

error of his state, had been chosen for the vice presidency by the same vote given to the president. To use a striking expression coined by Senator Johnson at Chicago recently, "there is only a heart beat" between him and the white house. He is now the choice of his state for the presidency, though not seeking the place. Strange that such a member of committee should have been overlooked.

Senator Pomerene, who represents Ohio on the resolutions committee, sat just in front of Chairman Glass. He is not only a prominent member of the senate, and from one of the four big states, but he may be regarded as the spokesman on the committee for Governor Cox, one of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination. Senator Pomerene may be supposed to be vitally interested in the platform, and it excited some surprise when Chairman Glass passed him by.

New York will present Governor Smith, but the empire state is not represented on the sub-committee, even though that state is represented on the resolutions committee by Hon. Bourke Cockran, a man who has many claims to distinction.

New Jersey, the home of the president, has a candidate for president in the person of its governor, whom the chief executive cordially congratulated when he was elected last fall. Even New Jersey's representative on the committee was not appointed on the sub-committee.

Oklahoma has endorsed Senator Owen and Iowa Secretary Meredith, but both of the states were ignored.

In selecting a representative of New England Chairman Glass passed by Senator Walsh of Massachusetts and named the representative of Maine. This is more astonishing when it is known that Senator Walsh who had been chosen secretary of the resolutions committee, sat by Mr. Glass on the platform, nearer to him than any one else except his volunteer aide, Secretary Colby. Senator Walsh is not only one of the ablest Democrats in the senate, but is one of the most progressive members of the party.

Even Senator Smith of South Carolina, who moved the appointment of the committee was forgotten. It is customary in parliamentary bodies to include on a committee the man who moves its appointment, but Senator Smith has become so unimportant a factor among the Democratic senators that his rights to a place on the sub-committee would not depend entirely on parliamentary usage.

The members selected are of course men who are respected and esteemed, the chosen men from their respective states.

Senator Walsh of Montana is not only a prominent senator, but was mentioned for chairman, but in conventions, men are estimated by relative standards and according to importance of the states they represent and especially with a view to embracing all important factions.

In the appointment of this committee the chairman seemed to have used an invisible yard stick or to have chosen by chemical analysis. Several of the members of the sub-committee are known to be favorable to ex-Secretary McAdoo, while others may be expected to swing into his column when relieved from allegiance to others. One so remote as myself from the fountains of information is unable to judge whether the test of availability for this important sub-committee was personal or had to do with platform plans.

I may add that the omission of my name from the list was to be expected—first, because my political activities, though extending over many years, have not yet been sufficient to bring me within the vision of the gentlemen from Virginia, and second, because my contributions to the president's successes would make my appointment seem like an effort on the part of the executive to interfere with the freedom of the committee deliberations.

Never before has a great convention of our party had to deal with issues so momentous. There is at home an unrest never before known, and the old world is nearer to chaos than it has been in centuries. If there was ever a time when Democrats ought to take counsel together, and in generous spirit seek to understand the new currents of thought and chart the political seas it is now. How inopportune that we should be sent upon the angry ocean with sealed instructions.

I have come to the convention more impressed than in any former convention with the responsibility of a delegate and anxious that the party platform shall meet the needs of the day

and draw to our standard a majority of the voters of the United States. In witness to my devotion to my party's welfare I am proposing five planks that seem to me to be of importance. One applies to industrial disputes, a plan presented by our nation to the world, endorsed by governments representing three-quarters of the population of the globe and made the chief cornerstone of the league of nations. Another proposes a government bulletin intended to furnish an unpolluted channel of information to the voters and to provide a means by which candidates for president, senate and congress may lay their claims before the public without any considerable expense. A third embodies proposals dealing effectively with the profiteers. The fourth congratulates the party upon its part in a great moral reform and pledges enforcement of a law upheld in every detail by the supreme court. The fifth seeks to make the conclusion of peace as easy as was a declaration of war; admits us to the league of nations, and gives our nation the moral leadership of the world with a Democratic president at the head of the procession.

Are not these things worth achieving? And yet when I come to San Francisco I find that a few men who claim a monopoly of interest in the president personally in the party's welfare seek to brush aside all the great issues that press upon us and announce as the one outstanding principle in the code of democracy that a president not only can do no wrong, but cannot make a mistake. Even Germany has repudiated the theory upon which this proposed slogan is based. These over-zealous friends cannot represent the president in such a course as they ought to know that the Democratic party was never less inclined than now to accept such a doctrine even if we had a president willing to ask it or courtiers foolish enough to advise it.

RIVALRY OF CANDIDATES

San Francisco, July 1.—The rule adopted by the committee on resolutions forbids the reporting of anything done in the committee until the platform is ready for the convention. As I am a member of the committee I cannot say anything from which conclusions may be drawn. As it is impossible to know when the committee will be able to report and impossible to do any writing between the conclusion of the committee's work and the action of the convention I am compelled to turn from the subject in which I feel the deepest interest to a subject of secondary importance, viz.: the ticket. The personal element is very much overestimated. Supporters of a candidate become inflamed with the idea that everything depends upon his nomination, and we are told "as goes Podunk, so goes the nation, and _____ can carry Podunk." This is especially true of the pivotal states.

States like New York and Indiana, and more recently, Ohio, have claimed to hold the elections in their hands. Indiana has had the vice presidency from the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, and the New York delegation takes the Democratic party up on the mountains and offers it the earth every four years. Just now Ohio poses as a pivotal state, but it does not take much to make a pivotal state out of any commonwealth that has a candidate. Since the presidential election four years ago turned on a few votes in California, it's a poor state that cannot prove to its own satisfaction that its electoral vote may determine the presidential contest, and therefore, "nominate our man and save the party."

One thing is apparent; no one can be nominated without the approval of the president. The Republican convention had to wait for word from a sick-bed in Pennsylvania, and this convention waits for word from a sick man in Washington, but Penrose was in position to confer with others. Here, we are dependent on intuition—no one says here "in a multitude of counsel there is safety."

Mr. Palmer made his campaign on the theory that he represented the President. In Georgia the question was whether the voters would sustain the administration by voting for Mr. Palmer or permit a cruel world to say that the President had been repudiated. In Michigan Mr. Palmer again appeared as a representative of the President's ideas and his forces here are marshalled under the leadership of the Honorable Vance McCormick, Chairman of the Democratic committee in the last campaign and now as near

to the President as anyone is permitted to go. But Mr. Palmer seems to be slipping, and the convention which is so unwilling, if we can judge by its leaders to admit that any mistake has been made during the past eight years does not seem to be rallying to the support of Mr. Palmer. Somehow there is a lack of the vim and the determination which is so evident whenever anyone suggests that there is any part of the country in which any Democratic voter has reached a different conclusion on any subject from that to which the President has arrived.

The Cox boom seems to have spent its force. The Governor of Ohio has done many things worthy of commendation; speaking politically he could not quite be said of him, as of the rich young man, that he had kept all the commandments from his youth but he certainly does "lack one thing" and that is loyalty to the home in its death grapple with the saloon. A man who can take an oath to support the constitution of his state and then sit in his office at the capital and without protest or lifting a hand to prevent it, watch the brewers, the distillers and liquor dealers (temporarily out of business but hoping to return) attempted to overthrow everything that the temperance forces of Ohio have accomplished in 50 years—such a man is not the man to put in the White House at such a time as this. When he tied up with the brewers at Cincinnati and went into the governor's office with a majority only about half as great as his increase in the county in which Cincinnati is located, he sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, and, in politics, it takes more than two years to get a birthright out of the pawnshop. No man can go before the 26,000,000 of women voters with the smell of the beer vat on his garments.

The drift is towards McAdoo. We are told that the President really doesn't want McAdoo but this does not harmonize with the fact that government employees are disregarding Mr. McAdoo's express wishes and trying to force the nomination upon him over his protest.

Mr. McAdoo cannot in my judgment, carry through the campaign the handicap of his relationship to the President, no matter how lovable a man he may be or how popular he is with certain groups of voters. He will be the target of every enemy of the President without the President's ability to express the idealism of the American people. The "Crown Prince" argument is already being used by Republicans and Democrats cannot deny that it has some effectiveness as a weapon. Some 30 years ago we talked about "Grandfather's hat" but there was a generation between a former President and his grandson candidate. That was a break in the line considerably greater than the break between a President and his daughter's husband. Hereditary government is at its lowest in Europe; is a family dynasty likely to become popular in the United States? It does not seem fair that a man should suffer merely because he has connected himself with an historic family, but a campaign is a poor time to turn aside from great questions to defend an individual's right to claim for himself the White House and for his offspring the honor of being the grandchildren of a President. The average Democrat is likely to feel that success in the campaign is of too great importance to be jeopardized by unnecessary hurdles and the partisan Republican who might otherwise be drawn to the ticket is apt to find in such a relationship too alluring an excuse for remaining with his party. What shall it profit a party if it gains the gratitude of a whole family and loses its opportunity to serve the country and the world!

CONVENTION TAKES UP TASK OF BALLOTING FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE

San Francisco, July 2.—The first and second ballots do not give much indication of the final result. Neither McAdoo nor Palmer, developed the strength that their supporters had expected. They were close together on the first ballot and their gains on the second ballot were small and almost equal. Cox's vote on the first ballot was surprisingly small. It increased some on the second ballot but is still too inconsiderable to give him much encouragement. The vote cast by his state for the wine and beer amendment puts him on record. As his manager gazed over the Sahara desert that extends from Pensacola to Puget Sound he must contemplate with dismay the arid nature of the political soil. If that second vote had not been taken he might