

ject by openly declaring in favor of intervention, although the platform may contain language which interventionists will construe to mean intervention.

The contest in the progressive convention over the resolution inviting the republican convention to appoint a conference committee was the first real debate of the conventions. The speeches of the temporary chairmen were keynote speeches, and being acceptable to their respective conventions, aroused no opposition, but fire flashed as soon as the subject of a conference was broached. Ex-Secretary Garfield introduced the resolution and supported it in an argument which appealed to the judgment of the majority of the delegates. He referred to the resolution adopted by the progressive national committee last January, pledging the convention to do all in its power to bring about harmonious co-operation between the two wings of the party, and he emphasized the very patent fact that the offer to confer would be an advantage to the progressives even if it was rejected. The resolution was at once combatted by the more radical element in the convention led by ex-Congressman Murdock of Kansas and Congressman McDonald of Michigan. Murdock warned them that they could expect nothing from the republican convention, and favored proceeding with the nomination of Roosevelt. Congressman McDonald went even further than Murdock and advised the progressive convention to tell the republican convention to depart thence and make its abode in the fiery realm where even a drop of water can not be had to cool a parched tongue. The speeches of Murdock and McDonald were cheered and there were even suggestions of a stampede, but Pinchot, Bonaparte, and Foulke, supported Garfield and their counsel prevailed. When the vote was taken, the ayes overwhelmed the opposition. But the fight indicated the spirit of the convention, and the independence of the delegates,—and, it might be added, gave great encouragement to democratic onlookers.

The acceptance by the republican convention of the progressive invitation to appoint a committee on conference makes this evening the important evening of the week. There is a strong element in both conventions in favor of getting together, but the difficulties in the way are great and the conference committee will win undying fame if it can devise a satisfactory plan for bringing the two parties into harmonious co-operation.

I shall discuss the platform in tomorrow's dispatches. W. J. B.

PLATFORMS OF REPUBLICANS AND PROGRESSIVES ANALYZED

Chicago, June 9.—The fight is so far a draw with no clear indication as to the outcome. The personal equation in the contest is emphasized by the fact that there is little substantial difference between the platforms of the two parties. There is difference, of course, in phraseology and difference in the accent, but the two conventions would have no difficulty whatever in uniting on any plank or phraseology if agreement on the statement of their principles would bring them together.

They not only agree upon the issues but they are in most hearty accord in the determination to evade the raising of any definite issues with the administration. They thunder out their condemnation and are horrified at the possibilities of harm involved in a democratic victory; they can quote each other's anathemas and they concur in the belief that the fate of the world for at least a quarter of a century trembles in the balance. But they fail to point out just what ought to be done to save the country from the catastrophes which they think would come with the re-election of President Wilson.

And they are strangely silent, too, as to the reforms accomplished under this administration. They do not condemn the currency law,—the greatest reform in financial machinery that the country has ever known; neither do they have the fairness to commend it. They do not point out any defects in the laws passed for the prevention of private monopolies or for the protection of labor. They neither commend these reforms nor specifically condemn. They do not present a list of industries and charge that they have suffered injury or injustice; on the contrary, their speeches confess that the country is prosperous, but they attribute that prosperity to the war. They profess to regard the nation as humiliated by the President's foreign policy, and yet they do not commit themselves to a declaration of war or to the actual use of force.

The two conventions agree in condemning the

President's Mexican policy and yet neither convention is willing to risk a demand for intervention.

Why do they hesitate to take a definite position and outline a definite policy as a substitute for the administration's policies? Why, because they dare not offend the peace sentiment of the country. They know that the President's strength is in large part due to the fact that he has kept the country out of war, and they know that the voters would sustain the President by an overwhelming majority if the issue were peace or war.

They know, also, that the American people are not willing to authorize or encourage intervention in the government of Mexico. All citizens deplore the conditions in Mexico, but those who went to Mexico to engage in business ventures knew the perils of the situation, and the great mass of the people in this country are no more in favor of using soldiers to guarantee profits in a foreign country than they are of using soldiers to guarantee profits in this country. The republicans can not condemn the President for warning Americans to leave Mexico, because President Taft did the same. The public quite generally understands that such intervention sentiment as there is, is largely confined to Americans who have ranches, mines, or other corporate enterprises in Mexico, that these people want intervention first and annexation afterwards, and that they want both for pecuniary reasons.

The general public also understands that intervention in Mexico would forfeit all the advantage that we have gained in Central and South America during the past fifty years. The suspicion aroused by the very few who talk about "On to Panama" is hard to overcome; such unfriendliness as we have to encounter in Latin America is due to the fears excited by these occasional outbursts of irresponsible men. The President thought it wise to set all fear at rest by declaring at Mobile that this nation would never take another foot of land by conquest, but the voice of the President is lost in the tumult raised by those who are SURE they see profit or THINK they see destiny in the absorption of neighboring territory.

In discussing preparedness neither convention goes as far as the military and naval experts, and the progressive convention, the only one that names a number, demands an army less than fifty thousand in excess of that provided for in bills which have already received the approval of congress.

On one proposition the two conventions seem to be out of harmony. The progressives demand a system of universal military training. This is the position taken by Colonel Roosevelt. The republicans do not go this far. They want a "sufficient and effective regular army" (number not stated) and, "a provision for ample reserves, already drilled and disciplined, who can be called at once to the colors when the hour of danger comes." There is a wide difference between AMPLE and UNIVERSAL. It is fortunate for the country that the democratic party and the larger element of the republican party refuse to be frightened into a militarism which would not only impose upon our people the burdens that have weighed down the population of Europe, but would be impossible without the cultivation of a military spirit, which would be a menace to republican institutions. The imaginary dangers from abroad, which are used to support the Roosevelt militarism, are inconsiderable when compared with the domestic dangers which such a policy would bring upon the nation.

On the tariff question the two parties are in such complete accord that either would have little difficulty in accepting the platform declarations of the other.

But can they get together? The progressives have shown no inclination to give up Mr. Roosevelt and the regular republicans have shown no disposition to accept him. This is the real sentiment as it is not at all certain that these differences will be carried to the point of nominating two tickets. There is talk of compromise,—the more radical of the regular republicans and the more conservative of the progressives favor this. Numerous combinations have been suggested. Hughes and Johnson is one combination, Hughes and Garfield another. Johnson would probably be more acceptable to the progressives than Garfield, but Garfield might be more acceptable to the regulars. Among the men who could be nominated by the regular convention for president, Borah of Idaho would be most acceptable to the progressives, partly because he was once counted among them, and partly because he lives in the west, but at this

writing the situation is so uncertain that there is really nothing upon which a prediction can be based if it is to be anything more than a guess.

The nominating speeches gave an opportunity for the favorite sons to manifest their strength among the delegates, but there were so many of them that no name could provoke a general demonstration. The proposal of Colonel Roosevelt's name aroused the galleries, but his following among the delegates was not large. W. J. B.

A COMEDY AND A TRAGEDY

Chicago, June 10.—The curtain has fallen on the two conventions—one a comedy and the other a tragedy—and the actors and the audiences have dispersed. These conventions have been unique—nothing else like them in our political history.

The republican convention was a comedy. The managers had it well staged; every actor had his part committed to memory, and there had evidently been many rehearsals. The crowd that had made the republican party a hissing and a byword were again in possession of the organization. All of the formalities were observed with scrupulous care, and order prevailed from beginning to end. Everybody behaved decorously, the convention was dignity itself. The call was read, the temporary chairman elected, the keynote speech was delivered, the credentials committee made its report, the platform was adopted, the candidates were put in nomination—each name being greeted with the proper demonstration, conducted with due regard to the proprieties of the occasion—the same little stuffed elephant leading all the parades.

The conference committee graciously met with the progressive committee and courteously declined all its overtures—and then in the fullness of time, the convention proceeded to ignore the progressives. After the second ballot, when Justice Hughes was within two hundred votes of the necessary majority, the convention listened to a communication from Mr. Roosevelt virtually refusing to be a candidate unless nominated by both conventions, and suggesting Senator Lodge as the proper man to nominate. The convention answered Colonel Roosevelt's recommendation by giving Justice Hughes about nine-tenths of its votes on the third ballot, and Senator Lodge, Colonel Roosevelt's residuary legatee, certified to the qualifications of the nominee and moved to make the nomination unanimous.

The announcement of Justice Hughes' nomination was followed by a scene that has hardly been paralleled in a national convention. Instead of the usual demonstration, giving expression to the joy which such a victory excites, a few of the standards of the states were carried in procession by a relatively small number of enthusiasts, while the delegates in almost unbroken phalanx stood and looked on in silence. If one had come into the hall after the vote was taken, he would never have suspected that these seemingly indifferent delegates had joined in nominating the candidate for the highest office withing the gift of the people in the world. The convention had already established a reputation for chilling receptions, but this was probably the most frigid greeting ever given to a victorious aspirant for a presidential nomination. The nomination of Mr. Fairbanks for vice-president was effected under conditions which gave no indication of a thaw. If the temperature of the convention is any indication of the character of the campaign, it will be necessary to substitute a polar bear for the elephant before election day.

The progressive convention was a tragedy. No one could attend the two conventions without being profoundly impressed with the radical difference in the personnel. The progressives are as earnest a group as ever assembled in a convention. Their high patriotic purpose can not be doubted. Viewed from a democratic standpoint, they have been misled by the man whom they have idolized. In their devotion to him, they have been led to endorse policies, believed by them to be patriotic, but which can have no part in the permanent plans of such a body of men. They have been alarmed by the manufactured scares which their leader has endeavored to convert to personal and political use. They have proclaimed purposes and committed themselves to doctrines which they will abandon when this inhuman war is over, and the military fever has run its course. They must be judged by the spirit of their movement rather than by the language in which they have given a momentary expression of their altruism.

Relying upon the assurances given by Colonel Roosevelt, and fired by his vehement language, they planned a real campaign, ready to join the