

mild-mannered man who likes to win his way as easily and inoffensively as possible. Judge Hastings, on the contrary, is recognized generally as a man of strong character, firm convictions and unflinching fidelity to principle, and he is, moreover, a lawyer whose clear judgement and legal attainments, have gained for him national repute.

If Judge Letton is elected the same evil influences that have hitherto been exerted within republican ranks will be brought to bear upon him in favor of the railways and corporations. On the other hand, if Judge Hastings is elected, those who have wielded this pernicious power over republican candidates will understand that their influence has slipped from their grasp. They will be led to this conviction not only by a lively sense of Judge Hastings' probity but by the fact that hitherto they have used all their efforts to control republican politics and have, therefore, no influence in populist or democratic circles at the present time.

The Independent makes this appeal because it believes that the percentage of independent voters, not only in Nebraska, but all over the country, is rapidly increasing. By an independent voter is not meant he who rejects all party ties, but rather he who rejects narrow partisanship. The Independent wishes to reiterate its view, expressed on several occasions, that the railway influence has been felt in republican politics, not because republicans in Nebraska are corrupt, blind or unintelligent, but because the republican party has been for years the dominant party. Corporation corruptionists have no party. They have tried their arts in every party that has come into power and will not desert the field permanently even if a strong man on a strong platform defeats a republican candidate on a weak platform. But by voting for Judge Hastings republicans would not be deserting their party or their principles. They would be simply demanding a new deal and a square deal in state affairs, and they would make more certain the ultimate triumph of the reform element in the republican party by shattering the railway machine. At the same time they would place on the supreme bench a good man who would be a good judge, who has no bias in favor of corporations and who would dispense even-handed justice to all men.

CHANGES WROUGHT BY THE TREATY

By the terms of their new alliance Great Britain and Japan are bound closer together for mutual defense. From the American point of view their alliance is more entangling than ever. The principal point in which the new treaty differs from the old is the stipulation that should either of the high contracting parties be involved in war in defense of its territorial rights or special interests the other will at once come to the assistance of its ally and both parties will conduct a war in common and make peace in mutual agreement with any power or powers involved in such a war.

Japan has been led into such an alliance because of Great Britain's prowess on the sea. Had Japan been supported in the present war by Great Britain's navy Russia must have succumbed much more quickly. When the old treaty was made Japan was placed on probation by England. Fearful that Japanese military prowess might not attain a high standard, England was loth to frame a treaty which provided that the contracting parties should render mutual assistance in case either party was attacked by one nation only. This caution on the part of English statesmanship prevented England from being involved in the Russo-Japanese war. Japan has now demonstrated that it can render as much aid to England as England can to Japan in case of war and the new treaty is the natural result.

By the threat of this paramount war force peace is guaranteed in the Far East. While the convention pretends to guarantee equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in China the nations outside the alliance must depend upon the sufferance of England and Japan for a "square deal." Only by a coalition of all the European powers and the United States could the paramount influence of the allied nations be questioned, and it is difficult to conceive of any circumstances likely to arise that would induce the United States to join such a coalition. Although not a party to the alliance, the United States is apt to reap much of its benefit while being exempt from any and all of its obligations. This comes about because of the fact that during the war just ended the American people happened to place their sympathies with the winning side, which will prove a greater asset than a big navy.

England's two weak spots have been India and Canada. Russia has long threatened Britain's power in the direction of India. This threat has been removed by the alliance with an oriental military power that is able to check Russia in Asia. Canada has always been a weak spot because in the event of war it would fall an easy prey to

the United States. Prior to our invasion of the Philippine islands Canada was placed in the attitude of being a hostage given by England to the United States as a guarantee of peace. The situation has so changed, however, that our Philippine dependency is a hostage given to England, for the new alliance, of course, places the Philippines at the mercy of Great Britain and Japan.

TRUSTS AND ARISTOCRACY

There is one view of trusts that disheartens all who seek an independent livelihood. Those who defend the trusts speak in glowing terms of the opportunity afforded men of brains and energy to get ahead in the world. But these trust advocates fail to promise the young man that freedom in the pursuit of happiness which is supposed to be guaranteed by our constitution and which is, at all events, proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence as the right of every individual.

The trust creates an aristocratic system. Certain men combine their industries to create a trust. Men in other industries follow their example and soon all the business of the country is established on a trust basis. The result is that no young man can be promised a business of his own. He is placed on a level with the subject in a monarchy who cannot expect to attain a position of independence. In this country we have been wont to boast that every man is a sovereign in his own right and that there is no position, social, business or political, to which the individual might not hopefully aspire. Under the trust system, however, the young man is always to be dependent upon the trust, and that means that he must always be a subject, politically, socially and industrially.

It is true that the trust system in this country is not as pervasive as is here described, but the tendency is in the direction of a trust domination from which there will be no escape. Such a condition is being hastened by the granting of special privileges, preferential rates and immunities to a favored few and by unfair taxation of the people and the non-enforcement of law against powerful lawbreakers.

The remedies for these evils must lie, of course, in the direction of preventing preferential treatment. There must be stricter enforcement of law and a fairer system of taxation. Where discrimination and extortion cannot be stopped government ownership must be adopted as the sole remedy. Where discrimination and extortion can be prevented by law private enterprise should not be interfered with. We have entered upon an era of test legislation. Only time can tell to what extent government ownership must be adopted and private enterprise maintained.

MERCY FOR BIG CRIMINALS ONLY

And still the knaves go unpunished. After all is said and done, we hear naught of any insurance officials or beef magnates going to prison. Insurance officials are found out and some of them pay back a morsel of what they have stolen. Poor Chauncey Depew was found out and he paid back \$250,000 to save his reputation. Chauncey is a bit proud and he is willing to pay well for a refurbished reputation. But alas and alack, after Chauncey had paid for a second-hand reputation he was found out again.

Most of the rogues are not like Chauncey. They care little for reputation. If they are found out they will not pay back stolen money to buy varnish for a damaged reputation. They consider a reputation exchanged for a goldpile a good bargain. They will cling to the goldpile with a financial frenzy that reckons not of that rag, reputation.

To deal adequately with such criminals the state must make them pay the full penalty of the law. They must be punished to the extreme limit of the law. Law must be enforced against them as it would be enforced against a labor leader caught in a black-mailing conspiracy. But we hear nothing of insurance criminals going to prison. If we hear any talk of chastisement it is by some investigator who says that the only interest that the investigators have is to find out what the thieves have stolen and not "to punish anybody." The investigators love to explore the sewer and to draw forth a wriggling victim into the lurid light of scandal. Sometimes a state's attorney suggests that the stolen money be paid back, but apparently all our ministers of justice forget that the place for a thief is the penitentiary. An humble burglar or pickpocket goes to prison by rapid transit, for the prosecutors who pounce upon the little criminal know that a cat can torture a mouse, but cannot safely menace a bear or a bull. Your beef magnate pays a fine and says he is too sick to go to prison. The food would not agree with him.