

from Canada who rode across the border into Vermont, burned a portion of St. Albans, looted its homes, robbed its bank of \$211,000, killed one of its citizens and wounded several more. In stinging language he told England that she violated neutrality by permitting "the use of British ports and British borders as a base for felonious depredations against the citizens of the United States," and he wrote into history his diplomatic battle against England for letting loose the Alabama to prey upon our commerce, to destroy \$100,000,000 worth of property, to capture eighty-four of our vessels and drive our flag from off the seas. No nation ever inflicted upon another nation a more damnable or more maddening wrong than England inflicted upon the United States in the Alabama outrage.

ASSERTS LINCOLN SETTLED TROUBLE AS WILSON IS TRYING TO END IT TODAY

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

When Pierce was president the British minister in this country and three of his consuls violated our neutrality during the Crimean war. We gave these representatives of Great Britain their passports and sent them home.

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

When Van Buren was president a detachment of Canadian militia, during the internal troubles in Canada, boarded the United States ship Carolina in the American waters of Niagara river, killed an American member of the crew, fired the ship and sent her adrift over Niagara Falls.

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

When Jefferson was president England seized hundreds of our ships and Napoleon hundreds more. From 1793 to 1807 historians say England and France together captured 1,600 American vessels and \$60,000,000 worth of American property. England compelled over 2,000 American seamen to serve against their will in the English navy, and Napoleon ordered the seizure and confiscation of American ships wherever found. Our shipping rotted at every French and British port, our crews were cast into prison and left to die of abuse and neglect. The British ship Leonard fired upon the American cruiser Chesapeake in American waters, killed and wounded several of our sailors, took three native-born American citizens off the Chesapeake and hanged one of them in Halifax.

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

When Adams was president France preyed upon our commerce. She extended her seizure, searches and confiscations to the very waters of the United States themselves until she had piled up in our state department charges of over 2,300 violations of neutrality's law. American ambassadors who sought to adjust these wrongs were refused recognition and openly insulted at the French court. President Adams called Washington out of retirement to head the army, he created the navy department and he built twelve battleships.

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

When Washington was president and "neutrality" first declared, war convulsed Europe, our ships dared not put out to sea, commerce was paralyzed and business depressed. American passengers and American crews were thrown into prison and deprived of legal rights. Genet, the minister from France, fitted out privateers in our harbors, flouted our officials and tried to rally this country to the support of France in return for the help France gave us in the revolutionary war. England and France seized 400 of our ships and confiscated millions of dollars' worth of our property, and up in Quebec Lord Dorchester promised Canadian Indians the pleasure of burning American homes and scalping American citizens.

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

In the face of this record do republicans realize that when they arraign the policy of the Presidents of the United States today they arraign the policy of Harrison, of Blaine, of Lincoln and of Grant? For the pleasure of criticising a democratic president, are they willing to read out of the republican party the greatest men the republican party ever had? Are they willing to say that the republican party of to-

day condemns what Hamilton did in revolutionary days, what Lincoln did in civil war days and what Grant and Blaine and Harrison did but yesterday.

In his policy of peaceful negotiations today the President of the United States follows the example set him by the greatest presidents the democratic party and the greatest presidents the republican party ever gave this nation.

Do the critics of the present administration believe that Lincoln should have risked national disaster by using the sword rather than the pen in pressing the Alabama claims? Are they willing to brand Grant as a coward because he kept us at peace with Spain?

Yet no incident of the present war shows so gross a violation of our neutral rights as England's action in building a navy to prey upon our commerce, no submarine attack surpasses in horror the butchery of American citizens by that Spanish firing squad in Santiago when Grant was in the presidential chair.

In this as in all the other big questions of life the more we understand the past, the better we shall judge the present. Where it took ten years to secure inadequate compensation for the Alabama claim, the present administration has already secured in the case of a single claimant, reparation greater than all the Alabama claims combined. Where, in other administrations during great foreign wars, the American flag was merely an invitation to plunder, today that flag is the best protection of all who desire to be safe upon the seas.

Where Washington vainly pleaded for recognition of our neutral rights, where Jefferson sought in vain to protect our shipping, where Lincoln failed to gain us the freedom of the seas, the man who now sits in the presidential chair has secured from every warring power, from every empire under the sun, the formal and definite assurance that the neutral rights of America shall be respected and observed.

We challenge our critics to deny a single fact in the record. We defy them to show a single point at which the helmsman who has safely piloted us through Europe's storm has departed from the course laid down by those who established America's foreign policy.

"To maintain our national honor by peace if we can, by war if we must," is the motto of the President of the United States.

But before submitting to the chance and misery of war, true statesman that he is, he proposes to put the reason and justice of negotiation to the test. If they are as patriotic as they pretend, those who censure this policy of negotiation may blush from shame to learn that they censure the policy pursued by the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

In the document which made us free, John Hancock and Benjamin Franklin and Charles Carroll and all the other signers declare (I quote their exact words), they declare they "appealed," they declare they "conjured," they declare they "warned," they declare they "reminded" England of our wrongs before we went to war.

Any one can disparage diplomatic procedure, but only men of patience and principle can successfully conduct it.

Just as Rufus King criticised Washington's negotiations with France in the Genet affair, just as the members of John Adams' own cabinet criticised his negotiations which averted war with France, just as Horace Greeley criticised Lincoln; so for personal and political purposes men whose ambitions outrun their sense of justice criticise the negotiations of the President today. But, say our critics, this policy satisfies no one.

They mean it does not satisfy those who would map out a new and untried course for this nation to pursue, but they forget it does satisfy those who believe the United States should live up to the principles it has professed for a century and more.

Chief Justice White of the United States supreme court says this policy has given America the greatest diplomatic victory of the past generation. Maximilian Harden, Germany's noted editor, says "that never once has this republic violated its neutrality," and Gilbert K. Chesterton, the famous English journalist, says, "it is the duty of the President of the United States to protect the interests of the people of the United States," that "he can't dip his country into hell just to show the world he has a keen sense of being an individual savior."

This policy may not satisfy those who revel in destruction and find pleasure in despair. It may not satisfy the fire-eater or the swashbuckler. But it does satisfy those who worship at the altar of the God of Peace. It does satisfy the

mothers of the land at whose hearth and fireside no jingoistic war has placed an empty chair. It does satisfy the daughters of this land from whom bluster and brag has sent no loving brother to the dissolution of the grave. It does satisfy the fathers of this land and the sons of this land who will fight for our flag, and die for our flag when reason primes the rifle, when honor draws the sword, when justice breathes a blessing on the standards they uphold.

"CHIP ON OUR SHOULDER" WOULD MAKE AMERICA THE COCKPIT OF THE WORLD

And whom, we ask, will the policy of our opponents satisfy, and for how long? Fighting for every degree of injury would mean perpetual war, and this is the policy of our opponents, deny it how they will. It would not allow the United States to keep the sword out of the scabbard as long as there remains an unrighted wrong or an unsatisfied hope between the snowy wastes of Siberia and the jungled hills of Borneo. It would make America as dangerous to itself and to others, as destructive and as uncontrollable, as the cannon that slipped its moorings in Victor Hugo's tale of '93. It would give us a war abroad each time the fighting cock of the European weathervane shifted with the breeze. It would make America the cockpit of the world. It would mean the reversal of our traditional policy of government. It would mean the adoption of imperialistic doctrines which we have denounced for over a century. It would make all the other nations the wards of the United States and the United States the keeper of the world. What would become of the Monroe doctrine under such a policy? How long do our opponents suppose we would be allowed to meddle in European affairs while denying Europe the right to meddle in American affairs? The policy of our opponents is a dream. It never could be a possibility. It is not even advanced in good faith; it is simply an appeal to passion and pride, to sympathy and prejudice, to secure partisan advantage. In a word this policy of our opponents would make the United States the policeman of the world. Rome tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Portugal tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Spain tried and went down and the United States proposes to profit by the experience of the ages and avoid ambitions whose reward is sorrow and whose crown is death.

In desperation for a slogan our opponents try to create an issue out of national honor.

Now national honor is not the whim of an individual mind. National honor is the composite sentiment, the composite reason of a whole people feeling the emotions of nature and following the dictates of God.

And it is for this reason that "the power" to declare war is conferred by the constitution of these United States, not on the individual will of the President, but on the composite reason, the representative decision of "the congress of the United States."

Do, then, the Hotspurs of this country mean to proclaim themselves more jealous of our national honor than the framers of the constitution, than Washington or Lincoln? Where, when and from whom did they receive their commission as keepers and interpreters of the honor of this nation? Who gave them a monopoly of the workings of the brain or the emotions of the heart? What mystic faculty do they possess which nature has denied to other men?

They proceed on the theory that the noisiest man in the land is the best patriot.

Fearful within, blustering without, the coward whistles to keep up courage, and hopes the world will read in his face what is not in his heart. The brave man, conscious of what is in his heart and careless of whether or not the world reads it in his face, neither whistles to deceive his neighbors nor publishes his patriotism to win the Pharisee's crown of self-praise.

These noisy critics forget that an appreciation of honor is as elemental in every man as the instinct which calls the flush of rage to the cheek or the blaze of anger to the eye. When the honor of this country is outraged or the glory of its flag is besmirched the man of the street, the toiler in the fields, the artisan in the shops, the man who shouldered his musket and marches away at his country's call will need no one to tell him, no one to show him where duty lies and manhood calls. The men who will do the fighting will not have to be drummed to war—they will summon themselves to battle with the valor of a Jackson and the ardor of a Wayne.

The genius of this country is for peace. Compared with the blood-smear pages of Europe