

Jim Hill, and their sinews of war from similar sources. That this movement is anti-democratic conspiracy, and not an honest fight waged for what are deemed to be the best interests of the party, is evident not only from its source—from the character of those who wage the fight—but also from the fact that it is not waged in behalf of any particular candidate.

The plan of campaign is to get anti-Bryan votes by any and every means. At the national committee meeting two schemes were proposed by these conspirators, but fortunately were defeated. One was to forbid the instruction of delegates, the other was to abolish the unit rule. The purpose of the first was to make it possible for delegates to betray their constituents; of the second to secure a few stray anti-Bryan delegates from states that are overwhelmingly committed to the Nebraskan.

These schemes blighted, the plotters are now turning to the ancient "favorite son" recourse. With Johnson they want to seduce Minnesota; with Harmon, Ohio; with Gray, Delaware; with Wilson, New Jersey; with Daniel, Virginia; with Chanler or some other, New York, and so on down the line. Then, where they can develop no favorite sons, they will fight for uninstructed delegations; delegations, even, which may seem friendly to Bryan, but which contain as many delegates as possible that can be counted on to oppose him if it becomes evident in the convention that there is a chance to defeat him.

It is important that the democrats of the United States should inform themselves as to what is going on. The plot depends entirely on the ability of the plotters to deceive the people. They will deceive them with favorite sons—if they can; with pleas for uninstructed delegations—if they can; with anti-Bryan men masquerading as Bryan's friends—if they can. It would take 323 delegates to prevent Bryan's nomination under the two-thirds rule. The plotters profess to believe they can get 240 of these from New York, New England, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware; the rest they want to get from Minnesota, Ohio, Virginia and two or three other states, either by chicanery or under the favorite son pretext.

There is very slight danger, in the World-Herald's judgment, that this plot will succeed. The reason it won't succeed is that the rank and file of the party is overwhelmingly for Bryan, in the east as well as in the west. When the rank and file realizes the true nature of the scheme it will rise and crush the schemers, and the Denver convention will be a love feast presaging victory rather than the riot forboding disaster for which the plotters are hoping.—Omaha World-Herald.

Mr. Bryan Before the Jefferson Club in Chicago

The following report of the Jefferson club banquet in Chicago is taken from the Chicago Record-Herald:

The opening gun in the Illinois campaign of William Jennings Bryan was fired last night at the Jackson day dinner of the Jefferson Club at the Auditorium hotel, when Democrats of all the warring factions in the state buried their differences and toasted the Nebraskan as "the guiding star of 1908," as William E. Dever, toastmaster, phrased it. The "peerless one" responded in an address in which he nourished the harmony idea. He devoted much attention to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson, attacked the republican leaders as "aristocrats" and therefore unable to understand the needs of the country, whacked at the tariff, blamed the recent financial stringency on the republican party, and wound up with the utterance that all that is necessary for a democratic victory next fall is "for the democratic party to convince the public that it will be truly democratic if entrusted with power."

Considerable attention was also devoted by Mr. Bryan to "federal encroachment," a phrase extremely popular with the members of the Jefferson Club, which had blazoned on its menu cards such quotations as:

.....
: The spirit of encroachment tends :
: to consolidate the powers of all the de- :
: partments in one, and thus to create, :
: whatever the form of government, a :
: real despotism.—Washington. :
:

A commentary from a democratic point of view on this utterance from the father of his

country was supplied by Mr. Bryan when in his speech he drew the following distinction between the two great parties:

"The aristocrat would substitute national remedies for state ones because predatory wealth can protect itself from national legislation more easily than from state legislation. The democrat would add the national remedy to the state remedy and thus give to the people the protection of both the state and federal government."

This drew a burst of applause from all the tables, and later on Toastmaster Dever took occasion to read from the menu cards another quotation on somewhat similar lines:

.....
: What has destroyed the liberty and :
: the rights of man in every government :
: which has ever existed under the sun? :
: The generalizing and concentrating all :
: cares and powers into one body.— :
: Jefferson. :
:

In a passing reference to the money question the Nebraskan shot the following bolt at the republican leaders:

"If the republican leaders had spent half as much time in trying to make depositors secure as they have in trying to increase the profits of the banker, we would not have had any panic at all."

The address was applauded by 750 guests, nearly every section of the state being represented at the banquet boards. All cliques and factions were on hand, and from the easy way in which they broke bread and spilled salt together the gathering was taken as a further indication that feuds will be forgotten in Illinois in the Bryan campaign, at least on the surface.

The Burke men were there in full force, in the full glory of dinner coats and diamond-studded expanses of shirt front. The Sullivan faction was well represented by State Chairman Charles Boeschstein and others. Roger C. Sullivan himself did not attend, the report being that he was suddenly called to Mount Clemens, Mich. The regular county organization had a deputation of over 100, in their ordinary clothes; the Jefferson club and the Iroquois club filed several tables; the Dunne men were there, and the followers of Carter H. Harrison, also the leaders of the Hearst movement four years ago. Added to all these elements was a large sprinkling of down state democrats. The leaders said that the attendance was substantial evidence that all the multifarious factions in the local democracy have clambered into the Bryan band van.

The democratic party of Indiana was represented on the programme by a speech from John W. Kern, who indicated during his remarks that the democrats across the state line are with the Nebraskan.

Senator W. J. Stone of Missouri handled the topic "1908" in a manner that brought rounds of applause from the banqueters. On gazing into the crystal the senator was able to discern signs that led him to augur a democratic victory in the national election, with Bryan heading the ticket. The list of toasts was completed by Adlai E. Stevenson, former vice president of the United States, who dwelt on "Thomas Jefferson" and preached democratic doctrines to his listeners. The address of welcome was delivered by Edgar Lee Masters, president of the Jefferson Club. Alderman William E. Dever served as toastmaster.

Although the dinner began at 7 o'clock and an early start was thus obtained on the speech-making, the orators were so imbued with their themes that it was not until a late hour that Mr. Bryan was called on for the concluding address. In his remarks the Nebraskan said:

"Jackson was democratic in the same sense in which Jefferson was democratic. Both believed in the people—both in their right to self-government and in their capacity for self-government. And what is of no less importance, both considered society and society's needs from the democratic standpoint—that is, from the standpoint of the interests of the whole people. On this day, when we meet in the memory of Jackson, it is entirely fitting that we should consider this the fundamental and far-reaching question, namely, from what standpoint shall we look at society? The aristocrat regards society as an organization suspended from the top; the democrat considers society as a structure built from the bottom. The democrat would legislate for the interests of the whole country, assured that the prosperity of the masses would

find its way up through the various classes that rest upon the masses.

"The aristocrat is always demanding something for the well-to-do—the employers, the captains of industry—on the theory that these would generously divide with the rest of the people. The republican leaders—I do not mean the comparatively few reform republicans but those who dominate the party's policy in the House and in the Senate—these look at society from the aristocratic standpoint, and therefore cannot understand the real needs of the country or propose the legislation necessary to correct existing abuses.

"If the trust question is under consideration the republican leaders at once become solicitous for fear rash and ill considered legislation may disturb the gigantic business enterprises which are crushing out independence and industry. The democrats look at the trust question from the standpoint of 80,000,000 of people who are victimized and insist upon effective legislation.

"If the tariff question is the one under discussion the republican leaders at once insist that the high tariff is responsible for the nation's prosperity and warn the country that any interference with the profits of protected manufacturers would bring business prostration.

"Just now they are not so noisy as usual because we have a panic with the high tariff system in full force. But even panics cannot convince the more partisan republicans of the falsity of their boast that panics are impossible under the republican rule. The democrats insist upon tariff reform because they regard it as unjust that the entire population should be taxed for the benefit of a small portion of the population, especially when the beneficiaries of the high tariff are so ungrateful as to sell abroad cheaper than at home.

"If the railroad question is under consideration the republican leaders at once take the side of the railroad magnates and assume that any effective regulation will bring business to a standstill. The republican leaders in the senate have refused to permit an inquiry into the present value of the railroads, and they have prevented legislation which would prohibit the issuance of watered stock. The democrats, looking at the question from the standpoint of the patrons of the road and the stockholders, insist that the railroad business should be put upon an honest basis so that there will be no great fluctuation in the value of the stocks and bonds.

"The fortunes that have been made by railroad managers have not come from salaries, for even enormous salaries do not make millionaires in so short a time. If a railroad president receives \$100,000 a year he has to work fifty years to earn \$5,000,000, but if he is allowed to juggle the stock of the road he can make more in a few months' time on the side than he can in a lifetime by honest attention to the management of the road.

"The questions which involve a discussion of the relative spheres of the nation and the state bring out the difference in the point of view. The aristocrat wants to get the government as far away from the people as possible; the democrat desires to bring the government as near to the people as possible. The aristocrat would substitute national remedies for state ones because predatory wealth can protect itself from national legislation more easily than from state legislation. The democrat would add the national remedy to the state remedy and thus give to the people the protection of both the state and federal governments.

"The labor question is considered from both standpoints; the aristocrat thinks only of the large employers; the democrats of the army of employes and of the general public which is inconvenienced by any disruption of friendly relations between employer and employe.

"And the question of imperialism in like manner presents the difference in viewpoint; the imperialist thinks more of the extension of commerce than he does of the preservation of the ideas of self-government and he thinks only of the benefits that might come to the comparatively few who engage in export trade; the democrat knows that trade purchased at the cannon's mouth costs more than it is worth and the cost falls upon all the people, while the profits accrue to but a few, and the masses have to furnish the sons as well as the money to support a carpet-bag government.

"And so whatever question we take up we find that everything depends upon the point of view from which we examine the question, and there is no better illustration of this than is to be found in the money stringency through which we are passing. The republican leaders at once