

that only the first one. Three votes were cast against the second, and only one against the third; the rest went through without opposition. And yet, I remind you, that the republican candidate for President has had no time to in-dorse a peace policy that goes farther than any other peace policy has gone.

Now, this is the record that you repudiate if you vote the republican ticket. Will you weigh these splendid achievements and then say to the President: We are not satisfied with what you have done. We want to go back into the mire with the reactionary party that had control before your administration began?

THE MEXICAN QUESTION

But, even if you were disposed to repudiate everything President Wilson has done in the matter of domestic policies, you must remember that your votes decide another question, and that is your attitude toward his dealings with foreign nations. I call your attention first to the Mexican situation, and ask you to remember that that did not commence under this administration. It came as an inheritance from the Taft administration.

Huerta seized control of the government of Mexico in February, before the President took the oath of office in March, and there is on file at Washington a telegram that was sent by Huerta to President Taft, saying "I have overthrown this government." When Mr. Taft writes his recollections he will not put that down as a high compliment paid to him by the executive of another nation. The very fact that Mr. Huerta sent such a telegram to the President of this nation is an indication that we had an ambassador there who ought never to have been appointed to such an office. Huerta would hardly have sent that telegram if he had not had some assurance that it would be cordially received at Washington.

Who was Huerta? He was head of the army under President Madero, and, while the trusted subordinate of the president, he turned traitor and, by an act of high treason that would have justified his execution in any civilized country in the world, made a prisoner of his president. Then, while he was in his custody as prisoner, Huerta either caused him to be assassinated or permitted his assassination. Huerta then seized the government, dissolved congress and proceeded to establish a despotism. And the President was asked to recognize this man as president of Mexico! Republican leaders insisted that he ought to be recognized, and the first speech Mr. Hughes made bears no other interpretation so well as that he intended to say that Huerta ought to have been recognized. Since then he has explained that he did not mean to say whether he ought to be recognized or not. If he wants an issue, a sure enough one, just let him say that the President ought to have recognized Huerta! Why, my friends, if the President has only done one good thing in all his administration, that one good thing was his refusal to give sanction to the claims of this man who secured his office by treason, if not by murder. Recognition would have set a premium on assassination throughout Latin America. Had Huerta secured the recognition of President Wilson he could have gone into the markets of the world, and borrowed the money necessary to equip an army with which to kill off anybody who wanted to improve conditions in Mexico.

A vast majority of the American people approve of President Wilson's refusal to recognize Huerta as president of Mexico. Mr. Hughes says that the President interfered in the politics of Mexico when he told Huerta that he could not run for president. That is not what the President said; what the President said was that it would not do him any good to run, because he would not be recognized as President, even if he did elect himself at a sham election controlled by his soldiers. What else could the President have said? If he could not recognize him when he seized the government, he could hardly recognize him as the result of an election such as he held.

While Mr. Hughes charges the President with interfering in the politics of Mexico, he has never said a word about the republican ambassador who permitted Huerta and Diaz to use the American embassy to form a conspiracy to overthrow a government to which our ambassador was accredited. We found in the papers of the embassy a copy of the contract made in the

embassy, by which Mr. Huerta was to be provisional president, upon the overthrow of the government, and then Diaz was to have the privilege of running for president.

If Mr. Hughes is really in earnest in not wanting us to interfere in Mexican politics, he should criticize the republican ambassador instead of the President.

INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

But the recognition of Huerta is no longer an issue. Huerta is dead. Mr. Hughes, even if elected, could not call him back and support him in the exercise of arbitrary authority. But intervention is a continuing menace, and the people are more interested in deciding whether this government should intervene in Mexico. To act intelligently on this subject we must know, first, what intervention would mean and, second, the real force behind the demand for intervention.

Intervention would mean a war with Mexico, the end of which no one could see, the cost of which no one could calculate, and a sacrifice of human life no one could estimate. It would also mean the sowing of the seeds of hatred in a sister republic, which would live for an hundred years, and the loss of the fruits of half a century's effort to establish confidence and friendship between us and the republics of Central and South America. And who asks for intervention? The real force behind this demand is the capital invested in mines and ranches and other development work in Mexico. Mr. Hughes will not dare to declare openly for intervention, but he uses language which the advocates of intervention construe to support their demand.

Let me state the objection to intervention. Intervention would mean a resort to war—THE KILLING OF HUMAN BEINGS ON BOTH SIDES—to advance the fortunes of speculators who, not satisfied with returns on investments in the United States, go abroad in search of larger profits. They buy property AT A PRICE WHICH TAKES ALL THE UNCERTAINTIES INTO CONSIDERATION and then ask this government to draw on the people who ARE content to invest in this country, for the blood and money necessary to guarantee speculative profits under other flags. Intervention would be followed by a demand for annexation because annexation would multiply the value of American investments in Mexico. Those who have investments in Mexico and who, THINKING MORE OF THEIR OWN ENRICHMENT THAN THEY DO OF THE WELFARE OF THEIR COUNTRY, are willing to plunge this nation into war with Mexico, may feel justified in voting for Hughes, but the rest of the people ought to vote for Wilson and be grateful that the President, in this as in other matters, has taken the side of the many against the selfish demands of the few.

In the position taken the President has not disregarded the rights of Americans having investments in Mexico. War is not the only way to protect investments in a foreign land. We do not resort to killing to determine property rights in this country. Americans whose holdings in Mexico have suffered because of internal disorders in that country will have redress when order is restored—just as citizens in this country have redress at law. What more can rightfully be demanded? Are speculators entitled to more consideration abroad than they would have at home?

Our government is still paying for damage caused by our Civil war, although it ended over fifty years ago; why should Mexico be expected to pay all damages within three or four years?

The republican who criticizes the President for not dragging the country into war with Mexico ought to furnish a list of the sons he is willing to sacrifice for the enrichment of American speculators.

THE WAR IN EUROPE

And now let us consider the remaining international question. Some demand that this government take part in the European war. Mr. Roosevelt seems to think, AFTER REFLECTION, that we ought to do so. He did not think so at the time, but the more he thinks about Belgium the madder he gets. When the question first arose he did not protest against the President's course, but he may not have understood then the political advantage to be gained. Now he is very much inflamed about Belgium. Well, if any one tells you we ought to have gone to war over the violation of Belgium's neutrality,

ask him when he reached this conclusion. If he says just recently, you might quote to him a part of Demosthenes' oration on the crown. You know the greatest blow Demosthenes struck Aeschines in that wonderful oration was: "You were there when I proposed these things, did you know THEN that my proposals were not wise? If so, why were you not patriotic enough to speak out and propose wiser things? If you did not know then that these things were not wise, why do you speak now?" Mr. Roosevelt was alive then and in politics. He knew what was done. If the President was wrong then, why did he not speak out? And if he did not know then, that the President was wrong, why does he not keep still now?

Some want us to go into this war. They had a meeting in Boston not long ago, and another meeting in New York. Speakers at these meetings said it was our duty to enter this war. Well, if Mr. Hughes thinks so, he should announce his opinion and we will have another live issue upon which the people can pass judgment.

What is this war: This is a war without a parallel, without a precedent in all history. They have killed three millions in this war. Five millions have been taken prisoners; ten millions have been wounded. That is what this war has cost in life and suffering. And in money? They are spending every week four hundred millions,—that is what it cost us to build the Panama canal. Since this war began they have spent enough killing each other to build an hundred Panama canals, and they have added more than forty billions of dollars to the world's indebtedness. The new war debts contracted to carry on this war are now greater than all the war debts that had come down from all the wars of history to the beginning of this war! Five hundred years from now little children will be born into Europe with their necks under a yoke of debt that this generation has fastened on posterity! And yet some people say we ought to go into this war! They tell us that our honor requires it. Oh, my countrymen, there is no honor that we can preserve or secure, by going into this war that is comparable with the honor to which we can attain if we can but persuade these warring nations to turn like prodigal sons from the husks on which they have fed; if we can but lift them out of the bloody mire in which they are fighting, up to a plane where they can join us in building a peace that will endure on love and brotherhood!

We are the greatest of the neutral nations, and the world is looking to us to act as mediators when the time for mediation comes; but if we go into this war, no matter what the reason, no matter what the excuse, we must turn over to some other nation an opportunity that never before came to any nation since time began. And we are the next of kin to all the nations that are at war; they are bone of our bone and blood of our blood. Not a soldier falls on any battlefield of Europe but that the wail of sorrow in his home finds an echo at some American fireside, and these people have a right to expect that we will remain the friend of all, and in God's good time play the part of friend. Some nation must lift the world out of this black night or war, and that honor should come to our nation. More glorious than any page of history that has yet been written will be that page that will record our nation's claim to the promise made to the peacemakers.

The world is waiting for us to lead the way from the blood-stained precedents of the past out into the larger and the brighter day, and if I know the heart of the American people they are not willing that this supreme opportunity shall pass by unimproved. This, I believe, is the task that God, in his wisdom, has reserved for the United States.

When this opportunity comes, and God grant that its coming may not long be delayed, some president is to be the world's mediator. Some president will write his name in letters of living light across the pages of history; is it fair to call in a new man who has not borne the burden or felt the responsibility? Is it fair to give this honor to one who has not had a word of commendation or encouragement for the President, but, instead, only scolding, fault-finding and criticism? The American people feel that they owe it to this President to reward him with this great honor for having preserved peace in the western hemisphere while the old world is drenched in human blood. We present him as our candidate, WOODROW WILSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.