OUR CORRESPONDENTS

More People Thinking and Writing Than Ever Before—The Editor Buried Under a Pile of MSS

Never before in the history of The Independent has the editor had so many letters from the people—letters containing valuable suggestions and sound thought. Even with the recent addition to the editorial force, both editors cannot hope to even mention the names of all the kind friends of the paper who help it along with cheering words, much less to print more than a small per cent of them, because they would fill two such papers as The Independent and leave no room for other matter.

But the editors are willing to work hard (and it is no easy task to read several hundred letters in the day or two allotted to that work) and they have no notion of crying "enough." All they ask is that correspondents must not feel discouraged if perchance their communications do not appear at once, or even at all; it is impossible to print all received, and because a letter fails to appear it is no sign that it was not well worthy of reproduction.

F. A. Foreman, Upton, Pa., takes The Independent severely to task for conducting a fusion paper. "Seems to me," he says, "that you are courting a drubbing. Well, I won't give it to you, as I believe every fusion pop, or every free silver democrat (which are one and the same thing) feels that they are a cipher in the political world. . . . Your paper? No, sir, thank you—no fusion in mine." (Mr. Foreman has a perfect right to his opinions on this subject—so has the editor. Evidently Mr. Foreman places party above principles, and this places him along with the other mullet heads. —Ed. Ind.)

J. B. Cox, Mann's Harbor, N. C., says he could not be pleased better than with The Independent. "Think you have succeeded in making it the leading reform paper in the United States."

A. H. Greene, Oregon, Mo., takes exception to the article by Francis Keyes in defense of Sampson. It reminds him so forcibly of the story of how "me and my Bettie killed the b'ar." Mr. Greene says: "Sampson should have been court-martialed for desertion in the face of the enemy. Coming down the chimney and claiming the victory on the ground of position is too gauzy for brave Americans."

Geo. Watkins, Verdon, Neb., warns the allied forces not to "be deceived by the Governor Savage embroglio. Do not think for a moment there is any misunderstanding among republican leaders, except, perhaps, between Rosewater and Mercer. Governor Savage has no more idea of being nominated for governor than I have, but there must be a sham fight put up and what they call the rank and file must apparently win out and nominate a man entirely satisfactory to Bartley and his partners. And Savage will get a good appointment. . . . I have not heard but one republican express any regrets on account of Bartley's pardon—their only regret is that it may hurt the party and cause them to lose the state. . . . What becomes of our surplus balance in foreign trade? Mr. Editor, did it ever occur to you that our imports are very largely undervalued in order to escape tariff charges? The theory of foreign debt is not correct. We have been exporting in the aggregate more for the last sixty years than we have imported. From 1849 to 1897 we exported of gold, silver and domestic products one billion five hundred million dollars more than we imported. What bothers me is this: If we owe them and they own our factories, farms and railroads in large amounts, what did we get for them? (Largely no consideration was received. For example, English capitalists own one million dollars in the capital stock of a five-million dollar railroad; afterward the stock is "watered" to ten millions; the Englishmen get one-fifth of the additional stock, but give nothing for it; no additional imports come to this country to cover the additional million of securities held by them; but they draw dividends just the same, when any are paid, and in the long run are supposed to have two millions invested in American railroads, while in fact only one million was actually invested. Rise in values of lands purchased at low figures years ago will also account for large foreign "investments" without a corresponding increase in the figures for imports.—Ed. Ind.)

J. W. Zarnes, Mountain Grove, Mo., believes that it would "be a manifestation of common sense for us to unite all the different political factions and stand together against the common enemy."

"One of the People," Clayton, Ill., orders a block of five Liberty Building Postals with the comment: "I voted the republican ticket straight up to 1896. In that memorable campaign the 'blind partisan scales' dropped from my eyes and I could then see clearly."

"Where is the sense," says J. B. Van Court, Newton, Ia., "of treating a country as foreign in fixing tariff duties, when we at the same time profess to own that country by purchase. . . . What right under our constitution have we to levy a tariff tax on them any more than we have on any other of our territories, or any state in the union?" (Chief Justice Marshall held that the territory west of the Mississippi river was just as much a part of the United States, and hence entitled to the same consideration, as New York or Massachusetts. He called it the "American empire," using that term in the sense of American nation. But our federal supreme court, claiming to be upholding Marshall, have in reality construed the constitution directly at variance with his ideas. The court holds that the uniformity clause in the constitution applies only to states, that is those admitted into the sisterhood of states, and that congress may legislate as it pleases for the territories. Under its holding there is nothing to prevent congress from placing a tariff tax on wheat shipped out of Oklahoma, for instance, but that would be a mighty unhealthy proceeding for congress and it wisely refrains.—Ed. Ind.)

Thomas F. Hynes, Philipsburg, Mont., suggests that "that man Shifaly with the $1,200 library in Indiana, I'll bet did not turn in to the assessor of his county as worth 30 cents. Men of different politics when nearing a duck of his caliber should exclaim, 'Shoo, fly.' . . . To my mind the main issue is the money question. Let the government be the only one to issue money, and let it be good, hard money, money that says on its face what it is and not a promise to pay like the national bank note, which one of these days will be the cause of the greatest panic we have ever encountered. . . Keep fusion up until the people come into their own again."

Clarence V. Straight, Brooklyn, N. Y., says: "The principles for which The Independent stands are in accord with my views, and I like the fearless way in which it is written. It is too bad we haven't a few more such papers so that the people could learn the truth. There is not one man in ten that understands the money question and I'm afraid they never will unless we get some more teachers."

Robert Lee Lane, Gate City, Va., subscribes and says that he is very much pleased with The Independent.

J. W. Lusby, Downings, Va., says: "I am an old-timer who has come over the trail. Tell 'old-timer' for me I would like to grasp his hand and shout sic semper tyrannus."

Our good old friend, F. Schweizer, Woodlawn, Neb., has a number of well written and timely articles on the editor's desk. Mr. Schweizer has such a firm grasp on the principles of reform and good government, and is such a prolific writer on the many matters which need attention, that the editor is always kept guessing which one or two of Mr. Schweizer's articles he ought to print this week and how much he can print without giving up the whole paper to Mr. Schweizer. His articles on canonizing Roosevelt, Smith and Madden; stealing Ninth street (Lincoln), and Prince Henry's visit are especially deserving of mention.

Frank Brownell, Cassa Grande, Ariz., was much delighted with The Independent's "roast" of John Shifaly. Thinks he is "like hundreds of other rock-ribbed, hunch-backed, crooked-necked, bow-legged, keg-ankled, bell-muzzled, one-sided republicans. . . . I venture to say if he has an ounce of brains and will read The Independent for a few months he would learn how to cast a ballot intelligently."

Charles M. Bowen, Bath, N. Y.: "Send me those five subscription postals p. d. q.—I will pay for them myself and send to some benighted republicans. . . . If I was rich I would place your paper in 1,000,000 homes. I was raised on Horace Greeley's Tribune, and your paper seems like old times in its fearless denunciation of wrong-doing everywhere."

"Yes; I like your paper," says J. M. Hall, Hamilton, N. Y. "I am with you in the fight to a finish, if my life is spared. Have been advocating the same principles as The Independent represents for the last twenty-five years, both in public and private, and the fight is not over by any means. If those reorganizers would go into the republican camp where they belong, the fight would be an easy one. . . . The Associated press hides and covers many great truths that would expose the republican rottenness that the people ought to know. Hence, we must get the information from the western independent press."

The Real Thing

Pictures printed from genuine photographs show more accurately than any others the real article. The Sure Hatch Incubator Co. have made hundreds of views of people using their machines and have printed them in their 1902 catalogue.

Mr. M. M. Johnson, the hustling business manager of the concern, goes in for this sort of real thing more than he does for braggadocio statements of the size of his factory, art catalogue, etc. He says it offers actual proof that the Sure Hatch Incubator can be run successfully under the most natural circumstances and conditions. Mr. Johnson has become well known among the poultry fraternity for his terse, apt sayings, and one of them is, "Folks can't hatch chickens in big factories nor in big catalogues, but in good incubators." This strain of good, hard common sense runs through the entire catalogue of this company. There are no ambiguous statements either in the catalogue or in the instructions for running the machine, none of that strained effort to make use of heavy adjectives or complex sentences. After reading the book one feels that he has had a good heart to heart talk with a man who knows the incubator and brooder business from A to Z.

You can get one of their catalogues by addressing them at Clay Center, Neb., and if you are interested in poultry you will do well to send for one of them. They mail them free.

Please mention this paper when you write them.

HELP THE POOR

How our Statesmen at Washington Provide for Destitute Millionaires and Ex-Presidents

Editor Independent: In a tenement house in Wichita, Kan., eighteen-year-old Laura Robinette is slowly dying of consumption, while her mother and three sisters are almost destitute of food and clothing. The widow and four daughters own but one small bed and a cot and the dying girl, of course, occupies the bed. The appearance of the two small rooms clearly indicates the destitute condition of the family. There is practically no furniture in the rooms, and what there is is broken and almost useless.

The newspapers say nothing about the husband of that unhappy widow, but most likely he was one of those extravagant employes of railroads or coal mines—one of those who never care for their families and instead of [illegible] their magnificent salaries or uries, so that if they should happen to be killed by accident on the road or in the mine their poor widows and orphans are left destitute of everything and dependent upon the charity of other people—who do not always find out and know the real deserving poor. It may be, too, that the widow had deposited her money in a Mosher bank or one of that kind.

In the same paper which contained the above information there was a notice that our great philanthropist, Grover Cleveland, is also in a destitute condition. His salary as president was not sufficient to live on, and in order to make a living for himself and family he was obliged to go fishing at Buzzard's Bay, where he fished about five million dollars together at public expense—but on such a mere bagatelle a man with a family cannot live!

Representative Lovering of Massachusetts deserves, therefore, the gratitude of every honest citizen for saving this nation, with its inexhaustible natural resources, from the disgrace of having to starve to death, for want of bread, one of its ex-presidents, the friend and protector of the poor—a fact clearly shown by his protection of the Coxey army and the Pullman laborers.

Representative Lovering introduced a bill providing a salary or pension for ex-presidents of the United States at the rate of $25,000 per annum from the date of retirement from the presidency. F. SCHWEIZER.

Woodlawn, Neb.

THE AMERICAN FLAG

American Flag Association Denounces Speaker Henderson—Army Appropriations

Washington, D. C., Feb. 8, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The American flag association, with headquarters in New York, has for several years been behind a movement to have congress pass laws to prevent the desecration of the stars and stripes in various ways. The association is now out in a circular denouncing Speaker Henderson of the house who has prevented the passage of such a law by refusing to allow the matter to come up. The speaker doubtless remembers how successfully his party worked the flag racket in the last two campaigns by using it to partisan advantage and hence does not propose that the privilege of its desecration in campaign time shall be curtailed. This flag-waving business is a winner—at least the g. o. p. has so found it.

The army appropriation bill is now ready to be reported by the chairman of that committee. It calls for an appropriation for the present fiscal year of $91,000,000. Prior to the Spanish war, the appropriations for the maintenance of the army used to run from $22,000,000 to $25,000,000 per year—that was before we had any colonial policy, before the country had entered upon the pathway of imperialism, and before we had been confronted with the proposition of holding a people in subjection by the force of arms. The difference between $25,000,000 which it used to require for our army and the $91,000,000 which is now required represents the expense to this country incident to maintaining an army in the Philippines. In this connection it may be well to state that there is a great contest going on between the rival steamboat companies, to obtain the contracts from the government to carry the troops and supplies necessary to the maintenance of an army in the Philippines, to these islands, it being now an established fact that an American soldier on account of the climate there, must be returned to this country in order to recuperate, and the amount now paid by the government, as shown by the official reports, for the transportation of troops and supplies to the Philippines, is $9,000,000 annually. These facts have been brought out by the contest between the rival steamship companies to get the job. This class of interests are piling up immense wealth out of the pockets of the American people on jobs of this kind.

A perusal of the laws passed by the Philippine commission has shown that the circulation of statements or arguments by Filipinos in favor of independence, the holding of meetings or forming of societies in favor of independence, is considered by the Philippine commission as treason and is punishable by fine and imprisonment. It is also commanded by the commission that any one knowing of any such utterances or deeds against the government of the United States must make it known, the concealment of such knowledge being in itself considered treasonable and punishable with imprisonment for seven years or a heavy fine. All this is official from the laws adopted by the American Philippine commission.

Because Senator Tillman denounced our un-American policy in the senate the other day (and Tillman seems the one man with the necessary courage) he was charged by Senator Foraker with treason against the United States. When did the denunciation of wrong begin to be betokened as treason to the United States? How long since a man became a traitor against American authority in voicing his aspirations for life and happiness and his hope for freedom? At what dread hour was it decreed that the unfortunate of the old world who invoked against us the protection of the immortal Declaration that set us free should be fined and imprisoned for "treason?"

Have we gone trade-mad? Has the lust of conquest dethroned reason? It would seem so.

H. W. RISLEY.

A PARCEL'S POST

A Republican Bill Introduced Into Congress That Needs Some Very Careful Scrutiny

Congressman Stark's recent letter, in which he intimated that he should oppose a parcels post law because he believed it would be detrimental to the interests of his congressional district, has brought out considerable discussion of the question. The Geneva Gazette and Jefferson County Journal take issue with Mr. Stark, while the Butler County Press believes that considerable may be said on both sides of the question. The Fairbury News takes the position that the bill is impracticable because it provides for a rate of postage which is below the cost of transportation to the government and predicts that the mail cars would be so loaded with merchandise that they would be virtually nothing but freight cars and would of necessity move as slowly.

The Independent is always a little suspicious of a measure of this kind if fathered by the republican party, and believes that the bill will bear the closest investigation. A parcels post, under a law properly framed, means relief from the extortions of the express companies. The express companies are ardent supporters of the republican party. And it does not stand to reason that the republican party will enact any legislation which will permanently put a stop to the express companies' robberies.

But the principles involved are correct. The only thing to look out for is a republican nigger in the parcels post wood-pile. The contention that a parcels post will permit the big mail order houses to destroy the small merchants in country towns is not well founded. It has its foundation in the premises upon which is based the republican argument for a protective tariff. To prevent the big "mail order houses" of Europe from destroying the local merchants of America, a tariff wall is built around the United States. To prevent the big mail order houses of one state from destroying the local merchants of another state, the railroads and express companies with their almost prohibitive tariff on small shipments are made to do duty as an interstate protective tariff wall. If it is a good thing to build a Chinese wall around the United States, of course it ought to be a good thing to build a similar one around each state; then a smaller one around each county, then around each town. Carried to its logical conclusion, this opposition to a parcels post, on the ground that the local merchant will be called upon to compete with the big mail order houses of other states, means that every farmer should be cut off from buying anywhere outside of that circle of territory within which he can drive with his team and wagon and get back the same day. If it is a good thing to protect the merchants of Fairbury against the robber competition of the big mail order houses of Chicago, then the still smaller merchants of Reynolds and Endicott and Steele City and Daykin ought in all conscience to be protected against the robber competition of the Fairbury merchants.

It seems to The Independent that the people who buy goods have some rights to be considered in the discussion of a parcels post system, and any argument against it based exclusively on the probable effect it may have on a comparatively small number of people is not sound. It is an argument against progress. It is the same argument that has always been used against the introduction of labor-saving machinery. With the populist motto, "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none," ever in mind and incorporated into the laws, there should be no opposition to the adoption of any labor-saving device.

An Editorial Skunk

The Senior Editor with eyes blazing wrathfully approached the Junior Editor's desk and, throwing down a copy of the Fremont Tribune, said: "I wish you'd attend to this: I'm so angry I can't see straight." The Junior Editor looked at the sheet and read:

"The Lincoln Independent, the populist organ, contains a vigorous editorial denouncing Senator Foraker for his treason against the United States. It is not ready to apologize for Meserve, but calls him and the rest of the fusion ex-officials to book after this fashion." (And here followed the item in Hardy's Column, referred to in last week's Independent.)

"I can see nothing in particular that can be accomplished by attending to it," remarked the Junior Editor. "Hammond knowingly and wilfully lied—that's about all there is to it, and that is not an unusual thing for him or men of his caliber. No good would be accomplished by telling him so. He knew that the item in question was not an editorial; he knew it was the utterance of Mr. Hardy; he knew that the position of The Independent was plainly stated in an editorial on the editorial page. I can't see that it can be 'attended' to any further than that. You recollect the fate of the minister who hurled a book at a skunk? Well, an answering editorial hurled at Ross Hammond would be quite on a par with the minister's action."

And the Senior Editor assented.

Is It Unconstitutional

Shibley's brief on majority rule—an outgrowth of the direct legislation idea—contains a suggestion that is worth study, inasmuch as it involves the question of whether it is constitutional for the people to hold the veto power in their own hands. He says: "It is provided in the federal constitution that the United States 'shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government.' The question is, Will the United States supreme court hold that the optional referendum and the initiative when added to a representative government, is 'a republican form of government?' The court has not as yet passed upon the question, nor has the supreme court of any state; but the monopolists and their apologists claim that the new system is a democracy and not a republican form of government. For example, during 1847, the supreme court of Delaware went out of its way to state:

1. That the final determination of legislative questions by a direct ballot of the voters is a democracy and not a republican form of government, and

2. That such a system is in violation of the constitution of the United States. On this point the court said: "'Although the people have the power in conformity with its provisions to alter the constitution, under no circumstance can they, so long as the constitution of the United States remains the paramount law of the land, establish a democracy or any other than a republican form of government.' Price vs. Foster, 4 Harr. (Del) 179.)

This raises an interesting question well worth investigation. In view of the position taken by the supreme court of the United States upon the income tax and a number of other questions, it seems to be a pretty safe guess what the decision would be in the case of direct legislation, especially as there can be no doubt as to the effect such legislation would ultimately have upon monopolies. It is extremely difficult for one to be an optimist in the face of such obstacles.

Shifaly "Snaffled" It

Editor Independent: In your paper of January 30 appeared a letter from Mr. John Shifaly, in which he tried to impress upon the minds of his readers that he has a small dictionary. His lot of "jaw-breaker" words were taken word for word from Frank V. Irish's orthography, a book used in most of the common schools of the country.

H. H. STROPE.

Venus, Neb.

Meier & Meier, Attorneys, 1241 O Street

NOTICE OF ADGISTER'S SALE

Public notice is hereby given that I will sell at Public Auction on my farm, NW¼, Section 23, Town 11, Range 5 East, one red yearling heifer and one red yearling steer, on the 25th day of February, at the hour of 10 o'clock a. m., 1902, to satisfy an Adgister's Lien of Thirty Dollars, against said animals, duly filed in the office of the County Clerk of Lancaster County, Nebraska. PETER HEISER.