

The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., DEC. 25, 1902.

No. 31.

HOW TO WIN IN INDIANA

Mr. VanVorhis Discusses the Cause of Recent Defeats and Suggests a Plan of Action

Editor Independent: The Indianapolis Sentinel is funny over the recent defeat and makes merry over the question, "Who is responsible for it?"

The democratic organization all over the United States in a proper and regular way selected delegates, and sent them to the national convention at Chicago. That convention in a proper and regular way made a platform and nominated candidates. The platform was such that it received the support of over two million votes from voters outside the party. A large number of republicans, headed by such men as Senator Teller and Congressman Towne, and almost all the populist party supported the ticket. These more than two million votes added to the democratic votes ought to have insured the election of the ticket, but it did not. It is certain that, if Mr. Bryan had received the vote of every living democrat who voted for Cleveland, the more than two million votes additional would have elected him.

Who were the men that prevented this? They were democrats, or called themselves such—not democrats who left the party, and openly and honorably allied themselves with the republican party, but men who remained with the party in appearance and name—often even taking part in its committee work—but who secretly voted the republican ticket. Thousands of such instances have since come to light all over the country.

No men can be blamed for changing his party associations, if the party to which he has belonged makes a platform that he does not believe, and he can find another party that comes nearer expressing his beliefs. The man who remains with a party and claims membership in it, and at the same time supports the other party is dishonest and hypocritical. The man who disbelieves in the principles for which a party stands, and yet holds to its organization, is unreliable and dangerous. We must respect men who differ from us, when they openly declare their convictions and honestly and courageously stand by them, but the man having no convictions but professing to have, or believing one thing professes another, deserves only public execration and personal contempt. In politics as everywhere else concealment and pretense are indicative of purposes neither honest nor patriotic.

Some of the men who betrayed the party in 1896 occupied responsible places in the councils of the party organization. In this state, Sterling R. Holt, chairman of the state committee, deliberately plotted to assist the republican party. He suppressed literature sent to him for distribution, and assisted in the distribution of republican literature. He held the position without rebuke from the Sentinel until it was thought that no campaign in this state was possible. It was as dastardly a treachery as was ever perpetrated in politics. The Sentinel has never had a word to say in condemnation of Holt's treachery. If street reports are to be at all credited, Holt is one of its stockholders. At any rate, he has recently erected a building expressly for the Sentinel, and which is now occupied by it. This party traitor is in good standing with the Sentinel.

Mr. Taggart is another Sentinel tool; or was until recently. Taggart attempted to run with the hare and bark with the hounds. He wanted to be in favor with both sides, but was neither. He attended and took part in secret meetings organized to give aid to the republican party. The Sentinel was then, and is now, fully conversant with Taggart's want of political reliability. It was the particular champion of Taggart for mayor in 1897, and was most bitter towards any one who opposed him. The Sentinel has supported T. Taggart for national chairman, but it does not mention his name any more. The Sentinel wanted Fleming for state chairman. Taggart pretended to be for Fleming, induced Fleming to be a candidate for the place, then assisted O'Brien to de-

feat him, and, when Fleming and the Sentinel discovered the trick Tom Taggart had played them, they danced around his collar in lively style.

It will not be forgotten that the so-called proprietor of the Sentinel was the recipient of favor from Cleveland, and was never running over with enthusiasm for the Chicago platform. It required some time for it to get very much energy into its pages.

Of course, as between Bryan and Cleveland, the Sentinel is for Cleveland. It is not a question about whether Bryan or Cleveland caused the defeat of 1896. It is a question in this state, however, how much of the responsibility for that defeat rests upon Mr. Cleveland's friends, among the number of which is the Indianapolis Sentinel. Ever since 1896, the Sentinel has been active in its efforts to make it pleasant for democrats, who opposed the Chicago platform, and quite as active in making it unpleasant for those in or out of the party, who had been in any degree conspicuous supporters of that platform. It is very strange, indeed, if the Sentinel really desired the success of the party in 1900, that neither it nor its particular friends, nor the state committee, had any hospitality to offer to those who desired to assist the party to elect Mr. Bryan.

There is not much doubt that if Mr.

party had been betrayed until they had no heart in the state platform, plainly intended to deceive them. It is a low estimate to say that 75 per cent of the democratic voters in this state are Bryan democrats. They can control 90 per cent of the township organizations in this state if they will.

We want to see them do it. When they do it, we are ready to help them carry the state. What is the use to go into another campaign with the traitors of 1896 and 1900 in a position to betray them again? The party can not succeed with men in control of it, who are in politics for the purpose of adding to the profits of their business, whether it be publishing a newspaper, manufacturing beer, or running a bank.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.
Indianapolis, Ind.

Opportunity to Rogues

"I observe myself," said John Ruskin, in Fors Clavigera, "to be getting into the habit of always thinking the last blockheadism I hear, or think of, the biggest. But this system of mercantile credit, invented simply to give power and opportunity to rogues, and enable them to live upon the wreck of honest men—was ever anything like it in the world before? That the wretched, impatient, scrambling, idiots, call-

Money and the Taxing Power

BY W. H. ASHBY.

All Rights Reserved.

It gives The Independent great pleasure to announce to its readers that arrangements have been completed for the publication in serial form of Capt. W. H. Ashby's work on political economy, "Money, and the Taxing Power." This will be published in installments of about two columns a week, beginning January 1, 1903, until finished—which will probably be some time next summer. The Independent's policy will be to progress by easy stages, giving our readers no more each week than they can read conveniently and mentally digest. Well written criticisms of any position taken by Captain Ashby will always be welcomed.

Captain Ashby has for years been a student of political economy, and for a long time accepted without question many of the so-called fundamentals of the science. But as his investigations proceeded he was at times confronted with obstacles that were insurmountable and which necessitated his taking a circuitous route, or a retracing of his steps and search for a new path. Finally he resolved to begin at the beginning and survey his

own road through the forest of political economy, accepting no landmarks and blazing which did not show unmistakable evidence of authenticity under the searchlight of reason. "Money, and the Taxing Power" constitutes his field notes in making this survey.

In part Captain Ashby's work is iconoclastic. He has no reverence for idols simply because they have been worshipped for generations. Yet his conclusions in many respects are in harmony with those of the great economists. Written in the clearest of English, and avoiding as far as possible the stilted style adopted by most writers on political economy, it cannot fail to give our readers a rare treat.

Tell your neighbors about this new feature of The Independent. Let them try a three months' educational trial subscription. A silver dime will pay the bill. And if at the end of that time Captain Ashby's instruction has not become a necessity, it will be easy to discontinue. Don't forget the date: January 1, 1903, when the first installment will be printed. Begin at the beginning and don't miss a number.

Bryan had come to this state after the Kansas City platform and had repudiated the whole Indiana-Cleveland-Hill outfit and called upon the voters to stand by him in support of that platform, he would have polled many more votes than he did. The party organization in this state was controlled by those who hoped for favors from concentrated wealth. It was the settled policy of the state committee to discourage all discussion of the financial questions. The columns of the Sentinel and the doors of the state committee rooms were wide open to gold-bug prodigals; but the allies received but scant courtesy from either.

We have no blame to lay at the door of the party masses. They are not responsible for the actions of the men who have had control of the organization. We are ready to assist them in the support of the principles of the Chicago and the Kansas City platforms; but there is not a ghost of hope of success unless they take possession of the party organization from the precinct up to the state convention, and exclude entirely from the party councils the men, who have been twice responsible for the defeat of the national ticket. Of course, the Sentinel does not care now to have the matter of the responsibility for the last defeat discussed. In this campaign, the Sentinel had everything its own way, but the rank and file of the

ing themselves commercial men, forsooth, should not be able so much as to see this plainest of all facts, that any given sum of money will be as serviceable to commerce in the pocket of the seller of the goods, as the buyer; and that nobody gains one farthing by "credit" in the long run. It is precisely as great a loss to commerce that every seller has to wait six months for his money, as it is a gain to commerce that every buyer should keep his money six months in his pocket. In reality there is neither gain nor loss—except by roguery, when the gain is all to the rogue, and the loss to the true men. In all wise commerce, payment, large or small, should be over the counter. If you can't pay for a thing—don't buy it. If you can't get paid for it—don't sell it. So, you will have calm days, drowsy nights, all the good business you have now, and none of the bad."

Custer county, the home of warring populist factions, finally dropped back into the republican column. But she has to pay for it. The first draft cost her \$1,142.68. Because the smallest school apportionment (December, '98) ever made to her by the fusionists was \$6,001.23. This year she gets \$4,857.55. The difference would pay 3 cents a bushel for shucking 38,000 bushels of corn.

THE CURRENCY QUESTION

Mr. DeHart Comments on the President's Platitudes Regarding an Elastic Currency

Editor Independent: The president says: "It is necessary that there should be an element of elasticity in our monetary system."

How much "elasticity" ought there to be? The president makes no answer to this question. Who shall decide as to the quantity of elasticity? The president answers this question by saying: "Banks are the natural servants of commerce, and upon them should be placed, as far as practicable, the burden of furnishing and maintaining a circulation adequate to supply the needs of our diversified industries and of our domestic and foreign commerce; and the issue of this should be so regulated that a sufficient supply should be always available for the business interests of the country."

Evidently Mr. Roosevelt thinks that the "banks" should decide as to the volume of money and currency. This is equivalent to saying that the "standard measure of value" should be decided by the banks and not by the government (or people generally, as represented in congress). To say that the elasticity of the currency should be decided by the banks, is to say how much and how little the volume of the money and currency shall be, and this is to decide the "measure of value" for the nation, which includes the "needs of our diversified industries and of our domestic and foreign commerce." Mr. Roosevelt thinks that the "currency should be so regulated (by the banks) that a sufficient supply should be always available for the business interests of the country." Does he think that there should always be money enough to supply the "needs" of Wall street speculators? or would he disregard their "needs?"

The president suggests "that all future legislation on the subject should be with the view of encouraging the use of such instrumentalities as will automatically supply every legitimate demand of productive industries and of commerce, not only in the amount, but in the character of circulation; and of making all kinds of money interchangeable, and, at the will of the holder, convertible into the established gold standard." The president speaks of "legitimate demand of productive industries and of commerce." Does he consider the "industries" of Wall street "productive?" Does he think that the business of Wall street is a part of "commerce?" If it is a part of commerce, is it a part of legitimate commerce, for which money or currency should be provided by the banks? He also speaks of "automatically" supplying money and currency by the banks. How is it possible for the banks to supply currency (or money) automatically?

I have heard people say that the government could regulate the currency automatically, but I have never heard it claimed that the banks could regulate the currency automatically. The president has in mind such "instrumentalities" as will make "all kinds of money interchangeable," and, at the will of the holder, convertible into the "established gold standard." But he does not specify the "instrumentalities," and therefore we are left in the dark as to how he will regulate the currency "automatically," except that the banks will do it, in some way, "automatically," which is an impossibility.

He also thinks that all kinds of money must be interchangeable and they must all be convertible into the "established gold standard." This is equivalent to saying that the government ought to exchange gold coin for silver coin, whenever the holders of silver demand the exchange. This would make all moneys interchangeable, as long as the government is able to give gold coin for silver coin. But suppose the balance of trade turns against our country and all the gold goes away, how is the government to give gold for silver? Suppose, again, the gold and the silver coin should both go away, would not this produce too much elasticity of the currency? If it would, is not the president's plan defective? He assumes that we must