

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 ways of peace before he seeks the paths of war. He stands where George Washington stood when he prayed that the country would never unsheath the sword except in self-defense so long as justice and our essential rights could be preserved without it.

For vain glory or for selfish purpose, 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 United 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 the 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 upward toward the sky—gnarled hands of labor and wrinkled hands of age, smooth hands of youth and tiny hands of babyhood, strong hands of men and delicate hands of women—hands of aspiration stretching upward from divine inspiration toward betterment 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 can not read Alexander Hamilton out of the republican party. Unless I mistake the temper 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 brawn 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 bloodstained pot 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 here.

AMERICA IS A TEMPLE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY WITH THE WORLD AFLAME

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.

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, carpers 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 Amer-

ica 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 can not wholly suppress crime, so in foreign affairs the law of neutrality can not 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.

SAYS JEFFERSON WAS FIRST TO WEIGH OUR NATIONAL HONOR IN THE SCALES

One hundred and twenty years ago when Europe went mad with war as 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 at 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.

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, during the war between Spain and the Spanish West Indies, a Spanish gunboat seized the vessel *Virginus*, flying the American flag, and a Spanish commandant in cold blood shot the captain of the *Virginus*, 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 Benjamin Harrison was president the people of Chile 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, 1892, supported by Secretary of State James G. Blaine, and on evidence submitted by Fighting "Bob" Evans and Winfield Scott Schley, President Harrison said this assault on our honor "had its origin in the hostilities to these men as sailors of the United States wearing the uniform of the government and not in any individual act of personal animosity" and that this nation "must take notice of the event as an infraction 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 this country's rights were violated on every side. England, Russia, France and Spain were guilty of such flagrant violations that Secretary of State Seward advanced a plan to go to war with all of them at one and the same time.

France used every possible influence short of open war to injure us. She not only permitted the building of confederate vessels in private ship yards, but she allowed at least two to be built in the national navy yard of France and she supplied them with supplies from her government arsenal.

And England did more.

Through his secretary of state Lincoln called England to account for the seizure of the United States ship *Chesapeake* on the high seas bound from New York to Portland, for the burning of the United States ship *Roanoke* off Bermuda, for the seizure on Lake Erie of the ship *Philo Parsons* and the scuttling of the *Island Queen*, the shooting of its engineer and the wounding of its passengers; and he protested to England against the invasion of the territory of the United States by a band of southern sympathizers