

of these United States I should want one man in my cabinet whose duty it should be to see that the one hundred and ten millions and more consumers get the necessities of life by paying therefore the reasonable cost of production and transportation with a fair profit added.

Geo. Wm. Moore, Michigan.—I am much pleased with your National Legislative Program and wish to emphasize some of the provisions.

1. The time has come for arbitration instead of force in international affairs and the Bryan plan ratified a few years ago by more than thirty nations should be the basis. With disarmament, a tribunal for national disputes and the referendum, war will be only a remote possibility.

2. A national bulletin would be extensively read and a great aid to the voter.

3. The Federal Reserve Bank changed our currency system from the worst to the best. That system should be carefully guarded against private control.

4. Regarding the guaranty of bank deposits, the people are entitled to have a place where they can deposit their money and know to an absolute certainty that it will be safe. Today the banks insure themselves against loss by fire, embezzlement, robbery, theft, etc. Why not insure their depositors? Banks depend upon their deposits for their profits. Why not protect those deposits? It will be a benefit to the banks because it would increase their deposits. People would no longer hoard or hide currency.

5. A public utility is a monopoly which the people alone should own and operate. If the managers do not produce satisfactory results we should remove them and not confess that we are incapable of self government by abandoning the property.

6. To reduce the income tax and increase the tariff tax and add a sales tax would be to reduce the tax burdens of the rich and increase those of the poor.

W. E. Moody, California.—I want to say to you that I endorse your National Legislative Program unreservedly, and believe that it will receive the endorsement of all thinking people. For some reason we are in a worse condition as a party today than we were in 1896. The Republican party is just as reactionary as it is possible for it to be, and the Democrats would have been in the same condition with Mr. Cox as president. The interests were controlling both the old parties, with an unequal swing, and the heavy side was toward the Republicans, hence it was successful at the polls last fall.

We cannot succeed as a party unless we can direct its policies in a clean manner, and in the interests of the people instead of the interest of the classes. When the people rule all is well; when the classes rule the masses suffer as a consequence. I am writing this because I want you to know I am in sympathy with your efforts at this time. You have always been right on all public questions, and results have proven it to a large majority of our people. I shall never be satisfied until we have you in the White House. I only regret we can't always stay young and be able to withstand the hardships that come with service. If ever any man has served a people, you certainly have and unselfishly. In my feeble way I shall stand by your every effort to better conditions and purify our party.

C. E. Jones, Virginia.—I note with a good deal of indignation that certain elements in the Democratic party are trying to force to the front for the reorganization of that party, Senator Underwood of Alabama. If the party is to be rebuilt with that kind of timber the writer and thousands will take no hand in the rebuilding.

Personally I wish to see the party reorganized along the lines as laid down in your recent promulgation of a platform. The unfortunate conditions in this country and the lack of faith of everybody in almost everything makes imperative that we shall adopt progressive sentiments to be carried out by progressive men, and men of truth and honesty. With the rottenness that has developed, or been brought out by the war and events since, have produced such unrest that the people will be satisfied with nothing less than the adoption of the platform you stand for as shown in The Commoner.

The profiteering of individuals and private ownership of public utilities should be broken up, and there seems no sure way to do that except through government ownership.

Billions of dollars have in the last few years been grabbed from the people in the sale of oil stocks that were worth nothing, and likewise in many other things that should be under government control, but if those utilities could have been under government ownership there would

have been no stocks to sell to a trusting public. Government ownership seems to be a phrase to shock with, to many people who carelessly forget that our public school system is covered by that fearful phrase, that our efficient postal system comes under the same head, and right here I wonder if under private ownership this letter that I am writing would be carried to Lincoln as efficiently and as cheaply as this one will be; instead of being done for 2 cents it would more likely be done for 3 to 4 cents or 5 cents.

There are many other illustrations that could be presented to show that phrase is a foolish bugbear and is used by the designing to prevent action along the lines of government ownership. Mr. Bryan's platform should be our platform and Mr. Bryan our next presidential candidate.

A. Gunnarson, Nebraska.—A reorganization in the Democratic party must be made. W. J. Bryan is big enough to do it. The landslide of 1920 was largely due to some of our leaders carrying water on both shoulders. Light wines and beer was a trap. As a champion of prohibition and a real leader for his party, W. J. Bryan is very much alive. Then came the League of Nations as a main issue of the day, very wrong.

A. C. Ruland, California.—My prediction is at this time that the Democratic party in 1924 will be in a better position to win at the polls than they have since 1912. I am in hearty sympathy with the platform just read in press dispatches, and can see no excuse for Democrats hesitating to place their approval upon it in every detail. Am ready for the "next battle."

A. J. Anders, Iowa.—I heartily approve the Legislative Program outlined by The Commoner, and will do what I can to have it written into the law of the land.

W. A. Toler, Illinois.—There are so many things to be done. First, military preparedness must be stopped; second, profiteering, or stealing the people's labor in all forms must be stopped. Something must be done with the idle land. I see land all over the country lying idle, and that has not been cultivated for years. You can't rent it or buy it. People are needing homes and can't get land to build on. I understand this earth was made for the people, not for a few to corner and speculate on.

J. A. Kemp, Indiana.—The proposed legislative program will receive sympathetic reading among progressives regardless of party affiliations—an excellent basis on which to reorganize the party machinery of the Democratic party.

E. W. Painter, Missouri.—You are the leader who can reorganize and lead the party again to victory, and, in my opinion, you are the only one in the party who can do so successfully. For one I will be only too willing to add my mite and follow your leadership.

Nels O. Alberts, Nebraska.—Well, again we find ourselves stranded on the rocks of defeat, and again we must go at it, and reorganize the masses and fight our battles over again for the welfare of the common people. I believe that the people will respond with more activity, and earnestness, than they ever have before, because I notice that organizations for the betterment of all classes are growing at such a rapid pace as was never known before. It indicates self-protection and that no protection can be relied on, except through their own efforts, in organizing and fighting their own battles.

Therefore I am in favor of the reorganization of the Democratic party, but with no men like Cox at the head of it. It must be on the progressive basis, and I believe that we can control the south, and the west, by organizing early.

C. P. Peterson, North Dakota.—I am heartily in favor of the Democratic Legislative Program outlined by the greatest living American—William Jennings Bryan—and shall do what little I can to help to promote it. It embodies true progressive principles, but why not add to it an amendment to the Federal Constitution that the President and Vice-President be elected by direct vote of the people. It shortens the ballot and is more democratic.

P. L. Frazier, Oregon.—A good deal has been said of late about the reorganization of the Democratic party. I am inclined to think that reconsecration is needed—reconsecration to the fundamental principles upon which the Democratic party was founded—all legislation for the "greatest good to the greatest number."

#### BRYAN'S LEADERSHIP

Editor Ohio State Journal:

As a constant reader of your esteemed paper I cannot let pass unchallenged your editorial of Feb. 12 on "Mr. Bryan as Leader."

You say Mr. Bryan doubtless is receiving a great deal of Republican encouragement in his effort to assume the task of reorganizing the Democratic party. That may be true, but he is also receiving a great deal of encouragement from those Democrats who would rather be right than be successful.

Mr. Bryan has accomplished more in defeat than all his opponents in success. It is true he was three times defeated for president, but it was his leadership in the fight against Wall St. that made Wilson president. You say he sulked through two national campaigns. He did not sulk; he simply followed his conscience, like millions of others, instead of Wall St. in all its crooked ways.

Do you speak as a Democratic or Republican editor when you say "Either his consistent record of defeat or his penchant for substituting sensationalism for economic soundness is enough to disqualify him as a party leader in whom there is any hope save for the happy opposition?" This has been the cry of Wall St. and the privileged classes ever since the campaign of '96. Whom do you represent that you speak with such authority? When you repudiate Bryan as a leader then you repudiate those reforms he has stood for and which have been forced upon the politicians and adopted one after another by the people through his wonderful leadership. Your editorial is tinged with the hues of the politician who sees no distinct colors in anything but party success, rather than that of the statesman who can distinguish between black and white.

Shakespeare through Hamlet was soliloquizing on suicide when he said "Conscience does make cowards of us all." If he had been a politician and soliloquizing upon modern politicians, methinks he would have said "Politics makes not only strange bed-fellows but cowards of us all." You say Bryan was not cut out for successful party leadership but might have been a great preacher and perhaps would have been but for his fondness for money. Such insinuation is unjust and unworthy of so highly esteemed a paper and reflects upon his honesty and sincerity as it likewise reflects upon yours. Mr. Bryan is a preacher, and a good one, preaching the gospel of cleaner politics and better citizenship. He is not preaching in the pulpits or synagogues, but out in the wilderness of politics, in the highways and byways and wicked ways of the politicians, and is driving them out of the temple of justice and high places and establishing the rule of right and righteousness coming up out of the hearts of the common people who are receiving the truth gladly as they did in Christ's time.

You say he was a failure as secretary of state. I say Christ himself would likewise have resigned from a war cabinet after preaching all his life peace on earth and good will toward men.

You can follow whom you please, but it requires a stronger chain of argument than you have forged to lead from Bryan the millions of Democrats who believe in and follow him. As for me, I had rather follow Christ and my conscience to Gethsemane and Calvary and William Jennings Bryan to apparent defeat all my life than to follow Wall St. in its wicked ways down to Washington for a season. M. L. BOYD.

Columbus, Feb. 14.

#### A NOTABLE NEW LAW FIRM

Announcement that Woodrow Wilson and Bainbridge Colby have formed a partnership for the practice of law, with offices in New York and Washington, brings to mind the probably half forgotten fact that Mr. Wilson began his career as a member of the bar. Graduating from the University of Virginia in 1881, he practiced at Atlanta in 1882 and 1883. His legal work was interrupted by a post-graduate course at Johns Hopkins, with incident court activity in Baltimore. In 1885, however, he left the law for the field of education. The most gratifying fact about the present announcement is the suggestion which it conveys that the former President has sufficiently regained his health to engage in active service. Other Presidents have upon retirement appeared in court as counselors. Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison and William H. Taft have returned to the law upon completing their presidential terms. In Mr. Wilson's case the return is after a much longer interval than in the other instances.—Washington Star.