

the jingoes and war traffickers would frighten the country into the belief that we have a little, puny, egg-shell of a navy!

The five-year naval program calls for AN INCREASE of \$500,000,000 — \$100,000,000 INCREASE a year—which, including the inevitable incidental expenses for expanding the whole naval establishment in order to accommodate the program, will reach \$600,000,000 or over by the time the five years expires!! This is all EXTRA—IN ADDITION TO the large appropriations we have been annually making.

The army four-year program demands \$450,000,000 INCREASE, over \$100,000,000 a year EXTRA, being an INCREASE of MORE THAN 100 per cent OVER OUR annual army appropriations! ALL EXTRA APPROPRIATIONS, be it remembered, EXTRA TAXES MUST BE PAID BY THE PEOPLE, BE IT REMEMBERED!

Before leaving the subject of the enormity of the proposed program, I desire to make a further observation:

At the expiration of the five-year period for the program this country will then be EXPENDING ON ITS ARMY AND NAVY MORE THAN ANY NATION IN THE WORLD in TIMES OF PEACE EVER EXPENDED ON ITS ARMY AND NAVY; more than England, with her navalism, more than Russia or Germany, with their huge militarism. At the beginning of the European war Germany was expending for past wars and preparations for wars (on its army and navy) 55 per cent of the total amount of revenues collected, Japan 45 per cent; Great Britain 37 per cent; France 35 per cent; THE UNITED STATES OVER 60 PER CENT. With the proposed MILITARY AND NAVAL PROGRAM ENACTED into law the UNITED STATES WILL BE EXPENDING OVER 70 per cent of ITS TOTAL REVENUES—that is, out of every \$100.00 COLLECTED FROM THE PEOPLE OVER \$70.00 WILL GO INTO MILITARISM AND NAVALISM, including pensions leaving LESS THAN \$30.00 FOR ALL OTHER FUNCTIONS OF OUR GOVERNMENT and FOR ALL OTHER BENEFITS OF THE PEOPLE.

### 3.—AS TO THE CONDITION OF OUR TREASURY AND ITS REVENUES AND EXTRA TAXATION REQUIRED

The condition of our treasury and our revenue and the necessities of the government are less able now to permit increased appropriations than ever before. The treasury has felt most heavily the burden of the present war. Our general surplus fund of over \$150,000,000 is monthly disappearing; our deficits are annual and monthly; our revenues have diminished; we have strained the nerves of the government to get sufficient revenue to meet its ordinary expenses; we have been forced to levy an emergency tax; our deficits still exist; our revenues still insufficient. After the expiration of the present emergency tax December 31, 1915, we will be faced with deficits for the coming year of at least \$117,000,000. This is upon the assumption that not a dollar of increased appropriation will be made for any purpose over the last year's appropriation (yet I understand that there will be from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 increase asked other than the army and navy increase). This \$117,000,000 deficit is upon the further assumption that congress will repeal the sugar free list provision of the Underwood act, which goes into effect May 1st, 1916 (which itself will impose \$100,000,000 burden upon the people). For this program of militarism and navalism—euphoniously called by its advocates "national defense" or "preparedness" program—\$200,000,000 annual increase of taxation IS REQUIRED. This, added to the deficit above mentioned, makes \$317,000,000 additional annual taxation, (even with the free sugar clause repealed), which must be raised, on the assumption, too, there will not be a dollar increase in any other appropriation over that of last year. This is THREE TIMES LARGER ANNUAL INCREASE THAN WAS EVER REQUIRED OR RAISED (and practically all of it must be raised by direct or excise taxes) THAN AT ANY TIME IN THE HISTORY OF OUR GOVERNMENT, except during the Civil war. No man in the administration or in the Ways and Means committee, although for months they have wearied their wits over it, has yet been able to solve even the beginning of the problem of raising this enormous increase of revenue. I have had hundreds of suggestions as to how to raise it. All the suggestions combined would not begin to raise the amount. Every suggestion has been, however, to raise the tax on the other fellow and on the other fellow's business or prod-

uct and not on his. When the Ways and Means committee beings to attempt to frame measures for raising the revenue, and especially when the people begin to pay the taxes for this enormous increase, they will then, perhaps, realize what the program means. I have had experience enough with taxation to know that those who are howling most loudly now for the big army and navy program will protest and howl most wildly against any measure which may be attempted or proposed for increase of taxes.

### 4.—THE BIG, OVERREACHING OBJECTION TO THE PROGRAM

The huge burden, heretofore unheard of or undreamed of, which this fabulous increase of appropriations for the army and navy will place upon the tax-payers can, and will have to be borne, in spite of their murmurs and protests, which will surely come in the future. This of itself to me is a cruel wrong, especially under the conditions and situation of our country and our navy, as I have above outlined.

But the big, overreaching objection to this stupendous program is that this sudden, radical and revolutionary move for big war preparation on our part is going to shock the civilized world, and whatever be the outcome of the present war, will alarm the world again into an armed camp. It will postpone for generations the day of universal peace for which all Christendom has been praying. It will deprive this government, through its President, of the greatest opportunity to serve mankind that ever came to nation or to man, in the final negotiation of peace terms among the belligerents, to lay the basis of perpetual international peace.

The militarists and war traffickers of every nation in the world will point to our conduct as an example and cause why big war preparations and big armaments should be renewed on a larger scale than ever before and its consummation will only be limited by the ability of the nations appealed to. If we take this step every nation will suspect—in fact, every nation will feel convinced, and no argument of our government can dissipate such conviction that our country in this tremendous step has other designs than mere self-defense. Every nation will absolutely know that no such step or measure is necessary. The world will be convinced, in spite of our protestations, that we are preparing, as the Seven Seas Magazine, the organ of the Navy league, declared in its last issue that we should prepare for "WARS OF CONQUEST." This organ of this so-called patriotic society in its same issue boldly broadcasts throughout our country the savage, barbarous sentiment which I quote, "There should be NO DOUBT THAT EVEN WITH ALL POSSIBLE MORAL REFINEMENTS IT IS THE ABSOLUTE RIGHT of a nation to live to its fullest intensity, to expand, TO FOUND COLONIES, TO GET RICHER AND RICHER BY ANY PROPER MEANS, SUCH AS ARMED CONQUEST. Such expansion AS AN AIM IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT and IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES IT IS A PARTICULAR DUTY." This organ of the Navy league, the organization, as I said before, which has, by organized effort, created the sentiment of our people for a big militarism and navalism, is but giving the people of this country and of the world an earnest of what we are to expect when this program is enacted into law.

The world, even among the belligerents of the present war, is already looking with grave suspicion and alarm upon this colossal step. Since writing the above, in confirmation of it, the morning papers bring to us the speech of Lord Rosebery, made at the London university on the night of November the 16th, from which I quote: "I know nothing more disheartening than the announcement recently made that the United States—the one great country left in the world free from the hideous, bloody burden of war—is about to EMBARK UPON THE BUILDING OF A HUGE ARMADA. IT MEANS THAT THE BURDEN WILL CONTINUE UPON THE OTHER NATIONS, and BE INCREASED EXACTLY IN PROPORTION TO THE FLEET OF THE UNITED STATES. I confess that it is a disheartening prospect that the United States, so remote from European conflicts, should voluntarily in these days take up the burden, which, after this war, will be found to have broken, or almost broken, our backs."

### 5.—AS TO THE FEARS OF OUR PEOPLE:

In the hope of allaying to some extent the alarmed state of mind and the fears of our people, provoked by the European war, and aggravated and intensified by the organized efforts of

the so-called "patriotic societies" and the war traffickers, I desire to make a few observations. With the experience of the present war, which we are daily observing, even if our fleet were not half as big as it is (and I have shown that it is superior to that of any other nation in the world, except that of Great Britain), it would be impossible, notwithstanding the jingoes and the war traffickers and the press, for Germany or any other country to ever bombard or land a soldier on our coast, provided we were equipped with mines and submarines. With these we are most rapidly equipping ourselves. England has a navy two and one-half times as strong as that of Germany. England and France have a fleet more than three times as strong as that of Germany. Take a map and you will see that the German seacoast on the North sea is practically at the head of the English channel, within less than 300 miles of London, and has several miles of seacoast along the Baltic. The bulk of the English and French fleet is now, and has been, within less than a day's run of the German coast. If England could bombard or land on the coast of Germany, on the North sea or on the Baltic sea, the war would end in sixty days. Germany would have to withdraw from France to protect her own soil. Why does not the fleet of the Allies, nearly four times as strong, go in and destroy the little fleet of Germany, bombard her seacoast at once, land an army, etc.? Certainly not because of a little German fleet already bottled up, one-fourth as large, but BECAUSE OF MINES AND SUBMARINES. Now, look at the map again and see how the Russian coast and the German coast compare and how they adjoin along the Baltic sea; Germany has control of the Baltic, even against the fleet of the Allies. Germany has a fleet four times as large as that of Russia. What keeps Germany away from the Russian coast? Why doesn't Germany, with a fleet four times as strong, destroy the Russian fleet, bombard her seaport towns and land an army? If she could do this, the war would end in sixty days.

Russia would be forced to a separate peace in spite of her agreement with the Allies. Certainly it is not the little one-fourth size fleet she has, but BECAUSE OF MINES AND SUBMARINES. If Germany, with her fleet not one-third as strong as that of the Allies, does not fear the bombardment of her coast or the landing of an army by the Allies, when within less than 200 miles, and if Russia, with her little fleet one-fourth as large as that of Germany, is not afraid of Germany bombarding her coast and landing an army on her shores, why in the name of common sense, should any man, woman or child in the United States fear that Germany or any other nation can ever get within gun reach of our shores or land an army on our coast, when they are over 3,000 miles away, provided we are equipped with mines and submarines? Add one thing further, that, in spite of the press, the "patriotic societies" and the jingoes and war traffickers, our coast defenses are superior to that of any nation in the world. President Taft, in his speech in Chicago, November 10th, before the National Security league, said: "American coast defenses are as good as any in the world." At the hearings in the last session of congress (this year) General Erasmus M. Weaver, chief of coast artillery, whose duty it is, he said, to "be advised as to the character and sufficiency of our sea coast armament," stated "My information is that our system of fortification is REASONABLY ADEQUATE FOR ALL DEFENSIVE PURPOSES WHICH THEY ARE LIKELY TO BE CALLED UPON TO MEET"; and further said, "I HAVE BEEN A CLOSE STUDENT OF THE WHOLE SUBJECT NATURALLY FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS and I KNOW OF NO FORTIFICATIONS IN THE WORLD, AS FAR AS MY READING, OBSERVATION AND KNOWLEDGE GOES, THAT COMPARE FAVORABLY IN EFFICIENCY WITH OURS." General Crozier, chief of ordnance, considered one of the greatest experts in the country on fortifications and guns, at the hearings, considering the alterations then asked for and now being made, said "In my opinion these guns with other advantages which our land-defense fortifications have, WILL BE ADEQUATE FOR MAINTAINING A SUCCESSFUL COMBAT WITH VESSELS OF WAR ARMED WITH ANY GUN WHICH IS NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD TO MY KNOWLEDGE."

### 6.—AS TO THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND MYSELF

We thoroughly understand each other. I know that he is convinced deeply and sincerely