

New York City, August 8, 1901.

Editor THE CADENZA:

On reading your article, "The Truth About the Banjo," and the controversy about the passing of the bnajo, in your valuable magazine, THE CADENZA, it behooves me to add that it was not the passing of the banjo, but the passing of one who could not play the banjo, which caused the difficulty.

When it comes to a question of who was responsible for the advancement of the instrument, I think you will agree with me that the reproduction of my work on the talking machines (phonograph, graphophone and gramophone) has been no small factor in creating interest in the banjo, as thousands of letters I have on file from all parts of the globe will testify.

Another argument which should speak well for the banjo: I was under contract to one of the phonograph companies for three years at an annual salary of \$5,200 a year, and my outside engagements netted me a similar sum. Does that look like the passing of the banjo?

I am no longer under contract to any one company, but play for all of them, and I find the remuneration much more than when I was under contract. You will find that a good banjoist who knows the instrument and plays by note will have no difficulty in making a good living anywhere.

The banjo will live and become more popular every year, even if the whole world takes to golf and other games. Banjo music is to the ear what the sun breaking through the clouds on a dark day is to the eye; and to my mind there is nothing to replace the good, clean, clear tones of the banjo.

This in defence of the banjo from one who loves the instrument.

Sincerely yours,

VESS. L. OSSMAN.