Pacifists Are Like the Tories and Copperheads, Says Roosevelt

COLONEL TELLS MICHIGAN WHAT FORD POLICY MEANS

Must Surrender Our Rights or Be Ready to Defend Them.

HYPHENS IN SAME PERIL AS NATIVES

No Nation Will Attack Unified and Prepared America, Asserts T. R.

Detroit, May 19.—Following is the full text of Theodore Roosevelt's speech on preparedness at the American Day celebration here to-day:

I have been very reluctant to make speeches during these weeks immediately preceding the national nominating conventions, because it is very difficult to make people understand that speeches at such a time are not of the ordinary political type made in the interest of some particular individual's candidacy. But I finally determined that I would come here to Michigan to say certain things which I believe should be said at this time.

What I have to say to you will not be in the interest of any man, and least of all of myself. It will not refer to the candidacy of any individual. It will not refer to the policy of any party, save as such party policy may, and ought to, vitally concern the welfare of the nation. My speech will be devoted exclusively to certain great principles which should be fundamental in this giant democratic commonwealth of ours.

Whenever I touch on an individual it will be because I cannot make my meaning clear save by speaking of individuals who embody or typify certain movements.

I come here to Michigan because in the primary for the selection of delegates to the Republican National Convention Mr. Ford was victorious, and following on his victory here he showed a marked popular strength in Nebraska and Pennsylvania. The effect of this showing has been immediately visible upon many of the politicians within and without Congress.

What Ford's Success Means.

One of the leading anti-preparedness, or peace-at-any-price, papers in New York recently commented with great satisfaction upon the defeat in the lower house of Congress of the proposal to increase our regular army to 250,000 men. This paper stated that originally the proposal was defeated by only 22 votes, but when the vote came up again, ten days ago, it was defeated by 79 votes.

It continues (I condense): "Of these 221 negative votes, 51 were cast by Republicans, 49 being from the Central West, what has come to be known as the Henry Ford territory. These included 6 of the 11 from Michigan—a notable change since it was proposed in the House. Since then Mr. Ford's large votes in Michigan and Nebraska have been recorded. All three Republican Congressmen from Nebraska were opposed. If this is not a pretty clear indication as to prevailing anti-militarist temper in the Middle West, what can be? It is as well refreshing proof that there will be strong forces in both party conventions to throw their influence against the militarist planks of Mr. Roosevelt."

This situation makes it advisable to speak with courtesy but with entire frankness of what the success of Mr. Ford means and is taken to mean, and of the forces that have given Mr. Ford his strength. It is in Michigan, Mr. Ford's own state, where the Ford movement began, that I wish to say what I have to say on the subject.

Much in Ford To Be Admired.

For Mr. Ford personally I feel not merely friendliness, but in many respects a very genuine admiration. There is much in the methods and very much in the purposes, with which he has conducted his business, notably in his relations to his working people, that commands my hearty sympathy and respect. Moreover, there is always something attractive to an American in the career of a man who has raised himself from the industrial ranks until he is one of the captains of industry.

But all that I have thus said can with truth be said of many, perhaps of most, of the Tories of the Revolutionary War and of many or most of the pacifists of the Civil War, the extremists among who were popularly known as Copperheads. Many of the Tories and Civil War pacifists were men of fine character and upright purpose, who sincerely believed in the cause they advocated. They included all the men who were the pacifists of their day.

These pacifists who formed so large a proportion of the old-time Tories and Copperheads abhorred and denounced the militarism of Washington in 1776 and of Lincoln in 1861. They were against all war and all preparedness for war. In the Revolutionary contest they insisted that Washington was the embodiment of anarchic militarism. Their purpose was to get the "boys" of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge "out of the trenches" and bring them back back to their homes and make them quit fighting.

Lincoln Denounced by Pacifists.

In 1864 they denounced Lincoln as a military dictator. They praised peace as the greatest of all earthly blessings. They demanded that the war should cease, and they wished to get the "boys" of the Army of the Potomac out "of the trenches" before Christmas and bring them back to the farm, the shop, and the counting house.

If these pacifists of the Revolutionary and Civil War had had their way, they would have put an immediate stop to much suffering and much loss of life. They would have secured immediate peace. They would have averted some years of war. They would have turned men away from military training into the paths of ordinary civil occupation. They would have secured the applause of every peace-at-any-price man at home and abroad.

And unwittingly they would have utterly ruined this nation. They would have prevented its being a nation. They would have made the countrymen of Washington and the countrymen of Lincoln objects of scorn and derision, and they would have made of this great Republic a hissing and a byword among the nations of the earth.

They would have purchased peace at the moment by ignoble submission to wrong, by ignoble cowardice. They would have rendered it certain in each case that for the one war they averted at the moment ten were insured for the years to come. They would have piled up an immeasurable load of shame and suffering for their children and their children's children, not merely unto the third and fourth but unto the ninth and tenth generations that were to come after them.

Like Tories of Old.

This is what these good, well meaning pacifists of those days would have done if they had achieved their purpose. This is what the pacifists of our day, the neo-Tories, the neo-Copperheads, will do if they achieve their purpose.

Remember that pacifists of to-day, the peace-at-any-price men, however well meaning, are the spiritual and moral heirs of the men who denounced and opposed Washington, of the men who denounced and voted against Abraham Lincoln. We can only be loyal to the souls of Washington and Lincoln and to the soul of the great people that caught flame from their teachings if we set our face like flint against the unworthy spirit which to-day would teach us that peace stands above righteousness and that this unrighteous peace can be secured by the refusal to prepare to defend our just rights.

Either we must surrender our rights, and at the same time our self-respect, or else we must be ready to defend our rights with a hand trained to exercise the weapons of free men and with a heart steeled to that stern courage for the lack of which the possession of the softer virtues can never atone.

Issue of Defence as Clear Cut in 1916 as It Was in 1776 or 1861

Such is the issue. It is as clear cut in this year 1916 as it was in 1861 or 1776. In the history of this country this is the third great crisis and it coincides with a tremendous world crisis. The issue is: Are we prepared with a sane and lofty idealism to fit ourselves to render great service to mankind by rendering ourselves fit for our own service, or are we content to avoid effort and labor in the present by preparing to tread the path that China has trodden?

We must choose one course or the other. We shall gain nothing by making believe that we can avoid choosing either course. At present the attitude of many of our politicians in Congress and outside strongly resembles the attitude of many of the politicians in the gold and silver controversy of twenty years ago.

At that time the free silver men were bold and insistent, just as the professional pacifists are to-day. At that time, as to-day, the great bulk of the politicians, not only in the Democratic Party, but in the Republican Party, were at first mortally afraid to offend the free silver men. They made every effort to compromise, and to take some position that should not be either for gold or for silver. Above all, they strove to avoid the use of the word "gold."

The fifty-one Republicans who, the other day, voted against an adequate army are the spiritual successors of the Republicans who, twenty years ago, in Congress voted for all kinds of half measures which they hoped would convince the free silver people that we were to have the unlimited coinage of silver, and would convince the other people that we were not to have it.

Squirmed to Avoid Word Gold.

The older among you, of course, remember how at that day the politicians squirmed in their effort to prevent the Republican National Convention from using the word "gold"; how they demanded that instead we should use some such expression as "having each dollar equally as good as every other dollar"; how they sought to evade facing the issue.

But when the time came, when the lines were drawn, and the battle was on, it became perfectly evident that the only way to beat the free silver people was to come straight out for the gold standard without equivocation or timidity. The effort to avoid a fight on the currency and make the fight only on the tariff was a failure. The gold men stood for a high tariff; but first and foremost they made the fight on the issue of maintaining and securing the gold standard, the sound money standard; and if they had tried double dealing and hesitation and equivocation they would have lost, and they would have deserved to lose. Let us to-day profit by their example.

In any serious crisis there are always men who try to carry water on both shoulders. These men try to escape the hard necessity of choice between two necessarily opposite alternatives by trying to work up some compromise. In actual practice, this compromise usually proves to combine with exquisite nicety all the defects and none of the advantages of both courses. It is true that in ordinary political matters compromise is essential. It is true that in ordinary times it is essential.

When Compromise Is Fatal.

But there come great crises when compromise is either impossible or fatal. This is one of those crises. There is no use in saying that we will fit ourselves to defend ourselves a little, but not much. Such a position is equivalent to announcing that, if necessary, we shall hit, but that we shall only hit soft.

The only right principle is to prepare thoroughly or not at all. The only right principle is to avoid hitting if it is possible to do so, but never under any circumstances to hit soft. To go to war a little, but not much, is the one absolutely certain way to insure disaster. To prepare a little but not much, stands on a par with a city developing a fire department which, after a fire occurs, can put it out a little, but not much.

Yet at this moment the majority of our political leaders either keep silent on the vital issues before our people, or else engage in conflicts which are almost meaningless because the men ranged on one side advocate total unpreparedness and the men ranged on the other side nervously deny that they desire any real and thoroughgoing preparedness.

Such a condition of affairs speaks badly for this nation. I say "this nation" advisedly. I mean you and me, my fellow countrymen. The executive and legislative agents of the government at Washington ought, of course, to lead in the right direction. But ultimately we, the people, have only ourselves to blame if they do not; for it is our fault if we permit them to lead us wrong. Therefore, I wish you to understand that I am putting the blame primarily on us, the people, on us ourselves; although it is necessary, in order to avoid circumlocution, that I speak at times of our governmental agents.

We, through our representatives at Washington, have absolutely refused in the smallest degree to prepare during these twenty-two months of world cataclysm. We have refused to learn the smallest part of the lesson being written on the scroll of torment in Europe. We have fatuously refused to take the smallest step, either to do our duty to ourselves or to do our duty to others. We have endeavored to deceive ourselves by announcing that in this policy of supine inaction and of failure to perform duty, we are actuated by the loftiest motives.

I doubt whether we have really deceived ourselves, and most certainly we have not deceived others. There is not a nation in the world which believes that our course of conduct has been dictated by anything save timidity, unworthy shrinking from effort and responsibility, and cold and selfish love of money making and of soft ease.

We first hysterically announced that we would not prepare because we were afraid that preparation might make us lose our vantage ground as a peace-loving people. Then we became frightened and announced loudly that we ought to prepare; that the world was on fire; that our own national structure was in danger of catching flame; and that we must immediately make ready. Then we turned another somersault and abandoned all talk of preparedness; and we never did anything more than talk.

The net result is that there has been no preparation so far, because of what has happened in the great war. Congress is still in the conversational stage on the matter. There is no sign, as far as governmental action goes, that we have any appreciation of our danger, or of the needs of the country. No action has been taken to meet these needs. No action adequate to meet them is even contemplated.

No Sign of Action Taken.

It has been announced in vindication of the political wisdom of those declining to take such action that thereby they would favorably impress our home pacifists. This hope has been only partially justified by the result. The ultra-pacifists, as represented by Mr. Ford, have made their great showing precisely because there has been no real and resolute opposition to them.

The Administration at Washington, backed by the majority of Congress, has taken no step for preparedness, and has done nothing efficient to sustain our national rights. It has stood for applied pacifism, as far as deeds are concerned. But because, although it has not acted, it has, at intervals, ventured feebly to speak in contradiction of its non-action, the ultra-pacifists and their allies have refused it any wholehearted support. They object even to make-believe preparedness. They insist on even more thoroughgoing helplessness than that which we had so amply provided at Washington.

Demand 100 Per Cent of Futility.

Although our governmental representatives have been 96 per cent feeble, the ultra-pacifists have demanded a clear 100 per cent of futility and feebleness, and have conducted their campaigns under various banners to achieve this purpose.

Hitherto most of our prominent political leaders have not ventured to take any thoroughgoing and clean-cut position in this matter. They have not ventured to expose the essential immorality of the ultra-pacifist or peace-at-any-price position. They stand exactly as twenty years ago the political leaders stood who desired to avoid flat-footedly taking sides for or against either silver or gold. Such a policy is probably futile from the party standpoint. It is certainly mischievous from the national standpoint.

Wrong Policy Should Be Opposed with Every Ounce of Earnestness

There is only one way to oppose a policy that is inherently wrong and that is by opposing it with every ounce of earnestness, every ounce of energy the man possesses. The only kind of faith to have in any policy is 100 per cent faith; if the opposition is 96 per cent wrong, very little is to be gained by trying to persuade people that we are only 93 per cent wrong. The difference between being 4 per cent right and 7 per cent right is not enough to arouse much fervor. If we believe that the most certain way for us to insure peace is to be prepared for war, and to have it known that we are prepared for war, then let us whole-heartedly advocate such a policy, not a little, not with tremors and gaspings, but fully and absolutely.

The old Whig party was beaten by the pro-slavery Democracy, and finally went out of existence, because it endeavored to be both for slavery and against it, and not too much of either. The party that won was the party that dared fearlessly to say that it was against slavery and for the Union and that stood aggressively by its principles. The party that has full confidence in its own policies and a conceded purpose to put these policies into effect will sooner or later get the people to back it—provided the policies are sound.

A party that stutters and stammers and that tries to be both for and against its own utterances has no right to complain if the people prove hesitant about giving it power. Why give it power when it does not say fearlessly what use it expects to make of the power?

Two Great Issues Before Us.

There are at this time two great issues before us, both inseparably bound together. They are the issues of Americanism and preparedness. As a people we have to decide whether we are to be in good faith a people and able and ready to take care of ourselves, or whether we doubt our national unity and fear to prepare and intend instead to trust partly to a merciful Providence and partly to elocutionary ability in high places. Those in power at Washington have taken the latter position. The followers of Mr. Ford in the Republican primaries have taken what is in reality the same position.

What stand do the opponents of this position intend to take? The advocates of unpreparedness, the advocates of sham preparedness and the peace-at-any-price men all advocate what is in reality the same policy. Those who stand against such a policy are not to be excused if they stand so half-heartedly that the people do not recognize much difference between themselves and their opponents.

Why should the people change their government if they are merely to change slightly the degree of unpreparedness? The only sufficient reason for a change would be to inaugurate a policy of real and thoroughgoing preparedness, from the top to the bottom, preparedness to defend ourselves in war, preparedness to do well and justly our normal work of peace.

We must make this nation as strong as are its convictions in reference to right and wrong. It little matters what our ideals may be and what achievements we may hope for if these ideals and achievements cannot be reduced to action. The events of the past and the events of to-day show that national ideals amount to nothing if the nation lacks the power to maintain them against opposition.

Strong Convictions Needed.

Therefore, if we are to win at home against those of our fellow-citizens who believe in the policy of unpreparedness—that is, of national weakness and inefficiency—we must have strong and well reasoned convictions and express them with strength and sincerity. A considerable part of the strength of Mr. Ford in the primaries and of the strength of the advocates of half-preparedness at Washington comes from the fact that no real alternative of policy is offered with sincerity and fearlessness.

Mr. Ford's supporters in the primaries seemingly come chiefly from three classes—the workingmen, who believe that he represents the desire to do justice to them; the pacifists, who think that a policy of helplessness in the face of other nations will insure our national safety, and the German-Americans, some of them in an honest and sincere mood of protest, and the others under the influence of that portion of the professional German-Americans who have permitted their devotion to Germany finally to make them antagonistic to the welfare of the United States.

As for the wage-workers who support Mr. Ford, I understand entirely their desire to support any man who, in their belief, stands for a more substantial measure of social and industrial justice. But I wish, with all the emphasis in my power, to call their attention to the fact that, in order for us to work within our own borders for social and industrial justice, it is necessary to secure to ourselves the power to determine these questions for ourselves.

Defenceless Fall Victims.

If a nation cannot defend itself then we may rest assured that sooner or later some stronger outside power will impose an alien will upon it and will deprive it of the say as to how it will determine its own destinies. It is of not the slightest consequence at this moment what the business men or the wage workers or the farmers of Belgium think should be done in the way of industrial and agricultural development and justice, because they have to do whatever the Germans tell them to do; and they work and live as they are told by their conquerors.

In the same way it is of no consequence what the native Koreans at the moment think should be done to raise themselves upward toward civilization, because the determining factor in their future is the Japanese attitude. I believe that the Japanese have done well in Korea. I know that the German invasion has wrought incredible woe in Belgium. But I am not, at the moment, concerned with either fact. I am concerned only with the fact that because Korea did not prepare itself in advance for defence it is now absolutely under the dominion of Japan, and that largely for the same reason Belgium is now under the absolute control of the Germans.

I wish the wage workers and the farmers, even more than the business men, of this country to realize that if we tread the steps of Belgium and Korea in pacifism and unpreparedness, sooner or later the Germans or the Japanese or some other men of virile race will wholly or partially control our destinies and deprive us of the right to control them wholly for ourselves.

Workingman Must Be Patriot.

The workingman, like the farmer and the business man, must be a patriot first or he is unfit to live in America; and the first duty of all true patriots is to see that we are able to prevent alien conquerors from dictating our home policies. Until this right to decide our home policies for ourselves has been guaranteed to us by our own forethought and exertion, it is idle to talk of the particular methods by which the right shall be exercised.

Let me take a concrete illustration: Mr. Ford in his business has, to his great credit, endeavored in his own way to secure the welfare of those who work for him. He also advocates our being helpless as a nation to protect him and his workingmen, and he works to keep himself and themselves helpless to aid in such protection. This is precisely the attitude that was taken in Belgium by many business men of the stamp of Mr. Ford. They were successful business men who tried to do justice to their work people. But they were pacifists who did not believe in thoroughgoing preparedness in military matters.

In consequence these Belgian analogues of Mr. Ford now see their business at a standstill; and their work people are in the direst misery, and do only such work, under such conditions, as their conquerors dictate. Let the business men and workingmen of America who tend to be misled by Mr. Ford's pacifist teachings take warning from what has befallen the business men and workingmen of Belgium because they actually reduced such teachings to practice.

WILSON NOTE WRITING NOT ANTIDOTE TO MURDER, DECLARES ROOSEVELT

There are at this time two great issues before us, both inseparably bound together. They are the issues of Americanism and preparedness. As a people we have to decide whether we are to be in good faith a people and able and ready to take care of ourselves, or whether we doubt our national unity and fear to prepare and intend instead to trust partly to a merciful Providence and partly to elocutionary ability in high places.

Those in power at Washington have taken the latter position. The followers of Mr. Ford in the Republican primaries have taken what is in reality the same position.

We have suffered as a nation from prolonged and excessive indulgence in note writing; and incidentally we have made the discovery that note writing is not an antidote to murder.

I firmly believe that if at the outset we had clearly made it evident that our words would be translated into deeds, that our first ultimatum sixteen months ago was really an ultimatum, Germany would have yielded, the Lusitania and the other ships would not have been sunk and all the lamentable loss of life would have been avoided.

We, through our Representatives at Washington, have absolutely refused in the smallest degree to prepare during these twenty-two months of world cataclysm. We have refused to learn the smallest part of the lesson being written on the scroll of torment in Europe. We have fatuously refused to take the smallest step, either to do our duty to ourselves or to do our duty to others.

We have endeavored to deceive ourselves by announcing that in this policy of supine inaction and of failure to perform duty we are actuated by the loftiest motives. I doubt whether we have really deceived ourselves, and most certainly we have not deceived others. There is not a nation in the world which believes that our course of conduct has been dictated by anything save timidity, unworthy shrinking from effort and responsibility, and cold and selfish love of money-making and of soft ease.—Theodore Roosevelt.

Let Pacifists Ponder on Mexico; United States Unprepared There

Now as to the pacifists. They have told us that if we remain helpless we shall escape all difficulties with other nations and earn their good will. Let them ponder on what has happened in Mexico to-day. Let them ponder our relations at this moment with Germany and the other great powers engaged in the world war. They will then realize the utter futility of their hopes.

For nearly five years we have followed the principles of the pacifists as regards Mexico. We have not ourselves prepared, but we have helped the Mexicans to prepare by furnishing them arms and munitions. We have tamely submitted to the murder of our men and the rape of our women. We have permitted foreigners to be plundered in Mexico and our own people to be plundered in Mexico, and murder has been added to plunder. Many of our troops have been shot.

While we have been nominally at peace with Mexico the Mexicans have killed more American citizens than the Spaniards killed in the entire Spanish war. Moreover, when the Spanish war was through, it was through; and Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines were started on a career of peace and prosperity such as had never been known in all their history. But in Mexico, after all the bloodshed, the trouble has only begun, and we are no nearer a solution than we were three years and a quarter ago.

I call the attention of the pacifists to the fact that we have not avoided trouble in Mexico. On the contrary, although we are assured that we are at peace with Mexico, we have killed and wounded nearly as many Mexicans as were killed and wounded among the Spaniards when our armies in the Spanish war took Santiago and Manila. We have not gained the good will of the Mexicans. They hate us and despise us infinitely more than they hated us five years ago—at which time they did not despise us at all.

Result of Pacifism in Mexico.

The policy of pacifism has been practically applied in Mexico, and it has resulted in incalculable loss of life and property. It has gained us the utter contempt of the people with whom we dealt, and it has brought us to the verge of war with them.

Exactly the same thing is true as regards Germany. For sixteen months we have been employed in sending Germany ultimatum after ultimatum in monotonous succession, while Germany in equally monotonous succession sank ship after ship, drowning our men, women and children by the hundreds. (I use the word "ultimatum" in the sense that it has been given by our practice with both Mexico and Germany during the last three years—for under this condition an ultimatum is a note which is not ultimate, but an invitation to further correspondence, and is on no account to be translated into action.)

We have suffered as a nation from prolonged and excessive indulgence in note-writing; and incidentally we have made the discovery that note-writing is not an antidote to murder. The pacifists assured us that note-writing and similar intellectual exercises would avert all difficulties and keep foreign nations feeling friendly toward us. As a matter of fact, while we have been writing these notes the loss of life among non-combatant men, women and children on the ships which were torpedoed and about which we wrote notes has exceeded the total number of lives lost in both the Union and Confederate navies during the entire Civil War. Think of that, friends!

Net Result of Note-Writing.

Such has been the net result of our note-writing; and incidentally we have incurred the contemptuous dislike of all the great powers engaged in the war. As regards the loss of American lives and the sinking of these ships, I hold Germany less responsible than I hold this nation. Germany is engaged in a life-and-death struggle; and we need not expect that she will forego any advantage which the weakness or timidity of our nation, of this Republic, offers her.

I firmly believe that if at the outset we had clearly made it evident that our words would be translated into deeds, that our first ultimatum sixteen months ago was really an ultimatum, Germany would have yielded, the Lusitania and the other ships would not have been sunk, and all the lamentable loss of life would have been avoided. It is our own attitude of culpable weakness and timidity—an attitude assumed under the pressure of the ultra-pacifists—which is primarily responsible for this dreadful loss of life and for our national humiliation.

We have suffered a loss of friendly feeling with each of the countries at war, and we have been within grave danger of trouble that would eventually lead to our being dragged into war with one or more of them. I would rather go to war than permit our women and children to be killed. But it is a crime against this nation that our own supine folly, our weakness and vacillation, our utter failure to prepare, should expose us to the possibility of war without having made us ready for war.

If, as soon as the great war broke out, our navy had been mobilized, and a competent man put at the head of the Navy Department (appointed for national and service reasons, instead of purely political reasons), and if we had begun vigorously to prepare, and had shown that we meant what we said, the Lusitania would never have been sunk; no power would have infringed on our rights; and we should to-day be absolutely free from all danger of war.

The pacifists have had their way as regards Mexico and as regards our behavior in the great war. Their policy has been practically applied. It has resulted in the loss of thousands of lives and in immeasurable national humiliation. It has rendered war more likely instead of less likely.

Let my pacifist friends understand that I am advocating preparedness so as to avoid war, and I am advocating preparedness in the work of peace as in military matters. I believe in a thoroughly efficient navy, the second in size in the world. I believe in a small but thoroughly efficient regular army, an army of 250,000 men, with a proper reserve. This would give us a mobile army of 125,000 men. But back of the regular army and navy must stand the strength of the people themselves, and this strength must be prepared in advance or it will be utterly useless in time of trial.

I believe in universal service based on universal training. I believe in this because I think it would be not only of incalculable benefit to the nation in the event of war, but of incalculable benefit to the individuals undergoing it, and, therefore, to the nation, as regards the work of peace. I believe that the dog-tent would prove a most effective agent for democratizing and nationalizing our life; quite as much so as the public school, and far more so than the American factory and the American city as they are to-day.

Preparedness by Universal Service Would Be Best School

Preparedness through universal service would turn out to be the best possible school of practical civics. In such a school all men who are Americans in spirit would get together and learn to work together, so as to insure coöperation among our people in social and industrial life. Such coöperation will secure not merely liberty and opportunity, but also the sense of obligation—which is just as important as the other two.

The civilian training camp movement started at Plattsburg, and now in session at Fort Oglethorpe, is the great civic movement of Americanism. When crystallized along the lines of universal training for universal service it will become the most powerful agent for national democratic progress in our land.

Our young men need discipline. There can be nothing better for them than such training. It would set them up physically. It would give them knowledge of sanitation, of cleanliness. They would learn regularity of habits, abstinence, obedience, self-respect and respect for others. They would learn to handle and command men, and to get along with them. They would become infinitely more competent for the daily tasks of American life.

In many respects Germany furnishes us an example we shall do well to heed, for she secures her people good government, orderly government and substantial economic justice combined with high industrial efficiency. We of the democracy hold that while good government is essential, what the world needs is to learn to govern itself. The worst men in any civilization are those who neither control themselves nor are controlled by others. In the long run lack of self-control means that there must be control from outside. But the best men are the men who exercise self-control. The highest civilization can only exist in the nation that controls itself.

Our purpose must be to secure the efficient government of the people that is found in Germany, but to make it spring from the people themselves, by training them in individual and collective self-control, in self-reliance, in power of coöperation for a common end, and ability to develop national unity for the good of the whole nation.

Above all, we must insist upon absolute Americanism. If within our own ranks we are split into a dozen jangling nationalities, severed by Old World antipathies, our chance for national greatness will vanish.

We believe in coöperation between the nation and industry; we wish to help and not to hamper industry. We recognize that in the modern world there can be no great national business success save by the fullest use of the great organizations demanded by modern industry; but we believe in insisting that these great organizations are used to work for the largest possible means of social and industrial justice for the workers and for the general public.

We do not believe that preparedness for national power lies wholly in guns and ships and armed men. We believe that we must organize our industries for defence in time of war as one result of organizing them for the most effective production of the necessities of life in time of peace. Such production must be on the largest scale, with government coöperation and government regulation; there must be organization both for capital and labor.

There must be a deliberate purpose to see that health and well-being of the workers, their standard of wages and of living and of the education of their children are held up to the level that will insure the greatest national efficiency, not only for the present, but for the future. The first step toward this is unequivocal declaration in favor of the preparedness programme, which is the essential step for national organization in matters industrial as much as in matters military.

There must be readiness to develop, to the utmost and immediately, business efficiency in time of war. At present we are as unprepared in industry as in military matters. It would take as long to organize our industries for war as to organize an army for war. Instead of adopting—and adapting—Germany's admirably successful method of dealing with her industries so as to insure their efficiency in time of war, our governmental agents at Washington have taken no step whatever except the thoroughly mischievous step of endeavoring to cripple a great private industry by the creation of a government armor plant—whereas, of course, they should encourage and at the same time efficiently regulate and control the private industry in question.

To "list" plants is useless when there are no efficient plants to list and when the efficient plant is promptly selected by the government for destruction. We need a big government munitions plant for regulatory purposes. We do not need a government armor plant, because we can do better by controlling and regulating and aiding in the development of the great and efficient plant which already exists. To destroy such an industry is sheer folly. In the event of war it is as impossible to improvise a great industry as to improvise a great army.

Must Abolish Pork Barrel.

We must abolish pork-barrel methods in the army—as regards army posts, navy yards, as regards everything else. Remember that after preparedness has been accepted by the country and the necessary funds voted the real work will have only begun. England's navy represents over three centuries and Germany's army over two centuries of development along an unbroken line of tradition and progress to the present stage of efficiency. The first and all-important essential is to divorce the army and navy organizations absolutely from politics.

Policy must be correlated to armament. To appoint the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for political reasons only, without regard to the efficiency of the men for the tasks, should be accepted by this country as being even more iniquitous than to appoint as Secretary of the Treasury a man who knows nothing of banking or currency, and as Secretary of Labor a man who had never heard of a labor union or of the minimum wage.

Pork-barrel graft is a crime against the nation when the army and navy are involved. But honesty and efficiency in managing the army and navy only represent the beginning of military preparedness.

We can have no effective army unless business is mobilized and especially unless our transportation system is nationalized. The railroads, whose business is directly or indirectly interstate, must, in all their relations, be regulated by the national government and not by forty-eight conflicting state governments.

Develop the Merchant Marine as Needed Basis for the Navy

The merchant marine must be developed not only for our own purposes of peace, but as a basis for the navy. It must be proportionate to the transportation needs and to the navy of this country. Our merchant fleet must build up a naval reserve. We must safeguard the rights of our sailors, but we can only do so if we upbuild the lines of ships on which they are to serve.

The employer of labor must feel that the government is his friend and will help him in every way, especially in international matters, and wishes him to make an ample profit; but at the same time that the government coöperates with him to secure his profit and his wellbeing it must also so regulate his activities as to secure the wellbeing of those who work for him and of the public which he serves.

As part of the work of preparedness, as part of the work of Americanism, and of nationalization, we must set our faces like flint against any effort to divide our people along the lines of creed or of national origin. The politico-racial hyphen is the breeder of moral treason.

One of the most sinister developments of the last twenty-two months has been the fact that a section of the professional German-Americans has joined the pacifists in the effort to keep America helpless, while this same section of German-Americans is lauding German militarism to the skies and apologizing for every manifestation of that militarism, even when it is ruthlessly used against the welfare of the weak.

One of the great German newspapers of this country—I cannot call it a German-American newspaper—the Illinois "Staats Zeitung," has been engaged in active propaganda on behalf of both German militarism and American pacifism. It applauds and advocates Germany's embarking upon a career of military strength unconditioned by any other consideration, and at the same time backs the movement of the extreme pacifists to keep the United States impotent for self-defence.

Preaching Moral Treason.

The men who take such a position are preaching moral treason to the American commonwealth. What they teach tends to keep our people divided. It tends to make our politicians subservient to the agents of an alien militarism. It tends to keep our own country helpless so that when the opportunity offers it may be a larger Belgium and offer a rich prey to Germany or to Japan or to any other great military power which thinks it worth while to make war upon us.

I wish to say a special word to my fellow Americans who are in whole or in part of German blood. I very heartily admire them. I believe in them. I understand the difficulties under which they have labored during the last twenty-two months. I sympathize with, I feel for them, even although I feel that many of them are not taking the position they ought to take. I know that what I preach to them is hard doctrine.

But I believe it to be a doctrine necessary for them and for all their—and my—fellow countrymen. I do not address them as German-Americans, for I hold that here in the United States ruin will come to the country in which our children and children's children are to live—your children's children and mine, friends—if we permit ourselves to be sundered one from the other by the lines either of creed or of national origin.

I shall speak a word of my own ancestry to illustrate the points I am about to make. Some two centuries and a half ago there were certain Dutch immigrants, mechanics and small merchants in New York City, which was then called New Amsterdam.

Has a German Strain.

There were in Eastern Pennsylvania two German peasant farmers who were among the founders of Germantown, having been driven out of the Palatinate when it was ravaged by the armies of Louis XIV, and west of them in Pennsylvania lived certain Irish, Welsh and English immigrants, the latter being Quakers, and in South Carolina and Georgia were certain Scotch and French Huguenot farmers.

These men and women left many descendants, who intermarried with one another. Our ancestors originally came from different countries, professed different creeds and spoke different tongues. But they became Americans and nothing else; and as the generations succeeded one another they did the ordinary work of American life. They fought in the War of the Revolution and again in the War of 1812, and they did not inquire whether the foreign foes whom Washington assailed were Germans, as at Trenton, or British, as at Princeton, or French, like those whom he fought near Pittsburgh in his youth.

If these old-time Americans had kept apart from one another and had made their loyalty a loyalty to the countries from which they came, and not to this new great Republic, and if their fellow citizens of that day had done the same thing, there would not be any United States now, and there would be no Americans to feel either pride or shame in what our people do.

My plea is that all our citizens today shall act in the spirit of the men of many different race strains—the Washingtons, Adamses and Lees, the Schuylers and Sullivans, the Carrolls and Muhlenbergs, the Marions and Herkimers—who disregarded all questions of national origin and became Americans and nothing else when they founded this country.

It is not possible permanently to possess a divided national allegiance. If men are not whole hearted in their Americanism, if they try to combine loyalty to this land with loyalty to some other land, it is inevitable that to a greater or lesser degree they make the loyalty to another land overshadow their loyalty to this.

Cannot Divide Allegiance.

There has come into my possession a copy of a letter written by Professor Paul Rohrbach, of Berlin, to a German, Professor Appelman, of the University of Vermont. This letter was printed in "The New York Times" of April 5. I have made careful inquiry and I find that the letter is unquestionably genuine. It was evidently written in answer to one from Dr. Rohrbach's correspondent in which the question was asked as to how German-Americans in the United States should vote on the question of preparedness.

Evidently neither of the two Germans who were corresponding devoted a thought to the interest of the United States; they were considering only whether it was or was not of advantage to Germany that the United States should be kept helpless. Professor Rohrbach is a university lecturer in Berlin; he is the author of various works on economics and other subjects, and was for a number of years the German Imperial Commissioner in Southwest Africa. He has been one of the most widely quoted of the German professors who in the present war have set forth German claims; and, according to the "Vorwaerts," many of his utterances can be taken as at least semi-official.

Blow Aimed at America.

This semi-official representative of the German government writes from Berlin under the date of January 17, 1916, as follows, explaining why German-Americans should not favor preparedness (which he calls armament):

"It is perhaps open to question whether genuine German interests would derive benefit from American armaments. In order to form an opinion one would have to be able to foresee . . . what lines German policy will follow after the conclusion of peace, and particularly how our relations with Japan will shape themselves.

"It seems to me quite conceivable that in an American-Japanese war, we should adopt an attitude of very benevolent neutrality toward Japan and thereby make it easier for her to beat America. In that case why should we help on the American armament policy? . . . I cannot see, therefore, that German political aims would be forwarded ipso facto by German-Americans lending themselves to the schemes for American armament."

Professor Rohrbach also speculates as to who may be "the next President after Wilson," saying: "If Roosevelt actually should become President again, which, after all, is not impossible, the German-Americans would then be found to have simply played his game for him."

Wants Support To Be American.

As regards this statement of Professor Rohrbach, I very freely admit that no man ought to back me or support the policies for which I stand unless with the clear understanding that these are straight-out American policies, not policies in the interest of some other nation against my own, and that our citizens do "play my game" precisely to the extent that they support such straight-out American policies.

This letter from Dr. Rohrbach unquestionably expressed the attitude of militaristic Germany in endeavoring to use, against the honor and interest of the United States, that portion of the professional "German-American" element of this country which is disloyal to this country, and shows why this disloyal element among the professional German-Americans has joined with the professional pacifists in the movement to leave the United States helpless against possible aggressors—movement which is traitorous to this Republic.

It is a deliberate suggestion and invitation to German-Americans not merely to vote in the interests of Germany, but to vote so that another foreign power, Japan, may be enabled to beat the United States in, as the letter states it, the "quite conceivable event" that Germany's interest is to see a war between Japan and the United States in which Japan shall be victorious.

I am certain that the German-Americans who can consciously be reached by any such suggestion form an utterly insignificant proportion of the Americans of German descent. But some of their genuinely patriotic fellows may be influenced unconsciously by such arguments.

Therefore, I ask my fellow citizens who are in whole or in part of German blood to consider very carefully the above letter and to ponder what is meant for their children and grandchildren by the attitude thus set forth. These descendants of theirs are to live here in this land, just as my children and children's children will live. Their interests and the interests of my children's children will be identical. In the end, as the generations go by, they will all intermarry and become not merely in interest, but by blood, identical.

The men of German blood have always played a high and honorable part in this country. In the great crisis of the Civil War they stood with loyal devotion by the Union and against slavery; and it is probably true of them that at that time more generally than those of any other blood they upheld the cause personified by Abraham Lincoln. I believe that the great mass of them are at the present day undivided in their loyal devotion to this country.

I know that our entire national government, from President down, could be manned with men of German birth or descent who would be Americans and nothing else, who would stand for the United States first and for no other nation second. A large proportion of my closest friends, of the men in whom I most believe, are Americans of German origin, but they are Americans first and last, and only Americans.

Should Be Repudiated.

I very earnestly wish that some way could be found for repudiating the men whose actions have made it possible for foreigners like Professor Rohrbach to write with the insolent belief that they can use our fellow citizens of German birth and descent so that their political influence may be exerted in such fashion as to make this country helpless to defend itself against foreign aggression, whether from Japan, from Germany or from any other power.

I should just as strongly denounce any men of English birth or descent or of any other birth or descent who, in the interest of their fatherland or of the country from which their ancestors sprang, advocated such action against the interest of America by Americans as is advocated in Professor Rohrbach's letter. We must all act as Americans, and we cannot afford to accept as our leaders either Germans or Englishmen, or men of any other foreign nationality.

I ask my fellow citizens of German birth to remember that whatever calamity befalls this country will make its effects felt on their children no less than on mine. If Professor Rohrbach's disciples here succeeded in shaping our action so that Japan, in the interest of Germany, beats the United States, the shame and the disgrace and the loss will be felt by your children, my fellow citizens of German origin, no less than by mine.

All Alike Would Be Oppressed.

The conquerors who overcome us in

Continued on page 9, column 1.