

the American soldier. There must be a very unmistakable line drawn between the great body of honorable and faithful officers and private soldiers whose records have been commendable and those, of whatever station, whose acts have received and should receive the earnest condemnation of all honorable men."

The general is right. A line must be drawn between the soldier who respects his country's position and always endeavors so act as to defend the nation's high position among the nations, and the soldier, whether he be officer or private, who permits an inherent brutality to manifest itself in cruelty to the helpless. It is natural for the guilty and for their friends to resent criticism of individual officers as if it were criticism of the whole army, just as the predatory rich seek to make it appear that punishment of them is an attack upon property and property rights. The punishment of the guilty is necessary for the protection of the innocent, for only in this way can the guilty be located and the whole army be exonerated. It is better that the offending member be punished than that whole body suffer.

Leadership.

Mr. Bryan has not thought it proper to use the columns of *The Commoner* to make answer to criticisms which are purely personal, for he desires to make the paper an exponent of ideas rather than of persons. There would be no room for anything else if he attempted to reply to the many republican and gold papers which contain unkind comments and groundless criticism. He has felt at liberty, however, to take notice of some editorials which, in condemning him, condemn the ideas which he advocates.

On another page will be found an editorial from the *Springfield Republican* which well illustrates one class of papers. The *Republican* opposed the democratic ticket in 1896, but in 1900 supported the ticket because the question of imperialism was made paramount. The editorials of that paper, while they have often found fault with the editor of *The Commoner*, are usually written in a friendly vein and with more fairness than many papers show. Attention is called to this editorial in order to point out a fact which must be borne in mind by the advocates of the Kansas City platform. It will be noticed that the main charge made by the *Republican* is that Mr. Bryan needs "a sane opportunism." It is pained that Mr. Bryan does not bury the silver question and thus become the "leader" of the radical movement. The *Republican's* position is easily explained. Its editor has never shown any comprehension of the real issue between the republicans and the gold democrats on the one side and the Kansas City platform democrats on the other side—namely, the issue between Mammon and man. The *Republican* thinks that the silver question should be buried, but the force of its opinion on this subject is materially weakened by the fact that it thought the same thing in 1896 and the years prior to that. When the dollar was constantly rising in value because of legislation hostile to silver, the *Republican* was in no wise alarmed. The appeals of the wealth-producers and the debt-payers never reached its sanctum. It treated the subject in a calmer manner than the ultra-gold standard organs, but it treated it from the side of the money lender and the money changer. It is hardly fair for a paper that could see no life in the money question prior to 1896 to pose as an expert physician and give an opinion upon the vitality of the issue now. The editorial quoted from shows that the editor does not understand today the issue between those who want money scarce and those who want a sufficient quantity; between those who want a financial system, made by the financiers for their own profit, and those who want a financial system made by the people for themselves. The editorial contains not the slightest reference to the gold standard plan, still uncompleted, which contemplates, first, the making of the silver dollar redeemable in gold; second, the withdrawal of full legal tender qualities from it; third, its final retirement; fourth, a branch bank system; fifth, the complete retirement of the greenbacks, and, sixth, an asset currency. These propositions are very important ones, and are being considered by the financiers and will be pushed as rapidly as possible.

If the editor of the *Republican* was as well informed on the subject of money as he is on the subject of imperialism, or if his sympathies were

as actively with the masses of America, who are the victims of Wall street's financial legislation, as his sympathies are actively with the Filipinos who are the victims of American exploitation, he would understand that the money question can not be dropped without a criminal disregard of public interests. If he understood the money questions or if his sympathies were on the right side of the question, he would know that no compromise short of complete surrender can be made with the financiers.

At this moment there is such a scarcity of money in the United States that that very scarcity is being used as a club to beat congress into the passage of an asset currency law. That scarcity is a sufficient reason for insisting upon opening the mints to the coinage of silver. Throughout the world there is a scarcity of standard money and that scarcity is evidence that silver is still needed. These things can be disregarded by those who do not understand the subject or by those who understand the subject, but sympathize with the financiers in their desire for dear money, but they cannot be overlooked by those who are acquainted with the principles of monetary science and whose sympathies are with the people once described by John G. Carlyle as "the struggling masses."

But even if the advocates of the Kansas City platform were willing, for the sake of harmony, to consider the money question as temporarily settled, if they were willing to waive their views on this subject and agree to keep the money question in abeyance for a few years while other questions were considered, they would find that no progress would be made toward harmony, first because the advocates of the gold standard are not satisfied with our money system as it is, but insist upon changes that are inimical to the interests of the public. The honest gold standard leaders would not agree to any proposition that would leave the money question in statu quo for four years, and there is no way by which they could be bound to an agreement, even if they were willing to make it. The advocates of the gold standard have proposed the only terms that they will propose, namely, that the platform shall ignore not only the silver part of the money question, but every part of the money question. Second, that the candidates shall be men who can be relied upon by Wall street to use the entire influence of the government to carry out the plans of Wall street. Third, that the party organization shall be turned over to the advocates of the gold standard to have and hold in perpetuity.

This is the only basis of compromise, and it is not compromise, but surrender, absolute and complete. If the *Republican* does not know this it has not improved the opportunity which it has had to discover what is going on. If the *Republican*, as is more likely, understands this, but can see no harm in it, that fact alone would disclose its bias in favor of the financiers. Like some of the other anti-imperialists, the *Republican* seems to wonder why the democrats who constitute the majority of the party are not disposed to accept an undemocratic man for a place at the head of the democratic ticket. The answer is plain and ought to be known without the necessity of stating it. A man who is undemocratic in his sympathies cannot be trusted with the immense power of the chief executive. The democratic party tried that in 1892, and the result was that the administration became more subservient to plutocratic influences than any republican administration had ever been, and this subserviency alienated an immense number of voters and placed upon the democratic name an odium that it has been difficult to remove.

In 1896 the most potent argument that we had to meet was, "The democratic administration has ruined the country; a republican administration will restore prosperity." Mr. Hanna presented Candidate McKinley as the advance agent of prosperity, and while the democratic party was being held responsible for Mr. Cleveland's administration Mr. Cleveland was helping the republicans to elect their candidate. In 1900, when the democratic party tried to make imperialism the paramount issue, the most potent argument it had to meet was, "The republican party has brought prosperity. Let well enough alone; do not risk a return to the hard times and soup houses of the last democratic administration." While the democratic party was bearing the burden of Mr. Cleveland's administration, he sat silent in his New Jersey home and refused to say one word to assist the party in its fight against the republican party, notwithstanding the fact that he had two years before denounced imperialism as a menace to the country. As soon as the election was over, his voice returned to him, and he has been making the air vocal ever since

with his advice to the party that he demoralized.

A man's sympathies control him—"as a man thinketh in his heart so is he." If one sits down in a street car and overhears a conversation between two men he can very soon tell their sympathies, and when he knows their sympathies he can guess the arguments they will use in support of their positions. The trouble with those who lead the reorganizing forces is that their sympathies are wrong; they look at every question from the standpoint of the capitalist. According to their theory society is constructed from the top—the capitalist is the great benefactor and the laborer ought to be in an attitude of thankfulness for the opportunity to work. A man's sympathies control his position on every question which he understands. A man may be misled, and may ignorantly oppose those with whom he sympathizes, but he will not knowingly do so.

While the editor of *The Commoner* appreciates the generous advice given him, his respect for the *Republican* compels him to answer with the same frankness with which it has spoken. He is not seeking leadership. Neither is he concerned about his "political position in future years;" no man is in position to do his duty who is controlled by the ambition to be a leader or who is always looking out for his own political future. Leadership is not secured that way, neither can one insure his political position in future years by centering his thoughts upon his own interests. Nominal leadership in a party is determined by the action of the convention, but leadership in thought and in political action is entirely independent of caucuses and conventions. He leads who proposes the wisest measures and defends them with the strongest argument. No one can see the truth who constantly gazes at himself. Those find truth who seek for it—who seek not casually or carelessly, but earnestly and constantly. The best evidence that one can give of his faith in a truth is to be willing to suffer for it. Christ gave utterance to a principle of wide application when He said, "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake shall find it." So it may be said of truth. He whose only object is to save his own political life will lose it, and will deserve to lose it, but he who is willing to lose his life for the sake of a cause or a principle, triumphs with the cause or principle to which he adheres; he grows with it and enjoys the confidence of those who are wedded to it. The advocates of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms have shown their willingness to suffer for their convictions. Why should they pretend a confession of error when they believe that they were right? Why pretend that the issue is past, when it is still upon us, and must remain? Why ignore, for the sake of a few offices, a fierce conflict between money and manhood? Why delude ourselves with the belief that a real or even a nominal victory can be won by a sacrifice of the people's interest to the cold, cruel and merciless dictation of monopolists, and magnates, in whom love of money has extinguished the feeling of brotherhood.

The *Republican's* reference to Jefferson is an unfortunate one, for no man, not excepting Jackson, was ever more consistent in his course or more tenaciously held to fundamental principles. Jefferson's sympathies were with the people. He was not only the defender of individual liberty, religious liberty and self-government, but he sounded the first note of warning against monopolies, against banks of issue and against the money power. He was assailed by the aristocrats because he was a democrat. He was assailed by those who enjoyed special privileges because he believed in equal rights to all and special privileges to none, and he himself said that he was denounced as a maniac by the bankers because he opposed banks of issue.

Gladstone may have changed parties, but that alone would not convict him of changing his principles. The silver men who came to the democratic party in 1896 insisted that they were maintaining the position that the republican party had maintained on the money question, and the anti-imperialists who came to us in 1900 insisted that they were maintaining the principles for which the party had stood.

Opportunism is a good or bad word according to its definition. If it means a willingness on the part of one to change his principles in order to compass individual success, it is a most offensive word; if it means that one employs new facts, new incidents and new conditions to give expression to his principles, it is an entirely proper word. Every man and every party must utilize circumstances and conditions to advance principles, but no man or party can justify the abandonment of principles for selfish gain.