

The Economic Club of New York

34th Meeting

National Defense

December 12, 1915

Hotel Astor
New York City

Table of Contents

Admiral Robert E. Peary Guest of Honor.....	1
The Honorable David Jayne Hill Former Ambassador to Berlin.....	9
Oswald Garrison Villard President, The New York Evening Post	23
Professor Albert Bushnell Hart Harvard University.....	35
Mr. Norman Angell Author of "The Great Illusion," "The World's Highway"	50

Introduction

Toastmaster Willcox

Gentlemen of the Economic Club: It is a great pleasure for me as your presiding officer to welcome you to the Second Dinner of the year. We have selected as the topic of the evening the subject which is uppermost in the minds of us all in the trying times in which we live. The subject of our national defense at this time needs no apology, as the one subject demanding attention from a club having the objects for which the Economic Club exists. In addition to our regular list of speakers, we are particularly fortunate in having with us tonight a man whose name is a household word, and whom you will all be glad to welcome as a guest of this organization.

I therefore take great pleasure in introducing Admiral Robert E. Peary. (Great Applause)

Admiral Robert E. Peary

Guest of Honor

Mr. President, Ladies, Gentlemen of the Economic Club: I very deeply appreciate this honor and distinction. I particularly appreciate the fact that I have been limited to ten minutes. (Applause)

My friend, President Willcox, and Director Ely, have stated to me: “You can talk on any subject you please” – but I feel so strongly, I feel so deeply on the subject which is under discussion and before you tonight, that what I do say I shall say in line with that subject – national defense, or preparedness, or whatever you choose to call it.

The recently set fashion of seeking in the scriptures material, which can be applied to current events, has perhaps reminded some of you of the story of the devout old...

***** (PAGE CUT OFF) *****

“Dog in the bible—are you sure of that, Auntie?”

“Why, yes, here it is. Lazarus’ dog—“Moreover, the dog came and licked him.”” (Great Laughter)

And the finding in the scriptures of texts both for and against preparedness has, perhaps, reminded others among you of the story of little Johnny, as illustrating the difference in points of view in the way of looking at the same thing.

Johnny was droning along through his reading lesson, and he read: “Here is a warm doughnut; step on it.”

“What is that, Johnny?”

“Here is a warm doughnut; step on it.”

“Johnny, bring me the book. Johnny, oh Johnny, how could you. Now listen to me: “Here is a worm; do not step on it.” (Laughter)

Ezekiel has been rather particularly in the spotlight lately, be he is by no means the only biblical authority who was versed on the question of preparedness. I have taken the trouble to look up on or two. Isaiah had a word to say on the subject: “Awake! Awake! Put on thy strength!”

Samuel also: “Gird ye on every man his sword”, and Jeremiah: “Stand fast and prepare thee, for the sword shall devour round about thee!:

All these remarks are applicable to the present state of affairs, and to us.

I was recently reading some literature of Cecil Rhodes, the great South African empire builder. It is said of him that the ever present thought that kept him spurred up to ceaseless activity was this: “So much to do, and so little time in which to do it.”

Never a word more appropriate for us, and it is said that his dying words were: “So much to do and so little done.” I pray that that this may never be the groan of those of us who may remain after the extinction of our national existence.

I think the country, today, has passed through the stage of asking: “Shall we do anything to provide against aggression?” I think, today we are asking: “What shall we do?” The major answer, the major part of the answer to that question, of course, rests with the Government, but there are some things which as citizens, can be, and which we can begin to do now and of two of those things I am going to speak to you tonight very briefly, both vital to our national defense. On both opinions is almost unanimous.

Up in Maine, today, there is a movement on foot for the establishment of the first station of an Aerial Coast Patrol System which, when completed, will guard—I say guard, it will assist in guarding—our coast from Eastport, Maine, to Brownsville, Texas; from San Diego, Cal., to Cape Flattery, Wash. This system is the idea of John Hays Hammond, Jr., who has enlisted the interest of the President of the United States, the Secretaries of War and Navy, the President of the Aero Club of America, the President of the Society of Aeronautical Engineers, and others.

Briefly, that system means this: The dividing of the entire coast into convenient sections of about one hundred miles, “beats” we will call them—supplying each one of these sections with a station, a powerful hydro-aero-plane capable of carrying its driver and an observer; a hydro-aeroplane or seaplane, floating boat, whatever you choose to call it, fitted with wireless apparatus with a radius of fifty miles, we will say now; a little later it will be more; powerful glasses, a microphone attachment; and that, in the case of emergency, each of these aeroplanes will go out

some fifty miles from the coast and there patrol continuously over its section, back and forth, reporting whatever may be of interest to report by means of its wireless apparatus. In clear weather, perhaps two thousand feet above the sea, from which altitude, with glasses, a ship can be seen fifty miles further out to sea—a hundred miles off shore. At night, or in foggy weather, helping with microphones set to detect the sound of a propeller, or the slightest sound of a ship, a glimmer, or a whiff of smoke; the system when in effective operation would mean that a continuous line of flagging pickets, fifty miles out at sea, two thousand feet in the air—you grasp the romance? The welding of the romance of past ages and of invention of today, in that idea; that line of shuttle weaving back and forth, their continuous curtain of observation around the entire country.

The estimate for the proposition is only about \$500,000 for our entire coast, including the lakes, a sum about one-third of what was raised each by Germany and France by public subscription previous to the war, for their aviation department and in this proposition, while the system is a national affair, each section is a local affair, and the cost of each section is assumed to be about \$10,000 for equipment, a comparatively moderate sum, which would fall upon the community affected. There is one of the things.

Now the other. A year ago last August, Switzerland, a particularly peaceful, commercial, non-militaristic, little country, with an area about twice that of Massachusetts, with a population essentially the same as that of Massachusetts, four million, we will say, in round numbers, at a

sudden call mobilized—figures differ a little, but we will see—four hundred thousand trained citizen soldiers on her frontiers, in 46 hours. From that time on Switzerland, though completely surrounded by desperate warring nations, has been immune from attack, aggression, from insult.

That striking example of efficiency was due to the Swiss system of citizen military education and instruction. That system means that every able bodied man in the country is ready for, and is subject to, the call for the nation's defense, and while awaiting that call is carrying on his ordinary avocation, pursuit, or profession. It is the most practical system known, but the germ of it is this for us, that the time and the expenditures devoted to that system are not wasted even though we never have occasion to use it as a military asset. Its peace value is unquestioned as an increase in our national efficiency. Think what it will mean for millions of boys throughout the country, yours and mine among them, to be taught how to take care of themselves physically, to be erect, manly, trained in self-reliance, self-control, discipline, obedience to orders and system, and the habit of once a thing has been undertaken or commenced, to stay with it until it is done!

(Applause)

Think of millions of young men throughout the country trained in the rudiments of military education and drill, trained in how to receive as valuable to civil life and business pursuits as in military. That, in my opinion, is the kind of system that we want here in this country over and above and in addition to whatever may be decided upon for the regular army. The Swiss system spells PREPAREDNESS in large capitals.

Colleges, universities, schools throughout the country, are adopting military education, and that is very fine. But it is not enough. What we want is some system like that in Switzerland that will reach every able bodied men in the country, and reach him now. (Applause)

There is a feeling today in Maine, that that state in its exposed condition, drawn over out to the eastward, should take up the Swiss system. I have a recent letter from the owner and publisher of a Southern paper with a circulation of some two hundred and fifty thousand, in which occurs the following sentence: "I am sure that our people prefer to have our young men given military training, rather than for us to establish a great standing army."

In a most interesting letter from the owner and publisher of a great Pacific Coast paper, occurs the following: "It seems to me that some kind of a system of universal training is the only effective and permanent solution of the problem of national defense. It seems as if the people of the United States are at this moment read to accept a system of universal military training similar to the Swiss system. I believe that if an expression of public sentiment could be called for by someone of sufficient prominence to command attention, it would be clear, it seems to me, that there is an overwhelming sentiment in favor of universal training at this time." That from the letter.

Now, Gentlemen of the Economic Club, I wish to suggest here tonight, and to urge upon your attention, the adoption of the Swiss system by the individual states. The adoption of the Swiss system as a national proposition has already been recommended and urged by those who know, has not been advanced. This permits action at once, without the of necessity, slow action of Congress for the nation, and would allow any state that felt itself exposed, or felt itself vitally interested, to take up the matter of beginning the training of its citizens now, without waiting for the more apathetic states. With the same percentage of efficiency as in Switzerland, this state of yours, New York, could, in an emergency, put one million trained citizens, one million trained citizen soldiers in her defense in 48 hours. If the system is adopted by the United States, it will mean ten million trained citizen soldiers immediately available in an emergency; a condition of splendid preparedness which will render us immune from aggression or insult, which will permit us in peace, and undisturbed, to follow down the future that magnificent path of national destiny which stretches beyond the utmost limits of the vision, so far as we today understand, beyond the wildest dreams of the founders of this nation.

To quote again from what I read in the beginning: “Awake! Awake! Awake! Put on thy strength!

Gird ye on every man his sword! Stand fast and prepare thee!”

Mr. President, I thank you. (Great applause)

Toastmaster Willcox: I am sure we were all glad to welcome here the distinguished guest who has just addressed us, and in your behalf I want to thank him for having come here and given us the benefit of his views, which come from such a wide experience.

We are fortunate tonight in having with us a gentlemen whose career in the diplomacy of our country has probably not been equaled in experience by any other man. First as Assistant Secretary of State, and then as minister to Switzerland, and later as ambassador to Berlin and a member of the Hague Tribunal, Dr. David Jayne Hill is well known to all Americans. (Great applause)

I may be pardoned a purely personal preference for Dr. Hill above most diplomatists, in that before he entered upon that brilliant career he was president of my Alma Mater, and as a student of that college and since that days when I was in the college, it has been a continuously good fortune for me to watch the great example and to note the great work that was done by the President of my Alma Mater.

I take pleasure in introducing Dr. David Jayne Hill. (Great applause)

The Honorable David Jayne Hill

Former Ambassador to Berlin

Mr. President, Ladies, Gentlemen of the Economic Club: It is a great deal easier for the military man to find suitable quotations from the Scriptures than it is for the diplomatist.

(Laughter) The diplomatist searches, but he searches somewhere else, and the only passage of Scripture that comes to my mind that has any bearing on the business, the customs, or the habits of diplomacy is: "Come all ye who are thirsty, and drink." (Laughter)

I happened to be in Switzerland, temporarily living in Switzerland, during those days of which Admiral Peary has spoken. I was dining with a Swiss friend, a colonel in the Swiss Army. They only have colonels there; they are afraid to trust generals. In the midst of the meal a telegram was brought to my host. He opened it, started up, and said: "I must go at once. I have to find sixty horses in less than 48 hours." And I said to him: "Colonel, do you know where to find them?" "Everyone of them," he said, and in 48 hours, 250,000 men came out of their cottages on the hillsides, and from their shops in the towns and villages, and were actually assembled in 48 hours on the Swiss frontier. It was the very moment that Belgium was invaded, but with an army of only forty-eight or fifty thousand men. Belgium had her military preparation on the basis of the observation of guaranteed neutrality. Switzerland had made her preparation on the basis of a neutrality guaranteed, but that she felt individually able to defend, -(Cries of "Good, Good." And great applause)- and when the grand hewing through France was undertaken in order to avoid that impassable line of French forts between Belfort and Verdun, it was not Switzerland, it was Belgium through which the Germans proceeded.

Well, now, gentlemen, I daresay you think I am getting rather military, and perhaps a little belligerent for a diplomatist. What I have said up to now has simply been that which was inspired in my thoughts by the speech of Admiral Peary. It seems that we are facing a situation in this country at this present moment, more grave in some respects than any that we have ever been called upon to face since the settlement of the Civil War, because we have this problem which is the subject of our discourse and our thoughts, this evening, under consideration—national defense. Do we need it, or do we not, and if we need it, of what kind shall it be? And we are going to have that question discussed this winter with an animation, and with a flood tide of eloquence and with a perfect cloudburst of fantastic rhetoric, such as we have not heard in this country for some time.

Now, if I could be in the slightest of service in a matter of this moment, I suppose it would be in trying to sober my own thoughts, and then exercising a sober influence over the minds of other men. I want to look at this subject in a large way. It is not merely a question of armament, either by land or by sea. It is not simply a question of making ourselves ready to receive, and repel an attack, and certainly it is not a question of any aggression on anyone else; and perhaps you will follow me as I describe to you in a very simple and direct way, without any effort at adornment, the process of thought that has taken place in my own mind.

There was a time, and it was not very long ago, when some of us dreamed that there is way to secure the rights of nations, and to settle their differences without appeal to armed forces. That

method was simply a general agreement to come together before a neutral international court, present their grievances, plead their causes, and receive an honest verdict from the judgment seat. But, alas! We have discovered that it was only a dream. It was a beautiful vision, an inspiring dream, but nevertheless it was a vision of the mind.

Now, in the last eighteen months we have been rudely awakened from that dream. We have learned that mankind has not yet developed to that state of rational perfection where dependence can be placed upon the appeal to reason. It is a sad disillusionment, but we are all compelled to face that facts.

Virtue and innocence are not yet exempt from violence in this world. Neither accepted law, nor solemn...

PAGE IS CUT OFF -- UNREADABLE

Been asking "What should we do if these things were to happen to us?"

Some have replied: "Why, there is no probability to it. We are so great a people with such unlimited resources, that no power would think of attacking us. It is true that we could not at once offer effective resistance, but we should not even attempt to do so or make the slightest preparation for it. We have only to make treaties; postpone the redress of injuries, if we receive any; show a dignified and lovely spirit, and all will be well with us. We can always be safe

through compliance, and finally our sweetness will melt the hearts of our enemies, and they will love us and respect us all the more because we have such faith in them! The fear of war is merely hysterical, and preparation for war is an unpardonable crime.

But others have given us what a different answer. They say: “You see what a spirit of conquest is abroad in the world, a lust for territory and the spoils of war. We are both hated and envied, and we are pitifully weak. Our wealth is no protection. On the contrary it exposes us to greater danger. An enemy’s fleet, under the threat of bombarding New York, for example, might force the immediate payment of millions of dollars. Troops could be landed almost anywhere on the thousands of miles of unprotected coast line, and before we could organize an army of resistance, nearly all our means of creating munitions of war would be in the enemy’s hands.

“Why, you might as well talk of a strongbox being burglar-proof because it contained a vast sum of money, without regard to the ease with which the burglar could open it.”

“Our wealth,” they say, “unless some of it is used in greatly increasing our army and navy, is actually a mark of our weakness. We must, therefore, without delay, spend billions and billions of dollars for national defense.”

As a result of this opposition of views, I think we are going to have during the next six months a running debate in the press and in the Halls of Congress that will occupy a great deal of our

precious time. But the truth we have to stand by, and to hold by is not to be found in the particularly idealistic conception or misconception of human nature on the part of our pacifist friends; nor, on the other hand in the wild fantasies of our alarmists. It is not at all likely that a hostile armada will soon cross the ocean for the purpose of plundering our cities, or that a new race of conquistadores will descend upon our shores to reduce us to a state of colonial dependence. But all this does not in any way effect our duty to be internationally strong.

Apart from every other possible danger, now or at any time in the future, of an external attack, it is our duty to stand for something internationally, and to be strong in our defense of our ideals and our principles. (Great applause) We cannot decently, as a great power, throw the whole burden, for example, of defending neutral rights upon the little nations. It would not be magnanimous; it would not be just, and in any age when influence is largely measured by force, it is necessary that we should be strong, or we shall be delinquent.

Now, I don't mean by this that we should enter the race for world domination-far from it. But we should be able to say to the rest of mankind: "We in America have stood for the dominion of law, for a world tribunal, for the sanctity of treaties, for the rights of neutrals, for the inviolability of innocent persons. We have discouraged armament, and sought to accomplish its limitation, both by precept and example, and now we say to you, if you are going on with it, if you are going by brute force to trample upon the little nations, and to exercise your absolute will upon

the sea, and to dominate the world by brute force, well, you shall not dominate over us. (Great applause)

Now that is where, as I see it, and not in the danger of any attack, that our duty lies, to stand for law and humanity, and the pacifist and militarist alike should have the perception to see it, and the conscience to say it.

Then we should add: “Come, now, let us reason together. Might doesn’t make right; justice has no relation to brute force, and brute force must not triumph. We want nothing of you but your friendship and fair play, and we are ready to give you these in return. But whether we have your friendship or not, we demand fair play and respect for our rights. We shall disarm when you do, and we shall continue to defend ourselves until you disarm.” (Great applause)

We hear very much just now about preparedness, by which, I suppose, is meant the result of preparation. But for what should we prepare? For war? Heaven forbid. We should prepare to make our words and our rights respected in the world; (Great applause) and how, then, must we proceed to make our words and our rights respected in the world? By signing treaties and conventions that will not be observed? By making law books to be read between the trenches under fire, on the field of battle? We occupied four months on that at The Hague, but it has been in vein.

There are, however, three answers to the question: “What should we do to be prepared to make our rights and our words respected?”

First of all, I think, we must have before our minds a clear international policy, a policy for which we can all stand, without regard to political party, or racial origin or religious belief, or any of the divisive circumstances of human society! (Great applause)

An international policy that we can support because it is truly American, and because we are first of all, and all the time, Americans. (Great applause)

Now, if there is to be any policy of that kind, it will have to have a negative and a positive side, and I have ventured to outline such a policy, of course in a purely tentative way, gentlemen, and without any official authority, or any other authority, except, as I believe, the authority of our national traditions and our common sense.

On the negative side, we do not desire to annex any foreign territory. We do not entertain any scheme of conquest. We do not wish to meddle with the internal affairs of our neighbors, great or small. We do not aim at acquiring exclusive commercial or other concessions in foreign countries; we want our share. We do not intend to impose our authority beyond our own local and proper jurisdiction.

Now on the positive side; we desire to have peace with all nations, based on justice, honor, and respect for treaties. We object to the intervention of Europe in the internal affairs of this continent. (Great applause) We favor deliberate negotiations wherever they are possible, rather than hasty ultimate. We demand and will require the recognitions of our right of innocent commerce on the high seas. (Great applause) We shall insist upon respect for American rights and property everywhere. (Great applause) We shall recognize any de facto government that really protects these rights within actual jurisdiction, and shall confide in no government that is incapable of such protection. (Great applause) We are prepared to negotiate conventions for the firmer establishment of international justice, but we shall enter into no formal alliance, or into any agreement binding us to make war upon any nation, or in the interests of any nation, but we shall hold ourselves free by concurrent action with others to pursue a common end of preserving peace, and procuring conformity to international law. (Great applause)

Now I have emphasized first of all the necessity of a clear international policy, because it is this alone that can justify a considerable increase of our military forces, and it is only by agreement upon that policy, but the understanding that that is the policy which is to be pursued, that we can hope to unite this country; otherwise, we are going to be deeply split right down the middle.

I will not say that this policy as I have outlined it is not subject to amendment, but I will say that unless we have some clear policy, some policy to which we feel ourselves bound, that we cannot justify ourselves in greatly increasing our military forces, and should it be felt that we have no

such justification, every intelligent person will instinctively ask: “For what is this navy and this army to be employed?” It must, therefore, be made plain in what direction we are moving, and for what we are preparing, and this is necessary, not only for the satisfaction and unification of our own people, but to avoid misunderstanding by our neighbors.

There is among us, I believe, no party, and there is probably no man that desires ruthless aggression or a dangerous augmentation of power, for power’s sake. But no many who loves his country and hopes ever to look his neighbors in the face, can raise his hand in protect against a policy of just international intercourse. (Great applause)

But it is evident, is it not, that no policy can be made effective by the employment of fine phrases, (laughter) no matter how fine they are or how expert the phrase maker. To say that we shall hold anyone accountable and not be able to do it—well, what is that? If I were making a phrase, I would say it is a stultification of the national honor. (Great applause)

Now, of course, it is never wise or desirable to make a prodigal use of menaces, but it is derisive, is it not, to speak of accountability, without means of enforcing it. I state it as an academic proposition.

Now it is true that there are other ways, and many other ways, than war—goodwill, friendship, diplomatic intercourse, commercial privilege—are not these effective ways in the scales of

accountability? But the false pretense of friendship, goodwill, where these do not exist and really ought not to exist, in order to escape hostilities, is not only unworthy—it still speak academically—is not only unworthy of a great nation, but the lowest depth of international immorality. (Great applause) Far better is it to say frankly, and to say it early: “We consider your action proposed or effected, wrong, and it can never have our approval.” The nation that has not the courage to say that, has already become contemptible. (Applause) Would you not say it to your friends; would you not say it to your wife, and wives; would you not say it to your husbands, if they were ever so unkind as to lead you to it? Would you not say it frankly, and say it early: “we consider that is wrong, and it can never, never have our approval.”

But something more than a right policy is necessary to make our words and our rights respected. We must be prepared for eventual action; to give out in advance, or to let it be tacitly understood that under no circumstances will action be resorted to, even in defense of seriously violated rights, would be to invite insult and injury; and an excessive spirit of pacifism, a spirit of pacifism that is not all pacifism, especially in places of high authority, is, therefore, a positive danger to the country.

Oh, it is, of course, undesirable, to accentuate the fighting spirit, for that also is a sign of weakness. It is the strong many only who can be calm and patient and long-suffering, for he knows that because he is strong he can humble the braggart and bring him to his senses. It is needful, therefore, that a nation be actually, and not merely potentially, prepared for

eventualities. But it does not require exaggerated preparation, so delicate is the balance of the world's forces that any real weight counts, but it must be a real weight; it must have a positive power of contribution to the determination of the issue. We see this well illustrated today in the Balkan Peninsula, where the decision of a comparatively small nation, with a good and well-equipped army, can determine the contest in that campaign.

The United States, if provided with a sufficient navy and an immediately available army of, let us say, even two or three hundred thousand men, would possess a staying power that would be formidable, until the Admiral could bring in his citizen dependents. But in an emergency, all would depend upon immediate availability.

Now, in spite of all that has been said against armament as provocative of war, and it must be admitted that over-armament and rival armament are provocative of war, a reasonable means of defense governed by a pacific policy, would certainly make powerfully for peace.

The curse of militarism, the curse of militarism, lies in the accumulation of force, with the purpose of using it for domination, but armament for the defense of national rights is not militarism. It is a contribution to the reign of law and justice in the world. (Great applause)

Now, if our aim really is to make our words and our rights respected in the world, we should have an army that would inspire us with entire confidence and admiration.

This leads to the third, and you will be glad to know, the last answer I have to offer to the question. We must have an army and navy thoroughly imbued with the supremacy of civil authority over military force.

We must, therefore—and I speak, Mr. Willcox, as an old teacher—we must carry our preparation into the schools. The American people, unless I greatly misinterpret them, will never tolerate the formation of an irresponsible fighting machine, whose chief aim is efficiency in the art of killing men, and whose chief passion is a desire for its own glory. What they will demand will be a body of trained citizen defenders of their own country, thoroughly permeated, every one of them, with its spirit and ideals, and devoted to carrying out its pacific policy. (Great applause)

This signifies that in addition to a national policy and an organized force, preparation must be made for the education and training of the citizen-soldier in the meaning and duties of citizenship. Such education must be of the mind and the body, the will and the character. It should include, I think, the manual of arms and the discipline of a camp, for their hygienic value.

I would seem that even the most ultra pacifist of our citizens might, in all consistency, favor the building up of the minds and the bodies of our young men, into whose lives may be infused the spirit of Washington and Lincoln. Without the armies they commanded, we should have today neither a republic, nor a union of the States.

And so, I think, we must begin to lay the foundations of our national security in the school, where the boys, and the girls, too, should be taught what it means to be a citizen of a self-governing country. (Great applause) And that meaning can never be truly and fully set forth unless young men are taught that it is their duty in case their country needs them, to take up arms for the national defense. But what a pitiable sacrifice it would be for these young patriots to be led to the slaughter by the hundreds, and the thousands, as they were in the Civil War, because they were unprepared for the service they were to render, and because the officers who commanded them had to acquire the greater part of their training in the beleaguered camp, and on the field of battle.

And so, in conclusion, Mr. President, and gentlemen, our preparation should include a clear and acceptable national policy, in harmony with our institutions, an efficient body of defenders, and the education in civil life and in civil duty, of all of our citizens.

I thank you for your attention. (Great applause)

Toastmaster Willcox: I will not detain you by words in introducing the next speaker, who is well known to the citizens of this city as a writer of distinction, Oswald Garrison Villard. (Great applause)

Oswald Garrison Villard

President, The New York Evening Post

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I must begin by confessing that I came totally unprepared to make a speech. (Laughter) I do not think I have flunked so completely since I sat under my dear friend and revered teacher, Professor Hart, at Harvard, years ago, at which time we had already begun to disagree on this question of what constituted adequate preparedness – at least in a recitation room. (Laughter) He had the advantage of me because of his despotic professorial authority. (Laughter)

I should not have dared to show myself here, because of my not having had time on account of the engrossment of my work in Washington to prepare anything, if I had not had the good fortune to run across a letter from Berlin, which I am going to ask you to listen to in place of a speech from me. It bears on the question. I think you will find it interesting.

It is an official paper, but you must not ask me the name of the writer who seems to be an officer of authority in Berlin, nor must you ask me, in these days when there are British Embassy detectives in every street corner, and German Embassy detectives in the middle of the block, and secret service men watching them both, in the middle of the street, where I got this from, whether I got it from a department of the Government, or whether I did not. I only ask you to believe that the translation which I made is accurate; and this is the letter:

“Berlin, November 10, 1915.

Main Lieber Karl,

For your long and interesting letter, my hearty thanks. Well, the news astounds me, I must confess, I had thought the Americans so bent only on coining dollars out of the Allies by making guns and ammunition for them and doing their best to help our enemies defeat us, while pretending to be neutral, that they were thinking of nothing else. So, it appears, they too have seen the light of day, and have come to realize that there is nothing in all the world so well worth while as men in arms, a great army, and a great fleet. In all the years I have worn the Kaiser’s uniform, nothing has seemed to me to augur as well as our profession and our soldier ideals. Truly our Great General Staff has conquered the world! Not only in the field does every army lie prostrate before us, or hide, impotent to move, in its trenches, but everywhere our teachings sweep all else before them. Pacifists everywhere see red, and even take to arms and so does now the greatest of republics, the Democracy that said that it would not and should not and need not arm, that pretended to despise our profession, where editors wrote that the soldier’s trade stood but just above that of the hangman’s, with none to cry out against this blasphemy.

And now, see what they do, everywhere. The men who pretend to wish to crush out our militarism and the Kultur that our militarism protects and defends against foreign feeds follow in our footsteps. Have you heard that even in England they copy our salute—the right leg thrown out and brought back to heel—our rigid bearing, and are going to have now, years behind time, a

General Staff just like our own? Nay, they demand universal compulsory service, many of them, learning too late that is it just that by which we Prussians have waxed so great that now they declare we menace all civilization. So, with sickening cant, they embrace that for which they hold us up to scorn and drink deep of the draught they say poisons our veins. And now America yields to our teachings, the very moment it prates its sympathy with the British hope to break down our militarism.

Well, for all I despise the Yankees, the news fills me with joy. You know what it has meant to us over here in the way of annoyance to have America unafraid and unarmed. Did not I, the very first month I joined the General Staff, sit in the Reichstag here in Berlin and hear the traitor August Bebel laud the United States—because it was free from an army and a large navy,—as the true exemplar of the world? Have not we soldiers in every debate in the Reichstag and in all the scandalous Jew-owned radical press had to read this Socialist nonsense? You and I know what damage this sort of talk did here, and how the spirit behind it often kept us from having our war. Well, one by one the obstacles before us soldiers have been brushed aside, until one begins to think that with only a blast of a corporal's trumpet our German General Staff will blow down the remaining walls of what called Liberalism, while Socialism is crushed beneath. What good news is this that America's war office asks 14,000 more officers, a brand new army, 450,000 more men, that the Herr Professor in the White House has recanted of his pacifism; that he speaks now the language of the crafty soldier about defense and never offense, and of arming for peace, and never arming for war, of seeking merely to defend the precious honor of a just nation that seeks

no other's land—how familiar the sound! All this, I say, removes from us the menace of America's love of peace. Never again shall Americans speak to us powerfully of disarmament, or play the fool again to the Czar's malevolence at The Hague. The President speaks now the words of the great von Meltke. I can show you when Bismarck addressed the people thus. Were we not trained to speak so in the General Staff? Forever be praised the patriotic words that make soldiers out of Socialists and spitfires out of the women that might otherwise talk of grounding arms and of peace! Would that Bertha von Suttner had lived to see this day, with the America that was her ideal picking up the arms grounded these fifty years.

Oh, these professors! The one in the White House is like the rest. He, too, swallowed the bait. Here they eat out of our hands and are delivered and bound to us by their own acts. Bismarck said you should never get into a war until you made everybody believe at home that you were the aggrieved one. Lord, how sure our people are of that today! The professors most of all. They do not even notice how their wild enthusiasm and swallowing of all our stories of the war and its causes has damaged their standing here and abroad. What they call their "learning of the ages" now takes second place after our learning that goes back to Abel and Cain. Will they tell us again that they are superior to us? And the press, how it cowers! We need but snap out fingers and its house come to heel! As for the clergy, they pray all day for the success of our arms and forget all about the Prince of Peace.

Can you now doubt we have our domestic situation well in hand? How many untold thousands of reformers will lie dead on the field of honor? Our Crown Prince is far stronger than ever. What Socialist or Liberal will dare complain if he should rejoice again in a Zabern incident? Indeed, if we militarists please, we'll make a Zabern of every town, laughing those to scorn who said the time was coming when the Reichstag would put a leash to our collars. Let the mob rage.

Wherever its demagogues rant, we'll ask them who saved Germany from the brutal Russians, from the British pigs, the Serbian assassins, the French and all the rest. And if that does not do the trick we'll turn their eyes across the Atlantic to the Republic that tried for 125 years to get on without great armies and now has put an end to all that stuff about ideals and moral precepts and is setting the world an example.

The American General Staff will help us. Aren't they dwelling on their danger from us now as a year or so ago they lifted up their voices in fear of Japan? Will they not ring the changes whenever we move for more ships and men as we'll cry out in alarm at their growing fleet, their five-year program, their army trained for duty across the seas, and say it will be our turn next after Spain, at the hands of these dreadful Yankees? But not even we can get such vast sums as they—70 cents of every dollar Congress, you say, now votes, for them and the pensions, and this with nothing to show for it in the way of an army! That's the way of General Staffs—to get all they can, and like us never be content. The new British one will do the same as long as it exists. That is the law of our nature, and then the rewards in rank are so great and the excuses so easy. Truly, my dear Karl, I need not tell you that with use soldiers, too, the appetite grows with the

eating. Why else has the United States voted as much money for an army and navy in President Wilson's two years as in the whole of President Taft's four years? And still the cry is, they're unprepared.

Well, let us not fail to rejoice for our Kaiser, too. Surely our uniform owes him such a debt our lives alone could never pay. But recently he must have worried lest a Socialist majority compel him to dissolve the Reichstag by the bayonet and to rewrite in blood, the Constitution to suit him and us. Now how things have changed! It makes one smile to see the leaders of the masses lauding our armies to the skies. Poor stupid geese! They do not see that it is we who forge their chains; that all their idle dreams of what they call a free State; of liberty, equality, and fraternity in Germany—of another French Revolution—comes to naught as long as our army exists. How could the Czar have held his throne were not his peasants taught to shoot their sons, their mothers, and their wives if the Little Father asked it? We, here, are safe as long as the cattle serve and we can teach them what we will.

Now I must tell you the shocking thing that happened the other day at the house of our old division commander, Excellenz Von Gaffron. You know he has been invalided from the front because of inflammatory rheumatism and last week there came the news of the death of the fourth son he has lost since the war began. The eldest, Robert, you remember, was killed at my side at Chalons; his blood spoiled the first of my field-gray tunics. Herman, the youngest, died in an insane asylum after his nerves gave way. He was not yet eighteen when he entered the

trenches. Frits met a glorious death going down with Admiral von Spee, whose aide he was. Do you recall what a gay and handsome boy he looked when, a mere cadet, he stabbed and killed in a restaurant in Kiel a dog of a civilian who dared to mock our sacred uniform? You will recall, too, what a fuss the Social-Democrats, the cowards, made about his case in the Reichstag and how a naval court of honor showed them what is what by upholding his defense of our uniform and the Kaiser himself wrote an autographed letter of thanks to Frits and prophesied a glorious career for him.

The left Wilhelm, only, alive—his mother's darling; he went to East Africa to the Schutztruppe three years ago, and his term of service there would have been up on October 30th. Not one word had they heard from him since the war began, yet his poor silly mother—an admirable wife and Hausfrau I used to think her—had, it seems, felt right along that Wilhelm would come back to her on the day his service expired. Some clairvoyant had told her to look forward to him on October 30th, and though it was manifestly impossible, since those damned British warships control the seas, she looked somehow for sight of him and went about quite glorified in this fancy that one child was coming back to her.

And, on October 30th, the news came of Wilhelm. It was the familiar form. Twice before had she received it: "The War Office begs to inform you that your son, Oberleutnant Wilhelm von Gaffron of the Second Company of his Imperial Majesty's East African Schutztruppe, according

to a report from the Commanding Officer of October 10th, fell on the field of honor on September 30th, shot through the head.”

Well, everybody felt sorry, of course. But what a record to be proud of! To give four sons to the Kaiser, to the defense of our Vaterland! Surely any woman but a foolish one would forget her grief in the thought that she stood out among all the officers' wives in Berlin as the one who had served her country best. Still it was such an unusual happening that the Commanding General thought it would be a nice compliment for his old comrade von Gaffron (who had at once applied to be sent back to the front to die like his sons) if we all went around to his home to make an official visit of condolence. In the kindness of his heart, he even obtained a letter of sympathy from the Chief of the General Staff himself, with which we all, in full dress uniform, proceeded to call upon their Excellencies von Gaffron.

I can still see it all so vividly: The old General, stiffened by his rheumatism so that he could hardly raise his hands, standing at salute with heels together at the door of the parlor, and then, though shaking like a reed, bowing his thanks for the great honor done him. And then there was the Frau Excellenz, holding tight to the back of a tall chair, dressed in all black, with face as white as the sheet which brings these lines to you—a face which made me think of all the pain that marked the countenance of the Italian Eleanora Duse, at the very end of her Camille. So the Commanding General made a pretty little speech congratulating them both that their sons had died so well, three with their faces to the enemy, doubtless, shouting “Deutschland uber Alles,”

their last thought one of joy that they had not lived in vain. To the father he said how proud he must be that his sons had died in highest standing in the noblest profession in the noblest nation in the world, of which profession he was himself so able and gracious an ornament, as the orders at his breast, those generous gifts of the best and ablest of sovereigns, testified beyond dispute.

And then, turning to the mother, our white-haired chief reminded her that like Cornelia of old her jewels were her children, and how exalted she must be by the thought that she had placed these jewels freely in the hands of our noble Kaiser and divine War Lord to do with as he deemed best. And the Lord in Heaven above, he added, had concurred in and decreed the sacrifice she must be so proud since she had given her best to our native land, to German Kultur, which is to redeem the world from barbarism, and to the profession of arms, the only profession for men of rank and distinction like that of her sons.

Really, I thought the old man had turned from the stiff, crusty martinet he is into a regular Reichstag orator, when suddenly he began to halt, to hesitate, to stammer. I glanced at him and then at her. Never have I seen such blazing anger, contempt, and yes, scorn, in any human being's eyes. So might Lucrese have looked into the invader's face, conscious of her irreparable loss, yet unconquered of spirit. Forgetful of the respect she owed to a Commanding General and to our exalted uniform, the symbol of our Empire's glory and might, ungrateful for the honor done to her by our great Chief of Staff himself, she stood there in tragic wrath until my Chief, confused by her aspect, lamely finished.

“Your Excellency, General von Glausewitz,” she burst forth formally—she from whose burning eyes not a single proper mother’s tear had fallen—“Must you, too, come to tell me these hateful platitudes? Does your Excellency believe that these empty sounds can bring back to life the mother’s heart that lies dead within me? Does your Excellency believe that you do else than mock my very soul with all these words about duty and glory and empire and the Kaiser, our War Lord?”

“No, Albert,” she cried, as her husband, horrified, implored her to stop, to be calm, to think of him, and of his military honor, “the time has passed for that. Thou knowest in thy heart that I am right. Hast thou not confessed it to me in the most intimate hours of the night, when thy soldier’s uniform was doffed, and no soldier, but the father of my sons, lay weeping in my arms? My boys, my little boys! The product of such bitter pains, and then, soon, such big, big boys, so tall and straight, so good and sweet, their hearts full of the joy of life! What have I done to see them in every dream, in every waking hour, mangled, blood red, soaking the ground about them, dying with fierce hate in their hearts, yes, with it writ upon the faces that but yesterday spoke with all the innocence in the world. Gott verdamme den Krieg!”

“Oh, I know well what you have just said, from my father, and from his father, from my four brothers, and my four sons, have I heard the worship of the uniform, this pride and glory of the soldier, and never save the unconvinced and quivering heart; that he who wears it is a superman;

that he is at once blind vassal to his King and the most exalted of his fellows, without whom there could be no peace on earth, no real good will among men. Did not my sailor boy redden his sword to protect the soldier's coat from civilian insults? Was I not ready then to forget the boy's mother and her bleeding heart? Did I not fling away with scorn the letter in which she heaped curses on me and on my Fritz's head? The dear God knows I sinned the unknowing what I did or what her pain!

“But now, now that I am bereft, I can see it all—the hand of Death has freed my eyes. I see beneath your gay coats, your baubles pinned to your breasts, your naked human selves—you who are no different when you lie stark in death from the groom's son who lived like a dog, with equal courage, equal sacrifice, in the trenches beside you, for whom some mother's heart forever aches and throbs like mine. Who gave you the right to be overlords of such as him? Who made you masters of privilege? By what right in Christendom did you Generals and the Kaiser decree that war that stole my sons from me, that kills my husband now before my eyes, that has caused my race to die out. Speak not to me of glory, nor all the cant of war that makes men slaves to it and women its hopeless, helpless pawns. I want not your sympathy; I pray with all my heart the only prayer I have left, that all armies, that our army, shall cease forever to be, that these streets shall never know again the march of armed men. Yes, yes, I am glad my boys are dead, my jewels gone. No sons of theirs shall wear such bribes as these!”

If you can believe, it, my dear Karl, this terrible woman flew then at her husband and tore from him struck to stone, the medals on his breast. The Iron Cross of the First and Second Class I saw under her feet. The Order of the Red Eagle she hurled into a corner. The most honored military medal, Pour Le Merite, she ruthlessly and sacrilegiously threw out our heels—and then we saw no more. With a stern “Punish her, General von Gaffron,” our Chief turned and fled, and we after him, leaving them in their shame, the virago, and the apology for a soldier who stood powerless while degraded. How many men have we officers killed for less? And then you tell me that women vote now in some American States! Heaven forbid. Their place is at home, their highest duty to breed soldiers to die as the Kaiser or the President wills. What right have they to think, or to speak out? It is their to obey—like the dirty Polish dogs of recruits we Prussians beat each year into some semblance of men. As it is, if we do not look out, they will soon be in the Leagues of Peace I’d have the Reichstag forbid by law as treason to the State.

Well, you’ll pity poor General von Gaffron. His career is ended now as if a bullet had struck him dead. But after all he is but one. The war goes on, the glorious war! And we soldiers are masters of the globe. Everywhere civilians cringe to us as we pass. Not statesmen, no members of the Reichstag, no demagogues to tell us what to do; they take their orders from us. Villages, towns, cities, crumple under our hands. Whole countryside’s go up in flames if we so will. We lay our mailed fists upon the maps, and behold, kingdoms rock and fall.

Tell the Americans for me to arm, arm, arm, and then will come more men, and more men, and still more men, and more power for us over here and for our casts and our kind. The military circle of the world will then be complete. And soon these boasted republicans will grovel at their soldiers' feet as our nation does before us. Tell the Yankees that if they will but soon have some bloodletting on their soul, they will know that Bernhardt tells the truth, and Treitschke, too; that might alone makes right. Oh, that you were but here to share with me the wonders, the glory, the climax of our time; even as glorified Caesar in his great day!

Adieu, my poor exile.

Es lebe der Krieg!

Thy faithful

Richard.”

Toastmaster Willcox: It is now my pleasure, gentlemen, to introduce the next speaker, who is no stranger to the Economic Club, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University.

(Applause)

Professor Albert Bushnell Hart

Harvard University

Almighty God, if there be on this earth, a land, a race, an army, or an officer, from whom such a letter as we have heard could have proceeded, and if my own beloved country is to rest while

there be such a people-undefended-may my right hand forget her cunning and may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. (Great applause) And yet, my friends, my former pupil, Mr. Villard, had he offered what he has now given us, when a student at Harvard College, as an example of his powers of translation, (laughter), would have received the highest commendation. (Laughter)

For I live in a state of thankfulness that here is a student, and there are many others, who have carried away from their teacher the consciousness that it was his effort not that they should think as he did, but that they should think as they thought themselves. It is the highest tribute that a college professor can receive, that his own students shall disagree with him. (Laughter)

But in the presence of things of such moment as have here been brought before us and the great thoughts that have been presented by the two preceding speakers, all that is like a sea and what I had to say fades away. I speak as one American to a body of his fellow countrymen by sharing in this passionate desire that our country shall be ready and that our country shall be permanent. (Great applause)

The spirit of the letter from Berlin is as Shakespeare once put it: "Therefore, be well advised, to leave me to mine own protection." We have lived in our own protection until peace has come to seem to us the only normal life of nations and of individuals. To us, war is a groan; to us has

come the realization in this age of that half despairing petition of the prayer-book, - “Lord, Give us Peace in Our Time.”

The fruits of peace are everywhere about us. Take this magnificent city of New York. No walls surround it; no soldiers tread its streets; no flashing uniforms call attention to themselves and divert the passer’s mind from the gaudier raiment of the avenue. (Laughter) Even our military and naval men religiously avoid the display of the garb of their profession and an Admiral of our navy, whose name is a household word throughout the worlds, sits among us, clad as we are and thinking the same thoughts. (Laughter)

It is peace which has filled our warehouses, our docks and factories with food and materials. Peace is the stepmother of the Capitalist and the teacher of school children. From earliest infancy we train our children to realize the advantage of brotherhood and agreement. Peace is ingrained in the structure of our Government. Peace it is that allows the tremendous complications of modern, social and industrial life. Nobody in our time in any country puts up a building or railroad or lays the keel of a ship with any other expectation than that the passengers and sailors will be able to go freely about their business. We are saturated with peace; we live in peace; our prayer is to die in peace. Till a few months ago, the civilized world seemed to be looking forward to an age of permanent peace. For us the poet’s vision---

“Upon the road to Romany

It’s stay, friend, stay!

There's lots of love and lots o' time
To linger on the way;
Poppies for the twilights
Roses for the noon,
It's happy goes as lucky goes
To Romany in June."

"But on the road to Rome-oh
It's march, man, march!
The dust is on the chariot wheels,
The seer is on the larch;
Helmets, and javelins
And bridles flecked with foam,
The flowers are dead, the world's ahead
Upon the road to Rome."

In the midst of this festival of the white robed Angel of Peace, there stalks today the awful figure of Importunate War. Has the character of mankind altered in these few months? No. It is what it was two years ago. Human nature has not changed. Mothers still are pierced with anguish at the sound of the drum beat. Man is neither more or less a beast of the field. The sound of marching feet is heard on three continents. The flames are burning villages inhabited by helpless men,

women and children in Poland, in the Trentino, and the Dardanelles, on the Suez Canal, in Persia, on the Coast of China, in the Islands of the Pacific. Peaceful merchantmen suddenly find themselves treated as enemies. Neutral rights are trampled underfoot. How many men and women in this assemblage have in the last few months been actually witnesses of the horrors of war. How many of those present can go back to their own experiences fifty years ago, when regiment after regiment, thousands of desirable young men, were sent off into the crater of the Volcano. The glamor of war disappears for those who have lived through it. That magnificent old black woman, Harriet Tubman, who saw the terrible essentials of war, for she was in the midst of it, once said, and I heard her say it,--

“And then we heard the thunder—and that was the
the guns—and then we saw the lightning—
and that was the big guns—and then we heard
the rain falling—and that was drops of blood
falling—and then we came to get in our crops
it was dead men that we reaped.”

Nor has it been reserved for our century to discover the horrors of war. Thousands of years ago, a Chinese sage protested that “When contentions about territory are the ground on which they fight, they slaughter men, till the fields are filled with them. When some struggle for a city as the ground on which they fight, they slaughter men until the city is filled with them. This is what is called “leading on the land to devour human flesh. Death is not enough for such a crime.

Therefore, those who are skillful to fight should suffer the highest punishment.” To this I respectfully refer for decision to the extreme pacifist; next to them should be punished those who united the princes in league. There are no righteous wars.

Common sense agrees that war is a hateful system. Our own experience has been not only that it destroys men, but that it destroys our own sense of the sanctity of the human body, and the human soul. We do not appreciate the sinking of a neutral ship unless there are at least 200 lives lost.

“But on the road to Rome—ah,
Its fight, man, fight!
Footman and horseman,
Treading left and right,
Campfires and watch-fires
Ruddying the gloam-
The fields are gray and worn away
Along the road to Rome.”

Now in the poet’s mind, you have your choice between Romany and Rome. If you like Romany, there you stay to the end. For all our schemes of making and keeping the world at peace rest upon the potential supposition that the world as a whole may choose between Romany and Rome, nay, that any independent nation may choose for itself, or to be more specific, that the

United States of American is so big, and powerful, and honest, and well-meaning, that it will be allowed to choose for itself, and by so choosing, it will bring the rest of the world into our happy state of peace.

Is there such a choice? That is the question before us tonight. If all the thinking people of the United States agreed upon the preference for peace and even upon means of peace, could we then have peace in the world, or peace in our hemisphere? Hopefulness is one of the most blessed gifts of the Almighty, but that habit of facing the truth is still more essential.

Sometimes I feel my neighbors are much like Dr. Samuel Johnson, who was asked once whether he believed the destruction of Lisbon by an earthquake: “Oh! Not for six months (said he); I did think that story too dreadful to be credited, and can hardly yet persuade myself that it was true to the full extent we all of us have heard.”

Are the tales that we hear about war true? Are the dangers of war, not only where it now rages, but in other parts of the world, true or false? When Johnson was told the story that Elliot in his brave defense of Gibraltar, fired red-hot cannon balls at the enemy, he replied, “Sir, I would advise you, (with a cold sneer), never to relate this story again.” Are we entitled to relate these stories again?

Lowell said: “There is no good arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wing is the put on an overcoat.”

Now a case of arguing with the inevitable is put by a recent and candid writer upon the Monroe Doctrine, who says: “The neutralization in America by a Third Hague Conference, not yet come off, or better still, a guarantee by that Confederation of all the members of the family of nations would apply that just and righteous principle to the entire world.”

And this is the first of three reasons why we have no reason to expect permanent peace in the world, even if we set the most glorious and the most sacrificing of sacrifices.

In the first place, the world is not completed, at any rate, in a state of permanent equilibrium. It is not in a complete mosaic, in which every tessera has its appointed place. So to substitute one color for another in any part of the magnificent picture would result in putting the offender to the band of mankind. That is not a fact upon which the great nations actually build their policies. A few years ago, I was in Asia, and I came away from that continent filled with the belief that all the European dependencies upon it are certain to disappear in no great number of years. Why, the Concert of European powers tried to apply that principle that the earth was crystallized, was completed, no longer to be changed in 1915. Suppose they had been successful in establishing a universal peace upon the boundaries of that period, what would have been the result? No Germany, no Italy, no Japan, no Latin American states, no United States of America extending to

the Pacific. The truth is that mankind is bigger than Congresses or Conventions or Treaties. The future of the world is not yet measured by the paint-box and the ruler of European geography. If the six great European powers at this moment engaged in awful conflict with China, Japan, and the United States were within a few months in a Congress to make a new map of the world and should agree by the most solemn obligations to maintain peace and to subdue and punish any country or dependency or group that disturbed that hand-made harmony, all their tremendous power would not avail. For some Persians or Australians or Scandinavians, or Mexicans, sooner or later would defy the combination and start this breaking up, unless the future combination of world states, therefore, can be trusted to undo as well as construct, to subdivide territory as well as to combine it, then universal peace is a more difficult task, because the warring nations have all broken through restraint which they professed to have bound about themselves. Samson, not simply the diplomat, and the naval authority,--even a college professor may quote the scripture and call you attention to the fact that green wythes were nothing to Samson when he rose in his might. So the First Hague Convention, which was opened in 1898 among the nations of the earth, the greatest step ever taken toward preventing war by avoiding and removing some of their causes. Sam Johnson would have refused to recognize the wars that have followed that Convention: The War of 1900, the Japan-Russo War of 1904-5; the Balkan War of 1912-3, the Second Balkan War of 1913, and the terrific European War of 1914, now involving 13 nations—five splendid opportunities for the Hague Tribunal and not one single nation, except poor, beset little Servia, so much as suggested applying for the preliminary investigation provided for by the Second Hague Convention.

Not only has the hateful spirit of war affected the nations, but it besets neutrals and peaceful people. As long ago as 1796 President Washington wrote: “It is in our own experience that the most sincere neutrality is not a sufficient guard against the depredations of nations at war. To secure respect to a neutral flag requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression.” And in the third place is an awful truth, whether Sam Johnson would accept it or not; is that it is today within the power of any one great nation to bring war not only upon its immediate enemy, but by alliances of nations, upon whole continents.

For example: The immediate cause of the present war was the conviction of Austria-Hungary that the Slavs within the boundaries of that empire were on the point of combining with other Slavs to form a new Servia State. Russia stood in the way of Austria. Germany sided with Austria. France sided with Russia. England sided with France. Japan sided with Allies. Belgium clung to that combination. All Europe and most of Asia has gone into the ring, and every effort is made to push neutral powers over. Even a great nation like the United States may well ponder upon the faith of the Russian hero: “Suddenly, whence I know not, a lovely damsel appeared to him so lovely that the like of her cannot be told in tale or written with pen, and she said to him: ‘Bread and salt, Ivan the Tsarevich.’ – ‘I cry thy pardon, lovely damsel, sit down and eat with me.’ – ‘I would sit down with thee, but I am afraid because thou hast an enchanted horse.’ – ‘Nay, lovely damsel, thou art ill-informed. I have left my magic horse at home and am riding on a common one.’ No sooner did the lovely damsel hear this, than she began to swell out and swell

out till she became a frightful lioness, opened wide her jaws, and swallowed up by the Tsarevich whole. She was not an ordinary damsel.” (Laughter)

Militarism is not an ordinary damsel, but observe that if the Tsarevich had not trusted to his ordinary hose, he might have remained outside the lovely damsel. But what we are most interested in, after al, is the defense not so much of mankind, but the protection of our own lands from the dangers and degradations of war. Now, preparedness means no more in national defense than in other parts of the national life. It means simply that the American people shall look the world in the face and make such preparation as is adequate for imperative dangers. Proper preparedness is no more than buying your ticket before you get on the train, so that you know what it is going to cost you. (Laughter) It is nothing different from building a levee before the flood comes, even though you may have no statement certified to by an audit company that there will be a flood next year. It will come sometime. (Laughter) Preparedness is nothing but efficiency supplied in advance. (Great applause)

In one respect, however, preparedness much reach our own boundaries. I wish I could believe the eloquent confidence of one of the speakers tonight to the effect that the United States has no designs upon territory outside our borders. How does it come that since 1897, there have been added to the circle of the influence and authority of the United States though not incorporated within our boundaries, the so-called independent countries of Cuba, of Santo Domingo, of Hayti, of Panama, and of Nicaragua, and between Nicaragua and Panama are the four other central

American states which are now prepared to be swallowed up by the same lovely damsel, (Laughter) and when the whole of Central America and the available Caribbean Islands are thus made dependencies of the United States, what will be the status of Mexico?

Now, the truth is that the United States has for a century been committed to a political principle which carries it out of the negative side of war and into negative principle so long as it simply foreshadowed what the United States might do under certain circumstances; a positive principle now that it takes the form of notifying European powers that they must not so much as temporarily occupy other American territory even in an effort to secure the settlement of unjust claims. That is why we have become the protector of these so-called independent nations. That policy of the Monroe Doctrine is not a peaceful policy. If it means anything, it means that there may be circumstances under which the United States will be obliged to defend its own interest. And my own conclusion is that if we should give up the Monroe Doctrine, the Monroe Doctrine would not give us up. To forsake the Monroe Doctrine means in the long run that the damage will come and that then there must be a different kind of preparedness.

And, in conclusion, if preparedness be necessary for self-defense or otherwise, how far shall preparedness go? As a nation our policy of dealing with international difficulties somewhat resembles that of the sea captain who had a chest of numbered medicines. No. 7 was a specific for fever and when No. 7 ran out, he simply took some out of No. 4, something out of No. 3 and mixed them together. If that wasn't No. 7, what was it? (Laughter) So we cure all our political

ills by Statute, and if we run out of statutes, then we find two more statutes and mix them up.

(Laughter) At present there seems to be a general widely spread belief that all we need is more laws for raising more men and building more ships, and more guns.

Forty-five years ago, General Grant said: “It is hardly wise statesmanship in a country like ours, with relations of every nature with foreign countries, to rest with such inadequate means of enforcing any foreign policy, either of protection or of redress.” For any army, there must be men and for a modern army there must be many thousand men.

The million soldiers, nevertheless, whom an American statesmen has recently promised to create at any time on 24 hours’ notice, (laughter), would, if they existed, not be more than one-fifth of the individuals who are now in the military service of the German Empire upon some terms, and soldier are as agents.

We are deceived by our own greatness. We have a fancy that the United States is one of the greatest powers, as it is one of the greatest nations in the world. There is a British Lion, there is a Russian Boar, there is a Gaelic Cock, there is a German Eagle, why should there not be an American—well, say, the Hippopotamus? (Laughter) And why the Hippopotamus? Why, is he not a big, strong, able, contented beast? (Laughter) He is the strongest creature in all his neighborhood. Everybody is afraid of stirring up the hippopotamus, because you don’t know what he may do when he is excited. (Laughter) And as an emblem of military power, what can

be better than the hippopotamus? (Laughter) You demand force. Well, is not that hippopotamus the equal of all the beasts on earth? In war, you need mobility, swiftness and surprise? Alright, the hippopotamus can pull 5 tons. You want a sharpshooter up a tree? Certainly, the hippopotamus can stay under what 5 minutes. You want a safe transportation system. By all means. The hippopotamus can carry her calf on her back. You want an efficient, highly endowed military organization? Why, of course, the hippopotamus has such a thick hide that it takes an eight-ounce bullet to kill it.

True preparedness must go beyond this. We are a great nation. We can meet the trouble because the hippopotamus thinks he can meet it when it comes, because of his strength.

Beyond that, there are other duties of preparedness, just as imperative. For instance, the preparation of the munitions of war at such terms that they would both be made the objects of a campaign if we were engaged in war with any first-class naval power.

One of the great and neglected things in our system of transportation is the lack of a definite arrangement and combination of railroads. We have four or five routes extending through to Key West, and yet there is not system about it. In Germany, they have eight double-tracked roads from end to end of the country. The Pacific Coast is a precious possession to us. Yet there is not a single double track railway that reaches it. Our merchant ships have not been built with reference to possible military service. We have no efficient system of accumulated supplies of

any kind or of any factories designated in advance for preparing for these needs as they arise.

Preparedness does not simply mean having men and the money to feed and equip them. It means that Congress and the Administration, and the Economic Club, shall unite in a common cause for us to arrange matters that if war did break out that you don't have to organize your defense from top to bottom after that enemy is at your doors. (Great applause)

Ancient Confucius said: "Let a good man teach the people seven years and they may then likewise be employed in war." The master said: "To lead an uninstructed people to war, is to throw them away." There is no man in this audience less anxious that the young men of America should be called to war. I have my own reason for hesitation at the idea that young men of 18 may be needed in the service of their country, but I will tell you what: I would rather that my two sons share in a universal military service than that we or they should depend upon volunteers. I think in my own heart that the likelihood that my two sons will live to be my age would be far greater under a proper discipline on the Swiss or Australian system, or what would you like, than under our present hit-and-miss system. (Great Applause) I would be willing that my sons should go to war. The poor German mother—she was willing. I am one of the people of this audience, there are not so many after all, who lived through the Civil War. My father was an officer. I saw him come and go, and I am tired of the theory that the United States of America has got to be saved by a special band of volunteers. We want something more than patriotism. We want the feeling throughout the nation that whatever is necessary in war, is necessary for all the people.

There are many other respects in which we need preparedness. I have no time to go into them. We have been living for many years upon Spencer's apothegm; "Be bold, be bold, and everywhere be bold." Let us take another motto; let us give ourselves up with no other thought, but

"Oh, woe, we guide the man, or ever he was born, that did not draw the sword, before he blew the born."

Toastmaster Willcox: Those who have had the pleasure of perusing the delightful pages of "The Great Illusion," will be pleased that we have with us tonight its gifted author, and it gives me great pleasure to present to you, Mr. Norman Angell. (Great Applause)

Mr. Norman Angell

Author of "The Great Illusion," "The World's Highway"

The penalty of the last speaker is always, of course, that the others have taken his best points, and there are other penalties also—that everybody is anxious to get home. However, I am going to sacrifice a great many things, so that I hope you will bear with me.

My thesis is this: That preparedness does not consist in armies alone, and in that I am going to develop the thesis of a speaker who has preceded me—Dr. Hill.

I suppose if you were to ask a hundred Americans what the increase of power in America was for, they would say, “It is very simple. It is to repel an invader from these shores, and that’s all there is about it, and we don’t need really to discuss it any more. It doesn’t bear on policy any more than that, because all we ask of the foreigner is kindly to keep out, and though we are not going to discuss it with him, it isn’t that international policy has any particular reference to his armies.”

Well, now, if you will look back in your history, you will find that of the several wars which America has had since it became an independent state, and of the wars which threatened and which very nearly came, not one has been for the purpose of repelling an invader. All arose out of an American policy which collided with some other policy. Your War of 1812 was concerned with rights of Americans on the high seas, and it is not yet vindicated. Your war with Mexico was not for the purpose of repelling an invader of your territory. If it was concerned with territory, it was rather for the purpose of taking it. Your war with Spain—I do not suppose any American will seriously urge that this country was in grave danger from the troops of the little boy king, Alfonso. The near war, when this country stood as one against Great Britain—President Cleveland ready to go to war with Great Britain—it was because if Great Britain pretended to threaten the invasion of these shores, it was on behalf of a certain American policy. If you had been compelled to go to Mexico—as you still may be compelled—that also would not have been a war to repel an invader. It would have been a war on behalf of an American policy. If you had

gone to war on behalf of Lusitania—and you may still have to—that also will be a war on behalf of a certain policy, and not to repel an invader.

Now, will you please note that I have no one word of criticism of those policies. They may be entirely good policies. I think they are for the most part, but your armies would not be used for the mere purpose of repelling a predatory raid upon your country. They are unlikely to be used for that purpose. They will be used, if at all, on behalf of a policy.

Now whether your influence in the world and your growing military power is on the whole to stand for good, will be determined by the factor whether those armies are for the enforcement of a good policy or a bad one. If they are for the enforcement of a bad policy, you will not protect your rights. You will not protect your interests. I am not even sure that you will protect your territory.

Let us just see how your armies might be employed. Let us assume that when you have a large and more efficient army than you have, that you have discovered during some future administration that the trouble with Mexico is not finished, is not over—and Mr. Wilson himself has given a hint that the trouble with that country may not be over. You will want to go in there and “cleanup that mess,” as Mr. Roosevelt will put it. You go in; you take over the Administration of that country and that means that you are predominant on this hemisphere right down to the Panama Canal, because as Professor Hart has very well stated, you are already

predominant in Cuba, in Haiti, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, etc. Your armies will, therefore, have complete control of the northern half of the western hemisphere, and we will assume in the hypothetical administration of the future that you have some strong protectionists who feel that as a fair payment for your sacrifices made in the domination of the territory, you are entitled to a preferential treatment commercially, and that concessions are given to you and not to the Europeans and you will compel a policy on the part of those countries in that sense. Then some extensive European country—any you like—Germany, or some country in southeastern Europe, or it may be from Asia-Japan-, what you will, will put to the question: “What is your predominant influence on the northern half of this continent going to be used for? What is this increasing power for.” They will ask whether it means really the exclusion of Europeans in a commercial sense in those territories. That will be complicated perhaps by difficulties with Japan in California; tempers will get a little ragged; we shall all lose our tempers and call it patriotism, and before you know what has happened, you will be in the midst of a great war on behalf of some interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. Because, you know, that is a very elastic doctrine. We are all prepared to die for it, but none of us know what it means. (Laughter)

Well, then this war is all over and you are triumphant, as you will be, you will then call a conference. You will sit down with the plenipotentiaries of the European and the Asiatic powers and you will ask what it is all about. Because you will find this: That you cannot simply say to the rest of the world that they have no rights on this hemisphere and when they put it to you that that is what your conduct has implied, you will deny that it had any such meaning. You will

recognize that you must establish with foreign nations, with other nations in this world, where we all have to live together, some kind of *modus vivendi*—in fact, you will do after the war what you very well would have done before the war.

Now you will have to do that, because if you do take the other stand, that you do not need an international policy, that foreigners have no particular rights on this hemisphere, even you great resources will not be equal to the task of enforcing that policy. Because, if ever this country is threatened by a Japan or a Germany, it will not be by one nation going alone. Nations no longer fight in units. They fight in groups, and if in an attempt to impose, shall we say, some extreme policy of exclusion, you touch really vital interests of the rest of the world. You will have to meet the resources, not of a single nation of 65 millions, but nations running into the hundreds of millions.

Then that will mean that in the attempt to enforce that policy, you will have to militarize your population, certainly to an equivalent extent of the militarization of a population like that of Prussia today, which means that the particular free faith of American society as we now know it, Anglo-Saxon society, will have disappeared by reason of the very measures taken to protect it.

Now I want to hint to you how in another way, unless you make up your minds what your international policy is to be, your sheer military or naval power cannot enforce your rights—Take this matter of the *Lusitania*, which is not yet done, which is not yet closed. Here you had a

hundred of your citizens massacred on the high seas. Supposing that you had determined immediately to go to war over that matter. Supposing that you had the greatest navy in the world, how would that have vindicated your rights to the safe travel of your citizens on the seas? How would the fact of the possession of a great navy have made any essential change in the situation at all?

The Allies, the enemies of Germany, had a command of the sea as complete as great ships could make it. The submarine raids existed in defiance. Merely adding your great ships, however great in number, would not have changed that situation. Supposing that you had your great army then and had sent it out to Flanders, or France or Turkey, and you had insured the defeat of Germany and you are victorious and are now seated at the conference table. You would then make this discovery: That as between what you were asking and what the Allies were asking, was this significant difference—that what they were asking, could be delivered on the spot and what you were thinking, could not. France, for instance, would be asking the retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine. Well, assuming that her armies are triumphant, she would have compelled the evacuation by the Germans of those territories and the retrocession could take place. The goods would be delivered. England, for instance, would be demanding, we will say, a transfer of German colonies. As she already commands them, as she already occupies them, those goods could also be delivered.

But what would you be asking? That in the future wars, American citizens should not be massacred on the high seas in a quarrel which did not concern them. Well, the plenipotentiaries of the powers seated there after your victory would say, “Yes, certainly, we agree. We agreed before.” (Laughter)

How do you know that your demands are guaranteed? How do you know that the goods you are asking for are delivered? You don’t know, and your only hope of having them delivered, would be to enter into some sort of international arrangements, because failing that, even supposing you could get this admission, it would mean your going to war virtually with every power in every country, if they cared to violate that rule, since the others would not be pledged, and you might even find this: That your enemy would come nearer to meeting your views along certain of your lines, - like Russia, who has always demanded the right to sow the seas with mines. So you might even find this: That after a great war, you would have an international admission that citizens should not be massacred by submarine torpedoes.

Now I put it up to you, I put it to you plainly: How would you propose by your own power to insure the delivery of what you were asking – the fulfillment of your own terms however victorious your armies, merely by your armies alone. You could not. You cannot satisfy the claims that you are now making for this very serious thing of the matter and what are you going to do? Are you going to give your pledge, your power, to some international rule? How far are you going to tire your hands as to the future concerning the fashion in which you are going to use

your power upon this hemisphere with reference to the exclusion of Europeans in South America? You have got to make up your minds to these things, because if you do not, if you leave these things vague, if on the one hand you will not pledge your power in any way to the enforcement of an international rule, and on the other you demand that your hands shall be entirely free to use your political and military powers on this hemisphere as you believe, then the increase of your power is going to make for increasing risk of war, it is for increasing disorder in the international field and you are not going to achieve what you ask in such matters as those which you are now asking of the two continents.

Now, unless you do define clearly, as Dr. Hill has stated, your international policy, and decide how far you can go towards meeting what will be the claims of the future of others, and how far you are going towards putting your power behind what you regard as your claims, this new Congress of Vienna, which we yet shall have at the end of the war, will be as much a failure as the Congress of Vienna a hundred years ago. Because you are today making demands concerning rights which are supposed to have been won earlier at the Congress of Vienna a hundred years ago. The great piling up of power by Europe since that Congress has not brought it any nearer to solution. Heaven knows that since 1815, they had power enough, armies enough, but there has been no common purpose: there has been no common will, no real international policy. Why, Europe could not even frame an international policy with reference to meeting a common danger like that of Napoleonic militarism a hundred years ago, and twenty or thirty years after the separation of the members of that Congress, who supposed that they had disposed of the

Napoleonic danger and had abolished the Napoleonic Dynasty, England herself was entering into alliance with another Napoleon, was fortifying the Napoleon dynasty again in Paris. England was shortly afterwards to fight a great war on the continent for the purpose of preventing Russia reaching Constantinople, which she is now fighting for the purpose of undoing. She fought a great war for the purpose of imposing the rule of Turkey upon Christian populations against which she is now fighting and she has France. England and France have threatened one another many times during that hundred years. In what way would increase of power, increase of military forced of the nations have solved any of the problems and any of the troubles which finally precipitated this war?

We are told if only England had been better prepared, if only she had adopted the advice of Lord Robertson and adopted conscription 20 years ago. Well, when universal military service was demanded in England about 20 years ago, do you know for what purpose they established their propaganda? For the purpose of creating a constant army that should fight France and it was so declared in the literature which they put out, and supposing that they had been successful and that England had had this great conscript army of two or three million men and when the crisis arose and both these armies had great armies facing one another across the channel,-do you know that less than 20 years ago, a prominent statesman like Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was openly advocating an alliance with Germany against France and was urging that all French colonies ought to be taken from her and given to Germany and if they had the power, they might have

done it? Don't you see that the mere piling up of power by the nations or giving any of them security, that you merely cancel by one power the power of the other? (Great applause)

Now, I know that it is fashionable just now to disparage international agreement, but I put it to you once more: How do you propose to secure the safety of your citizens in the future at sea without some sort of international agreement? Secondly, if Democracy has any hope whatever today in Western Europe, it is by virtue of the fact that eight nations can abide by some sort of agreement. If they could not, if Germany knew that sooner or later that combination of England and France and their authority could be broken up, that they be detached, Germany knows that her day will come. Because, it is simply untrue to say that any nation can depend upon its own forces. Well, there is not one of the western democracy now fighting, that could have depended upon its own forces alone. Suppose that France had simply and purely been depending upon her own forces, without reliance upon an international treaty, where would she be? Russia, England, Belgium. What is the hope of Belgium? Belgium could never hope to have defended herself by her own arms alone, and if ever Germany is to learn that the rights of small nations must be protected, it will be by virtue of the fact that nations can unite for that purpose. Democracy today rests upon the hope of the permanence of international treaty, and if that hope is vain, than Democracy is done. (Great applause)

Now, there is this curious failure of reasoning, if I may say it, on the part of certain of our militaristic friends, because a method may not avail a conclusion that they say that you should

train, but that you should not train at all. Now, do you propose to do anything whatsoever without some sort of an international treaty? We can't do it. If you – and I am sorry as I know you are getting away and I have to miss a few points here – but if you do not allow your prospective enemy to know what this increasing power of yours is for, what policy is it going to enforce, what it is going to stand for, you are not going to protect this American society, which you love, however much you follow up your armies. What is it we defend, when we talk of defense? It isn't a piece of soil; it isn't a piece of area, because we are a migratory figure. What we defend is a type of society.

Now if you adopt this creed that you have no obligations to foreigners, that you need not worry what those obligations are, that you need not worry about creating some method life, which will enable you to live in this world together with them, but adopt everything upon your mere force of arms, then you will have to build up those armies, by which the American society will resemble in all particulars that Prussian society, with the morality that was revealed in the letter that was read to you earlier. Because, let us be honest about this. I believe in the employment of force, but a force with a human and enlightened will behind it and that enlightened will must come first, and if you put the force first and the will afterward, then your force will be ill-used. You must put the human will and body first and then use your force for that purpose. If you do not, you are going to impose upon this society of America certainly the kind of slavery that your Europeans have managed to impose upon their society, which is this: that we have no longer the freedom of conscience in that a man can kill his fellow over some political difference. If you intend to use

your nations simply as military instruments, you must prescribe for your citizen's freedom of judgment, as to whether this killing they are to do is for a good or a bad cause. The State of Prussia lays it down that not only must a man give body and soul to the State, but he must not judge whether that cause of the State is right or wrong and if he attempts to, he is shot. How is it all necessary and I think an inevitable part of the perfection of the military machine, but it is freedom? Do you propose to protect your freedom by imposing upon your society that kind of slavery? This, then, all America will probably have to answer: What is the American freedom that you are going to protect? What are you going to do with your increasing power? What kind of American society are you going to protect with it? (Great applause)

Toastmaster Willcox: The meeting is now ended.