

The Economic Club of New York

35th Meeting

A National Economic Program

February 25, 1916

Hotel Astor
New York City

Table of Contents

First Speaker	
The Honorable Edmund J. James	
President, University of Illinois	2
Second Speaker	
The Honorable Henry Morgenthau	
U.S. Ambassador to Turkey	27
Third Speaker	
The Honorable Ben Lindsey	
Judge, Children’s Court, Denver Colorado.....	31
Fourth Speaker	
The Honorable L.B. Hanna	
Governor of North Dakota	42
Fifth Speaker	
A. Lawrence Lowell	
President of Harvard University	48
Sixth Speaker	
Major-General Leonard Wood, U.S.A	
Commanding The Department of the East, U.S. Army	63

Introduction

Toastmaster Willcox

Gentlemen of the Economic Club: The program as it appears by the paper in your hands has been somewhat changed. We are in receipt of a telegram from Congressman Bailey, which I will read:

“Owing to the tense condition in Congress it is deemed imprudent that I should absent myself at this time. Must therefore forego engagement. Had hoped situation would clear but remains cloudy. Convey my sincere regrets.

Warren Worth Bailey”

In place of Mr. Bailey we are fortunate in having with us, or expect to have with us a little later, Judge Ben Lindsey of Denver, who, as you know, has just returned from the historic trip to the War Zone. (Laughter and applause)

We are also expecting to have here as a guest of honor, that distinguished New Yorker of whom all of us are so proud, our Ambassador to Turkey, the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, and we also expect to have here, a little later, as a guest of honor, a man whom I am sure we will be delighted to honor – General Leonard Wood. (Great applause)

As one of the fundamental principles of this organization is to start on time, we will not await the

arrival of any of these gentlemen to whom I have made reference, but we will begin the evening's program, and I will first call upon that distinguished educator from the University of Illinois, which is doing such great work in the great Middle West, and which is largely due to the important work of its president whom I now have the honor of introducing to you, President James. (Great applause)

First Speaker

The Honorable Edmund J. James

President, University of Illinois

Members and friends of the Economic Club, I have been asked to talk to you for a few minutes this evening on "A National Economic Program".

One may naturally raise the question: whether in such exciting times as these, when the whole world is living in the midst of war or war's alarms, it is really worthwhile to try to consider or discuss such a subject as A National Economic Program. My answer is that this is just the time when public attention can be most easily obtained for certain aspects of such a program.

It is an historical fact that during or in the wake of great wars many of the most important movements for human progress have been started. The great wave of popular emotion which war with all its horrors excites, often bears the peoples on to new heights of vision and achievement.

The present unhappy conflict in Europe has stirred popular feeling to its depths and quickened the religious spirit and the spiritual impulse throughout the nations in a very unusual way. Its reflex is felt even here, and prepares the soil for policies and actions which might have stood little chance of real success in piping times of peace.

It is, of course, rather difficult to separate an economic program from various other kinds of programs. Economic effort and economic policies are so closely bound up with social and political efforts and policies, that it is almost impossible to separate them – even for purposes of discussion, let alone for purposes of action and life. A program which looks primarily to producing sounder and better conditions of moral life for the people of a country has the most intense economic relationships. The more moral a people is, other things being equal, the more effective it is as an economic agent; and the sounder the moral character of a people, the greater its effectiveness in the production of wealth. And so, in discussing a national economic program, it will be necessary, of course, to include certain aspects of the movements in other fields than economics.

My first proposition is that a national economic program in a large and comprehensive way is not possible at present for the United States. Such a program, in the fullest sense, presupposes a nation, and that we have not yet become. As a shrewd publicist has recently pointed out, the great mass of the people of the United States live still a local life, instead of a national one. We are still to a large extent congeries of groups, provinces and racial stocks. We are still too much

devoted to our local group, class or ethnic loyalties to permit the development of the highest form of American citizenship. Some of these facts have been impressed upon our attention most strongly by recent events in the midst of our body politic and social, growing out of the Great War beyond the seas.

We are still trying to solve some of our greatest national problems by local experiments which confuse and interfere with one another, and prevent any real progress toward the end we have in view.

Nothing, for instance, could be more national in its essential nature than the transportation system, resting upon the use of the steam railway as its most important element. Of all methods of solving the fundamental economic and social problems connected with such as development as we have had in the United States in this field, the division of authority between the nation on the one hand, and nearly fifty local jurisdictions on the other, is most absurd. (Applause) the claim of Illinois across whose broad prairies such a large percentage of the products of national labor must pass, to be permitted to determine the railway policy within its territory is, of course, destructive of any reasonable policy of any kind. The claim of Nevada to tax the transportation of a nation under the guise of local regulation of railway matters is really too absurd to be considered as a reasonable proposition; and yet we are consuming the time of hundreds of judges and scores of courts in trying to determine the exact limitations between state and federal authority in the regulation of this fundamental, national issue. There will be no solution of the

railway question in any of its important aspects, either on the traffic side, the wages of railway employees, or the rate on capital invested in the railways, or the rates which the public shall pay for the use of the railways; until the federal government shall exercise throughout the whole scope of this business, to the exclusion of the states, the power of regulation and control, until this branch of our national life essentially national in its economic relation shall be made national also in its legal and administration relations. (Great applause)

We are still trying to solve another fundamental issue of our American life which has the very largest economic relations through local agencies; though of all interests it is the most essentially national and that is education. In a democracy the education of the people is the most vital of all interests, it is the most national of all issues, and yet we have not only left it almost entirely to the locality, but have compelled the locality to bear the burden of its support. A group of farmers in Massachusetts or in Kentucky, are compelled to support the burden of the community in the first instance, is really educating the children of the nation, for these youngsters go out from these local districts into the entire territory of the Republic, and the benefit of their education accrues to the advantage of other communities, while the burden rests on the community compelled to support the school. This, of course, would not be so bad if the locality were able to give the kind of school which the children of a Republic like ours should enjoy. The rural elementary school, however, in the United States is at its best far below a decent standard of efficiency, and at its worst is a disgrace to our civilization.

We have as a nation done almost nothing in the direction of definite and effective vocational education, and we shall do nothing of large consequence until the nation is willing to get behind the movement and support it by pecuniary aid, and administrative and legal support. No nation can have a really effective national economic program which doesn't include as an essential part the vocational training of its youth, and yet the American people has been thus far unwilling to take any effective steps in this direction.

Again, if we are to accomplish the reasonable regulation of industry in such a way as to protect the laborers engaged in our mines and mills, we must have a national system of regulation which will put all employers upon the same relative basis. (Applause) We cannot expect Massachusetts, or Indiana, or Iowa to organize and maintain permanently effective systems of protection of the laborer unless Connecticut and New York and Ohio and Missouri are put under the same general rules, and yet the American people has been unwilling to face this issue in any definite and conclusive way.

We have, perhaps, the most striking illustration of our lack of nationality in the fact that in our administration of justice, in a department which ought to be general and uniform throughout the territory of the Republic, we have more than fifty different jurisdictions, and we are supporting thousands of lawyers and hundreds of courts to determine the complications of jurisdiction, the total outcome of which is often times, such an absolute miscarriage of justice as to be a reproach to the nation. And yet any real effort to develop a common civil code for all the United States

suffers shipwreck at every attempt upon the local provincial habits and thoughts of the people.

But, perhaps, the most striking of all evidences that we are not in any real sense of the term a nation, is to be found in our scheme of national defense.

There is no doubt whatever that if a nation has to maintain a large and comprehensive military and naval force, the only economic, efficient, and democratic system of organization is that of universal military service; (applause) a scheme under which every man must do his duty in the military service of the state because he is a male citizen of the state, and which permits no man to escape the recognition and performance of this obligation because he is rich, or cowardly, or lazy, or busy. If the outlook for world peace at the close of the present conflict is as unpromising as it was for the ten years preceding its outbreak, and nobody in the world can tell at the present time whether it is going to be so or not, we must in the long run accept and make effective the system recommended by Washington and the older statesmen, and which was implied in the Constitution and laws of the country at its very beginning, of a universal liability to military service. Or else we must be content to take; I will not say a secondary place in the councils of the world, but a place which will be so subordinate that we shall be practically a negligible factor.

In the presence of an armed world and the possibility of sudden attack, it is pure bunk of a criminal sort for any statesman or citizen to tell the American people that we can safely rely in any serious exigency upon the so-called voluntary and local system. It broke down in the

Revolutionary War, which we should have lost if it had not been for French aid; in the War of 1812, in which we attained no victories of importance on land until after the war closed; in the Civil War; in the Spanish War; and in a most striking way in the sister nation most like our own in this great conflict beyond the seas. But in spite of these facts, and in spite of the present outlook, there is no indication that the American people is willing at the present time to adopt any real, national scheme of providing for national defense. I believe, myself, that the Constitution of the United States gives to the Federal Government ample authority to organize the state contingents into an efficient national army, but with our way of doing things, and our way of looking at things, I have just as little doubt that Congress will not, except under the pressure of imminent war, put the laws upon the Statute Book which will be necessary to make this exercise of federal authority efficient.

We still leave to the States, to neglect or perform as they please, such a fundamental national function as that of the care and assimilation of our immigrants. A national economic program, therefore, in the large and comprehensive sense of the term is, in my opinion, an impossibility at the present time, because, in fact, we are not yet a nation, but a union of semi-independent and semi-local autonomous provinces.

On the other hand, even though this be so, we certainly ought by every means in our power to strive toward the realization in fact of such a nation; though our progress may only be little by little.

In the progress of the nation of the people towards a nation, it is not merely friends we have seen in the last few months or the last year or two in the field of a lack of cohesion among the elements which make the American people, but we have had a most striking and ominous illustration, recently, of how some of our own Americans, genuine so far as their birth is concerned, fail to see the necessity of cultivating a higher standard of patriotism. This striking and ominous illustration, to me is the poem of Owen Wister, on President Wilson.

I hold no brief for President Wilson. I do not belong to the same political party. I have not; in general sympathized with his ideas either in politics or education during the twenty-five years I have been following them with interest and care. It is true that lately driven by the logic of facts and experience, he has gradually given up, one after another, nearly all his most cherished ideas and has, in two or three notable instances, changed his point of view so suddenly and radically, that he could not help accepting the ideas of his opponents. But speaking generally, our ideas in politics and education have been fundamentally opposed.

It is not, therefore, from any sympathy with these views that I confess I was profoundly shocked by this bitter attack on the character and motives of the President of the United States – a man whom no matter how we regard his policies, we must concede to be one of the fairest fruits of our American civilization (Great applause) A man of whom, among men, we may all be proud as American citizens, and be glad that our Republic can produce this kind.

It bodes ill for national harmony when such vitriolic attacks can proceed from such a source.

Mr. Wister is a native son of our most American city; a graduate of our oldest and greatest University; a facile and pleasing writer who has charmed us all into believing that he was one of that great group of modern authors who would help to create a genuine American literature. And yet he writes a bitter poem of hate:

This poem of hate – the bitterest of all such poems which this war has produced, so far as I know, was first printed in one of the oldest, most conservative, best managed, and most influential newspapers of the country – of all days in the year, on the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington, who saw most clearly and stressed most emphatically the danger to the Republic which lay in fanning the flames of bitterness and passion.

Omen absit! Noblesse oblige! Let us fight, if fight we must, like gentlemen – keenly, boldly, with all our energy, nay, to the bitter end; but not call names or indulge in curses or impute motives. And let us go down to defeat, if defeat is our end, with the serenity of mind and courage which befits a citizen of the Great Republic.

Though in the stress of political combat, passion may strain, let us not break the bonds of affection and esteem which should unite all sections, all classes, all political parties, and all individuals of the great union in its front to the outside world.

Our only consolation in this unhappy incident is that this bitter outburst was greeted by all thoughtful and patriotic Americans with grief and astonishment. Our conviction is that when the waves of passion shall have subsided, and Mr. Wister can again see things face to face as they are, and not through a glass, darkly, he will be as deeply ashamed for himself of having written this poem, as his fellow countrymen are now ashamed for him, and our confident hope is that in the fullness of time he will apologize as sincerely as Punch did for its attacks on another great American, the heroic and devoted Lincoln! (Great applause)

In discussing a national economic program, we should distinguish here, first of all, between a temporary and a permanent one. We must do some things immediately, because of conditions which the Great War has brought with it. An effective program of national defense is immediate and pressing. A flexible system of administration of the tariff which will enable us to protect American industry and American labor from the disastrous effects of bankrupt competition at the close of this Great War is necessary, and some scheme of getting ships and getting them quickly, is imperative. (Applause) And all important parties are now coming around to the fact that these things must be done.

Fundamental to the large proposition of a comprehensive national economic program is the requisite that we should first of all think and act in terms of the nation; that we should conserve the assets of the American people as national assets, and the policy to develop them as a national policy. Now what are our assets? First, of course, the people themselves. They are the greatest of

all the assets of any nation. Human history demonstrates amply enough that it is not a fertile soil, or a favorable climate, or a fortunate location which necessarily determines the development and the place in human history of any group of people to which we may properly give the name “nation”. In advance of what actually happened, nobody would have selected Athens as the seat of a world empire; nor would anybody have picked out the shepherd robbers on the Seven Hills as the conquerors of the world; nor would anyone have selected the Netherlands as the home of wealth and power and art and science, in advance of the actual realization of that wonderful civilization which these people, while fighting their fellow men and the elements about them, hammered out of the unfavorable surroundings in the swamps along the German Ocean.

As a necessary and intimate part of a national economic program, our policy should be directed to protect and improve the health, to secure the effective liberal and technical education, and preserve and improve the economic condition of the great masses of the people.

Our national economic policy should be directed toward developing all the strength and power of the members of the nation, individually and collectively, and also the complete and satisfactory utilization of our natural resources.

1. We should have a definite national policy, not state, national, directed toward preserving the health of the women and children of the country by forbidding their employment in the industries under conditions prejudicial to their health. This must be accompanied by a

system of education which will take adequate care of these children thus driven out of the industries and often times into the streets, and fit them by proper training for the careers they wish to follow.

2. We must study carefully and inaugurate as rapidly as circumstances will permit a policy which will forever banish that constant and deadening fear of lack of employment, inability to work through accident or sickness, and poverty arising from old age and feebleness which rests like a pall upon such a large portion of our people.
3. It is just as necessary that we should elaborate and put into operation a system of courts which will secure justice to the poor and defenseless as well as to the rich and powerful.

This is no easy task. The trouble is that as a nation we are not working on the problem at all, and yet the welfare of the nation is intimately bound up with its solution.

4. The so-called working classes of our countrymen form the greatest asset of the nation, and every effort should be put forth in our economic policy to preserve and increase the body of healthy, vigorous, trained and ambitious working men as the basis of our national prosperity. Under no conditions must we let the standard of life of the laboring men sink below the present level, and every effort should be put forth to raise it still higher.

5. We must maintain and advance the present high wage scale, and make ever more humane the conditions of working. On the other hand, we must plan systematically to develop and train our industrial, political and social leaders; for the possibility of the economic advance of any great people depends quite as much upon the development and maintenance of able and aggressive leadership as upon the welfare and prosperity of the great mass of society who must follow. In no respects do nations differ more in an economic way than in their ability to develop and their willingness to follow true leadership; and this ability and willingness are an absolute condition of the highest type of civilization. And in no form of society are such leaders more necessary than in a democracy. Happy for us they come out of all classes of society, rich and poor, employer and employee, laborer and capitalist, educated and uneducated, and when we find them, we should encourage their activity and their initiative enterprise by offering the widest possible field for their employment. We should place no shackles upon them which are not imperatively demanded in the interests of the people as a whole.

The American people have made up their minds to control Big Business in the interests of the community, and to indicate the lines within which it must act. There will be, in my opinion, no reversal of this policy. On the other hand, much of the half-baked legislation passed by state and nation in the last few years has been a source of damage to the community, without any resulting benefit. (Applause) If, in our well meant and perfectly proper endeavors to prevent the abuses of large and small business, we paralyze the initiative enterprise of the average businessman, teach

him to look hesitatingly and inquiringly to the government for assistance and advice before undertaking any enterprise of moment, hobbling and harassing by unnecessary restrictions, cutting out the desire for speculation and the willingness to assume risks, which, after all, are fundamental to any aggressive and growing industry, we may end by having no business at all, either large or small. The shackles which timidity, envy and ignorance have thrown around the progressive and enterprising members of society, must be removed if our advance is to continue uninterruptedly, and laws must be made certain and interfere as little as possible with that liberty of action and thought which is the strength of the democracy whether in industry or politics.

(Applause) We must plan to adopt a well-rounded scheme for developing our national industry which will find its mainspring in the systematic and complete exploitation of the magnificent natural resources which are our heritage. We must, of course, conserve for the people and for our posterity and vast deposit of primeval wealth represented in our soils and mines and forests and rivers; and the general policy of conservation already adopted will doubtless be maintained and extended. But, after all, true conservation doesn't mean non-use, and every effort should be exerted to put the natural resources of our people to their natural use, of increasing by the application of private and public capital and wealth and power and happiness of the nation.

No better policy of developing such a well-rounded industry has been thus far devised than that known as the system of protection; only the new system of protection has in view not primarily the interest of this or that producer or the development of this or that industry, but the ultimate interest of the community as a whole, which arises from national industry which, in its

fundamental elements, is self-dependent and self-centered, including the interest of the laborer on the farm and in the mines and factories, and of the capitalist whose desire to invest and use his capital in a productive way, we should stimulate, and of the consumer which we all are.

In the evolution and application of such a system of national protection, a properly constituted tariff commission is a necessity. The tariff is, of course, in many of its aspects at bottom fundamentally a political issue, and no tariff commission will ever solve all the problems connected with it; but a much wiser plan of organizing and changing the tariff may be devised in harmony with the fundamental policy of protection or of free trade; and in such work the assistance of a tariff commission may be of the very highest value.

As a temporary and a permanent element in a national economic policy, the development of an adequate merchant marine is essential. The present European war has brought about a sudden change in national sentiment on this important subject. The average American away from the seaboard states has not been much interested in the question of whether the products he exported, or the wares he imported, went or came in American or foreign bottoms. He has persisted in looking at it purely as a matter of dollars and cents. If the foreigner could do the service for less than the native, let him do it, and let the native turn his attention to something else. But now, all of a sudden, we found ourselves in a most critical condition. The sea became uncertain; we had no ships; we could buy none from the belligerent powers; it took time to build them; and so our perishable products lay rotting on the wharves, and the more permanent ones piled up in all the

seaports. If this had been a sea war as it has been a land war, we should have experienced a panic in the United States, the like of which we have not known in American history, and probably we should have been mixed up in the war ourselves long before this time. It was only the complete domination of the sea by England which has enabled us to keep out of this great conflict.

We have come, moreover, in this brief period, to realize what every thoughtful person has, of course, known for a long time, that a naval power cannot be effective and comprehensive, unless based upon a merchant marine. From the extreme of indifference we then rushed to the other extreme. So frightened have we suddenly become that we are seriously considering a most remarkable proposition; namely, that the government of the United State should itself go into the business of building, owning, and managing a merchant marine. I have no doubt, myself, that if this is the only way out of the difficulty, we shall do it; but what a commentary upon the foresight or rather lack of foresight and intelligence of the American people!

We have come to recognize, therefore, that the existence of a merchant marine is not merely an economic matter, not merely a question of dollars and cents, but a vital question – one of life and death, intimately bound up with the possibility of national defense, and the carrying out of any national policies. We must, therefore, create and maintain a merchant navy to help handle that world commerce which will surely be ours as a result of a sound economic policy. Our own ships are the only method of securing to us the freedom of the seas.

I have been concerned, in presenting this subject of the national economic program, to emphasize what seemed to me the fundamental elements in such a scheme, mentioning simply certain individual things rather as illustrations of what we should aim at accomplishing than indicating any particular order in which it should be done. The important question here is one of attitude, individual, state, and national. There are other fundamental questions before the nation which can only be settled rightly by taking this national point of view and looking at the whole problem under these aspects. We have, as a result of recent developments, come around to a pretty general opinion that the development of foreign commerce is an important element in a national economic program, though we are not all agreed, perhaps as to the method by which this can be best accomplished. One thing is certain, we cannot expect to pursue the policy of hampering American business and preventing the reasonable exploitation of American resources and still compete in foreign markets with the products of nations which pursue in this respect a wiser and more far-sighted policy. Here again the grip of government interference must be loosened up if American business is to do for us in the foreign fields what we have a reasonable right to demand of it. The heavy hand of uncertainty must be lifted from American business, whether domestic or foreign.

The development of our agriculture is so fundamental an interest, and we are spending such large sums of money in many different directions in promoting its development, that we may lose sight of the fact that there is still much to be done which can only be done in an efficient way by the nation; in the direction of securing a sound basis for the permanent and comprehensive

development of our agricultural interests. The development and maintenance of a permanent agriculture calls for much more than cheap fertilizers and tile drainage. The great question of agricultural credit, which our banks are not yet grappling with in any serious or satisfactory way, awaits it – I will not say solution, but its first serious study. If it is not solved as much as any ever-persisting problem can be solved, we shall see a steady increase of the tenant class, with all the complications and with all the injury to national welfare which such a development will surely involve.

I have referred before to the railway situation in the United States. This affords a most excellent illustration of the manner in which we are handling one of the most critical and difficult of our national problems. Most of the people believe in private ownership and management of the railways, and yet we are pursuing a policy which will inevitably lead to government ownership – a policy in many ways of laissez faire, in others of continued and vexatious interference, growing out of local jealousies and conflicting jurisdictions. The railways of the United States are distinctly in a condition of unstable equilibrium, and yet we are doing little or nothing to provide an adjustment by which that equilibrium shall become stable.

We are all in favor of liberal wages for the railway employees. We are all in favor of reasonable conditions for employees in the operation of the railways as to hours of employment, etc.; we are all in favor of the lowest possible rates for passenger and freight traffic. We are all in favor of the highest possible efficiency of our railway system, of the greatest possible speed, and of the

maximum of comfort for passengers, and great frequency of trains and of adequate returns to the capital invested in this railway system. We all see how absolutely essential to the existence of our society on the present basis is the continued development of this great system of transportation. But there we seem to have stopped. We are rushing blindly along toward a condition of things in which, because capital invested in these railways receives uncertain returns, partly on account of this policy of conflicting jurisdictions, we shall not be able to get a sufficient amount of capital to maintain, let alone extend, this system. We already see signs that the rates allowed at present are not sufficient to maintain the roads, and improve them out of the earnings of the railways themselves. We are facing a demand for an immense increase in the wages of labor and diminution in the hours, and however desirable and proper the granting of these demands may be, it doesn't change the fact that they will enormously increase the expense of operation at the very time when, owing to the decrease of income, capital shows signs of shying against such investments, and the pressure for lower rates on the part of the public is ever increasing.

Friends, this is one of the greatest and most critical questions now before the American people, and it is not getting that attention from railway men, the general public, or our statesmen at Washington, which it deserves. A solution of this problem based upon the most careful study of all the elements entering into it, upon the foundation of private ownership and management, is absolutely necessary if we would prevent the passage of this whole interest into the absolute control of the federal government. And it is a serious question whether things have not already

gone so far that the ultimate solution can only be government ownership and management; as an economic problem it is, of course, par excellence national in its nature.

A national economic policy should be based upon a nationalization, if I may use such a term, of all these problems which are really at bottom and necessarily national, as distinguished from state and local problems, and no other economic policy can in the long run be permanent. Such a policy must be dynamic. It must grapple with the problems as they come up in a positive way and not drift in the shiftless, careless manner in which, as a people, we are allowing many of these important national issues to dispose of themselves by the mere process not of watchful, but of careless waiting.

In closing this discussion I should feel that I was, to the extent of my influence and ability, small though it may be, misleading you and anybody else who gives attention to this problem if I did not call attention to the fact that none of these things are possible, that no permanent national economic program can be carried out, until the question is really settled whether or not we are to preserve our independence of thought and action.

We are greatly blessed that we can gather today anywhere within the limits of the great Republic, except possibly on the Mexican border, to discuss in a calm and dispassionate manner an economic problem. It is due, however, to our good fortune rather than to our foresight and wisdom that this is the case.

With no more fault in the matter than we, Greece has little time or opportunity to discuss these great subjects; Belgium still less; and unhappy Poland none at all.

We have been living in a fool's paradise. Our leaders have, with few exceptions, incurred the just blame of lulling the mass of the people into a false sense of security. The watchers on the walls of our Zion have played us an ill trick. We have been led to believe that nobody would, nay, that nobody could, attack us, and as we had no desire to attack anybody else, we felt entirely secure in going about our own business in our own way. Many of our leaders assured us that the days of a great war were over; that no nation would ever want to fight again because the world was growing peaceable; that no nation would ever dare to fight again because of the horrible destruction of war; and that, at any rate, no nation could reach us to do us harm.

And then, suddenly, the great war broke out and we saw that no nation was afraid to fight – nay, that some nations seemed to want to fight, attracted, not driven, into the struggle like moths by a candle's flame. And then, the gigantic events which took place showed that any first-class nation which could command the seas for a short time might deal us sickening blows before we could ward them off. Speaking for myself, I am not a bellicosity, – one who believes like Ruskin, or Carlyle, and Nietzsche or Bernhardt, that war is a moral agency, per se – a means of moral and religious uplift, owing to the struggles involved in it; one who, like St. Paul before his conversion, breathes forth threatenings and slaughter. Nor am I a pacificist, like our

distinguished ex-Secretary of State, who believes, if I understand him correctly, that there is no such thing as a just war.

I am a pacifist in the sense of one who would like to see all war abolished, and the reign of the Prince of Peace come in. But this very Prince of Peace declared that He was come not to bring peace but a sword and His intention was to turn and overturn until justice and righteousness should prevail – and then peace would come.

In the meantime, if we wish to be in a position to promote peace and righteousness, we must trust in God, do justice, and keep our powder dry.

The most immediate and pressing thing, then, for the American people to do, if it wishes to secure the proper basis for the advance of civilization within itself and in the rest of the world, is to provide a more effective system of national defense. It is essential to our safety and to the possibility of carrying out a reasonable, economic, or any other program, that the American citizen may feel that he can go about his business without the constant fear of possible disturbance which comes from war and war's alarms. This can only be done by the creation of an adequate system of defense.

When the war is over, and the world has had time to settle down again into something like normal conditions, it may be possible to organize a World League to enforce peace, with power

and willingness to use the power. God grant it may be so. Such a League, if successful, would, of course, enable us to dispense with a large part of the military force which would otherwise be required. But the time for that is not yet.

If we are to be at liberty to pursue our own ways, to develop our own ideals of government and social organization uninterrupted by the interference of other nations, we must organize a practical and adequate system of national defense. You will note that I speak of national defense, – not of national armament – to indicate that the object of the necessary increase of our army and navy is not aggression, but to enable us to maintain in a dignified, firm, and effective manner, our rights as a nation, and the rights of our citizens wherever they may be, on land or sea, in the enjoyment of their lawful rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I am heartily in favor of stretching the arm of the Republic over every sea and into every land to protect the American citizen in his legitimate activities. I am in favor of the nation having a definite policy and a definite attitude in favor of the maintenance and development of international law on the foundation of justice, and righteousness and equality and mercy. I am in favor of the American people having a dynamic and definite policy on all those things which are fundamental to the advance of human civilization. And if we do nothing more than raise our voice on all proper occasions in favor of justice and right and mercy; we must still be in a position to defend ourselves in our right, to take such an attitude and make such pronouncements.

We must be in a position to defend ourselves, not by treaties of neutrality, nor by agreements of offense or defense, nor by ententes cordiale, nor triple or quadruple alliances, but by the Grace of God and the power of the right of our own right arm. The President of the United States should be in a position to defend our rights by a more effective means than literary notes

I am aware that some people would depart from the policy outlined by George Washington and create for us all sorts of entangling alliances in Europe and Asia and America. We have created some of them already which will come home to curse us in the years to come. I am aware that some patriotic Americans think that we should engage England to protect us with her fleet by a treaty of offense and defense as the easiest way out of a difficult situation – one which would save us much money! God Save the mark!

I yield to no one in my admiration for the deeds and character of the English people, and for the great contributions which they have made to human civilization. But we in America fought twice to get rid of England's domination, and there is no evidence that her hand would rest more lightly on us now, than then. It is to me, as an American citizen, an utterly revolting idea that this great Republic should live under the protection of the English fleet, or that of the German armies. I do not know and I think no one knows at present how large a fleet or army may be necessary to maintain our independence, but whatever it may be, we must have it.

I know not what other men may think, but as for my own single self, I should feel that the blood of our ancestors who fell at Bunker Hill, and Long Island, at Saratoga and Yorktown in the winning of our independence had been spilled in vain if the future before us now is to exist on the sufferance of other nations, be they one or many. In vain were the sacrifices of our fathers and brothers and uncles and cousins who fell at Vicksburg, and Gettysburg, and in the Battles of the Wilderness, thus sealing by their blood the unity of the Republic, if the outcome of it all is a people to be dictated to by Europe or Asia. The deep humiliation of belonging to a pusillanimous people deprives a generous soul of all joy and comfort in life or living. Bread and meat and clothes and yachts and automobiles and schools and colleges and all the other necessities or luxuries of life are but so many added signs of increasing degradation and carry with them at bottom a stinging rebuke to the smallness of soul, and meanness of spirit which such a people would cherish.

With malice toward none, with charity toward all our unhappy brethren beyond the seas, with a determination to extend a very aid to their suffering members, we must still insist that we have a right to safeguard our own independence of action and thought by the creation of a military and industrial power sufficient for our defense, and we must create such power or forever give up all idea of being a moral or political force in the world! (Great applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: I now present one of the leading citizens of our country, a man whom we all in New York delight to honor – Ambassador Morgenthau. (Loud Applause)

Second Speaker

The Honorable Henry Morgenthau

U.S. Ambassador to Turkey

Ladies and gentlemen: I have just arrived from Washington, and I thought that the President might give me a chance to familiarize myself a little bit with my old friends.

I have sat in your midst many a time, but I have never undertaken to speak to you like this evening. Now the great difficulty is that during my sojourn in Constantinople my lips were sealed; I had to remain neutral, absolutely neutral. Coming from Washington today, I was told that now I must also be somewhat colorless in everything I say. (Laughter)

Now it is very difficult for me and I almost feel, with the extreme desire to be strictly neutral and the wish to be colorless, somewhat of a mental eunuch, (laughter) and they are not the most admirable class of people. One of your professors wrote me from America, and it was one of those interesting things that come to Ambassadors, whether I wouldn't kindly have a thorough study made of the habits and thoughts of the eunuchs, because he thought that they were about to go out of existence and their habits and their ideas and whether they had certain nerves and whether they thought as we thought, should be preserved for the future ages. (Laughter) There wasn't anybody in the Embassy that was willing to undertake it. (Great laughter) I believe if they

had asked me to find out the inner workings of the Harem, everybody in the embassy would have volunteered. (Great laughter)

I feel tremendously pleased to be with you. I feel it my duty from now on for a little while to pass myself around and be admired. (Laughter) I think it is extremely encouraging to men like myself, who have entered into public office to come back and have such a reception as has been accorded to me and have so many invitations extended. It is about time that the public appreciates services while they are rendered and that the newspapers will stop haunting and pursuing everybody in public life, and if I happen to be the cause of a new custom being established, I shall feel very grateful.

The opportunities that I had in Constantinople to render the service which some of you evidently appreciated were unusual. It is very amusing to think how the people first looked at an untried diplomat. My fellow ambassadors sniffed about me like dogs do about a new one. They didn't know just what right an American businessman, who never had been in diplomacy, had to come in their preserves. They thought that we Americans were entirely wrong, not having a magnificent university where we trained the diplomats and sent them out, and it was astonishing, it was astonishing, how after a while, when they realized that new York business life was as good an education for a diplomat as being passed from one court or from one capitol to another, and I can assure you, gentlemen, that any one of the gentlemen that I see before me, who have succeeded in making a mark in their various callings here in this city, in their professions, etc.,

are better equipped than some of the best trained diplomats, because they know how to give and take.

One of the things that I ascribe my success to, what little I have had, was due to the fact that I told every member in that Embassy that he had no right to say “No” to anybody, and if “No” had to be said in his opinion, it would have to be passed up to me, and I never said “No” because I passed up to me, and I never said “No” because I passed it up still a little higher to the Turkish authorities, or to the Secretary of State, or to the Foreign Offices in England, France and elsewhere, and tried until the last minute to find some way of doing the thing and not say “no” and refuse them and that was a new policy in diplomacy and it was a very successful one.

Now, I am not going to tell all my tricks, because I would have too much competition, (Laughter) but if any one of you is ever appointed an Ambassador or Minister, if he will come to me, I will be only too happy to assist him. (Laughter) I could tell you a great many things and will some day. I have an idea of writing a book; (laughter), I’ve got the title – “My Dip into Diplomacy.” (Laughter and Applause)

But I think that it is wiser for me to say comparatively little, but I can’t stop without saying something to you. I caught the last few remarks of the previous speaker, and I want to say this to you; Ladies and Gentlemen, that I had the extreme honor and privilege of spending about 50 minutes today with the best, justest and most capable man in this country–The President of the

United States. (Great Applause)

I have seen a good many important men and a great many leading spirits recently, but there is no one that measures up to him. All of us can feel perfectly safe, that nothing untoward will occur in this country as long as he is in the Presidential chair. It is rather exciting in Washington just now, but he is perfectly calm and quiet, and he sits there as the master spirit of this country, and if the citizens of this country, irrespective of party or affiliation, know what is good for them, they will stand behind the President of the United States, because he represents the Government in the most hearty fashion that they know of.

I did not want to touch politics, but that picture of the President sitting there today in the White House and discussing these matters with me, made me feel that I ought to give you a little reflex of it, and it impressed me so tremendously, it convinced me so firmly that everything was safe, that I felt I would like to give you that message. (Great Applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: The next speaker, a gentleman whose reputation as Judge in Denver is so well-known to us all here in the East, recently had somewhat of a diplomatic experience of his own, (laughter) and it is a great pleasure for the Economic Club to welcome him here. I am going to call upon Ben Lindsey, of Denver, as the next speaker. (Great Applause)

Third Speaker

The Honorable Ben Lindsey

Judge, Children's Court, Denver Colorado

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I am sure I appreciate the honor of being here tonight, even though it is a somewhat unexpected one, and I was not counting upon to make a speech. I shall not make a speech. As I have sometimes said in our little campaigns about Denver, and as I said to my good friend, Mr. Ely, I am willing to make a short talk and detail some recent experiences, and give some ideas of American policies, that are some ideas I had up to a recent time.

When my name was mentioned, I saw some titters go around the audience, and I felt a good deal like the man from Missouri. A number of speakers had been introduced and they got down to Kansas and there was a laugh, and when they got down to Arkansas there were more laughs and when they introduced the gentleman from Missouri, everybody laughed (laughter) I suppose that some of you had in mind that trip that Governor Hanna, of North Dakota, who comes with me her tonight and myself undertook, as proof of the now somewhat celebrated Ford expedition (laughter) and I feel like the man from Missouri, who, when he was introduced said, "Now, damn you , laugh." (Laughter) That is what we naturally expect, (laughter), but in a somewhat different way.

I was quite curious in a way to know what I should be asked to speak tonight, unless it was to get

the expected laugh, (laughter), but I could not help but laugh at my good friend, Mr.

Morgenthau, for he was taking unto himself all of the success that no doubt he was entitled to. I

asked an official in Europe from this country, whom I met, what diplomacy really was, and he

said, “Diplomacy was the scientific art of lying.” (Laughter) I did not know that my good friend,

Henry Morgenthau, was going to be so successful as all that. (Laughter)

I got word from him in Berlin about two weeks ago that he would be glad to see me and I was

informed he was going back on the “New Amsterdam” and I concluded that we would have

ample time to exchange experiences on the “New Amsterdam”, only to find that he went the

other way and got in the wrong boat, but he isn't in the wrong boat, I am sure, in the post in

which he so honorably occupies. I had hoped to be his guest in Turkey up to a few weeks ago,

when I was assured by the German Government that the military communications were open

with Constantinople and the trains were running on schedule time. When I found he wasn't there,

I concluded it wouldn't be quite so safe a place to go to. I was glad to go home.

I was somewhat surprised to find that I could get into Germany. The first thing I met with was an

interview that was put up to me in the German Foreign office that I had stated in a New York

paper before I sailed on the fortunate or unfortunate “Oscar, II” that I did not understand why

Mr. Ford wanted me in the aggregation, because I was not a pacifist, that I was pro-Ally and they

could not lick a certain nation any too quick for me. (Laughter) That made it rather embarrassing

to get into Germany, (laughter). I didn't admit that I said it, (laughter), but nevertheless I did get

into Germany and without much difficulty either, and only yesterday I returned from nearly a fortnight's visit throughout Germany. And notwithstanding the trials and tribulations of that very hastily organized and in the opinion of so many, a questionably conceived expedition of an American businessman, by the way, personally I feel that I should have no apologies to make for the part, the small part that I took in that expedition, if for no other reason than the opportunity that came to me to visit one of the belligerent countries in this, the greatest of the world's wars.

I may say primarily that I went with the expedition because I was interested in the suffering people of Europe, without regard to who they were or to which country they belonged, and these suffering people mostly were the little people. I had received letters from people in Poland and other sections of stricken Europe, describing some of the frightful suffering among the non-combatants and especially how it affected the women and the children, and my wife and I were quite anxious to know what the conditions might be and what might be done, if anything, to help bring relief where relief was most needed, and just before I left Berlin I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Walkwit and Mr. Whiting, of the Rockefeller Foundation, that has done so much in Serbia and in Belgium. These gentlemen by the courtesy of the German government had gone throughout Poland and they told me to say to those who were interested, when I returned to the United States, that conditions there had not only not been exaggerated, but no one could sufficiently describe how terrible they were. In some cities, they were informed that there was no a child under six years of age alive. In many towns and cities no child under three years of age was longer in the land of the living. An interesting feature of this war is that it is taking life at

both ends, the beginning and the ending of life, even more than in the middle of life, as most of the soldiers are.

I do not pretend to speak with any authority, because in the ten days or two weeks that we were in Germany, I had to depend a good deal upon statements made by others, although I did see some things firsthand that were of great interest and I was told that nearly a half a million of children, young people, mostly babies, infants, in Poland and Serbia largely, and now because of the blockade and shortage of the milk supply in Germany, had perished during the last year.

I feel that I should avail myself of this opportunity for at least a moment to refer to this suffering in any public address I had the privilege to make in the neutral countries, and I did have that privilege upon many occasions and I always defended the legal right of our people to furnish supplies to the belligerents – munitions, if you please. However much we might differ about it morally, and however much we might regret the heritage of hat that is piling up in Central Europe for our country, it did seem to me that those of us in America who are profiting directly and indirectly by the sufferings and misfortunes of those people, so many of whom are such innocent sufferers, that there was some sort of moral obligation in some way to help, as far as we can within the rather sever limitations to which we are confined, to relieve that suffering.

(Applause)

I may say, my friends, that you cannot begin to appreciate until you get into the atmosphere of

Europe, how much a moral obligation we owe to these people, who because of the economic struggle involved, are terribly taxed, but who can't tax those of us who are, as I say, legitimately enough profiting by this terrible waste of human life and property. Let me say in that connection that I never realized how I should personally feel on this question until I would be offering a friendly hand to a German soldier in a hospital and be told that the bullet in his body was made in America.

When one visited the great exhibition of captured war material in Berlin, as I did in the last two weeks, and saw there the instruments of torture and death, bearing the stamp and name of American businessman, I am compelled to say that in the face of the kindly reception we had everywhere, which I am frank also to say was quite surprising to me from the things I had heard, it aroused in me emotions and feelings that are hard for me here to analyze, but forcing me to the conclusion, at least, that I should wish that it might not have been so and we might have better kept out of this struggle. But, my friends, we have not kept out of it, we are in it more than you think we are in it.

I have a little picture in my library of a little boy and underneath this picture this cheerful little boy has written on the legend, "Nobody loves me." It is that way with those of us in America. Nobody in Europe loves us, and that also applies, much to my surprise, as I found it in England. I talked to some of the English sailors and soldiers within the last few weeks. I talked to English prisoners, Scotchmen, Irish prisoners, within the last three weeks in a camp of thirty to forty

thousand, representing 12 nationalities. I was allowed to mingle freely with these prisoners as I wished to mingle. I was allowed to talk to these men. Let me tell you just a few of the things they said, for the concrete is so much better than the abstract to get the judgment of people, the feelings of people. I said to one of these Englishmen of the war, "We in America are at least indirectly helping you fellows by burnishing you munitions." I thought that might evoke some friendly response. Do you think it did? Not much. Curling his lip, with a sneer in his face and a kind of scorn that would have been withering if one cared to be withered, he said: "Yes, you fellows in America are getting all the money and we are getting all the hell. You furnish us the munitions, but what about your 300%?"

I stood on the deck of a ship flying a neutral flag and I saw Uncle Sam's mail taken out of the hold of that neutral ship and put on the boat of a belligerent country, to be taken into the latter's country to be censored and inspected, knowing that on that boat, even our own embassies didn't dare trust their mail, and hitched to the flagpole of this boat of the belligerent country was a shaggy, pitiful little dog, and every once in a while one of these sailors of this belligerent country would step on the dog's tail, and the dog would whine and dodge, until a lady of humanitarian instincts put in her protest, that the little dog should not be so cuffed about. And it was somewhat humiliating to hear the response right back of me by one of these army gentlemen: "Oh, that is only little U.S.A. He emits a howl and a few things like that and we step on his tail." It made me feel that we ought to have some kind of preparation in this country. It made me feel the truth of what was so eloquently stated in the magnificent address to which we all had the privilege of

listening by President James, that if we are going to have our place in the sun and be respected in the sun, we have got to change some of our politics.

Just one or two other experiences and I will not further transgress upon your time in this unexpected entrance here tonight, to fill up time as I understood, because one of the speakers had not yet arrived (laughter) and I am rattling around the best I can (Laughter).

I must say that this experience in Europe in the neutral country is disposed to sober one in his judgment. I don't care how infuriated one has been because of what he considered a national or international outrage or an imposition upon the rights of others, after one has for months listened to both sides, after one has mingled with these people and heard their story, he must share more or less of the kind of attitude that I am in the habit of assuming as a judge on the bench – that there are two sides to every question and one must not decide the case until we have heard both sides. I know that when I went to Europe I thought there was only one side of some things; I do not know but what that is true yet. You go into Germany and you talk to a man who has helped to take 13 mangled children and 4 dead school teachers out of a schoolhouse, upon which a bomb from a French aeroplane has been dropped in the effort to find a warehouse; you talk to an American citizen who came very nearly being blown up in the streets of Dusseldorf three days after the war started, and you see the long rows of mothers, as I saw them, with their babes in their arms, some of them with tears in their faces, because of the shortage of the milk supply, made by the blockade, which may be legitimate enough from one standpoint in time of war, and

then you look across the sea and you see this dreadful serial navy coming out of the sky and dropping their ghastly dew upon another people, and the conclusion you come to in the end is that people are just people, that perhaps they are not good people and not bad people, but there are certain horrible conditions in the world that must be remedied and must be understood and that this thing is war, and as General Sherman said, “War is Hell,” and there never was a truer statement that makes a more profound impression after you have been as close to the battle lines as I have been in the last few weeks and that the policy and attitude of those of us who would play some part, as we must play, in the settlement of this world’s struggle, is more and more to hold on to our neutrality. (Great Applause) Because, my friends, if you will sit down in a club or a hotel in Germany, if you are willing to listen – now don’t get infuriated if I tell you one or two things that they told me in Germany; in Europe it depends to whom you are talking as to how quickly they below up, (laughter), and I find it the same way in America – I want to say, my friends, that intelligent, delightful gentlemen and women that you meet in Germany as you might meet in America and England, will have a defense for every indictment that has been made against them, and the longer you listen to them, the more you conclude at least that they are sincere, these people; they may be obsessed and they may be wrong, but they are just people after all.

They treat Americans, as far as I could learn in Germany, with the greatest courtesy. I was told that if I talked English in the subways and on the cars I would be mobbed, but, my friends, we did not know anything but the English languages, we made no attempt at any other language, and

I saw nothing of that kind.

I was in Wilhelmstrasse about a month ago, discussing with the Commissioner of Food Supplies, what might be done for the poor and the needy children of Poland and Serbia and I read four days afterward in a newspaper of a belligerent country a despatch from a well-known city of one of the belligerent countries that there was a food riot at 3:30 on the afternoon that day in Wilhelmstrasse and three children were killed and two women were crushed in the riot in the demands upon this particular gentleman for food. Now the only riot at that particular hour was my unfortunate self in inquiry in the most peaceful way about these conditions.

You can buy the English newspapers in Berlin three days old without any difficulty. I must say that it was rather amusing to those Americans who happened to be in Berlin to read news of that kind. You can buy a French paper and see a photograph of a Belgium atrocity, the horrible and mutilated body of some poor unfortunate and then you can go around to a certain place and see the same photographs taken ten years before at the time of the massacres by the Russians in Kishinev or somewhere else.

I am not saying that the same thing is not done in Germany that will apply to other belligerents – I don't know – but it at least sobers us with reference to news and we were also sobered with reference to some of these other questions that have been so much discussed, and so I say, going as I did as an American citizen, whose four grandparents came from England, Ireland, Scotland

and Wales, and not likely to be pro-German, any more than than now, and having this opportunity, I was interested in hearing all they had to say, and of course, we listened to what they had to say.

I think two of the things that I saw that will never be erased from my memory were these:

Coming down a long road were thousands of prisoners, French soldiers in their red trousers and blue caps, straggling along this country road, and the men in charge of these soldiers seemed to be on friendly terms with them, in fact, we found less bitterness among the soldiers themselves on both sides, than we found among the non-belligerents in the clubs and the hotels who had never seen the firing line. There seemed to be a sort of fraternity between these men in a way, the fraternity of the professional, I suppose, the professional soldier, who realizes he has a duty to do, however terrible it is, and he is the one who is giving his life to do that duty, to give his life for his country. You can't help but respect such an individual.

The other sight that will never be erased from my memory was the sight of German's aerial navy, or a part of that aerial navy, as horrible as has been some of the destruction that it has wrought, and I thought if only such ingenuity could be devoted to the arts of peace instead of the arts of war, how much better it would be for the world. I saw Zeppelins that were said to be able to carry 50 men or more. I saw them flying their flags celebrating their triumphs and I must say that such sights fill one with emotions that are hard to describe, because no one can justify, or no

one at least can sympathize with the terrible destruction that has been wrought on either side in this war, but, my friends, you come to this final conclusion: that we have a big moral responsibility growing out of this war and that moral responsibility, as I see it, is that kind of a policy that shall hold fast to principles of humanity and justice, as has been so well expressed here tonight, but shall look forward to giving us that strength that we must have and ought to have to play a big part in forming a union of the civilized countries of the world upon whom shall rest the responsibility of making these terrible holocausts impossible and to hold that position in the world. I saw more than I ever saw before after I had been privileged to have these experiences, how important it was that we should be jealous of our neutrality and hold to ourselves our feelings and our prejudices that might seem however justifiable.

The night before I left Berlin, and I could not close, I think, better than with this sentiment that came from one of the highest officials in the German Navy. He turned to me with a rather sad face when I asked him about the future for world's peace. He said, "You know, we don't hate the English; we don't hate America. Why should we? For there is the hope for the peace of the world, a union, sometime, when this terrible war is over, of the United States of America, the British Empire, and the German Empire, a white man's world, to preserve its peace forever."

(Great Applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: We are privileged in having with us tonight, a gentleman whose name does not appear upon the list of speakers, but whom I know we will all be glad to hear

from for a few minutes, because he has recently had experience in Europe and I take great pleasure in calling upon Governor Hanna, of North Dakota. (Great Applause)

Fourth Speaker

The Honorable L.B. Hanna

Governor of North Dakota

Members of the Economic Club: I am glad to have an opportunity to speak to you just for a few moments tonight, although when I came here I had no idea I would be called upon to speak, but expected to hear General Wood, whom I had the honor to hear out in our own state last year or just about a year ago.

I live out west you know, in one of the prairie states and as I look over this gathering you look a great deal like North Dakota farmers to me, only you are not dressed that way. (Great laughter and applause)

I shall not speak very long tonight and when you think I have said sufficient, why you just tell me and I am going to stop. (Voice from audience: "Louder, louder")

Well, then, I will have to take a drink for "louder." We drink water out in North Dakota.

(Laughter)

You know I heard a story once of a Scotchman who was bragging about what great fighters the Scotch people were – you are talking about fighting a great deal here tonight – and there was an Irishman who heard him speaking about it, and of course, you know, the Irishman couldn't stand it. The Irishman said they were the greatest fighters in the world, and they finally agreed to have a fight to see who were the greatest fighters and whichever one wanted to stop was to say the word "Sufficient". So they went at it and fought and fought for a long while and then they started and rested again and they went back at it and at last the Scotchman said, "Sufficient," when the Irishman said, "Man, man what a fine memory you've got. I've been trying to think of that word myself." (Great Applause and Laughter) And so whenever you think I have said sufficient, why just say so and I am going to quit.

I was one of those that went over with this expedition to the other side of the world, and I didn't go over there with the idea or the expectation of stopping the war in Europe or of making peace, but I did believe that there might be some chance of getting a peace movement started over in Europe, as well as in the United States, and stop this terrible war that is tearing the world apart. And so I went over there and I am glad that I did and we had a good many experiences, some of which have been told here by Judge Lindsey, whom I was wishing every minute might stop, because he was getting my speech out before the opportunity to tell it myself. (Laughter)

I remember that when they left Denmark, I was kind of left behind a little bit; I was sick in a

hospital over I Copenhagen – it wasn't the peace movement that made me sick – but I was over there in Denmark and the people were mighty good to me, and then after a while, our passport did not call for Germany, with a friend who had stayed behind with me, we went down to the German Consul and he very kindly fixed up our passports so that we could get into Germany for 5 days. Well, that was pretty good. We then went down to a place on the frontier and when we got there, we found that the Consul had sent word that we were not to be examined. You know, they examine people pretty closely when they go over into Germany. There were some people waiting there, and there was one from New York. This man from New York has been bragging all along coming down on the train, how he had it "fixed"; he wouldn't be examined on the frontier. So we passed in our passports. I was a little under the weather and I kept in the background, and pretty soon this man's name was called and he went on it. Well it seemed he did have it fixed after all, and then in a little while after that they called out my name. I went up there and soon found out that the soldier at the door, had been in North Dakota, or he had been over in North Dakota and had heard my name, and pretty soon he came out and said everything was alright and we went in where all these people were examined. There was one lady, I remember, that was being examined and she had to take off her clothes and she took down her hair, and among the other people was this man from New York, that had everything fixed, like you New Yorkers have things "fixed", and he was holding up a pair of pants, and after a while he came into the train and he was the maddest fellow I had ever seen.

You know, friends, I was wonderfully impressed with this matter of German efficiency and

proficiency. I went into one of the prison camps with my friend, Judge Lindsey, and everything seemed to be so orderly and right up and then we went into a place and they showed us the weights of all of these men and we found that every prisoner was weighed every week to see whether he was gaining or losing and we looked over the records and we found all these prisoners had gained in weight. We found that food was sent into the camp from France by way of Switzerland and that stuff came in there from England, but there was nothing sent in from Russia. The Russians wrote back to their people – only a few of them could read or write – but they got back word that those at home didn't have enough for themselves.

It is true that they have these bread tickets. I got a bread ticket every morning, but it isn't so much as not having bread to go around, but the idea of preserving it. Then they have these two meatless days, which by the way is a good thing. There are two days, Tuesdays and Fridays; they most always go without meat on Friday anyway, but two days out of the week they do that and then two days they don't use butter. Now, I tell you that that is a great thing, as she is being held in there from the sea by England. After all, she is living largely within herself.

The nations over there are piling up enormous debts. I have an English paper in my satchel down at the hotel and in that English paper they say that it will cost the English government for its maintenance and the money that it will advance to the other nations, eighteen hundred million pounds for the year 1916, or nine billions of dollars. Our national debt, if I remember right, is about a billion dollars, consequently, in one year they will use nine times our national debt, so

that these nations are piling up this enormous debt, and the question will be after a while: How will they ever pay it? I found in Germany that a man with an income of a thousand marks, about \$200 at the present time, in our money, is paying an income tax, and so up all along the line. And yet money seemed to be plentiful in Germany. I found women n the street cars and I found one woman on the street car and she said she had more money today that she had ever had before in her life, because she was taking the place of her husband who was at the front. He was getting 45 marks at the front, and as a war widow she was getting 18 marks and then she had four children and for each one of these children she was getting 9 marks, so that in fact they had 63, 64, or 65 marks every month, and in addition to that she was getting her salary as conductor of that street car. But after the war, her husband is coming home and he will take her place and then they will only have that salary of 65 marks.

And so I believe that after the war is over and we come to the period of reconstruction just as we had here 50 years ago, that that is the time some of the biggest problems the countries of Europe will have to face. Take over there in Russia with two crops of wheat that are already tied up there in the Black sea. That has got to be let loose and it will come in competition with the crops of this country and so on along the line and I don't believe that the war will ever be over permanently until the time will come when Russia will have an outlet to the sea absolutely, when Germany will have an outlet to the sea. Those countries are not like ours. We have the opportunity from both our coasts to the sea and so does Canada and so does Mexico to the south of us.

In the evening mail today there is an article by Mr. McClure, who was with us on the other side, who wrote an article along the line and thought of this matter. It is one of the best things I have ever seen written and I brought it along to the United States, and being afraid that I couldn't get it by the British Censor, I hid it in the bath tub and it was in the paper tonight. It wasn't in the bath tub, it was under the bath tub – I made a mistake about that.

Now I think I have talked a little bit longer than I intended to talk. (Cries from audience of "Go ahead", and Great Applause)

Now that reminds me of a little story. Out in our state there was a girl, who was awfully homely, and she didn't have any beaux. But one night there was a fellow that called at her house and he took her out for a buggy ride. After a while they rode along during the evening quiet and he said, "Lena, will you marry me?" And she said, "You bet I will." You know girls don't wait very long. And they went along for quite a while after that and after a while he turned around and started going back home and they finally got back and he helped her out of the buggy into the house and Lena couldn't keep in any longer and she , "Ole, why you no speak?" And Ole looked at Lena and said, "Speak, by jiminy, I speak too much already." (Great Laughter and Applause)

And so, my friends, I think I have already spoken too much. I am glad to be back here in the United States, and I want to tell you that I never thought more of the United States in all my life

than when I got back here yesterday. It is a splendid thing to go abroad for a little while and see what they are doing over on the other side of the world, but after all, this is the country for you and me to live in. (Great Applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: It is now my very great pleasure to call upon the next speaker, President Lowell of Harvard University. (Applause)

Fifth Speaker

A. Lawrence Lowell

President of Harvard University

The topic upon which I have been asked to speak to you tonight is one that requires no eloquence. I want to lay before you a plain proposition in a plain, business-like way.

If you will imagine yourselves – which requires indeed a stretch of imagination – but if you will imagine yourselves collected together, the businessmen in a mining town in the Far West, some thirty or forty years ago, where disorder was rampant, shooting affrays common, and you came together to see what could be done to stop it, it would not be a place for eloquence, but a place for considering quietly and very sternly the things that would have to be done to prevent outrages in the future. Now, I say that requires a stretch of the imagination, and yet that is exactly the position we are in today, as between nations. We are exactly in that same position. You know

very well that in that imaginary western town, mining town in the hills, there would have been some people who would have said: “Well, it is against our principles to shoot anybody. We can’t take part, no matter what the exigency may be, in any movement which requires the taking of life, or even the wounding or maiming of people to prevent an outrage.” Such people exist today. We call them “pacifists.”

You know, also, there would have been many people in the suburbs who would have said: “We live in the suburbs. It is not very likely that trouble will reach us.” There are such people today. They are mainly the Americans. (Laughter) Nevertheless, you would have rather liked to see the man who lived in the suburbs and who was not quite so likely to be shot as the man who lived in the city, take his part with the rest in restoring order.

Now, I say that that is exactly the position we are in today. We hope and pray that wars may never come again, but though we hope and pray that wars may never come again, we know very well they will. Why? Because that has been the history of the world, and the history of the world is nothing but the experience of mankind under the emotions, passions, feelings good and evil, that man has had with comparatively small change from the dawn of history.

We know very well that if we were to take any place in the world today, say New York, for instance, and withdraw all police protection, abolish all reason for obeying laws except the kindly feeling of every person in the community, that this place, this city, would become

uninhabitable in six months. We know that crimes of violence would occur, and that any amount of preaching we chose to do about the perfectibility of human nature, and how that perfectibility was likely soon to come, would not prevent the advent of crimes. It is exactly the same thing among nations. That does not mean that nations are wicked. It means, in the main, that they are blind.

As Judge Lindsey said, they are nothing but people, and people are creatures of limited intelligence. If we were all infinitely wise, and infinitely good, we should probably need no laws, we should certainly need no police. Nations are no better than individuals. On the other hand, they are probably somewhat worse, because they tend to magnify their passions by getting together in great groups. Did you ever know any country in which the bulk of the people in each belligerent country did not honestly believe they had the right of the quarrel; in fact, where an overwhelming majority did not believe they had the right of the quarrel? It is not merely because they are in hot blood. Let me ask any of you how great wars he can remember in the whole of human history in which the people of the country did not, in cold blood, one hundred years afterwards, believe that their country had been in the right in that particular war? IT is human nature.

Very few of us go into a lawsuit without believing that we have the right on our side. Very few of us get into a quarrel or have bitter feelings about our neighbor, without thinking he is in the wrong or we in the right, or he is much more in the wrong than we are. If it were not for that we

should not quarrel with our neighbors; we should not have ill feelings toward one another; that is simply a part of human nature.

Let us not, therefore, suppose that wars come simply from the rapacity of one nation which desires to devour another. I do not think, either, that a few, ambitious leaders can mislead their people into a war which the people do not care about, and do not believe in. No doubt a man can take advantage of sudden passion and drive men into a war which they would not have gone into if they had had time to think about it. War comes vastly more from fear than it does from any other motive. Nations go to war much more because they are afraid that if they don't, that some other nations will attack them at a disadvantage, than from any other purpose. It has been truly pointed out that the real cause of the Reign of Terror in France was the fact that every man in France believed that if he didn't cut off the head of the other man first, he would lose his own, and that is true of nations. And if fear is the predominant thing, and if fear is the predominant cause of war, then protection should be the predominant cure of war. (Applause)

Gentlemen, I am not speaking about this war, because one thing that we must realize, anybody who has seen a war go on, and everybody today has seen a war go on, and has seen the most disastrous and terrible war that has occurred in history go on, everybody who has seen a war go on knows that it is like a conflagration, that you can't stop it after it has once got going. It is like burning oil. There is no use trying to stop the oil after it has a hold of the object, and the project that I propose to lay before you is to prevent the war from getting started, for after it has got

started nothing but the exhaustion or defeat of one of the belligerents could possibly prevent it.

Now, granted that that is so, what can we do to stop it, for, I assume, that everybody at the present day, and certainly everybody who is listening here feels strongly that one of the prime interests of mankind is to prevent war from breaking out. If we did not know it before, we know today what a disastrous thing war is. We know very well that the destruction by war of life and of property is far greater than it has ever been in the world before. We know that the control of man over the physical forces of nature gives him a destructive power, when that knowledge is turned in that direction, that the world has never dreamed of in the past, and we have no reason to suppose that the next war of the world, which may occur in thirty years, will be less destructive, nor have we any reason to believe that it will be ore destructive than the present war, and whereas the present war has involved all Europe and a part of each end of Asia, we may, perhaps, prophecy when the war occurs thirty or forty years hence, it will involve every member of the civilized and non-civilized world.

If that is so, it is clearly the object, and the duty of every country, and of every man in every country today, to do what in him lies to prevent such a thing from occurring. Now then, mark you; I say the object is to prevent wars breaking out. We can sometimes gain some knowledge from history. History is a subject from which people have derived every possible support for every possible theory, and I am going to try to derive one for my theory. I have spoken to you about the dwellers in a mining town a generation or so ago, when shooting was common. How as

that prevented? It was prevented when the Government did not interfere, it was prevented by the formation of a Vigilante Committee; that is, by a body of well-meaning citizens who said that kind of outbreak should not occur, and that they would insist by force that it should not occur and that it should be put out. They organized themselves for the purpose of disarming the brigands; in other words, they organized, the respectable citizens, so far as was necessary, to prevent outbreaks of violence.

Now, let me go back in the history of the world. That state is a good deal like one of the things of the present, with this difference, that in that mining town, the power of the nation or of the state was certain, sooner or later, to come in and insist upon order; and there is no such power in the world today. We are in the portion that mining town would have been in if it stood alone on the Earth, with but its own force to call upon to maintain order.

Let me go back from that mining town to another period, and I will take a period somewhat more distant, to wit, about a thousand years ago, when the old kings of England, – and the same thing was true all through the countries inhabited by the Germanic tribes – when the old kings of England tried to reduce or to prevent the feuds among their barons, when the barons would go out, and the tribes would go out, and slaughter their neighbors, and they would enjoy themselves thoroughly in a free fight, and disorder reigned upon the land. What did the kings do? He insisted that violent war should not take place except after the parties had impleaded one another in his court, and that if anyone would not come into his court after he was summoned by another baron,

he, the king, would go for him with force and compel him to come in. But private war was not abolished. The trial by battle lasted down until a date much later than many of you are aware. The last case that a trial by battle was waged in an English Court was in 1830, or thereabout, in the twenties or thirties. It had become obsolete, but not abolished by statute until that year. When one man threw down his glove in court and challenged another man to fight a duel, the Court had to say it was legal, but as the man who threw down his glove was much bigger than the other, the combat was declined.

But what did the King do? He could not abolish private war entirely and absolutely, but he insisted that private war should not take place until after the case had been heard by a Court, and that the fight should take place only between the chief parties thereto, and who should not be enabled to bring in their other friends on either side. Now, you find that same system running through all the early tribes in the German Forest, the demand to reduce war by combinations among the tribes, by which they insisted that they would suppress any tribe that attacked another. Leagues were formed for that purpose, and the king came in later and did the same thing in England.

Now, that is the thing that I propose to you; that a league should be formed among the nations to prevent any member of that league from attacking another member of that league until they had laid their case before an intelligent tribunal, if the case is one which is capable of being judged on legal points before a tribunal; if it is not one involving points of law, before a council, who

shall attempt to bring the parties together by arbitration. This does not go to the point of saying that war shall never come, because we know very well that that is an impossibility. The object of all sensible men is to reduce war just as much as it can be. Now, what is the object of bringing the men in before a tribunal? Two-fold. Chiefly that it causes delay, and what does delay mean? Any of you who have watched the outbreak of this war know very well that just as soon as war was declared no opposition could last anywhere. You know very well that as each country went into the war; all opposition to it was silenced. It is unpatriotic to attack your country. It is unpatriotic, it is furnishing means to the enemy. While war is going on everybody must be silent; everybody must aid their country with their moral force, as well as with their military force. I say “must”, simply because by looking around the countries of Europe we find that that is so; that they did it. If, on the other hand, the breaking out of the war could be postponed for a year, and I assume that ordinarily a court would take something like a year in taking evidence and rendering its verdict, during that year there would be plenty of time for the minority to say: “Well, really, this thing is not worth fighting about.” And there is a chance for public opinion to form in other countries, and moreover, there is no chance that one country, readily prepared, can say: “This is our chance; we will take the others unawares,” which always goes more or less into the calculations of all countries. This was the case with France in 1870, when it thought that it was prepared better than the other. It gives a chance for sober second thought. It gives a chance for considering, and I think if you will take the causes of all the recent wars that have occurred – I can go over all the wars of the nineteenth century with you, and you will be surprised how very few of them would have taken place if there had been a year’s delay, if there had been a chance

to think it over.

Now let me ask you one further thing; grant for the moment that what I have said is true; grant that it is desirable to prevent war; grant that delay will operate seriously to prevent war; grant that if we oblige nations to go into Court before they can go to war; how will they necessarily abide by it? We should all be glad to have them abide by it, but, perhaps that is a step too far, too Utopian at the present day. Grant that if you can force them into Court to have a hearing that wars will be less frequent, but how are you going to force them into Court?

I can conceive of only one way which would be thoroughly and wholly effective, and that is that if a country should attack another before going to a tribunal or Court of Arbitration, she would have to face the whole world in arms. Any country which believed that that was true would think a moment before it acted. The world does not turn to you and say: "You shall not fight about this question," but it says: "You shall not fight about this question until you have had a hearing in Court, until there has been a public hearing, on pain or facing the whole world."

There are, I admit, questions which could probably not be settled without arms. It is very doubtful whether the relations between the Christians and the Turks could have been settled without arms. I don't wish to assert that it couldn't, but there the question involved such conditions that they could not be settled without arms. Those questions are certainly very few, but even in that case, if one party wanted to go to war, and they knew that unless they went and

heard what the Court had to say about it, they would have all the world to fight, they would say:

“Let us go to the Court and have those questions passed upon.”

Now, that is the proposition, in brief, that we have to suggest. I know what you will say; that is, I know what many of you will say. You will say: “It is a very good theory, but is it practicable; can it be made to work?”

Well, now I don't say that it can. I merely say that it is worth trying; I assert that it is worthwhile to try for the nations of the world, and especially for the United States, as being the one nation which is not engaged in this conflict, to try and bring about a league with that object.

Of course, I recognize there are difficulties. People will say: “Now, how are you to know which country attacks the other in a war? It is always the object of every country to try and make the other attack it first.”

As someone said to me a little while ago: “Suppose, just for the sake of supposing, that ten years ago Germany had come over and insisting upon the payment of a debt had seized the Port of Venezuela. We should not have been ready to attack her until we had gone to arbitration.”

Well, I guess all these things would have to be settled by treaty. Did any of you, years ago, ever see a street fight in France, where the two men swore at one another, shook their fists in one

another's face, tore one another's hair, knowing that the penalty for slapping the other's face would be jail?

Now, I won't say that that will not be the result, that that will not happen under a properly drawn treaty and that any nation that would be guilty of aggression would find itself at war with the whole world. But that nation would take great pains to avoid all those things which are denominated in the bond as aggression, and if both sides are trying very hard to avoid those things which are denominated as aggression, the chances of war are greatly reduced, to say the least.

Then it has been said: "Why not try a military oppression?" Yes, why not try a military oppression, but, after all, your pressure must be a deterrent. People have said to me: "Why not try military oppression, and then if war results, try your military force."

Well, but if war results the harm is done. Our object is not to punish the nation that goes to war, but merely to prevent war. Our nation is not to let two nations go to war and then make up our minds which to thrash. The object is to prevent war from breaking out, and if the war breaks out, the system has failed. The whole point is that the deterrent should be such that the war will not break out until after the nations had gone before a Court of conciliation, or a Court of Justice.

It has been suggested that if one nation attacks another, the nations of the world who may come

together and consider what ought to be done and use such measures, diplomatic, economic, or military, as the occasion may require, would meet either after the war has taken place or else was merely threatened. In either case, you know very well what a concert of nations acting together would do. One of them will say: "It doesn't seem to me that this quarrel interests me very much. I have very close commercial relations with this power that you complain of, and I think our action will be limited to diplomatic action."

And nation number two says: "Well, if their action is to be limited to diplomatic action, I think I shall follow their course." And number three will do likewise.

If you are going to produce any effect, you have got to have your results as automatic and as necessary as in civil life. We don't wait until two men have shot at one another in the street before the policeman intervenes. When men begin to shoot at one another the police authorities don't call on counsel and consider what had better be done. Their business is to arrest the man and take his pistol before he gets a chance to fire it off. It is because everyone knows what will happen to him if he does fire.

Now I speak to an assembly of businessmen, to an economic club. Why would not it be sufficient for the nations of the world to all agree on a universal boycott of the delinquent people? Well, now, let me look at it. I don't say that an economic boycott would not in many cases be very desirable, the idea being that the economic boycott would be a means to force a

nation to go into arbitration. The nation that actually goes to war is generally so blind or so well prepared that it does not care such a vast deal about an economic boycott. We know at the present day that Germany is very nearly cut off from the resources of the world, and yet Germany has been able to conduct this war and conduct it with extreme efficiency. We tried an economic boycott once. We called it the “embargo,” and it had no effect on England whatever, and resulted in our skidding into the war of 1812 against our wishes, and against the wishes of England, and it was another of those cases of struggle between the upper and the nether millstones, and we were being crushed between, and much good the economic boycott did to us. It is a remedy which has its value, but it is not strong enough as a positive deterrent upon a power that is itself in a position to wage its war alone.

I admit freely that there are dangers, that there are difficulties. Of course, I admit freely that it is very doubtful whether the combination would bind themselves in such a way, but all I say to you is this: This is the part that civilization has pursued among individuals. It was by establishing a tribunal and putting behind the tribunal a sheriff, and behind that sheriff the whole power of the community, whatever form that power took, that has started civilization among men. It is that which makes us live an orderly and happy life. It is that which has brought about civilization among mankind, and unless we are to live in a recurring state of war, we must develop the tribunal with the sheriff behind it. We must begin, gradually, of course, but are we to stand still and say: “There are difficulties here; I see objections; so we will not try to even establish the Court with this sheriff; or we will establish the Court without a sheriff hoping that nations will be

good enough to follow its dictates without violations.”

Oh, no, gentlemen. We are speaking in a fearful time. We are speaking in a time when men think about the foundations of society. We are speaking in a time when it looks as if the foundations of society were breaking up under us. We look down and at one moment we feel secure on the hot peak of a mountain; and then, instantly, we feel a crater opening down through the depths of civilization, and we see the red lava flowing through, and we feel as hopeless as a new born child. But let us realize that human posterity is in human hands, and that if war is to come, if war is to go on, it is because mankind is not wise enough, or determined enough, or able enough to adopt a remedy. The remedy is in our hands; it is in the hands of all of us.

Perhaps I feel this more deeply than some men, because it happens to be my lot in life to look into the faces of large numbers of young men just on the threshold of manhood, and no one can look into the face of the American youth without feeling what the possibilities for good are in this world; and when I look into the faces of these men, and think that other men as good as they are, are being slaughtered by the thousands, are slaughtering one another with no real animosity against one another, that those slaughtered in the German ranks, and the French and English ranks, have no reason to kill one another; that they are being simply sacrificed for the world is so organized that it can't go on otherwise; and when I think what kind of people are being destroyed there; and when I think what these young men who are ruthlessly chopped down and buried in shallow graves might be; and I wonder whether the best of the next generation, or the men who

would have been the best of the next generation, can save their fellow-beings from an enormous amount of disease and suffering; when I think of that, I confess I am appalled at the duty that falls upon a neutral nation. When I think, as I say, that that all happens because mankind is wrongly organized, because we have not had, in these thousands and thousands of years of the world's history, brains enough to keep nations from cutting one another's throats as we have kept the people inside of nations from cutting one another's throats – when I think of that, I say: “Can we not do it?” And if we can do it, is there any way to do it except the way that history has pointed out to us in the civilization of individual nations within themselves? And is it too much to hope that human nations will be able to extend that between nations? If it is not, is it not for us, the only great country of the world today that has the civilization and the resources, and the ability to have an effect upon the world? Is it not for us to see if we cannot prevent this thing happening again?

That, gentlemen, is the message that I came to bring to you tonight. Perhaps it is futile; perhaps it is the dream of an idiot. But I think if one who studies history and is familiar with the extent of conflicts which have taken place in the world, to him it doesn't seem so all together hopeless but what it is worthy of consideration until something more practical and more better that may grow out of it shall be suggested.

I thank you. (Great Applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: Gentlemen, before we close, I want to introduce one of our guests of honor, whom the members of the Economic Club, I know, desire to honor, General Leonard Wood. (Applause)

Sixth Speaker

Major-General Leonard Wood, U.S.A

Commanding The Department of the East, U.S. Army

Mr. President, and gentlemen: I think we can all agree that what we have heard President Lowell say, at least to the extent of hoping that we may find some method of avoiding resource to force. I think all of us believe in arbitration. Most honorable men are willing to arbitrate matters which can be arbitrated, but, unfortunately, there are many matters which do not seem to be, in the present state of civilization, at any rate, capable of arbitration. Certainly, arbitration is not the weapon which the weak and unprepared nation can select at will, unless there is such a thing as a World's Court, and that Court we have not yet, desirable as it is, it does not exist, it is not in sight.

The hour of force is pretty evident on all sides, and whatever our ideals may be, we owe it to ourselves, and to our children, and to those all about us to take such reasonable measures of precaution as ordinary commonsense and good judgement indicate. It is well to remember that it is not the weak and unprepared nation which determines whether it is arbitration or war, but it is

rather the strong and well-prepared nation which generally has the right of selection as to whether force or arbitration is to be applied.

I think we ought to work for arbitration, work for world's peace, do all these things but don't neglect to use the intellects which God has given us in taking note of what is going on about us, and making such reasonable preparation as will insure us against ruthless attack. Wars of aggression, of pure aggression for trade routes, commercial areas, additional territory, for any purpose, are usually thought out pretty carefully, and the cost is weighed, by measuring it against the men, and it is like the well guarded house. When a house is well guarded and securely locked, the ordinary burglar passes on, whether he be international or individual, to some easy task, some place where he can get what he wants with less cost. Today is not the day, apparently, of arbitration, much as we want it to be. You see the great Peace Palace at The Hague standing empty. No cause leading to the world's greatest war has been heard within its walls. That may be all very wrong, but unfortunately it is a fact, and it is with facts that we must deal primarily, while we try to establish traditions which will result in more ideal conditions.

You see a land, peaceful people lie our own, devoted to industry, commerce, disinclined strongly to war, and yet what do you say to seeing 500,000 men under arms; for what purpose, for fighting? No, for protecting the neutrality of their own territory which they did not dare to trust to promises. That is unfortunate, but, notwithstanding, it is a fact, and we are dealing with an important proposition in safeguarding this nation, and we must, during the period of

establishment of better conditions, take heed of conditions as they are. You know a lot of head hunters whom we hope to make into good Christians in a generation or two. But we don't fail to remember and recognize the fact that they are head hunters, that we don't go to sleep idle, and unprotected, without great danger to ourselves.

Wealth alone is no protection. It is one of the great causes of war. A rich, unprotected, commercially aggressive people is as strong an inducement for war as exists. Moral righteousness, fair dealing, justice – you have seen all these things trampled on. That, too, is regrettable, but nevertheless it is a fact, and we are dealing with conditions such as these today, and probably will be for a number of years, at least, and I think we owe it to ourselves and to our country, and to the institutions we profess so earnestly to be addicted to, to see that adequate measures of protection are taken in order that they may be preserved and passed on.

The words of our early presidents, and they were all conservative men, pretty much all of them, are always words of warning about being prepared to protect our interests, our rights, our lives, our institutions. Washington, in every message, practically, was equally forceful and, perhaps, even more emphatic. He said: "The only way to secure peace is to be prepared for war." He might have said in a less irritating way, that the only way to be secure in retaining peace would be to prepare against war, for it is, after all, preparation against war that we are asking for; it is an insurance for peace, not a preparation for war.

Now, how are we going to prepare in this country so as to give us an adequate peace insurance without violating all our traditions, without bringing about a condition of militarism. By militarism I do not mean a normal and proper interest in the military preparedness of our country. I mean a condition which is indicated by the demands for all the expedients of unusual official and social precedence of the military class; a condition under which the military class are accredited with exercising an undue influence in the welfare of the nation, as well as in its international relations. I do not think anything could be more unfortunate than to have such a condition, and there is no class in the country who would resent it more than the officers of your Army and Navy, for you people forget that your officers are nothing but your paid professional public servants, whom you hire and pay just as you do your engineers, just as you do your professors in the universities, or men in any educational or professional walk of life. Our business is to study, as well as we can the development of a proper defense for the country; to work out plans for defending it successfully in case of emergency; in other words, to handle as far as we can the war business of the nation whenever the nation is unfortunate enough to become involved in war.

We have no desire for war, not that we have seen much of it in this country, but we know of it from our studies and relations with those unfortunate countries abroad. We know, to go back and repeat again, that wars are not passing; we know that for many, many generations predictions have been made, regularly, that war had come for the last time. You have heard that before the Balkan Wars, you have heard it during the Balkan Wars, and you are hearing it now, and one

statement was as well justified as the other. It is unfortunate, but it is true.

Now, we have got to adopt some kind of system under which we can have adequate military preparation without militarism, or having an unusually heavy military burden, and I have always believed that we could go to the system of the Swiss, or Australian, without great difficulty.

We went first-class Navy, ready, not tomorrow, or tonight, but now; well balanced, well prepared, well equipped. It is the first line of our defense. We want a regular army, adequate for the peace needs of the nation, which will enable the proper garrisoning of the Philippines and Hawaii, which is the key to the Pacific Ocean, dominating the trade routes, and is the main defense of the Pacific Coast, and the Panama Canal to secure holding of the Panama Canal. It is the great instrument of war, and a tremendous instrument of commerce. We have built it at great cost; and then a small garrison in Puerto Rico, and one in Alaska. Then in the United States we must have troops for our seacoast defense, and an adequate army, and by a properly equipped army I mean cavalry, infantry, field artillery, and certain auxiliary troops, such as the Signal Corps. We want all of these, and we want an adequate training for our national soldiery, for our National Guard. We want behind the regular army a good reserve of trained men, and adequate materials of war. Now you cannot make these things in a hurry, as you gentlemen who have dabbled in European contracts probably realize. All that sort of thing has got to be done in time of peace. In time of peace prepare for war, was Washington's advice. Let me change that by saying: In time of peace, prepare against war. You never have time when the trouble is on you.

Modern war is a highly organized business and nations which are prepared for it are prepared for immediate action. The advice which our early presidents gave us, and they all gave us the same – be ready to make ready in time of peace – was good. If they gave this when the ocean was a real barrier, when the arms of war were simple and easy to make, and when our forefathers knew how to use them in getting their daily food, when no nation has a large organized force of transports to move their troops quickly, how much more today are they needed, when every large power save China and ourselves is highly organized and prepared for defense or for aggression, if need be, to prepare? Today when the implements of war are so very intricate, when it takes a long time to make them, and still a longer time to teach men to use them with skill; when our own commerce is spread over the world, and when our territory extends from the Caribbean Sea almost to the coast of China; when our coastal wealth is a hundred times more valuable than it was then!

You have got to have the force of right ready to meet the force of evil if you look at it in that way. You must be prepared to defend your country, and you will have to defend it a long, long time in this world.

Now, organization involves a great many things. First comes the moral organization which is the big thing to accomplish in this world, the organization of our people to a point where each and every man recognizes that he has an important part to play in the defense of this country; that exercising the suffrage, he assumes the obligation for service; that he cannot avoid it and let

some better man do the dangerous work for him; that suffrage carries the obligation for service, and you cannot get away from that, the two things go hand in hand. As long as you are physically fit, it may not be with the armies, but it will be somewhere in that great organization as the men of a nation organized to defend itself. It may be at the front, as a soldier; it may be as a surgeon a hundred miles in the rear; it may be as an agent of transportation; a telegraph operator; any one of a hundred occupations which are found behind the line of an army, but somewhere in the organization you are going to have a place, as long as you are physically fit.

No true democracy, no representative government, can stand the shock and severe strain, which does not recognize that basic principle, that every man who is physically fit, owes to the nation a soldier service in time of war. Now, we have tried the volunteer system. Washington told us it would be a failure. It has always been a failure. We had to go to the draft even in the Civil War, and with it came that curse, that bounty system, coupled with the purchase of substitutes, which has done much more to lower that sense of individual responsibility for service to the nation than any other thing that has ever happened in this country, and there is nothing more degrading than a condition which permits a man, when needed for his country's service in time of war, to go out and buy another man to take his place. It cheapens patriotism; it is one of the things which caused unparalleled desertion in our history, both north and south. Would you men as businessmen go out and bind yourselves with enormous contracts, with huge penalty clauses, without any certainty of what you are going to have in the way of resources, and then go out on the street and ask men to come to your relief? That is the volunteer system. We always call for

volunteers when war is upon us and we expect to train our officers, train our men, make our munitions then. Nothing is more silly.

Can you pick up these men on the street and put them into your business anywhere and expect good results, and yet you expect your officers to do that with untrained men. A nation doing that becomes the murderers of its citizens. You cannot send untrained men against equally good men and well trained, with any hope of success. They never have done it. Remember the loss of the Capitol in 1813; with a loss of 8 killed and 11 wounded before a force only half its own strength. Unorganized and untrained men do not mean anything in modern war. No one is afraid of them. The wolf is not frightened by a block of sheep. Your men mean nothing unless you have behind them a little bit of steel, a steel of individual obligation to the nation. That is what I mean by being organized – to put that sense of individual obligation on the part of every man and every woman too, for that matter, because she has got something to do behind the line. She has her place in war, as you see where they are doing much of the manual labor in the present war.

Then we have got the organization of our industries. The nation ought to know what each great industrial establishment can do for it and it in turn ought to know what can be done for it by the nation. The medical profession must be organized much more extensively than it is at present. The engineers are now organizing, so that we can make use of them. Transportation must be built up and organized. Back of it is a great mass of steel, which represents men, material, organized transport, communication, supplies, munition, a thousand and one things which give that aid

rigidity and firmness.

You cannot do those things after trouble is upon you. If there is one fundamental fact, one word of warning to any people who want to continue a free people – it is to organize.

You must organize your chemical resources. Do you realize how many articles there are in general that we cannot supply due to the shortage of chemical ingredients, various substances that we don't find in this country and haven't even any way to make a substitute; that your nitrates come from over sea; that you don't make optical glass in this country; that there are hundreds of things which you don't make, and that your contractors in the present war can't work fast because they haven't got high speed tools, simply because they haven't certain forms of tungsten? Chemistry is one of the great things in modern war, alongside of which is the organization of industries of all sorts – the mechanical industry, the machine shop, transportation, communication.

We don't mean when we organize a nation that we are going to turn it into an encampment. We don't want any signs of a camp. We want as few men in uniform as possible. But we want as many men who are trained as possible and who have returned to their normal occupations, ready to be soldiers if we need them, but not living the lives of soldiers. That, I think, is the general policy.

We have got to build a large reserve of officers, some 50,000 of them. That is the recommendation of the General Staff. You think that is a large number perhaps, but if you remember the numbers of the Civil War you will not think so. We had 127,000 officers in the Northern Army, outside of what they had in the Southern Army – in round numbers, 200,000 officers. At the end of the Civil War we had one of the greatest navies in the world and we had a well organized force. That was one time in history, the only time that we were prepared for war and that we were prepared and that our preparedness was recognized is evidenced by the promptness with which Napoleon got out of Mexico when it was suggested to him that it would be a good thing to do. We were ready then. We were just, but we were ready.

Our officers we must train. Thousands of men are lost in war because of incompetent officers. The officer must be prepared. I haven't time tonight to go into details, but we have in our colleges, where military training is in force, some forty thousand students, and we have at the great non-military colleges, like Harvard, Yale and Princeton and many others, military courses being started. We ought to have ten or fifteen thousand men in camp each year for this training as reserve officers. We can do it and we must do it.

Now we want to federalize the militia, severing it absolutely, root and branch of connection with the State. (Great Applause) I have been recently south and west and I have yet to meet a single militia officer who is not anxious to be placed upon a federal footing. We want our militia well prepared, we want it a federal instrument. Our navy has had much better results than our

volunteer army, and the reason is that the Federal Government has never entrusted to States the right to raise and maintain a navy. The officers and men of the militia are good, but it is the system that is bad. If the regular army were put under the same system it would go to pieces in a few years. Forty-eight different masters are too many for military efficiency. It is not the trouble with the men, it is the system.

Now all these things must be done in time of peace. I have no patience with people who say that this country of ours cannot be strong without being military, cannot be prepared without being an aggressor. I think that is absolute nonsense. We can be ready and be prepared and be strong and still be honest and still be just, and I think once the people wake up to the fact how needful preparation is, how easily we can do it, by adopting a system like the Swiss or Australian, keeping our army down to the real needs of the nation. I think we shall find an intelligent start in the movement for preparedness, which will leave us as simple and as democratic as Switzerland, and you all know what there is not a more quiet, unassuming, unmilitary power in the world than the people of the little Swiss Republic. (Great Applause)

TOASTMASTER WILLCOX: Gentlemen, the meeting is now adjourned.