

**Brave Men And Cowards.**

It is a remarkable fact that the sportsman who comes from the jungle, where he has encountered without a tremor the deadliest animal foes, has been known, upon his return home with the trophies of his prowess, not infrequently to show himself a man who does not dare to oppose the wrong fad of an hour or a popular political belief. England, the nation of sportsmen, gave a strange exhibition of this trait of humanity during the Boer war. But a very few men, at the head of whom stood the prophet W. T. Stead, dared to antagonize the jingo cries. After mobs had smashed the windows in the houses of a few of the most outspoken, there was immediately noticeable throughout England an absence of men who cared to encounter the opprobrium of advocating unpopular justice, and the condemnation of their enthusiastically warlike neighbors—who were quite willing to go in large crowds and make demonstrations against single individuals.

In France during the revolution, we had another curious phase of courage. There were men, and many of them, who did not dare to set themselves in opposition to the dictates of their class, though they might have saved France by a timely exhibition of their beliefs, who later on marched from the prison to the guillotine with a light-heartedness and insouciance that showed physical courage of the highest type. So confusing are these contradictions, that we come almost to wonder what the word courage really means.

Perhaps its vagaries are best exhibited in that cartoon of "Life" which shows a lion-tamer, who has returned at a late hour and fears to encounter his spouse, going into the cage of the lion for his night's rest, and being discovered presently, the woman looking through the bars and exclaiming, "Oh! you coward!" And this cartoon is founded upon not rare idiosyncrasies of courage.

We then reach a point where we ask ourselves:

Am I a brave man, or am I a coward?

For instance, does my courage extend to the point of telling the truth when I lose advantage by such a course; or do I prove myself a liar through cowardice?

If I see a fellow man drowning, am I sufficiently brave to risk my own life in his rescue?

If I am in a society where an opinion that I hold to be based on truth is vigorously denounced, have I the courage to defend it?

Or do I slink? Slink is a good word, though not a very nice one. It is not pleasant to imagine oneself as a slinker.

And if a fire were occurring in the adjoining house, would I be willing to incur the risks of suffocation in order to rescue a woman who might otherwise perish?—and if I did this, would I on the next day give a smiling assent to the suggestion of my employer that I should vote a ticket which I believed to be not for the best interests of the community?

If I have a long-founded belief, which has been disturbed by argument, am I of that mental caliber which bravely goes to meet a demolition of my views, preferring to encounter a shock to these conceptions? Or do I mentally slink and carefully run away from disturbing thought?

In other words, am I a coward? True courage is a component part of so many things that it is worth our while to examine.

For instance, no man can be truly a gentleman if a coward. He may have the exterior marks of a gentleman—the veneering—but at heart he lacks, if he lacks courage.

There can be no such thing as true manliness, or true womanliness, if there is a lack of courage.

Yet I do not know of any course on courage that is given in the public schools. I do not know of any textbook on courage. I do not know of any book that has gathered together the great examples of moral courage which have been given to the world by its heroes.

Physical courage we lay stress upon. Physical courage is told of in books.

But physical courage is so common in form as to be almost unworthy of notice. In some it is a form of hysteria. In a thousand instances it has been known to be a lack of moral courage. The man touching elbows and going unflinchingly into battle, we speak of as exhibiting courage. Yet it may be merely that he fears to incur the criticism of his companions.

From the "Iliad" down, we have had much talk of this kind of courage. It is trifling. It is unimportant. It means very little. But moral courage—why have we no books which explain to the young the thousand ways in which moral courage may be cultivated,

and how much it means in each man's or woman's success?

Courage gives the man or the woman power to consider facts upon their merits. He will investigate. He will analyze and so obtain the truth. And this power of obtaining the truth—truth obtained through a courageous mind—is most valuable to every pursuit of life.—John Brisbane Walker, in Cosmopolitan.

**The Money Question.**

Editor Independent: It should be patent to all that whoever controls the money of our country may control everything including the government itself. It is a truism to state that a product should be subject to the undisputed control of the party who clearly produces it. I mean control for legitimate uses, of course.

It is indisputable that government produces all our money today. It is equally indisputable that government abandons its prerogative of controlling the same, and this notwithstanding that in doing so it subjects itself to the domination of the syndicated usurer who does control it and controls it for anything but legitimate purposes often.

In abandoning its right to control the circulating medium, a tool of its own production, the government deprives itself of all power to resist the demands of all business interests that are owned or controlled by the syndicated usurer. These interests are numerous and are rapidly on the increase and we are fast becoming a nation of hired men, wage serfs, beggars, paupers and criminals.

We may with some consistency flatter ourselves with the reflection that this is the greatest, the best, the most powerful nation on the globe; nevertheless when it comes to defending an individual or an interest against the syndicated usurer or any interest he dominates, this government today is a pusillanimous weakling, a contemptible poltroon.

This will continue to be the case until the government shall assume the control of the money which it creates. No chief executive will be allowed to respect his official oath who is not fortified with a clear knowledge of the origin of both money and its efficacy and is backed by a party which is in possession of the same knowledge and is determined that the government shall observe its rights and assert the same regarding money.

When such condition prevails the syndicated usurer will be found on his knees begging for such portion of the holdings which he has wrested as the government in clemency may see fit to grant him.

The people need educating at this point. They need to learn the secret of the usurer's power and how utterly useless it is to submit to his diabolical tyranny. To this end the people's party in its convention at Springfield should with much emphasis declare in favor of government control of government made money. Such a declaration would in discussion bring new light to bear on the mooted money question, which is not dead nor ever will be so long as the usurer depends on the government for money which the government in turn is depending on the usurer for the privilege of using. A. F. ALLEN.

Vinland, Kas. (This was written prior to the national convention, but crowded out with a mass of other manuscripts ten times greater than could possibly be used at the time.)

Mr. Allen has, in a number of communications to The Independent, stated his general propositions, the essence of which is "government control of government-made money." Does this mean any more than the constitutional avowment that congress shall have power "to coin money and regulate the value thereof"? If so, wherein is the difference? As The Independent views it, congress has never exercised its power to "regulate the value" of money; and as this regulation would necessarily imply "government control of government-made money," it would seem that the money plank of the Springfield platform covers the ground. What does Mr. Allen say to this?—Associate Editor.)

**Facts About Colorado.**

The miners' statement of the facts about the anarchy in Colorado, and the statement is true as far as The Independent can learn, is as follows:

Almost a year has passed since the strikes were precipitated in Colorado. What caused them and who is responsible for the consequences? Let the facts be stated.

The legislature of Colorado passed an eight-hour law in 1899 exactly like the eight-hour law of Utah, which the United States supreme court had declared constitutional.

The supreme court of Colorado, owned by the mine owners' associa-

tion and smelter trust, declared the law unconstitutional.

In 1902 a constitutional amendment was submitted to the people of the state, commanding the legislature in express terms to pass an eight-hour law. This was carried by a popular majority of more than 40,000 votes.

The legislature met and was bought outright by the mine and mill owners, with scarcely an attempt to conceal the crime. The members of the legislature, with the gold of the capitalists bulging in their breeches, refused to pass the law demanded by a majority of over 40,000 of the people.

These are the facts. No one can deny them. These facts caused the present strike.

The mine, mill and smelter workers, inhaling the poison fumes and gases which undermined their health and destroyed their lives, struck only after the mine and mill owners had debauched the supreme court, bought the legislature and trampled roughshod over the legally expressed will of the people.

The miners struck. They struck as the last resort.

Who are the criminals, the law-breakers, the corrupters of the body politic, the debauchers of the nation?

Who but the capitalist anarchists who compose the mine owners' association, the Colorado Fuel and Iron company and the American Smelting and Refining company?

These are the brigands who have the face to talk about law and order.

"To hell with the constitution" has been their motto from the start.

Wanted—Agents to sell pianos and organs on commission; big money made. We represent the largest factories in the world. G. A. Crancer Co., Lincoln, Neb.

**"Hocus Pocus Money"**

Believers in the quantitative theory of money—those of them who believed in the general proposition, but have not dug much beneath the surface—have been puzzled to explain, for example, what caused the panic of 1893. Or, more specifically, what caused the enormous decline in prices—in the general price level—when it was well known that not a dollar of coin (except an insignificant amount lost in various ways) had gone out of existence. There was just as much coined money as before; in fact, more than before.

If the value of money depends not upon the material substance upon which it is stamped or printed, but depends like the value of other useful articles upon the supply of and demand for it—how then could the value of money rise and price level fall in 1893? The supply of coined money had not diminished. The need for it, the desire for it, was not essentially greater; and, if we define "demand" as desire coupled with ability to gratify it, the demand for money was certainly less than before. Why, then, should the value of money rise enormously in 1893 and 1894—this being shown in the lowered prices of everything else?

The explanation is that although not a dollar of actual coin, except the negligible quantity destroyed by fire or lost in various ways, passed out of existence, yet millions and millions of intangible "dollars," in the form of "deposits" or "bank credits," did cease to exist; that these intangible, unreal, bank-ledger dollars, so long as the bank continued solvent, were as potent in affecting the price level as if coined upon gold; but instantly, when the bank closed its doors, their power ceased and the effect was exactly the same as the annihilation of so many coined dollars.

A good many populists have understood this for some time, but it was left for Albert Griffin of Topeka, Kas., to work out the whole matter in detail and put it in language which will readily be understood by the masses. Alexander Del Mar, in his "Science of Money," has given the matter attention, considering all the various credit devices as instruments for increasing the velocity of money in circulation—and his book should be read carefully by every person who expects to make public speeches upon the money question.

But for popular reading, Mr. Griffin's book cannot be too highly recommended. He has an apt way of saying things. These intangible, unreal, hypothetical "dollars," now known technically as "bank credits," Mr. Griffin names "hocus pocus money"—a title that will very likely stick. Now you see it—and now you don't—hocus pocus. The banker is prestidigitator. From under the wealth-producer's hat-band he draws a bank credit rabbit. It is alive—breathing—trembling.

"Hocus pocus," presto change! It is gone! There is no rabbit.

Mr. Griffin, in a recent letter, says: "I have re-enlisted as a straight populist (he had retired, disgusted over the fusion scrambles in Kansas); and I shall hereafter be always found on the fighting line. I am ready to do anything and everything that I can to aid the cause." Mr. Griffin is an effective campaign speaker before an audience that desires something more solid than jokes and platitudes. He has a message to impart and he gives it understandingly—but not in a dry way.

At considerable expense Mr. Griffin has issued his "Hocus Pocus Money Book" and while he does not doubt that it will have a large sale during the latter part of the campaign, he is very naturally anxious that it have as large a sale as possible early in the campaign in order that more effective work may be done.

Some weeks ago The Independent gave an editorial review of this book and Mr. Griffin reported at Springfield that as a result thereof he had received, up to that time, orders from 22 states and territories—a fact not attributed to the wide-spread interest in the money question, especially where an hitherto neglected field has been occupied, and to The Independent's increasing circulation in every state and its class of readers.

It is to be hoped that populist clubs and individuals everywhere will buy freely the "Hocus Pocus Money Book." It will spread populism faster than any similar book The Independent has yet seen. And the price is reasonable—25 cents a copy, paper covers, or 5 for \$1. Address: Albert Griffin, 321 Kansas ave., Topeka, Kas.; and mention The Independent.

Why not send in a club of new subscribers from your neighborhood?

You can save money by patronizing Independent advertisers.

**H. F. BISHOP ATTORNEY.**

**Legal Notice.**  
JAMES M. IRWIN, and PHOEBE M. WEIR defendants, will take Notice that on the 2nd day of July, 1904 the Mead Plumbing Heating and Lightning Company, also known as the Mead Plumbing Company, George E. Willamuth sole proprietor, as plaintiff, filed a petition in the district court of Lancaster County, Nebraska against James M. Irwin, and Phoebe M. Weir interpleaded with Emma McGahey, and Victor Dalby, the object and prayer of which are to foreclose a mechanic's lien on Lot 10, of Block 98 of the city of Lincoln, Nebraska, an itemized statement of which, duly verified, with a copy of the contract was duly filed in the office of the register of deeds of Lancaster County, Nebraska, on the 16th day of July, 1903, claiming a lien on the above described property in the sum of \$248.26 for supplies furnished and labor performed as therein itemized; that there is now due upon said mechanic's lien the sum of \$248.26 together with interest thereon from the 23rd day of April, 1903, for which sum plaintiff prays for a decree that the defendant be required to pay, or that said premises may be sold to satisfy the amount found due.

You are required to answer said petition on or before the 29th day of August, 1904.

Dated this 21st day of July, 1904.

Mead Plumbing, Heating & Lightning Company, also known as the Mead Plumbing Company, George E. Willamuth, sole proprietor,

Plaintiff,  
BY RICKETTS & RICKETTS, & H. F. BISHOP, Attorneys.

**BROWNE & SIDLES ATTORNEYS.**

**Notice of Amended Articles.**  
Waverly, Nebraska, July 16 1904.

At a special meeting of the Swedish Emanuel Society of Waverly Nebr., pursuant to a call of said Congregation, regularly made and at the time and place mentioned in said call, and in compliance with the terms of said call, the meeting was had and held on the 16th day of July 1904 at 8 o'clock P. M.

Meeting was called to order by August Branden, President of the Board of Trustees.

The call of the meeting was read by the secretary of the meeting duly chosen.

On motion of Rev. A. P. Nelson an amendment to the Articles of Incorporation was adopted, which amendment was in words and figures as follows:

**AMENDED ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION.**  
1. The name of this organization shall be "The Swedish Emanuel Congregational Church," of Waverly, Nebraska.

2. At no time shall the indebtedness of said Church organization exceed the sum of \$1,000.00.

3. The object of this Church organization shall be to conduct religious services of the Congregational order, for the benefit of the Swedish speaking people in and about the Village of Waverly, and to be conducted as directed by the board of trustees of said Church.

4. The business of said Church organization shall be conducted by a board of trustees consisting of five (5) members to be elected at the next election of officers, and to serve, one for one year, two for two years, and two for three years.

5. That the property real and personal of said Association shall be held by the said trustees for the use and benefit of the Congregation and members of said Church organization, and the said Trustees shall have full authority and control of the said Church, its property, its services and the conduct and management of same.

It being the desire of this Congregation to affiliate with and become a part of said Congregational order.

Said Church organization shall have power to receive and hold title to such real estate as may from time to time be necessary in conducting said Church, according to its needs, or property that might come to it by devise, and to dispose of same as provided by law.

Which motion to amend was carried unanimously and the following named persons subscribed their names to the amended articles Mr. and Mrs. August Branden, Mr. and Mrs. John Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. John Olson, Mr. and Mrs. John Adams, Mr. and Mrs. Gust Larson, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Olson, Rev. A. P. Nelson, Mr. and Mrs. P. Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Victor Noren.

This is to certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of the record of the special or called meeting as therein noted.

A. F. NELSON, Secretary, Pro tem.