

This, then is the situation which we face--a long course of nations wanting peace, knowing as they must know that a real war now would crush them one and all, drive them back through centuries to primitive poverty and emaciation, until our civilization passes out as did civilization of old--knowing all these things but nevertheless fearful, and arming, ever arming, in response to the instinct for security.

We know, they know, everybody knows, that security by armaments for one country means insecurity for another, and that competitive armaments will end where they have always ended, in competitive war.

What is the conclusion? It is the plainest conclusion ever drawn from the plainest facts. There has to be found a substitute for armaments, something else that will bring security not only to one but to all.

There is manifestly nothing in effect now which goes far enough, for armaments still keep up, and larger every day. We have the Bryan Treaties, the Peace Treaties, the Pacific Treaties, the Locarno Treaties, the Pact of Paris, all these; but armaments multiply in every quarter of the globe, armaments that carry with them the menace and well-nigh the certainty of war. Try these Treaties by that test which is virtually the only test, and as a substitute they fail. We are a long way yet from being adequately organized against war, though we know--if we know anything--that the one supremely important task before our world today is to bring about that organization--nothing else and nothing less.

I am going to say something now which I hope will be heard in thoughtfulness and not in resentment. Such an organization cannot be brought about without the United States. That sentence opens to my last observation. It embraces within its periods the conclusion of the whole matter, and on the faith of it I make my appeal. Does this country accept the truth of that sentence? I do not know; but believing as I do that destiny hangs on the American nation coming to accept it, I dare to implore you not lightly to cast those simple words aside. From your own viewpoint you, yourselves, must make decision and from that viewpoint I am hardly qualified to judge and perhaps I have no right to speak, but these hundred million people are, like all the rest of us, citizens of the world and far more vitally interwoven with its fate than we are apt to appreciate and understand. I speak to you as one from without, as one from a nation among many whose hands already are joined. I speak as one who wants you with us, and especially as one from a neighbour who knows you and trusts you and has never trusted you in vain. It was one of your own number, a great President of the United States, who pointed the way and portrayed the objective in language which can never be excelled. He said that the only substitute for the war system of his day was

"A universal association of nations to maintain the inviolate security of the Highway of the Seas for the common and unhindered use of all the nations of the world, and to prevent any war."

Down the vista and toward the palace which your President pictured in those words we all must march, for there only is the home and the citadel of peace.

I know of the historic disinclination of this country to re-interpret an admonition of its first patriarch and President. "Entangling alliances" was a phrase brilliantly coined to describe a peril of the eighteenth century, but surely it should not be used now to prevent that co-operation by which alone we can escape a far greater peril in the twentieth. Something to take the place of competing armaments has to be found, and I despair of finding it except in "a universal association of nations" including as fundamentally indispensable the United States of America--an association within which means will be found to define and identify a guilty power and to hold that power in restraint.