

Supplement

TO THE LEADER.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1900.

IS NOT FOR BRYAN.

ECKELSTELLS WHY HE'S AGAINST THE NEBRASKAN.

Ex-Comptroller of the Currency Under President Cleveland Will Vigorously Oppose the Election of the Democratic Candidate.

I did not support Mr. Bryan in 1896, and I do not intend to now. I shall oppose his election this year with all the vigor and ability I possess. I do not feel that I could stand to my convictions by remaining merely passive and contenting myself with simply voting against him.

Bryan the Issue.
No issue set forth in any platform, no matter how cunningly devised and arranged, in this campaign can be made paramount to the issue of Mr. Bryan himself, his erroneous views of public questions, his numerous vagaries and his demonstrated desire to find popularity and votes in a never-absent appeal to class prejudices and supposed race hatreds.

I am still a Democrat, if believing in Democratic principles correctly interpreted and properly enforced as an agency for good constitutes true Democracy; but I am not one of the utterances of the platform adopted at Chicago four years since and just reaffirmed and re-emphasized at Kansas City are the rightful expressions of what modern Democracy stands for.

Isms of Populism.

The many isms of Populism were abhorrent four years since to my sense of what is safe and sound in the operations of government and the general well-being of the people, because I viewed them as being fundamentally wrong, and being so, neither lapse of time nor errors of the party in power reconcile me to their adoption or make it possible that I should support a candidate who not only approves of them, but is their best embodiment and most vigorous champion.

I have not read all of Mr. Bryan's utterances during the past four years, but I have taken note of enough of them to know that his views have not changed on any important question since 1896, and his determination to stir up class strife is not less manifest. Throughout all his addresses, public and private, is shown uniformly an apparent pleasure in preaching the desirability of discord between employer and employee, class and class. No appeal ever comes from him which is not tinged with advice to those who must work to distrust those who must employ.

Harmful to Labor.

All this is not only un-American, but it is unjust, unfair and harmful, most of all to the laborer, for whose well-being beyond all others it is necessary that complete harmony between capital and labor and not continual antagonism should exist. The interests of labor are never in such great jeopardy as when interested to a man who has the gift of oratory coupled with unbounded political ambition and no business judgment or training.

No man is fitted for the presidency who day in and day out proclaims, in the midst of a demonstrated better condition of affairs, the reverse to be true in order to foment a discontent, which will gain to himself and party a political advantage.

Ignorant or Blind.

Mr. Bryan, without the statesmanship to analyze the conditions as they exist, and find a remedy therefor, gives utterance to nothing that would improve them, but only to that which would make them worse and cause greater injury to the great mass of the people, whose fate he constantly bewails. I do not believe in the public value of any man who is, under any and all circumstances, a fault-finder and mere protester against all existing order of things.

Mr. Bryan's friends insist that he is nothing if not intellectually honest and fearless. Granted that their contention is true, the inquiring public must then be forced to conclude that he is either woefully ignorant or willfully blind. At no time since his coming into political power has he made an economic prediction which has not failed of fulfillment, or laid down as truth an economic doctrine which has not in the course of quick events been demonstrated to be an economic fallacy.

Dictation of Platform.

If he does not study grave public questions in the light of past history and present facts and human experiences, but only views them in the glare of his own preconceived notions and flame of his own fiery political oratory, he is unsuited either to advise the public as a teacher or guide them as a leader.

If he was unfit because of his erroneous views and economic heresies, to be elected to the presidency in 1896, he is equally an unfit man now, for he boasts, with triumphant self-satisfaction, that he stands to-day on all these questions exactly where he stood then, and to make more manifest and clearly defined his position he compels his party to blazon such fact in a platform so constructed as to accord with his views and wishes.

Alliance with Croker.

I can conceive of nothing more pitiable than the sight of accredited delegates of a once great political party in a national convention supinely surrendering their own views on a vitally important economic question at the behest of a once defeated presidential candidate, who only had brought that party into disgrace and disrepute, unless it be the sight of that presidential candidate and to be nominated, appealing through his confidential agent, Richard Croker, Tammany dictator, to be his chief aid, trusted friend and lieutenant in the emergency which confronted him.

Heretofore Democratic presidential candidates have gained public respect and strength by having the open enemy of Tammany, Mr. Bryan, who more than any of them has boasted of his stand for principle and his integrity of character, has done what Mr. Seymour, Mr. Tilden and Mr. Cleveland would not do. He has formed an open alliance, offensive and defensive, with Tammany, and that too, at a time when that organization is

known to be thoroughly corrupt, and a constant menace to all the best interests of good government.

Unity with Populists.

Mr. Bryan hardly appeals to the thoughtful citizen, with whom political parties are only agencies for public good to the extent that they stand for fundamentally right principles and honest administration, when upon the one hand he is presented by the Populists and on the other by Tammany. The joining hands of one constitutes an offense against safety in governmental administration, the alliance with the other an offense against political decency, making it doubtful as to his ability, no matter how strenuously he might try, to secure honesty in the conduct of public affairs in an administration over which he presided.

It is not difficult to predict what would be the outcome of any administration based upon the socialism of Populism and the rapacity of Tammany.

Reaffirming of 16 to 1

I am told that not a few Democrats who refused to sanction the nominee and platform of the Chicago convention will add the nominee presented at Kansas City. I doubt if there are many who will do so. Why should they? The same candidate has been named, the same doctrine announced, only in a more offensive way.

It must not be forgotten that, the reaffirming of the principles of the Chicago platform was the repudiation of an intention, when opportunity is afforded, to debase the country's currency. It was re-assaulting the Supreme Court of the country. It means a realliance with the elements of disorder, as against the properly constituted authorities of peace, integrity of property and person. It is the announcing once more of a desire to get into power that the sacred right of private contract under the guaranty of law may be abrogated. It is the acceptance of those elements of socialism which work injury to both government and people.

In fine, the reaffirmation at Kansas City was the re-asserting of the resolutions made at Chicago, which, revolutionary then, are none the less so now. A source of menace to the country then, they are equally so now; and every man

The evils and burdens of the present moment growing out of the Spanish war are to be laid as much at the door of Mr. Bryan and his party as at that of Mr. McKinley and his. His explanation of his reason for wishing the treaty ratified is wholly superficial and does not bear analysis.

Policy on Philippines.

I imagine that self-government will come quite as readily through the administration of Mr. McKinley as through that of Mr. Bryan. It will not come under either until the Philippines are fitted for it, property rights safe and personal ones protected. I hardly believe Mr. Bryan could do more than send a commission there, as the President has done, in order to take steps looking to supplanting the military government with a civil one.

The country will not sanction the immediate abandonment of those islands to disorder and pillage. When a time comes that there is safety in a constitutional home government, only remaining within the sphere of the influence of the United States, and public sentiment is to this end, it can be put down that Mr. McKinley's administration will readily grant it, for I believe it is generally admitted that no one is more ready to put himself in touch with public sentiment than the President, or act in accordance therewith with more alacrity. If Mr. Bryan means an immediate abandonment of our control in the islands he must certainly fail of support, for no thoughtful person will sanction a policy which will make the country ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

Would Not Trust Him.

If Mr. Bryan and his party had stood out as they should have against the Spanish war and had opposed instead of assisted in ratifying the Paris treaty, they would be in a better position to confront Republican plans and purposes, for they would at least be consistent with their action. As it is now, they urged the war, but now wish to avoid the consequences in order to gain political power by so doing. As it is, I don't see that Mr. Bryan is less of an expansionist, through force of circumstances which he assisted in creating, than is Mr. McKinley. The

and protesting against any debasement of the country's coin, will aid and abet such a proceeding because of a belief in any injustice done by Great Britain to some afflicted race ten thousand miles away.

If Mr. Bryan was a statesman and not a mere declaimer, and dealt in a statesmanlike manner with American problems, we would not be treated to the floods of petulant fault-finding and appeals to prejudice which are manifest in all that he says, but would have instead suggested solutions, grounded upon principles, and in accord with the facts of national history and national experience.

Disturb His Wisdom.

I am sure the American people rightly distrust the wisdom of one who thus far in life has been a living expression, in every address he has made of that best definition of the essential elements of stump speech, namely, to claim everything and denounce well.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there are many conditions in this country requiring careful, thoughtful and statesmanlike dealing with. There are many evils to which labor is subject that need to be remedied. Likewise there are many prejudices unjustly entertained against capital, but in neither instance can they be dealt with to the good of all by any one who brings to them none of the elements of a statesman and all of those which wholly make up the successful stump speaker and campaign orator.

Where Remedies Lie.

I believe that more of the remedy lies without the pale of enacted legislation than within it, and that neither labor nor capital is benefited by public utterances on the platform, in legislative halls and through the columns of the press to the effect that there is an irrepressible conflict between them.

I do not believe any man benefits his country by being a preacher of discontent, strife between classes, social and political pessimism, financial disorder and continuous financial gloom, despite surroundings and widespread prosperity, and therefore I do not believe in Mr. Bryan. There are some things in President McKinley's administration and official acts I am not in accord with. I do not accept

ASSENT OF GOVERNED

ARMY OF A MILLION VOTERS DISFRANCHISED IN SOUTH.

Government by Force Imposed by the Democrats at Home, While They Denounce Republican Administration in Our Colonies.

(From the New York Times.)

Four years ago, in the so-called Democratic convention at Chicago, Senator Benjamin H. Tillman of South Carolina, in offering a resolution to denounce the administration of President Cleveland, made an attempt to convert the convention to his view that the campaign about to begin was a sectional one, in which the South and West were to be combined by a common sentiment against the North and East, to overthrow those sections and make their financial opinions odious, and to destroy their domination in future national financial legislation and operations.

Tillman has learned something since that day, when he was deservedly hissed and hooted in a convention otherwise none too sane or sensible, and the merited rebuke administered by Senator J. K. Jones possibly convinced him that sectionalism is as hopeless an issue as secession to divide the country. But he was still a man of impulse at Kansas City. Restored to favor after a civilizing ordeal of four years of service in the Senate, he helped to prepare a platform exposing his party to the charge of gross inconsistency or insincerity.

To Tillman was assigned the task of reading the platform. He does not lack dramatic sense, and he has a large voice. With prodigious volume and vehemence he rolled forth the references, in the opening phrases to "the inalienable rights" of men guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. As a sweet morsel he mouthed the language of the declaration that governments must "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." "Any other government," he shouted with agonizing intensity, "is tyranny, and to impose upon any people a government of force is to sustain the methods of imperialism." The case of the Porto Ricans was described as appealing "with peculiar force to our justice and magnanimity."

These sentiments were prepared and emitted by Mr. Tillman for application solely to the question of imperialism and the conduct of the administration in endeavoring to deal with the new problems that vex the country. But they seem to have a more interesting meaning, as applied to Southern States, than they would as interpreted only to denounce and embarrass the administration in its effort to establish free governments in the Philippines, Cuba and Porto Rico.

Alabama's population in 1890 was 1,513,017. There were upon the common calculation of one voter in five, 302,203 voters in that State in 1896. Alabama gave to all candidates for President 193,453 votes, Bryan receiving 190,307. Louisiana's population in 1890 was 1,183,597. The State was entitled in 1896 to at least 223,000 votes. It cast 102,046, and Bryan had 77,000 of these. Mississippi had 1,289,000 population in 1890, and presumably 257,320 males of voting age. In 1896 there were cast for President in Mississippi 70,545 votes, Bryan getting 53,859. North Carolina was reported in 1890, in the census of that year, as having 1,617,947 population. The State cast 331,210 votes in the presidential contest of 1896, or a little more than the reasonable ratio for 1890. South Carolina, with a reported population in 1890 of 1,151,149, and with not less than 230,000 voters, cast for all candidates in 1896 68,907 votes, and 58,798 of them went to Mr. Tillman's man Bryan.

What became of the 600,000 votes that appear to have been missing from the election returns of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina? Were these 600,000 voters to be governed, in case Mr. Bryan was chosen or defeated, without their consent, thus subjecting them to the "tyranny" referred to by the Democratic platform? Have those missing voters been since found and required to give their consent to the election of Representatives in Congress in order that they should not be taxed without national representation fairly secured? Or has their consent been obtained to new restrictions of the suffrage? Has there been shown any tendency in any of those States to exchange "the methods of imperialism for those of a republic?"

How have Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina qualified themselves to reproach the administration for imperialism? Have not three of those States formally and completely and the two others by progressive steps undertaken to deprive some 600,000 of "the governed" of the opportunity to give or withhold that consent guaranteed as a right according to the Democratic application of the Declaration of Independence, and secured by the Constitution?

Why waste hypocritical platform sentiment on the people of Porto Rico because they have "a government without their consent and taxation without representation," when 600,000 voters in four States, all Democratic States, are deprived of the right to consent, and about 1,000,000 altogether, if we consider Virginia, Georgia, Florida and Tennessee, are in like manner subjected to "tyranny." Mr. Tillman's platform also declares its opposition to "militarism" for the reason that "it means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the standing army that has always been fatal to free institutions." What apology does Senator Tillman offer to the standing army of 1,000,000 voters disfranchised in Southern States? Were "intimidation and oppression at home" practiced to bring about that result, peculiar only to one section of the country? Does not the condition of those silenced voters "appeal with peculiar force to our justice and magnanimity?"

Labor Prosperous in New York.

In New York State the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the number of employes in 3,553 of the largest factories in the State has increased in the last three years by 56,321, or 18.7 per cent, while the increase in wages is \$21,400,894, or 15.2 per cent.

Wages on the Great Lakes.

Wages of employes connected with the shipping on the Great Lakes have been generally advanced.

BRYAN'S SOLILOQUY.

(Dedicated to soft citizens.)
I favor Free Silver and paper,
I honor Free Trade and Free Gold,
In fact, I shall play any caper
That brings me a vote, young or old.

I preach "the consent of the governed,"
And practice "imperial sway."
I'll promise all things to the voter
Who stands on my platform to-day.

I know I'm a talker from Way Back,
And gifted with "gall" and with "mouth."
It matters not how I maneuver,
I'm sure of the Red, Solid South!

I favor "Expansion" and taxes,
But don't wish to justify wrong,
And believe in the riot of "Red Shirts"
If they vote for me often and strong.

I'll promise all things if elected,
And do what I please when I'm in;
I favor all virtue in office,
But wink at tough Tammany sin.

I know I'm a Blower and Actor,
By hiding my "Sixteen to One"
Behind Anti-Imperial blubber,
That soon, like Free Silver, is gone.

I know I'm a Howler and Hoodoo,
But the Farmer and Miner don't see
That my Anti-Imperial clap trap
Is a Farumont Fraud, just per se.

A Dictator, I'm bold to my party;
I force them to do what I think,
And still to the trough I can lead them,
But can I induce them to drink?

And when the election is over,
If I should the White House attain
I'll turn and twist with the Rabble-
Bamboozle and fool them again!

JOHN A. JOYCE, Washington, D. C.

"Dear Boy" Letters

My Dear Boy—In your last letter you say that old man Skinner, your employer, says that he "doesn't see what a farmer can be thinking of to vote for McKinley when the trusts are squeezing the life out of the farmers and the country is drifting right into imperialism every day."

You want to know how to answer him. Well, I will tell you what to say to him and then I have a few words to say to you.

Ask Mr. Skinner if he remembers that in 1896 he sold that sorrel mare that used to work on the high side with old Jim for \$45. Ask him whether the sorrel wasn't a better horse than that bay that he sold to Crawford the other day for \$80. Remind him that he sold his wool in 1896 for 14 cents and that he sold this year at 27 cents, and kicked like a steer because he didn't get 30.

Gently suggest that he sold a couple of steers in 1896 for \$3.25 per hundred, and that they were as good as those splendid fellows that he sold last week for \$5.10.

The old man runs a huckster wagon into Nelsonville and sells produce to the miners' wives. Ask him if he remembers that four years ago a woman would come out to the wagon and say:

"Can you let me have a peck of potatoes and trust me till John gets work?"

Remind him that the same woman comes out now and says: "Give me three dozen of eggs and two pounds of butter. What are those peaches worth? I'll take a basketful of them. Give me a peck of those tomatoes. How much does it all come to? Here's your money. When are you going to bring in some veal? John likes veal for breakfast."

Ask him if he doesn't know that more money has been paid out as wages to working men during the past year than in any other year in the history of the Hocking Valley. Ask him whether a considerable part of this money hasn't found its way into his capacious pocketbook.

Remind him that he told me that whenever the Mayhew farm is put up for sale he intends to bid on that upper eighty that joins his, and that he has made enough money in the last two years to "pay for it."

And then gently suggest that he does not appear to be suffering much from imperialism or trusts either. Tell him that perhaps he had better let well enough alone. Tell him not to vote for what he doesn't want. Tell him that when trade is good and business confidence strong and healthful, it is not wise to tear the whole thing down by giving the administration into untried hands.

I think that this is the only kind of argument that will touch old man Skinner, but you, my boy, have a larger soul. I want to say some other things to you.

My boy, thank God that you live in a country prosperous at home and honored abroad, and never so prosperous and honored as now.

When you come to vote this fall, remember that the national credit has reached its highest point, that the work of American laborers has gained its highest reward, and that the glory of American arms on land and sea has been most widely maintained under the wise, thoughtful, patriotic administration of William McKinley.

Remember that his administration is carrying out the principles and policy of the Republican party.

Remember that the blood of four generations of American soldiers runs in your veins, and then vote so that you will not be ashamed of your vote on the day after election. YOUR FATHER.

Farm Mortgages and Interest.

In 1890 the farm mortgages of the State of Kansas amounted to the vast sum of \$240,000,000, much of it bearing the exorbitant interest of 12 per cent, was reduced in 1899 to less than \$41,000,000, certainly a remarkable evidence of the prosperity of the farmer. The present rates of interest on Kansas farm loans are the lowest ever known.

Prosperity Proof in Money Orders.

Postoffice statistics are significant. From June 30, 1895, to June 30, 1899, there was a gain of 7,000,000 in the number of money orders issued, while their value increased by \$55,000,000, and the average amount of each order from \$7.00 to \$7.40. This is another proof of the existence of McKinley prosperity.

Labor in Michigan.

Labor Commissioner Cox, of Michigan, says in his 1899 report: "Wages show a decided increase over those of 1898, and an average of more than 10 per cent increase over 1897. The greatest gain is in the fact that all idle labor is now steadily employed at remunerative wages."

Sheep Worth Money Now.
Sheep are higher than for twenty years and worth about double what they were four years ago.

What Cows Are Worth.
The total value of the farmer's and dairyman's milk cows is 53 per cent greater than in 1896.

THE NEGRO DISFRANCHISED

THE FIRST STEP INTO A NEW SLAVERY.



"SENATOR TILLMAN IN CONGRESS." "We do our best to keep every negro in our State from voting."

who stood out against them then ought not on some new issue, which does not in any degree lessen the danger of these for harm, fail to denounce and defeat them.

I do not think that the fact that here and there may be some elements more conservative in the party than seemed to be the case in 1896, makes any difference. Mr. Bryan still gives official voice to the party's views, maps out its campaigns and writes its platforms. Mr. Bryan's intimates and advisers are still Populists and self-seekers, with the added contingent of Tammany bosses. He has neither use nor care for any man who is conservative in his views or careful in his utterances.

Effect on Gold Basis.

If elected President the public must be prepared to see Mr. Bryan as chief executive and those associated with him as cabinet counselors construe every law bearing upon the currency and the powers of the Treasury Department in such a manner as to nullify as best they can its provisions in so far as they bear upon the question of the maintenance of the gold standard. His Populist allies boast that they seek power that they may bring about the repeal of the existing laws and to this end they are Mr. Bryan's champions and defenders.

He can and will keep the country in a state of ferment and uncertainty in an attempt to bring about the larger use of silver as a redeemable money. The experiment is too dangerous a one to be entered upon by any on the grounds that the gold standard is so fixed in law that it cannot be disturbed, no matter who may be President or Secretary of the Treasury. The law ought to be executed with a construction favorable to it to fully carry out its provisions and not in a manner antagonistic to them. It is not a perfect law, but can be made so by its friends. It can be made abortive by its enemies once firmly entrenched in power.

Bryan and Recent War.

It will hardly do for any sound money Democrat or Republican to support Mr. Bryan because of a supposed better position he occupies than Mr. McKinley on the question of colonial possessions despite his worst position on the question of the monetary standard, the Supreme Court, the enforcement of law and the right of private contract. Mr. Bryan's position can hardly be as satisfactory a one on an analysis growing out of the Spanish war.

He and his friends, in order to put the administration to a political disadvantage, urged on the declaration of war with Spain, and when it was over Mr. Bryan, personally at Washington, through personal advice and solicitation, brought into line a sufficient number of Democratic Senators to ratify the treaty of Paris, despite the fact that it provided for the purchase and taking of sovereign possession of Porto Rico, and the Philippines, without any provision for giving them any home government whatsoever.

difference is certainly not great enough to make any man surrender his convictions on other great questions to accept him upon one.

It may also be fairly doubted whether a man with so many erroneous ideas as to the conduct of the domestic affairs of the nation can be trusted to have right ones when it comes to managing our foreign policies.

As to Porto Rico.

As to the question growing out of the Porto Rican tariff, I believe the administration made a most egregious error, but as Democracy is now constituted and controlled it stands for nothing so far as a tariff policy is concerned. It has abandoned all the advantages of its position on this question, by advocating in its silver policy the very worst kind of protection. Mr. Bryan stands responsible for making it a party unable to manfully advocate a Democratic tariff doctrine.

It is to-day under Mr. Bryan's leadership, a party emphasizing a desire for special privileges and class legislation, appealing for the support of every element of discontent by falling in with and advocating the particularly special legislation which such element stands for. Its demagoguery is manifest on every hand.

Raising the Boer Issue.

What thoughtful and inquiring person can possibly believe that either Mr. Bryan or the delegates at Kansas City are really deeply solicitous to the extent which it is made to appear that they are as to the alleged wrongs of the Boers in South Africa? Is it not manifest, through the thin disguise of a love of human freedom, rights and republican form of government, that Mr. Bryan and his followers hope for the German and Dutch vote as a determining factor in the election because of racial affiliations with the Boers and a supposed race prejudice against Great Britain, and not because the question or the integrity of the Boer republics is so dear to them?

It is absurd that the great questions with which we have to do affecting the vital interests of the United States shall be overlooked in a debate upon how Great Britain shall conduct its own affairs, especially in the face of a proclaimed reaffirmation of the Monroe doctrine, which means, properly interpreted, that the people of the United States shall attend to their own affairs and let European nations look after theirs.

Confidence in Germans.

Having voiced such a sentiment, the Kansas City convention, under the inspiration of Mr. Bryan, immediately proceeds, for political effect, to express a wish to interfere with a European government in a matter strictly its own. I think such politics cheap, and unstatesmanlike, quite beneath the dignity of any great party or leader.

I shall be surprised if any German voter, heretofore the bulwark of the country, against every assault upon the integrity of the country's currency system

Republican doctrines as against pure Democratic ones, rightly interpreted and incorporated into the administration of public affairs. But as between Republicanism and Populism, filtered through the channel of Bryanism, I prefer Republicanism.

Denies His Democracy.

There is no Democratic doctrine presented this year and no Democratic candidate. Mr. Bryan was first named by the Populists because he best stood for Populist doctrines. He was only induced by the convention at Kansas City, called under alleged Democratic auspices, because Bryanism, Populism and Democracy as now made up are synonymous terms.

The combined forces of the elements of discontent of the country having gathered in one fold and found without a dissenting voice a candidate so manifestly as to respond with an equal degree of satisfaction to each one's peculiarism, it seems to me the part of wisdom to meet them in another election, and again demonstrate that the electorate of this country in every critical time always stands ready to do that which is wise, putting down the wrong thing and putting up the right.

To Vote for McKinley.

I am going to vote for President McKinley, and do whatever I consistently can to aid in his election, not because I favor all his policies or approve of all his political acts, but because under all existing conditions I believe the affairs of the country will be better off in his hands than in those of Mr. Bryan.

I hope some time to see the Democratic party re-created, advocating Democratic candidates and Democratic principles, but it cannot be more than a disturbing force in the country's daily history until it finds itself a leadership which has brought it to its present low estate and ceases making itself the lying-in arm of those elements of discontent which, if once entrusted with governmental power would work injury at home and loss of standing abroad.

Advice to Democrats.

It can live under defeat without complete and ultimate destruction, but a victory gained by it with a candidate holding the views of Mr. Bryan and a platform pledging the party to carry out the things advocated at Chicago in 1896, and in Kansas City this year, would work such results to the country that it would pass out of political power at a recurring election, without the smallest minorities to do it honor.

"Unwept, unhonored and unsung."

The Democrat who wishes to save his party's future will only aid that end by defeating Mr. Bryan and burying his platform. Its ultimate recurrence to power and prestige lies in the independence of Democrats who are such on principle, and not through expediency.

JAMES H. ECKELS.