

and these tendencies ought to be understood by those who are about to enter upon the exercise of the privileges of citizenship.

The democratic party leans toward the people; the republican party leans away from the people. The democratic party has faith in the people; the republican party has not. Democrats look back to Jefferson as the founder of their political faith; Republican leaders are admirers of Hamilton. When one knows the difference between Jefferson and Hamilton he knows the difference between the dominant thought of those who admire Jefferson and those who admire Hamilton. Jefferson not only believed in popular elections, but he believed in having the elections frequent enough to keep the representative under the control of the voters; he recognized the frailty of man and knew that too long a tenure in office would lead the office holder to look out for himself and forget the people who elected him. Hamilton, on the other hand, did not have faith in the people and he desired to remove the government as far as possible from the people; he drew up a form of government and tried to secure its adoption, but happily he failed to engraft his ideas upon the constitution. His plan provided for a president elected for life, for senators elected for life and for governors of the several states appointed by the president for life. It was a centralized system which betrayed in every part a lack of trust in the masses. It is significant of the fundamental differences between the two parties that democrats grow more and more fond of Jefferson, while republican leaders talk more and more about Hamilton. As an evidence that this distinction is a real one, it is only necessary to review the history of the effort to secure the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people.

Something more than fourteen years ago a resolution was adopted by the house of representatives, then democratic, submitting the necessary amendment to the people; the next house also democratic, acted favorably upon this reso-

lution; then two republican houses adjourned without action. Why did two democratic houses favor the election of senators by the people and two republican houses oppose it? Is there any other reason than that the democrats have more faith in popular elections? After awhile public sentiment became so strong that even a republican house was compelled to pass a similar resolution, but in doing so it followed the example of the democratic houses before it and that, too, after an interval of some eight years.

The democratic national platforms of 1900 and 1904 contained planks in favor of the popular election of senators, but no republican national platform has yet endorsed this reform. How can this be explained? It is either because the Republican party lacks faith in the people or because the leaders are under the domination of the corporations which oppose the popular election of senators.

Let the young voter consider the questions which are at issue and he will find that the democratic party looks at these questions from the standpoint of the common people, while the republican leaders are constantly doing the bidding of the trusts, syndicates and other large corporations. Which party will ultimately triumph? No student of history can doubt that democracy will win. In every civilized country there are two parties, one democratic and one aristocratic—one leaning toward the people and the other leaning away from them—and in every country the democratic party is growing and the aristocratic party diminishing in strength. Great Britain has witnessed a recent triumph of its democratic party, for the Liberal party is the democratic party of Great Britain. In the House of Lords the Conservatives outnumber the Liberals in the ratio of 12 to 1, but in the House of Commons the Liberals have 200 majority. This new democratic government, with Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at its head, is preparing a home rule measure for Ireland, a measure for the protection of tenants of England and another measure depriving the landlords of their multiple

votes; at present a landlord can vote in each district where he has land, but in the new law he will be restricted to one vote and be compelled to choose his residence.

Thus democracy grows in Great Britain. In Russia, the most despotic of the governments, a duma has already been established and at the election the democratic vote overwhelmed the votes cast by the czar's party. Democracy grows in Japan, in China, in India and throughout the world. It grows because it is founded upon living truth. Those who trust the people make no mistake; those who distrust the people will sooner or later find themselves in a minority, for the doctrine of self-government has been vindicated and will triumph everywhere.

If the young voter will read the speeches made by democrats and compare those speeches with the speeches made by republicans he will find that the democrat seeks to make society prosperous by making the masses prosperous, believing that prosperity comes up from the people; the republican leaders seek to make society prosperous by making the corporations prosperous, believing that prosperity comes down from the employer to the employes.

Young voter, on which side will you fight, with the people for popular government, brought near to the people—for government of the people, by the people and for the people, or will you distrust the capacity of the people for self-government and build upon an intermediate power between them and those in authority? Will you protect the exploiter, the grafter and the plunderer—those who grow rich upon the earnings of the public, and having grown rich, debauch society, politics and government? Citizenship in a republic involves responsibility; prove that you appreciate that responsibility by, first, studying the differences between the parties and the differences between the policies presented by them and then make your vote represent a freeman's will—always remembering that truth will triumph whether you fight for it or fight against it. You may delay the triumph of the truth, but you cannot prevent it.

GLIMPSES OF SPAIN-- MR. BRYAN'S FORTY-FIRST LETTER

The peninsula which Spain and Portugal divide between them is the part of western Europe least visited by Americans, although it stretches out like a friendly hand toward the western hemisphere and has furnished not only the discoverer of North America, but the colonizers of Central and South America. When early last June we attempted to secure homeward passage we found the ships sailing from Hamburg, Bremen and Antwerp already filled and had to look to a Mediterranean boat for accommodation. I mention this experience in the hope that it may help some other traveler who finds himself in the same dilemma, for we not only secured satisfactory accommodations on one of the North German Lloyd steamers, the Princess Irene, but had in addition an opportunity to see the most backward country in western Europe, the stronghold of the Moors during the middle ages and one of the great fortresses of the globe.

A fast train makes the distance from Paris to Madrid in a little over a day, the only drawback being that it passes through the Pyrennes in the night. As we had remained in Paris longer than we expected we were deprived of a view of the mountain scenery and of the summer resorts of northern Spain. Morning found us in the very heart of Castile and the landscape resembles some parts of Mexico. The country is in the midst of the dry season and, the grain having been gathered, the fields look quite barren save for the vineyards. These are numerous all over Spain and recall the fact that Spain, like other colonizers, tried to make her colonies supplement her own products rather than compete with them. She forbade grape growing in Cuba and in Mexico not only prohibited the culture of the vine, but the production of silk also. Speaking of grapes, it is only fair to say that in this fruit Spain cannot be surpassed. Nowhere have we found grapes so abundant, so cheap or so delicious. At a Vienna hotel last June they were asking three dollars for a cluster—probably raised in a hot house—that in August could be bought in Spain for ten or fifteen cents. The large white grapes exported to the United States and sold as a luxury during the winter months are here within

of all. Along the railroad one sees primitive agri-

cultural methods. The old-fashioned threshing floor is in common use, but instead of the flail they employ a machine resembling a light disc harrow which is hitched to a pair of mules and drawn rapidly round and round. When the wheat is separated from the straw men go over the threshing floor and winnow out the wheat, the wind blowing away the chaff. We were informed that they had had a prosperous year in the grain districts, but the stubble did not indicate as heavy a crop as we raise in the United States.

Madrid surprised us. It contains more than half a million of inhabitants, is about two thousand feet above the sea and is really a very attractive city. It is not an ancient city, being less than a thousand years old, but it has substantial blocks, a beautiful boulevard and a picture gallery one and a half centuries old. In the different galleries at Madrid are some of the best canvasses of Velasquez and Murillo.

As in all other Spanish countries one finds here reminders of the national sport, the bull fight. Each city has its amphitheater or circular bull pit, and it is often the most conspicuous building in the place; the fans—and in Spain the fan is omnipresent and often of great value—are ornamented with scenes from the bull fight and the bill boards blaze with announcements of the next Sunday's combat. The bull fight is probably a lineal descendant of the gladiatorial contests of Rome, a surviving relic of brutality which must disappear when Spain follows her northern neighbors in the adoption of universal education. At present her percentage of illiteracy is disgracefully large.

While Spain has a constitutional government and goes through the form of electing a legislative body, her elections do not seem to be characterized by the freedom and fairness that attend elections in northern Europe. There is, however, in this country, as in others, a growing spirit of reform which is already demanding more schools and less religious interference in the government. Much is expected of the present king, both because of the independence which he has manifested and because the new queen comes from England where parliamentary government has for centuries been an established fact.

Before leaving Madrid a word should be said

in regard to the Toledo ware—iron and steel inlaid with gold. It resembles somewhat the Damascus work of Japan and the old inlaid work of Damascus and Constantinople. The far famed Toledo blade was not less dangerous in war because it was ornamented with delicate tracery of gold.

A night's ride brought us to Cordova, once the Moorish capital of Spain. It had been a city of some note under the Romans before the Christian era and the Moors undertook to make it a western Mecca for the Mohammedans. There are still to be seen two gates and a wall which were built by the Romans and a bridge which rests upon the foundations laid by the great builders. The bridge with its massive arches and ponderous piers is interesting for other than historic reasons as it gives evidence of the fact that the Moors were quick to appreciate and to follow the example of their predecessors. In the stream near the bridge are three grist mills dating from the middle ages, one of which still supplies flour to the neighborhood.

The old mosque, however, is the overshadowing object of interest in Cordova, and in itself well repays a visit to this city of narrow, winding streets and oriental appearance. The ground plan of the mosque covers about two hundred and forty thousand square feet—nearly as much as St. Peter's at Rome, but one-third of the space is occupied by a court. All well regulated mosques have a court where the worshippers assemble and purify themselves before entering upon their devotions. The mosque was some four centuries in building, one ruler after another extending its limits in order to accommodate the increasing number of converts. In appearance the structure is low and flat and gives little idea of its immensity. It is surrounded by a strong wall heavily buttressed and is entered by huge gates. One of these gates bears striking testimony to a remarkable agreement entered into by the Christians and Mohammedans whereby the two antagonistic religions divided the church between them. These gates are covered with plates of bronze on which Catholic and Arabic symbols alternate. The joint occupation did not last very long, but Abderrahman when he desired to secure more room for the followers of the Prophet was considerate enough to purchase the other half from the Christians.