

and vote for Teddy Roosevelt for spite—why can't they fuse with other Roosevelt supporters? Populists have no choice as between Teddy and Alton B.—why should they discriminate between the respective supporters of these two worthies?

Hearst has formally notified Judge Parker that he will have the enthusiastic support of all the Hearst newspapers. What do those populists who were talking Hearst a while ago now think of what The Independent told them.

More than 100,000 people attended the funeral of Golden Rule Jones, mayor of Toledo. Many of them wept at his bier and offered prayer. That is a record more to be desired than to have held the highest office in the gift of the people.

The Japanese seem to be able to manufacture anything, from a cambric needle to a modern battleship with all its intricate machinery. The Japanese run great banks, but no failure was ever reported and no charge of defalcation ever made.

The republican papers are lending their earnest aid to bring about a fusion of Parker democrats and Watson populists. And well they may, for it would be the greatest "snap" they could ask. On every hand the fusion candidates would be harassed and embarrassed by the most annoying questions. "Are you for Parker and sound money, or Watson and greenbacks?" would be asked ten thousand times. And all the poor devil of a candidate could say would be, "I'm for the office, because I need the money!"

The communication from I. W. Zornes, Mountain Grove, Mo., on another page, undoubtedly expresses the determination of thousands who supported Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900. No other man in the history of America ever had such a following as Mr. Bryan. His great power lay in the universal belief in his honesty, sincerity, and integrity—but his followers were for the most part men with minds of their own, and with all his powers he cannot lead them into the Parker camp. They still believe in Mr. Bryan's honesty—but believe he has allowed love of party to overshadow love of the principles he contends for.

An Ultimatum.

Editor Independent: I am 65 years old; voted the republican ticket 35 years; left that party in 1896, after the St. Louis convention, when they showed beyond a doubt that they belonged to the money power, by adopting the gold standard, which could be of no possible benefit to any one but the money power.

I then thought our first and best chance lay in a combined effort on Mr. Bryan. So I supported him with tongue and vote. And now, as his party has committed suicide at St. Louis, I am again compelled to hunt a new home. And as I am still of the opinion that pure democracy is the best form of government that can be established and maintained among men, I must join the populist party as the only hope of a return to political liberty.

I now, therefore, pledge the remainder of my life, my fortune, and my sacred honor, to the establishment of the principles set forth in the platform adopted at Springfield, Ill. I am now ready to go to work at any time, anywhere, that I am needed. I now offer my services to the national committee to work anywhere they want me. Tending congratulations and hoping for success, I am yours for the war.

I. W. ZORNES.

Mountain Grove, Mo.

Phelps Co., Neb.

Editor Independent: I like the way you define your position on fusion this year. Our party lost thousands of votes in this state through our tie-up with Bryan democracy, and to now fuse with Parker democracy would put the party out of action.

The democratic plea for fusion and harmony reminds me of the man that borrowed \$30 of his neighbor, who could ill afford to lend that sum, but did so. Nineteen years afterwards, being sore pressed for funds to pay his taxes, and on his way down town, what appeared to him a stranger, stepped up to the lender, called him by name, asked him if he remembered lending him \$30 nineteen years ago. With surprise, and with hope rising, the lender said he did. He was cheered by the statement of the gentleman who said he had not forgotten, nor could he ever forget, and he intended, some day, to pay in full; but just at this time was hard up, and would he be kind enough to lend him

\$5 for the sake of old times?

Hurrah for the two Toms, and no fusion.
L. C. BARR.
Holdrege, Neb.

A New York Bolt.

Editor Independent: The St. Louis platform is a glaring inconsistent fraud, a great disappointment, and a humiliating surrender to the plutocrats who wrecked the party in 1896. There is not a line of progressive democracy in it and its own creators admit that it was made to get in on.

If either Roosevelt or Parker is elected the trusts, banks, and railroads will get anything they want in the way of special privileges.

Although both old parties claim the money question is settled, because the gold standard is established, before the end of another administration the banks will attempt to force an asset currency bill of some kind through congress.

I have voted the straight democratic ticket for twenty years. Since 1896, like thousands of other democrats, I have looked upon Mr. Bryan as the savior and redeemer of the party that once stood for the rights of the common people, but pure democracy consists of something more than partisan insanity, victory at the polls, or a scramble for office (party leaders to the contrary notwithstanding) and I shall not vote for Judge Parker.

The Springfield platform is sound, progressive, and democratic. It is full of old Bunker Hill and Yorktown. It breathes the immortal spirit of the patriots from Washington to Lincoln. It stands for a higher and better civilization.
A. L. HEMENWAY.
Dekalb Junction, N. Y.

Will Not Reciprocate.

In two successive presidential campaigns the populists have followed the Bryan banner, putting aside their own leaders on the ground of principle, professing to believe that they would secure through the election of Mr. Bryan almost as many of the peculiar reforms upon their program as they would by the election of one of their own number. They insisted that Bryan was as good a populist as any one of them and that they would as soon see him in the White house as any self-styled populist.

But Mr. Bryan is not manifesting anything like the same sort of reciprocal devotion that the populists paid to him. This year seems to have brought him the opportunity to pay back past favors by enrolling himself among the supporters of Watson and Tibbles. If Watson was good enough to run for vice president on the same ticket with him in 1896, and to vote and work for him in 1896 and 1900, he ought to be good enough to receive the support of Mr. Bryan in 1904. If, as he has been constantly telling us in upholding fusion in this state, it is principles rather than men and policies rather than partisanship that should claim the good citizen's allegiance, then the ticket promulgated by the populists at Springfield should offer Mr. Bryan more in common with his ideas of national government than the ticket nominated at St. Louis.—Omaha Bee.

Kansas Democrats Rebel.

Editor Independent: I went to Springfield an independent, expecting to vote for Roosevelt, in spite of his party; I returned a populist, determined to vote for Watson because of his party. I was more than pleased at what I saw and the men I met at Springfield; and I was greatly encouraged by what I learned in Springfield and St. Louis as to the temper of the people in different parts of the country.

I was not, however, fully prepared for the spirit of rebellion in the democratic ranks in my own state due to the action of the St. Louis convention and its members. The Manhattan Mercury of this week contained a double-headed editorial, 11-4 columns long, headed "Bryan Surrendered." Its real editor is the democratic leader in Riley county; and I had not expected that paper to take a pronounced stand at this time. I wish you could give the entire article to your readers, but I will quote only three paragraphs, which are fair samples of the whole.

"The 6,000,000 democrats who voted for Bryan will not follow him into the bastard republican organization known as the gold standard democracy."

"If democrats are forced to vote for republican principles, and the choice is resolved into a choice of men, all intelligent patriots will prefer Roosevelt to Parker, for, with all his erraticism, he is a safer man for the republic than Parker—because he is more democratic. Parker backed as he is by the Rothschilds, the Rockefeller, the Belmonts and the money

power, is the ultra embodiment of imperialism. We repudiate the St. Louis platform and the candidate nominated upon that platform."

"The money power now has absolute control of both democratic and republican parties. The voters are now left to a choice of men, but not of principles. So long as the national democracy adhered to democratic principles, there was no need of a third party; now it has become an absolute necessity."

Can you give space for one more paragraph?

"Bryan said he had fought a good fight and his course might be finished, but no one would say he had not kept the faith. With an admiration second to on one for the great man who has at last surrendered to the money power, for the sake of harmony and slavery, we challenge the keeping of that faith in which 6,000,000 intelligent voters found comfort and assured success, if God rules and the republic of the United States is to endure."

The populists of Kansas will never again fight under any banner but their own, nor will they ever again be the third party in the race. It is exhilarating to enter once more upon a campaign in which we have no apologies to make for either our party, its principles, or its candidates.

ALBERT GRIFFIN.

Topeka, Kas.

A Bit Pessimistic.

Editor Independent: I write extemporaneously, but have come to look upon a great majority of the people, as well as political leaders, as being dishonest, as longing for, and really expecting, that some day, something will turn up that will enable them to get some kind of an office. You, I know, have noticed that they are easily swayed to the mean side of a question, even turned back to the old wallow by slight influence, against those who are their true friends and helpers. For instance, they stick to gold and silver with the same empty stardness that people did in the time of Solomon. We try to improve in everything else, but not in our monetary system.

The people delusively stick to the idea that "all will come out right," it has always been so and always will be, and all such dreggy, musty, sepulchral refuse. We often hear the remark approvingly made that "a little war will help things," and we living in a land that has a school house on every hill-top, and a church in every valley! I dislike to entertain the thought, but does not such sentiment cause the thought that these "good people" are not far from the highwayman, from the assassin, from the—oh! let me stop!

A bad financial system, fostered by all civilized (?) governments, is the bane of proper lives, because it is the most bland and greatest thief extant.

My good brother, my sympathies are with you, but I am not able to devote time and money for the benefit of those who will not help themselves; for those who try to strain the mud from the stream, instead of driving the old, old hog out of the spring.

Yours for all that is right,

J. S. STEWARD.

Gratis, O.

(This is the inevitable frame of mind which will be reached by every man who disregards self-interest as one of the important factors not only in politics, but in every other human activity. The attempt to place politics or anything else upon a purely idealistic, altruistic, sentimental plane is sure to cause a reaction. Mr. Steward doubtless started out with the idea that men are hungry and thirsting for lofty idealism and that once they should be told the truth, they would flock to that standard by the millions.)

Christianity itself is a living example of the slowness of spreading altruistic ideals. If every man would live up to Christ's Sermon on the Mount, then indeed would the kingdom of heaven be at hand. But every man will not do so. He cannot be compelled to. The absurdity of an enforced altruism needs no comment.

Populism is not a scheme of altruism, but a plea for justice. And justice does not consist in attending to the other fellow's affairs and allowing some other to attend to ours. Let every man look to his own feet to avoid the ordinary little stumblings. Co-operation is only necessary when the feet of many are simultaneously threatened.

An enlightened self-interest is the dominant note in populism. Why should populists demand reform in the monetary system? Simply that the wealth-producers may be free from the present robbery which results from allowing some individuals to control the circulation to the detriment of others. Altruism would suggest to the robbed that they make no

complaint—"it is more blessed to give than to receive."

Why should populists demand public ownership of railways and similar utilities? Well, it isn't altruism that inspires the demand, but a desire to be rid of the robbery which is inevitable whenever private persons are permitted to exercise sovereign powers. Every populist wants scientific money and public railroads primarily because he will be the gainer; he will be enabled to retain unto himself considerable wealth which is now wringed from him because these things are controlled by private persons for private gain.

Populism is conservative, however, and contains none of the aggressive features, for example, well typified in the demand for a "protective tariff." The self-interest of populism is defensive, and not offensive, in its character. But it is self-interest, just the same; and whenever men allow themselves to be carried away in a wave of altruism, which they fondly believe is synonymous with populism, they are sooner or later sure to reach the frame of mind in which Bro. Steward now finds himself.

Of course men "long" and "expect" that some day something will "turn up that will enable them to get some kind of an office." Why deny it? It is a laudable ambition. It is no disgrace for a man to hope for, to aspire for office. The real disgrace is when he lies about it and saying, "I will never consent," consents.

Suppose that instead of worrying our heads about lofty sentiment, we say, "We are sick and tired of producing great quantities of wealth and having it taken from us unjustly through the operation of man-made laws; and now, by the Eternal, this must stop. We intend to stop it. We demand immunity from further aggressions on the part of predatory wealth. We intend to be selfish now for a time and look after our own. Our altruism has made paupers of us. Let us frankly state what we want—and fight for it."—Associate Editor.)

Mr. Bryan's Position.

Friends and countrymen, let's trust him—

Though he's not a man to trust—
Let's endeavor to elect him,
Though his cause is far from just;
I have put away all rancor
As I promised them I would,
I am for the splendid ticket,
Though it isn't any good.

Let us gird ourselves for battle—

But I hope we cannot win—
Let us pray to be successful,
Though success would be a sin;
Let us give the people's banner
Unto him to nobly bear,
But it's dangerous to do it,
For he isn't on the square.

Let us wave our hats for Parker,

The poor tool of foxy Dave;
Let us rest our hopes upon him,
Though he's Mammon's cringing
slave!

Let us raise him up to power,
Help to send him whooping through,
But remember—here I warn you—
You'll be sorry if you do.

—S. E. Kisor.

Washington Co., Neb.

Editor Independent: Enclosed herewith a postoffice order for \$2.51 to pay my subscription to The Independent and \$1 to help toward the Old Guard enrollment. It is not much, but it will help some, and if every one that believes in populist principles would give as much, you would have enough to enroll a whole lot of Old Guards and Vanguards.

I am a populist all over and hope to see them win this fall. As to a populist organization here, I have been unable to find out so far. If there are any pops here, they are very still. I took those blanks you sent me and went around and tried to sell them. I also took the sample copies of The Independent. I could get them to take a copy, but it would make you laugh to hear what they said. One said he did not care for politics, he just wanted the news (war and prize fights). Another said he would not read a column of it all summer. Another said he was a socialist, but if I would give him 25c for his paper, the Appeal to Reason, he would give 25c for The Independent, and finally said there was no use of either of us being out any money at all, for we could exchange papers. So you see how it is with most of them. Until we can get the people to read and understand the situation we must let them go to destruction in their own sweet way.

JEROME BAILEY.

Kennard, Neb.

Advertisers in The Independent are always glad to receive orders by mail. When writing please mention The Independent.