# CHAIRMAN IN KEYNOTE SPEECH LAUDS PRESIDENT WILSON

## CUMMINGS SEES LEAGUE FIGHT AS BIG ISSUE

### 'Choice Is Plain—Let Us Stand With the Forces of Civilization.'

(Continued From Page One.)

support him that this question be made the outstanding issue of the 1920 campaign by the democratic party.

The speech was as follows:

The people will shortly determine which political instrumentality is best suited to their purposes, most responsive to their needs. They will have before them many platforms and many promises. In what direction will they turn? There is no better way of judging the future than by the past. We ask, therefore, that the people turn from the passions and the prejudices of the day to the consideration of a record as clear as it is enduring.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SAME AS OF OLD.

The republican party was unsuccessful in the elections of 1912 because it had persistently served special interests and had lost touch with the spirit of the time. Those who controlled its destiny derived their political inspiration from "the good old days of Mark Hanna" and neither desired a new day nor were willing to recognize a new day when it had dawned. To each pressing problem they sought merely to reapply the processes of antiquity.

There were elements in the republican party which were intolerant of its mental sloth and moral irresponsibility. These influences sought to gain party control in 1912 and again, in 1916. They renewed the hopeless struggle at the convention recently held at Chicago.

Despite these efforts, the leaders who have manipulated the party mechanism for more than a generation, are still in undisputed control.

The republican platform, reactionary and provincial, is the very apotheosis of political expediency. Filled with premeditated slanders and vague promises, it will be searched in vain for one constructive suggestion for the reformation of the conditions which it criticises and deplores. The oppressed peoples of the earth will look to it in vain. It contains no message of hope for Ireland; no word of mercy for Armenia; and it conceals a sword for Mexico. It is the work of men concerned more with material things than with human rights. It contains no thought, no purpose which can give impulse or thrill to those who love liberty and hope to make the world a safer and happier place for the average man.

DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENTS PROOF AGAINST SLANDERS.

The democratic party is an unentangled party—a free party—owing no allegiance to any class or group or special interest. We were able to take up and carry through to success the great progressive program outlined in our platform of 1912. During the months which intervened between March 4, 1913, and the outbreak of the world war, we placed upon the statute books of our country more effective, constructive and remedial legislation than the republican party had placed there in a generation.

The income tax was made a permanent part of the revenue producing agencies of the country, thereby relieving our law of the reproach of being unjustly burdensome to the poor. The extravagances and iniquities of the tariff system were removed; and a non-partisan tariff commission was established so that future revisions might be made in the light of accurate information, scientifically and impartially obtained. Pan-Americanism was encouraged; and the bread cast upon the troubled international waters came back to us many fold. The great reaches of Alaska were opened up to commerce and development. Dollar diplomacy was destroyed. A corrupt lobby was driven from the national capitol. An effective seaman's act was adopted. The federal trade commission was created. Child labor legislation was enacted. The parcel post and the rural free delivery were developed. A good roads bill and a rural credits act were passed. A secretary of labor was given a seat in the cabinet of the president. Eight-hour laws were adopted. The Clayton amendment to the Sherman anti-trust act was passed, freeing American labor and taking it from the category of commodities. The Smith-Lever bill for the improvement of agricultural conditions was enacted. A corrupt practice act was adopted. A well-considered warehouse act was passed. Federal employment bureaus were created. Farm loan banks, postal savings banks and the federal reserve system were established.

These enactments, and many other provisions of a remedial character, had a cleansing and quickening effect upon the economic life of our country. The farmer was freed from the deadening effects of usurious financial control. Labor was given its Magna Charta of liberty. Business and finance were released from a thraldom of uncertainty and hazard. The economic life of America was refreshed by the vitalizing breath of economic freedom.

This extraordinary narration sounds like a platform of promises. The sober fact is that it is an inadequate recital of actual performance. It constitutes democracy's response to the demands of social justice. It will be useless for an antiquated slander that the democratic party is unable to understand the great affairs of the country.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM EARNS NATION'S GRATITUDE.

If the democratic party had accomplished nothing more than the passage of the federal reserve act, it would be entitled to the enduring gratitude of the nation. This act supplied the country with an elastic currency controlled by the American people. Panics—the recurring phenomena of disaster which the republican party could neither control nor explain—are now but a memory. Under the republican system there was an average of one bank failure every twenty-one days for a period of nearly forty years. After the passage of the federal reserve system, there were, in 1915, four bank failures; in 1916 and 1917, three bank failures; in 1918, one bank failure, and in 1919, no bank failures at all. The federal reserve system, passed over the opposition of the leaders of the republican party, enabled America to withstand the strain of war without shock or panic; and ultimately made our country the greatest creditor nation of the world.

PROUD OF AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENTS IN WAR.

And then the great war came on. Ultimately, by the logical steps of necessity, our peace-loving nation was drawn into the conflict. The necessary war legislation was quickly supplied.

A war finance corporation was created. War risk insurance was provided. Shipbuilding laws re-established America's supremacy upon the seas. The office of alien property custodian was created. A war industries board was established. A war trade board was created. Food and fuel regulations were formulated. Vast loans were successfully formulated. Vocational training was provided. A national council of defense was created. Industry was successfully mobilized.

Almost over night, the factories of the nation were made a part of the war machine, and the miraculous revival of the shipping industry filled the ocean lines with our transports.

Our fleet laid the North sea mine barrage. We sent fighting craft to every sea and brought new courage and inventive genius to the crucial fight against the U-boat.

In transporting our troops to France, we never lost a man in a ship convoyed by the American navy.

One of the first decisions was between the "volunteer system" and the selective draft. Many patriotic citizens strongly deprecated conscription and dreaded its possibilities. The administration, however, placed its influence behind the measure, secured its passage, and made possible the winning of the war.

It proved a democratic system assuring equal service, equal danger and equal opportunity. At one stroke of the pen, bounty jumping, and the hired substitutes that had disgraced the management of the Civil war were made impossible. The selection of men to go to the front was placed not merely in the hands of the civil authorities, but actually in the hands of the friends and neighbors of the men eligible for service. No fundamental law was ever administered with such scrupulous honor. Not a breath of scandal touched this legislation; and so cheerfully was it accepted that today the term "draft dodger" is an epithet of reproach in any community.

### Keynoter

HOMER S. CUMMINGS.

Partisanship was put aside in the selection of Gen. Pershing as leader of our forces and no military commander in history was ever given a freer hand or more unflagging support. The policy of selecting officers through training camps avoided the use of political favorites and guaranteed competent leadership for the youth of the land. Ten million men were registered within three months from the declaration of war and thirty-two camp cities, complete in every municipal detail, were built in ninety days.

In France we had to construct our own docks, railroad lines, storage depots, hospitals and ordnance bases. We had to cut down the forests for our barracks. In June, two months after the declaration of war, our fighting men were in France; in October, Americans were on the firing line; in scarcely more than a year we had 2,000,000 men in France, had whipped the enemy at Belleau wood, beaten them back at Chateau Thierry, wiped out the St. Mihiel salient and delivered the terrific hammer blow at Sedan that virtually ended the war.

Less than two years ago, Gen. Haig, with the bluntness of a soldier, said: "The British army is fighting with its back to the wall"; Lloyd George was crying: "It is a race between Wilson and Hindenburg," and France clung like a drowning man to the Rock of Verdun, turning agonized eyes toward America. And America came. We challenge the critics of the administration to point out how, within the limits of human possibility, the war could have been won more promptly or with less loss of American life.

It was not by mere chance that these things were accomplished. To readjust the processes of peace so as to meet the activities of war required leadership and unexampled skill. Petty criticism of minor defects and individual officials may for a time attract a superficial attention, but the significant things, the great outstanding facts plead eloquently for the democratic cause.

Let no one misunderstand us. These great affairs were carried forward under the stimulus of American patriotism, supported by the courage and the spirit of our people. All this is freely and gladly acknowledged, but surely the time has come when, because of the calculated criticism and the premeditated calumnies of the opposition, we are entitled to call attention to the fact that all of these things were accomplished under the leadership of a great democrat and a great democratic administration. We have no apologies to make—not one. We are proud of our great navy; we are proud of our splendid army; we are proud of the power of our country and the manner in which that power has been used; we are proud of the work that America has done in the world; we are proud of the heroism of American men and women; and we are proud of the inspired and incomparable leadership of Woodrow Wilson.

Has not the time come when all Americans, irrespective of party, should begin to praise the achievements of our country rather than to criticize them? Surely a just and righteous sense of national pride should protect us from the insensate assaults of mere partisans. We fought a great war, for a great cause, and we had a leadership that carried America to greater heights of honor and power and glory than she has ever known before in her entire history. If the American flag must be lowered, it will be hauled down in a republican convention and not in a democratic convention.

FOES VAINLY SEEK TO BESMIRCH THIS RECORD.

It is this shining record of tremendous achievement that republican managers and the Chicago platform seek to shame and besmirch. Various congressional committees, which for want of a more appropriate term, are called "smelling committees," were appointed for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there was any graft in the conduct of the great war. Over eighty investigations have been made, over two million dollars have been wasted, and the one result has been to prove that it was the cleanest war ever fought in the history of civilization.

Through the hands of a democratic administration, there have passed more than forty billions of dollars, and the finger of scorn does not point to one single democratic official in all America. It is a record never before made by any political party in any country that ever conducted a war.

If republican leaders are not able to rejoice with us in this American triumph, they should have the grace to remain silent, for it does not lie in the mouths of those who conducted the Spanish-American war to indulge in the luxury of criticism. What was there in this war to compare with the typhoid infested camps and the paper soled shoe controversy of 1898? What was there in this war to compare to the embalmed beef scandal of the Spanish-American war? Despite all their investigations, not one single democratic official has either been indicted or accused or even suspected; and the only dignitary in America, of any outstanding political significance who is moving in the direction of the penitentiary, is Truman Newberry, of Michigan.

The very power of the republican party to conduct a partisan investigation of the war, to criticise the president, to control the organization of the senate and to wreck the prospect of world peace, rests upon a bare majority of one, secured through the tainted senatorial vote from Michigan.

The republican party became so fixed in its incorrigible habit of conducting investigations that it finally turned to the fruitful task of investigating itself. For the first time since they entered upon this program, they discovered fraud and graft and gross and inexcusable expenditures. The revelations disclose the fact, long understood by the initiated, that the meeting at Chicago was not a convention but an auction. The highest bidder, however, did not get the prize. The publicity which overtook the proceedings frustrated the initial purpose. In more senses than one, the recent Chicago convention has left the democratic party as the sole custodian of the honor of the country.

There are men so small in spirit, so pitifully cramped in soul, that they suggest that the war cost too much. The republican platform echoes this complaint. It was, indeed, an expensive war. War is the most wasteful thing in the world. But is money to be measured against the blood of American soldiers? Would it not be better to spend a billion dollars for shells that were never exploded, than to have one American boy on the firing line minus an essential cartridge? Was it not better to prepare for a long war and make it short, than to prepare for a short war and make it long? When criticism is made of the expense of war, let us not forget that we bought with it the freedom and the safety of the civilization of the world.

Again, they say that we were not prepared for war. In a strict military sense, a democracy is never prepared for war; but America made ready in a way that was far more effective than by maintaining, at enormous cost, great armaments, which neither party ever advocated and which our people would never approve.

Wars are not fought by armies alone. They are fought by nations. It is a measuring of the economic strength of nations. The front line trench is no stronger than the forces which lie behind the trench. The line of communication reaches back to every village, farm, counting house, factory and home. America prepared by making the economic life of the country sound.

What would have been our situation if, prior to the outbreak of the war, we had not prepared so that our farmers were able to feed the armies of the world? What would have been our situation if labor had not been willing to follow the leadership of the president? What would have been the situation if we had not established a currency system which made it possible for us to finance the war? What would have been the situation if the republican party had been in control and had maintained its old attitude toward legislation? There would have been an inevitable breaking down of the economic structure of our country. We would have been caught in the throes of a panic more devastating than any we had ever known. Industrial life would have been disorganized and the tasks of war, difficult as they were, might then have become altogether impossible.

WHAT HAVE REPUBLICANS ACCOMPLISHED SINCE 1918?

The republicans have now been in control of the senate and the house for more than a year. They won the election of 1918 upon the faith of alluring promises. They said that they would earnestly support the president, at least until the tasks of war were finished. It was their contention that they would enter upon the work of reconstruction with superior intelligence and even with greater patriotism than would be possible under democratic leadership. They gave publicity, when they entered upon the recent session, to detailed and ambitious statements as to their program. If we are to be judged, as I hope we may be, by the record, let them also be judged by the record. What have the republicans accomplished since their political success in 1918? What beneficial results have flowed to the American people? What promises have been redeemed? What progress has been made in the settlement of foreign or domestic questions?

Twice the president went before congress, since the termination of hostilities, calling attention to needed legislation. He urged the passage of laws relating to profiteering; measures to simplify and reduce taxation; appropriate action relative to the returning soldiers; the passage of a resolution concerning the constructive plans worked out in detail by former Secretary Lane, and the measures advocated by the secretary of agriculture. He suggested that the congress take counsel together and provide legislation with reference to industrial unrest, and the mutual relations of capital and labor. After more than a year of sterile debate our country has neither peace nor reconstruction. Barren of achievement, shameless in waste of time and money, the record of the present congress is without parallel for its incompetencies, failure and recriminations. Are the American people so unjust or so lacking in discrimination that they will reject the service of a party which has kept its word, and place trust in a party which merely renews the broken promises of a previous campaign?

DENOUNCES MALICE IN ATTACKS UPON PRESIDENT.

Republican leaders have been moved by a strange and inexplicable jealousy of the president. Their feverish animosity, expressed in gross abuse and through secret intrigue, has been productive of one of the most unhappy chapters in American history, recalling the similar experiences of Lincoln and Washington. Political malice followed the president to the peace table. A senatorial "round robin" was widely circulated. Every device which partisanship could develop was employed for the purpose of weakening the influence of our commission at Paris, and making the task there still more difficult. At a time when every instinct of fairness pleaded for a whole-hearted support of the president, political antagonism and personal envy controlled the anti-administration forces.

The president made every sacrifice for the cause of peace. The long-continued strain while composing differences abroad; the expenditure of nervous vitality and intellectual force in building a new order of human relationships upon the ruins of the old, laid heavy toll upon his reserve powers. Then came the return in triumph, only to find there a widespread propaganda of opposition, making it imperative that he take up in his own country a struggle for the preservation of that which had been won at such incalculable cost. Following the superhuman labors of seven years of unexampled service, this meant the wreck of his health, sickness for months upon a bed of pain, and worse than the physical sickness, the sickness of hope which comes from the knowledge that political adversaries, lost to the larger sense of things, are savagely destroying not merely the work of men's hands, but the world's hope of settled peace. This was the affliction—this the crucifixion.

As he lay stricken in the whitehouse the relentless hand of malice beat upon the door of the sick chamber. The enemies of the president upon the floor of the senate repeated every slander that envy could invent and they could scarcely control the open manifestation of their glee when the great man was stricken at last. The congress was in session for months while the president lay in the whitehouse struggling with a terrifying illness and, at times, close to the point of death. He had been physically wounded just as surely as were Garfield and McKinley and Lincoln, for, it is but a difference of degree between fanatics and partisans. The congress, during all this period, when the whole heart of America ought to have been flowing out, in love and sympathy, did not find time, amid their bickerings, to pass one resolution of generous import or extend one kindly inquiry as to the fate of the president of their own country.

And what was his offense? Merely this—that he strove to redeem the word that America had given to the world; that he sought to save a future generation from the agony through which this generation had passed; that he had taken seriously the promises that all nations had made that they would unite at the end of the war in a compact to preserve the peace of the world; and that he relied upon the good faith of his own people. If there was any mistake it was that he made a too generous estimate of mankind, that he believed that the idealism which had made the war a great spiritual victory, could be relied upon to secure the legitimate fruit of the war—the reign of universal peace.

In one sense, it is quite immaterial what people say about the president. Nothing we can say can add or detract from the fame that will flow down the unending channels of history. Generations yet unborn will look back to this era and pay their tribute of honor to the man who led a people through troublous ways out of the valleys of selfishness up to the mountain tops of achievement and honor, and there showed them the promised land of freedom and safety and fraternity. Whether history records that they entered in or turned their backs upon the vision, it is all one with him—he is immortal.

WOULD NOT EVADE REQUIREMENTS OF HONOR.

There are men who seem to be annoyed when we suggest that American honor is bound up in this contest, and that good faith requires that we should enter the league of nations. The whole republican case is based upon the theory that we may, with honor, do as we please about this matter and that we have made no promises which it is our duty to redeem. Let us turn again to the record.

The republican party in its platform in 1916 had declared for a world court, "for the pacific settlement of international disputes." The progressive party in 1912 and in 1916 had likewise declared for an arrangement between nations to make peace permanent. The democratic party in 1916 had specifically declared in favor of the establishment of a league of nations. The senate itself, on Aug. 28, 1916, by unanimous vote, passed a measure requesting the president to take the lead in such a world movement.

On Dec. 18, 1916, the president addressed an identic note to the nations at war, requesting them to state the terms upon which they would deem it possible to make peace. In this note, he proposed the creation of a league of nations, saying:

"In the measures to be taken to secure the future peace of the world, the people and government of the United States are as vitally and directly interested as the governments now at war. They stand ready and even eager to co-operate in the accomplishment of these ends when the war is over with every influence and resource at their command."

This was four months before America entered the war.

To this identic note the central powers answered evasively, but the allies, in their reply dated at Paris, Jan. 10, 1917, declared:

"Their whole-hearted agreement with the proposal to create a league of nations which shall assure peace and justice throughout the world."

On Jan. 22, 1917, the president addressed the senate with reference to these replies, and said:

"In every discussion of the peace that must end this war, it is taken for granted that the peace must be followed by some definite concert of power which shall make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe shall overwhelm us again."

Speaking of the league of peace which was to follow the war, he said:

"If the peace presently to be made is to endure, it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind."

Acting upon these proposals, both the French and the British governments appointed committees to study the problem while the war was still in progress. On April 2, 1917, the president delivered his famous war message to congress, and thrilled the heart of the country anew by his announced purpose to make the contest "a war against war." High above all of our other aims he placed

"a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

Following this message the congress, by resolution passed April 6, 1917, recognized the state of war.

On Jan. 8, 1918, the president went before congress and set forth his famous fourteen points. The fourteenth point, which is practically identical in language with the provisions of Article X of the covenant, provided that

"a general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."

Senator Lodge himself, before the exigencies of politics forced him to take the other side, said that an attempt to make a separate peace would "brand us with everlasting dishonor," and that "the intent of the congress and the intent of the president, was that there could be no peace until we could create a situation where no such war as this could recur."

Former President Roosevelt, on July 18, 1918, said:

"Unless we stand by all our allies who have stood by us, we shall have failed in making the liberty of well-behaved, civilized peoples secure and we shall have shown that our announcement about making the world safe for democracy was an empty boast."

On Nov. 4, 1918, the armistice was agreed to and it was concluded upon the basis of the fourteen points set forth in the address of President Wilson delivered to congress on Jan. 8, 1918, and the principles subsequently enunciated by him. At no point, at no time, during no period while this history was in the making, was one responsible American voice raised in protest.

Thus, before we entered the war, we made the pledge; during the war we restated the pledge; and when the armistice was signed, all of the nations, ourselves included, renewed the pledge; and it was upon the faith of these promises that Germany laid down her arms. Practically all of the civilized nations of the earth have now united in a covenant which constitutes the redemption of that pledge. We alone have thus far failed to keep our word. Others may break faith; the senate of the United States may break faith; the republican party may break faith; but neither President Wilson nor the democratic party will break faith.

TREATY AS MONROE DOCTRINE OF WORLD.

In this hemisphere, the mere declaration of our young republic that the attempt of any foreign power to set foot on American soil would be considered an unfriendly act, has served to preserve "the territorial integrity and the political independence" of the nations of Central and South America. The treaty pledges all of the signatories to make this doctrine effective everywhere. It is the Monroe doctrine of the world.

The purpose of the league is to give notice that if any nation raises its menacing hand and seeks to cross the line into any other country, the forces of civilization will be aroused to suppress the common enemy of peace. Therein lies the security of small nations and the safety of the world.

Every war between nations that has ever been fought began in an attempt to seize foreign territory or to invade political independence. In 1914, Germany had known that in the event of hostilities, Britain would have entered the war; that France would go in; that Italy would go in; that Japan would go in, and that the United States would go in, there would have been no war.

The opponents of the treaty cry out "Shall we send our boys abroad to settle a political quarrel in the Balkans?" Immediately, the unthinking applaud and the orator records a momentary triumph. Have we forgotten that that is precisely what America has already done? Have we forgotten that we sent more than 2,000,000 men to France, spent more than twenty billions of dollars and sacrificed nearly 100,000 lives to settle a Balkan dispute?

There was a controversy between Serbia and Austria. Territorial questions, political rights and boundary lines were involved. The crown prince of the house of Austria was assassinated. A little flame of war licked up into the powder house of Europe, and in a moment the continent was in flames. It took all the power of civilization to put out the conflagration. How idle to inquire whether we wish to send our boys to settle political disputes in the Balkans!

It is extraordinary that men should waste our time and try our patience by suggesting the fear that we may be forced into future wars while forgetting entirely that America was forced into this greatest of all wars. No league of nations existed when we entered the war; and it was only when we formed in haste, in the midst of battle, a league of friendship, under unified command, that we were able to win victory. The association of nations, held together by a common purpose, fought the war to a victorious conclusion, dictated the terms of the armistice and formulated the terms of peace. If such a result could be achieved by an informal and temporary agreement, why should not the association be continued in a more definite and binding form? What plausible reason can be suggested for wasting the one great asset which has come out of the war? How else shall we provide for international arbitration? How else shall we provide for a permanent court of international justice? How else shall we provide for open diplomacy? How else shall we provide safety from external aggression? How else shall we provide for progressive disarmament? How else shall we check the spread of bolshevism? How else shall industry be made safe and the basis of reconstruction established? How else shall society be steadied so that the processes of healing may serve their beneficent purpose? Until the critics of the league offer a better method of preserving the peace of the world, they are not entitled to one moment's consideration in the forum of the conscience of mankind.

Not only does the covenant guarantee justice for the future but it holds the one remedy for the evils of the past. As it stands today, war is the one way in which America can express its sympathy for the oppressed of the world. The league of nations removes the conventional shackles of diplomacy. Under the covenant, it is our friendly right to protest against tyranny and to act as counsel for the weak nations now without an effective champion.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS ALREADY IN EXISTENCE.

The republican platform contains a vague promise to establish another or a different form of association amongst nations of a tenuous and shadowy character. Our proposed co-partners in such a project are unnamed and unnamable. It is not stated whether it is proposed to invite the nations that have established the present league to dissolve it and to begin anew, or whether the purpose is to establish a new association of a competitive character, composed of the nations that repudiated the existing league. The devitalizing character of such an expedient requires no comment. Fatuous futility could be carried no farther. There is no mental dishonesty more transparent than that which expresses fealty to a league of nations while opposing the only league of nations that exists or is ever apt to exist. Why close our eyes to actual world conditions? A league of nations already exists. It is not a project, it is a fact. We must either enter it or remain out of it.

What nations have actually signed and ratified the treaty?

Brazil, Bolivia, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, Czecho-Slovakia, Guatemala, Liberia, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Siam, Greece, Poland, Japan, Italy, France and Belgium.

What neutral states, invited to join the league, have actually done so?

Norway, Venezuela, the Netherlands, Denmark, Colombia, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

Even China will become a member when she ratifies the Austrian treaty.

Germany has signed and is preparing to take the place which awaits her in the league of nations.

What nations stand outside? Revolutionary Mexico, bolshevist Russia, unspeakble Turkey and—the United States of America.

It is not yet too late. Let us stand with the forces of civilization. The choice is plain. It is between the democratic party's support of the league of nations, with its program of peace, disarmament and world fraternity, and the republican party's platform of repudiation, provincialism, militarism and world chaos.

This is great pretense of alarm because the United States has but one vote in the international assembly, against the six votes of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and India.

This popular argument against the league of nations is as insincere as it is superficial. It ignores the fact that the executive council, and not the assembly, is the governing body of the league, and that our country is one of the five countries having permanent membership in the council. The colonial votes exist only in the assembly.

Nor should we forget that France has but one vote; Italy has but one vote; and Japan has but one vote. If there were any injustice in the arrangement, surely these nations would have sensed it and objected to it. No affirmative action can be taken in any essential matter without a unanimous vote of all members of the council of the league. No decision of the league, if America joined it, could be made effective or even promulgated without our consent. Like every other nation, we have a veto power upon every resolution or act of the league. We can be involved in no enterprise except of our own choosing; and if we are not satisfied with the league we can sever our connections with it upon two years' notice. The risk exists only in the imagination, the service is inconceivable.

Moreover, the United States insisted that Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, Panama, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala should each be given a vote, as well as the nations of South America, great and small. Including the nations which are bound by vital interests to the United States, or, indeed, directly under our tutelage, we have more votes in the league of nations than any other nation. How could we, in good faith, urge that these nations be given a voice to such self-governing nations as Canada, New Zealand and the rest, which relatively speaking, made far more sacrifices in the war than our own country? It is desirable that all countries should have an opportunity to be heard in the league; and the safety of each nation resides in the fact that no action can be taken without the consent of all.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFEAT OF TREATY.

It was the design of Senator Lodge, from the outset, to mutilate the treaty and to frustrate the purposes of the administration. And yet Senator Lodge, with the help of the irreconcilables, having torn the treaty to tatters and thrown its fragments in the face of the world, has the effrontery to suggest, in his address at Chicago, that the president blocked ratification and postponed peace.

The trouble with the treaty of peace is that it was negotiated by a democratic president. It is not difficult to assess the responsibility for its defeat. The responsibility rests, not upon its friends, but upon its enemies.

The foreign relations committee, immediately following the last election, was reorganized with a personnel consisting of the open foes of the treaty. Amongst the number was Senator Borah, who declared that he would not be for a league of nations, were the savior of mankind, to advocate it. Senator Johnson, Senator Knox and Senator Moses, whose hatred of the president amounts to an obsession, were also members; and Senator Lodge was chairman.

The treaty was referred to the committee thus studiously prepared for its hostile reception. The members of this committee adopted every subterfuge to misrepresent the document which they were supposed to be considering as statesmen. Deputations of foreign born citizens were brought to Washington in an effort to color and exaggerate the impression of popular opposition.

The senate had even begun the discussion of the treaty months before its negotiation was concluded, and did not terminate its debate until nine months after the submission of the treaty. It took the senate nearly three times as long to kill the treaty by protracted debate and by confusing and nullifying amendments and reservations as it took the representatives of the allied governments to draft it.

It was not the business of the president, when he brought this treaty back from France, to join with Mr. Lodge and other republican leaders in their deliberate purpose to destroy it. Had he initiated, suggested or assented to changes which would have substantially altered its nature, it would have been a distinct breach of faith with his associates of the peace council and a violation of American pledges. Every one acquainted with diplomatic usages, or with the plain requirements of honesty, understands this. The foolish invention that the president refused to permit the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" has been so often repeated that many honest people believe in its truth.

In every speech made during his tour the president stated entire willingness to accept any and all reservations not incompatible with America's honor and true interests. It is the plain intent of the covenant that the Monroe doctrine is excluded, that domestic questions are exempted, that not one American can be sent out of the country without formal action by congress and that the right of withdrawal is absolute. If there are words which can make these meanings clearer they will be welcomed. It is not reservations that the president stands against, but nullification.

When the president came back from Paris in February, 1919, he brought the first tentative draft of the covenant of the league of nations. He gave publicity to it. It was published throughout the land. He invited the friends of such a league to submit criticisms. Former President Taft offered four amendments; former Senator Root offered six amendments; and Mr. Hughes suggested seven. At a meeting of the committee on foreign relations at the whitehouse in March, 1919, other changes were suggested. These amendments were taken back by the president to Paris and their substance was actually incorporated in the revised draft of the league. Dr. Lowell, president of Harvard university, in his joint debate with Senator Lodge, invited the latter to suggest constructive amendments which the president might incorporate in the draft; but he refused so to do. At no time has he offered constructive amendments. At no time has he failed to offer destructive criticism. So intolerant was his attitude that he would not even consider a compromise proposed by former President Taft of his own party and which was assured of the support of forty democratic senators. Senator Lodge knew that he controlled the senate and that in his own time and way he could destroy the treaty.

This is the sordid story of its defeat. No blacker crime against civilization has ever soiled the pages of our history. The last chapter was written at Chicago.

"OLD GUARD" SOLD HONOR OF AMERICA.

The republican platform not only repudiates the league of nations, but praises, without discrimination, all of the republican senators who participated in its defeat. Its words of benediction fall alike upon the irreconcilables, the Lodge reservationists, the mild reservationists and those who propose a separate peace with Germany. It is consistent in one thing only, the recognition of the fact that the open foes of the treaty, the secret foes of the treaty, and the apparent friends of the treaty who conspired with the enemies, are equally responsible for the destruction of the instrument itself. It would be idle to inquire by what political legerdemain this meaningless and yet ominous declaration was prepared. It is enough to know that the "Old Guard" sold the honor of America for the privilege of nominating a reactionary for president.

The war had made a great task for statesmanship. The best thought of the world demanded that a serious attempt be made by the leaders of the allied governments to formulate a treaty of peace which should prevent the recurrence of war. Every kindlier impulse of the human heart was in accord with that purpose. From time immemorial, men have dreamed of peace; poets have sung of it; philosophers have written about it; statesmen have discussed it; men everywhere have hoped and prayed that the day might come when wars would no longer be necessary in the settlement of international differences.

For the first time in the turbulent annals of the human race, such a project had become feasible. The destruction of militarism, the crumbling of thrones, the dissolution of dynasties, the world-wide appreciation of the inner meaning of war and the final triumph of democracy had at last made it possible to realize the dearest dream that ever crossed the night of man's dark mind. The opportunity for service was as great as the need of the world and the failure to render it must stand as a reproach for all time.

It is said that if the dead who died in the great war were placed head to feet, they would stretch from New York to San Francisco, and from San Francisco back again to New York; and if those who perished from starvation and from other causes collateral to the war were placed head to feet, they would reach around the great globe itself. At this very hour, millions of men ad women and little children are the victims of our hesitancy. How can the heart of America be closed to these things?

I have been many miles in this country and it has been my fortune to visit most of the states of the union. It has so happened that I have been in many of these states when the boys were coming from the front. I have seen the great avenues of our splendid American cities lined with the populace, cheering and cheering again as these brave lads marched by, happy that they had come triumphantly home. But I have never witnessed these inspiring sights without thinking of the boys who did not come home. They do not rest as strangers in a strange land—these soldiers of liberty. The generous heart of France enfolds them. The women and the children of France cover their graves with flowers and water them with tears. Destiny seized these lads and led them far from home to die for an ideal. And yet they live and speak to us here in the homeland, not of trivial things but of immortal things. Reverence and pity and high resolve—surely these remain to us. In that heart of hearts where the great works of man are wrought, there can be no forgetting. Oh, God, release the imprisoned soul of America, touch once more the hidden springs of the spirit and reveal us to ourselves.

SUPPORT THE ONLY PLAN FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE.

Let the true purpose of our party be clearly understood. We stand squarely for the same ideals of peace as those for which the war was fought. We support without flinching the only feasible plan for peace and justice. We will not submit to the repudiation of the peace treaty or to any process by which it is whittled down to the vanishing point. We decline to compromise our principles or pawn our immortal souls for selfish purposes. We do not turn our backs upon the history of the last three years. We seek no avenue of retreat. We insist that the forward course is the only righteous course.

We seek to re-establish the fruits of victory, to reinstate the good faith of our country, and to restore it to its rightful place among the nations of the earth. Our cause constitutes a summons to duty. The heart of America stirs again. The ancient faith revives. The immortal part of man speaks for us. The services of the past, the sacrifices of the war, the hopes of the future, constitute a spiritual force gathering about our banners. We shall release again the checked forces of civilization and America shall take up once more the leadership of the world.

## Boonesville Grows

WASHINGTON, June 28.—The census bureau today announced 1920 figures for Boonesville, Ind., as 4,451; increase 517, or 13.1 per cent.

## Women Are a Power at Convention—and Know it

Fair delegates at the convention. Above, Mrs. C. P. Crosby of Rhinelander, Wis., at left, and Miss Jenny Lind of Minneapolis.. Below, Mrs. Kate S. Morrow, delegate at large from Missouri; in center, and Miss Lulu M. Barry, also from Missouri.

By WINIFRED BLACK.

(Copyright, 1920, by International News Service.)

SAN FRANCISCO, June 28.—This is woman's day in convention circles. All San Francisco is standing amazed at the strength and the number of women delegates and alternates.

From all over the country they have come, and from many of the state where women do not vote, great committees of women workers and visitors and suggestors and hinters have arrived.

The hotel corridors are jammed with women—New York, Chicago, Montana, Colorado, Texas, Tennessee, Louisiana, Oklahoma Virginia and the state of Maine—they all sit down together for breakfast every morning at great tables arranged specially for them in one of the big hotels.

The tables are gay with flowers after the prodigal California fashion, and the visiting women have all caught the California fad of wearing flowers in the belt, or pinned somewhere to the waist. So it is rather a gay, holiday-looking, friendly assemblage.

After breakfast they divide into little groups and talk committees and planks and programs quite as if they had been going to conventions all their lives, and by noon they are all divided up into separate parties and being entertained at lavish luncheons and little teas and astonishing motor trips over the mountains and down by the seas—these San Franciscans think nothing of a 150 miles across the mountains and back again by moonlight after dinner.

The women are a power at this convention and they intend to let everybody know that they are.

As far as that aspect of the situation goes, they are as one woman and speak in a dozen different dialects with one voice.

Individually the woman delegate knows her own mind and her own candidate.

And gay, good-natured, worldly, kind-hearted, generous, tolerant San Francisco is getting the shock of its life, for, be it known, San Francisco went by a good majority against suffrage, and the typical San Franciscan believes to this day that woman's place is in the home—or in the safe—but never, no, never, in a political convention.

Even the newspapers have had to suspend for the nonce their well-known San Francisco rule never to print in the news columns the picture of any woman over 30 years of age.

### Salient Facts About 'Frisco Convention

A MEMORANDUM distributed among the members of the national committee shows 756 of the 1,092 delegates to the convention are uninstructed.

According to the card, the instructed delegates are: Iowa, 26 for Meredith; Kentucky, 26 for Cox; Nebraska, 16 for Hitchcock; New Jersey, 28 for Edwards. North Carolina, 24 for Simmons; Ohio, 48 for Cox; Oklahoma, 20 for Owen; Oregon, 10 for McAdoo; Pennsylvania, 76 for Palmer; South Dakota, 10 for Gerard; Virginia, 24 for Glass. The 28 votes from Georgia are contested.

An examination of the temporary roll shows there will be 308 women delegates and alternates in the democratic national convention. They will be divided as follows: At large, 41, alternates at large, 39; district delegates, 63. district alternates, 16.

728 votes necessary to choice.

## SEES VICTORY FOR DEMOCRAT WITH REAL MA

### Must Choose Statesman and Meet Issues to Win, Says Dr. Jordan.

By DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN. (Republican.)

(Copyright, 1920, by International News Service.)

SAN FRANCISCO, June 28.—The San Francisco convention is a gathering fraught with great possibilities which may or may not become actual.

If its deliberations bring to the front a statesman, it will take its place as a maker of history.

Otherwise it will prove one more futile assemblage of small politicians built on local or temporary gains; such a result would be to follow the line of least resistance, a course for which there are ample precedents.

Therefore, if the democratic convention is to mark an epoch in American history it must leave the beaten track.

It must stand for something positive with a real man as standard-bearer.

Victory next November would thus be sought for the welfare of the nation and, through the nation, of the whole world, not as a mere preliminary for the distribution of offices.

WORK FALLS INTO TWO PARTS.

The work of the convention falls naturally into two parts, the writing of a platform and the selection of a candidate.

The platform, to be effective, should be short, direct, courageous and forward-looking.

The real issues may be covered in 300 words—evaded in 6,000.

To score the shortcomings of the rival party is easy and tempting, but it serves little purpose unless done in discriminating and convincing fashion.

The chief republican delinquency, perhaps the only one worth noticing, is the control of public affairs by a senatorial cabal, a proceedings which has given a temporary black eye to a democracy the world over.

Furthermore, no energy, it seems to me, should be spent on side issues, not on facts accomplished, nor in meddling with the internal affairs of foreign countries, for when wide divergencies open within a party they can not be closed.

SILENCE BETTER THAN VERBOSITY.

Silence is a better form of evasion than verbosity.

I see little gain and much chance of loss in platform declarations concerning alcohol, Ireland, Mexico and Japan.

As for the second, merely to express sympathy with Ireland, at the same time commending her to the league of nations, the arbiter of self-determination, seems rather worse than nothing, while on the other hand, a flat approval of Irish independence, Sinn Fein type, the virtual dismemberment of the British empire, would damn any party at the polls in November.

As to Mexico, while we should use every honorable effort toward bringing about orderly and livable conditions there, the democrats should avoid playing into the hands of capitalists who clamor for military intervention merely as a means of stabilizing property.

REGARDING THE JAPANESE MENACE.

Concerning the Japanese menace, it is to be remembered that nearly all the agricultural Japanese entered California as a result of the annexation of Hawaii, and so far as known none at all through any official violation of the so-called "g