

corded in language which should become the text for all political education.

We are compelled by every consideration of honor, of duty and of interest to repudiate Bryanism and all that it represents. The coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 is the least of the false doctrines in this platform, but it necessarily occupies the first place. You ask whether I believe in the coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1. You might as well ask me whether I believed that an ounce should be made to pass for a pound in the ordinary transactions of commerce. The ratio is a false ratio. The value of silver measured by gold is, as everyone knows, not 16 to 1, but 32 to 1. The proposition, therefore, of the platform is to declare that 50 cents shall by law be made equal to one dollar. This absurd proposition is based upon the professed belief that in 1873 when silver was demonetized a crime was committed, by which creditors benefited at the expense of debtors. The fact is that silver was then overvalued, and hence its demonetization was a relief to debtors and of no benefit to creditors.

The extraordinary thing is that the Kansas City platform proposes to commit the very crime which it falsely denounces as having been perpetrated in 1873. It proposes to substitute a fifty-cent dollar in payment of debts which ought to be discharged with 100 cents to the dollar. This is robbery, and therefore a crime, in which no honest man can have any part. The pretense that the bullion value of silver could be raised to its coinage value by the fiat of the government is ridiculous. In fact we have tried the experiment by purchasing more than six hundred millions of dollars worth of silver in order to preserve the parity between silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. We have seen the price of silver steadily fall in the face of these large purchases. The United States strained its ability to the last thread of tension in this effort. Universal distress existed, and we were only relieved from general bankruptcy by the repeal of the Sherman act. To repeat this experiment in a time when business is good is an act of folly so glaring that it is difficult for a sane man to understand how the proposition could have received a single vote in the convention.

You ask me whether the present administration is likely to establish an imperialistic form of government over this country or in its new possessions.

I answer that the constitution of the United States is too strongly entrenched in the affections of the people to permit its possible violation by the administration, and that if such an attempt were made the supreme court of the United States will surely interpret the constitution in the spirit of its founders and for the preservation of the constitutional government to which we owe our

stability and our prosperity. Personally, I regret very much that we have acquired the Philippine Islands, and so far as I might have any influence I would exert it for the purpose of divesting ourselves of the ownership of these islands.

* * * *

Lastly, you ask whether a democrat by voting for McKinley and Roosevelt could be considered false to the interests of democracy.

I answer that I do not see how a democrat who is true to the interests of democracy can in the present exigency take any other course than to vote for the republican ticket. I propose myself so to vote, and I do this because I am a democrat who feels that Bryanism and all that it stands for is diametrically opposed to the principles of the democratic party as they are enunciated by Jefferson and as they have been construed by all the great men who have led the democratic party up to the time of the holding of the unhappy convention of 1896, when the old organization was broken up.

* * * *

I have but little sympathy with the republican party and as a rule have found its leaders to be opportunists and not statesmen. Nevertheless, in the present crisis the Philadelphia platform is much more acceptable than the platform of the Kansas City convention. It may be a choice of evils, but it is certainly a lesser evil to continue the government in the hands of the republican party for the next four years than to encounter the perils which would confront us in case Bryan and his followers should have the opportunity of putting in practice the insane policy to which they are committed.

Very truly yours,

ABRAM S. HEWITT.

New York.

From the New York Oesterreichisch-Ungarische Zeitung.

ECKELS GAUGES BRYAN BY HIS FRIENDS AND FOES.

In his speech at the Auditorium James H. Eckels suggested a significant contrast between one class of people whom Bryan is repelling and another class with whom he proposes to divide the spoil. He is repelling the whole business world, and it is true of his party that it "has so completely eliminated all employers of labor from its councils" that it "is not to be trusted with the power to legislate for either labor or capital." On the other hand, this same party under the Bryan leadership has become "a party solely of politicians, controlled wholly for the benefit of politicians and by politicians alone."

Speaking generally this entire analysis is a fair one. The business world, including the employers of labor, has almost completely withdrawn from the

democracy because it is the object of Mr. Bryan's most vicious assaults. He attacks it when he attacks the banks and a sound currency, and when he makes his demagogic appeals for a war of the employed against the employing classes. From the first he has proclaimed its extermination with a cry of "no quarter," and he himself can expect no quarter from those whom he has pursued so relentlessly when the day comes for them to be heard.

But aside from the antagonism that is excited in the particular class it is worth while to consider the more general significance of this phenomenon. Is not he a dangerous man who is continually threatening a great conservative element in our society which manages the trade, commerce and manufacturing industries of the country? Will the judgment of this peripatetic politician weigh against the judgment of the thousands upon thousands of able, progressive men of affairs who have been among the foremost agents in the development of the nation? Not unless the tramp is entitled to more respect than the reputable citizen at whose gate he waits.

And with Bryan there is a grand assortment of tramps of the political order, as Mr. Eckels intimates. They represent nothing but the appetite for office, and if from time to time they achieve a small measure of political success the American comment upon such lives as theirs is "failure." They are never useful members of society, but parasites merely, and are held in almost universal public contempt.—Chicago Times-Herald.

THE ARMY OF PEACE.

There's an army in the field,
Hear the sound!
See the thousand swords they wield,
And the ground
Trembles to their mighty tread,
Flashes now each golden head,
Bound about with silken thread,
They are crowned!

Who are these that silent come,
Thousands strong,
Swift, with neither fife nor drum,
Nor with song?
Do they come in war or peace,
To bring havoc or increase,
To take captive or release,
Right or wrong?

'Tis the army of the King,
Sovereign Corn,
To the needy minst'ring,
The forlorn.
Bringing bread and meat and wine,
That the starving souls may dine,
That the haggard face may shine,
Like the morn.

Open every parched throat,
Give a cheer
That shall echo, that shall float,
'Till the ear
Of the giver of the grain,
Of the sun and of the rain,
Shall drink in the blessed strain
Loud and clear.

—ISABEL RICHEY.