

# The Independent.

Vol. XVI.

LINCOLN, NEB., DECEMBER 22, 1904.

No. 31

## A Little Mother's Christmas

She Had Presents  
For All.

A little maid of the tenements went out to do her Christmas shopping.

She was a little German girl, which meant that she must buy a present for each member of the family. It meant, also, that she did her Christmas shopping on Avenue A, between First and Eighth streets, in that exciting little village of Christmas booths which springs up there as if by magic just before Christmas every year.

The little girl of the tenements said that the explorer might go along with her while she did her shopping, and the explorer was glad to go.

She was a little mother, but she managed to leave "my baby" at home for just this one day. It is very wearing to have the baby along when one goes shopping.

She had three brothers, and three sisters, counting in the baby. And her father and mother made eight to buy presents for, and she had exactly 25 cents. The explorer thought it would be profitable and interesting to watch this Christmas shopping.

The little maid had been to school and knew very well that she had three

cents to spend on each one and a cent over, probably to add to her mother's present. But really, the baby would hardly need three cents. That would be extravagant for a baby, who can not be expected to appreciate expensive presents.

Two gay little tin balls, one gilt, the other crimson, tied together with a bright cord, and rattling when they are shaken—that will please the baby, and they cost only a cent.

A candy chair, quite perfect, rounds, back and everything, catches the shopper's eye next. An Italian boy is selling them for a cent apiece. One of these will do for the next baby. He was the baby until six months ago, and he will admire the chair and then eat it.

And so there are two presents bought and only two cents gone.

There is a wine glass, too; only it isn't wine; but only make believe, and the man selling them is telling people what a good joke it is to invite one's friends to have a drink out of it. That would please Johnny, who is big enough to see a joke. One cent for Johnny. It

is wonderfully how money holds out, anyway, especially in the hands of a skillful shopper who knows what things are worth.

But Mamie Rose must have her full three cents. Mamie Rose is old and critical. She knows the value of things. A doll's washbowl and pitcher—it costs three cents, but it is worth it. There is a vine painted all up and down one side of the beautiful white crockery.

A little washboard for Elizabeth costs only two cents. Elizabeth is not so critical. She will be pleased with anything one gives her.

And then a drum for the third brother costs another three cents. He must have something to make noise with, and this is the noisiest thing for the money.

Only 11 cents spent, and six presents bought. That means 14 cents to spend for father and mother. Seven cents apiece.

It is much more difficult to buy expensive presents than cheap ones! The astute little shopper hesitates and ponders long. She goes up and down the village of booths many times, and

even condescends to ask the explorer's advice.

Eventually she decides on a bright, silvery thimble for her mother, cunningly imbedded in a dainty little box of its own, with plush all around it and roses on the outside of the box. She is well satisfied with this purchase, but she hesitates long over the gift for her father. Men are so hard to buy presents for.

At last she stops at a crockery booth and decides on a cup and saucer, which will do for father's coffee in the morning, for he always has coffee, it being the main part of his breakfast. The cups and saucers are ten cents. But she displays the last remnant of her funds, the nickel and the two cents clasped tightly in her little hand, and firmly demands the coffee cup.

Some sharp bargaining ensues. The salesman orders her to go home and get more money. But when she finally turns to go he weakens, and the cup and saucer are hers.

Eight presents, all suitable, new and welcome, and the little maid's quarter is just exactly gone.—N. Y. Sun.

## A New Classification.

National Committeeman A. W. Files of Little Rock, Ark., in a letter to headquarters shortly after election, replying to a request for a forecast of the votes in Pulaski county, said: "It is folly to try to forecast the results here. We have a nefarious system that depends not upon votes cast, but upon the count. I learn that in Jefferson county, one of the most populous counties outside of this, that the names of the populist, socialist and prohibition electors were left off the ticket, in some instances, if not entirely so. Hurrah for Watson and Tibbles! Let us up and at 'em again. Bogus democracy is now out of the way. This is my classification:

No. 1. Watson men—genuine democrats.  
"No. 2. Bryan men—fairly good democrats.  
"No. 3. Parker men (goldbrick)—'alf and 'alf democrats.  
"No. 4. Yaller dogs—anybody's and everybody's men if labeled 'democrat.'"

### A Question of Ways and Means

To the Members of the People's Party:

Recent press dispatches give a fairly correct summary of the popular vote on president. Four counties in Michigan are estimated, and in Tennessee one county is treated similarly. It is also defective in that no vote is reported from the state of Washington, where Watson and Tibbles electors were duly nominated and must have received some votes.

The electoral vote stands 336 for Roosevelt to 140 for Parker. The popular vote, as follows:

—1904—	
Parker	5,094,091
Roosevelt	7,640,561
Watson	124,381
Swallow	248,411
Debs	392,857
Corregan	33,519
Totals	13,534,650

—1900—	
Bryan	6,357,826
McKinley	7,217,810
Barker	50,218
Woolley	208,791
Debs	87,769
Malloney	39,944
Ellis (U. R.)	5,698
Leonard	518
Totals	13,968,574

Notwithstanding the voting population must have grown considerably in the past four years, the vote of 1904 is short of that of 1900 in the sum of 433,924. The natural increase in voting population is somewhere near a quar-

ter of a million every year; hence, it is safe to say that a million and a quarter of able-bodied men refused to exercise their sovereignty in 1904. Doubtless the number is even greater than this.

Inasmuch as the total vote did not increase, it is fair to assume that the 1,263,735 who voted for Bryan in 1900, but failed to vote for Parker in 1904, make up the increase which other parties gained, and include the loss in the total vote. The socialist labor party candidate, Corregan, ran 6,425 behind Malloney in 1900, and neither the union reform nor the United Christian parties were represented this year—making another loss of 6,216. Hence, the total party losses sustained were 1,276,376. These votes were distributed as follows:

Stayed at home	433,934
Voted for Roosevelt	422,751
Voted for Debs	305,088
Voted for Watson	74,163
Voted for Swallow	39,620
Voted for Holcomb	830
Total	1,276,376

Compared with the Weaver vote of 1892, Mr. Watson's eighth of a million may seem small to those who were expecting over a million—and may cause some to feel discouraged. But when we consider that a million and a quarter who voted for Bryan and a populist platform in 1900, refused to be delivered to the Belmont crowd this year, it is evident that there is a large field for future work. In addition to this there must be nearly a million more of new voters (or substitutes for them) who were not interested in a sham battle between two plutocratic parties and who also stayed at home. There were 799,998—eight hundred thousand in round numbers—radical votes cast this year. There are three times that many more radicals who did not vote—or voted for plutocracy out of spite.

Hence, instead of feeling discouraged, the people's party has reason to feel encouraged. Had the total vote increased proportionately to increase in population, both old parties increased their vote, and the minor parties fallen behind—then there would have been ground for despair. But such is not the case. The socialists, prohibitionists, and populists, have all made gains—and any reasoning man knows that there is a wider field than ever before for making further gains. The question as to which of these three parties shall gain most of the recruits, is of no moment right now. The important work is to teach them how to make an effective protest against plutocracy and to cease the unpatriotic,

foolish practice of indulging in political pouting.

During the winter months the national committee desire to keep up constant communication with every state, congressional, and county committee of the people's party now organized, and, in conjunction with the state committees, to perfect temporary organization in all unorganized counties and districts, in order to have an official head to the party in every locality. To carry on this work properly will require from \$250 to \$400 per month for clerk hire, printing, postage, etc.—less than 5 cents a year for every man who voted for Watson and Tibbles. But the practical impossibility of collecting such a small amount from each, makes it imperative that those who do contribute should give a dollar or more each year. Populists, man for man, own more property and pay more taxes than the average voter in other parties. Shall it be said that they are less inclined to give financial assistance to their party?

CHARLES Q. DE FRANCE,  
Joliet, Ill. Secretary.

### From Mr. Bryan's Neighborhood

Editor Independent: I am still a populist, but am getting a little tired of being so very still. I have read from week to week in your columns since the election, the comments on, and the attempted explanations of the late political disaster, by more or less prominent populists throughout the country. I have also noted carefully their numerous suggestions as to what should be our party's future policy and line of action. To my mind some of these suggestions seem wise, while many of them seem very much otherwise. Among the most sensible, sincere and sane of these articles I would place those of ex-Senator Allen, ex-Governor Gilbert and M. F. Harrington.

While it is perhaps well, or at least harmless, to discuss, in a temperate and tentative manner, the results of the late election, and the probable causes that led up to them I regard the attempt to mark out a definite policy for the populist party to pursue with reference to the next national campaign, as entirely premature. Three years and a half is entirely too long for any of us to know, beforehand, or even to predict with any certainty the wisest course to be taken at that time, or even to any great extent in the mean time. We are living at a time in which things are not only liable to happen, but in which wonderful things are almost daily happening.

Who dare say what the number, or character of the changes or happenings, in this country are going to be in the near future, or, at least, in the next three years that may affect, if not

control, to a large extent, the political actions of any or all parties? Apparently very small matters frequently, not only control party action, but often determine party success.

The financial condition of the masses of the people, at the time of an election, has frequently more to do with the result than has party candidates or party platforms. In their indifference, or I might say in their blindness, the people have come to regard the national administration as entitled to all the credit for good, and equally responsible for all the evils growing out of bad times. "Let well enough alone" has been the republican slogan, and the most potent argument of republican orators for the last three national campaigns. With all our boasted intelligence the average voter in casting his ballot is controlled more by the products of his fields and the condition of his finances than he is by the production of oratory or the position of his party upon any, or all the political questions of the day. From this viewpoint the republican party has had largely the advantage of all others for a number of years. Added

to this and contributing largely to Mr. Roosevelt's unprecedented majority were the bitter feuds among democrats for the control of their last national convention at St. Louis, together with the unorganized condition of the populist party before, and even during the campaign. To anyone, therefore, except the merest tyro in politics the result of the last campaign was no surprise for it was visible from its beginning. There was little in Mr. Roosevelt, as a man, or in the republican platform as a political creed to drive a single republican to vote for any other candidate, while the republican candidate was the natural legatee of the dissatisfied and recalcitrant voters of all other parties in the race. Mr. Bryan loyally supported Mr. Parker, as I claim, under all the circumstances, he was in honor bound to do, and while he brought him hundreds of thousands of votes that Mr. Parker would not otherwise have received, yet there were other hundreds of thousands of democrats that would not listen to even the persuasive voice of their former, and, I predict, their future great leader, and to show their displeasure, and to emphasize their protest against the action of their party at St. Louis voted for the republican nominee. And our candidate, the gallant and gifted son of the south, Tom Watson, while wishing and seeking as large a vote as possible for himself, as it was his duty to do, held out no hope of his own election, but by his fiery eloquence, keen wit and withering sarcasm directed against the action of the St. Louis convention, and its nominee, Mr. Parker, and its most active and conspicuous member, Mc-