

Mr. Bryan Forecasts the Democratic Convention

(Copyright, 1912, by the Newspaper Enterprise Association.)

The course of the democratic convention will be largely shaped by the action of the republican convention. The democratic platform will set forth the democratic side of the issues presented at Chicago. For instance, if President Taft is renominated a considerable portion of the platform will be devoted to pointing out a difference between the president and congress on the tariff question. His administration will be condemned for its sins of omission and commission and an appeal will be made to progressives to join in administering a fitting rebuke to the administration.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Roosevelt is nominated, the paramount issue will be the third term—shall the traditions of the nation be overturned? Shall we embark on the road to a dictatorship? Shall we intrust the power and patronage of the presidency in the hands of a man who might use it to keep himself in power for life?

The third term issue is no trivial thing—the protest against it is not an idle cry of alarm. A dictatorship is the one danger which threatens republics. Because of the intelligence of our people the danger is less here than elsewhere, but it is not a danger that we can afford to invite even here.

No one who has had experience in public affairs is indifferent to the fact that a president has several hundred thousand officeholders who can be coerced into activity in his behalf; he has an army that is obedient to his command (and the standing army has been doubled since ninety-six) and battleships whose guns can overawe our seaport cities. Given the desire to establish a dictatorship, and the man in the White House has a material advantage over any rival in his own party or in any other party.

But these suggestions are by way of illustration to show how the action of our convention will be influenced by the action of the republican convention. If a dark horse should happen to be nominated our platform would have to be written to correspond with the new

conditions which such a result would create.

In the selection of candidate, also, our convention can not escape from the influence that will be exerted by the republican nomination. The democratic nominee will be a progressive—that is already settled. No reactionary could be nominated now, even if the republican situation did not forbid such action on our part. Mr. Clark and Mr. Wilson, both progressives, will have, together, more than a majority—possibly two-thirds—of the convention. While a few reactionaries may be included among their delegates the number can not be great enough to give any hope to those democrats who are hostile to progressive ideas.

Governor Harmon will have all of his own state, Ohio having adopted the unit rule, but to carry his state by 11,000 majority out of nearly 200,000 votes cast, and receive less than one-fourth of the vote he received when he was elected governor, gives him no standing in a national convention. The progressives elected 19 district delegates in Ohio—more than twice as many delegates as Mr. Harmon secured in all the states outside of Ohio.

Mr. Underwood, the other reactionary candidate, did not allow his name to go before the people in 42 of the 48 states, and he carried only four of the states in which he was a candidate—his own, and three that bordered on it. In the three neighboring states he had a spirited contest and his majority was not large enough to emphasize his claims.

If these two men, selected from among the reactionaries as the two most popular of the men holding their views, have made so poor a showing, what dark horse of the reactionary type would have a chance to secure a nomination at the hands of a progressive convention?

While neither Clark nor Wilson has enough votes to make his nomination certain, the chances are largely in favor of the nomination of one or the other of them. If they differed radically in the standpoint from which they view public questions the contest between them might bring out a compromise candidate, but their supporters have rivaled each other in praising their progressiveness.

The one question which has been asked—and the answer to it has decided the complexion of the delegates in most states—is: Which of the two is the better progressive? Which one can be most fully trusted to carry out the principles and policies to which the democratic party has been committed for 16 years?

There can not be a bitter fight between two such candidates, and if one, whichever one, finally withdraws, the other is quite sure to get his votes.

Instructions will bind wherever they have been given—the convention would hardly permit instructions to be violated—but we must expect some influence to be exerted by the public opinion which will express itself after the republican convention has acted. The democrats are anxious to win and while it now seems almost impossible for them to lose, no matter who is nominated by the republicans, still the delegates to a national convention are usually men of caution as well as men of enthusiasm and some of them have ambition. They want the strongest man nominated and they will sacrifice their personal choice when convinced that someone else is more available. Then there will be a great many unofficial visitors and they will have their influence in moulding opinion.

The men who attend a national convention are the more active men in politics, many of them candidates for local offices. They realize that the national ticket can aid or hinder the campaign in states and counties, and, other things being equal, they are ready to shout for the man who, in their judgment, will poll the most votes. This public opinion, while it can not affect the instructed vote, may have a determining influence on the uninstructed vote, and this uninstructed vote may determine the result if a considerable majority of it is thrown to one or the other of the two men now in the lead.

The conclusion is, therefore, that either Clark or Wilson will be nominated, unless some contingency, now unforeseen, arises, but the Chicago convention may go a long way towards determining the relative availability of these two candidates.

W. J. BRYAN.

to witness, and a judgment upon combatants is expressed by a bit of paper (possibly yards of paper in the near future) rather than the position of the thumb.

Woman has always been influenced by her environment, so we find the Judiths, the Jael, the Amazons, the Joans of ancient times giving place to the Portias, the Florence Nightingales, the Clara Bartons, the Helen Goulds and the Ethel Boardmans of this. Mind, in its manifestations, is what engages, or, she engages, the interest and attention of those who today occupy the "highest station." Everything depends upon our point of view. If our ideal of the "highest" is "character" and we recognize that its fundamental elements are truth and altruism, a yielding not only to the "rights" of others, but a generous consideration of the wishes and tastes of those outside the charmed pale of our own exclusive circle, if we really believe there is something good and worth knowing in every one, that "there is an angel in every stone," and it may be our privilege to "get it out," if we ask with George Eliot, "What do we live for if not to make life less difficult to others," then do we answer the requirements of our toast, and are "examples of those occupying the highest position."

The desire for money and position, or, not to be too grasping, money or position, is so general that there is no use denying or disparaging it. If as an end in itself, from which to look down upon those outstripped in the race, then does its possession truly "Leave the soul in wider emptiness," and prove the owner not worthy of the gift. But if a means to an end, and that end the betterment and uplift of our kind, if we feel our souls responding to the cry of those who come to us for the "cup of strength in some great agony," or oftener still, for just a word of cheer or advice because we are we, then may we be justified in our desire for time, money or position and so catch a glimpse of what "examples in the highest station" may become. The responsibility of this "privileged class" was defined nearly two thousand years ago by One whom we all try to follow, when He said, "To whomsoever much is given of him

shall be much required." Nothing could be plainer than that, but our mental or moral strabismus has been so great that we have confused it, or preferred the other saying, "Whomsoever hath to him shall be given and he shall have more abundance."

I suppose we have all had occasion to wonder why it is that those to whom we naturally look as examples are often so markedly deficient. Why, with libraries that are wonderful, they read and know so little; why, with so many charities demanding help they are satisfied with giving pennies to them, when they spend pounds on superfluous baubles? Why, with their own dear daughters wanting nothing and surrounded by every protection, they should be so thoughtless of the multitudes so woefully destitute, and by nature as good as their own? Why so much time and money is spent on pouring attentions upon those who are satiated with them and withholding them from others to whom they would be as a gift from heaven? Why, oh why? Because our perspective is all wrong. We forget that "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things that he possesseth," we fail to understand the relative values of things, and by an insidious selfishness which we should only admit as thoughtlessness if brought to our notice, and of which we should be heartily ashamed, we unconsciously take on an "I am holier than thou" attitude so that the example required by those "highest in station" is so marred as to make angels weep in pity. But this, too, is passing away, and a better day even now is here. There are more young women interesting themselves in their factory sisters, more friendly societies, more work among women for girls and women in industrial homes and reformatories than ever before, and I know from my own observation, a more methodical consecration of a stated portion of time to others that formerly was frittered away on self and society.

We are hearing a great deal these days against "special privilege," and we, as loyal democratic women, are not recreant to this vital protest of our party (I mean our husbands' party, as women we belong to no party, as yet,

in this part of the country) when we glory in the fact of our special privilege, to prove to others our belief in the principle as expressed by "Noblesse Oblige," and which we consider good democratic doctrine, and should rejoice to see adopted as our motto; for isn't it also true democratic doctrine to disregard all artificial lines of distinction, and isn't every woman, be her purse light or heavy, her position humble or exalted, a woman of "highest station," provided—and here's the rub—provided she is noble in heart and purpose, if her eyes are lifted "toward the hills," if she is gentle and courteous and considerate of others, and of whom rudeness to anyone, particularly a subordinate, would be an impossibility. Can any one challenge her position as "highest in station," or do aught but admire such an "example" even in these unsettled days when many not to the manor born seem to fear their proper due will not be awarded them.

But with the example of the lovely and gracious lady whose anniversary we celebrate today and whose reputation for charm consisted largely in the traits and graces we speak of, let us, her admirers and would-be followers, resolve that the next Dolly Madison reunion shall find in us less incongruity between profession and performance. So shall we not only have been able to "lend a hand" to others, but find as a personal reward a new outlook on life, a greater joy in service and become ourselves better exponents of "Noblesse Oblige."

SOME ANSWERS WANTED

Puck's magazine gives the republican leaders something to think about in the following:

The Politician—What is the next question to bring before the American people?

The Voter—They have had questions enough. What they want is a few answers.

The United States senate agreed to a \$150 per month pension for Mrs. Schley, widow of the late Admiral Schley, after it had rejected an amendment proposing to cut this amount to \$50. Good for the senate.