

sult; that he would bring peace by fighting for it. Let the other announce that he did not intend to do any injustice to anybody, and that he would not assume that anybody was going to do injustice to him, and that he was not going to arm himself. He might go farther and announce that he would promise in advance not to resist any violence attempted against him or to punish any man or any woman who struck him. Which one would have the least scars at the end of ten years? My friends, I believe that if this nation announced to the world that it would not spend its money getting ready for wars that ought never to come, that it would rather try to prevent the coming of war; that as it did not intend, as some one has put it, to go out as a burglar it would not equip itself with burglary tools; that it had faith in the good intent of other people and that it expected other people to have faith in its good intent. Do you think our nation would suffer for that?

Some one has said here—I believe it was the distinguished president of Columbia—that whenever there is an appropriation to be made for battleships it is preceded by a vociferous discussion of a profitable kind of patriotism—the spending of money for battleships. I am glad he said it. Every time there is something good and strong to be said I am always glad to have somebody else say it so I can quote it, I am so conservative, that whenever I wish to make a radical statement I always look for some man as an authority—some one who stands higher than I do, and if I can find that he has said what I want to say then I can say it and hide behind authority. So I am glad that one of these college presidents says a thing like that because I can now quote that and it will be more effective than if I had said it first—but what he said was so.

We have a navy league in this country; they have one in Germany; they have one in Great Britain and they have one in France; and these navy leagues play one nation against the other. Whenever we build a battleship the picture of it is published in the literature of all the others and the building of that battleship is urged as a reason why all the other nations should build one more at least, and possibly two. Then when they get scared and build we get the picture over here and we must build another. That is exactly what goes on and what has been going on for years. We are expected to get scared whenever another nation builds a battleship and then we are to build two and scare them until they build three and then get scared again and build four. That is exactly what is going on and I am satisfied that Dr. Butler put his finger upon the cause. It is this patriotism that finds a profit in building ships and getting ready for war, and then as soon as we get our ships built the very same men forget their patriotism and build ships for other nations with which to sink our ships if they get a chance. I have used this illustration:

Suppose you had a lake—I will not say this lake, because beautiful as it is it is not large enough for the purpose that I have in view in this illustration—suppose you took a large lake and suppose that there were half a dozen farmers or land owners—probably I better say land-owners, because the word farmer does not usually suggest enough land to illustrate what I want to illustrate, so we will say land owners—half a dozen land owners are around this lake and are living peacefully together, no trouble or sign of trouble. But a man who builds ships goes to one of them and says: "You are foolish; you are living here with no protection whatever. Don't you know that any of these men around you might build a battleship and attack you, and you are defenseless. Now let me build a ship for you and you will get ahead of them." Suppose the man was foolish enough to take the advice. Just as soon as that ship was built the ship builder would go to the next neighbor and say: "Why, don't you see that man over there has a battleship? What is it for? Do you suppose he is building it for nothing? Have you any doubt he has designs on you? Where else can he use it except on this lake? You had better get ready. Now I can build you two." And if this man was foolish he would build two. Then what an argument the ship builder would have when he got to the third man! "Why, there are two of them against you. They might combine and you are absolutely at their mercy." Now, with that argument he could go all round that lake and after building ships for each one he could go back to the first one and say: "You are out of date. Look at the improvements since you built. And then you have only one and these other people

have four. There is nothing for you to do but mortgage your farm. Now you are in for it!" Now that is the race of the world, my friends, that is the mad race of the world.

I have to be parliamentary down east; out west I can speak with a little more freedom and that makes it hard for me to express myself on these subjects in the language that is considered proper in these public meetings. (Mr. Smiley: You need not be afraid here.) Can I just imagine for a minute I am at home? (The chairman: O, yes.) Well, my friends, if this were a place where I could speak with freedom and say what I wanted to say—if it were such a place—I would say that the building of these great battleships, these preparations by Christian nations to fight one another, is a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world; that it is infidelity to the doctrine taught by the Founder of the Christian religion. Christ taught no such doctrine; he taught us the power of love, not the power of the sword, and those who have tried to put into practice this doctrine are the ones who have suffered least from the use of force.

I suppose that the most significant example in all this world today of one who preaches this doctrine of love, and lives as he preaches, is Tolstoy. He is not only a believer in the doctrine of love, but he is a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance, and there he stands proclaiming to the world that he believes that love is a better protection than force; that he thinks a man will suffer less by refusing to use violence than if he used it. And what is the result? He is the only man in Russia on whom the czar, with all his army, dare not lay his hand. Those who have gone out preaching the doctrine of force in Russia have gone into exile, but Tolstoy stands there and waits for them come; but the power that is about him, the power that is over him and the power that is in him is proof against the violence of the czar. I believe it would be true of a nation. I believe that this nation should stand before the world today and tell the world that it did not believe in war, that it did not believe that it was the right way to settle disputes, that it had no disputes that it was not willing to submit to the judgment of the world, and if this nation did it, it not only would not be attacked by any other nation on the earth, but that it would become the supreme power in this world. I have no doubt of it, and I believe that the whole tendency is toward that. I believe that our nation can take a long step in advance now by announcing doctrines of this kind, announcing that its navy will not be used for the collection of debt; that we do not imprison people

for debt in this country, that we do not take men's lives because they owe in this country, and that, therefore, we will not man battleships and kill people because they owe people in this country; that we will apply to international affairs the same doctrines we apply to our affairs here; that if any one in the United States wishes to invest money in another country he should do so according to the laws of that country and be subject to the authority of that country. Then every country would be open to American investments, for that is the kind of investments they would look for. They have had enough of investments which begin with the purchase of a little land, to be followed by a battleship that takes the rest of the country. I believe that from every standpoint this would be a proper thing. I believe that if our nation would announce to the world that it stands ready to enter into a treaty of peace with every other nation, big or little, providing that whenever there is any dispute which defies diplomatic settlement, that dispute shall be submitted to an impartial international tribunal for investigation and report—if our nation did that I believe it would not be a year's time until we would have treaties of peace of that kind with the leading nations, and in two years' time with practically all of them. And when this nation had entered into that kind of a treaty of peace with other nations we would find the example so powerful that it would result in similar treaties being made between other nations, and the day of war would be past.

Every time we talk about arbitration they say: "But there are some questions that effect national honor and you can not submit that kind of a question to arbitration." The trouble is that whenever a nation wants to fight it manufactures a question of honor. It is like the old doctor—I do not know that you ever had him in the east, but we used to have a doctor in the west who, whenever he was asked to treat a disease which he did not understand said that he could not treat that disease but that he could give the patient something that would knock the disease into fits and that he was "death on fits." So, my friends, whenever a nation wants to go to war, no matter what the subject is, it turns it into a question of "national honor" and goes to shooting. If we could have an investigation of every controversy that can not be settled by diplomacy, we would separate the questions of fact from the question of honor, and I think we would generally find that there was no real question of honor involved when the questions of fact were settled.

But I have run over my time (Members: Go on, go on.) No, I have so shaped my speech as to make it as near half an hour as possible, and if I go on I will have to commence over and make a new speech. I am very glad to have had this opportunity of meeting with you. I am glad to join with you in an effort to advance a movement in whose ultimate triumph I have absolute confidence, and when one is working for something which he believes is right and for something which he believes will triumph he is not so particular as to the exact date of the triumph. A man who is trying to get something that he knows to be wrong must get it right away, for he knows that, if he does not get it soon, he can not get it at all; but when one is working for something he believes to be right he knows that every hour will increase the chances of his triumph for he believes that back of truth stands God with an arm strong enough to bring victory to his side.

THE IMMORTAL MUSIC

The soft, sweet notes of woodland birds,
The crooning of the lowing herds,
The rustling zephyrs as they pass
Across the tree tops and lush grass,
The humming of the bees, the throng
Of insects with their evensong,
The chirp of cricket and the note
Of tree toads on the air afloat,
The monotonous of waters free,
The murmurs of the forest tree,
The rich crescendos of the gale,
Staccato of the rain and hail—
These are the songs our fathers stirred;
These are the songs that Adam heard;
These are the anthems that will be
Unchanged through all eternity;
The Symphony Divine, that rolls
From heaven forth to human souls,
To cheer the heart and ease earth's strife
With promise of immortal life.

—John Kendrick Bangs in the Smart Set.

NOT AN IRIDESCENT DREAM

It is not true, Mr. President, that purity in politics is an iridescent dream. It can be made a reality through the Oregon system of popular government and by the overthrow of the imperfect mechanism of party government which has evolved the bad system of machine-rule government. The remedy for the evils from which our national, state, and municipal governments have suffered is to restore the rule of the people—to restore the full powers of government to the people by the Oregon system; to pass laws by which the people can directly nominate, directly initiate laws they do want, directly veto laws they do not want, directly recall public servants.

The people are "safe and sane."
The people are conservative and sound.
The people are honest and intelligent.
The people would vote for the public interest alone and would not vote for purely selfish interests.
The people would not grant ninety-nine year or perpetual corporate franchises or legislative privileges of enormous value without adequate consideration.
The people would not deprive any persons of their just rights.
Under the rule of the people the issue of world-wide peace would be raised and would, by popular vote of all nations, be made a permanent international law.
The people know more than their representatives do, and are less passionate and less liable to be led into either internal or international complications.
The people are worthier to be confided in than any individuals trusted with temporary power.
The people would be economical in government.

Under the rule of the people, with the right of recall, their public servants would be more upright, more faithful, more diligent, more economical, and more honest; the public service would be purified; the bad example of corruption and extravagance in high places would be removed and new and better standards of public and private conduct would prevail.
The servants of the people would then concern themselves more in bringing about the reforms which the people desire.—From Senator Owen's Speech.