

tion will come a patriot command to crush partisanship, and rebuke whomever is mean or blind.

That command will be heard by the ploughman in his field, and by the laborer at his bench. It will reach the merchant in his office and the lawyer at his desk.

Responding to this command a nation true to its traditions, proud of its greatness, glorying in its progress and believing in its future will prove that the spirit of Americanism burns as brightly in the heart of America today as it did in the splendid days of old.

And when, a century from now, America's children come to read our history, when at last they learn whether the men of 1776 were as true to America as the men of 1776, we pray God that the history we are about to make may prove an inspiration to their loyalty, that the pages we are about to write may be a spur to their patriotism and that our labors here and in the months to come may have preserved for them a nation free and proud, an ideal sublime and true, a flag whose stars reflect the changeless majesty of the celestial galaxy itself.

In the attainment of this hope, the utterance of this prayer we who gather here today have a responsibility that sobers our emotions as it strengthens our resolutions. We would be false to ourselves, and recreant to those who send us here if we permitted any thought of partisan profit, any consideration of political advantage to obscure our vision of the tremendous issues now before the people of the United States. We must cast aside all that is selfish, we must hold ourselves worthy of a nation's confidence by offering only the best of our intelligence, the flower of our patriotism toward the solution of what all men perceive to be a crisis in the nation's affairs.

SHALL WE REJECT THE DOCTRINES OF OUR FATHERS?

One hundred and forty years ago the manhood of America was called upon to decide whether this should be a nation. Half a century ago Americans were forced to determine whether this should continue to be a nation. Today the Republic faces a third crisis no less momentous than that of 1776 or that of 1860. Today Americans must again determine whether their country shall preserve its national ideals, whether it shall have a national soul, whether it shall stand forth as a mighty and undivided force, whether the United States for which Washington fought and for which Lincoln died, shall hold its place among the nations.

For two years the world has been afire; the civilization that we know has been torn by the mightiest struggle in its history. Sparks from Europe's conflagration have blazed in our own skies, echoes of her strife have sounded at our very doors. That fire still burns, that struggle still continues, but thus far the United States has held the flame at bay; thus far it has saved its people from participation in the conflict.

What the people of the United States must determine through their suffrage is whether the course the country has pursued through this crucial period is to be continued; whether the principles that have been asserted as our national policy shall be endorsed or withdrawn.

This is the paramount issue. No lesser issue must cloud it, no unrelated problems must confuse it. In the submission of this issue to the electorate we, of this convention, hold these truths to be self-evident to every student of America's history, to every friend of America's institutions.

First: That the United States is constrained by the traditions of its past, by the logic of its present and by the promise of its future to hold itself apart from the European warfare, to save its citizens from participation in the conflict that now devastates the nations across the seas.

Second: That the United States in its relations with the European belligerents must continue the policy that it has pursued since the beginning of the war, the policy of strict neutrality in relation to every warring nation, the policy which Thomas Jefferson defined as "rendering to all the services and courtesies of friendship and praying for the re-establishment of peace and right."

Third: That save where the liberties, the territory or the substantial rights of the United States are invaded and assailed, it is the duty of this nation to avoid war by every honorable means.

Fourth: That it is the duty of the United States government to maintain the dignity and the honor of the American nation and in every situation to demand and secure from every belligerent the recognition of the neutral rights of its citizens.

Fifth: That because the President of the United States has asserted these principles and pursued these policies the American people must support him with vigor and with enthusiasm in order that these principles and policies may be known to all the world, not as the opinion of an individual but as the doctrine and faith of a loyal and united nation.

THE POLICY OF NEUTRALITY IS AN AMERICAN AS THE AMERICAN FLAG.

In emphasis of these self-evident propositions we assert that the policy of neutrality is as truly American as the American flag.

For 200 years neutrality was a theory; America made it a fact.

The first President of the United States was the first man to pronounce neutrality a rule of international conduct. In April, 1775, Washington declared the doctrine and within a month, John Jay, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in an epoch-making decision from the bench, whose recital thus would ensure universal and perpetual peace, wrote the principle into the law of this land. The Declaration of Independence had foretold

it by declaring "the rest of mankind enemies in war, in peace friends"; the Constitution recognized it; but the first President of the United States by proclamation, the first Chief Justice by interpretation gave it vitality and power.

And so neutrality is American in its initiation.

Thirty years later Prime Minister Canning in the British Parliament pointed to the American policy of neutrality as a model for the world; and eighty years later, after approval by various statutes and agreements, it was written almost word for word in the treaty wherewith we settled our differences with England over violations of neutrality throughout the Civil War.

And so neutrality is American in its consummation.

And today in this hall, so that all the world may hear, we proclaim that this American policy of neutrality is the policy which the present administration pursues with patriotic zeal and religious devotion; while Europe's skies blaze red from fires of war, Europe's soil turns red from blood of men, Europe's eyes see red from tears of mourning women and from sobs of starving children.

The men who say this policy is not American appeal to passion and to prejudice and ignore the facts of history.

Neutrality is America's contribution to the laws of the world. Sir Henry Maine says so, Charles Francis Adams says so, Henry Clay says so, Daniel Webster says so and upon the evidence of these witnesses we rest our Americanism against the sputterings of pepper-pot politicians or the fabrications of those with whom a false issue is a good issue until its falsity is shown, its maliciousness exposed.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

For enforcing this policy of neutrality George Washington was hoisted by a howling mob of 10,000 war fanatics who threatened to pull him from the Presidential chair and start a revolution. Not half a century later Charles Sumner said that "Washington upholding the peaceful neutrality of this country, while he met unmoved the clamor of the people wicketedly crying for war, is a greater man than Washington crossing the Delaware or taking Cornwallis' sword at Yorktown."

For supporting this policy of neutrality Alexander Hamilton was stoned almost to death, and yet today New York honors Hamilton with a statue and Republicans bow down to him as a god of wisdom.

For supporting this policy of neutrality John Jay was burned in effigy upon a thousand hills, and yet today the portrait of John Jay hangs in nearly every courtroom in the land.

For supporting this policy of neutrality Thomas Jefferson was called a spineless poltroon, and yet today Jefferson is hailed as one of the wisest men of the world and for millions his opinions are a political bible.

For supporting this policy of neutrality Abraham Lincoln was pictured as a craven, and yet today Lincoln is enshrined in the heart of America and canonized on our calendar of political martyrs.

Condemned in their day for supporting neutrality, to these men today every American turns for his every conception of what is best in American citizenship.

The fate of the fathers of our country at the hands of a noisy minority is the fate of the President of the United States today. But their reward of dignities, merit and honors conferred will be his reward, when the people speak on the eighth of next November.

WHERE THE PRESIDENT STANDS.

To win this priceless right of neutrality this nation had to undergo a long and painful struggle.

It took Washington with his allies and sword eight years to win recognition of his country's liberty; it took Washington and his successors eighty years of endless negotiation to win recognition of American neutrality. And this eighty years of struggle wove the doctrine of neutrality so closely into the warp and woof of our national life that to tear it out now would unravel the very threads of our existence.

What is the American hardy enough to challenge a policy so firmly fixed in the nation's traditions? Is there among us any man bold enough to set his wisdom above that of Washington, his patriotism above that of Hamilton and his Americanism above that of Jefferson? Is there any American so blind to our past, so hostile to our future, that, departing from our policy of neutrality, he would hurl us headlong into the maelstrom of the war across the sea?

The President of the United States stands today where stood the men who made America and who saved America. He stands where John Adams stood, when he told King George that America was the land he loved and that peace was her grandeur and her welfare. He stands where General Grant stood when he said there never was a war that could not have been settled better some other way, and he has shown his willingness to try the way of peace before he seeks the path of war. He stands where George Washington stood when he prayed that this country would never stretch her sword except in self-defense so long as justice and our essential rights could be preserved without it.

For vain glory or for selfish purposes, others may cry up a policy of blood and iron, but the President of the United States has acted on the belief that the leader of a nation who plunges his people into an unnecessary war, like Pontius Pilate vainly washes his hands of innocent blood while the earth quakes and the heavens are darkened and thousands give up the ghost.

Only by standing on this rock of Americanism, against which dashed the waves of conflict, could the President of the Uni-

ted States, faced by a world in arms, save this country from being drawn into the whirlpool of disaster. One false step in any direction and he would have carried the nation with him over the precipice.

This difference, my friends, between "what is" and "what might be" is well illustrated by two pictures which hung on the walls of the art museum here in this city of St. Louis during the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

One of these pictures portrayed the famous warriors who have stricken terror into the heart of mankind since the dawn of history. Alexander the Great was there, Caesar was there, Hannibal was there, Napoleon was there, and on either side of this sinister group lay in endless rows the sheeted dead of war.

The other picture represented hands, myriads of hands, humanity's hands stretching upwards towards the sky—gnarled hands of labor and withered hands of age, eager hands of youth and helpless hands of babes, rugged hands of men and delicate hands of women—hands of aspiration stretching upward to the sky from Divine Inspiration toward happiness and peace.

These two pictures symbolize the banners of this campaign.

Others may follow the Lords of War who ride among the corpses of mankind. We follow the President of the United States and seek inspiration of humanity that aspires to higher things.

IF WASHINGTON AND LINCOLN WERE RIGHT, THE PRESIDENT IS RIGHT.

By opposing what we stand for today the Republican party opposes what Hamilton stood for a century ago. The founder of the Republican party and the founder of the Democratic party, placing their country's happiness above every other consideration, forgot partisanship and made American neutrality a national creed. We who follow Jefferson stand where Jefferson stood, but we look in vain for a sign from the present leaders of the Republican party to show that they follow where Hamilton led. Where Hamilton counseled moderation they denounce it. Where Hamilton thought only of country they think only of self. Where Hamilton placed patriotism above partisanship they placed partisanship above patriotism. How then do they dare to speak for the great body of American citizens who form the rank and file of the Republican party? Do these leaders believe that their Republicanism is a better Republicanism than Hamilton's, their Americanism a purer Americanism than that of Washington?

Unless statesmanship has fallen into disrepute among Republicans, the men who controlled the Chicago convention cannot read Alexander Hamilton out of the Republican party. Unless I mistake the tenor of the American people the Republican bosses can no more lead their adherents away from the neutrality for which Washington and Hamilton struggled than they can lead them away from the flag for which Washington and Hamilton fought.

If Washington was right, if Jefferson was right, if Hamilton was right, if Lincoln was right, then the President of the United States is right today; if the Republican leaders are right then Lincoln was wrong and Jefferson was wrong and Hamilton was wrong and Washington was wrong.

THE JUSTIFICATION OF HISTORY.

In all the history of the world there is no other national policy that has justified itself so completely and entirely as the American policy of neutrality and isolation from the quarrels of European powers. Before we declared our neutrality we were embroiled in all the troubles of Great Britain, France and Spain; since then we have had less than three years of war with Europe and 116 years of amity and peace.

Before this declaration every war was a world-war; since this declaration nearly every war has been a local war. Before this declaration war was a whirlpool, ever-increasing in area and in its whirl dragging down the nations of the earth; since this declaration war has become a sea of trouble upon which nations embark only from self-will, from self-interest or the necessity of geographical position, of financial obligation or political alliance.

Neutrality is the policy which has kept us at peace while Europe has been driving the nails of war through the hands and feet of a crucified humanity.

It has banished conquest from our program of national greatness and has made us find our destiny at home. It has forced us to build on the brow of our sons and the energy of our daughters rather than upon the tears of conquered women and the blood of conquered men. It has made us seek treasure in our harvests, wealth in our fields by staying our hands from war's blood-stained rot of gold. It has been the flaming sword which forbade us to devastate the Eden of others and compelled us to make an Eden of our own. It has freed us from the paralyzing touch of Europe's balance of power, leaving to Europe the things that are Europe's and preserving for America the independence, the peace and the happiness that now are hers.

As a result of this policy America stands serene and confident, mighty and proud, a temple of peace and liberty in a world aflame; a sanctuary where the lamp of civilization burns clear and strong, a living, breathing monument to the statesmanship of the great Americans who kept it free from the menace of European war.

Wealth has come to us, power has come to us, but better than wealth or power we have maintained for ourselves and for our children a nation dedicated to the ideals of peace rather than to the gospel of selfishness and slaughter.

The praises of this policy are not written in the ruins of American homes, not in the wreck of American industries, not in

the mourning of American families; they are found in the myriad evidences of prosperity and plenty that make this a contented land. From every whirling spindle in America, from every factory wheel that turns, from every growing thing that breathes its prayer of plenty to the skies, from every quiet school, from every crowded mart, from every peaceful home goes up a song of praise, a psalm of thanksgiving to hymn a nation's tribute, to the statesmanship that has brought these things to pass.

NEUTRAL RIGHTS ASSERTED AND MAINTAINED AS NEVER BEFORE.

No American who knows the facts can honestly oppose or criticize the policy of neutrality which the present Democratic administration has pursued. Driven from this position, by the logic of our history and the lesson of our prosperity, exerts and defamers rush to the opposite extreme and assert that this policy has not been enforced with sufficient vigor by the present administration.

Standing here with the eyes of the nation upon this convention, with the cold light of reason, the piercing shafts of logic streaming upon all that we may say or do, I declare, with history as my witness and with fact as my proof, that the neutral rights of American citizens have never been so vigorously asserted or so successfully maintained as they have been asserted and maintained by the President of the United States during the present war.

America's doctrine of neutrality never meant that this nation must rush headlong into war at the first invasion of its neutral rights. Neutrality is not a hair-triggered policy that explodes in violence at the first assault. It is a policy that has proved successful because it has always been asserted through negotiation rather than through force, through diplomacy rather than by an appeal to arms. This does not mean that America will not resort to war when all other means of protecting its neutral rights have failed, but it does mean that America will exhaust every peaceful means of protecting those rights before it takes the step from which there is no appeal. Just as in domestic affairs the penal statutes cannot wholly suppress crime, so in foreign affairs the law of neutrality cannot entirely prevent the breach of neutral rights. There has scarcely been a war since the principle of neutrality was embodied in international law, in which some neutral citizens have not been killed, in which some neutral trade has not been interfered with.

A judicial review of relative values, a distinction between honor and sensitiveness, a consideration of life as well as property, a proper equation of conditions and circumstances are elements of neutrality's law.

One hundred and twenty years ago when Europe went mad with war, it has gone mad today Jefferson pointed to the north star of our policy of neutrality when he said "in the present maniac state of Europe we should not estimate the point of honor by the ordinary scale." The reasoning which made this a sound rule in "the maniac state of Europe" in Jefferson's day makes it an equally strong rule in "the maniac state of Europe" today.

This nation, let us never forget, has always remembered that neutrality is a policy which is asserted against nations of war, against nations inflamed and disordered. It has always been wise enough to proceed with calmness and patience, and events have ever justified its willingness to appeal from Philip drunk with war to Philip sobered by reason and reflection.

HOW STANDS THE RECORD?

The issue, raised by our opponents, of the vigor with which our neutrality has been enforced is a comparative issue which can be decided only by comparative results.

And what are the comparative results? How stands the record of this administration compared with other administrations?

WHEN GRANT WAS PRESIDENT.

When Grant was President, during the war between Spain and the Spanish West Indies, a Spanish gunboat seized the vessel "Virginia" flying the American flag and a Spanish commandant in cold blood shot the captain of the "Virginia," thirty-six of the crew and sixteen of the passengers.

But we didn't go to war. Grant settled our troubles by negotiation just as the President of the United States is trying to do today.

WHEN HARRISON WAS PRESIDENT.

When Benjamin Harrison was President the people of Chili conceived a violent dislike to the United States for our insistence upon neutrality during the Chilean revolution. When this feeling was at its height one junior officer from the United States warship Baltimore was killed outright in the streets of Valparaiso and sixteen of our sailors wounded, of whom one afterwards died. In a message to Congress on January 25, 1882, supported by Secretary of State James G. Blaine, and an evidence submitted by Fighting "Bob" Evans and Winfield Scott Schley, President Harrison said this assault on our honor "had its origin in the hostility to these men, as soldiers of the United States wearing the uniform of the government and yet in any individual act of personal animosity" and that this nation "must take notice of the event as an infringement of its rights and dignity" and as an "invasion of its 'international rights'."

But we didn't go to war. Harrison settled our troubles by negotiation just as the President of the United States is trying to do today.

WHEN LINCOLN WAS PRESIDENT.

When Lincoln was President this country's rights were violated on every side, England, Russia, France and Spain were