American citizen or subject to escape the payment of tribute to the steel trust, for every man, woman and child uses steel in some form. Every human being on the face of the earth that has advanced beyond the "stone age" uses steel. But it is the American citizen who has to pay ten dollars a ton extra on steel above a fair profit to the manufacturer. The rest of the world is exempt. They can all get their steel at a reasonable price. But the American citizen, because of the Dingley tariff, must contribute this tremendous amount to the trust. There never was a more outrageous robbery perpetrated on any people. The tergivers and silence of the whole press of the United States under such a condition of things is the most astonishing thing of all. The Independent will keep on publishing the facts as long as the postmaster-general sees fit to let it circulate through the mails.

When he issues his order excluding it, the editor will retire to his farm and wait until some of the mullet heads get an idea driven into their craniums and are willing to join with the pops in a demand for equal rights to all and special privileges—especially tariff privileges—to none.

It makes the anti perk up a good deal when they think of the railroad consolidations and the developments that may come as a result of them. The Union Pacific and Elkhorn interests are strongly anti-Thompson, while the Burlington furnished that statesman the strength that made him so formidable last winter. Some of the wise ones figure it out that the sale of the Burlington will cause that road to go out of politics, creating a political revolution in Iowa and Nebraska. It is safe to say that there is nothing more tangible than wishes and gossip behind these predictions, for nobody knows what the railroad policies are going to be when the new railroad maps are finally ready for distribution.

Both of these objections are without any foundation at all. The ownership of the railroads does not bankrupt the men who now own them. Why should they bankrupt a new owner? Every railroad now in the United States could be purchased by the government and instead of bankrupting the government or adding to taxation, it would reduce taxation. Government bonds could be issued for the whole amount and the interest on them, instead of being paid by taxation, would be paid by the freight and passenger tariffs. Those tariffs could probably be reduced one-half and they would pay the interest on the bonds and provide a sinking fund that would finally extinguish every bond in less than fifty years.

On the other hand, if the rates were left as they are now, instead of bankrupting the government it would provide a revenue sufficient to pay all necessary government expenses without any taxation at all. This argument that it would bankrupt the government falls to the ground under the very slightest examination.

The other objection that it would put in the hands of the party in office a power that could defy public opinion is equally as fallacious. The railroads are in politics much more under private ownership than it would be possible for them to be under public ownership. They control state and national legislation and to a very large extent the courts. They contribute millions to keep their party in power. They use intimidation, bribery and all the agencies that control legislation to the fullest extent now. Every railroad office is a political headquarters. They are able to defy public opinion now. Put them into the hands of the government and these evils would disappear.

There can be no argument invented that will stand the test of reason against the government ownership of the railroads—at least no such argument has so far ever been offered.

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

Both of these objections are without any foundation at all. The ownership of the railroads does not bankrupt the men who now own them. Why should they bankrupt a new owner? Every railroad now in the United States could be purchased by the government and instead of bankrupting the government or adding to taxation, it would reduce taxation. Government bonds could be issued for the whole amount and the interest on them, instead of being paid by taxation, would be paid by the freight and passenger tariffs. Those tariffs could probably be reduced one-half and they would pay the interest on the bonds and provide a sinking fund that would finally extinguish every bond in less than fifty years.

On the other hand, if the rates were left as they are now, instead of bankrupting the government it would provide a revenue sufficient to pay all necessary government expenses without any taxation at all. This argument that it would bankrupt the government falls to the ground under the very slightest examination.

The other objection that it would put in the hands of the party in office a power that could defy public opinion is equally as fallacious. The railroads are in politics much more under private ownership than it would be possible for them to be under public ownership. They control state and national legislation and to a very large extent the courts. They contribute millions to keep their party in power. They use intimidation, bribery and all the agencies that control legislation to the fullest extent now. Every railroad office is a political headquarters. They are able to defy public opinion now. Put them into the hands of the government and these evils would disappear.

There can be no argument invented that will stand the test of reason against the government ownership of the railroads—at least no such argument has so far ever been offered.

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

Both of these objections are without any foundation at all. The ownership of the railroads does not bankrupt the men who now own them. Why should they bankrupt a new owner? Every railroad now in the United States could be purchased by the government and instead of bankrupting the government or adding to taxation, it would reduce taxation. Government bonds could be issued for the whole amount and the interest on them, instead of being paid by taxation, would be paid by the freight and passenger tariffs. Those tariffs could probably be reduced one-half and they would pay the interest on the bonds and provide a sinking fund that would finally extinguish every bond in less than fifty years.

On the other hand, if the rates were left as they are now, instead of bankrupting the government it would provide a revenue sufficient to pay all necessary government expenses without any taxation at all. This argument that it would bankrupt the government falls to the ground under the very slightest examination.

IS HE SHELVED?

The Hill crowd are not so happy as they were some days ago, especially that part of them who edit republican newspapers. A new light has dawned upon their benighted minds. Here is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the most wildly insane of the Hill boomers in the republican ranks, which, after a day or two of reflection, commented as follows:

"At any large democratic convention in this country the entrance of Bryan would stampede the whole assemblage. Through two campaigns he was celebrated as 'the peerless leader' by many who now propose to turn their backs on him. His name always brought a shout and his presence a crowd. Has he really been shelved?"

Shelved? The question is provocative of smiles. In the ten years that Bryan has been before the public he has always been firm, steadfast, wise and brilliant in the defense of a certain set of principles. He has more personal friends who would fight for him to the bitter end than any man who ever lived in these United States. He is young, full of life and vigor. He is animated by the very highest ideals. He is the same upright, honest man that he always was, a lover of his country and mankind. He bears no malice, but is as full of fight as a bunch of wild cats. Shelved? It is not to be wondered at that the Globe-Democrat seems to have some doubts on that subject.

REPUBLICAN BANK DIRECTORS

Simply because Mr. Heath is secretary of the republican national committee is no reason why he should be held responsible for something for which he could not have been to blame.—Fremont Tribune.

Mr. Heath was a director in the Seventh National bank of New York. The directors of a bank have heretofore been supposed to be responsible for the management of the bank, and when it violated the law have always been held responsible. But it seems that banks having members of the republican national committee for directors are not responsible. They can induce confiding men to deposit with them millions of money for safe-keeping, then steal it or squander it in wild speculations on Wall street and "are not to blame." That is the republican idea, and the people generally would better make note of it. Look and see if any of the directors of a bank are republicans before you deposit money in it.

A MINORITY PARTY

Powerful minorities, even if small in numbers, have effected about all the reforms that ever were effected in this country. Minorities gave us all of the civil service that we have. It was a minority that secured the Granger legislation, that overthrew the reign of credit mobiler corruption, and, greatest of all, has secured an enormous increase in the volume of money. A minority will yet overthrow the iniquitous trust tariff system. Minorities are often the most potent factors in government. Intelligence is always in the minority, but in the end intelligence wins every time. The populist party has always been in the minority in the United States, but it has had greater effect upon legislation and public opinion than all other parties. It has given to municipal ownership of public utilities the standing that it has today. Because you belong to a minority party is no reason why you should be discouraged. What difference does it make to the farmer what party wins if he gets the kind of legislation that he wants. He gets it more frequently by casting his vote for the minority than he would by voting for the majority. What have the people of Pennsylvania obtained by voting in countless thousands for the majority party?

APOLOGIES BEGIN

As soon as the news from the Ohio convention was received The Independent remarked that those chaps would shortly begin to apologize. McLean's paper now says:

"The fact that Mr. Bryan's picture was not thrown down and no marching club walked on it. Some time toward the close of the proceedings Jim Newman of Miami county, who likes to have some fun, and is not averse to having his name in the papers, found a lithograph of Bryan and insecurely tacked it to a pole used for opening windows. He brought it to the press tables and tried to get recognition from the chair. That officer was busy and failed to see Major Newman, who thereupon announced to the reporters that he wanted to introduce a gentleman to the convention. Then he carefully deposited the pole against the railing between the press seats and the delegates' chairs. There it remained until it was lifted out of the way. No more attention was paid to the incident."

The Independent repeats that apologies will not be accepted. Honest Bryan democrats and populists don't want and will have nothing to do with that crowd. They won't vote the ticket. They will either stay at home election day or get up a ticket to suit themselves. The McLean crowd will be beaten by the biggest majority ever rolled up in Ohio. We are sorry for Kilbourne. He is a very decent sort of man, but he got in with the wrong crowd.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

Both of these objections are without any foundation at all. The ownership of the railroads does not bankrupt the men who now own them. Why should they bankrupt a new owner? Every railroad now in the United States could be purchased by the government and instead of bankrupting the government or adding to taxation, it would reduce taxation. Government bonds could be issued for the whole amount and the interest on them, instead of being paid by taxation, would be paid by the freight and passenger tariffs. Those tariffs could probably be reduced one-half and they would pay the interest on the bonds and provide a sinking fund that would finally extinguish every bond in less than fifty years.

On the other hand, if the rates were left as they are now, instead of bankrupting the government it would provide a revenue sufficient to pay all necessary government expenses without any taxation at all. This argument that it would bankrupt the government falls to the ground under the very slightest examination.

The other objection that it would put in the hands of the party in office a power that could defy public opinion is equally as fallacious. The railroads are in politics much more under private ownership than it would be possible for them to be under public ownership. They control state and national legislation and to a very large extent the courts. They contribute millions to keep their party in power. They use intimidation, bribery and all the agencies that control legislation to the fullest extent now. Every railroad office is a political headquarters. They are able to defy public opinion now. Put them into the hands of the government and these evils would disappear.

There can be no argument invented that will stand the test of reason against the government ownership of the railroads—at least no such argument has so far ever been offered.

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

IS HE SHELVED?

The Hill crowd are not so happy as they were some days ago, especially that part of them who edit republican newspapers. A new light has dawned upon their benighted minds. Here is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the most wildly insane of the Hill boomers in the republican ranks, which, after a day or two of reflection, commented as follows:

"At any large democratic convention in this country the entrance of Bryan would stampede the whole assemblage. Through two campaigns he was celebrated as 'the peerless leader' by many who now propose to turn their backs on him. His name always brought a shout and his presence a crowd. Has he really been shelved?"

Shelved? The question is provocative of smiles. In the ten years that Bryan has been before the public he has always been firm, steadfast, wise and brilliant in the defense of a certain set of principles. He has more personal friends who would fight for him to the bitter end than any man who ever lived in these United States. He is young, full of life and vigor. He is animated by the very highest ideals. He is the same upright, honest man that he always was, a lover of his country and mankind. He bears no malice, but is as full of fight as a bunch of wild cats. Shelved? It is not to be wondered at that the Globe-Democrat seems to have some doubts on that subject.

REPUBLICAN BANK DIRECTORS

Simply because Mr. Heath is secretary of the republican national committee is no reason why he should be held responsible for something for which he could not have been to blame.—Fremont Tribune.

Mr. Heath was a director in the Seventh National bank of New York. The directors of a bank have heretofore been supposed to be responsible for the management of the bank, and when it violated the law have always been held responsible. But it seems that banks having members of the republican national committee for directors are not responsible. They can induce confiding men to deposit with them millions of money for safe-keeping, then steal it or squander it in wild speculations on Wall street and "are not to blame." That is the republican idea, and the people generally would better make note of it. Look and see if any of the directors of a bank are republicans before you deposit money in it.

A MINORITY PARTY

Powerful minorities, even if small in numbers, have effected about all the reforms that ever were effected in this country. Minorities gave us all of the civil service that we have. It was a minority that secured the Granger legislation, that overthrew the reign of credit mobiler corruption, and, greatest of all, has secured an enormous increase in the volume of money. A minority will yet overthrow the iniquitous trust tariff system. Minorities are often the most potent factors in government. Intelligence is always in the minority, but in the end intelligence wins every time. The populist party has always been in the minority in the United States, but it has had greater effect upon legislation and public opinion than all other parties. It has given to municipal ownership of public utilities the standing that it has today. Because you belong to a minority party is no reason why you should be discouraged. What difference does it make to the farmer what party wins if he gets the kind of legislation that he wants. He gets it more frequently by casting his vote for the minority than he would by voting for the majority. What have the people of Pennsylvania obtained by voting in countless thousands for the majority party?

APOLOGIES BEGIN

As soon as the news from the Ohio convention was received The Independent remarked that those chaps would shortly begin to apologize. McLean's paper now says:

"The fact that Mr. Bryan's picture was not thrown down and no marching club walked on it. Some time toward the close of the proceedings Jim Newman of Miami county, who likes to have some fun, and is not averse to having his name in the papers, found a lithograph of Bryan and insecurely tacked it to a pole used for opening windows. He brought it to the press tables and tried to get recognition from the chair. That officer was busy and failed to see Major Newman, who thereupon announced to the reporters that he wanted to introduce a gentleman to the convention. Then he carefully deposited the pole against the railing between the press seats and the delegates' chairs. There it remained until it was lifted out of the way. No more attention was paid to the incident."

The Independent repeats that apologies will not be accepted. Honest Bryan democrats and populists don't want and will have nothing to do with that crowd. They won't vote the ticket. They will either stay at home election day or get up a ticket to suit themselves. The McLean crowd will be beaten by the biggest majority ever rolled up in Ohio. We are sorry for Kilbourne. He is a very decent sort of man, but he got in with the wrong crowd.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

Both of these objections are without any foundation at all. The ownership of the railroads does not bankrupt the men who now own them. Why should they bankrupt a new owner? Every railroad now in the United States could be purchased by the government and instead of bankrupting the government or adding to taxation, it would reduce taxation. Government bonds could be issued for the whole amount and the interest on them, instead of being paid by taxation, would be paid by the freight and passenger tariffs. Those tariffs could probably be reduced one-half and they would pay the interest on the bonds and provide a sinking fund that would finally extinguish every bond in less than fifty years.

On the other hand, if the rates were left as they are now, instead of bankrupting the government it would provide a revenue sufficient to pay all necessary government expenses without any taxation at all. This argument that it would bankrupt the government falls to the ground under the very slightest examination.

The other objection that it would put in the hands of the party in office a power that could defy public opinion is equally as fallacious. The railroads are in politics much more under private ownership than it would be possible for them to be under public ownership. They control state and national legislation and to a very large extent the courts. They contribute millions to keep their party in power. They use intimidation, bribery and all the agencies that control legislation to the fullest extent now. Every railroad office is a political headquarters. They are able to defy public opinion now. Put them into the hands of the government and these evils would disappear.

There can be no argument invented that will stand the test of reason against the government ownership of the railroads—at least no such argument has so far ever been offered.

There has never been but two arguments made against government ownership of the railroads. "To take them by paying for them would be bankruptcy. To have government manage them would put in the hands of any party in office a power that could overcome and defy public opinion."

FROM THE WAY THE EASTERN PAPERS

comment on Governor Savage's patronage of the Omaha bull fights, The Independent is led to think that they never heard that Nebraska had been redeemed.

Julia Ward Howe's battle hymn of the republic has been knocked into "smithereens" by the decision of the supreme court. When changed to read: "Let us die to make men subjects," there is no longer any rhyme or rhythm in it.

Rosewater promised Clem Deaver a place and he kept his promise. The other republicans were eager to accept of Deaver's treachery, but do not want to keep their promises. Rosewater is the better of the two, if there is any better in such disgusting business.

The republicans used to say that there were only two bad apples in the barrel—Moore and Bartley. Now that they have got their second wind they declare that there were no bad apples at all; that Bartley never should have been arrested. Look out for another crop of embezzlers.

Which do you think has the most to do in producing prosperity now, McKinley or good crops? Four years of good crops with an enormous output of gold produced prosperity, but the republicans all declared that it was McKinley who did it. Do they believe in that doctrine yet?

The populists who took the advice of The Independent to pay off old debts and make no new ones do not view the hot winds and drought with the despair that some other fellows do who imagined that we were sure to have good crops and prosperity as long as McKinley was president.

When the plutocrats at Washington started out to destroy the weekly press they said they must do it because of the deficit in the postal revenues. They now say it was to reduce letter postage to one cent. Who ever asked for one-cent letters? Was any congressman ever requested to push such a bill?

Forgings used in American war vessels cost the government \$2.26 a pound. The English government gets the same things for 48 cents a pound. Is it any wonder that Carnegie still has \$276,000,000 to give away? The Carnegie and Bethlehem steel outfits have pulled enough to move the earth from its foundation.

When Governor Savage disgraced himself and the state by patronizing the South Omaha bull fight, he should have expected just the reputation that he has got in the Chicago and eastern papers. Some of them devote pages to the humiliating exhibit with Governor Savage's picture set large in the illustrations.

The English government refuses to release the Americans who were captured while fighting in the Boer army. What does she propose to do with them? Has she sentenced them all to life imprisonment? The British won't exchange them and won't release them. Perhaps she is figuring them at so much a head for ransom.

The English have an added grief to that caused by the under-selling of British manufactures by American concerns. The American athletes and race horses are giving them a great deal of trouble. They say that they have one comfort because the American sprinters ran away from the English in the running races.

The scriptures say that a merciful man is merciful to his beast, but the church-going plutocrats claim that nothing of the kind is said about wage-working men. Therefore they don't have to be merciful to them and they can be kept in the stoke holes and frey furnaces when the thermometer is at 105 in the shade just as long as it helps to pile up dividends.

Our redeemers are singing very low these days. Joe Bartley, lessened school appropriations, reductions in railroad assessments, penitentiary fires, continual pardons, Clem Deaver and several other things have taken the vim out of them. The fusionists will carry the state this fall by twenty thousand majority.

When Secretary Root was in Omaha he remarked that preparations must be made for the support of a large army. That is what The Independent has been telling the people for the last two years. But when corn is above 50 cents on the Chicago market a very large number of men conclude that the millennium is at hand and there is no use of wasting time on politics. They will find out one of these days. The new outbreak in the Philippines will be all the excuse that plutocrats will want. More shoulder straps. More idle men loafing around barracks. More the expense of whose keep must be dug out of the soil, is the prospect ahead of us.

AN IOWA LAWYER DELIVERED A FERCE

address against the prevalence of perjury in the courts the other day, but if he wants samples of the utmost degeneracy in that line he should investigate the oaths made by the New York millionaires, including the saintly Carnegie, before the equalization board concerning the amount of their wealth. J. Pierpont Morgan swears that he is only worth \$400,000. Russell Sage swore that he was only worth the same amount. Depew swore that he had only \$25,000; John D. Rockefeller only a million; James Stillman, president of the City National bank, only \$50,000, and Andrew Carnegie, one million. If Max Nordau wants any more evidence of the degeneracy of the modern man, he can find it in the returns of the New York millionaires, made under oath to the tax assessor. That is the kind of men who rule this country. When the church stands silent in the presence of such immorality and crime as this, what must be the future?

If honesty is any evidence of the ability of a people to govern themselves the provisional government of the Cubans under Gomez, and those acting with him in the island and in New York, bears ample testimony to that fact. The revolutionary government issued a total of printed bonds amounting to \$3,145,600, and the total of the bonds disposed of was \$122,400, leaving bonds in the amount of \$3,023,200 still in the treasury. The republican press has been harping about these bonds and claiming that Cuban "patriots" who hung around the headquarters of the junta in New York had disposed of them for their own profit. All the expenses of the junta in sending relief to the island and maintaining their quarters in this country is summed up in that \$122,400. There was nothing to hinder them from disposing of the whole amount, but they preferred to be honest.

A socialist writer tries to answer what The Independent said in regard to the distinction between socialism and populism by saying: "Do not 'all' the people own the postoffice and yet the employes get salaries, which the writer above says they would not under socialism." There may not be any difference between "all" the people owning the postoffice, and the people owning "all" the means of production and distribution, or in the common ownership of "all" property, but most men will think that there is. The common ownership of one thing and the common ownership of "all" property, may be one and the same thing, but The Independent don't believe it is. If all property is owned in common, who'll pay the salaries?

R. B. Dickson, chairman of the republican county committee of Holt county, says that he had an agreement with Chairman Lindsay and the Omaha heavenly twin and "that we felt that we were dealing with men of honor and whose word was good." How he ever came to believe that these chaps were men of honor is past comprehension. If Mr. Dickson had been a reader of The Independent or some other good pop paper he would never have come to so ridiculous a conclusion. If he had been possessed of the knowledge common to all populists he would not have been compelled to say: "While we rested secure in this belief, some one conspired and conspired to saddle on the party this political Judas," Clem Deaver.

The Bee says, "Away with populism." Well, populism is away down in Boston where it saved the people from the traction corporation; it is away down at Topeka where the people are flying to it to save them from an ice trust, and it is away up at the White house where it reversed the financial policy of the republican party and resulted in coining more silver than was ever coined before. It is away down in New Orleans where according to an official report just issued from Washington, the city has regained the control of a great public utility in the wharfs of that city. Populism is getting away to all parts of the country. It is not confined to Nebraska.

In every state where populists refused to fuse with the Bryan democracy they have been knocked clear out of the box, yet some of them say that fusion ruined the populist party. Nebraska is still the banner populist state and it has kept its position and organization by fusion. How much of populism is left as an effective organization in any state where fusion has been rejected? Populists in Nebraska have in no case abandoned or compromised their principles. They started out with the Omaha platform and stand by it yet.

The dilettante admirers of millionaires are now making excuses for the moral rottenness of Lorillard for keeping a mistress and then willing her a million dollars by saying that the woman involved "belonged to one of the best families of New York." That is the sort of families who have been

FURNISHING THESE CREATURES. THE VIRTUOUS, sane men and women who have made this nation great have not belonged to the "first families." They have come from the farms, where the decalogue is still in force.

Tom Johnson gave Hanna one on the point of the jaw that knocked him clear over the ropes the other day. Tom went before the tax assessment board and proved by expert witnesses that Hanna's consolidated street railroad was worth \$10,000,000. He proved beyond a doubt that at the market quotations of the stock that was its value. Then the assessment was raised from \$595,000 to \$6,000,000. As soon as Hanna was able to get himself on his feet he went straight to Canton to see McKinley.

The railroads of the country have in their employ over a million men. They have 259,788 miles of track, or enough to belt the earth at the equator with a ten-track road. All of these men and all of this mighty machinery was used to beat Bryan and elect McKinley. Pierpont Morgan now sits at the head of a railroad combination that has the equivalent of a ten-track road around the whole earth. How small a man is the czar with his little Siberian railway when compared to Morgan?

Morton was looking through his dictionary the other day to learn how to spell a word and accidentally ran across the word "pseudology." He was so delighted with the discovery that he worked it in three times in one paragraph. The little-minded egotist, thinking that he had done something exceedingly clever, patted himself on the head and said: "What a great man am I." Of course he applied the word to Bryan and will likely keep running it for the next two years.

There never was a banking system that provided any protection to depositors except the honesty of the banker. This is getting to be understood by a good many people. The Ne-high Yeoman remarked last week that "the people will learn after a while that a bank, national or state, is no safer than a business firm. In either case if you trust your money with them, your dependence is on the honesty and business ability of the management, only that and nothing more."

The postmaster-general, after failing to get a law passed to exclude certain classes of publications from transportation through the mails as second class matter, has issued an Imperial order on his own authority. Only a synopsis was sent out by the Associated press. Whether The Independent is among the excluded papers or not it is impossible to tell until a full copy of the order is obtained. If you don't get your paper one of these days you will know what the reason is.

The Dubuque Telegraph, one of the sound old democratic dailies, says: "What the welfare of democracy now imperatively demands is the success of the regular republican ticket in Ohio by a larger majority than has ever before been given to any ticket in that state." It thinks that that will drive the democratic reactionaries into the republican camp where they belong. The Telegraph must have seen a copy of The Independent.

Two years ago The Independent refuted the excess of exports fallacy. After all that time some of the magazines and slow-going democratic dailies have been able to comprehend the matter and the editors begin to write about it. That is not so very bad, generally they are about five years behind The Independent, for it takes about that length of time to beat an idea into the heads of editors who get \$5,000 a year.

Hardy's Column

Here we are, thirty miles up the north side of the Big Horn mountains, in one of the four states that carry out the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that of giving all the people of full age and sound mind a voice in state government. So high up are we that the clouds often just pass over our heads and again they wrap us about as a mantle. The lightning and thunder sport below us. Frozen rain or snow increases the summer supply of snow in sight. We read of the extreme heat in Nebraska, while here we have to build a camp fire every night to warm us up for bed. From 9 a. m. till 3 p. m. it is quite warm, perhaps as high as 70. We have eaten little wild fruit yet. The strawberries are just beginning to ripen. We have eaten no wild meat excepting trout and we have had of them all we could make way with. Our average catch has been about one dozen an hour. We kept count until we got up into the hundreds. We would send a mass to The Independent office, on ice, but the state law forbids sending any unseasoned trout out of the state. The law also forbids the killing of sage hens or deer before the first of September. It is a very inconvenient hunting ground anyway. Fire ran over the mountains years ago, killing the timber, and since then the dead trees have rotted at the root and fallen cross-ways in every direction. The young trees have started up