

deepened as time passed into a sort of fascinated horror. He found the oratory bad beyond belief—dull, bombastic, insincere, repetitious and above all, insufferably long-winded. He looked on with angry scorn as speaker after speaker, announced to take three or four minutes, took ten or twelve and was at last hauled off the platform by the coat-tails. He watched with weary nausea as a nominator, having spoken for thirty minutes, named his man and then after the demonstration had started, frantically hushed it and went on forty minutes longer. He wondered, as he listened, feverish with fatigue, whether the delegates had all gone crazy.

The truth is, of course, that this is what Main Street is like, though the New Yorker has never known it or has forgotten such knowledge as he once possessed. The oratory at the Democratic Convention, desolatingly bad as it was, was no worse than all American oratory, and probably no worse than most of it has always been. The tempo of life on farm and in village is slower than in the metropolis. The delegate whose visit to New York will be one of the two or three great events of his life doesn't mind a few extra hours devoted to hearing men of his own breed indulging in a familiar type of verbal fireworks. After all, what's time to a delegate?

While New York scorns the convention, the delegates with some justice can scorn certain aspects of New York. The nation's largest city was able to offer nothing better than an aged and inadequate gathering place, inferior in ventilation and acoustics, a fire-trap haunted by faint smells of the circus, its annual occupant. In the broiling heat which prevailed on several days during the first week, to sit through a lengthy session was an act of real physical endurance.

On only a few occasions in the history of the convention was this endurance amply rewarded. First on the list comes the scene at twilight Saturday evening when Newton D. Baker made his gallant fight for endorsement of the League. Second, perhaps, one would place the occasion a little later in the same evening when Andrew C. Erwin, a tall young man from Georgia, and almost the only anti-Klansman in his delegation, stood up bravely and demanded that his state throw off the dominance of the hooded order. A third dramatic moment, much later that night, was when the youthful Miss Marion Colley, also from Georgia, after being bullied by a dozen men until she was frightened nearly out of her wits, changed her vote and thereby, as she believed, defeated the minority report of the Resolutions Committee which called the Klan by name.

A fourth high spot, for many, came when Franklin Roosevelt, rising bravely above the handicap of physical incapacity, made a fine speech putting Al Smith in nomination—a speech which struck home to all those who believe in the American tradition that every private's knapsack should contain a mar-

shal's baton, that there is something thrilling and fine in the rise of any man from newsboy to governor and Presidential aspirant. And there was a fifth thrill, witnessed by no reporter, when the Resolutions Committee rose at six o'clock in the morning after having battled all night, and for three previous days, in the hopeless effort to reach agreement, and by a sort of spontaneous consent, uttered the Lord's Prayer in unison.

A thrill of a different sort was found when William Jennings Bryan stood up to advocate that the convention should pussyfoot on the naming of the Klan. To those whose memories went back even as far as his great speech at San Francisco four years ago, it was shocking to see how much of his former glory had departed in the interval. Like every other member of the Resolutions Committee, he was, of course, rocking on his feet with fatigue; but this fact alone could not explain his failure to hold his auditors. Baker, as tired as Bryan, made a finer address than the elder statesman has achieved in at least a decade past.

These moments of drama were memorable; and they stood out all the more vividly because most of the sessions were so completely without the divine spark. No sweeping generalization about this convention could be entirely fair. It has done some fine things, very few of which are definitely bad, and a number which like the soul of Tomlinson are fit neither for Heaven nor hell. If the candidate whom it will have nominated, perhaps during the interval between the writing and the reading of these lines, proves to be a genuine progressive he may be able to counterbalance to some extent the timidity, the evasions and vagueness of the platform. Whether the discontented West, dissatisfied labor, the unattached liberals of the East can be roused to enthusiasm over any candidate handicapped by such a platform—these are questions which I shall be glad to answer for inquirers on and after Wednesday, November 5, 1924.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

On the Line

Nobody knows, now, when he first began
To pass from life to legend, how he turned
Into this "Portrait of a Gentleman,"
Impeccable, aloof and unconcerned.
Romney or Reynolds would have painted him
In wig and ermine: as a landed squire,
Conscious of his aristocratic limb,
Fastidious in each trifle of attire.

But we are come upon an age too crass
For flowered waistcoats. If he lives at all
It will not be in any looking-glass
Held up to *our* vainglory! To forestall
Huckster historians, call him one of those
Who could keep silent counsel when he chose.
LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS.

Toward the Outlawry of War

THE draft treaty framed and submitted by the American committee to the League at Geneva is the most encouraging event in the movement for peace which has taken place for many a day.

I say this without regard to the particular terms of the treaty and without regard to changes which will undoubtedly appear necessary as discussion proceeds. Four great church conferences, or conventions, within the last sixty days have declared for the outlawry of war. With true insight into the situation as it really exists and with masterly comprehension of the question, these church associations, or conventions, have made the question of outlawry the dominant question. Now, there is submitted at Geneva the draft of a treaty contemplating the signature of all nations, solemnly declaring "that aggressive war is an international crime." Putting aside, therefore, for the present the terms of the treaty, which we will all wish to consider more at our leisure, let us reflect a moment upon what all this means in the progress toward peace and as a matter of molding public opinion to the end that war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes shall pass forever under the ban and take its place with murder and piracy where it rightly belongs.

From the beginning of recorded history, men have schemed and planned for peace and have submitted ambitious proposals in that behalf. But these proposals have speedily passed away, leaving no durable result behind. All these schemes, or plans, so far as we are advised, recognized war, wars of invasion, wars of aggression, all kinds of war, as legitimate. War was neither denounced by international codes, international law, or agreements, nor condemned by the moral judgment of mankind. Peace was desirable, but if anyone wanted to go to war for any reason, no condemnation attached. Even William Penn, in many respects the noblest of all the advocates of peace, in his great proposal recognized war as a legitimate institution for the settlement of international controversies and no condemnation under his scheme rested upon any nation which invoked it. The League of Nations framed at Versailles recognizes war as legitimate, and in some instances, relies upon it for the settlement of international disputes. But any scheme for peace, any alliance made in the name of peace, holy or unholy, which recognizes war as legal will speedily become nothing more than a military alliance. That is as logical and inevitable as that night must succeed the day. It must necessarily follow that any combination, agreement, or understanding which recognizes war as a proper method of settling disputes will ultimately come to rely upon war as a method of settling disputes. So long as force is

recognized as the final arbiter in international affairs, force will be appealed to in preference to courts or conciliation commissions. Anyone with a casual knowledge of history or the slightest conception of human nature will, upon reflection readily realize this.

If there be those nations which are anxious to form a league, ostensibly for peace, but are unwilling to sign a treaty making war a crime, you may rest assured that they look upon the league, whatever may be its expressed purpose, as nothing more than a military alliance. All the great nations of Europe regarded the League as really a military alliance. And France, with more candor than others, openly declared at Versailles that that is what it should be, and with more boldness than others, that is what she is now making it. If there be individuals who want a league of nations or a world court, while war is still recognized as legitimate and may be invoked even by the League, then they are content to trifle with the most vital problem ever submitted to mankind for its solution, and that is, the problem of how to be rid of this cruel and savage system of indiscriminate murder, euphoniously called war. We must all derive great pleasure therefore from the fact that we are at last accepting the stone which the builders have heretofore rejected, and propose to make outlawry of war the precedent and dominant principle for which we shall contend, the basis upon which all plans for peace shall be built. Without such a principle acknowledged and accepted as a basis for all plans and schemes of peace, leagues and international courts must become either worthless, or in the end dangerous. Dr. John Dewey has said: "Unless the moral sentiment of the world has reached the point of condemning war, there is nothing that can be done about it. If it has reached this stage, then that conviction should be crystallized in law—in orderly, authorized procedure."

I do not see how you are going to stop war or even check war until you outlaw war, make war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes a crime and hold responsible those who foment war. President Wilson most correctly declared: "Peoples do not make war." Less than a score of men brought on the Great War. No nation was responsible for that war, no peoples were responsible for it. It was forced upon the world with all its attendant sacrifices and misery by a few men. Lord Loreburn, the Ex-Chancellor of England, declared: "We went to war in a Russian quarrel because we were tied to France in the dark. This nation was guided blindfold until it came to the exit, and on the bandages being removed, was confronted by the awful visage of war." Lord Hugh Cecil declared: "When war was decided

upon, it was not decided by the House of Commons or the electorate, but by the concurrence of ministers and ex-ministers." These same men, or some of them, and the same breed of men, the same system and the same policies, are again leading the world to the verge of war. How shall we control such situations except by declaring war a crime and making the fomenters of war criminally liable? What other protection have the people against being manipulated into war?

How utterly vain are all schemes for peace not based upon the principle that war is a crime and its fomenters to be dealt with as criminals, may be illustrated by what has taken place since the organization of the League of Nations. Every war of invasion, every invasion of territory, since the League was created has been by a member of the League. Every move for disarmament has been opposed by a member of the League. Every military alliance since the Treaty of Versailles has been initiated by a member of the League. It was a League member which incited Greece to war and then deserted her in her humiliation and defeat. It was a League member which armed and financed Turkey and brought her back into power. The army which butchered helpless and defenseless women and children on that field of carnage in Asia Minor was armed and equipped by a member of the League of Nations. The three invasions of Russia were equipped and munitioned by members of the League of Nations. The Serb-Croat-Slovene state began war on Albania. Albania appealed to the League, the League evaded the issue, and the war continued between the two members of the League. The Italian Fascisti under D'Annunzio, began war on and captured Fiume. Italy was a mem-

ber of the League and of the Council at the time. Italy later expelled D'Annunzio but kept Fiume. Greece was a member of the League when she invaded Asia Minor. Poland, a member of the League, invaded and took Vilna and began war on Lithuania. Poland, a member of the League used arms against Eastern Galicia. France, a member of the League, invaded the Ruhr.

It has been repeatedly said that the plan for outlawing war is illusory and impracticable. It is not so much so as the plan to end war, while all nations and all international plans for peace still recognize war as legitimate, as morally permissible, still rely upon force as the ultimate arbiter. When the sentiment of mankind has been taught to look upon war as a crime and when that sentiment has been crystallized into international law and to be construed by an independent international judicial tribunal, the world will be near to universal peace. The work of educating the world to this task is tremendous. But unless we are to go on as we have for three thousand years, talking peace and practising war, we shall at once undertake the task; we shall seek to change the attitude of the public mind toward war, as the first step to end war. If, therefore, this proposed treaty marks another step in an effort to found the plans of peace upon the proposition that war is a crime, that it is no longer recognized as an institution for the settlement of international disputes, it is the most encouraging feature of the peace movement which has transpired since the Armistice. I sincerely hope we are to move tremendously along these lines and that this treaty will be made to conform absolutely to the proposition of outlawing war.

WILLIAM E. BORAH.

De-Bunking Mr. Dawes

IN the course of his first speech as a candidate Charles Gates Dawes, the Republican nominee for Vice-President, said:

In the campaign which is before me . . . I pledge myself to adhere to the truth and to the common sense conclusions to be drawn therefrom. As to the demagogue on the stump, whatever may be his party, I want it distinctly understood that in the coming campaign I ask no quarter and will give none.

Is it not, therefore, appropriate immediately to consider the truth about Mr. Dawes and the "common sense conclusions to be drawn therefrom" as to his fitness for the Vice-Presidency? Mr. Dawes describes himself as a "financier." (See *Who's Who*.) He was Comptroller of the Currency from 1897 to 1902 and has been president of the Central Trust Company of Illinois since that date (until recently made chairman of the board of directors).

He was admitted to the Bar in 1886 and practised law for some seven years. He is, therefore, a banker and a lawyer. The quality of his character, the soundness of his ethics and the depth of his integrity may well be tested by his acts as a banker, and perhaps more safely than by his speeches as a politician.

The records of the Supreme Court of Illinois show that Mr. Dawes, without the knowledge or authority of the board of directors or executive committee of his bank, furnished William Lorimer on October 21, 1912, with \$1,250,000 in cash of the Central Trust Company, which was counted by a state bank examiner as the property of the LaSalle Street Trust and Savings Bank, which Mr. Lorimer was organizing to take the place of the LaSalle Street National Bank which was rapidly going on the rocks. The money was then immediately returned to the Central Trust Company. In the language of the Supreme Court of Illinois: