

Marshall's Speech of Acceptance

[Below is the speech of acceptance of Thomas R. Marshall, democratic candidate for vice-president, at Indianapolis, Ind., September 14, 1916.]

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The years which I have spent in the United States senate have taught me at least humility. I speak, not with authority, but rather as an onlooker, with distinct knowledge that under our system of government my personality is of small moment; with no other desire than to voice my loyalty to my party and my admiration for, and confidence in, its leader, with whom we go to success or failure and to explain briefly why we ought in this campaign to appeal to the average voter who, however loyal he may be to party tradition, feels resting upon his conscience a more compelling duty to the republic.

By 1912, the highway which was supposed to lead from republicans to their officials had been narrowed to a squirrel track known only to the initiated. The right of the rank and file was ratification not consultation. Instead of the republican party remaining the party of the many, it had become the perquisite of the few. A majority of its members, dissatisfied with the men in charge of it, with the measures enacted by them and the methods of their enactment, as yet unwilling to trust the democratic party, courageously declared their secession and formed the progressive party. This movement was organized with as much enthusiasm as any of the Crusades and its campaign was waged along camp-meeting methods. Ignorantly, it trusted its fortunes to a leader who promised that he would lead at Armageddon but who, alas! deserted at Bull Moose Run. This spiritual and political upheaval resulted in the election of Woodrow Wilson to the presidency.

A LEADER THAT TURNED BACK

More than three years of the most fateful history in the annals of mankind have elapsed. Now the leader of the crusade has turned his back on the holy land. As he runs, he cries that the great mission of the progressive party has been accomplished and that it is now time to turn the country over to the very men he condemned. If the mission of the progressive party has been accomplished, then to the democratic party belongs the honor, for what has been written, it has written; what has been done, it has done. Fairness, however, compels the statement that the nomination of Mr. Hughes fulfilled the promise to recall the judiciary. The evangelist has pronounced the benediction and adjourned the camp-meeting sine deo. The highway is again to be narrowed to a squirrel track under the control of the same men against whom and whose methods three-quarters of the American voters solemnly protested four years ago. If proof be needed, look around you anywhere. If they are not upon the ticket or in control of the party machinery, it is the exception, not the rule.

In accordance with custom, the great political parties have nominated candidates and endeavored to present to the people what they are pleased to call the issues of this campaign. These, in ordinary years, would be accepted as the issues. But this is an abnormal year. You can not interest a bridegroom in the tariff nor a widow in the coffin trust. Civilization is turning a corner and the people are more interested in getting around it safely than they are in the character of the load. The American people this year have made their own issue. Those that the parties present may be only side issues. If the side issues square with the main issue, well and good. If not, the people will settle the main issue first, the side issues afterwards. True, we can mourn more sincerely if we be named in the will, but whether a legatee or not the thing to do first is to bury the corpse, then read the will.

So multiform are the thoughts and interests of this people that here and there may be found men interested primarily in the side issues. Chief among them are those republicans who can live, but who do not thrive, out of office. They have become so accustomed to listening to their prophets that they really believe, in the face of the records of 1873, '77, '97 and 1907, that prosperity depends upon republican rule. The present prosperity of the people is therefore the result of

the war and in spite of democratic rule although the war business is a negligible part of the business of this country. So they tender to the voter a side issue phrased somewhat as follows: "Temporary prosperity is not essentially permanent. You may die tomorrow. Prepare to meet your God."

This cry comes from those whose speeches fairly ooze with protestations of their faith in the brotherhood of men. But in the midst of their apostrophes to the flag as the emblem of liberty, fraternity and equality, the far-reaching hand of temporary prosperity clutches them by the throat and chokes them into semi-insensibility while the spectre of a one-legged or a one-armed remnant of the European conflict, a blood brother under God, keeping himself from starvation by selling some article in America rises before them.

Straightway, this brotherhood of men is absorbed into the fatherhood of self. With a shudder these men realize how true it is that temporary prosperity is not permanent. Thank God for His trustees who guard the squirrel track for having discovered this for us before it was too late. What must we do to be saved? Trust the republican soothsayer to answer that the entrails have disclosed that common prudence dictates raising tariff duties so as to prevent the dumping of pauper-made, cripple-made and orphan-made goods upon our market to the detriment of the American working man and that while doing this we should go out and preempt the markets of the world. How, if it be necessary to protect our working men we can capture against these pauper-cripple-orphan-made goods the markets of the world where they may freely enter, eludes the understanding of every intellect save those who blindly worship the Baal of protection.

But the democratic party is a growing — a progressive party. Part of its duty is to quiet the fears of the timid. It proposes that the social and economic justice of the tariff towards the workingman shall have a practical instead of a theoretical test. It waives its ancient views as to a tariff commission, now that the tariff has been lowered and wealth has been made to bear its fair proportion of the burdens of government, and it proposes to ascertain the real purchasing difference between the wage here and abroad, and to put that difference into the tariff schedule, if needed, which I doubt, and provided that the manufacturer agrees that the difference shall go into the pay envelopes and not into dividends. What the republicans used to fool, we shall use to cheer, the weary hearts of labor.

PANICS NO LONGER DREADED

Who now wants to hear about the banking and currency system of this country? The honest business man no longer dreads a panic nor doubts that with good security his credit will remain indefinitely unimpaired. Who longer denies that government should protect both person and property, and that each should contribute to that end? Who, then, would repeal the income tax amendment, which was "too broad" to suit the republican candidate for president when advising the New York legislature? Who now thinks that it would be better to let the careless or semi-dishonest business man run on until he has involved himself in the toils of the criminal law rather than by advice, admonition and reproof from the Federal Trade commission keep him in the ways of fair and honest business dealing? Who objects that in the exercise of its peace-preparing and war-making power, congress has seen fit to provide for the erection of powder, armor-plate and nitrate plants rather than to trust this entire business to private patriotism? Who would not have the government engage temporarily in shipping rather than have the country return to the old slavish customs of the sea? Who balks at good roads, rural credits, agricultural education and federal aid for the betterment in every way of men and conditions?

All these measures received more or less support from members of the minority who did not have faith in the trustees and who would not guard or walk the squirrel track. These enactments have had but one object — the common weal. A referendum upon them would poll a larger percentage of favorable republican votes

than they received in the halls of congress. A changed administration would not dare to repeal a single one of them.

What then is the ground upon which the republican party bases its hopes of a return to power? Surely not upon anything which it says it would have done or will do. It carefully conceals from the voter any view upon the real issue of the campaign while it seeks by insinuation to provoke a prejudice against the President. The real issue of this campaign is that thought which goes with the father to his work or business, which engrosses every mother, wife and sweetheart, which sits down with them at every fireside and goes to bed with them in every home—and that thought is, "Can the President of the United States continue to so patiently manage our international affairs as to maintain honorable peace?"

SCORES REPUBLICAN ATTITUDE

And what is the attitude of republicans toward this issue? In the halls of congress I hear the President daily assaulted as a tyrant such as American history has not hitherto recorded. From the stump I hear him proclaimed as a weak and vacillating man. One assaults him because he did not go to war when Belgium was invaded, and another because the Lusitania was sunk, while a third condemns him as being pro-ally merely because he and the German Emperor agreed upon the rules that govern neutral nations in time of war. Racial pride and church loyalty are given to understand that he has not considered them. It is hinted that he should have done so, but his detractors have not the courage to say that the republican party will decide between races or churches or which race or church it will prefer.

Before we are beguiled by any of this, we have a right to demand categorical answers to these questions: Would the republican party, if it had been in power have declared war when Germany entered Belgium or when the Lusitania was submarined; or because the allies have violated the rights of neutral trade? Will the republican party, if it comes into power, intervene in Mexico? Is there anything in the constitution which prevents the congress of the United States from declaring war without seeking the advice of the President? What views did the republican party in the congress of the United States entertain with reference to Belgium, to the Lusitania, to the blacklist and to the Mexican situation? Why, if it was displeased with the conduct of the President of the United States, did it not offer resolutions upon one or more of these subjects and place itself upon record? What does the republican candidate for president think he would have done or would do?

And here are questions for the people to answer before they decide how they will vote. Do you have much faith in a candidate, who in the most awful cataclysm of civilization, assaults, for mere party supremacy, a patient and patriotic President for acts of omission and commission and yet is not courageous enough to say what he would have done under the circumstances or to make any promises as to his future conduct? What do you think of an organization which seeks to foment trouble among our own citizens for partisan purposes with the certain knowledge that the warring nations of the world will be impressed with the idea that we are a divided people and that they may freely violate the laws of neutrality without fear of either punishment or reparation? Are you dissatisfied with present conditions? Are you willing to be plunged into war which may sacrifice the best blood of the republic, rend us into factions which decades may not again reunite, and dissipate the resources of the most prosperous and contented people on earth for the cooling of the hot blood of some few men who have gotten too close to the conflagration to remain calm and self-poised Americans? Don't you know that the one thing which would have rendered the re-election of the President a certainty would have been to engage in war? Do you want to punish him for the peace which comes at eventide like a benediction upon every home and for her handmaiden, plenty, which cheers and warms our hearts?

LOYALTY CONSTITUTES THE AMERICAN

But, those who criticise, say the President is an infirm American. Now it so happens in this country not birth nor religion, but loyalty to America constitutes the American. Any blood and any faith and any party that assaults an