

Dawes Declares Issue Today Is Red Flag Against Stars and Stripes

Europe, Tax Cut, Theme of Address

Nominee Flays Radicalism, Demagogic Politicians; Sees Traditions of Forefathers Threatened by Unrest.

Sees World Court Need

I accept the nomination of the republican party for the office of vice president, of which you now formally notify me.

The formal notification of the candidates of the political parties has established the custom of discussion by them of the issues of the campaign.

This is a campaign of domestic issues, and in the campaign I shall try to discuss them fully, but I cannot cover them all in one speech and say what I want to say. Political issues in the United States have become too serious to trifle with, and its citizens realize it.

The discussion of facts and truth is demanded, and that takes time. This is a campaign of brass-tacks—not bombast.

This administration has reduced the cost of governmental operation, and it was not an accident. It did this by firmly assuming executive control of the business organization of government and by hard work—not by oratory. As a result, under only new tax-law, approximately \$6,000,000 per day less for national purposes, will be collected in 1925 from the taxpayers, than for the fiscal year of 1921, and our public debt has been reduced during the budget years, under this administration, in the sum of \$2,722,396,311.49.

In 1921, the least pre-budget year of the cost of government collected in national, state, and municipal taxes, after debt payments, our federal expenditures were 59 per cent and those of the states, cities and towns, 41 per cent, but in 1923 the federal government took only 28 per cent of the taxes, and 72 per cent was spent by the states, cities, and towns.

U. S. Expenses Down

Other Expenses Going Up.

These figures indicate that in the matter of economy and tax reduction, the federal government is headed in the right direction, and most of the states, cities, and towns of our country in the wrong direction.

The administration, in lowering the enormous amount of federal taxation, has lessened the drain from the pockets of the people and from the capital actively employed in productive industry.

President Coolidge, with fearless common sense and full knowledge of the facts and circumstances surrounding important decisions, endeavors to do the right and wise thing in the interests of the nation, unswayed by motives of political expediency. He courageously recommended the recognition of right principles in the tax reduction bill, indifferent to the demagogues who represent to the unthinking that those who lightened the burden on their backs sought to betray them in the method of unloading. But statesmanship, braving temporary criticism and misrepresentation of right purpose, is always decorated with the eventual vindication which comes with full understanding on the part of the public.

This subject of public economy, the subject of relief from taxation, and of an adequate tariff for the protection of our national prosperity, I will discuss upon other occasions. The non-partisan and economic agricultural question is a national question of such vital importance and so affecting national welfare, that it demands fuller consideration than is here possible. I shall discuss it in my speech at Lincoln, Neb., on August 2.

I will therefore cover, however shortly, in this speech of acceptance, only three issues: one which I deem of the utmost importance, and two others—the league of nations and the world court.

It is in the heart and conscience of our people that great issues are defined, and politicians align on them, but have little to do with selecting them. A formidable attack has been launched on the fundamental principles of our constitution, and elemental things like this must be fought out.

Dangerous Radicalism Against Constitution Government. One party—the republican party, the party of progressive conservatism, under the leadership of President Coolidge, has taken its stand firmly upon the constitution of the United States and all know where it stands. Opposed to it, and in reality its chief opponent, though the result of the effort may be to deadlock the contest for the presidency and make Bryanism succeed the Coolidge policy, is a movement of untried and dangerous radicalism.

With a platform drawn by one man, designed to soften as much as possible the apprehensions as to what the movement really means, an attempt is made to induce those who are patriotic at heart but disconcerted with existing conditions, to join with the socialists and other diverse elements opposing the existing order of things, in a mobilization of extreme radicalism. A man is known by the company he keeps.

In the words of the Associated Press of July 7: "The national convention of the socialist party of America formally enrolled under the La Follette presidential banner." What is this banner which confronts the flag of the United States, upheld by President Coolidge and his platform? In answer, I quote from the same dispatch of the Associated Press, from a telegram sent by Eugene V. Debs, reading in part: "I think it wise for our party to make no nominations under the circumstances, but at the same time to

hold the socialist party intact, adhere rigidly to its principles and keep the red flag flying."

Says the Associated Press further: "The Debs sentiment echoed the opinions expressed in the debate by such party leaders as Morris Hillquit of New York, Representative Victor Berger of Wisconsin, and Mayor Daniel Hoan of Milwaukee." Here is the battle alignment and here are the flags.

Lying between these two armies of progressive conservatism and of radicalism, which are properly aligned upon this issue in the minds and consciences of the American people, is the republican party, with one conservative and one radical candidate on its ticket, hoping to get votes by avoiding the issue.

Democrats Going Both Ways

Fate Same as All Who Straddle.

In this situation, for which the American people alone are responsible, the democratic party, as a party, instead of recruiting itself from the two battle lines, will suffer only the fate which befalls those who try to straddle in a real fight.

We are face to face with an abnormal condition in this country, existing because of lack of respect for law, caused in part by widespread demagoguery in legislative bodies, in part by the weakness of many of those commissioned to execute the law, and in part by the existence and activities of aggressive minority organizations behind selfish purposes.

In congress, during the last few years, the American citizen has heard more demagogic utterances than have ever before characterized it. He has seen men running for congress and the senate, advocating in the same state at the same time, and irrespective of their inconsistency, increased wages for railroad labor and decreased railroad rates, and higher prices for beef on the hoof and lower prices for beef on the table.

It is not too much to say that from the average candidate for office, in either party, we must accept either evasion or doctrine designed to please him and appeal to his prejudices, irrespective of whether or not it tends to plunge the whole country into disaster.

He has seen the disposition on the part of the political leaders and office holders to condone in minority organizations, acts of lawlessness. He has witnessed the stealing on the part of the candidates, of the habits of a conservative party for election purposes, and then, after election, the betrayal of that party to those arrayed against fundamental principles of the constitution.

The average man, with his sense of fair play, despises and condemns the man who catches votes under false pretenses, and he feels that the desire of politicians to get votes in this way is endangering the fundamentals of this great republic.

Principles Our Fathers Won Are Now At Stake.

As the enemies of the existing order of things group themselves for battle, the average good citizen knows that the elemental principles for which his forefathers fought are at stake.

He demands a strong leadership, standing on the constitution, and moving forward with law and order, common sense and high purpose, to combat strong leadership tending towards disintegration.

He has this in Calvin Coolidge and the platform on which he stands. Neither President Coolidge nor his party platform assumes that the constitution of the United States is an outworn document of old-fashioned ideas, to be discarded for the principles of the new socialism.

Robert M. La Follette, leading the army of extreme radicalism, has a platform demanding public ownership of railroads and attacking our courts which are a fundamental and constitutional safeguard of American citizens.

Our nation is asked to leave important constitutional moorings to embark again into those contests through which the establishment of government. Through the war of the Revolution, through the Civil war, and through the World war, our people have struggled to establish and maintain our constitutional principles.

They are asked to follow into an attack upon them, massed behind an aggressive personality, a heterogeneous collection of those opposing the existing order of things, the greatest section of which, the socialists, flies the red flag; and into what?

Into confusion and conflict of ideas and ideals and into the reopening of war upon those fundamental principles of human liberty and the inalienable rights of men which are existing in this country safety and opportunity to the humblest, and to establish which the blood of our forefathers was shed. This is the predominant issue in this campaign.

The league of nations, however noble may have been its intentions, was not approved by the people of the United States because it did not make clear to their minds that it did not encroach upon the sovereignty, and the power and right of independent decision of the United States, as to its own duty and action under all circumstances.

While many men, after study, believed that the league of nations did not encroach upon the sovereignty and right of independent decision of the United States, the fact that there was a just doubt as to this stamped the plan as one which could not be accepted by the citizens of the United States.

as an act of cowardice. Upon what theory was it an act of cowardice? If the work of that mission was not now recognized as having been of some assistance, or if the experts' plan had signally failed to offer anything of value to the world, President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes would have been denounced as men who had humiliated their country instead of endeavoring to put it in its proper and helpful place with its fearlessness which should adorn strength and the Christian purpose which should glorify it?

If the president and the secretary of state had evaded this duty and precipitated the question of official representation for debate, delay, and non-action, into the United States senate, the United States would have had no part in the last desperate but successful effort to find a common ground of agreement for a new peace in the world, if indeed, but for their action, there would have been any agreement at all.

Had it not been for this attitude of President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes toward the expert committee, Europe might not today be facing away from the chaos and hatred of war. With the experts' plan inaugurated, France, England, Germany, Italy, Belgium, and all Europe turn toward a new and peaceful life, with hope and happiness rather than despair, in their hearts and prosperity ahead. The United States will be saved from the depths of an inevitable and great depression in industry and agriculture which the continued chaos and misery of Europe would entail. Indeed the whole world enters upon a period of peace and prosperity.

Under President Harding and President Coolidge, again, in pursuance of this constructive foreign policy, there has been urged upon the nation membership in the world court. What a confused mass of argument, pro and con, as to our entrance into the world court, has been created, not only by the political demagogues but by some profoundly wise men! What, again, are the fundamental propositions which will determine eventual public sentiment in the matter of our adherence to the world court? As I said before, the people have in their minds principally but two things in regard to our foreign policy: first, they do not want any impairment of the right of sovereignty of the United States or its right to make a decision as to its own interests, by itself; and second, with that settled, they want the United States to do its duty in its international relations.

But in the propositions of President Coolidge in connection with the world court, there is safeguarded the sovereignty of the United States and its interests.

In the fog of the argument to which the people of the United States are asked to listen on this subject, they want to keep clearly in mind that even when we join the world court we are not compelled to submit a case to it if we do not wish to do so. If any particular case is one where our national interests seem to forbid legal arbitration, we are not bound to resort to the court. Be-

cause we help build the courthouse, we do not have to try any cases in it, unless at the time, in any particular case, we desire to do it.

But we must remember that sometimes when a house is built, it may be a very convenient thing to go into to avoid rain and lightning. Yes, and probably avoid the thunder-bolts of war! It is to our national interests and the interests of the world to have a court to use if its use is mutually desired by two nations in a given case.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

These simple thoughts upon the world court and the obligations which we would assume by adherence to it are sufficient to relieve us from any fears of that bogymen and the smoke-screens thrown up from behind political fences by the man who would drag this question of high purpose, of clear, simple, and plain duty, into the mire of political demagoguery. International problems are always susceptible of clear statement when thoughts of political expediency as to form of statement cease to be the desire to plainly set forth truth.

Here we are, the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth, possessing the capacity for world leadership. There may be people in the United States who fear that our representatives, when sent abroad, are not the peers, in patriotism and sense of duty, in ability and independence of character, of those whom they meet; they may believe that we should have a "crawfish" foreign policy; but the great majority feel that to whatever conference in foreign matters, which involves the interests of the United States, our representatives may be sent, they will ably and fearlessly uphold the honor of the American people and the American flag.

The American people are a proud people. They will tolerate no leadership which will surrender a lot of their independence or sovereignty to any other nation or combination of nations. Such an action on the part of any of our representatives would be regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. But the man misjudges the temper and the fiber of American citizenship who maintains that it is not as fearless in trusting its representatives in any conflict of peace as it is in trusting its youth behind the flag in war.

To resort morally to a policy of national isolation rather than cleanly to contest in those mental battlefields in which questions must be solved for the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad—is that the temper of the American people? I think not!

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the world's good. It offers the only policy, which, at the present time, means the possibility of accomplishment.

In the matter of our foreign policy, therefore, the two major parties, in their platforms, have made an issue to be decided by the American people.

The democratic party asks them to turn back with them into the morass of the debate on the league of nations, through a public referendum, thereby paralyzing the hope of constructive action and policy in this time of an existing world crisis.

The republican party asks them to abandon the debate upon the question of the league of nations, which they have already decided, and to stand by the common sense and constructive foreign policy of President Coolidge and the republican party, which is placing the United States in that proud position of world leadership for which she has been designed by providence and from which she can be debarrd only by reversal to political expediency.

The republican platform on foreign relations outlines a policy which, carried out with the common sense, clear vision, and courage of Calvin Coolidge offers the American people a constructive course of honor, safety, and progress, for its own and the