

A United American Nation --- A Declaration of Principles by This Newspaper

This newspaper stands for AN AMERICAN NATION!

One and indivisible! Long ago the mingled blood of our heroic forefathers, south and north, washed from Columbia's slate the threatened blight of sectionalism. Today, at a moment well nigh as critical, this newspaper presents to its readers for their indorsement a great national policy—a declaration of principles which proclaims for a nation united in its ideals, indivisible in the American nationalism of its combined citizenry, universal in the response of its people to the stern duties of the loftiest patriotism.

The Times submits as the first and most important plank in its platform the necessity of military preparedness which shall be adequate for the defense of the country AGAINST ANY ATTACK THAT CAN BE MADE AGAINST IT.

It is our firm conviction that the best possible insurance against such an attack would be world-knowledge that we were prepared successfully to resist it.

No man can say with any certainty that the chances are that the United States—in its present state of defenselessness—will be attacked and suffer a great disaster—so great a disaster that our imaginations cannot compass it.

But that there is at least the possibility that we may be attacked, and the probability that the attack would be successful in the present state of the national defense, seems to be outside the realm of argument.

If our ideals, the lives of our people, the material wealth which we have accumulated by our toil, are things of value, we must be prepared to defend them.

That we are not prepared; that, population, extent of territory and wealth considered, the United States is the most defenseless nation in the world—is known to every one who has given serious thought to the matter.

We have many domestic problems pressing for solution, problems which are so complex as at times to seem impossible of solution. We have been so occupied with these problems, so busy developing our material resources, so industrious becoming the richest nation in the world, that we have forgotten that our first duty is to be prepared to defend ourselves.

By comparison with other nations, we are richer today than we ever have been. By the same comparison, we are weaker from a military standpoint and therefore less able to defend ourselves.

It is probably well within the facts to say that WE HAVE NOT ONE REAL FRIEND AMONG THE GREAT NATIONS. We are hated by some and envied or despised by others.

As matters stand, and as they probably will stand for some years to come, our position in the world of nations—if not our very existence as a nation—depends upon our willingness to make whatever sacrifices are called for to prepare to defend ourselves.

The best and cheapest peace insurance that we can have is the STRONGEST NAVY in the world and a citizenry, every male of which has been trained for military service. That is what this newspaper means by adequate preparedness.

We believe that this should be the keystone of the arch of our national policy, and it is our purpose to use whatever influence we may have, in all legitimate ways, to accomplish this object.

THE NAVY

The coast of the United States is about 21,000 miles long. It is obviously impracticable to defend more than a very small portion of this with coast defense guns. About the most that we can do in the way of land fortifications is to protect the large cities and the important harbors. Our chief reliance against a foreign enemy must be

the navy and the strength of this navy must be in exact proportion to its responsibilities.

These responsibilities are greater than those of any navy in the world. Logically, the American navy must be the strongest navy in the world.

The one outstanding and unanswerable argument for the strongest navy in the world is—THAT IT MUST BE A DIVIDED NAVY.

No man can say whether our danger is greater on the Pacific or the Atlantic.

No man can say that we will not be attacked on both coasts at the same time.

Certainly, if this is a nation with one national spirit and one national ambition and the same national ideals, each coast is entitled to the same consideration from a government worthy to be entrusted with the supreme powers which we delegate to our government.

Strategically, the Panama canal has not solved the problem of making a given amount of naval strength equally efficient on both oceans. It would not solve it, even if its safety-could be relied upon, for the very reason that the navy may be called upon to give battle to hostile fleets off both coasts at the same time. One does not have to let his imagination run riot to conceive of just this situation.

There have been many suggestions as to how the United States is to proceed to acquire the strongest navy in the world—a navy strong enough to make any nation, or probable combination of nations, hesitate to attack us—and strong enough to defeat any single enemy, or probable combination of enemies, should they refuse to be over-awed by our apparent strength.

The character of our navy must be decided by the experts, the officers in the service who have devoted their lives to the study of this problem.

That there is enough ability and patriotism in the American navy to create a fleet, such as outlined above, in the shortest possible time, cannot be doubted. That such a navy should have its full complement of battleships, battle-cruisers, submarines, torpedo boat destroyers, aircraft and supply ships, all of the most efficient type, goes without saying. It is for the president and congress to determine that we are to have a navy that will render our shores immune from attack and to appropriate the money AND THEN TO KEEP THEIR HANDS OFF SO LONG AS THE MONEY IS BEING HONESTLY SPENT.

THE ARMY

The navy is our first line of defense and should be planned and built on the theory that nothing that can be anticipated will be left undone to defeat the enemy before he reaches our shores.

But, strong as our navy may be, we can never be sure that it will not be defeated when it is called upon to meet the supreme test of battle. Our preparedness must be based on the theory that we will engage and fight the enemy on the sea and hope to defeat him there, but that should we fail, we have an army of sufficient strength to prevent invasion.

That our army, today, is not strong enough, either in men or armament, to prevent the landing of a determined foe on either the Atlantic or Pacific coast, is as well known to the general staff of every nation in the world as to our own army chiefs and such of our statesmen as THINK WITH THEIR BRAINS INSTEAD OF THEIR EMOTIONS.

There are bills in congress to increase the regular army and to supplement it with an increased state militia. Every military expert in this country knows that it is impossible to get as many men as we need for national defense thru voluntary enlistment in a regular paid army and they also know that the state militia always has been, and always will be, almost, if not quite, useless. An

army to be effective as a fighting force must be a national, not a state, institution.

National defense is one thing; strike duty is something else. They won't mix, and so long as we put any reliance as a nation on soldiers—who, when they enlist in the state militia, know that their chief duty is to act as state policemen—we are simply fooling ourselves.

Switzerland and Austria are where we must get our ideas for an army upon which we can rely with implicit confidence in its efficiency and patriotism.

The theory upon which the Swiss and the Austrians provide for national defense is that the first duty of every man is to submit to military training; that every man who enjoys the privileges of democracy must not only be willing, BUT MUST BE PREPARED TO FIGHT FOR HIS COUNTRY; that he cannot be prepared unless he has been trained.

There is a great difference between universal military training and universal military service. In this country, universal military service—calling for men to serve one, two or three years consecutively, with the colors—would mean a standing army of several million men, obviously unnecessary from the standpoint of military necessity. Universal military training would mean no larger standing army than we now have, if it were considered wise to have it no larger. But, it would also mean that ready to respond to the call of their country are MILLIONS OF TRAINED AND EQUIPPED MEN—THE EQUALS OF ANY SOLDIERS IN THE WORLD from the standpoint of physical fitness, technical knowledge and the courage which comes of having been schooled to do the thing which is to be done. THIS WOULD BE A DEMOCRATIC ARMY, an army capable of defending this nation against the world, considering that the enemy would have to be transported over seas.

HOW TO RAISE THE MONEY

The building and maintaining of the strongest navy in the world and the training and equipping of a great democratic army, based on the Swiss-Austrian systems, will cost a lot of money. How is this money to be raised so as to impose the least burden on the people of the nation?

In a series of articles recently published in this newspaper, Basil Manly proved that income tax frauds amount to at least \$320,000,000 a year.

Without going into details, it seems probable that these taxes, out of which the nation is now being defrauded, would pay our preparedness bill. THE COMPLETE COLLECTION OF THE INCOME TAX IS NOT ONLY A MATTER OF JUSTICE BUT, UNDER THE PLAN FOR NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS WHICH WE ARE FORMULATING, IT WOULD BE A MATTER OF NECESSITY.

The remedy which has been urged as fundamental to the prevention of income tax frauds—publicity of returns—must be the keynote of American fiscal policy as it relates to preparedness.

We demand the PUBLICATION of the income tax returns, therefore, not only as the most effective method of detecting the income tax thieves and raising the money for national defense, but as a sure preventive of possible inefficiency and graft among government officials who are charged with the enforcement of the income tax.

IMMIGRATION

This newspaper stands for the further restriction of immigration. Hence, we favor the bill now in congress providing for a literacy test. We have many and important reasons for including this policy in our declarations of principles. We favor restriction, in the first place, FOR THE SAKE OF THE IMMIGRANT HIMSELF who is brought in most cases from a life of lowly sim-

plicity in his native land, to a life of deadly isolation, exploitation and degradation in this country.

Millions of these people are herded today in smoke and soot-swept settlements and insanitary slums, where, shunned, lonesome and abused, they learn nothing whatever of the land of their so-called adoption—LEARN RATHER TO HATE IT because of the miseries they are compelled to suffer by those who exploit them. It was once America's proud boast that this country was the haven of the poor and oppressed. The evidence is clear and conclusive that the peasant who is poor and oppressed in Europe is still further impoverished and oppressed when, having fled, he finds himself in this haven of his dreams.

We hold that this nation has not assimilated the thirteen millions odd of immigrants who have landed on our shores since the opening of this century and that it is high time now to call a halt upon further immigration until we shall have taken this great mass of humanity to our hearts, cheered them with our interest, educated them to our national ideals and made them Americans who will love, and die, if need be, for the nation which has really lifted them from poverty and freed them from oppression. We insist that this process of valid absorption is one of the prime necessities in the making of a new and united American nation.

We, too, believe, with organized labor, that the practically unrestricted immigration of the past 15 years has been UNFAIR TO THE WORKING PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY. The competition of a million new arrivals every year, in addition to the natural native increase of hands that work, was too great. The entire advantage was with capital—often heartless, ruthless capital. The almost complete cessation of immigration since the beginning of the war has been a double-edged revelation to the American workingman and to those thoughtful citizens who have viewed with anxiety the increasingly serious labor problem in our land. Unemployment has passed. Wages have increased. Working people are more prosperous, their families more comfortable. And mark this: Altho immigration was suspended and the working population was decreased by the half million who returned to Europe to fight, PRODUCTION INCREASED BEYOND ALL RECORDS, as shown by the official figures of our exports and domestic consumption. Does this not prove that well paid, regularly employed labor, unhampered by competition flowing from abroad, is a greater producer of national wealth than dissatisfied labor, working half time and suffering from undue competition? Have we not also the proof before us that a population of ONE HUNDRED MILLION can provide, in the natural human increase, all the labor needed for the work to be done?

Thus—restriction of immigration promises better citizens of our foreign born, more prosperous and more contented citizens in our great working classes, better homes, a stronger people in body and mind, greater production of wealth, all of which will combine to cement us into a nation strong for hearth and country and willing and quick to defend both when the occasion demands.

A WORD FROM THE EDITOR TO READERS

In presenting today the accompanying declaration of national principles, this newspaper is at the same time particularly anxious to receive comments from its readers on the policies contained therein. We therefore solicit letters from you, giving your views, one way or the other. If you have only a few words to say, send us a post card. The editor will be very glad to discuss editorially any specific points wherein a large number of the people of this city and vicinity are shown to be interested, and will not fail to give due attention to criticism or suggestion that his policy should be reconsidered.—EDITOR.

Ayes Still Have It In Mayor For Congress Debate

The "Shall the Mayor Go to Congress?" discussion waxes brisker and brisker. And the letters continue to be nearly all on the affirmative side. There still is plenty of time to get in your letter. There are 16 cash prizes offered for the best reasons why the mayor should, or should not go, and YOU might as well not land one of them. Now read what some of your neighbors say on the subject.

"By All Means," Says He Editor The Times: Shall the mayor go to congress? is a question being asked throughout the city today. Inasmuch as our honored mayor has lived in Tacoma since 1883 and has, to the perfect satisfaction of all but a few, served one term as county commissioner, and is in his third term as mayor, I should say, "By all means send him on to congress."

I think that the third district could not make a nobler or better choice than that of electing Mr. Fawcett as representative, for he is, to my conviction, a very able man for the position. The mayor has, during his public life, studied, and knows the wants and needs of us people. I dare say if he were to run, he would have a larger majority of votes than any other man the district could put up for the office.

It would be most selfish of this city to try to hold the mayor back from a position where he would be of more actual service to this city, district and state. Shall we, the people of this city, be so selfish as to try to retain him as mayor? No! Shall we of both district and state keep from bettering our condition by putting a practically unknown office seeker in the position or shall it be a person more popular, like our mayor? Yes! By all means let us "send Mr. Fawcett to congress."

Yours sincerely, JAMES HALL. Gen. Del.; 3513 So. Cedar st., City.

Wheeler for Him, Too Shall Angelo V. Fawcett be sent to congress as representative from the Third District? Yes, emphatically yes.

ty, is interested in being capably and progressively represented in congress. Fawcett unquestionably is more progressive than Johnson. Hence, my answer: Certainly the mayor should go to congress. A. L. SOMERSET.

Would Promote Him Editor The Times: The position of mayor of Tacoma is as big and important as representative in congress. Fawcett has made good—abundantly good—in the former. So let's promote him. T. R. H. Olympia.

HIPPODROME 10c

4 More Days CHAPLIN

In His First Mutual Comedy The Floorwalker

Other Offerings

HIPPODROME 10c

CHANCE TO LEARN ALL ABOUT BABY

The first of the child welfare conferences, in charge of the Child Welfare committee of the Presidents' council, and open to all Tacoma mothers, will be held at 4 p. m. tomorrow afternoon at the Tacoma Day Nursery, 1115 South I street.

Dr. Robert Miles will be in charge of the conference, and graduate nurses and experts in infant feeding will be present to examine the children and answer the mothers' questions. The Child Welfare committee has the co-operation of the city health department, the medical, dental and nurses' associations, and the Home Economics club. Mrs. A. K. Stebbins is chairman of the committee.

'Name T.R. or be Sorry for It,' He Warns

CHICAGO, May 22.—"The republicans have one week in which to nominate Roosevelt and four years in which to regret for not doing so," O. K. Davis, secretary of the progressives, said today as a final statement. Chairman Hillis, of the republican committee, is en route to Chicago. Frank Hitchcock and other Hughes supporters are expected tonight.

ASKS \$2,000 FOR VIADUCT

Commissioner Gronen today recommended to the council that \$2,000 be taken from the council emergency fund for the purchase of a piledriver, to repair the north waterfront viaduct, and of earth for filling North 30th street. The viaduct and fill are both in dangerous condition, and unless the money is appropriated, a bond issue will have to be voted.

Expect Sensations In Policeman's Hearing

A young married woman living in the residence district on Upper Broadway will be one of the principal witnesses against Patrolman J. M. Cochran when he is tried before a civil service jury at the city hall tonight. It was hinted this morning.

The woman is reported to have signed an affidavit to the effect that the policeman made advances towards her while her husband was absent. It was partially on her complaint that the policeman was discharged two weeks ago by Commissioner Pettit.

Shakeup Will Follow Trial

A general shakeup in the police department will follow on the heels of tonight's hearing of charges against Patrolman J. M. Cochran, it was announced by Commissioner Pettit today. At least four detectives will be ordered to provide themselves with uniforms and will be placed on beats. Three street sergeants will become patrolmen, while several patrolmen will be promoted to the rank of detective. Other changes in the personnel of the department are contemplated, together with the addition of at least three motorcycle officers.

FRANCE RECALLS RUMANIAN ENVOY

PARIS, May 22.—Col. Saint Aulaire succeeded M. Blondel, French minister to Rumania, it was announced today. It is rumored Blondel was recalled because he failed to prevent the signing of treaties between Rumania and the central powers. BERLIN—Constantinople advices claim the British troops have been defeated by native tribesmen of the Soudan.

the police department. I intend to make the department as efficient and moral as is absolutely possible. Policemen should be models by which other persons can guide their own conduct, and not something to be sneered at by the community."

Variety Is the Spice of Life

Today We Offer a Program That Sent Our Patrons Out Sunday With the Highest Praise.

Dustin Farnum

In An Exceptional Picturization of

David Garrick

The Play Made Famous by the Elder Soth-ern and Other Famous Actors.

It Is Dustin Farnum's Best Picture

EXTRA

Moving Pictures of the City League Ball Game Taken Sunday, May 4.

PATHE WEEKY COMEDY

COLONIAL

Matinees 10c. Evenings 15c. Children 5c.

\$50 in Gold if You Find the Colonial Theater Man.