

ognize the need of the policeman on the beat, the safe in the bank and the watchdog on the farm.

We pray for the millennium but we accept things as they are. As men of common sense we realize that, for a nation, the policy of turning the other cheek when unjustly smitten means national decapitation and a funeral at which our people would be the mourners, our enemies our heirs.

We fought one war for existence and one for survival. We fought one war to exclude foreign influence and another to preserve internal peace. And we would fight four more wars for the same reasons, but the reasons we must have. When necessity demands we stand ready to meet with force the enemies of our liberty, the defamers of our honor and the foes of our integrity.

The war across the seas has brought home to us the fear that so long as men are men and nations nations, wars will continue.

We have been aroused from our dreams of the millennium to the knowledge that nothing that men cherish is safe from assault; that the man who would preserve his rights to life, to liberty and to happiness, must stand ready to defend those rights with the last drop of his blood.

We have been carried too close to the rocks of war during the past two years to believe that those rocks do not exist. And looking into the future we can perceive that if our sovereignty is not challenged, if our peace is not assailed, it will only be because the world knows that we are strong enough to defend ourselves from every foe.

For these reasons this administration has done more for our army and our navy than any administration in our history.

More than this, it has mobilized the resources of the nation to meet the needs of war. It has placed the wealth of the country back of the strength of the country, the toiler back of the soldier and the sailor.

And to our opponents we say you can't create an army, can't build a navy in the course of a day; to them we say if our navy is not strong enough, if our army is not big enough, the Republican party is eighty per cent. to blame, for the Republican party has been in control of the nation 80 per cent. of the time during the past fifty years.

The Democratic party advocates and seeks preparedness, but it is preparedness for defense, not preparedness for aggression.

It is the preparedness which builds the nation's house upon a rock, so it will not fall when the rains descend and the floods come and the winds blow.

We may look upon preparedness with as little favor as we look upon taxes, but we pay the taxes because we want the protection for which the taxes pay.

Democracy refuses to be frightened by those who pretend to fear that this great land of freedom will descend into the abyss of militarism.

It knows that militarism can no more thrive in this country than the cockle and the tare can thrive amid the wheat of the husbandman who loves his land. It knows that preparedness, that reasonable preparedness, will not kill democracy in this country any more than it killed democracy in Switzerland. It knows that reasonable preparedness will ensure us peace just as it ensured peace for Switzerland though war thundered at her doors.

Militarism in the United States is as impossible as the shadow of a ghost in the mid-day sun. We had a triumphant army in 1776, we had an invincible navy in 1812 and in 1865 we had the two greatest armies the world has ever seen.

But when the crisis passed that called these freemen to the colors the first to leap forward at their country's call were the first to return to the farms and factories whence they came.

From the ranks of democracy they came as silently as Putnam left his plough in answer to the shot heard around the world; and back to democracy they went as silently as the Southern heroes whose horses Grant returned that they might plow the very fields which had been harrowed by their cannons' wheels.

#### NATIONAL SOUL

These, then, are the principles that have been asserted and followed by the President of the United States during the past two years—that the United States shall not embroil itself in European strife, that the United States shall endeavor to maintain friendly and cordial relations with every other nation and that the United States shall firmly assert and maintain—and be prepared to assert and maintain its neutral rights against every belligerent.

Nothing in the assertion of these principles by the President has caused the nation so many anxious hours as the fear that the temper of the American people might be misunderstood.

Efforts have been made and may be made again to create an impression here and abroad that in asserting these principles the President spoke only for a fraction of the American people, that the nation itself was divided and that the President's solemn words could be disregarded because the American people would not stand solidly behind him.

This convention must make it plain that all divisions among the American people stop at the ocean's edge. This convention must declare and must give the country the means to declare that when the President of the United States speaks to a foreign power, he speaks for every citizen of America; that when the nation's chief executive asserts a policy that has been an American policy since the beginning of the nation, his action has behind it the force and strength of a loyal and united people.

We, who know and love America, know how false, how vain, how unreal, are the efforts of those who picture us to the world as divided against ourselves. We know that so far as our international relations are concerned, we hold but one faith, acknowledge but one loyalty, follow but one flag.

We of this convention, representing every section of the United States, speaking for every racial strain in America, must send forth a message to all the world that will leave no room for doubt.

We must tell the world that though we are of many minds and many bloods, we are of one heart, one hand, one land, one flag, one nation now and forever.

We must enable every real American to stand up and assert his Americanism. We must make the issue so clear that every ballot box in the land may become a monument to the loyalty of American manhood.

The citizens of this country will stand behind their President because his policies are right. They will stand behind him because his policies are the policies which have brought the nation a century of prosperous and honored peace. They will stand behind him because they want these policies continued, that prosperity prolonged, that peace assured.

Yet over and above every other reason that the nation may have for upholding its President, is the necessity of proving to the world that we are a united people.

So long as the other nations of the earth realize that the millions under America's flag think as one, believe as one and act as one in the face of foreign war, we shall be free from foreign intrigue, and all that it entails. Once let the notion get abroad that this nation is merely a confederation of diverse and conflicting allegiances, and we shall never be safe from the machinations of foreign powers.

A regard for national surety as well as a pride of personal honor will therefore bring the American people the support of their President. Whether their blood is drawn from the banks of the Rhine, or where the River Shannon flows, whether they hail from Alpine valleys or the meadows of the Pyrenees, whether their descent be German or French, Irish or English, Austrian or Italian, Russian or Greek, the men who have sworn an oath of fealty to the ideals of America will be true.

When danger threatens our institutions, when enemies menace our country and our homes, these adopted sons of ours, whose names are enrolled on the pages of the nation's family, will prove that their blood is as red, their skin as white, their veins as blue as the Red and the White and the Blue of the flag they have sworn to maintain and uphold, to sustain and support.

They may love the lands of their fathers much, but they love the land of their children more. They may cherish the memory of the sod from which they sprung, but they stand ready to die for the soil that they have hallowed with their homes.

Their loyalty to America is more than loyalty to a name; their allegiance is more than allegiance to a flag. The man who serves America serves only the best in himself. The man who is loyal to America is loyal only to the noblest of humanity's ideals. The man who swears allegiance to America enrolls himself in the ranks of those who are pledged to freedom, to opportunity, to justice and to human progress.

High above every other issue that this convention offers to the American people we must therefore write a vindication of American loyalty. Secure in our conviction that America comes first with every American, confident that the great warm heart of the Republic beats true and strong, convinced that the stars of the heavens are not more firmly fixed in the firmament than the stars of America's flag are shined in the hearts of America's citizens, we must call upon our countrymen to show their devotion and their loyalty, not to a Democratic President but to the President of the land of their birth and the land of their adoption; not to the President of any race, nor any creed, nor any man, but to the President of every man, of every creed and of every race; to the President of our Constitution and our flag; to the President of these United States.

#### MEXICAN SITUATION A DIPLOMATIC INHERITANCE

A great deal of criticism has been directed against the present administration because of the President's advice to Americans in Mexico to leave that country and return to the United States. As is the case in many matters involving our foreign relations a great part of this criticism is based upon an incomplete knowledge of the facts and a failure to take into consideration all the phases of the situation. President Wilson's advice to Americans to leave Mexico was not by any means a radical departure from the policy of the previous administration. It was merely an affirmation and reiteration of an apparently well considered and wholly justifiable position taken by Mr. Taft in 1912 when he advised Americans to withdraw from localities where conditions or prospects of lawlessness threatened the personal safety of Americans and when he directed consular officers to take charge of abandoned effects of American citizens. This advice was applied in practically the entire republic. This plainly shows, therefore, the opinion of the Taft administration at that time. On November 21, 1910, the commanding general of the Department of Texas was authorized to send troops to the border to enforce the neutrality laws. Additional troops were later sent to patrol the entire border. The War Department early in February, 1912, held all troops in readiness for service along the Mexican border. This created a situation in Mexico which made some of the people doubt the stability of the Madero government and gave rise to widespread brigandage throughout Mexico. On February 24, 1912, the Washington authorities hinted to the Mexican authorities that military force was contemplated.

The truth of the matter is if the Taft administration had given Madero one-tenth part of the support and assistance that this administration is giving the de facto government, President Madero would most assuredly have been successful in establishing peace and order, the alleged crime of Huerta would not have been committed, the loss of American lives and property since that time would not have occurred and Mexico would have been spared the horrors of the fratricidal war which has since prevailed there.

On April 15, 1912, the Department of State and President Taft sent what was

practically an ultimatum to the Madero Government in which intervention was threatened.

This ultimatum stated that "until more headway was made in unseating Madero, no interviews could be granted, and no communications received from insurgents."

It seems that the Taft administration had devoted itself to a campaign of nagging and persecuting the struggling government of Madero. During the early part of September, 1912, President Taft stated to Ambassador Cañero that this government was dissatisfied with internal conditions in Mexico. The newspapers, in reporting the matter, said:

"Mr. Taft is opposed to intervention except as a last resort. It is admitted, however, that conditions in Mexico have become much worse in the last few weeks and if the Madero Government is unable to check the attacks on American citizens, the United States will be constrained to take action."

So it will be seen that the situation in Mexico when Woodrow Wilson became President was an unfortunate inheritance.

Our opponents say it was President Wilson's duty to do the very things which President Taft did not do and for which they condemn President Taft while condemning President Wilson.

The Taft administration had nagged and persecuted President Madero almost up to the breaking point; it had shifted its troops down to the border for the supposed purpose of protecting its Ambassador to Mexico, a time when such a move weakened and embarrassed the Madero government; it had allowed Americans to be killed in Mexico and American property to be looted and menaced. About sixty Americans are known to have been killed during the Taft administration and yet our opponents assume for their part a "holier than thou" attitude.

In view of all the circumstances the last administration had all the opportunity it could wish for to send an army into Mexico if it had desired to avail itself of the justification which our opponents are now urging upon this administration.

Mr. Taft did not believe it wise to sacrifice thousands of lives and millions of dollars in order to intervene in the internal affairs of Mexico.

President Wilson has found nothing so far which would justify the great sacrifice of human life which would be necessary to obtain military control of Mexico.

President Wilson's Mexican policy has been born of the belief that no permanency in government would be obtained in Mexico or in any other American republic so long as this government was ready to recognize every revolutionist who might secure control.

President Wilson's Mexican policy is consistent with the American idea that the government of any republic should be the choice of its people.

So long as governments created by force and financed from without can control in Mexico just so long will there be no safety of life or security of property in that country.

For 50 years we have been talking Pan-Americanism and Pan-Americanism has been impossible because the other American republics have always suspected sinister purposes in our attitude towards them.

But President Wilson's policy has made every American republic believe for the first time that our government has no desire or purpose to take their territory or coerce their government. Out of this European war no man can tell what will come but this much is certain that it is vital for the peace and prosperity and honor of the Western Hemisphere that there be a fidelity in the pretensions and an honesty in the relations between the governments of the American continent.

Our opponents charge that our policy has been vacillating, that the President invaded Mexico and then retreated. The charge is not true. Our opponents have no evidence upon which to base such an accusation.

Here is the truth about the Vera Cruz incident. Admiral Mayo was at Tampico. American sailors and officers were insulted by Mexican soldiers. A boat crew and paymaster of the United States Navy were arrested on the wharf at Tampico by Huerta's followers. Without the knowledge and without any instruction from the administration at Washington Admiral Mayo demanded the release of his men, an apology and a salute to the flag. Huerta's followers did not comply, and the President backed up the demands of our officers. The salute was denied. Vera Cruz was occupied, not for invasion, but to punish an insult to the flag and the navy. With a loss of 300 men Huerta's band was punished and the incident was closed. The Vera Cruz incident did not have its origin in or any relation to the fixed policy of President Wilson towards Mexico and the other American republics.

Our opponents say we invaded Vera Cruz to help Carranza and hurt Huerta. They forget that Carranza protested at the landing of United States troops in Vera Cruz. Would Carranza have protested if this charge of our opponents were true?

In their assault on the Mexican policy of President Wilson the Republicans make Elihu Root the blower of their bugle blast. On this question Senator Root again plays the weather-cock and veers in the shifting winds of opportunism. What he urged President Wilson to do in Mexico, he advised President Taft not to do. And so I say that Senator Root's conduct as an official and his talk as a political agitator illustrate the difference between the conservation of responsibility and the anarchy of speech.

And here is the proof that Mr. Root can blow hot one day and cold the next, can talk like Therasias today though yesterday he acted like Nestor.

When Senator Stone, the present Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, introduced into the Senate a

resolution which would have committed this country to the very Mexican policy which Mr. Root now urges, he rose in the Senate and condemned the effort of the Democrats to do the very thing which he says should have been done and for want of which he says the democracy has forfeited the respect of the citizens of this country. Here are the exact words of Mr. Root which expose the somersault he has thrown on the Mexican situation:

"Mr. President, before the subject is passed over and the resolution laid upon the table, I wish to express my entire dissent from the assumption which seemed to me to be carried by the expression of opinion on the part of the Senator from Missouri. Granting that injuries have been done to American citizens which ought to be redressed, that wounds have been inflicted, that lives have been taken, that property has been destroyed, it does not follow, sir, that we should begin the process of seeking redress for those injuries by a showing of force on the part of a great and powerful nation against a smaller and weaker nation. That, sir, is to reverse the policy of the United States and to take a step backward in the pathway of civilization."

"There is no reason whatever, sir, to assume, if injuries have been done of the kind described, that the Government of Mexico is unwilling to make due redress upon having those injuries and claims presented to her in the ordinary course of peaceful negotiations; and for redress the passage of such a resolution as has been described, equivalent to a declaration of war, would be to preface the ordinary demand—the demand which it is the duty of every civilized power to make upon a friendly nation—with a threat that if the demand is not complied with force will be used."

"Sympathy with the people of Mexico in their distress, a just sense of the duties that we owe to that friendly people, and the duties that we owe to the peace of the world must forbid our assenting to or yielding to any such course."

Evidently Mr. Root's opinion as to what should be our Mexican policy shifts from day to day. He is for any policy that at the moment promises the most votes for the Republican party. Anyway it is a source of consolation to know that as a United States Senator he approved, though as a political agitator he condemns, the policy which President Wilson is following in Mexico.

#### DOMESTIC POLICIES

It is more than coincidence that an administration which has steadfastly maintained the peace and the honor of the nation, should have sought with equal energy and equal success the internal progress and domestic prosperity which is the natural product of tranquility and fair dealing.

It is not surprising that an administration which has jealously guarded the national rights of the United States should have cherished with equal zeal the individual rights of its citizens. It is natural that an administration which has stoutly asserted the ancient freedom of our commerce on the seas, should have labored with equal sincerity for the new freedom of opportunity on America's soil.

Four years ago the people of this country entrusted their government to a man and to a party who promised that they would liberate the nation from the chains of industrial tyranny, who pledged themselves to break down the barriers behind which special privilege sat entrenched; who engaged themselves to emancipate business, to throw wide the gates of lawful enterprise, to restore to the men and women of America the paths of progress which had been choked and blocked by long years of invisible government.

That promise has been kept; that pledge which the nation enjoys bears witness that Democracy has kept the faith. Today the gates of opportunity are open; the hoas of special privilege stand disarmed. Today the forces of government are encouraging, not blocking the full expression of the nation's progress. Today the business man, the artisan and farmer find themselves free to enjoy the fruits of their labors, unhampered by the sinister power of special privilege or the selfish oppression of "invisible government."

To attempt to describe the myriad ways in which this new spirit of government has found expression would necessitate a review of every national activity, a compendium of every department of the national government. We must content ourselves here with a brief consideration of the great landmarks which chart the change from government for the fortunate few to an even-handed government in the interest of all.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The first of these is the Federal Reserve Act which freed the business man and the farmer from the financial domination of the money changers and lifted the menace of panic from our industrial life.

Five times during the past thirty years, at periods when industry was flourishing and crops were abundant, the purse strings of the country have tightened without apparent reason and the nation has been devastated by panics.

Business men had seen the patient work of years swept away in a night. Farmers had watched their homes sold over their heads. The widow and the orphan, the tire-woman and the mechanic had found themselves defrauded of their pitances as they beat upon the closed doors of insolvent banks. Paralysis had fallen upon the nation's industries. Armies of the unemployed had marched from factory to factory begging for work. Bread lines and soup kitchens had sprung up in every city of the land and within their financial fortresses the few who brought about this universal misery watched their work and counted their gains.

Throwing down the gauntlet to those who had fattened on the system that made these