

differ from you. I am also aware that many of the leading populists do not understand the nature and effects of hocus pocus money and are loath to openly antagonize the banks. As 95 per cent of the bankers are virulently opposed to populism and populists, it is strange that this should be so. But I doubt not that you have been seriously criticised for what you have already said on the subject.

I submit, however, that what you have already said has caused you to be blacklisted and that you might as well be killed for a sheep as a lamb. You are in the midst of the Tiber, can not return and would better cross over. Personally it seems to me that you have nothing to lose and much to gain by bringing the money problem once more to the front.

It seems to me that a good way to do this would be to (1) call attention to the bills now before congress that propose to add so enormously to the power and profits of bankers; (2) bring out clearly some of the facts about hocus pocus money, and (3) ask your readers to give their views as to the advisability of committing the populist party to the partial or total elimination of hocus pocus money and the substitution for it of some kind of real money. I believe that if you do this it will lead to the general discussion of this subject wherever your paper goes; that there will at first be considerable opposition, but that its approval will, with discussion, become more general and hearty until it approximates unanimity with all those who do not insist on the commodity value idea of money.

I have inflicted a long letter on you, but you will admit that the importance of the subject is a sufficient justification. To adopt the course suggested herein requires courage, but you have no lack of that quality. It also requires enough of the seer to be able to look somewhat into the future, and I believe that you are in some measure this also.

ALBERT GRIFFIN.

Topeka, Kan.

For A New Party

The Independent: I enclose "Referendum Ballot" marked "For a new party." In voting thus I wish to present a few reasons which seem to me most pertinent to the situation. The salvation of the American people lies in the independent voter. Partisanship—the devotion to party above principle—is the one thing that is responsible for the wrongs that now exist. Partisanship is the only thing that has kept or can keep, plutocracy in power. If this is to be overcome, we must come before the people and preach a new gospel—the gospel of devotion first, last and always to principle above any party.

It seems to me that this is the fundamental principle of true populism. If this be so, all true populists should be willing to sacrifice their party name for the success of principle. I maintain that we are now face to face with a situation that demands just such radical action. We are at the parting of the ways. Unless we make the proper stand we will drift, one way or the other, into the by-paths of defeat. The forces of reform must be united. Although the populist banner is undoubtedly the best now in existence under which this could be done, yet there are barriers in the way that makes such a course impossible. As the word "democrat" is wormwood to many, so the word "populist" is gall to many more. Why? Because in the eyes of many the populist party sacrificed its right to live by fusing with the democrats; because populism has been the brunt of so much ridicule and abuse, and has been likened so often to socialism

Hood's

Sarsaparilla enjoys the distinction of being the greatest curative and preventive medicine the world has ever known. It is an all-round medicine, producing its unequalled effects by purifying, vitalizing and enriching the blood on which the health and strength of every organ, bone and tissue depend. Accept no substitute for Hood's, but insist on having Hood's AND ONLY HOOD'S.

and anarchy; because it has been held up so long as being everything terrible, that in the minds of the multitudes of misled and unlearned voters there has sprung up a prejudice too biased to be overcome.

Therefore it behooves us as sincere reformers to bury our party and its name, with all its load of prejudice, and come out under a new banner where all can stand, handicapped by no prejudice and on equal footing with them who malign and abuse us. If we will do this, we can make a fight so swift and brilliant that we will sweep the country in 1908.

Can we form a new party where all can stand? Yes. Bryan is the only obstacle in the way, and he can easily be disposed of. And it will take a little educating of the people to show where he stands. Thomas E. Watson has charged Bryan with being plutocratic, and he is certainly justified in such charges and conclusions. If Bryan is not plutocratic, why is he thus aiding with plutocracy? It is for him to answer. He can not charge populists with keeping or striving to keep the forces of reform divided. Indeed, the populist party is at present the only tangible thing that honest reformers can tie to.

Tie to Bryan Never! He submitted once to plutocracy. How do we know that he will not submit again? No true reformer can follow him. It is up to him to follow the reformers. If he does not, he is a traitor to his country, and I defy him to give an explanation that will show otherwise.

Then let reformers unite on common ground under a new party, advocating only the most practical remedies for the wrongs that exist, appealing to the honesty and brains of the American people and not to their prejudices, and the wave of reform that will sweep the country will be such that the antagonism of Bryan would no more stay it than a pebble on the beach would hinder the rising tide. Yours very sincerely,

W. R. TWIFORD.

Lincoln, Neb.

(Can a new party antagonistic to plutocracy be guaranteed against abuse and ridicule and likened to socialism and anarchy? Or can plutocracy be prevented from "holding up as being everything terrible?" Can anybody be deceived by changing a party name without changing the party principles? Can any name be found less liable to attack than the simple name "people's party?" Where is the money to come from to send men into every county of the United States to find other men who will act as county committeemen, call conventions and organize a new party? Is not the abuse and ridicule directed at the principles, rather than the name of the people's party? Does anyone advocate changing the principles of the people's party? What other principles would be adopted in their place?—Ed. Ind.)

Tried It Eight Years

Editor Independent: I sent you my vote on your ballot some time ago and voted against fusion, and should not write more, but find that no one from here does so.

My friend Helder writes in favor of fusion, but no one against. I know that there are many in this county who are opposed to fusion of any kind. We have tried that for eight years and are in a less desirable condition now than when we began. I for one always voted fusion under protest, for I have always expected just the result we have. I can see nothing to be gained by fusion or by forming a new party, which would require a great deal of time and petitions in many cases to get on the ballot and other troubles. Our experience in the last eight years should admonish us that the middle of the road is the place for all true reformers. Our eight years of fusion have had the effect of dividing the democrats and populists so that we may know one from the other. That is one of the good results of the St. Louis convention, but in this state a great share of the populist managers this year voted the democratic state ticket, I think in many cases voted for Parker. Still we will have them to meet when we attempt a reorganization in two years, but I have faith in the people and believe we shall win and make the democratic the third party in this state. As things are now I think Thomas E. Watson should be kept to the front. We certainly should nominate some one that has stood by the party and not some new comer. We want them all, but they should come in and bring forth fruits before asking office. The principles are what we want. P. D. MONTGOMERY.

Manhattan, Kan.

Let Us Have Co-operation

Editor Independent: You promised to give some space to those who wish co-operation with the democrats, and I should like to fill a little of that space. Yes, we ought to have co-operation with the reform democrats. At the very same time and no whit less we ought to have co-operation with the reform republicans.

What do we care for Bryan with his talk about "the common enemy?" Or for his followers? He and they have joined the common enemy. We may just as well say the democratic party is the common enemy of us and the republicans. It is not true that the democratic party in its essential nature stands for people's rights, contrasting with the republican party. Both are popular institutions. Both embody popular errors.

Thousands of republicans sincerely desire reform; they would rather follow their party in demanding reform than in protecting abuses; but they will follow it anyway. That is Bryan's position exactly. Alas, how are the mighty fallen!

We ought, then, to cultivate the reform element in both old parties. Draw them into our party if we can; but at the same time make reform ideas popular even inside the old parties. That sort of thing will not ultimately hurt our party, and it will help our country.

How can we co-operate with old party reformers?

First, by joining with them in non-partisan effort. This may be either by the formation of non-partisan discussion meetings, or by inviting them into populist clubs, with the understanding that when a campaign comes on they may go their own ways again if they choose. But many of them will stay populist.

Second, by endorsing individuals favorable to reform on old party tickets. This must not be through any agreement with the democrats. It must be made plain that while helping some individuals on the old party tickets, we openly aim to injure the parties these individuals belong to. Whether they welcome such aid or not, we need not care. If we are impartial, and can affect the result, it will attract attention to our ideas, and draw votes. Incidentally, it will be apt to create dissension in the old parties.

As to the democrats having an organization everywhere—so have the republicans. We can just as hopefully use the latter as the former. The counties in which the democratic party is unqualifiedly a reform party are probably as few or fewer than those in which the populist party is already organized.

MARK FOSTER.

Washington, D. C.

What Plutocracy Fears

Editor Independent: I am sorry to report to you the death of our state chairman, S. H. Peirsol of Parkersburg. He has been chairman for over twenty years and when we lose him we lose one of the best leaders of our party. I see that the official returns give us 639 votes cast for Tom Watson. Now this does not show the number of populists in West Virginia, for there are many times this number, but owing to having no state or county tickets many were afraid to transfer or make any marks upon their tickets. Therefore, as they wanted to vote upon state matters, they voted one or the other old hypocritical party tickets. Therefore we had only a small per cent of the number of votes that belong to our party. I am glad that the so-called democratic party is dead, and I trust that Bryan may fail to even make a one per cent showing of resurrecting it. I have lost confidence in Bryan, and not only me, but his followers in the democratic party. I do thank the editor of the Independent for the honest and manly stand he has taken in organizing a new people's party. I would to God that we had 1,500 editors as we once had, that would do as much as you have done. The mistakes of the past must be forgotten and go to work organizing our party anew upon the Springfield platform. Let every populist feel that he has a work to do. I heard an old dyed republican say after the election that the only party to fear was the people's party. This I believe to be true. Whenever the voting people see that we stand for reform out and entirely away from all other parties, then we will win. Our noble Toms have accomplished much. Words fail to do them justice. I believe with a few more faithful Toms success is sure in 1908, and if we go to work we can elect congressmen enough in 1906 to wield a power not even thought of. We as a party must stand aloof from the democratic and republican par-

ties, for we must draw our voters from both old parties. There is such a party prejudice that democrats won't go to the republicans, nor republicans to the democrats; but they are willing to meet half way. We have shown and proven this fact, when we cast over two million votes. Let us make the people's party a party standing alone for the necessary reforms such as we have declared to the public. Today three-fourths of the voters in the United States are in favor of our principles.

I enclose you three referendum ballots for myself and two of my neighbors. If the people's party will stand to its present principles and no fusion under any circumstances, national, state or county, it is as sure to win as the sun shines.

D. L. PERINE,
Good Hope, W. Va.

Harrison Co.

Blame

No One But Yourself
if You Don't Get
Well When Sick.

All we can do is give advice.

Of course that's easy.

But our advice is really worth a little more to you than most people's, for we offer to give you the first bottle of our medicine free, if it fails to help you.

We could not afford to do this unless our medicine was good. Such an offer, on the wrong kind of medicine, would put a merchant prince in the poor house.

Dr. Miles' Nervine, however, as years of experience have proved, is a medicine that cures the sick.

Those whom it cannot benefit—less than one in ten thousand—we prefer to refund their money.

All we ask of you is to try Dr. Miles' Restorative Nervine for your complaint. If you suffer from sleeplessness, nervous exhaustion, dizziness, headache, muscular twitchings, melancholy, loss of memory, weak stomach, poor blood, bilious troubles, epilepsy, St. Vitus' Dance, etc., we will guarantee to benefit you or refund your money.

You are the doctor.

"My son Bert, when in his 17th year, became subject to attacks of epilepsy, so serious that we were compelled to take him out of school. After several physicians had failed to relieve him, we gave Dr. Miles' Nervine a trial. Ten months treatment with Nervine and Liver Pills restored our boy to perfect health."—MR. JOHN S. WILSON, Deputy Co. Clerk, Dallas Co., Mo.

COLUMBIA NATIONAL BANK

OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

Capital, \$100,000.00

Surplus, 14,000.00

Deposits, 1,350,000.00

OFFICERS

JOHN B. WRIGHT, President

J. H. WESTCOTT, 1st Vice Pres.

JOE SAMUELS, 2d Vice Pres.

P. L. HALL, Cashier

W. B. RYONS, Asst. Cashier

SADDLES HARNESS OR HORSE COLLARS

With this Brand on are the Best Made

ASK YOUR DEALER TO SHOW THEM
BEFORE YOU BUY.

MANUFACTURED BY

HARPHAM BROS. CO.

LINCOLN, NEB.

\$12.50 For
200 Egg
INCUBATORPerfect in construction and
action. Hatches every fertile
egg. Write for catalog to-day.

GEO. H. STAHL, Quincy, Ill.

