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Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Peace Congress meets today in the metropolis of the Southwest for the first time. Your cordial reception makes us all feel quite at home and glad, indeed, are we to be here.

Our last national Congress adjourned after a stormy session debating the subject of Naval Armament. The Army was also heard from, the Secretary of War proposing merging our Militia with the regular Army, adding largely to cost.

Little do our people realize the cost of what is called national defence against imaginary foes of unduly fritened Army and Naval officials, doomed to live peaceful days and spend their lives dreaming of active life which they are destined never to experience. Not one admiral or captain, not one officer in our Army or Navy was ever engaged in war, ever fired a hostile shot, if we except the petty skirmishes involved by our taking Texas from Mexico and expelling Spain from our Continent. No nation has attacked us for a century, and today no nation can attack us successfully. If a man wisht to select the safest life possible, the one freest from all danger of violent death, let him enter our Army or Navy. There is not a workman attending machinery or erecting buildings, nor a railway train employee or a policeman—the soldier of civilization, whose duty is never to attack but always to protect—not one but runs far greater risk of sudden injury or death than the soldier or marine of our country does today. There is little danger of any of
these ever seeing war, thank God! They will only hav
to parade. The chivalry, the heroism of war is gone.
To shoot from a warship at unseen foes ten miles dis-

tant, or shooting from under cover at a foe a mile distant
is not conduciv to the growth of the heroic.

Our 'war alarmists hav no basis for their fears of
attack. We hav still with us General Miles, the only
living Lieutenant-General, who expelled Spain, now dis-
pelling the groundless fears of possible attack. He tells
us: "Great Britain controlled 52 per cent. of the ocean
commerce of the world, and yet it took her a good part
of one year to transport an army of two hundred thou-
sand men to the coast of Africa, where the opponent
had not a single vessel to intercept or to oppose the
movement." Our foremost military authority thus
warns his country against the crime of Jingoism, saying:
"I trust that our patriotic people and nation may be
unmoved by jingoism, hysteria, intrigue, or unworthy
motives. Some other nations may support colossal
armies, compel all their male population to become parts
of a great military machine, burdening their people and
exhausting their national resources, simply for the
aggrandizement of some war lord or imperial despot, or
to protect their country from the menace of some simi-
lar power; but for the United States to follow such an
example would be a national crime, undemocratic, un-
American, and would violate every tradition and prin-
ciple that we hav maintained for more than a hundred
years." Besides, he adds, "It would be putting a
dangerous power into the hands of some ambitious
start or usurper of the future." Here speaks the
tried, experienced soldier, who has led armies to war. Little do our people know the cost of defence against imaginary foes. Listen and ponder over this. The Army estimates for this year are $149,153,320. Navy estimates, $154,100,000. The actual expenditure usually exceeds the estimates by some millions.

Here we find that in round numbers, always tending to increase, our military and naval expenditure combined exceeds three hundred millions of dollars per year, just about one million dollars every working day—a ruinous insurance price to pay for supposed security from invasion, from which we have been free for a hundred years, and which today is impracticable.

Three hundred millions per year for a hundred years is three hundred trillions of dollars—in figures, $300,000,000,000—eleven cyfers required to express this insurance fund against baseless fears of foreign attack. Is it not high time to investigate and abandon this abnormal and in great part unnecessary expenditure? Officials under the past administration recently became prominent in surprising efforts to increase our naval and military forces, the latest and most startling being Colonel Goethals's estimate of no less than 25,000 soldiers as necessary to guard the Panama Canal, strongly fortified against naval assault, as it is. Under present conditions no sensible man would object to adequate protection of our country by the Army and Navy, but surely this is madness.

The demand was for three battleships this session, and General Wood tells us that the Canal once opened is to require more battleships than hitherto, differing in
this from President Taft, who has assured us that only one battleship per year would be required after the Canal was opened, and that only to maintain the efficiency of our present Navy, because our fleet could then be transferred, either to the Atlantic or Pacific, as required, thus doubling its efficiency.

Ex-President Roosevelt holds "that there is but one way to maintain international peace—that is, by keeping our Army and Navy in such a state of preparation that there will be no temptation on the part of some one else to go to war with us. "Some one else" is indefinite, indeed. Our Republic has no one who wishes to go to war with her, and has not in our day had one desirous of doing so, altho Mr. Roosevelt, when President, was once strangely frittened. He had proclaimed his policy to be one battleship a year, as President Taft has, not to increase the present Navy, but to maintain its efficiency, but he applied for four warships the next session, which Congress wisely denied. The dreaded foe has not yet appeared. His fears were groundless. It is stated that we, remote as we are from danger, are now spending about 70 per cent. of our total expenditures upon Army and Navy, including pensions, while Britain, in the very center of the only strong military and naval powers, spends only 43 per cent. of hers on army and navy and pensions, which seems incredible. But the essential facts, as stated by Pres't Starr Jordan, a trustworthy authority, are as follows: "Expenses of Army and Navy in 1910–1911 were 283 millions of dollars. Entire running expenses for that year 654 millions of dollars, thus Army and Navy received
It is held that one of our prime needs today is residences for our Ambassadors abroad, the supply of millionaires willing to serve being limited. Why not decide to vote no more Dreadnoughts till the five now under construction are completed. A single one omitted and we have fifteen million dollars, sufficient to pay for sixty embassies, costing $250,000 apiece. I believe it to be the duty of the President of the United States under present conditions to veto any bill that provides for another Dreadnought until these five are completed. Of Dreadnoughts proper Britain has today only 20, Germany only 13, France 2 and Italy only 1.
43\frac{1}{2} per cent., nearly one-half. Adding cost of pensions, 161 millions—interest on war debt about 21 millions—we have a total of 466 millions, as against the civil expenses of 188 millions, which represents 71 per cent. of the total.” It is high time we should look into this.

No one ventures to name the nations or nation that has the faintest idea of quarreling with us, nor have we any idea of quarreling with any. All we have to do is to show our confidence in the continuance of present happy relations with all and cease expanding either Army or Navy.

Our military and naval officials sire imaginary foes when they think of possible invasions of enemies. Our Republic, having no designs of territorial acquisition nor powerful nabors, has no enemies to fear. It is the reverse with European lands, joined together, each armed against the other as a probable invader, yet we must expect those of our military and naval circles to dwell in their dreams upon possible attacks, devising counter measures of attack and defense—“‘Tis their vocation.” But to any proposal for increase Army or Navy we hope our President’s response will be: “Pray tell me first against what enemy you need this further protection.” Name the power or powers and tell us what object they can have for attacking us, how they can benefit therefrom—what end have they in view?” There are today only two navies greater than our own, those of Britain and Germany. We rank third. France has only two Dreadnoughts, Italy only one. We have thirty-three first-class battleships, and five more under construction. Does any sensible man,
naval and military officers excepted, fear war between the two parts of our English-speaking race. Is not this unthinkable? As we English-speaking men hav outgrown the duel, so hav we outgrown fratricidal war. We are never again to assail each other. That day has past. Has there ever been danger of war between Germany and ourselves, members of the same Teutonic race? Never has it been imagined. America, Britain and Germany in China marched their united forces under a German general to Peking, and so will these three Powers some day unite again when danger requires. We are all of the same Teutonic blood, and united could ensure world peace. The fourth naval power is our ally of the Revolution, our sister Republic of France. Could even an American admiral or commanding general succeed in believing that war was possible between the two Republics? No! This would be found beyond the wildest flights of even his vivid imagination. What foe, therefore, can we fear?

The last census shows that we hav no less than twenty-two millions of men subject to militia duty. Imagine an invading force preparing abroad to attack this force we hold in reserve. Weeks, probably months, would be needed before the expedition could be ready to sail, with its hundreds of steamers needed for the troops, food supplies, artillery and amunition. The President, as Commander-in-Chief, would call out half a million or a million if needed of the militia, and these prepare for action. We could confidently await results. But our best policy would probably be to invite them to land. Meanwhile our harbors would be mined. Our only
fear would be that the enemy mite refuse our pressing invitation to march inland, we giving peaceful guidance until they decided to stop. Entrance would be unimpeded, but how about their exit, surrounded as they would be by hundreds of thousands of armed men who could shoot and would shoot from every point of the compass? Meanwhile our non-export of food and cotton, to say nothing of our manufactured articles, at present averaging a million and a half dollars a day, could not fail to disturb the European equilibrium. We need not pursue the subject; there is no armed nation or combination of nations so foolish as to dream of invasion. Their ships mite try to so some mischief, firing many miles away from the coast, but no power in the world could or would attempt to land or march inland. If any did, the number left to anser roll call and return would be small indeed. British authorities consider it mite be possible for an enemy to land as many as one hundred and seventy thousand men upon their island in three weeks, and they believe they hav provided a force sufficient to deal with this number. We could cope with seven times this number of invaders, if we could only induce them to accept our invitation to march far enough inland and partake of our hospitality until they were rested and gave us notis they were redy to begin operations. We would probably conquer without firing a shot. Thousands mite decide to stay in the great West and work and save until they could buy a farm. We mite turn invaders into citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to go as missionary to the invaders’ camp and preach the blessings of trium-
fant Democracy, and tell of a country where one man’s privilege was every citizen’s right.

Our Republic, soon to number 100,000,000 of free and independent citizens; our men, old and yung, redy with their rifles to do or die for their country, if attacked; surely every man, even the narrow professional soldier in his sane moments, must realize that no such hairbrained madness as invasion will ever be attempted.

Men who refused today to walk abroad without lightning rods down their backs with a ground connection, because men hav been struck with lightning, would be the counterparts of those who fear invasion; the first risk, however, being much greater than the second. Insurance companies would make huge profits by selling even at a dollar a head life policies against invasion—all would be clear gain, less cost of printing. Falstaff’s foes, both in “Buckram” and in “Kendal green,” were scarcely less imaginary than the fears which apparently surround and appal most of our present professionals, able men as these are in their respective fields. Not one of the three additional warships demanded this year, if bilt, would in all probability ever fire a shot against a foe, but would rust into uselessness—forty-five million of dollars needlessly squandered. What a waste of capital which could be put to useful ends in improving for the masses the conditions of life! There is to be an end of this folly some day. A man’s profession is his hobby; therefore, if generals are to decide how many soldiers are to be maintained for parade, and admirals how many fifteen-million-
Fortunately, we hav at present in the Chairman of the House Committee on appropriations an able man, Mr. Fitzgerald, one who judges for himself. He attended the recent Dinner of the Navy League in Washington and said:

"We hear a great deal about an adequate Navy, but what is an adequate Navy? It reminds one of the old conundrum—'How long is a piece of string?' Why does the House of Representatives look with suspicion upon these demands for a very large Navy? Because of the lack of frankness on the part of those who make the demands. When we were urged to provide for the construction of the Panama Canal, we were told it would double the efficiency of the Navy. Now we are informed that it is the principal reason for a very much larger Navy. Our separation by oceans from other countries in the earlier days was held to be the assurance of our safety. Now we are told this is the source of our danger, requiring a greatly increase military and naval force. The Navy League should be frank and give the real reason for its demand for a larger Navy. Last year the general staff of the Army told us of certain needed precautions which could be provided for six hundred thousand dollars. It turned out that the work they wanted done will cost eight millions."

Secretary of State Bryan ended his speech thus:

"If I were to speak to you on the subject that seems to be uppermost in your minds, I should not make an oration, but enter into a joint debate with you. While you are working for more battleships, I shall work hard during the next four years to prevent the need of battleships."

Never profecty unless you know is a sound maxim, but if I were to venture to do so I should predict the success of the Secretary of State and not that of the Warrior. I should like to be present when the President asks the fritened men of war what foe they dread. No anser possible, silence and ignominious retreat their only refuge. The President's probable response will be, "Gentlemen, when you are redy to anser me, call again, but not till then."
dollar battleships we are to build to rust away, farewell to common sense, for there are no extremes to which men's hobbies may not lead them. Few, if any, of our officers of today have ever seen war, and, thank God! fewer still are ever to see it, but the professional hobby takes root early and grows apace.

I believe that the President will prove to be a man of sound judgment, that his first care will be to guard our country from present obvious dangers, consigning imaginary dangers of the future to the future they belong to—that future in which so many of our imaginary troubles vanish. A story told the writer in his youth has been fruitful. Condoling with an old man upon his numerous misfortunes, the reply came: "True, I have many grievous ills to bear, but the strange thing is that nine-tenths of the worst of them never happened." So with our Republic. She bears a charmed life and all works for her good. Would that her officials of today, in Cabinet and in Army and Navy, had proper confidence in her future and more faith in her star. She has not an enemy in the world, nor need she have one. The rulers have no cause of complaint against her, and the masses of the world in all civilized lands see in her the standard to which they fondly hope to attain, and they love her. Hence an Army and Navy, maintained at present standard, are ample and more than ample. We have no enemies, all nations are our friends and we are friends of all nations.

Our Republic has been from her birth the world's foremost advocate of international peace, from the time of the fathers onward—Washington, Franklin, Hamilton,
Lincoln and others. Washington’s first wish was that war be abolisht. Grant declared to the Duke of Cambridge, who offered a Review in his honor, he never wisht to see a regiment of soldiers again. The following resolution passed Senate February 14, 1890, and the House April 3, 1890. The British Parliament expresst its redy cooperation July 16, 1893:

"Resolv’d by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the President be, and is hereby requested to invite, from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may hav diplomatic relations, to the end that any difference or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, may be referd to arbi- tration and be peaceably adjusted by such means."

Hence our treaties with Britain, including the last and most advanced, which the Senate recently failed to ratify. Here we find the initial movement which resulted in the first Conference at the Hague. No less than eighty treaties of obligatory arbitration between the great nations of the world hav since been made, our country being party to twenty-three of these. Thirteen nations hav agreed to settle all disputes thus.

I believe in the League of Peace idea, the formation of an International Police, never for aggression, always for protection, if needed, of the peace of the civilized world. This requires only the agreement of a few of the leading nations. Recently six of these—Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Japan and America—combined their forces in China, under command of a Ger-
man general, for a specific purpose, which was successfully accomplisht. All the great naval nations (eight in number) agreed in London two years ago to exempt private property at sea from capture as property on land is. The British House of Commons has past the bill and it awaits action of House of Lords. Our Senate has unanimously ratified it. The good work goes bravely on.

Since nations are now bound together as members of one body in telegraphic communication, and their yearly commerce reaches three thousand millions of dollars, it is unreasonable that any one nation should longer be permitted to disturb the general peace, in which all nations are more or less concerned.

Three or four leading peace nations combined, constituting, as they would, an overwhelming force, unbroken peace would almost certainly be ensured, for to break it would be folly. If ever it were broken, however, it would be well before resorting to force for the peace-preserving nations to first proclaim non-intercourse with the offender, no loans, no exchange of products, no military or naval supplies—above all, no mails—this would serve as a solemn warning and probably prove effective, but if not, then as a last resort force should be used.

This plan seems the easiest and speediest mode of attaining international peace.

We still hear echoes of the past which hold that war, having existed from the earliest times, has been and must remain an ineradicable element in humanity. When war ceases it is said "then farewell the race of
heroes in the land—the many great qualities will exist no more.” The reverse has proved to be true. Peace under industrialism has produced and is producing and will continue to produce the truly heroic, the heroism which kills not, but which saves our fellows. Not a day passes unmarked by men or women who voluntarily imperil their lives, not to kill but to save or serve their fellows, and that without hope of reward. Compare the soldiers paid to kill his fellows as ordered with the peaceful volunteer who saved others without reward—one the hero of barbarism who wounds or kills—the other the hero of civilization who serves or saves his fellows. History proves that only as man becomes civilized he becomes truly heroic. The numerous reports of heroic action in various lands which come to our knowledge proves this beyond question.

Recently world peace was upon the eve of victory. A treaty of peace was signed by Britain, France and our Government which would have prevented war between civilized powers, because Germany would have joined us, as its ambassador intimated. A joint remonstrance against war by these four powers would have given any powers threatening war just a gentle intimation that they were expected to follow the example of those who had abolisht war and who had interests in the preservation of peace which could not be and would not be overlooked, and peaceful adjustment would be certain.

Why this treaty failed to receive the support of the Senate need not be here dwelt upon. Suffice it to say the fault was not altogether that of the Senate—sometimes a blunder is said to be worse than a crime. Well,
some one blundered. Looking backward, the error is now clearly seen, and we venture to predict that the present administration will deal successfully with this vital question.

This sole remaining task accomplisht, it will rank highest of all services ever performed by man to man, because its influence will be world wide and the President will take rank above all men as the greatest world benefactor who has ever lived; because he will have laid the ax to the root of the tree and banisht man-killing from the civilized world. All the good done by any or all reformers pales into insignificance compared with the banishment of this appalling crime of crimes. The President has stood and still stands absolutely for international peace under the reign of law.

Our Secretary of State no doubtful utterance upon this commanding issue. He has been round the world and realizes that the brotherhood of man is no dream, and has risen to the height of this great argument. Let our anxious prayer be that this great boon to man may come from our Republic, which was first to invite the nations to dethrone war, and establish peace.

Let us recognize the truth that man killing man as a means of settling disputes is the crying sin, curse and disgrace of our time, and bars our claim to civilization, that as long as we tolerate man-killing as a profession we remain barbaric—yes, savage. Future ages are to regard this heinous crime as we today regard those who in past times poisoned wells, sacked cities and burnt
prisoners as offerings to the gods, which Shakespeare thus describes:

The gates of Mercy shall be all shut up,
And the flesh’d soldier, rough and hard of heart,
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell.

All this war permitted until recent times. Today we could not induce men to engage in such savagery, nor to enlist under these conditions in what was then considered the only profession fit for gentlemen born. This diabolical practis of man killing man is truly, as has been said, “the foulest fiend ever vomited from the mouth of hell.” General Sherman declared war to be hell.

Friends of Peace, be of good cheer; this savage crime of man killing man is soon to become a crime of the past. The new era has dawned proclaiming the coming of the day

When the war drum beats no longer and the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

Burns’s prophecy comes true apace:

When man to man the world o’er
Shall brothers be and a’ that.

All is well, friends, all is well, since all grows better. In this our holy crusade there can be no such word as fail.