

ful. If the men who eat their bread in the sweat of the face would act in concert at the polls, a speedy and inexpensive remedy would be found for every evil complained of.

The Issues of 1904.

The following letter, written in reply to an invitation to outline the issues of 1904, is reproduced because it will answer many similar letters received from persons who are impatient to begin the next campaign:

LINCOLN, NEB., September 2, 1901.

MR. GEORGE W. HARRIS,
President W. J. Bryan Travelling Mens'
Club, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR:—

I am just in receipt of your letter on my return to the city. Before complying with your request, permit me to suggest that the name of your club should be so changed as to proclaim your allegiance to the party rather than to the personality or views of an individual. When I was the party candidate your club, following the usual custom, took my name, but now that I am a private citizen I do not desire that any organization should suffer because of criticism aimed at me. I believe that your club will be more useful if it stands as the representative of Democratic principles and is free from the suspicion that it is attached to the political fortunes of any man.

I beg to assure you of my appreciation of the work done by your organization and I am gratified to know that it takes a lively interest in the discussion of pending questions.

Replying to your inquiry, I would say that it is too early to outline a platform for the next campaign. Conditions make issues; parties must meet issues as they arise. The tariff question occupied the largest share of public attention in 1892—the McKinley law being the irritating cause. Before 1896 rolled around, however, Mr. Cleveland and his Republican and gold-Democratic associates had forced the tariff question into the background and created conditions which made the money question paramount. The Democratic party was compelled to meet that issue and it met it fairly and honestly.

Between 1896 and 1900, the Republican party by its inaction on the trust question and by its un-American action on the Philippine question compelled a consideration of individualism, which was attacked by private monopoly, and of the fundamental principles of government, which were attacked by imperialism. The tariff question was not settled in 1896 when it gave way to the money question; neither was the money question settled in 1900, when imperialism and monopoly took precedence over it. The position taken by the Democratic party on the money question is as sound as its position on the tariff question, but circumstances must, in the future as in the past, determine the relative importance of issues.

No one is able to say what new issues may arise between now and 1904; neither can any one say what relations the various issues may bear to each other. It seems probable that imperialism will again be prominent, and prob-

ably paramount, for the Republican party shows no disposition to abandon its colonial policy, and we cannot accept colonialism without repudiating all that we have been taught to regard as Democratic in government.

The trusts are increasing in number and magnitude, and we must resolutely oppose them or forfeit the confidence of the common people.

The Republican party is determined to retire greenbacks and substitute bank notes, to be issued by the banks for their own profit and controlled by them for their own advantage. We must resist this effort or place the Democratic party in a position entirely antagonistic to the position of Jefferson, Jackson and all the Democratic leaders down to the time when Cleveland betrayed the party into the hand of the Philistines of finance. The paper money issue is entirely separate and distinct from the silver question, and yet it is a significant fact that those who declare the silver question dead have nothing to say about the irreconcilable conflict between government paper money and national bank notes. The increased supply of gold does not affect, one way or the other, the question of paper money, but the influence of the money power is such that whenever it can bribe or terrify a man into the support of the gold standard it can silence his opposition to banks of issue.

Whether the silver question will play an important part in the next campaign is a question which cannot now be determined. The thing to be desired is a stable dollar, and that can only be secured by legislation which will furnish a volume of standard money sufficient to keep pace with the demand for money. We have no assurance that gold alone will do this, and certainly the interests of the people ought not to be entrusted to those who defended the gold standard when the dollar was increasing in purchasing power and who would favor the gold standard still, even though the production of gold was decreasing.

The gold standard is not yet complete—it remains yet to make silver redeemable in gold and limit its legal tender qualities. The Republican party has these further steps in contemplation. We cannot abandon the Democratic position until we are ready to accept the Republican position, and we cannot accept the Republican position until we are sure that the world's supply of gold is sufficient to furnish all the nations with enough primary money. As the influence of our nation, if cast on the side of the yellow metal, would tend to hasten an universal gold standard, we cannot afford to join in the crusade against silver until the world is ready to do without it as a money metal.

The Kansas City platform covered a number of other important questions—among them the dangerous and tyrannical system known as government by injunction. This judicial abuse is growing more and more threatening to liberty, and no one can say at what moment some judge may so shamefully exceed his authority as to make the settlement of the question imperative.

The election of senators by a direct vote of the people is a reform which will come ultimately and the Democratic party must aid in bringing it.

The Kansas City platform is sound throughout because it applied Democratic principles to the conditions then existing. Those principles are still Democratic and we must apply them to present and future conditions. The line between the Republican party and the Democratic party is the line between plutocracy and Democracy, and we cannot afford to obliterate that line or to make it less distinct. As a matter of principle we must not compromise with those whose sympathies are against the rights and welfare of the masses; as a matter of policy we cannot afford to compromise, because organized wealth has more confidence in the Republican party than it could possibly have in the Democratic party. If we abandon the Kansas City platform we shall lose the support of the plain people without gaining the support of those who are opposed to that platform. We may deserve to win and still lose, but it remains true that to deserve success is the surest road to victory. Those who boast of their willingness to do "anything to win" are unsafe pilots, because they throw away the compass when they discard Democratic principles. The party now stands for positive principles and definite policies. If the party is right, as I believe it is, we can confidently expect vindication, and we can better afford to wait for that vindication than prove recreant to the trust reposed in the party by more than six million voters.

Thanking you again and wishing for the club still greater influence I am,

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Making and Receiving Apologies.

The Emperor of Germany has done the world a distinct service by modifying his requirements of the Chinese representative, charged with making an apology to Germany, to the extent that it was not necessary for the Chinese representative to "kowtow." This ceremony would have consisted of the Chinese representative approaching the Emperor of Germany on his knees and knocking his head on the floor nine times.

In the presence of an apology between individuals, if both parties be intelligent, there must necessarily be some embarrassment, and the embarrassment is by no means one sided. It is just as difficult to accept an apology gracefully as it is to gracefully extend an apology. And the burden of acting gracefully rests as heavily upon the recipient of an apology as it does upon the one required to make the apology.

The man who, being tendered a full and complete apology, made in a manly way with the form of the apologist erect, with the eye of the apologist looking frankly into the eye of the one to whom the apology is due, must on his part be equally manly. He must accept it in the spirit in which it is tendered, and the real man, appreciating the difficulties of his unfortunate fellow, will make the situation as easy as possible for the apologist.

So the ruler of a nation to whom an apology must be made by the representative of another nation has nothing to gain and everything to