Topeka State Journal

An Independent Newspaper.
By FRANK P. MAC LENNAN.

[Entered July 1, 1875, as second-class matter at the postoffice at Topeka, Kan., under the act of congress.]

VOLUME XXXVIII.....No. 210

Official State Paper.
Official Paper City of Topeka.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
Daily edition, delivered by carrier, 10 cents a week to any part of Topeka or suburbs or at the same price in any Kansas town where the paper has a carrier system:
By mail, one year.....$3.60
By mail six months.....1.80
By mail, 100 calendar days.....1.00

TELEPHONES.
Private branch exchange. Call 3530 and ask the State Journal operator for person or department desired.
Topeka State Journal building, 800, 802 and 804 Kansas avenue, corner Eighth.
New York Office, 250 Fifth avenue, Paul Block, manager.
Chicago Office, Mallers building, Paul Block, manager.
Detroit Office, Kresge building, Paul Block, manager.
Boston Office, 201 Devonshire street, Paul Block, manager.

FULL LEASED WIRE REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.

The State Journal is a member of the Associated Press and receives the full day telegraph report of that great news organization, for the exclusive afternoon publication in Topeka.
The news is received in The State Journal building over wires for this sole purpose.

MEMBER:
Associated Press.
Audit Bureau of Circulations.
American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

HOME NEWS WHILE AWAY.
Subscribers of the State Journal away from home during the summer may have the paper mailed regularly each day to any address at the rate of ten cents a week or thirty cents a month (by mail only). Address changed as often as desired. Write out of town the State Journal will be to you like a daily letter from home.
Advance payment is requested on these short time subscriptions, to save bookkeeping expenses.

Topeka, at any rate, seldom plays any favorites when it comes to the homage she accords to distinguished guests and visitors. The reception and welcome that the people of the Kansas capital gave today to Governor Hughes was as impressively large and equally wholehearted, if not more so, than was the case when President Wilson stopped over here not so long ago on his "preparedness" swing around the circle. Of course, the Kansas soldiery were not out in such numbers today as they were when Mr. Wilson and his bride were here. But they cannot be in two places at the same time, and the exigencies of the times appear to demand that they, or most of them, do their bit of "watchful waiting" along the Mexican border.

Being the last actor to appear on the scene so far, Rumania is naturally holding the center of the state in the war news from Europe.

There seems to be an unnecessary amount of worrying about the Topeka food supply in the event that the railroad strike comes on Monday and the nation's transportation facilities are tied up for a shorter or longer time. Almost everything that people need to eat is produced in and around Topeka, and there is probably a sufficient supply in the city of such staples as are not Kansas born and bred, like sugar, coffee and so on and so forth. Tide all the people of the town over as long a period as the strike in prospect may seriously interfere with railroad traffic. And this period is not likely to be as lengthy as a few of the alarmists seem to think.

Sings the weather expert on the Jefferson County Tribune: When it's hot we want it cold, and when it's cold we want it hot, and when it's neither one nor the other we're just as disgruntled as ever.

Verily there is no ill wind that may not blow some good. If the threatened railroad strike should tie up railway traffic as tightly as the officials of the railroad brotherhoods appear to think it will, there will be a surcease from the noise that the spell-binders of the several political parties have been planning to inflict on the people of Kansas, as an incident to the presidential campaign, which has been going along pretty strenuously of late even if President Wilson has not yet been officially notified that he is again the Democratic party's nominee for the presidential office. Of course, these campaign orators can deliver their goods at their home states, but even political prophets are without much honor in their own bailiwicks. It seems to be only another human frailty that the people, as a rule prefer to obtain their political information from "strangers" rather than from their fellow-townsmen whom they may think they know so well.

A few days ago it appeared that the king of Greece had usurped the role of the Sick Man of Europe and which has been acted for so long by the sultan of Turkey. At any rate, he was then too ill to hold an audience with a group of the leaders of the liberal party of Greece who wished to urge him to put Greece actively in the war on the side of the Entente Allies. But this indisposition on the part of King Constantine appears to have been but a temporary ailment. According to the current dispatches from Greece he was sufficiently healthy and vigorous to stage a most successful as well as hurried flight from his throne and responsibilities. The few lines that will be devoted to King Constantine in the history of the European war, when the latter comes to be written some fifty or a hundred years hence, are not likely to make much of a hit with any of his descendants who may then be living, provided, of course, they have red blood in their veins.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS.

There has been considerable enthusiasm among the states and their communities, or counties, over the good roads legislation enacted not so long ago by congress—the national good roads' endeavor which contemplates the expenditure of $85,000,000 of the government's funds during the next ten years in the construction of good roads or the improvement of existing ones; that is, of course, if the states will put up an equal share for road improvement work and which they must do in order to get their quota of the federal good roads' funds.

But is this enthusiasm justified? Would it not be possible for the federal government to put $85,000,000 in ten years and perhaps a like sum or a larger one during the succeeding ten years into road building work in a different manner and to a better purpose and the larger advantage of the whole people of the country?

It is true that in several of the states, especially in the eastern section of the country, where there is really progressive legislation and endeavor for the improvement of the highways, this federal good roads' law and the money it appropriates will be of material assistance in the good roads' work that is already under way in these states or which is yet to be undertaken.

How, tho, will these federal good roads' funds help in other states in any considerable manner in respect to adding to their highway equipment.

Take Kansas, for instance, and where many eager eyes have been turned to this state's first year's allotment of this national good roads' appropriation. The sum is less than $145,000.

Kansas's constitution is so ingenuously framed that the state cannot engage in the business of internal improvements. Hence, the state of itself cannot even participate in this federal good roads' plan unless a loophole is inserted in the new national good roads' law, or until the Kansas constitution may be amended so as to permit a state, that needs permanent highways as badly as any state in the union, to go into the road building business in a proper and serviceable way.

The probabilities are, tho, that congress will listen to the prayers of divers Kansans and that some way will be found to allow the state to enjoy its share of the federal good roads' fund for this year and for succeeding years.

This being accomplished, how will these federal funds be applied in Kansas. There is only one way open. They must be distributed pro rata or proportionately among the several counties of the state, or among, at least, those counties that are willing to match with equal sums for road improvement whatever may be their portions of this national fund, or Kansas's share of it.

Suppose all the Kansas counties jump in because this good roads' water looks so fine!

This means that during an ensuing year Kansas's quota of the federal good roads' appropriation—and it is less than $145,000—will be divided up in some fashion among no less than 105 counties. How much good road work will be done with this money in Kansas even with each county putting up as much money as it gets from the government for this purpose, and especially under the hit and miss system of road construction that is now in order in Kansas, even tho most earnest efforts are being made in many counties to get something like adequate returns for the money they are now putting into road improvement?

This is a rather lengthy question, but it seems to be one that answers itself.

If the national government is really sincere, or if congress is really sincere in having the federal government go into the good roads' business, wouldn't it be a better plan, and one that would provide the nation and many of the states with really good roads, if Uncle Sam devoted this $85,000,000 during the next ten years and a like sum or more during the following ten years to the construction of national highways?

Two such highways crossing the country at different latitudes between the Atlantic and the Pacific and two such highways on widely separated longitudinal lines running from the Canadian border to our southern boundaries would be sufficient for starters in such a national highway movement.

They might be, and undoubtedly would be, of considerably larger advantage to the states thru which they ran than they would be to the states they missed. But the latter would not be so many.

And think of the stimulus the construction of such national highways would be to the good roads movement in all the states. Every state would bend all of its good roads' energies to building adequate features to these national highways.

States that they might not traverse in whole or in part would work overtime to build highways to compete with these national roads.

Such a national good roads' program would surely, it would appear, do more to equip all of the states with adequate highways and highway systems than any other good roads' plan which might be devised.

INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON

BY W. T. ELLIS

For September 3 is "Paul's Sorrows and Comforts."—II Corinthians, 11:21-33.

Militancy in Religion.

Gelatinousness is the commonest and most dangerous substitute for Christianity current today. A jellyfish negativeness, which is as timid as a muskrat, passes current as goodness. In some minds piousness and spinelessness are synonyms. A common idea of goodness is not to disagree with anybody, even with the devil himself. Our grandfathers were called Dissenters, but their grandchildren are of the creed called Assenters. We agree with everybody and everything, from the proposition that God and man were both originally "in the yolk of an addled egg," to the familiar doctrine that "whatever is, is right," and that to be popular is the chief end of man and woman.

Altho it may be sheer bosh, the newest ism and spasm may get a respectful and sympathetic hearing from Christian people. "After all," says the current notion, "it does not matter what you believe, so long as you try to be kind." Therefore, the latest colored fakir from Bombay, if he be at all clever, can get a large following, a fat living, and much sweet adulation from Boston women who have "outgrown" the illiberal creed of their Puritan forbears. No cult is too silly to find a vogue, be it the religion of walking naked thru the grass in the sunlight, or of breathing by a certain rote, or of entering into the silence of a supreme Egoism, or the burning of incense to the sun, or the worship of nebulous Mind, or the Hinduism of transmigration, or—but what is the use of trying to catalogue all our follies?

Any earnest chronicler of the times must confess that, as a whole, our society is intellectually enervated. We are not sure what we believe. Boston and New York are almost as ready to hear a Hindu Yogi as a Billy Sunday. Old religions, new religions; comparative religion, no religion—all are pretty much alike to your modern man or woman. This is true to a degree that would alarm the average minister, if he knew it, of many persons within the churches, as well as of the great mass outside. Present-day Christians, owing perhaps to a lack of leadership, are willing to let many precious inheritances go by default. They surrender the Christian Sabbath almost without a protest. So also they let the Bible go from the public schools. The proposition that this a Christian nation is likewise permitted to go by default. The integrity and inspiration of the Bible is quietly given as easily. Once let anybody,—be he a soap-box orator, or a fledging college professor,—say that "the consensus of modern scholarship affirms"—and shoo! the Christians run like chickens before a hawk, without waiting to see whether the bird that affrights them may not be only a crow.

When to Stand Up and Fight.

Opportunely, the Sunday schools of the world are this week called into the school of study of old Paul of Tarsus, to learn to stand up and contend for the truth. As this lesson and many other New Testament passages make clear, controversy may be a Christian duty. The early church fathers were great controversalists. Truth was so precious in their eyes that they would be alienated from friends and homes, and even from life itself, for its sake. There is something majestic about the spectacle of those great intellects battling over doctrinal and ecclesiastical points. We have entered into the inheritance they left, but we have forgotten their militancy. I wonder if the reader of these lines can name a Christian, name a single great Christian controversalist in North America today, a champion of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus? In the past there have been the men who have made Christendom their debtors.

Controversy on a high plane, which will not dodge or misstate any facts, nor impugn the motives of an adversary, is one of the essential methods of Christian Progress. There is a sense in which every Christian leader and teacher should, like Paul, be a controversalist.

I hasten to add, that Christian controversy is as different from church squabbles and denominational bickerings and petty quarrels as an eagle is from a mosquito. There is no warrant in Scripture for the miserable little bickerings which sometimes stultify the life of a congregation.

The first qualification of a controversalist,—as Paul makes clear in his second letter to his Corinthian converts—is an unimpeachable personal record. He must go into court with clean hands. The self-seeker and the money-lover cannot contend successfully for the faith of Christ. That is why Paul pointed to his own record in Corinth and elsewhere. He tore aside the mantle of personal reserve, and showed that he bore in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus. Pauline conduct squared with Pauline doctrine. All during those arduous tent-making days, and through perilous persecutions and personal sufferings, he had been unconsciously preparing his credentials for the great debate. Thus does the everyday duty, well done, prepare us for life's great crises.

The Cause of Controversy.

Like every other pioneer, Paul knew the bitterness of seeing others follow along the path he had blazed in order to wrest his leadership from him. In addition to garnering the fruit of his labors, they tried to discredit him. After he had established a Christian church at Corinth, these false shepherds came to mislead his flock, for their own advantage. It seems as if always during the church's periods of activity there have been these pretenders and usurpers, with their special isms and cults, and their criticisms of the church. It is no new plague from which the church suffers today. Claiming high titles and especial gifts for themselves, these false apostles had attempted, apparently, to wean the Corinthian Christians away from Paul, and to cast aspersions upon his authority, his ability, and his financial integrity, in the matter of the collection for the Jerusalem poor. Evidently, also, these usurpers condoned unchristian practices on the part of church members, so that they were departing from the strict line of morality laid down by Paul. Kipling's fable of the moth that corrupted a hive of young bees is quite applicable.

Some saints would have gone off whimpering to sympathetic friends, if ill-treated as Paul was by the Church at Corinth. They would have had a grievance for the rest of their days. Not so Paul. He was of sterner stuff. He knew the place of the grace of resignation, and also the place of militant indignation. He could be a suffering saint, but he could also be a smiting soldier with a sword of controversy. For he was a first-class fighting man. It seemed to him the more Christian way to give those interlopers at Athens a chance to practice the virtues of resignation and humiliation. It is better to wipe out a plague than to flee from it. Paul was not the sort of citizen who would flee to a pleasant suburb and let the city go to the devil. Instead, he would stay and help clean up the city. In this spirit he undertook to enlighten the misled Corinthian Christians, and to contend with their usurping leaders.

While he offers it with diffidence and apologies, having all of a strong man's dislike for boasting, Paul nevertheless submits his own character and achievements as "Exhibit A" in the great controversy. Really the whole case rested on the character of the apostles.

That is why it is such an awesome thing to be a preacher or a Christian leader. What if Dwight L. Moody had been a grafter, and the world had found it out. What if Robert E. Speer should be discovered to be an idle, self-seeking lover of money and of notoriety? Imagine John R. Mott putting his own comfort and reputation and bank account above the Christianization of the world! The consequence would be calamitous for all Christendom.

Whoever dares to accept a place of leadership in Christian service thereby assumes a responsibility of living up to the ideals of Jesus that is nothing less than tremendous. A noble Atlanta layman said to me not long since in discussing the retirement of two laymen from places of Christian leadership into private employ. "I tell you, this sort of thing is having a terrible effect upon our laymen. We have followed these men for years, and now they seem to nullify everything they have ever taught by turning aside from the big work and looking out for themselves." As in crusading days, the knight who takes the cross on his arm must surrender private aims and quests, for the Christian is himself a vindication of his message and ministry.

In this great Corinthian controversy, Paul could submit his life as evidence. His case, freely paraphrased, to show the magnitude of his heroic sufferings and activities, ran like this:

"I have been as bold as the best.
"I am anybody's equal as a Hebrew and Israelite.
"I have been myself a minister of Christ,
By labors more abundant,
By stripe without number,
By frequent imprisonment,
By danger of death many times.
"To particularize, here is a part of my record:
Five times the Jews beat me with thirty-nine stripes;
Three times I have been beaten with Roman rods;
Once I was stoned;
Thrice I was shipwrecked, being afloat twenty-four hours in the open sea.
"In my travels I have undergone:
Perils of waters,
Perils of robbers,
Perils from my countrymen,
Perils from the heathen,
Perils in the city,
Perils in the desert,
Perils in the sea,
Perils among false brethren,
In weariness often,
In travail often,
In watchings often,
In hunger often,
In fastings often,
In cold often,
In poor clothing often.
"Besides all the foregoing adversities, there is that which cometh upon me daily, anxiety for all the church."

Really, that closed the case. A mere recital of the incontrovertible facts showed that Paul was everything for Christ and the brethren, and nothing for himself. He had traveled the flinty road to Calvary. He had been crucified with Christ. The brand-marks of the Lord Jesus were on his feet, which had traveled for him; on his hands, which had ministered for him; on his brow, which had thought for him and on his heart, which had been broken over the needs of the world. The man was full proof of the message. The final argument for Christianity in every case is the Christ-like Christian.

"East, West, Hame's Best."

Terse Comments on the Uniform Prayer Meeting Topic of the Young People's Societies—Christian Endeavor, etc.—For September 3: "The Consecration of Home Life."—Acts 10:1-8, 17-24, 44-48.

Stay, stay at home my heart and rest
Home-keeping hearts are happiest;
For those that wander they know not where
Are full of trouble and full of care;
To stay at home is best.
* * * —Longfellow.

There is no part of human relationships where tender thoughtfulness is so greatly needed as in the home. If a family is to live together in harmony and helpfulness each must be thoughtful of the other's rights and comfort. To attempt to do as one pleases is sure destruction to the peace of home life. Each ought to yield to the other. Our homes should train us to think first of the welfare of the other members of the family, putting our own interests last. For "even Christ pleased not Himself." Than this there is no other surer recipe for happiness.

The home life claims an obligation from every member of a family. Our debt to the common interests of the home is more real than our debt to most of the outside affairs that demand so much of our attention. Put home first. We should recognize the home as a divine institution which we dare not neglect. This truth is too much overlooked, and the result is a dangerous decay of the home life.

When each member of a family thinks first of the welfare of others, then the welfare of all is assured.

Forbearance is a magic word in home life. In it is wrapped up the love that suffereth long and is kind, that seeketh not her own, that thinketh no evil, that is not easily provoked and that endureth all things. We are too "touchy." Our common temptation is to stand up for our "rights" about trivial things, when the Christlier way would be to yield cheerfully to others. Forbearance is essential to a happy home life. Without it there must be continual jarring and discord. With it there will be peace.

"In honor preferring one another" is a royal rule for every home.

A family altar has altered many a family. Happiness usually shines from the home where the fire on the family altar burns brightly.

There is a spot of earth supremely blest,
A dearer, sweeter spot than all the rest.
—James Montgomery.
* * *

No matter what goes on in other homes close to ours where we visit, and whose inmates visit us, we must live right within our own doors.—J. R. Miller.

"An empty house, it gloomed beside the way,
With staring windows open to the rain;
A ghost by night, a ruined heap by day,
It never looked to hover life again.

"An empty house with mould half covered o'er,
Where seldom foot of human cared to roam;
But two came, singing, to the door one day,
Lit fires upon the hearth, and called it "Home."

"A bit of muslin 'gainst the window shone,
And by the wall a red rose's happy face;
And travelers passing; hopeless and alone,
Thought of far hearths and, smiling, blessed the place."

The quality of the home life is a true test of national strength or weakness.—William J. Hart.

There is a Guest who is always in our homes. The sense of His presence should make sacred the family life, for He is daily blessing us when we live as becomes His friends, and our unworthy home life makes Him displeased. We ought to be glad that Christ dwells in our homes, and our ambition should be to make these homes more befitting such a heavenly Guest.

Fault-finding harries happiness to death.

Hospitality helps to happiness in the home. With the guest whom we welcome to our best there comes often a pleasure that we never knew while we kept our homes selfishly to ourselves.

Where practical unselfishness dwells there happiness is at home.

T. R. RAPS WILSON AND DEMOCRATS IN MAINE SPEECH

Mexican Policy Scored by Colonel at Lewiston.

Progressives and G. O. P. Unite in Big Demonstration.

COST MORE THAN SPANISH WAR

Lives Lost in Mexico Outnumber List in Cuba.

Preparedness and Pure Patriotism Also Got Notice.

Lewiston, Me., Sept. 1.—Progressives united with Republicans in greeting Theodore Roosevelt, who delivered here his first speech of the campaign in behalf of Charles Evans Hughes, Republican candidate for the presidency. A large delegation of Republicans and Progressives met him in Portland and escorted him here, where he reviewed an old fashioned torchlight procession in which many former Progressive leaders marched.

From the time he landed in Boston from the New York steamer until he retired to his rooms, the former president received enthusiastic demonstrations. His address was devoted largely to an attack on the administration and to a criticism of hyphenism. There should be in American citizenship no dual allegiance, he declared.

Why He's for Hughes.

Mr. Roosevelt spoke as follows: "I come here to Maine to advocate the election of Charles E. Hughes as president of the United States, and the election of a senate and house of representatives to support him, and to give some of the reasons why, in my judgment, it would be a grave misfortune for the people of the United States to re-elect Mr. Wilson.

"I make no merely partisan appeal. I ask the support of all good citizens for our cause. I ask the support of all good Americans. And I not merely ask, but demand as a matter of right, that every citizen voting this year shall consider the question at issue from the standpoint of America, and not from the standpoint of any other nation.

"The root idea of American citizenship, and necessary prerequisite for patriotic service at home, and for service to mankind at large, is that there shall be in our citizenship no dual allegiance. There can be no divided loyalty between this country and the country from which any of our citizens, or the ancestors of any of our citizens, have come. The policy of the United States must be shaped with a view to two conditions only: First, with a view to the honor and interest of the United States, and, second, with a view to its interest of the world as a whole. It is therefore our high and solemn duty, both to prepare our own strength so as to guarantee our own safety, and also to treat every foreign nation, in any given crisis, as its conduct in that crisis demands. The citizen who does not so act and who endeavors to shape American policy in the interest of the country from which he or his ancestors have sprung, is no true American, and has no moral right to citizenship in this country.

"Any attempt to organize American citizens along politico-racial lines is a foul and evil thing. Any organization of American citizens which acts in the interest of a foreign power is guilty of moral treason to the republic. It is because of such action that I condemn those professional German-Americans who in effect politics act as servants and allies of Germany, not as Americans interested solely in the honor and welfare of America; and I would condemn just as quickly English-Americans or French-Americans or Irish-Americans who acted in such manner.

"Americanism is a matter of the spirit, of the soul, of the mind; not of birthplace or creed. We care nothing, as to where any man was born, or as to the land from which his forefathers came, so long as he is wholeheartedly and in good faith an American and nothing else. If the man is a good American we care nothing as to his creed, whether he be Protestant, Catholic or Jew; we care nothing whether his ancestors came over in the Mayflower, or whether he himself was born in England or Ireland, in France or Germany, in Scandinavia or Russia.

"During the last two years we have seen an evil revival in this country of non-American and anti-American division along politico-racial lines; and we owe this primarily to the fact that President Wilson has lacked the courage and the vision to lead this nation in the path of high duty, and by this lack of affirmative leadership has loosened the moral fiber of our people, has weakened our national spirit, and has encouraged the upgrowth within our own borders of separatism along the lines of racial origin. When our own government so acted as to bring shame on all our people, it shook the spirit of loyalty among those to whom it was vital that loyalty should be taught. Full hearted allegiance is shattered by the government that fails to uphold the honor and interest of the nation by immediate and effective action when the lives of its citizens are menaced or taken by foreign powers.

"The cause of preparedness is inseparably connected with the cause of Americanism, of patriotism, of whole hearted loyalty to this nation and to all for which all the great men of this nation in the past have stood. The events of the last two years have made it evident that the dreams of the professional pacifists were not merely dreams but nightmares, so far as the unfortunate nations who trusted them were concerned. Moreover, in practice these pacifists have shown not only utter futility, but moral baseness.

"As the world now is, our great free democracy must understand that unless it can protect itself by its own strength—and its strength is not strength at all unless it is carefully trained in advance—it will sooner or later suffer the fate that China is suffering before our eyes. Thanks to the fact that President Wilson has sometimes led us wrong, and sometimes not led us at all, and that at the best he has merely followed afar off when convinced that it was politically safe to do so, we are at this moment no more prepared to defend ourselves then we were two years ago when the world war broke out. At last we have begun the work of restoring our navy to the position it formerly held; but it will take years to undo the harm done when in 1910 the Democratic party gained control of the house and stopped upbuilding the navy; and it is entirely impossible to make the navy what it should be made as long as we have a president who appoints and retains at its head a public official of the type of Mr. Daniels.

Applied Patriotism.

"The policies of Americanism and preparedness, taken together, mean applied patriotism. They should be correlation of policy and armament. Our first duty as citizens of the United States is owed to the United States. But if we are true to our principles we must also think or serving the interests of mankind at large. In addition to serving our own country, we must shape the policy of our country so as to secure the cause of international righteousness, fair play and humanity. Our first duty is to protect our own rights; our second, to stand up for the rights of others. President Wilson has signally failed to perform either duty. They can be performed only by deed. Words alone are useless.

"At this moment Mr. Wilson and Mr. Wilson's fuglemen advance as his greatest claim that 'he has kept us out of war.' This claim can be seriously made only by individuals who indorse President Wilson's belief that deeds are nothing and words everything, and who make no distinction between the armed forces of two countries. Nowadays, thanks quite as much to the professional pacifists as to the militarists, it means, furthermore, the destruction of the lives of civilians, and the property of civilians, as well as the property of the government. Under President McKinley we had a war with Spain. Under President Wilson we are assured that we have had 'peace' with Mexico. These are the words. Now for the deeds.

"During the war with Spain fewer Americans were killed by the Spaniards than have been killed by Mexicans during the present 'peace' with Mexico. Let us repeat this. A greater number of Americans have been killed by Mexicans during these years, when we are officially informed that we have been at peace with them, than were killed by the Spaniards during our entire war with Spain. Moreover, when the war with Spain was thru, it was thru. But peace still continues to rage as furiously as ever in Mexico.

Stopped Cuban Butchery.

"Nor is this all. The instant effect of the outcome of the war with Spain was to put a stop to the dreadful butchery and starvation in Cuba and the Philippines, and the entry of both Cuba and the Philippines on a career of eighteen years of peace and prosperity such as they have never known before in all their checkered history. But during these three years of Mr. Wilson's 'peace,' the Mexicans themselves have been butchered by their own bandits steadily and without intermission; and Mexican women and children have died by thousands—probably by scores of thousands—of starvation, and of the diseases incident to starvation. In other words, Mr. McKinley's war cost less bloodshed than Mr. Wilson's peace; and it reflected high honor on the American people; whereas Mr. Wilson's peace has been one of shame and dishonor for the American people, and one of ruin bloodshed for the Mexicans themselves.

"Mr. Wilson says we have had peace with Mexico. He says he did not wage war with Mexico. If he takes any comfort out of this denial, let us not insist upon the proper terminology, and admit that he merely waged peace with Mexico. Well, as one incident of his waging peace, we took Vera Cruz. Some seventy-five men wearing the American uniform were killed and wounded, and three or four times that number of Mexicans. In Mr. McKinley's war, we took Manila; and Dewey's fleet lost fewer men in the operation that resulted in the fall of Manila than were lost in the taking of Vera Cruz. Under these conditions, of what earthly consequence is it to assert that the taking of Vera Cruz was an act of war? Only by a misuse of terminology, only by the use of an incorrect nomenclature, can we distinguish one military operation from the other.

"The real difference was that Mr. Wilson became frightened and abandoned Vera Cruz, whereas Mr. McKinley did not abandon Manila. Mr. Wilson's operations were war just as much as Mr. McKinley's. But Mr. Wilson was beaten in his war. It was a war which was entered into pointlessly and abandoned ignobly; it was a war which failed; a war which did damage both to the Mexicans and ourselves, and which in its outcome reflected infinite dishonor upon our nation. But it was a war, nevertheless.

"Again, in March last, Villa made a raid into American territory. He was a bandit leader whose career of successful infamy had been greatly aided by Mr. Wilson's favor and backing. He was at the head of Mexican soldiers, whose arms and ammunition had been supplied to them in consequence of Mr. Wilson's reversing Mr. Taft's policy and lifting the embargo against arms and munitions into Mexico. They attacked Columbus, N. M., and killed a number of civilians and a number of United States troops. On the next day the president issued an announcement that adequate forces would be sent in pursuit of Villa 'with the single object of capturing him.' April 8 the announcement was made from the White House that the troops would remain in Mexico until Villa was captured. It was furthermore announced in the press dispatches from Washington that he was to be taken 'dead or alive.' Fine words! Only—they meant nothing. He is not dead. He has not been taken alive.

"You do not have to accept my statement of conditions in Mexico. Accept the official statement of President Wilson's secretary of state to Carranza June 20 last.

"In this official statement President Wilson gives the final result of his policy in Mexico for the past three years. I call your attention to the fact that he states that the attacks on the four enumerated American towns in September last were 'typical,' and says that 'in these attacks on American territory there were Carranzista adherents and Carranzista soldiers, who took part in the burning and killing. Not only were these murders characterized by ruthless brutality, but uncivilized acts of mutilation were perpetrated.'

Glad to Recognize Carranza.

"President Wilson therefore explicitly shows that the Carranzistas, not once, but repeatedly, made attacks on American towns, and killed American citizens, and mutilated them, in September, 1915. Yet October 19, 1915, less than a month later, this same President Wilson, thru his same secretary of state, formally announced to Carranza's agent that it was his 'pleasure' to take the opportunity 'of extending recognition to the de facto government of Mexico, of which Gen. Venustiano Carranza is the chief executive.'

"President Wilson thus recognized the government which, his own secretary of state declares, had been less than a month previously engaged in repeated assaults upon Americans, and in the invasion of American soil, the government at whose head was General Carranza, who, less than two months previously, on August 2, 1915, had contemptuously refused to pay any heed to any representations of President Wilson on behalf of mediation, saying that 'under no consideration would I permit interference in the internal affairs of Mexico.'

"President Wilson did not merely kiss the hand that slapped him in the face. He kissed that hand when it was red with the blood of American men, women and children who had been murdered and mutilated with, as President Wilson, through his secretary of state, says, 'ruthless brutality.'

"In all this shameful history of Mr. Wilson's dealings with Mexico during the past three years, nothing has been more shameful than his conduct at Tampico.

"At that time the particular bandit Mr. Wilson was favoring happened to be Villa. This, however, is of no consequence. Mr. Wilson has sometimes helped the different Mexican leaders of bandits against one another; now Villa against Huerta, now Carranza against Villa; but he has never stood up effectively for American rights against any of them. When he has ventured to take action against any of them, he has always hastily abandoned the attempt as soon as the resistance by the bandit involved became serious.

Held Back Navy.

"At Tampico there was a general attack by Mexicans on Americans and other foreigners. We had a squadron of American warships in the neighborhood. The Wilson administration declined to permit this squadron to be used to defend the lives of American men, and the honor of American women, at the commanders of the French and English ships at Tampico had to step in and perform the task our representatives had so basely abandoned. At the very time the Mexican mob had surrounded the building in which the Americans had taken refuge, and was howling for their blood, the American fleet, in spite of the protests of the American naval commander, and in accordance with wireless orders from Washington, was forced to steam out of the harbor and leave the Americans to be massacred by the Mexicans, or rescued by the Germans and English.

"Hundreds have been killed, and Mr. Wilson has watched their fortunes disinterestedly. This administration has displayed no feeling of responsibility for American women who have been attacked and for American men, women and children who have been killed in Mexico. And now the American people are asked to sanction this policy in the name of peace, righteousness and humanity.

"President Wilson took Vera Cruz in 1914, as we were officially informed at the time, to get a salute for the flag and to prevent the shipment of arms into Mexico. He did not get his salute. He did not prevent the shipment of arms. But several hundred men were killed or wounded; and then he brought the army home without achieving either object. President Wilson sent an army into Mexico in 1916, as we were informed at the time, to get Villa 'dead or alive.' They did not get him dead. They did not get him alive. Again several hundred men were killed and wounded. Again President Wilson is bringing the army home without achieving his object.

Pointless Little Wars.

"Of course it is a mere play upon words to say that these were not 'wars.' They were wars, and nothing else; ignoble, pointless, unsuccessful little wars, but wars. They cost millions of dollars and hundreds of lives, squandered to no purpose; they accomplished nothing; but they were wars.

"And yet Mr. Wilson's defenders say that he 'has kept us out of war.' As a matter of fact his policy in Mexico has combined all the evils of feeble peace with all the evils of feeble war. He has secured none of the benefits of war; but he has not avoided war. He has sacrificed the honor and the interest of the country; but he has not received the thirty pieces of silver. In fact, when Mr. Wilson forgets himself, he admits that we have been at war; for example: May 11, 1914, in an address over the dead marines at the Navy Yard in Brooklyn, he said the marines had been engaged in a 'war of service.' A war of service to whom or what? Certainly not to the United States; nor to Mexico; nor to humanity at large. Was it to Mr. Wilson?

"As it is with 'war' so it is with 'intervention.' President Wilson has again and again said he would not 'intervene' in Mexico. As a matter of fact he has intervened continuously.

"At one time Mr. Wilson's policy of intervention produced such unhappy results that June 2, 1915, he issued a formal warning to the Mexican factions in which he said:

"'Mexico is apparently no nearer a solution of her tragical troubles than she was when the revolution was first kindled. She has been swept by civil war as if by fire. Her crops are destroyed, her cattle confiscated, her people flee to the mountains to escape being drawn into unavailing bloodshed, and no man seems to see or lead the way to peace and settled order. There is no proper protection either for her own citizens or for the citizens of other nations resident and at work within her territory. Mexico is starving and without a government.'

Must Act Soon.

"A delightful picture of the effects of Mr. Wilson's policy! He therefore tells Mexico that unless 'within a very short time' the Mexican leaders get together for the relief and redemption of their prostrate country the United States 'will be constrained to decide what means should be employed' to deal with the situation. But as usual with Mr. Wilson, this solemn warning meant precisely and exactly nothing, and the Carranzistas and Villistas and the rest knew it meant precisely nothing. They knew Mr. Wilson would either not back up his words by deeds at all or would back them up so feebly that by a sufficient show of resistance he could be forced to abandon his purpose.

"Some of the defenders of Mr. Wilson, in answer to Mr. Hughes's merciless indictment of Mr. Wilson's second term, have sought to justify Mr. Wilson by attempting to turn the whole issue on the character of Huerta, who was the de facto president when Mr. Wilson became President of the United States. They ask Mr. Hughes, 'Would you have recognized Huerta?' The answer is that any one of several courses could have been adopted, provided only that the course adopted had been followed with resolution and with full acceptance of the responsibility involved.

"There was much to be said in favor of the policy of recognizing Huerta and avoiding intervention. There was also much to be said in favor of the policy of refusing to recognize Huerta, which was intervention, and then of fully accepting the responsibility implied in intervention. But there is nothing to be said in favor of wobbling between the two policies, and neither recognizing Huerta nor accepting the responsibility for the chaos caused by failure to recognize him. Yet this was the course Mr Wilson followed.

Wilson Hits Soft.

"It should be a cardinal rule of conduct in international as in individual affairs never to hit if hitting can possibly be avoided; but never under any circumstances to hit soft. Mr. Wilson has been engaged in continual hitting. But he has always hit soft. And whenever his opponent has hit back, he has promptly dropped his arms, stopped hitting and taken refuge in platitudes about peace, nonintervention and humanity.

"We know that the mass of the voters, the mass of the American people, will approve the policy of the administration, the policy of drift, the policy of spineless failure to do our duty to ourselves and to others because they believe in 'safety first.' Such being the case, it is worth while examining just what 'safety' or 'safety first' means, and how far a policy based only on considerations of safety is materially advantageous and morally justifiable.

"To treat safety as an indispensable element of any continuous national policy is perfectly proper, and indicates wisdom, to wisdom that we shall shape our military policy so as to make ourselves—our home country, our canal zone, all our islands—absolutely safe against successful attack by any great European or Asiatic military power. To this extent safety coincides with duty. But this ultimate safety in the future is to be obtained, not by shirking, but by performing, our duty in the present.

"When President Wilson two years ago assured the American nation there was no need for preparedness, no need to worry about our military shortcomings, no need for self sacrifice and effort in order to make good these shortcomings, he was sacrificing our future safety to considerations of momentary political popularity obtained by pandering to popular desire for the enjoyment of material ease, and the avoidance of effort and of serious facing of duties. Mr. Wilson then put 'safety first' as compared to duty; but he put it last as compared to momentary enjoyment of ease and material pleasures, and lazy refusal to face facts. I hold that this was exactly the reverse of what he ought to have done.

Believe in Safety First.

"But this is not in the least what Mr. Wilson's advocates mean when they ask us to support him, because he and they are for 'safety first.' They are for the unworthy safety that is merely obtained by the abandonment of duty. They are for the momentary safety which shortsighted men secure when they purchase escape from present risk and effort at the cost of future disaster. They are for the 'safety' of each man to spend his time in money making and in flabby ease, at the cost of remaining untrained and unfit to render service to the Nation in the Nation's hour of need. They are for the mean safety which this Nation secured when it treated The Hague Conventions, which it had signed, as a scrap of paper and declined to make even a protest on behalf of tortured Belgium. They are for the safety of this Nation temporarily secured by tame submission to the murder of its men, women and children on land by Mexican bandits, and at sea in the Lusitania and similar cases by German submarines. This kind of 'safety first' means dirty last, honor last, courage last. I do not believe in it. I believe that it is obtained at moral cost so overwhelming to the present and at the risk of national ruin in the future.

"Every life saving crew is composed of men who are tough, hardy and well trained. They put safety first as far as self indulgence and soft ease and mere money getting are concerned; otherwise they would be helpless in a storm. But when duty and safety are concerned, they put duty first and safety last.

"We want to see this Nation act in similar fashion, both as regards its own safety and as regards the performance of international duty. I wish to see it by forethought, by effort and training, and by the cultivation of a broad and intense feeling of national endeavor and national patriotism, to so develop its courage and its efficient strength as to be able to hold its own against any possible aggression; and then I wish to see it put duty first, not safety first, when any small, well behaved people is treated as Belgium has been treated. I stand for the safety that is obtained by the performance of duty. I do not stand for safety obtained by the sacrifice of duty.

Will Put Duty First

"I believe when the American people realize the issue is squarely before them they will put duty first and not safety first; and I believe only by so doing will they secure real and ultimate safety. I believe they will support a policy of national action demanding a spirit of national courage. The American people are at heart moral idealists and enthusiasts; and in the past they have again and again responded to some appeal for practical action, calling for idealism to perceive it and enthusiasm and self devotion in order to achieve it.

"It is just that this Nation should concern itself with its rights; but it is even more necessary that it should concern itself with its duties. As between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Wilson, who can doubt which is the man who will with austere courage stand for the national duty? Mr. Wilson has blown hot and contradicted one another; and all his words have been contradicted by his acts. Mr. Wilson's promise has not borne the slightest reference to his performance. We have against him in Mr. Hughes a man whose public life is a guarantee that whatever he says he will make good, and that all his words will be borne out by the deeds. Against Mr. Wilson's combination of grace in elocution with futility in action; against his record of words unbacked by deeds or betrayed by deeds, we set Mr. Hughes's rugged and uncompromising straightforwardness of character and action in every office he has held. We put the man who thinks and speaks directly, and whose words have always been made good, against the man whose adroit and fac