

shown themselves recreant to their trust. What the country wants to know is that the candidate represents the people.

A president can not serve two masters. Every honest man knows this, and the honest man ought to learn it. It does matter a great deal whether, when he takes the oath of office, he can take it without reservation. We have any number of men entirely qualified for the position, men whose sympathies are with the people. If this convention will select any one of them and give him a clean committee, made up of honest and earnest men, the progressive-republicans will not need to talk of starting a third party.

The crisis is at hand, and those who read this report tomorrow morning may at the same time learn the name of our candidate. A multitude of democrats are praying that he may measure up to the requirements of the situation and that a successful fight may be made to rescue the government from the hands of the exploiters. W. J. B.

**MR. BRYAN EXPLAINS HIS STAND**

Baltimore, Md., June 30.—If I be permitted to speak on my own part I shall devote a few sentences to the explanation which I gave of the change of thirteen of the Nebraska delegates from Clark to Wilson. I was not in the hall Friday night when New York cast her ninety votes for Clark, but went in later during the demonstration. After having a night to reflect over the matter I decided upon a course of action in case an attempt was made to use the New York vote to elect Mr. Clark. On the action one must always consider the conditions to be met, for candidates are usually the measure of exertion. At the Chicago convention I saw how unfairly a holdover political machine had made up the temporary roll of the convention and then used the votes of those put upon the roll to seat each other, thus giving to the committee control of the convention. I was in a good position to watch the roller as it moved noisily along overcoming every obstruction, and when its work was completed thwarting the will of a large majority of the republican party. To add aggravation to wrong, the committee was made up of representatives from the southern states where there is practically no republican vote. These committeemen representing merely a paper organization and held to the republican party largely by the power of patronage, were used to outvote the representatives from states that cast a large republican vote. And to add further cause for indignation, this unfairly proportioned committee seated delegates upon the same congressional proportion as in the north. The congressional district in which I live, for instance, has a republican vote of some 25,000 and has two district delegates. The state of Louisiana casts some 5,000 republican votes and has twenty delegates in the republican convention, or nearly a hundred times as much influence in the convention in proportion to voting population.

About the time this outrage on popular government had had time to soak in I came to Baltimore, and here I find the democratic national committee acting upon the same plan, using holdover committeemen to misrepresent the delegations, and intending to open a progressive convention with a reactionary keynote. I soon learned that the same influences which at Chicago defied popular sentiment in the republican party were here in force. I found that, having defeated the progressive program at Chicago, they were

bent upon defeating it here. Cunning was substituted for boldness, and the progressive brand was being used to mask the real character of the work outlined.

I have already described the first contest in which I was defeated for temporary chairman, a position which I did not desire, and for which I was a candidate only because I felt that some one ought to represent the progressive cause. I have also chronicled the second contest, which resulted in the passage of the Morgan-Ryan-Belmont resolution. It was the passage of that resolution and the pledge that it gave to the public that made it imperative, according to my judgment, that I refuse to enter into partnership with Mr. Murphy in nominating a democratic candidate.

I felt sure, from telegrams received and news reports read, that the people were aroused as they had seldom been before, to the importance of presenting a candidate upon whose nomination there could be no suspicion of connection with the interests which we had denounced. It distressed me to have to do anything that might result in injury to the political fortunes of Mr. Clark. I have known him for 18 years, rejoiced in his selection as minority leader, and a year and a half ago regarded him as more likely than anyone else to fight into the conditions as I could estimate them. If he had made good use of the opportunity he had, he would have been nominated by acclamation, but instead of leading the progressive element of the party, the element with which he had always been identified, he became impressed with the idea that his special duty was to harmonize the two elements of the party and prevent any break in the ranks. The leader and the harmonizer are two entirely different persons, and Mr. Clark chose to be the latter. There are times when the harmonizer is the most available candidate, but the situation is different just now. The country is alive with progressive ideas and progressivism has been defeated at Chicago. Two or three million republicans are following the proceedings of this convention and waiting to see whether they can use the democratic party for the rebuking of standpat republicanism or be forced to organize a new party.

Mr. Clark's first mistake was in attempting to overlook the radical difference which existed in the democratic party between the progressives and the reactionaries. His second mistake was in selecting managers who sought to advance his cause by manipulation rather than by that candid appeal which brought the present hour. After permitting a considerable number of reactionaries to come into the convention under instructions, these managers endeavored to win votes by tying up with reactionary votes of the convention. While Mr. Clark himself remained neutral in the fight between Judge Parker and myself for temporary chairman, his managers were working like beavers for Judge Parker. They were not even willing for me to take Mr. James, their own candidate for temporary chairmanship, before the sub-committee and put him against Judge Parker.

The public is not particularly interested in Judge Parker or myself, but it is vitally interested in the acute issue between those who desire to continue the old regime wherein the privileged classes control the government in their own interest through machine politics. Mr. Clark aroused much hostile criticism when he refused to take sides, and this criticism became more emphatic with a great demonstration. When one reads the resolution in which Morgan, Belmont and Ryan were specifically named as the men who

must not be permitted to control the nomination, when it enumerates the predatory interests represented by agents or its attorneys in the New York delegations, when he sees Mr. Murphy in charge and the unit rule throwing this large body of the convention, nearly one-twelfth of the entire membership, to whomsoever he pleases, when one considers these facts and then looks out upon the anxious and expectant multitude who await our action, he can understand, I hope, why I was not ready to go into partnership with Mr. Murphy and the interests who speak for him. There is too much at stake to risk defeat, and we would risk defeat if we had to spend the campaign explaining how a candidate could owe his nomination to predatory interests without danger to his administration.

Mr. Clark's friends spurn the thought of his being influenced by such support, but they forget that the mass of the people can not know Mr. Clark personally, as his intimate friends do. I know him well enough to have confidence in his high purpose and in his good intent, as I have in the purpose and intent of other candidates. I believe that he would try to carry out the people's will. But few, if indeed any, can entirely fortify themselves against the unconscious influence exerted by favors received. We do not allow judges to accept favors from litigants and the president continually acts as an arbiter between organized and the unorganized masses. But even if we could feel certain that the securing of a presidential nomination by the aid of those directly connected with the exploiting class would have no influence whatever upon Mr. Clark's official conduct, we could not possibly hope to impart this confidence to millions of voters who, not enjoying the personal acquaintance of Mr. Clark, would have to rely upon newspaper reports, and it must be remembered that in the contested states the republicans have five to one, if not ten to one, advantage of us. I announced that we would withhold our vote from Mr. Clark so long as New York supported him, and that we apply the same rule to other candidates; that is, we would not enter into partnership with Wall street. I shall discuss tomorrow the question of candidates and attempt to estimate their chances. W. J. B.

**FORMING THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

Following is an Associated Press dispatch: Baltimore, June 26.—W. J. Bryan declined to accept the chairmanship of the committee on resolutions, and Senator Kern of Indiana was chosen for the place.

In refusing to accept the chairmanship Mr. Bryan said:

"I appreciate the compliment but I am not willing to act as chairman. I am a believer in harmony, but I think that the committee and its officers ought to be in harmony with the convention, and I am not in harmony with the organization of the convention nor of the national committee which controls the organization of the convention.

"We used to have two kinds of democrats, progressive and conservatives; we now have only one kind, progressive, but we find there is a wide difference in the definition of the word 'progressive,' and I do not define progressiveness as it is defined by a majority of this convention, and believing in harmony I want to be in harmony with the convention and I desire to be more free to represent the minority sentiment.

"I do not say that there will be a minority report, but it would not look well for the chairman of the committee to take in a minority report. It might be necessary for me

to take in a minority report. I do not know that I will, but I do not want to place myself in that awkward position and for that reason I decline."

By a vote of 22 to 16 the rules committee of the convention today agreed to the plan to defer the presentation of the platform until after the party's candidate for president had been nominated. In the absence of any true indication as to whether the conservative or the progressive wings of the party would dominate the convention it was considered good policy to hold back the platform in order to have it drawn so as to be acceptable to the convention.

Cautious advisers of the Nebraska leader argued against his accepting the chairmanship of the resolutions committee on the ground that an attempt to have him draft the platform is a poorly concealed plot to commit him in advance to the subsequent act of the convention and to any nominee willing to accept what will be known as the "Bryan platform."

Mr. Bryan himself, it was said, was loath to have anything to do with the platform, until he is sure who the nominee will be. For that reason, it was declared, he would advocate the upsetting of precedent and the naming of a candidate before the platform is written and adopted.

As soon as the committee organized, Mr. Bryan moved the presentation of the platform be deferred until after the convention had nominated a candidate for president. Senator Raynor seconded the proposition. He spoke at some length urging a progressive platform and particularly in reference to the tariff and direct election of senators on which planks there was found to be a division of sentiment. The proposal would have to go to the convention if approved by the committee.

"We don't want, and must not have, a perpetual debate between the candidate and the platform," said Mr. Bryan in advocacy of his motion postponing action on the platform until after the nomination of the presidential candidate, "and," he continued, "the only way to prevent such a result is to make the nomination first."

"The candidate," he argued, "should have an opportunity to talk about the platform in advance of its making rather than to feel impatient and talk against the platform afterwards."

Senator Clarke of Arkansas opposed the change as a reversal of all precedents, but was antagonized by Senator Raynor of Maryland, who, taking sides emphatically with Mr. Bryan, said the time had come for overthrowing undesirable precedents.

Mr. Bryan had no statement to make this morning either regarding the platform or Judge Parker's appeal to the delegates to make Mr. Bryan chairman of the resolutions committee.

Returning to his hotel from a visit to Mayor Preston, the Nebraskan spent the early morning hours in correspondence and then went to the convention hall to attend the meeting of the resolutions committee.

"The delegates are saying below stairs that you will write the platform," was suggested.

"But a progressive platform would be a rebuke to the convention, would it not?" was Mr. Bryan's reply.

Mr. Bryan was told that many delegates believed the vote yesterday indicated the convention was progressive and that he would be able to name the candidate for the presidential nomination.

"I think I have given the opinion that the convention would have the