

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. SIXTEENTH YEAR.

CAMPAIGN RATES. One for 15 cents.—Seven for a Dollar.

\$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.

T H TIBBLES, Editor.
C Q DEFRANCE, Associate Editor.
F. D. EAGER, Business Manager.



Bryan will vote for Parker and Davis.

Oh! for some power that would make men free from party bondage.

The people of the United States absolutely repudiated the supreme court decision in the Dred Scott case and they will serve the Colorado supreme court in the same way.

Four of the leaders of the republican party have died since the last national campaign—McKinley, Hanna, Quay and Reed; but the machine moves along in the same old groove.

President Roosevelt got mixed in a speech that he made the other day when he delivered a little homily on anarchy in a certain South American republic. It must have been Colorado that he had in mind.

There is the hottest political fight on in Wisconsin that has been known in these states since the civil war. An appeal from the republican national convention has been entered. The title of the case is "The People vs. the Railroads."

It is said that Roosevelt comforted himself when he was informed that Hanna's pictures were placed all over the convention hall, while not one of his was to be seen, by repeating the old phrase: "The king is dead; long live the king."

The Fremont reporters are certainly an enterprising lot. They did not print the resolutions passed by the state convention complimenting and thanking their own citizens for their part in the musical program and courtesies extended.

A platform should be a plain statement of principles and demands. The argument to sustain those principles and demands should be left to our public speakers and the populist press. A platform with a stump speech in it, is a drag on any party.

The English papers are denouncing the Russians in unmeasured terms for the crushing out of the Finish nationality. Do those editors think that the world has forgotten about a certain Boer war? And the imperialist editors in this country should also keep their mouths shut. In all the world only the populists are in the position to denounce those sort of things without playing the hypocrite.

Nothing more excites the anger of the corporations than for a man to say that he wants to see the corporations have justice done them. When a man says that, there are no more papers for him. The suggestion that the corporations should have justice makes the managers knees smite together. Before their vision there immediately rises stone piles and penitentiaries. Never tell a corporation man that you believe that he should have justice, unless you speak in the Pickwickian sense.

THE PARTING OF THE WAYS.

The people's party is the successor of one or two "third" parties which have risen since the civil war in response to a demand on the part of the wealth-producers for a political organization which would represent their economic welfare.

The election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 was a temporary victory for that large class described by him in his first annual message as—

"Men, with their families—wives, sons, and daughters—who work for themselves on their farms, in their houses, and in their shops, taking the whole product to themselves, and asking no favors of capital on the one hand nor of hired laborers or slaves on the other."

But, "as the result of the war, corporations have been enthroned," and as early as 1868 it became apparent that the republican party organization had passed into the hands of the same type of men Christ drove from the temple. The democratic party, cursed with the odium of slavery, and driven from power, might have died a peaceful death had not the Belmont family furnished the funds to keep the organization alive—the same tribe of Belmonts who dominated the recent convention at St. Louis.

In 1868 the House of Belmont defeated "Gentleman" Geo. Pendleton in convention and nominated Horatio Seymour—who was known to favor coin payment of the bonds. But they were unable to control the platform declaration, which was for—

"One currency for the government and the people, the laborer and the officeholders, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder."

And when it became apparent that Seymour would defeat Grant and that he would religiously carry out the platform—although a "hard money" man himself—the Belmonts, Sam Tilden, and Manton Marble of the New York World, a short time before election contrived a hellish scheme to defeat him—and they succeeded. There is no room here to tell this story, but it may be found at length in Alex. Del Mar's "History of Monetary Crimes."

The Peter Cooper "greenback" movement of 1876 was after the war the first organized protest against plutocratic domination of both old parties. In 1880, with James B. Weaver its standard-bearer, it polled 307,306 votes—and was promptly "fused" to death between that and 1884. In 1884, under the leadership of Ben Butler, it fell back to 175,370 votes; and in 1888 was supplanted by the union labor party with A. J. Streater as leader, polling 146,935 votes.

The people's party, then began to rise from the ashes of the "greenback" and union labor parties. Gatherings at St. Louis in 1889, at Ocala, Fla., in 1890; at Cincinnati, May 19, 1892, each of which adopted resolutions, each of which adopted resolutions in the nature of a platform, were the forerunners of the people's party national convention which met at Omaha, July 4, 1892, and nominated James B. Weaver for president and James G. Field for vice president.

So rapid was the rise of the people's party that the Weaver electors had 22 votes in the electoral college, and the popular vote was 1,055,424. The subsequent history of the people's party is too recent to need repetition here. Suffice it to say that the apparent revolution in the democratic party in 1896 almost—but not quite—wrought the undoing of the people's party.

The radical change from the straddling, meaningless democratic platform of 1892 to the Chicago platform of 1896, together with the nomination of Mr. Bryan, led most populists to hope that for once in its history the democratic party was completely divorced from its plutocratic leading strings. The Palmer and Buckner bolt strengthened this notion. Hence, it was most natural that the great majority of populists should sanction the action of the people's party at St. Louis in 1896, and give Mr. Bryan the full measure of their support.

The national democratic convention at Kansas City in 1900, however, was sufficient notice to most populists that the plutocratic leadership in the democratic party had not been eliminated, but was simply pretending to be asleep. Yet the magnetic personality of Mr. Bryan still charmed them and they—with a few exceptions—retained confidence in his integrity; and they cheerfully joined forces with Dick Croker, et al., in an effort to elect Mr. Bryan.

The recent democratic convention at St. Louis marks the complete return of the democratic party to its plutocratic leading strings. Its "old man of the sea," the Belmont family, is again riding. The "taint of populism" has been removed from the platform. But—and this is most incomprehensible

even to populists who knew that the plutocrats had never been completely driven from the democratic party—Mr. Bryan now says:

"I shall vote for Parker and Davis."

"The parting of the ways" has been reached. When a man of Mr. Bryan's great ability so far places party above principle as to support the man he denounced in his Chicago address as an unfit man for president, simply and only for the sake of "party regularity"—surely less gifted populists cannot be blamed for being "regular," especially when they have such a brilliant leader as Watson and such a platform as that adopted at Springfield.

Fusion in Nebraska is done. In the past the populists here have joined hands with the democrats in carrying on state campaigns, and they have no regrets because of it, for the democrats then stood for the Chicago and Kansas City platforms. But co-operation with Parker democrats is unthinkable. "The parting of the ways" is reached. Former "Bryan democrats" and "Bryan populists" must now choose whether they will become Parker democrats or Watson populists. Mr. Bryan himself has declared his intention of becoming a Parker democrat until the election is over. That is his personal privilege.

There can be no co-operation in Nebraska this year on the state ticket between Watson populists and Parker democrats. The democratic state convention which meets in Lincoln, August 10, will without doubt be "regular" and put up Parker electors. The populist state convention, which meets the same day, will be equally "regular" and put a Watson and Tibbles electoral ticket. To then join forces in nominating state officers would mean that neither populists nor democrats care anything for their respective platforms, but are simply "an organized appetite" hungry for office.

Among the democrats of Nebraska are men the populists have learned to love and respect as fully as members of their own party, and to break the heretofore pleasant relations cannot be done without regret. But it must be done. The minor differences between Bryan democracy and populism were no barrier to consistent co-operation—because both were headed in the same direction; both were a unit in opposing plutocracy. Populism still stands opposed to plutocracy. Its opposition may be feeble, it's true, but it can be genuine and unstilted nevertheless. But Bryan democracy has been transformed into Parker plutocracy, and Mr. Bryan, making a wry face, accepts the transformation for the sake of regularity. And this means that his own party followers must also choose whether they will be Parker democrats or Watson populists. There is no middle ground—even on state matters.

This is The Independent's view. It lays no claim to infallibility, however, and desires its Nebraska readers to express themselves freely and candidly on the subject. The state convention is less than a month away, and every delegate who comes should

thoroughly understand the situation and be ready to represent his constituents in an intelligent manner.

DO IT NOW.

Both of the old political parties are thoroughly in the control of plutocracy. All of those people who have hoped for reform through either of the old parties have seen the last hope vanish with the nomination of Parker at St. Louis. Mr. Bryan, the greatest living champion of the rights of the plain people, has been unable to make a reform party out of the democratic organization. Despite his eloquent protests it has returned to the Cleveland vomit and is now more thoroughly plutocratic than ever before in its history.

The people's party offers the only hope for relief from trust extortion and corporate domination. Thousands of democrats in every state will refuse to follow Mr. Parker to worship at the shrine of Mammon. As self-respecting, independent, thinking men they will cast their ballots for the only party that stands for true reform—for Watson and Tibbles.

Likewise hosts of anti-monopoly republicans in every part of the country will see in the present situation an opportunity to align themselves on the side of real reform—an opportunity to support a platform as clear in its meaning as the platforms of the republican party in 1860-1864 when it was first organized—an opportunity to cast their ballots for a leader as bold and fearless in his fight for the people's rights as Abraham Lincoln—the scholar, the author, patriotic Thomas E. Watson of Georgia.

The Independent appeals to every populist to GO TO WORK. Do it now. Help push the educational work in every neighborhood. Help to teach the people that between Parker and Roosevelt there is not the slightest difference. Both stand for the rule of plutocracy—for the dollar before the man. Every reader of The Independent should help to extend its circulation. To make the work easy we have made a rate for campaign subscriptions that hardly covers the cost for white paper and press work. Think of it, you can have The Independent sent every week until after election to seven of your neighbors for a dollar—only 15 cents each. Invite every neighbor to subscribe and send in the names and addresses without delay.

SEVEN FOR A DOLLAR means seven votes for Watson and Tibbles and true reform. Do it now—and soon those whose names you send in will themselves be sending others, and the people's party will grow as it has never grown before in its history.

And thousands of democrats in the west and the south will continue to vote for what they don't want. And Wall street said it was good.

The Dingley tariff follows the flag whether the constitution does or not. The officers and soldiers in the Philippines have to pay a heavy duty upon every article that they bring with them or which is sent to them.

Patronize Independent advertisers.

Can You Match This PHENOMENAL RECORD?

The cash and invested assets of the

Bankers Reserve Life Company,

of Omaha, Nebraska,

On June 30th, 1902.....\$ 45,593.81
On June 30th, 1904..... 257,510.52
Percentage of Gain.....(over) 500 per cent

Its policies not excelled in the world.

Active, reliable agents wanted.

B. H. ROBISON, - President