

The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, OCT. 30, 1902.

NO. 23.

EASTERN POLITICS

Hill and Platt Stop the Discussion of all Vital Issues—Grover Cleveland to Take the Stump

Editor Independent: One week ago today we could not think of anything except how to get coal. Now we cannot think of anything except the election.

The Fourth congressional district of New Jersey Charles N. Fowler, of the Fowler bill, is running against DeWitt Clinton Flanagan. The state was newly districted in 1891 and Fowler has a new district to run in. Grover Cleveland, if Princeton, N. J., is to speak for Flanagan on October 30, and when you take into consideration that Flanagan means Grover Cleveland and that Fowler means the Fowler bill, there is not much to choose from. It is not likely that the Fowler bill will be much discussed. Mr. Fowler will talk for protection and Mr. Cleveland will talk for tariff-revenue-only. If Mr. Fowler is elected, he will vote for the Fowler bill and if Mr. Flanagan is elected, he will vote for the same bill; and therefore it makes very little difference to the plain people who pay the taxes who is elected. If I were going to predict, I would say that Flanagan will be elected, first, because some of the republicans are opposed to Fowler, and, in the next place, there is a small democratic majority in the district. Mr. Fowler is under the disadvantage of having enemies in his own political household, while he is fighting the enemy outside.

In New York they are fighting very much on the old lines. Bird S. Coler, the democratic candidate for governor, David B. Hill's candidate—is in favor of tariff-revenue-only, while, of course, Odell, the republican candidate for governor, stands for protection, nothing being said about the currency. The democrats declared, in their state convention, in favor of taking, by the federal government, the coal lands of Pennsylvania under the power or right of eminent domain. This has been talked about, in the newspapers, more than any other issue. The democrats in New York are making it a national issue, inasmuch as the coal lands are to be taken by the national government instead of having the state of Pennsylvania do it. But, Bird S. Coler, the democratic candidate for governor, does not favor the measure, so that Mr. David B. Hill and his own candidate do not agree on what is one of the most prominent issues. It is hardly necessary to say, that there is not much prospect of Mr. Hill's electing his candidate, nor much prospect of his carrying the New York legislature, and much less prospect of his being senator again; nor will he be leader much longer of the New York democracy. It is a pity, however, that Hill is able to prevent the policy of an income tax from being discussed—and can also prevent the money question from being discussed. It is the great state of New York can be made to turn on such issues as are of no consequence to the plain people who pay nearly all the taxes.

The tariff question seems to be used for the purpose of preventing the people from seeing their own true interests. If the attention of the people could be directed to an income tax and such a law could be enacted, there would be no necessity for a tariff for revenue, and then all the discussion about a revenue tariff could be dropped and we would have nothing left to talk about except an income tax, on the one side, and a law on the other side. When will the democrats cease to talk about tariff reform and revenue reform, all of which means a tariff for revenue only? If the tariff must be talked about, let the republicans talk about it. They are in favor of a tariff for revenue as well as for protection. If there is any difference between the two systems the republicans have the best of it, because, if there is any virtue in a revenue tariff they have it, and if there is any virtue in a protective tariff, they have it. If the democrats would only stop talking about the tariff and substitute an income tax, they would soon begin to get in favor with the people, because they would be advocating a system of taxation that would fall upon wealth instead of consumption. The poor consume a thousand times as much as the rich, and therefore they now pay a thousand times as much taxes as the rich. We are collecting about two hundred millions annually through the custom houses and putting it into the country, which must necessarily add to the prices of the goods, imported, unless foreigners, who bring the goods here, pay the tariff duties, which seldom happens. We are obliged to collect this amount for the government annually, and as long as we continue to collect this amount in this way, the poor will be obliged to pay nine hundred and ninety-nine dollars (\$999) to every single dollar that a rich man pays; and they will be obliged to pay their large share out of their wages, which they have to work hard for, while the rich will pay their small share out of their interest or dividends, which the poor have to pay to the rich, in addition to paying their large share of the tariff taxes. If we have a tariff for revenue only (as the democrats propose) then the tariff duties will be high on such goods as we do not produce or wish to produce, and very low on such goods as we do produce or wish to produce. This will make high prices for goods which we do not produce and low prices for all goods which we produce or wish to produce. Low prices for goods which we produce will necessitate low wages and our working people will be called upon to pay high prices for tea, coffee and all other things which we cannot produce, out of their low wages. Low duties on such goods as we pro-

duce (as the democrats propose) will not only cause low prices for all such goods, but foreign goods will have a tendency to come in and our working people will then be out of work, and they will be called upon to pay high prices for their tea, coffee, and all other articles which we cannot produce and low prices for all goods which we can produce and they will have to do it when they are out of work and have no wages with which to pay high or low prices for anything.

Such is the practical working of a tariff for revenue only. It has been tried and found wanting, wherever we have free labor. If we have a tariff for protection only, then all goods which we do not produce, such as tea and coffee, will come in free of duty and the prices of all such goods will be low, and our working people can have them by paying the price abroad, plus transportation, plus the cost of distribution here, without paying any duty or tax to the federal government; the duties will be high on such goods as we produce or desire to produce, and the prices of all such goods will have a tendency to be high, on account of the lack of foreign competition, especially if there is a domestic trust formed here for the purpose of preventing competition here. But even if prices of commodities are high here and we have a domestic trust here for the purpose of keeping them up, yet if the trust keeps our people at work, and they have high wages, as they can have by exercising the power and the right of striking for higher wages, then a protective tariff is better than a revenue tariff, because our working people have their wages, with which to pay for things, when they are high as well as when they are low.

We are now living under a protective tariff, with plenty of trusts. We are better off with our tariff and our trusts than if we should have a tariff for revenue only, because, with the latter, foreign goods would come in and our people would have no work and no wages. The worst thing that can happen to a nation is no work. This means anarchy and a general break-up.

The difficulty with our present tariff is, not that we have a tariff for protection, but we have a tariff for revenue as well as protection. Here is the trouble and the great defect. We ought to have a tariff for protection only, if we have any at all. We never ought to have a tariff for revenue only. On the contrary, we ought to have an income tax or some kind of a tax that falls upon wealth, for revenue only. If the democrats would only stop their talk about revenue tariffs, and go in for an income tax, there would be some hope of reform. But as long as they keep up the old talk about tariff reform, meaning a tariff for revenue only, there is no hope. We can see this in the congressional record.

JNO. S. DE HART.

Jersey City, N. J.

Plutocratic Lies

Editor Independent: A story has been going the rounds of the eastern dailies to the effect that Mr. Bryan is worth more than \$200,000, etc. The tale has appeared in several Baltimore papers and as the wording is identical in each, it is evidently the work of some "bureau" for the dissemination of information, located at, or near, Wall street, probably by the same crowd which furnished "sound money" boiler-plate matter in 1896. Mr. Bryan's wealth greatly worries these gentlemen, but it cannot be said he got any of it in the way most of the thieves do, by robbing the common people.

THOMAS O. CLARK.

In 1896 these men were circulating through their boiler-plate literary bureaus the story that Mr. Bryan was practically a pauper and had never made enough to decently support his family until he went into politics. They sent agents here to examine the county records to see how much taxes he paid. Now that he has shown the whole world that he can make money if he turns his attention to that sordid work, they are no better satisfied than they were before. Both the accusations that have been brought against Mr. Bryan by the plutocrats go to show the wiliness of these human vampires whom he has fought. There is no doubt that with his paper, his books and his lectures Mr. Bryan makes money—perhaps more than if he had been president. But every dollar of it is honestly made. The reason that these vampires object to it is because he does not make it by trust methods or tariff grafts.—Ed. Ind.)

Must Take Their Medicine

Editor Independent: It is amusing to see the people here in the talk up and take their medicine. They voted the millionaires into power and the coal out of their stoves and now are howling because some one does not stop the strife. They talk about getting up a man and going down and work the mines themselves. But they will have to take their medicine. They now want the government to own the mines, but I asked them why they didn't vote for the party that has been fighting for public ownership for the last ten years.

The democratic party of New York has a grand anti-trust platform, but they nominated Bird Coler for governor and he is a Wall street broker and the president of two trusts. A fine man to nominate on an anti-trust, democratic platform.

P. J. CATLIN.

Oswego, N. Y.

An Oregon Populist

Editor Independent: Look out for barbed wire fences until 1904 and prepare to bury the republican party in 1908 by the populists and socialists.

LOSSEN TOLLEN.

Fossil, Ore.

SECRETARY SHAW'S BLUNDER

Fooled by the Clearing House Yarn That the New York Banks Were Furnishing Money to Move the Crops

In the last few days it has been shown indubitably that the money stringency in New York is not caused by a scarcity in the west coincident with enormous demands for crop-moving. The west has plenty of money for all its needs, as is attested by the bank statement and the shipment of millions to New York to relieve the situation there. Nor is the stringency caused by legitimate business. Commercial paper finds all the accommodation it requires, and money is easy for the legitimate demands of trade, commerce and industry. Where, then, lies the source of the trouble? It is discoverable in Wall street, where speculation is the only business known. After spending in the neighborhood of thirty thousand dollars in a vain endeavor to fool the people into believing that the railroads are paying their fair share of taxes, and feeling the futility of trying to deny that Mickey is an abject tool of theirs, these "broads" have stooped to the dirtiest piece of politics since they abducted Taylor.

No republican paper has ever attempted to deny the Baldwin interview, which appeared in the Omaha Bee of June 9, 1902—nine days before the republican state convention. Mr. Smith, the Bee's correspondent, was on course on the alert for political news. Judge Baldwin and a number of other railroad attorneys were in Lincoln looking after that "second answer" which the republican board of equalization and the republican board of general finance in the case of the Bee's staff correspondent says that Judge Baldwin was in "a loquacious mood," but fails to say whether the loquacity was caused by Baldwin's success in getting the second answer filed, or whether he had just taken a nip from the bottle of "Mickey whisky" at the Lindell hotel bar. In any event he was loquacious, and he said:

"We are not bothering about the governorship any more. That has all been settled. We had a conference a day or two ago and we all agreed on Mickey as OUR MAN."

No single thing in the whole campaign has been so damaging to Mr. Mickey's chances for election. It cannot be denied that the words quoted above appeared in the Omaha Bee of June 9, 1902, first page, 7th column. So disastrous has been Judge Baldwin's loquacity that Mr. Mickey has for some time been proclaiming from the stump that he made no promises whatever in order to get his nomination. Of course, he has not. No one has charged him with making any. It was wholly unnecessary. That had all been settled at the conference of Judge Baldwin and his fellow railroad attorneys. They had "all agreed on Mickey as our man."

If the people had a voice in the matter they would quickly put a stop to a practice which makes the nation's wealth in money subject to the demand of "the street" for its stock-jobbing deals. If Secretary Shaw's purpose is to establish precedents under which Wall street may drain the treasury vaults, the people will know it, that they may rid themselves of such an official, for as things now stand a blundering secretary of the treasury, who goes out of his way to encourage inflation and protect watered securities with the money that belongs to the nation, is more to be dreaded than a panic among the speculators in watered stocks.—Baltimore American.

READ
Moses P. Kinkaid's

Letter to
Joe Bartley
Page 3

George III and Baer

It appears that Baer in his celebrated letter concerning the divine rights of the coal barons plagiarized George III. John W. Slayton has been looking the matter up and finds that King George, referring to the American revolutionists, and President Baer, writing of the coal strikers, were not only animated by the same thought, but that they used almost the same language. Here is the deadly parallel:

King George III.—"The rights and interests of the American colonists will be looked after and cared for, not by the agitators and rebels, but by the kind of Christian gentlemen whom I, as the direct representative of God, have appointed to look after my lands in the western world."

President Baer—"The rights and interests of the laboring man will be looked after and cared for, not by the agitators, but by Christian men to whom God, in His infinite wisdom, has given the control of the property interests of the country."

Mr. Baer has been unfortunate in his selection of a model. George III. never forgave the Americans who rebelled against his tyranny, and it isn't likely that Mr. Baer will ever be reconciled to the policy of liberty in the coal regions. But the rebels of 1776 are honored by the successors of George the king, and the successors of Mr. Baer are quite sure to regard both arbitration and industrial progress with favor. Thus does history repeat itself.—Chicago Record-Herald.

A Bold Forgery

The Nebraska State Journal of Sunday, October 26, 1902, carried on its front page what purports to be facsimiles of three annual passes issued to W. H. Thompson, one each by Burlington, Elkhorn, and Union Pacific. No comment is made except the words: "Our Man" Thompson, democratic candidate for governor of Nebraska." The whole thing is as glaring a fraud as was ever perpetrated. The originals from which the pretended facsimiles were made were filled out by the respective roads and issued to the State Journal—not to Mr. Thompson at all. They were never in his possession. He never saw them. They bear no number—and important fact, showing their fraudulent character. They are mere make-believe passes issued to the State Journal, as any discerning person can see by examining the facsimiles.

That these character assassins are desperate is very evident. After spending in the neighborhood of thirty thousand dollars in a vain endeavor to fool the people into believing that the railroads are paying their fair share of taxes, and feeling the futility of trying to deny that Mickey is an abject tool of theirs, these "broads" have stooped to the dirtiest piece of politics since they abducted Taylor.

No republican paper has ever attempted to deny the Baldwin interview, which appeared in the Omaha Bee of June 9, 1902—nine days before the republican state convention. Mr. Smith, the Bee's correspondent, was on course on the alert for political news. Judge Baldwin and a number of other railroad attorneys were in Lincoln looking after that "second answer" which the republican board of equalization and the republican board of general finance in the case of the Bee's staff correspondent says that Judge Baldwin was in "a loquacious mood," but fails to say whether the loquacity was caused by Baldwin's success in getting the second answer filed, or whether he had just taken a nip from the bottle of "Mickey whisky" at the Lindell hotel bar. In any event he was loquacious, and he said:

"We are not bothering about the governorship any more. That has all been settled. We had a conference a day or two ago and we all agreed on Mickey as OUR MAN."

No single thing in the whole campaign has been so damaging to Mr. Mickey's chances for election. It cannot be denied that the words quoted above appeared in the Omaha Bee of June 9, 1902, first page, 7th column. So disastrous has been Judge Baldwin's loquacity that Mr. Mickey has for some time been proclaiming from the stump that he made no promises whatever in order to get his nomination. Of course, he has not. No one has charged him with making any. It was wholly unnecessary. That had all been settled at the conference of Judge Baldwin and his fellow railroad attorneys. They had "all agreed on Mickey as our man."

Thompson For Schools

For the past nine years I have known Hon. W. H. Thompson quite intimately. He is an ideal neighbor and a public-spirited citizen. And also a successful business man. As mayor of the city of Grand Island he carried his business tact and rare administrative ability into the management of public affairs and thereby won the confidence and admiration of his fellow citizens.

Mr. Thompson has been a trustee of the Grand Island college since its organization, for many years being the chairman of its executive committee. As such he has freely devoted his time, money and legal services to the furtherance of the interests of the institution.

I know Mr. Thompson's sympathies and influence are always on the side of religion and morality. His contributions for the support of both ministers and churches have been both generous and frequent. Very truly yours,

GEORGE SUTHERLAND,
Pres. Grand Island College.

As some wrong statements have been made and circulated among our preachers, I am glad to say, in the interest of justice and fair play, that Hon. W. H. Thompson is regarded by the Christian people of this community as a man of sterling character and a warm friend of the churches.

While he himself is not a member of any religious body, yet he is always ready with voice, pen or pocketbook to help on every worthy enterprise.

At the recent session of our annual conference his fine home was cheerfully thrown open and a number of our ministers were welcomed as honored guests.

W. W. CARR,
Pastor First Methodist Church,
Grand Island, Neb.

It will pay you to read the advertisements and take advantage of the bargains offered.

ABSOLUTE OWNERSHIP

No Such Thing Ever Existed or Ever Can Exist in Civilized Society

The Independent has long been begging the people and especially the voters to read and "think." The result of it is that in all the states and territories there are readers of the paper have been engaged in "thinking." Among them there are many fair economists, and the professors in our great universities who have an idea that the intricacies of the science of political economy can only be understood by the liberally educated and scholastic class, would be greatly astonished to hear some of them discuss the questions which have been treated in the dailies (strange as the statement may seem) that the Independent has done something toward getting men to "think," the great mass were satisfied to follow their party leaders, swallow all the catch phrases and adopt all the sophistries of the politicians whose greatest object was "to keep the party in power" so that they might themselves profit thereby.

Recently something has happened that has set a great many men to "thinking." The divine right to do what one pleases with his property, regardless of the public welfare, has been called in question in such a way as to "force" men to "think." After thinking, as is always the case, they want to express their thoughts and that has produced some articles in the dailies (strange as the statement may seem) that have been worth reading and their educational effect will bear upon government in the near future.

So far, none of them have taken the true stand, that there is no such thing as the absolute ownership of property by individuals and cannot be, if by that we mean that the owner can do what he pleases with his property under any and all circumstances. However, this discussion some things have been well said, and among them is the following article written by William E. Singleton and first printed in the Chicago Record-Herald:

The plea of Edward S. Elliott for the sanctity of property rights of the anthracite coal operators contains presumptions which appear to me to be not only unwarranted, but dangerous. Each individual has the right to absolute right to control and do what he pleases with that which is his own."

I submit that this sweeping statement is—to put it mildly—a mistake. I may own a lot in Evanston, but if I open a saloon upon it I will soon learn that the city has rights superior to mine.

If I should start a glue factory in Hyde Park I would speedily be taught the same lesson.

If I try to make a bonfire of my residence I will learn that such use of my property is contrary to public good. Many similar limitations will readily suggest themselves without number.

Again, there are distinctions between different sorts of property, as to the degree of control which the individual owner may exercise over it. In some sorts of property, like the anthracite coal mines, for instance, the public has a much larger interest because it has become a necessity to the comfort of the people—also to the industrial progress of the nation.

From its very nature it, like the railroads, is a quasi-public property, and this characteristic is enhanced by the fact that the production has been monopolized by a few men who also own the railways which haul the coal to market.

One of the conditions of such quasi-public property is that while the owners are entitled to fair, reasonable profit on their investment (not on watered stock), the public, through state or national government, is entitled to supervise the management, so far as to see that the public interest is served. The underlying reason in this, as in all other limitations of individual ownership, is "the public good."

The individual owner owes his property rights to the consent of the public as expressed in constitution and statutes. But in every instance and in all countries his individual rights are subject to the prior rights of the public.

If, for instance, John Smith of Oswego county, New York, had monopolized all the land in the country capable of bearing wheat, and, setting into a controversy with his employees, had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer of the president to mediate in the interest of peace and for the public welfare; had refused to consider their demands because they had organized into a union, had refused to arbitrate, had called for an army to repress alleged violence, and then had failed to grow wheat when protected by 10,000 armed men; had spurned the offer