

Army and Navy Expenditures of the Principal World Powers

Congressman Mondell, of Wyoming, in a speech in the house December 17, 1915, gave the following figures showing the expenditure for the armies and navies of the world:

TOTAL ARMY EXPENDITURES, 1901-1912	TOTAL NAVAL EXPENDITURES, 1901-1912	GRAND TOTALS FOR ARMY AND NAVY, 1901-1912
United States \$1,616,898,165	United States \$1,331,821,032	United States \$2,984,719,197
Germany 1,756,453,041	Germany 354,055,078	Germany 2,110,508,119
France 1,774,631,558	France 789,242,168	France 2,563,873,726
Great Britain 2,486,126,900	Great Britain 1,981,209,088	Great Britain 4,467,335,988

sage to congress December 7, 1914, declared that the program that he is now advocating would be a reversal of our entire policy as a nation. And again, it seems to be the impression of some people that because the President recommends it, therefore, regardless of whether it constitutes a reversal of the entire history of the democratic party and of the nation, that any one who refuses to accept the President's view is disloyal to the democratic party, or to the government.

Fortunately there are not many sensible Americans who belong to this silly class or who take any stock in the preachment that the President is the keeper of the national conscience.

Every one admits that the President has a perfect right to recommend to congress the adoption of his so-called preparedness program. If he believed that it was the course that ought to be pursued it was his duty under the constitution to make the recommendation. He recommended it as a non-partisan policy. He so stated. The President would not recommend something which he did not believe to be for the welfare of his country. It would be strange indeed if, while holding to high ideals himself, he would expect members of the congress or citizens in private life to uphold and support a policy merely because it had been recommended by him, if it did not meet with their approval.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN PROFITS

To carry out the President's recommendations at this time would, in my judgment, be to establish a dangerous situation in this country. It would mean paying millions of dollars in profits to a group of powerful men and interests who are taking advantage of the situation in Europe to attempt to terrorize this country into adopting a military policy. These men exercise undue influence not only in the industrial but in the political world, in this country. They have shown by their conduct in the past, and by their attitude in the manufacture of munitions of war that they look upon war as a good thing. The profit derived from the manufacture of arms and munitions of war, not only furnishes great temptation, but it places in their hands a mighty influence to create conditions, even war itself, which will increase the demand for their products. This nation ought not to take a step in the direction of placing in the hands of this group of men the power to endanger the peace and welfare of this and other nations. And to adopt the policy recommended by the President, before the nation has declared its purpose and adopted the policy of manufacturing its own munitions of war would be to do just that thing.

Those who demand an increase in our standing army, and the organization of a continental army, declare that conscription will be necessary. This is doubtless true, if their program is to be carried out. But if we are to have conscription, I am in favor of a broader application of that law than is contemplated by those who are urging a military policy. Let us try the conscription of wealth and property first, and of men last. Let us place human life above the dollar, in time of war, and preparation for war. The rule of conscription should be applied to wealth in preparing for war, in that the cost should fall upon wealth, and not upon industry, consumption and the necessities of life. As the demand for a large army and navy comes largely from those who fear for their vast property interests, to the end that their riches may be secure from attack from abroad, and more particularly from danger at home, let wealth bear its just share of the burdens. In time of war wealth should be taken under conscription, to any extent required for purposes of defense. The conscription of men should follow, in case of need. The government in time of war, and preparation for war, should apply the law of conscription to arms, armament, and munitions

of war, paying therefore at such prices as the government may fix, just as it does when it appropriates the services and lives of men for war purposes. Then too, the government should apply the law of conscription to wealth and secure such funds as may be necessary to equip and support the army and navy.

The government may take the son from his mother, the husband from his wife, the father from his children, without regard to conditions or circumstances and send him out upon the battlefield to become food for powder. It takes not only his services, but if need be, his life, and without compensation. It is not a matter of contract between the citizen and the government. The government does not warrant that he shall be returned to his family or that any sum will be paid in compensation for his life, if that shall be sacrificed. It offers no real compensation to his family, and can give none, in fact. It may pay something in the way of dollars and cents for the pecuniary loss, but this is not compensation. Why not treat vast accumulations of property in the same way? If it is necessary to prepare for war, why not compel wealth to serve as well as men? Why not apply the rule of conscription to the industries that manufacture arms, ammunition and armament?

It is proposed to say to the young men of this country, that they must enter the army, and give certain services, and the government will fix the price for these services. Then why not apply the same rule to property, to guns, ammunition, battleships and other war supplies. Why pay high prices for equipment to carry on war or to prepare for war, while taking human flesh and blood for nothing, or practically nothing? If the government can fix the price at which human beings may be taken, and destroyed if need be, as instrumentalities of war, why may it not fix the price at which guns and armor plate and munitions of war shall be secured for like purposes? If human lives are to be held cheap, then why not iron and steel and powder? If the living bulwarks, the armament of flesh and blood, can be taken by the government, without limit and without price, then why must the government cringe and bargain and contract and guarantee that it will pay the pound of flesh demanded by the bond holder, the money changer, and the munition ring before it may lay its hands upon the sacred thing called property? I say treat men and property according to the same rule, and apply conscription to both. This of course would be evolutionary, or revolutionary, and treason to the war king and the patriots of greed, and if put into practice would cause revolution in any country in the world. That is why I favor it. There ought to be revolution in every country in the world so far as war and preparation for war is concerned. Not a revolution of blood and destruction, but a revolution in sentiment and in practice that will end war and preparation for war.

Let the people declare in favor of applying the law of conscription to wealth as well as men, in time of war, and preparation for war, and the forces that now favor war and seek to embroil the nations in war will lose their interest in this international pastime.

PRESIDENT WILSON TO CONGRESS

President Wilson in his message to congress December 7, 1914, said:
 "More than this carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our policy. More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession; that we had been thrown off our balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes can not touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble. This is assured-

ly the opportunity for which a people and a government like ours were raised up, the opportunity not only to speak but actually to embody and exemplify the counsels of peace and amity and the lasting concord which is based on justice and fair and generous dealing.

"Let there be no misconception. The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility that rests upon us."

Secretary Daniels, in his report to the last session of congress, December, 1914, said:

"The naval appropriations in our own country have doubled in a dozen years, and have gone up by leaps and bounds in other countries. If this mad rivalry in construction goes on, the burden will become too heavy for any nation to bear."

In his report of December, 1913, he says:

"The growing cost of dreadnaughts, of powder, and of everything that makes an efficient navy, gives reason to pause. The heavy expense commands national and international consideration. Ten years ago our largest battleships cost \$5,282,000. The next dreadnaught will cost \$14,044,000. When is this accelerating expenditure to be reduced? * * * If it is not hastened by appeals for the peaceful settlement of national differences, the day is not far distant when the growing burdens of taxation for excessive war and naval expenditure will call a halt."

CLAUDE KITCHIN'S STATEMENT

In a statement issued a short time ago, Claude Kitchin, democratic leader of the house, said:

"At the expiration of the five-year period for the program (the program recommended by President Wilson) this country will then be expending on its navy and army more than any nation in the world in times of peace ever expended on its army and navy; more than England, with her vast 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 collected from the people, over \$70 will go into militarism and navalism, including pensions, leaving less than \$30 for all other functions of our government and for all other benefits of the people."

WHERE KANSAS STANDS

A number of "preparedness" papers are trying to make it appear that Kansas favors the big appropriation program.

Here is a list of organizations that have formally gone on record against it in Kansas:

The Kansas State Teachers' association, in a convention of 6,000.

The Kansas State Grange, with 24,000 members.

The Kansas State Farmers union, with 21,000 members.

The Kansas State Federation of Labor, with 30,000 members.

The Kansas State Mutual Insurance association, with 60,000 members.

The Kansas State Socialist society, with 26,000 members.

More than 100 churches, 150 fraternal organizations and forty women's clubs.

Besides these state organizations there is scarcely a week that from three to half a dozen local farmers institutions have not adopted resolutions against it.

Up to this time not one organization of any description has declared FOR the "preparedness" program in the state of Kansas.—Exchange.