

which came from, or supported by the capital of New England and the middle (eastern) states, on account of the tariff, had a reflective influence on all those states. Connecticut and Rhode Island and Delaware and New Jersey ought naturally have gone for Mr. Bryan. The "solid south" has today less mental servitude than the solid New England, with her tariff trust manufacturing interests. My life was from boyhood to young manhood spent in the factories of New England, and I know whereof I have spoken. I would be glad to see the "solid New England" freed from its white servitude. I believe for my ninth reason that a large number of the democratic party, who left its ranks in 1896, failed to come home to vote; and, tenth, the remedy-reformers must get together from now on, stay together, vote together, and these must include the great body of smaller merchants, farmers and laboring men of the whole country, standing on the great principle of "equality for all and special privileges to and for none." Eleventh, I answer that unless the reform element get together as above (not aligning themselves as this year independents socialists, etc.) the democratic party, as such, can never hope to and can never gain control of the federal government.

W. Ramsey, Solomon, Kan.—I would say first, that farmers here are prosperous, getting good crops, and good prices, and republican papers and speakers always called the attention of these facts and claimed these facts as results of wise legislation and advised their hearers not to make a change, as Bryanism would surely bring disaster. "Can the democratic party get control of the government?" If we should have a succession of bad crops and a bad money panic the party might get control of government. But with the whole power of the federal government, with more than 6,000 national banks, with millions of ignorant laborers that can be voted like cattle, the prospect of a change in the near future is not encouraging.

James Conzitt, Deadwood, S. D.—To your first question: Yes. To your second question: Largely the inconsistent attitude manifested by democratic leaders on banking and money. To your third question: Act consistently and remember that a right principle never changes. "Can the democratic party hope ever to gain control of the federal government?" No. There are too many traitors in the democratic party, and the honest leaders are too timid. They use too much confetti in fighting the enemy. They should come out more boldly, be more aggressive in exposing republican corruption in high places. For instance: Panama canal deal, Philippines railroad deal, New Mexico land deals, asset currency law evils, showing inconsistency of the honest money cry, evils of our national banking system, show up the immense increase in paper money in the last twelve years, none of which is a legal tender, and the interest we pay on its circulation. How the manipulators can control its volume show how it would be better to open up mines giving employment to labor, digging gold and silver to make money out of than to allow the manipulators to start printing presses to make money out of paper. Go after them with hot shot. Put them on the defensive in every case. Don't be timid, always be the aggressor. Never allow them to put you on the defensive. This will stimulate your followers and bring new recruits and last, but not least, show how utterly impossible it will be for the government to control corporations and trusts so long as the manipulators have power to control the volume of our circulating money.

John Sinclair Smith, 518 East Cambria Street, Philadelphia, Pa.—The party lost in my ward. I attribute this loss to the Catholic vote. Answering the question, "What course shall reformers adopt for the future," I would say: Hold still closer to the first principles of democracy, equal rights to all, special privileges to none. Let the people know the whole truth about our colonies in both the East and West Indies, and the millions paid to certain privileged sects for their support at the polls, saving Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller and others many millions of dollars. It was a great scheme and it worked out first class. The press of the whole country on this question have been dumb dogs—as old Jeremiah once called the leaders of Israel, they could not bark, and the Jews went to Babylon. Educate the people and give us all the facts. Fourth, "Can the democratic party hope ever to gain control of the federal government?" Yes. Truth crushed to earth shall rise again. The eternal years of God are hers. Cunning and capital can not always rule. The scales will ere long fall from the eyes of many I think in the near future and then we

will be ruled from Washington again. But, Mr. Bryan, there is no mystery about your defeat. McKinley's millions to Spain knocked you out the last time and Roosevelt and Taft's millions to the friars knocked you out this time. I am a working man, mingling with those of my own class, and know all about those who once were democrats—meet many now who can not look me square in the face when politics come up—although I bear them no malice, poor dupes, I pity them. But no one need weep for you, Mr. Bryan; the time is coming when they will be kicking themselves.

George H. Phelps, Findlay, Ohio.—In my judgment, the defeat of Mr. Bryan was due primarily to two causes: First "the system" controls the politicians of both dominant parties, and the system sought through the politicians to defeat the nomination of Mr. Bryan, and failing in this they were determined to compass his defeat at the polls. The politicians generally did not honestly and earnestly support the candidate whose nomination was forced upon them by a determined popular sentiment of the people. Second, the business interests of the country, honest for the most part, were sure that the election of Mr. Bryan would effect to unsettle business confidence. Not that the honest business interests thought there was any reason for this disturbance of public confidence, but fear is fear, and however groundless, its practical effect is none the less disastrous. These are the two principal elements which led to the defeat of Mr. Bryan, the people's real choice for president, and this element of defeat was universal in its operation, and in no sense local, though no doubt it was more potent in the east than in the west or middle west.

John P. St. John, Olathe, Kan.—The democratic party sustained no losses in this, Johnson county. Reformers should get together, and stay together, and open fire along the whole line against the saloons and gambling dens, the hot beds of crime. Against the present high tariff system, which is legalized robbery of the masses. Against our present financial system, which is the worst graft ever inflicted upon the American people. Let all money be issued by the general government, and be a full legal tender for all purposes, except when otherwise provided by prior contract. Let the banking be done by the government. This would put an end to financial panics, and obviate the necessity for a bank deposit guaranty law. Elect all civil officers by direct vote of the people. Spend more money for good roads for the people, and less money for a large standing army, and a long line of battleships. "Can the democratic party hope ever to gain control of the federal government?" Under present conditions, never. The money power, the monopolies and trusts, and all the great railway corporations, the breweries and saloons are united in their hearty support of the republican party. The party has hundreds of thousands of place holders and place hunters working for it. It controls nearly all the great metropolitan newspapers. It is thoroughly organized, and has millions of dollars at its command. Nothing can overthrow it, short of a union of all reformers on a high moral plane, that cares more for a high standard of manhood, than for a high price for stocks and bonds. More for honest government, and sober happy homes, than for tainted revenue. This re-alignment of political forces should be under a new name.

J. M. Chatterton, Louisville, Ky.—Last year the republicans carried this city and county by a majority of over four thousand, this year by only about one thousand, so we have no apology to make. Answering the question broadly, however, "How did it happen in the country?" the result was due to the power of money and corporate influence. Many people like to be on the side where the money and influence is. They think it gives them standing to be known as on that side of public questions. They care nothing for principle, but look only to men and influence. They like to be identified with the rich and powerful, and "feed of the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table." This will continue until they personally feel oppression and want, when they will turn and be the bitterest enemies of those upon whom they fawned. Until this occurs to a more marked degree than at present, we must be content with trying to arouse public conscience, and to instill into the minds of the people a desire to rule.

F. C. Whitten, Portland, Ore.—Mr. Bryan would have carried Oregon had it not been that

the larger business men were induced by the republican managers to frighten their employes into voting for Taft by threats of a panic and low wages if Mr. Bryan should win. All political reformers should stand by the principles laid down by Mr. Bryan and set forth in the Denver platform, they are right and will ultimately win, for continued disaster will surely follow the continuance of the present republican policy of allowing the "interests" to rule.

M. S. Parsons, Carthage, Mo.—The democratic campaign was made above the heads of the people, necessarily, because of the dignity of democratic principles and the integrity of the candidate. Even the victors could not glory over the victory. They see the shadow of shame hang over the spoils, and every honest thinking voter, whether democratic or republican, deplores the condition which suggests the necessity for lowering the standard of manhood to preserve human life, and will soon either refuse to be driven farther, or accept the seeming inevitable and sink lower until they become deadened and lose entirely the inspiration which has raised American manhood above the manhood of other nations. Upon the democratic party rests the responsibility of maintaining the dignity of this nation by encouraging the men to continue the fight for principle. What man could ask for a greater heritage than this privilege, and what man well grounded in the faith can doubt the final triumph?

William Gleeson, Chicago, Ill.—Some there are who will attribute it to Mr. Bryan's unpopularity and give as proof Taft's majority in many of the states, notably New York and Illinois, and will plead that if we had had another candidate results would have been different. With those, I agree. I believe that it would be vastly different, as I am firm in the belief, that if the democratic national convention had named any other living man than Mr. Bryan on that occasion, his fate would have been sealed in advance, and ere the convention was over his friends and supporters might have carried him off to the political morgue, ere they had adjourned, and so have saved the democratic detractors from burying him under an avalanche of votes on November 3, 1908. With the true democracy at that time it was Bryan or bust. I believe that were it possible to restore Washington, Jefferson, Jackson or Lincoln to the flesh and have placed either one in the position occupied by Mr. Bryan he would have received the same fate. And further, I believe that if the democratic party had adopted as their platform the Ten Commandments, the apostles' creed, and the gospel's, the republican press and party would have ridiculed it as detrimental to the business interests of the country, and as a check to our prospective prosperity of which Mr. William Howard Taft was the advance agent. How did it happen? This is an era of Hamiltonianism in every large city of the country; there are clubs which bear his name, and whose members revere his principles. There are other organizations, such as manufacturers and commercial associations, etc., which are auxiliaries, the membership in the three societies are nearly identical. In those organizations are the men of wealth, they have the money; in the cities it is to them, a venal press looks for advertising patronage, and so shape their policies to get it. The newspapers of today have deviated from their original purpose, namely, to publish the news and record facts and events; they are now run on purely business principles and there to print that pays. In political controversies they are unscrupulous and on such occasions as a national campaign the political editor secures on his staff the most competent prevaricators. To this stricture on the cosmopolitan press there are a few honorable exceptions, and the country press in most cases are not influenced by the same Machivellian tempters. I have been a staunch trades unionist all my life, believing that it was a duty of wageworkers to combine to protect their labor, as a rule their only capital; but they are today about as potent a factor in stemming the trend of political aggression as was the stink pots of the Chinese to prevent the onward march of a modern army equipped with the improved machinery so potent in dealing death and destruction amongst their foes. Today there are in this country classes as distinct to the intelligent observer as ever there was in ancient Rome, when the patricians and the plebeians were distinct factors in their political and social economy. True, many will dispute this proposition, but none louder than those who believe in and revere the principles and policies as advocated by Alexander Hamilton. I, however, to sustain my position point to the vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few,