

The Nebraska Independent

Lincoln, Nebraska.

LIBERTY BUILDING. 1328 O STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress of March 3, 1879, at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class mail matter.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.
FOURTEENTH YEAR.

\$1.00 PER YEAR

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.

If "16 to 1" is such a horrible thing, why don't the republicans change the ratio or stop coining silver?

Quay is not yet done counting up the majority of his man over the gold bug plutocrat that the democrats nominated in Pennsylvania for governor. Better reorganize the party some more.

Free passes have been abolished for all time in Wisconsin, a constitutional amendment having been adopted that prohibits the issuing of them. Oh! that Nebraska would go and do likewise.

No jury has ever hung a man on the testimony of hand-writing experts. Juries have been known to do some silly things, but not one ever did a thing like that. Yet the "experts" continue to appear in the courts and draw their \$50 a day.

There is trouble ahead for the tariff grafters. John B. Perkins, a republican member from Rochester, N. Y., declares that the first day after the next session of congress opens he will introduce a bill to put coal, hides and meat on the free list and greatly reduce the tariff on lumber.

The president went on a bear hunt down in Mississippi. Another fellow roped a bear and tied it to a tree and then asked the president to shoot it, but he refused. That "reminds us" that another fellow roped a coal trust, and asked the president to kill it with a criminal prosecution, but he refused. So he keeps up "the party."

Four genuine newspaper men have been elected as members of the next house and they are all democrats, namely, W. R. Hearst, New York Journal; F. E. Shober, reporter New York World; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, publisher Omaha World-Herald, and E. J. Livernash, a reporter of the San Francisco Examiner.

Oxford college taught the doctrine of the divine right of kings for generations after the last king of that pretention had been beheaded. Harvard college is of the same stamp and is teaching the making of heroes out of scabs after all the world has awakened to a believe that labor has some rights that capital is bound to respect.

For several days silver has remained constantly at 49 7-8 cents an ounce. The editor of the Springfield Republican ought to sleep well of nights during these days in the happy thought that American money has not lost in "worth" any more millions in that time. That unhappy editor don't know that while silver bullion has fluctuated over 3 cents an ounce during the last year, the silver dollar has been at a parity with gold all the time.

MARION BUTLER, LISTEN!

The editor of The Independent has received several letters since the election from parties in different states, some of which he hopes to get permission to publish, asking for a statement concerning the course that the people's party should now pursue. Events have proved that the people's party was right in its financial theories. The increase in the volume of money has produced exactly the result that populists said it would. The doctrine of public ownership of all public utilities continually receives new adherents and as far as cities are concerned, is being constantly adopted. On the money question the populists and Bryan democrats were right. The populist position upon the necessity of the public ownership of railroads and telegraphs is just as sound. Everywhere, in every state in the union, populists are at a perfect agreement on platforms and principles. The fears that all populists have always entertained that the democratic party could never, as a whole, be brought over to the advocacy of these principles seems to have been realized. Except in the south, where the race question holds it together at the polls, it is divided into two factions which fight each other with more bitterness than they do the republicans. Even in the south it cannot be relied upon to act as a whole in the support of any principle. Louisiana democrats are as much protectionists as Lodge or Aldrich. In Tennessee there are democratic papers and democratic leaders advocating exactly the same financial principles that Mark Hanna entertains. In Alabama there are democrats who are just as ardent imperialists as Beveridge. In Massachusetts their candidate for governor was as much of a trust promoter as J. Pierpont Morgan.

On the other hand, there are some millions of democrats who are honest and faithful, who believe in the Kansas City platform, in the referendum, the public ownership of public utilities, who are opposed to the concentration of the wealth of the country in few hands by means of tariffs, trusts, combinations and rebates on the railroads, who still believe in the Declaration of Independence, and who are just as ardent and radical reformers as any populist.

This class of democrats are forever done with the Cleverlands, the Hills, the Gormans, the Taggarts, and will no longer vote the democratic ticket while those men are in the leadership.

The charge is made that Bryan is the cause of the failure of such democrats to vote. That is not true at all. If Bryan should go over to the Hill-Cleveland crowd, all his magnetic eloquence could not get them to do it. He would simply be denounced by them as another traitor, just as the democratic voters in Indiana denounced Dan Voorhees when he turned traitor, and Dan was as much an idol to the democrats of Indiana as Bryan ever was anywhere.

The editor of The Independent has had hundreds of letters from democrats during the last two years and knows whereof he writes. Not long since a chairman of a democratic state committee said to the editor of The Independent: "If Hill and that crowd get control of the democratic party I would leave it. If the choice of the two evils were presented to me and I had to vote one or the other of the two tickets, I would vote for the republican ticket before I would for that crowd."

It is with that kind of democrats that populists have been willing to co-operate. But if Hill, Cleveland and Gorman have succeeded in making of the democratic party, instead of an united organization, a set of wrangling factions, without any settled principles or defined policy, what is the use of trying to further co-operate? It produces no effect.

The Independent believes that the

chairman of the people's party, under these conditions, should call a national and representative council some time during next winter and let the party make a formal and official statement concerning the policy that it proposes to pursue in the future. Let him invite to that council representative Bryan democrats, and let both of them promulgate a statement to plutocratic democrats that there can be no misunderstanding. Let these democrats and populists bid defiance to the reorganizers and tell them that from henceforth there is a fight on with no let-up until it is decided whether a party can put up candidates for congress and president under one name, when it is divided into two sections holding diametrically opposing principles.

ECONOMIC IDIOCY

The demand coming from every source at the meeting of the convention of national bankers at New Orleans was for "more money." The comptroller of the currency while declaring that the volume of money had been greatly increased, said there "is not enough to handle the additional business. Not only is there more of every kind of material, but prices are higher, requiring much larger sums of money. Transactions which ordinarily could be conducted with comparative ease are now matters of great anxiety. The operations of the treasury department in collecting money for taxes and the disposition of the funds of the government; the money required for moving crops, or any large payments of money for interest, dividends, or syndicate payments of unusual size, produce much more disturbance than they did before the present condition was reached."

The consensus of opinion among all the bankers was that there must be more money furnished from some source, or not only stagnation of business would ensue, but there would be a large amount of "liquidation" in the near future, and "liquidation" is a banker's phrase for a panic.

Of the amount of money now in circulation \$600,000,000 is silver, (during October \$2,287,000 more of it was coined at the ratio of 16 to 1), and \$346,000,000 of greenbacks, neither of which is a drain upon the government gold reserve. Here are \$1,000,000,000 of the money now in circulation, which it is proposed to destroy, while all the bankers are calling for "more money." What has the republican party proposed in regard to this matter? They have introduced three bills "to reform the currency."

One of these bills provides for the recoinage of standard legal tender silver dollars into small change. Originally it was part of the Hill bill, but was placed in a separate bill, was passed by the house, and is pending in the senate.

The second of these bills is the Hill bill, which provides for the redemption of standard legal tender silver dollars in gold and their ultimate retirement and destruction.

The third of these bills is the Fowler bill, which contemplates the redemption and destruction of the greenbacks and the establishment of bank note currency, based on the assets of the banks.

With a cry going up from all over the land for "more money," the republicans propose to destroy \$1,000,000,000 of the money we now have and the only proposition that they make toward increasing it, is to issue bank promises to pay, with the depositor's money which they hold, the only security!

If this is not economic idiocy, then will some one please give us a name that will better describe it.

Knox Lehman, Francesville, Ind., believes that "The Independent is a good educator—there is none better" and accordingly sends a club of five educational subscriptions.

THE GOSPEL OF DISCONTENT

The wise and great editor who was imported from the mouth of the Kaw to take charge of the drive department of D. E. Thompson's Lincoln Daily Star, undertook Monday to preach The Independent a sermon on the sinfulness of "preaching the doctrine of discontent to the constitutionally discontented." He takes for his text the communication of James W. Fitch, Uncasville, Conn., which appeared in column 3, page 7, of The Independent last week. Mr. Fitch has apparently given up all hope of ever accomplishing any reform by means of the ballot, and said so in his letter, and closed by daring the editor to print it. Of course The Independent does not pretend to indorse all the various shades of belief expressed by its readers in their communications, and so far as space will permit it denies no man a respectful hearing if his thoughts are couched in decent terms.

The Star is shocked because Mr. Fitch believes there must be "either a moral and spiritual reformation or civil war," and beseechingly implores the editor of The Independent to "pause and ask himself if he has not made quite enough frantic asses more frantic by preaching the doctrine of discontent." Doubtless the Star would call Herbert Spencer a "frantic ass" because back in 1894 in writing to an American friend he said: "We have had times before us (in England) and you have still more dreadful times before you—civil war, immense bloodshed, and eventually military despotism of the severest type." Surely the Star will not charge up Mr. Spencer's frantic assinity to The Independent.

Like all others of its ilk, the Star is working overtime preaching two inconsistent doctrines: (a) that the republican party is a party of progress, a party of affirmation, a party that does things; and (b) that we should "keep on letting well enough alone." No individual or nation ever made progress by "letting well enough alone." Had that doctrine been applied to the newspaper situation in Lincoln prior to October of this year, there would have been no exodus of editorial gray matter from the mouth of the Kaw. There would have been no Lincoln Daily Star to cause Will Owen Jones and the Seacrests to lie awake nights wondering how to stop the leaks in their newspaper circulation.

The gospel of discontent is the gospel of progress. Not the discontent that merely snarls and whines, but the discontent that points out defects fearlessly, suggests remedies, and attempts to apply them. The Independent is not afraid to give the devil his due, and frequently accords the republican party its meed of praise whenever, in its judgment, praise is deserved. But it is tired, very tired, of this everlasting bombast about the "greatest, the best, the most prosperous and liberty-enjoying people under the sun," as the Star puts it. Granted that this is true—what of it? It does not follow that we are as great and good and prosperous and liberty-loving as we might be under a better system of laws, or even under a better administration of what we have. It does not follow that we cannot become greater, better, more prosperous and more liberty-loving—and that is why The Independent preaches the gospel of discontent.

Mr. De Hart feels quite sure that President Roosevelt will smash the trusts. It is to be hoped he will. But however sincere the president may be, The Independent cannot agree with Mr. De Hart that any great "smashing" will be done by bringing civil and criminal actions under the provisions of the Sherman law. These suits may help a great deal—but until discrimination in railroad freight rates is wiped out, The Independent has little hopes of any smashing "staying put."