

representing the voters. Two years ago I assisted in having a plank in our state platform demanding a general primary elections law under which all parties could make their nominations, as in the Minneapolis system in Minnesota, or the plan supported by Governor La Follette of Wisconsin. I am glad to see you test that plan.

The admirable work you are doing in card-indexing the Old Guard deserves commendation, and reward. I enclose \$1 bill to help pay expenses. The Old Guard will continue to be a power whether the people's party continues an organization or not. They will be thoughtful radicals somewhere, in some party, and always contributing to thoughtful solving of great questions.

A call has been issued for people's state convention for April 12 in Kansas, and they may nominate a ticket, ignoring the democrats entirely.

The Independent has suggested that the laws governing presidential elections in each state be reported to the paper. The Kansas statute says little about such elections:

"On the Tuesday succeeding the first Monday in November . . . in every fourth year (after 1868), there shall be held a general election for the election . . . of as many electors of president and vice president of the United States as this state may be entitled to." (Sec. 2679 g. a. 1901.)

Under the Australian ballot system the presidential electors are recognized and referred to in connection with certificates of nomination, and also with the arrangement of names on the ballots, thus:

"All certificates of nomination shall be in writing, shall contain the name of each person nominated, his residence, his business, and the office for which he is nominated. . . . When electors for president and vice president of the United States are nominated, the names of the candidates for president and vice president may also be shown on the certificates. . . . (Sec. 2699 gen. stat. 1901.)" . . . "All nominations made and certified in accordance with the provisions of this act and none other, shall be printed on the official ballot. . . . Ballots shall contain no other names than those of nominees, except that the names of candidates for electors for president and vice president of the United States may be preceded by the names of the candidates for president and vice president." . . . (Sec. 2, ch. 228, laws 1903.)

"All nominations made by political parties shall be known and designated as 'party nominations,' and the certificates by which such nominations are certified shall be known and designated as 'party certificates of nomination.' Party nominations of candidates for public office can be made only by a delegate or mass convention, primary election or caucus of qualified voters belonging to one political party having a national or state organization." (Sec. 2696, gen. stat. 1901.)

"Any political party having a state or national organization, by means of a delegate or mass convention, primary election, or caucus of qualified voters belonging to such party, may, for the state . . . nominate one person for each office that is to be filled . . . at the next ensuing election, and subject to the provisions of this act, file a certificate of such nominations so made." . . . (Sec. 2697, gen. stat. 1901.)

"All nominations other than party nominations shall be known and designated as 'independent nominations,' and the nomination papers whereby such nominations are made shall be known and designated as 'independent certificates of nomination.' Independent nominations of candidates for any office to be filled by the voters of the state at large may be made by nomination papers signed by not less than 2,500 qualified voters of the state for each candidate." . . . (Sec. 2698, gen. stat. 1901.)

As the people's party has a national and state organization, it can nominate the ten presidential electors, I think, by a delegate or mass convention, or primary election, unless the republicans, in whose hands the state government is, should decide that the party has no national or state organization. They might do this on the theory that we had no separate state ticket in 1902, though we nominated a full ticket. Said ticket was nominated also by the democrats, and appeared on the ballot under that heading as the republicans had passed a law preventing two or more parties from nominating the same candidate, or rather forbidding the name to appear more than once on the official ballot. But surely organization does not depend upon whether a ticket was printed on the ballots or not.

J. C. RUPPENTHAL.

## South Dakota Populists

The Old Guard Waking Up—Pleased With Action at St. Louis

Of all the states where populism once had a strong foothold, none has, up to this time, shown so much apathy as South Dakota. Up to the middle of February only four had enrolled in the Old Guard of Populism, and one of those is really a Nebraskan—Senator Muffy of Madison county, temporarily at Hot Springs for his wife's health, and another was a prominent people's party worker in Iowa in 1901.

But the action of the committees at St. Louis seems to have had a good effect. The letter below tells its own story. It was written upon a letter head practically identical with the one I have used in the Old Guard work, except that it carries the names of the state organization where mine has the Denver conference organization. J. M. Pease—the writer—is chairman; E. J. Tracy, of Minnehaha county, is secretary; N. L. Crawley, of Hand county, treasurer; and T. J. Thompson, of Beadle county, organizer.

Hurrah for the Old Guard of Populism of South Dakota! "Have you heard from South Dakota," was the significant inquiry of several gentlemen at the St. Louis meeting, with many grimaces and shrugging of shoulders, as much as to say, "Ah, gentlemen, Mr. Hearst has the populists of South Dakota in his vest pocket—have you heard from South Dakota?"

Now, The Independent is not the conscience-keeper for any populists, except those connected with the paper, and it cheerfully acknowledges the undoubted right of every populist to be "for" Mr. Hearst or any other candidate he prefers. But it dislikes to see snap judgment taken, especially under the conditions which prevail in South Dakota.

The suggestion of Mr. Pease is good. Some sort of working organization should be effected in each of the 53 counties. I should suggest that something after the plan outlined for the Vanguard of Populism would be about right. Make an enrollment of every voter who is willing to stand up and be counted for the fundamental principles of populism as outlined in the Omaha platform and in the St. Louis address, and who approves the action of the two committees at St. Louis in calling the Springfield convention. Advertise thoroughly the Springfield call. Call a state convention, say for about June 15, giving plenty of time to perfect the enrollment. See that county conventions are called in time to elect delegates to the state convention. And see to it that Vanguards are elected as delegates to all conventions, county, state and national. Then no matter who is the choice of South Dakota for president, there can be no charge of bad faith or snap judgment, and the populists of South Dakota can be depended upon to support the ticket nominated at Springfield.

A record of this enrollment should be made by the South Dakota organization; but for the benefit of the national committee, every enrolled member in the state should also be enrolled in the national Vanguard records, thus keeping in touch with the national organization. Mr. Pease's letter follows.—D.

Editor Independent: A reference to your enrollment of the Old Guard of Populism will convince you that no state in the Union, more than South Dakota, needed the reviving influences and inestimable benefits which are sure to result to our cause in this state from that gathering of reform patriots held in St. Louis on Washington's birthday.

The St. Louis meeting possessed, in the highest degree, the two essential elements for success which have characterized every crisis in the life of the republic and of every worthy reform movement in this country.

First, its leading spirits placed every vital interest of the cause above self, and, second, both factions were possessed by a determination for ultimate and complete union that no personal differences, past or present, could overcome. Reunion under such heroic conditions and dispositions was inevitable.

The future of the cause of economic reform is secure in the hands of such men as recently met at St. Louis.

This reunion of populism will so encourage and revive our drooping spirits here in South Dakota that we hope to be able in the near future to show that it was just what was needed to rekindle our campfires and put new life and hope into our disheartened and discouraged membership.

If such a populist revivalist as Col.

J. S. Felter, of Springfield, Ill., could be sent to this state for a series of meetings to be held at ten principal county seat towns, it would result in an awakening such as we have not seen since the days of the farmers' alliance and the independent party.

If we can perfect county organizations under whatever plan the national joint committee shall decide upon, between now and the date for holding our national convention, the people's party, in this state, would soon become so strongly fortified and securely established that those populists who are now looking for the Bryan-Hearst democrats to dominate the national democratic convention, may return and find a welcome and comfortable political home in the people's party of South Dakota.

There are no bounds to our enthusiasm or limits to our gratitude for the success of the recent St. Louis conference. We will now get together and organize for the most important presidential campaign since that of Weaver and Field in 1832.

JOHN M. PEASE.

Davison County, S. D.

### Bryan a Populist?

Editor Independent: The reorganizers bring against Mr. Bryan the charge of populism, but they cannot establish their case.

With populists the paramount issues are money, land and transportation, and in none of these does Mr. Bryan assent to our ideas.

We believe in the old Jeffersonian idea of "treasury notes bottomed on taxes," or "notes redeemable by taxation," as some consider more explicit; not in an irredeemable currency as Mr. Bryan has charged. Did he ever advocate the right of the people to issue any money but coin, or notes redeemable in coin? He has much to say about the money changer's rule, but would he really support a measure to break their power?

We have declared that "the land should not be monopolized for speculative traffic." The source of power of the coal trust, steel trust, and many others is the monopolization of the base of supplies, and so long as they control this base, any regulations in regard to publicity, interstate commerce or the tariff will be of little avail, for they will skin the producer, fleece the manufacturer and rob the consumer just the same.

But perhaps there is no other question of such vital importance to the people of the United States as that of the railroads; certainly not to the farmers of the west. The railways rob us by day and by night; they catch us both coming and going; and the farmer pays the freight. The roads pay their chief officers royal salaries and get their attorneys elected governor and United States senator. They have inflated their capital beyond belief and yet make more money than any legitimate business, and "the people be damned."

We populists had heard that in some other countries some of the railroads were owned by the government, and the people got service much more reasonable than we, and yet the roads were a great source of revenue to the countries owning them. So we demanded that the government take possession of these roads, paying the owners the original cost or what it would cost to duplicate them, and operate them for the benefit of the people. Did Mr. Bryan ever intentionally, by inadvertence or by accident, say a word that could be construed to be in favor of such a plan?

He has recently been in Europe and has written some very interesting letters about things, people and customs; and some of his admirers have been anxiously waiting to see what he would have to say about government railroads. They read, with interest, his letter in regard to municipal ownership of street railways, water and gas monopolies, etc., but were beginning to fear he had missed connection with the state railroads. But not so. He actually saw them! And he tells us all about them in The Commoner of February 26! Ginger! Did you ever see a man walk on eggs and not crack a shell?

He saw government railroads in Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Russia; was writing from Germany, but no word of German roads. And before he has finished the fifth line he switches off onto the important subject of his discovery, in Russia, of a community that employed

a physician who treats the people without charge!

We have politicians in this country who do that in October.

There is no doubt he could have written five columns of very interesting matter instead of less than five lines on that subject, without committing himself one way or the other.

Against the base libel that he is a populist, Mr. Bryan has just cause of action and can produce volumes of unimpeachable evidence.

GEO. H. STEELE.

Rockham, S. D.

### A Democratic View

Editor Independent: Received your Old Guard circular letter, and as I am not a populist, I did not answer. Have always been a democrat and will remain one as long as W. J. Bryan controls the organization of that party.

The populists in this county, while they had an organization, were composed of a few disgruntled republicans who always wanted office. By this I mean an honest populist could not do anything in their conventions; so nearly all are now with the old parties.

I take The Independent because I like to read all sides of the question, which I think every voter should do.

In my opinion the populists will never become a party of national importance unless the gold democrats get control of the democratic party.

If this happens, then the only course for Bryan's followers is to vote 'er straight for the populist nominee.

C. E. DOTY.

Cass County, Neb.

### How's This for Democracy?

Archie Roosevelt, if the story told by some of his playmates is to be believed, is very much handicapped in the selection of his friends by the fact that his father is temporarily occupying the White house. He may only play, so Archie has explained the situation, with the children of families in "ranking society," such as those of diplomatic, senatorial, army and navy circles. No others at least can be received by Archie at the White house, and these must present their fathers' visiting cards as an evidence of their privilege to call upon the president's son.

Archie goes to the public school, and presents thereby a very edifying spectacle of a democratic principle in practice which has been generously exploited at home and abroad. This exposure to the masses, however, sometimes throws temptation in his way under the guise of small boys who never heard of such a thing as "ranking society."

He had a little chum of this kind at Christmas time when his mother was sending out invitations for a children's party at the White house. Archie was very anxious to have him included among the guests, but he was somewhat perplexed to know how it could be managed. He explained the situation quite frankly to his little friend and concluded with a promise to ask his mother if he couldn't be invited anyway.

The little friend also had a mother at home, to whom he revealed his hopes and expectations. But she, misguided woman, had grown up in the belief which Benjamin Franklin's democratic daughter essayed to establish when she insisted that there was "no rank in America but rank inton." And when Archie reported on the following day that he had asked his mother and that she had said the little boy could come, the little boy responded reluctantly: "I've asked mine, too, and she says I can't." —New York World.

### Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure

Costs Nothing if it Fails

Any honest person who suffers from Rheumatism is welcome to this offer. For years I searched everywhere to find a specific for Rheumatism. For nearly 20 years I worked to this end. At last, in Germany, my search was rewarded. I found a costly chemical that did not disappoint me as other Rheumatic prescriptions had disappointed physicians everywhere.

I do not mean that Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure can turn bony joints into flesh again. That is impossible. But it will drive from the blood the poison that causes pain and swelling, and then that is the end of Rheumatism. I know this so well that I will furnish for a full month my Rheumatic Cure on trial. I cannot cure all cases within a month. It would be unreasonable to expect that. But most cases will yield within 30 days. This trial treatment will convince you that Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure is a power against Rheumatism—a potent force against disease that is irresistible.

My offer is made to convince you of my faith. My faith is but the outcome of experience—of actual knowledge. I know what it can do. And I know this so well that I will furnish my remedy on trial. Simply write me a postal for my book on Rheumatism. I will then arrange with a druggist in your vicinity so that you can secure six bottles of Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure to make the test. You may take it a full month on trial. If it succeeds the cost to you is \$5.00. If it fails the loss is mine and mine alone. It will be left entirely to you. I mean that exactly. I don't expect a penny from you.

Write me and I will send you the book. Try my remedy for a month. If it fails the loss is mine. Address Dr. Shoop, Box 1900, Racine, Wis. Mild cases not chronic are often cured by use of two bottles. At all druggists.