

Letters From the People

Charles Adcock, Hiwasse, Ark.—Being a regular subscriber I wish to suggest to the masses that the republicans organize a Lincoln republican party and nominate for the presidency some such reform republican as ex-Congressman Stephens of Wisconsin, or Senator LaFollette for the presidency and that the democrats endorse him. Such a fusion, or union, of the masses would insure a victory for the masses as well as for the candidates. There is no difference between Lincoln republicanism and Jacksonian, Jefferson and Bryan democracy except the names.

K. Audley, Lindsay, East Brady, Pa.—Inasmuch as I hold a good opinion of The Commoner and its work, I write to say that of the eighteen periodicals to which I subscribe, The Commoner has the preference. No article therein escapes my notice and if all but one of these periodicals had to be discontinued that one would be The Commoner. The press that derives pleasure from hooting at Mr. Bryan's theories of government ownership of railroads as the ultimate solution of the railroad question and the initiative and referendum will some day cheer what they now ridicule. This has been true of other great questions advocated by Mr. Bryan, namely tariff reform and Philippine freedom. And all originate from the unselfish principle states rights. A "square deal" for poor as well as rich. I fail to see a "square deal" for everyone from the principle of centralization. But how many who vote the republican ticket will tell you that the party for which they vote, represents centralization? I put it about one in ten thousand. President Roosevelt is to be admired for his work, but why nominate a republican on the democratic ticket?

Frank Philbrick, Bellingham, Wash.—"Why not LaFollette?" Referring to above quotation on page two in The Commoner of April 19, it is easy to answer: Because LaFollette has but one face and it looks straight to the front, while Taft, as well as Roosevelt, has two or more faces looking in different ways.

W. B. Fleming, Chicago, Ill.—John Temple Graves favors the nomination of Roosevelt by the democratic party. This vagary would hardly be worthy of serious mention were it not that there are others who are of this way of thinking. The president is not only fooling scores of republicans, but some democrats as well. What has the president done to merit the confidence of democratic democrats? He has veneered his administration with some pretenses which smack of democracy. He has stolen some democratic "thunder," but what has he done with it? Has he turned his guns upon the citadel of the enemy of the people? The railroad merger case was brought and decided for the people, but is it not a fact that the merger still exists? An amendment to the interstate commerce act has been passed, but at the last moment the heart was taken out of the bill by the president's consent, and the railroads still carry on business at the same old stand in the same old way. A civil suit was brought against the beef trust, but that octopus was given an "immunity bath." Suits have been instituted against the oil trust, and some of the other trusts, not to dissolve the trust nor to send their managers and owners to prison, but to fine them, and, if fined, the people will pay the fine. Thus it has been with all the reform measures of the administration. Mr. Roosevelt's reform measures fail to reform. The great conspiracy against the commonweal still goes on. The great combinations still live. The people still pay tribute to their old masters. Wealth still continues to concentrate in the hands of the few. The government is still run by the rich and powerful, and the people are still at the mercy of their enemies. The reason is plain. The president does not lay the axe at the root of the tree. He "stands pat" on the robber tariff, the father of the trusts. He favors the money trust, the prolific mother of many trusts. He has failed to invoke the criminal statutes against the arch lawbreakers. He goes to the protection of the Mortons. He still has Root, the cunning attorney of the trusts, as his chief adviser. He was the willing beneficiary of the contributions for political purposes of the predatory corporations. In Pennsylvania he went to the support, not of the Lincoln republicans, but the old Quay machine. In Delaware he sided with the Addicks faction. In Wisconsin he supports, not LaFollette, but the corrupt machine. Everywhere his voice is the voice of Jacob, but his hand is the hand of Esau.

He stands for concentration of federal power and the obliteration of state lines. He is the representative of Hamiltonianism, not of Jeffersonian democracy, or Lincoln republicanism. Why, then, should he be the nominee of the democratic party? He is not the worst republican, but he is bad enough. It is true his policy has tended to an agitation which is distasteful, as his petty suits have been annoying, to the plutocracy. For this the Harrimans, et id omne genus, do not like him, and may wish to see him turned down by his party. There is one warning that ought to be sounded. In the event the plunderbund fail absolutely to control the next republican convention, it will undertake to manage the democratic convention, and to select and elect its nominee. It will prefer another Cleveland to Roosevelt. The duty of the democracy is not to nominate Roosevelt, but to see to it that the democratic convention is loyal to democratic principles, and that its standard bearer shall be one known to the democracy as its true champion.

Sol W. Johnson, Rippey, Ia.—Enclosed I hand you a clipping from Farm, Stock and Home, published at Minneapolis, Minn., which speaks for itself and looks to me like conclusive evidence of the way our government is run. I would like to see these figures published in The Commoner with such comments as the editor deems fit: "The following estimate of presidential campaign funds for the years given has been going the rounds of the press for several weeks, and so far as we have noticed its approximate accuracy has not been disputed; therefore it is inserted here as a text for a little comment that may be of some value as a lesson in 'popular government,' which we like to flatter ourselves we enjoy in something approaching perfection; and, besides, both table and comment will be timely just now, when the subject of regulating contributions to campaign funds is before congress. The table follows:

	Republican.	Democratic.
1860.....	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000
1864.....	125,000	50,000
1868.....	150,000	75,000
1872.....	250,000	50,000
1876.....	950,000	900,000
1880.....	1,100,000	355,000
1884.....	1,300,000	1,400,000
1888.....	1,350,000	855,000
1892.....	1,850,000	2,350,000
1896.....	16,500,000	675,000
1900.....	9,500,000	425,000
1904.....	3,500,000	1,250,000

The aggregate amounts for the twelve campaigns are \$36,675,000 for the republicans and \$8,435,000 for the democrats, which is not very complimentary to the innate goodness and helpfulness of the first, for if it had been really good and helpful would it have required so much money to keep itself in power? The steady and rapid growth of the fund of both parties down to 1896 is significant, but much less so, and less alarming, than the startling fact that in every instance victory has been on the side of the largest purse! In two years out of the twelve the democrats had the largest campaign fund and only in those years was their candidate elected! He does not know how his fellow citizens feel about it, but the writer feels profoundly humiliated by this revelation. Schooled from youth in the theory that this is a government of and by the people it not only humiliates but shocks the writer to learn that it is a government of and by the dollar. He has had suspicions of this condition, but is compelled to confess that he never expected to see its truth demonstrated mathematically. Now, seriously, fellow citizens, can you expect this republic to endure if dollars instead of men are to determine its policy; if the longest purse continues to be the controlling factor in the most important of our elections? In fact, has not the republic already disappeared, since it is shown that the dollar and not the man has been the controlling factor for many years?"

V. B. Kittel, New Richmond, Wis.—I took a good deal of interest in a letter written by Mr. Graves and published by you April 19. I can't share Mr. Graves's opinion of its being necessary to give the president another term to finish up unfinished legislation desired by most of our people. All honor to the president for having adopted some of the measures democrats have advocated for years. No party is justified in nominating a man for president who don't fully endorse the sentiments and principles of that party. The president antagonizes some of the vital principles of our party. They are too well known by well informed men to need enumerating here. To endorse him is to

surrender those principles; we can't afford that. It seems to me we have some people who are ready to tumble over each other to give the president credit for things that he don't deserve. The rate bill is defective in so many respects it amounts to a control that don't control. How can a commission know what a just and equitable rate is without knowing the value of the property? If I rightly understand that bill the commission hasn't the power to force an unwilling witness to tell some things he don't want the commission or the public to know. I could show wherein the meat inspection law is far from what farmers need but space forbids it being done now. The president didn't have the power to pass either of the bills mentioned had not a popular demand from the people insisted on it. The great need of our times is to put partisanship aside. Place the good of the public above party, carefully and impartially investigate the position of each party and see whether their history justifies the opinion that the platform contains the economic questions that deeply concerns us and that the general complexion of the convention justifies the opinion that the platform is a declaration of principles they mean to carry out instead of an affair to fool the people and get in on. Once when Senator LaFollette was speaking in a political meeting here in the north part of Wisconsin he said there is no use of electing me governor unless you elect a legislature that will carry out the measures I advocate. That sentiment is just as good to use with congressmen as with members of a state legislature. When voters generally in the various states will see that the men who are sent to congress will represent the interests of labor as well as capital there will be no trouble about any good president getting the various reforms we are in need of.

TOMORROW

There's a bully time a-comin' and it's only over there,
There's a pickin' up o' happiness a-layin' down o' care,
There's a chucklin' in the breezes and a-singin' everywhere,
And a walkin' in the sunshine in the mornin'.

There's a ring-around-a-rosy with a dimpled hand to hold,
There are baby eyes a-laughin' full o' happiness an' bold
As can be, and yellow tresses shinin' like a mess o' gold,
And a walkin' in the sunshine in the mornin'.

There's a place just over yonder where the singin' streamlets run
In and out o' coolin' shadows, tinklin' in the yellow sun,
You'll have hardly stopped your grumblin' till your laughin' is begun,
And you're walkin' in the sunshine in the mornin'.

So cheer up, it's over yonder, just beyond the farthest hill,
There'll be callin' in the moonlight and the song o' whippoorwill,
There'll be perfumes ten times sweeter than a jasmine bloom-can spill,
And a walkin' in the sunshine in the mornin'.

—J. M. Lewis, in Houston, Texas, Post.

DID HE THINK OF HER?

Did he think of her when he struck the blow—
Of her who sits where the light is dim?
Of her who, crushed in her endless woe,
Would willingly give her soul for him?
His victim fell and was freed from care
And ceased to suffer and ceased to moan;
But she lives on to remain aware
That his blow fell not on the dead alone.

Did he think of her when he raised his glass—
Of her who weeps through the lonely night?
Of her who prays as the moments pass
And trembles as one who was haunted might?
Did he pause to think, ere his lips were pressed
On the tainted mouth and the painted cheek,
Of her who rocked him upon her breast
When his heart was pure and his hands were weak?

Oh, he pities her now! He has time at last
To give her a thought—but she weeps away!
Her heart is crushed and her joys are past,
Her hopes were slain where his victim lay.
And, whether the law is to be denied
Or whether its punishment shall be felt,
Her soul has already been crucified,
Her breast was struck by the blow he dealt.

—S. E. Kiser, in Chicago Record-Herald.