

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

SUMMER OF 1897

A CIVILIAN'S VIEW OF THE NAVY

LECTURE DELIVERED SEPTEMBER 6, 1897

BY

MOORFIELD STOREY, Esq.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1897.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

SUMMER OF 1897

A CIVILIAN'S VIEW OF THE NAVY

LECTURE DELIVERED SEPTEMBER 6, 1897

BY

MOORFIELD STOREY, Esq.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1897.

A CIVILIAN'S VIEW OF THE NAVY.

From the earliest days there has been always an atmosphere of romance about the sea, and if there ever was a man who failed to feel it, he certainly was not born of Anglo-Saxon stock. No one ever dwelt within sight of the waves who did not believe that sooner or later they would bring to his feet "something rich and strange," who did not smell in the sea breeze a faint aroma of spice borne from distant shores, who did not dream of finding beyond the horizon untold wonder, beauty, and wealth. Every boy at some time in his life has determined to be at least a sailor if not a buccaneer, and has turned with reluctance from his vision of the quarter deck to the humdrum pursuits of ordinary life.

The sea is no barren waste but the richest field ever plowed by man. Tyre and Sidon stand in the Bible for all that is magnificent. In its quaint language, they did "enrich the kings of the earth with the multitude of their riches and of their merchandise," but their splendor did not come from the land. As the prophet tells us, they were "replenished and made very glorious in the midst of the seas."

Venice, with its wonderful history of more than a thousand years, drew nothing from the bare islets on which it was founded, but it made them the seat of the widest commerce, the greatest naval power, the most luxurious civilization, that the world had then known. The great festival in every year, when the Doge, accompanied by all that was first in the state and with splendid ceremonials, wedded the Adriatic, was the sea-born republic's recognition of the debt which it owed to its parent ocean.

A Genoese, sailor whose preëminence among men becomes only clearer as the centuries roll on, gave to

Spain the New World and thus made her for a while mistress of the globe, and it was on the sea that the Dutch, hopeless on land, were able to resist and overthrow her overwhelming power, and on sand dunes swept by the waves that they erected an enduring edifice of freedom and civilization.

No school boy with English blood in his veins but knows that the mighty empire of Victoria, which governs and protects more human beings to-day than ever before recognized a common ruler, owes its existence to the seas which have been England's bulwarks in times of danger, and always her pathway to power.

At home in the narrow beginnings of New England, the most cherished ornaments in many a quiet home have been the shells brought back by the sailors of the family, in which we have all as children heard the roar of the ocean, while in the daily speech of men all prosperity was to begin on the day "when my ship comes in."

But if our common associations with the sea are romantic, how much more romantic is everything connected with naval war. All that is horrible in warfare, the beleaguered town with its starving inhabitants, the stricken field with its thousands of wounded suffering every extremity of torture from pain and thirst, the sack of great cities, the ruin and exhaustion of the peasants robbed alike by friend and foe, all the cruel facts which led Sidney Smith to say "In war God is forgotten," we associate with war on land. The waves which mercifully receive the dead and wash away the stains of conflict, the ocean air which blows away the smoke of battle, make us forget that in the sea fight also there are horrors and that the sailor knows hardship and suffering at least as great as the soldier's.

When we think of Themistocles breaking the whole power of the barbarians at Salamis, of Dandolo storming Constantinople, of Sir Richard Grenville in the *Revenge* fighting single-handed Spaniard after Spaniard, of

Howard and Drake destroying the Armada, of Peterboro at Barcelona, of Nelson at Trafalgar, of Tromp sweeping the British channel with his broom at his masthead, of John Paul Jones fighting England in her own waters and making her shores ring with the echoes of his cannon, of Farragut at New Orleans, we never remember what it cost in wounds and death to win their fame. These great figures stand out on the canvas of history in singularly vivid colors, and the man does not live whose blood is not quickened by the story of their exploits. They are heroes whose examples are peculiarly inspiring. There is a gay and reckless daring about the sailor that must always fascinate us. The very children in our schools remember the naval battles of the Revolution and of 1812 better than anything else in history, and fight them over again in their play. As a result I am afraid they are too apt to carry through life the feeling of the actual combatants.

If such is the influence which the history of naval battles exerts upon us all, it is impossible that you whom I address should not feel it with peculiar strength. War upon the ocean is your profession. It is for this that you are educated, and to it you must inevitably look for the greatest success and the highest distinction that your profession offers. The traditions of our service are especially glorious, for however our fortune may have varied on land, our flag has witnessed an almost unbroken series of triumphs on the water, whether salt or fresh. Hull, the Porters, Perry, McDonough, Decatur, Preble, Dupont, Foote, Worden, Cushing,—how much does each of these names recall? The list might be lengthened indefinitely, but it is not necessary here, for the complete roll of our naval heroes is graven on the memory of every man before me. Their trophies will not let you sleep. There is not one of you to whom their example does not appeal, who has not in his day-dreams stood by Decatur's side at Tripoli, or sunk with the *Cumberland* in Hampton Roads, or shared the Bay

Fight with Farragut, or done some deed of desperate courage like Cushing. Unless you hoped some day to say with Perry "We've met the enemy and they are ours," or at least to die like Lawrence on the *Chesapeake*, or Smith on the *Congress*, or Craven at Mobile, you would not be fit to remain in your country's service, and to undertake the difficult task of keeping untarnished the glorious record of her navy.

Believe me, gentlemen, I sympathize with you and understand your hopes. I could not spring from ancestors who for five successive generations died at sea, without some of a sailor's instincts, some comprehension of his feelings. I appreciate therefore the difficulties of my position, perhaps my own audacity, in undertaking to speak as I propose to speak to-day. I hope you will bear with me while I try to make my meaning plain. We are all Americans, having, let us hope, the true interests of our country at heart, and it may be worth your while to hear what some of your fellow countrymen consider the real function of your chosen profession.

It must be admitted that the present position of the world is singular. We are at the end of nineteen Christian centuries, as men sometimes call them. For many hundred years the civilized nations of Christendom have professed to believe that war should cease, and that we were approaching the time when the sword would be beaten into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning hook. This is one of the doctrines preached in every church and by every military and naval chaplain in every fort and garrison and on every ship. We all profess to believe that these ministers are right, and that it is our duty to respect their teachings.

More than fifty years ago Charles Sumner made his striking comparison between the frigate *Ohio* and Harvard University, showing that the ship in a few years had cost to build and repair more by one hundred thousand dollars than the whole endowment of the university accumulated in two centuries, while the sums

expended to keep the *Ohio* in service for a year of peace would more than pay the annual expenses of four institutions like Harvard. It seemed to many good men then that the day of great wars was gone forever. Yet since that time what a series of wars have we seen. Our own country has been the theatre of a conflict in which, it has been said, more men were killed on the Southern side alone than have been killed of Englishmen in all the wars that England has waged since the battle of Hastings.

And never in the history of the world were there so many disciplined soldiers either actually under arms or ready to march at a moment's notice as to-day. The naval review at Spithead, which ended the jubilee last June, was an exhibition of naval power never approached in the history of the world. It is amazing if not appalling to remember that England could bring into a single squadron ships enough with reasonable spaces to cover twenty square miles of water without calling back a ship from foreign service. Yet some English statesmen are urging that it is not enough for England to have a fleet more powerful than that of any other single nation, but that her supremacy can only be maintained if her fleets are greater than all others combined. When we remember how great the other fleets of Europe are and that every nation is building more ships, the enormous possibilities of expenditure and consequent taxation, if such a rivalry continues, baffle the imagination.

Lord Dufferin, who has filled the highest post in the English service, and who as Viceroy of India, Governor-General of Canada, and ambassador at Paris, has had every opportunity to know the inmost secrets of European politics, thus described the situation in Europe a year ago:

What do we see around us? The whole of Europe is little better than a standing camp numbering millions of armed men, while a double row of frowning and opposing fortresses bristle along every frontier. Our harbors are stuffed and the seas swarm with iron-clad navies. * * * In fact, thanks to the telegraph,

the globe itself has become a mere bundle of nerves, and the slightest disturbance at any one point of the system sends a portentous tremor through its morbidly sensitive surface. To-day it would suffice for any one of half a dozen august personages to speak above his breath, or unwittingly to raise his little finger, and, like in a heaven overcharged with electricity, the existing condition of unstable equilibrium which sustains the European political system would be upset and war, waged in circumstances of greater horror than has been hitherto known to the experience of mankind, might eventually envelope not Europe alone but two, nay all the four continents at once.

We have men preaching peace for hundreds of years and practicing war at the end of the period more vigorously than ever before. The real forces which direct the world, however, are the deeper currents which men do not recognize. We seem to be on the eve of war, but peace remains unbroken. It is in this fact that we find the evidence of progress—that we detect the inevitable effect of the influences which control mankind. Consider for a moment what we have seen within two years. "The sick man of Europe," the weakest of its rulers, has exhibited a barbarous ferocity which we thought the world had outgrown; has probably commanded—at least has countenanced and rewarded—a series of terrible massacres within his borders at which all nations have stood aghast. It is believed that more people were killed in Constantinople, under the very eyes of the foreign ambassadors, than ever fell in any massacre of which history preserves an authentic record. The great powers of Europe have combined to remonstrate and, by concerted action, to prevent the continuance of these massacres, but they have been constantly repeated. There never was a time when such deeds would have excited more general horror, or when the demand that they should cease would have been more universal. There never was a time when the force at the command of the allied powers was more overwhelming. A fraction of their fleets, a small part of their armies could at any time have crushed the resistance of the Sultan.

Unless the character of the Turkish Government has changed radically, the clearly expressed determination to use force would have been enough. Yet the whole moral power of Europe, the fierce indignation of her peoples, backed by this overwhelming force, has accomplished nothing. How is it that this feeble, bankrupt barbarian has been able to defy Europe and to paralyze its enormous resources?

I can perhaps best put the answer in the language of an English writer who gives the only reasonable reply to this question. He says that the exercise of force would be followed either by resistance or by the collapse of Turkey into anarchy, and in either event Europe "would decide that Turkey must cease to be, and in partitioning, quarrel as fiercely as its States have ever quarreled over their most vital interests. Each of these results, therefore, involves European war, and this war, it is firmly believed, would be on an unprecedented scale; first, because the armies are large beyond all precedent, and mobile, owing to the existence of railways, as armies have ever been; and, secondly, because as Von Moltke foresaw, the stakes would be too large to allow of any peace which was not the product of complete and recognized exhaustion. Before the war ended six millions of drilled men would be in motion or in conflict, the slaughter would affect the very population, as Napoleon's wars affected the population of France, the taxation of Europe would be doubled, as was that of England in her struggle with Napoleon, and when the war ended that comity of the civilized nations, on which so much of the future depends, would have disappeared, to be replaced by enmities as fierce as that which since 1871 has divided Germany and France. The public fortune of each State would be so reduced that material progress would be impossible, while all thought would be turned in the direction of preparing against invasion, and of avoiding an explosion of that discontent among those who toil which follows upon all

great wars, and in modern circumstances would produce attacks upon the State organism and upon the rich, of a magnitude for which modern history, which is the history of populations much separated by class differences and physical distances now overcome, affords scarcely any precedent."

In other words, the rulers of Europe in these vast armaments have created a new Frankenstein, and they tremble before their own creation. War costs too much. The community has so large a stake in the accumulated wealth, the established civilization, the well ordered life, which are the growth of centuries, that it can not afford to risk them all on the issue of a battle. The result of the Franco-Prussian war, the overthrow of China in its recent war with Japan, have disturbed the repose of many a statesman, who shudders to think what the destruction of an entire fleet, as at the Yalu, or the capture of an army, as at Sedan, might mean to his country, and behind the rulers lie the still more anxious people. To quote again from Lord Dufferin:

We can form no conception of the haunting anxieties which embitter the existence of the nations of central Europe, upon whose every frontier hangs, black and motionless, a threatening cloud of war, and whose citizens even within the recesses of their innermost chambers, mingling with the prattle of their children and the tender converse of the hearth, can hear the ominous tramp of alien armies, the rattling of their artillery, the thunder of their squadrons, as they periodically gather, march, and manœuvre within, so to speak, "a stone's throw" of their unprotected fields and villages and often towns.

Rulers and people alike dread nothing so much as the war for which they prepare every day. It is in their view, and rightly, the worst of calamities. Nor is it merely the danger of war which disturbs them. Even peace under the existing conditions involves intolerable burdens. The financial considerations alone are controlling. Portugal is bankrupt. Spain is nearly so. Italy shivers on the brink and her people crushed by an overwhelming burden of taxes are far from content.

France spends more than her income every year. Germany probably does the same. Russia borrows on terms which do not indicate that her credit is good notwithstanding her enormous resources. England alone is rich enough to pay all her expenses, but wise enough to know that she grows stronger, richer, and happier in peace, while her extended empire offers many a tempting point to an attacking foe in case of war.

Behind emperors and kings and ministers of state lie the people, on whom fall the burdens of war and who dread it. They cannot welcome the conscription which carries off their sons and postpones the marriage of their daughters, and which shortens the industrial and family life of each generation. Millions of men, who produce nothing and consume much, must strain the resources of any country and entail poverty and hardship on its inhabitants. It is these and not "peace and plenty" which are to-day the uncompromising facts of everyday life to the nations of Europe.

It is not surprising, therefore, that men should seek some escape from this situation, some method of laying aside the armaments which they cannot support and which they dare not use. Not merely the moral but the political and economical considerations demand permanent peace. How can it be secured? This is the great question of the day.

We may draw a lesson from experience. In early days men settled their disputes by private war, but as civilization advanced society found that the system was too expensive. Bullets aimed with the best intentions sometimes hit the wrong man, and a fight begun between two men may grow into a riot which would threaten a whole city. It became necessary to suppress family feuds and duels and to punish every breach of the peace, not to save the combatants but to protect their neighbors. If you will examine an indictment for any crime you will find it alleged as the gravamen of the offense that it was committed against the public

peace. It is to preserve this that our whole system of police exists.

Nations are now so connected by ties of every kind that a war between any two injures all. To-day the powers combine to stop the war between Turkey and Greece. When they are more civilized and stronger, war between any two countries will be prevented by all others acting together, because such a war hurts all.

For private war men have substituted courts of justice. The State decides the quarrel of her citizens, and behind her judgments lies the whole force of the community. In like manner impartial tribunals must decide the quarrels of nations, and their decrees must be enforced by the whole power of the world. This is international arbitration, for which statesmen, teachers, and all enlightened men who have the welfare of the world at heart are now striving. This is the practical, indeed the only escape from the frightful dangers and burdens of constant preparation for war.

Our country stands at the parting of the ways. Shall we, with all its evils before us, deliberately assume the burden which Europe is so anxious to lay aside? Shall we enter the frightful competition in destruction, which crushes the populations of Europe and creates the "pauper labor" of which we hear so much? Or shall we throw our weight with the forces that make for a more perfect civilization? Shall we strive to establish peace, or seek to provoke war? This is to-day a very practical question in this country.

We are singularly favored in our situation. Separated by two great oceans from dangerous enemies, and unquestionably the most powerful nation in our own hemisphere, we have thus far felt the inspiration of Washington and the founders of our Government, and have pursued the policy of peace. Secure in our own strength, we have never had a standing army nor sought to vie with foreign powers by creating a powerful Navy. We have believed that, if we dealt with other nations

justly, we need fear no attacks, and our experience has shown that we were right. For more than three-quarters of a century we have never known a foreign war, save that which we caused by attacking our helpless neighbor Mexico, and meanwhile we have grown rich and great. We have enjoyed the friendship of the world and have profited by it as a nation and as individuals. Our dangers and difficulties have come from within, and never in the history of the world was there a country with less to fear from foreign enemies and less to gain by war.

Yet many of our politicians, supported by some reckless newspapers and with a noisy following of unthinking or irresponsible men, have been doing their best to embroil us in some foreign war. This has always been the method by which rulers who feel their positions in peril have sought to divert attention from the consequences of their misrule, and to reestablish their own power by an appeal to patriotic feeling. Our country has been embarked in the work of building ships and forts with a vigor which is new in our experience. Wars and rumors of wars are the daily food of our political warriors. The supposed wrongs of naturalized citizens, who recognize this country as their own only when they wish its protection from the consequences of their conspiracies against some friendly power, engross the attention which should be given to the interests of us all; and we never know what resolution breathing fire and sword may pass our Senate, what hostile message come from our Department of State.

We are in the throes of a "vigorous foreign policy," which seems to mean a general interference with the affairs of other nations, and a tone in the conduct of our diplomatic correspondence, which is only excused by the general concession that we are ignorant of the usages which prevail in the polite society of nations. This policy and the legislation which fetters our commercial intercourse with our greatest customers have

helped to alienate all our friends in Europe, and it might be difficult for us now to specify a single powerful nation which has not some grievance against us, except perhaps Russia, whose despotic government can have no real sympathy with our own.

You gentlemen of the navy are constantly placed in a position where tact and courtesy may prevent or foolish arrogance precipitate an international conflict. You may generally be found at the points of probable collision, and you can not too strongly appreciate the full responsibilities of your position. Though we would not perhaps have had him do otherwise, yet the action of Captain Wilkes in stopping the *Trent* might well have embroiled us in a war with England, and perhaps have established the Southern Confederacy, with results to this continent that no man can imagine. I mention this merely as an illustration of the far-reaching consequences which may flow from an ill-advised act. Our Government was strong enough and wise enough to disavow the act, and thereby to establish a principle of international law for which we had long contended; but the incident inculcates the importance of discretion. Pardon me, therefore, if I point out what war has meant and must mean to this country.

I think it may be fairly said that our dangers to-day lie within and not without, that we have more to dread from our own citizens than from foreigners. It is not my purpose to discuss before you any controverted political question. I would simply remind you of admitted facts in our contemporary history.

We are engaged in conducting the experiment of self-government on a larger scale than has ever before been tried. We have under our flag an enormous territory containing every variety of climate and physical condition, and every sort of interest. We have among our voters large bodies of foreigners who have come here ignorant of our questions, our methods, our traditions, and often of our language. One recognizes the

extent to which this is true when he finds that the official advertisements in some cities are required by law to be published in English, German, and Polish while in Massachusetts election addresses are printed in Scandinavian, and when he hears that New York as a German city comes next to Berlin and Vienna.

Another element of difficulty is found in the colored voters of the south, whose transformation from slaves to citizens is inevitably a slow process, and whose political position has been, to say the least, anomalous, since the Constitution secures their right to vote, while in many communities the exercise of this right is practically denied. Before the colored race receives the full recognition of all its rights, there may well be some serious trouble.

The relations between labor and capital have within recent years been constantly disturbed, and we are liable at any time to acute conflicts which, like the strikes in Pennsylvania some years ago and in Chicago in 1893, disturb the peace of whole sections and threaten the most serious consequences.

There is a strong socialistic movement born of discontent with existing conditions, which in any period of business depression becomes formidable and which a year ago inspired the political platform which was supported by nearly half the voters in the country. The growing power of capital and the unscrupulous use of that power have done much to justify a feeling of dissatisfaction, which is all the more dangerous because it is just.

To reconcile the conflict of interests, to educate the ignorant, to make the natives of other countries into true Americans, to give our colored fellow citizens their proper standing in the community, to secure labor its just rights while preventing its organizations from oppressing men who do not join them, to regulate the aggregations of capital, to control for good the socialistic movements, and to remove the causes of dangerous dis-

content—in short, to secure for our whole people the benefit of wise and honest government—these are things which may well tax all the ability and patriotism that our country can command, and they are things which must be done, if our institutions are to endure. If it was difficult to establish a frame of government which would meet the needs of five millions of people living along the seaboard, united by descent, by traditions, by language, and by interest, it is far more difficult to administer that government, with a population of seventy millions divided as has been suggested.

The most practical questions confront us. Our currency is disordered, and while our citizens differ widely as to the remedy for our financial troubles, we have all suffered alike from the disturbances which they cause.

Our expenses are enormous, and economy is neglected. Our system of taxation is the subject of bitter controversy, which is likely to continue until our people are satisfied that their taxes are imposed in the interest of all and not for the benefit of a few. Oppressive and unjust taxation is a potent cause of discontent and often of revolution, and no man can foresee what the future has in store for us, while disputes as to the principles and rates of taxation divide the country.

If our difficulties are great, our government has become less competent to deal with them. Our cities as a rule are very badly, too often corruptly governed, and as they are growing rapidly, an increasing proportion of our population suffers from this misgovernment. Go to any of our largest states and listen to the speech of men or read the comments of the press while the legislatures are in session. Judge these legislatures by the men whom they send to the Senate of the United States. When these legislators meet we begin to tremble, when they adjourn we rejoice. No man knows upon what to depend while Congress is in session, and when the session ends business revives. Compare in New York Hamilton and Jay and Livingston, her great men of a

century ago, with her senators and governor to-day. Compare Franklin with the present ruler of Pennsylvania, Rutledge with Tillman in South Carolina, Washington and Jefferson and Madison with the Virginia statesmen whom we know. Make the same comparison in any state, and you will understand why we have ceased to trust our representatives. We fought the Revolution for the right to be taxed by representatives of our own choice. The privilege seems less valuable to-day.

I could run over the history of every State in the Union since the war, and give you in each evidence of disorders which show the dangers which threaten us from within, the signs of decay in our public life. Such governors as Waite in Colorado, Pennoyer in Oregon, Lewelling in Kansas have their parallels in the older States. Garcelon in Maine, Butler in Massachusetts, Altgeld in Illinois, represented the same political feeling and belonged in the same class of statesmen.

Americans have short memories, but even the shortest can carry us back to the revolutionary attempt of Governor Garcelon and his associates to change the result of a popular election in Maine, when constitutional government was for a while suspended and the major-general of the state militia discharged the duty of "protecting the public property and the institutions of the State" during the interregnum. Since then we have seen the legislature of Connecticut paralyzed for its entire term and unable to pass a single law, while an election was nullified and the term of the retiring governor and other officers of State was prolonged for two years without the popular assent. Rhode Island has witnessed a similar suspension of its legislature, though for a shorter period. New Jersey was plunged into confusion by two senates, while in Kansas we have seen two rival houses, each with its speaker, holding simultaneous sessions in the same chamber, until one party barred the other out, and the commander-in-chief of the

militia when directed by the governor to expel the party in possession refused to obey the order.

These things have happened not in Mexico or South America, not even in our new communities, but in "the land of steady habits," in the oldest States of the Union, and in Kansas, the child of New England.

With scarcely an exception, these troubles are the legacies of war, the greatest war that we ever knew. The war disordered our finances, forced us to spend some six million dollars a day and piled up an enormous debt. We are still paying for it, through our pension list, every year almost the cost of a European army. To the war we owe our present scheme of taxation, the source of many woes. The war is responsible especially for the strong party spirit, which makes honest men support leaders and laws that they condemn, rather than vote with their political opponents or take independent action. The war left us a legacy of adventurers, who use the gratitude of the country to its veteran soldiers and the comradeship of the veterans themselves for their personal profit. What with veterans and sons of veterans, it will be years before the country is free from the evils of a political standing army. The war sowed the seeds of the corrupt government which prevails in too many States—the "boss" system under which we languish.

Every thoughtful student of history must see in our country much to inspire anxiety. No one can deny that our hands are full now with the problems which confront us; that we have much to do if we would make our Government what it should be. It is folly to build higher until the foundation of our present edifice is secure. We are rich, but riches do not insure good government. The city of New York is rich, but it is an open question to-day whether New York will elect an honest mayor or surrender herself again to the mercies of Tammany. Riches which only tempt and do not resist dishonest attack are a menace to free government.

We may overcome our difficulties in peace, but what must be the effect of a war? If our expenses are enormous now, what would they become? If our system of taxation is oppressive, war would multiply our burdens. Another generation would lose, perhaps, a large share of its best men, and a new crop of adventurers and "bummers" would spring up to curse our children with their clamor for office and their demands on the treasury. Worse than all this, the attention of men would be diverted from the evils which we are struggling to cure, and a new party spirit, a fresh legacy of hatred and unreasoning prejudice, would obstruct the progress of civilization in the nation. War is demoralizing, uncivilizing, corrupting, and its worst effects are not wounds and death, the loss of life and property, all that we usually term the horrors of war. Far worse are its less direct results. War turns the minds of men away from their domestic questions and surrounds them with an atmosphere of excitement. The patriotic citizen devotes his time and his thought, perhaps his property and his life to his country's service. But there are thousands of others who see in the confusion which war causes a chance to advance their own prospects at the expense of their fellows. There are fraudulent contractors, general waste, unnecessary increase of offices, fortunes rapidly made by individuals while the community grows poorer. War is the great opportunity of adventurers and charlatans. It is a debauch from which a nation recovers slowly.

The more successful the war, the worse the danger. Easy victory intoxicates a people, fills them with arrogance and the desire of public conquest, in short, with that pride which goes before destruction. The victories of Hannibal and Louis XIV and Napoleon paved the way for the gravest disaster to their countries. From the Second Punic War dates the decline of the Roman Republic. The seeds of Cæsarism were sown at Zama. Were we to wage a successful war, our political leaders

would preach the annexation of neighboring territory, and would declaim about our manifest destiny. The greater we grow, the more diverse our interests would become, the more difficult the problems of government, and the harder it would be to preserve our Union.

We have no neighbors who can safely be admitted to take part in the work of governing us as States of this Union, least of all those who have shown until now only a conspicuous inability to govern themselves. We complain of the power possessed by the recently admitted States, which is entirely out of proportion to their population. Do we want more Montanas and Wyomings, but peopled by men of alien race, sending their Senators to Washington? Our system makes no provision for provinces, and if it did there could be nothing more dangerous to free government, as is shown by the history of Rome. Her prætors plundered her provinces and used their ill-gotten wealth to corrupt the magistrates and the senate at home. Would not the Government of Hawaii or Cuba be likely to resemble the "carpet-bag" governments in the South? Be sure that Roman history would repeat itself.

Only a country whose own government is strong and pure can extend its sway over others. The vast conquests of Spain, with soldiers and sailors that were second to none, did not save her from the consequences of misrule. They rather hastened her fall. The valor of the French soldiers did not preserve Napoleon III. from Sedan. The overwhelming power of China melted at the touch of Japan. The Sultan is a sick man notwithstanding his splendid army. These are illustrations of the universal law that, when government becomes corrupt, disaster inevitably follows. Unless the heart is sound, strong limbs are a delusion and a snare, tempting their possessor to athletic feats that may prove fatal. I can imagine no greater calamity to this country than a successful war, which should lead us to enlarge our boundaries, and to assume greater responsibilities.

It is easy to begin a war, and the prospect seems brilliantly attractive to men who have never known its horrors. We see the war of 1812 and the civil war already through a distance which lends the usual enchantment. Read the history of your country and you will see how anxiously during those wars men longed for peace, and how joyfully peace was hailed when it came. The generation that knew by personal experience what war meant would have given scant countenance to the jingoes of to-day. God grant that the present generation may learn from them, and not insist upon a bitter lesson from their own experience.

There are many of your fellow citizens, gentlemen, who share these views, and who watch the growth of our Navy with anxiety. They feel that a powerful fleet may be as dangerous in the hands of reckless politicians on shore or an indiscreet commander at sea as a new rifle is in the hands of a boy. The young proprietor of the rifle will find some way of testing its power, and the community is fortunate if his experiments are not fatal. Something of the boy's temper seems to show itself among our rulers, and occasionally, as at the time of the Chilian difficulty some years ago, it has been suggested that their spirit found supporters in the Navy. Let us hope that there was no foundation for such suspicions. Could we be assured that the influence of your profession would be thrown against hostilities, the growth of the Navy would be regarded with far less solicitude. We approve new rifles, but we want them in the hands of men who realize how far they carry a ball, and who will not fire recklessly. We want no new difficulties till we have conquered what we have, no new territory till we govern well what we now own, no new war till we have recovered from the last.

When that time comes, the danger of war will be over. When wise and strong men control the government, it will not play with fire. That childish fancy of the hour, "a vigorous foreign policy," will be forgotten.

It will have given place to a just foreign policy, under which our country, conscious of its power, will consider the rights of others while maintaining its own, and our statesmen will have learned that courtesy in the expression of an opinion or the assertion of a claim is a sign of strength, not weakness, as well in a nation as in a man. Under such a government a strong navy may never be employed in war, though it may help the progress of civilization or advance the cause of science in ways familiar to you all. Its great office is to make war impossible, and this is the function of the greatest navy that the world now knows.

An English newspaper, after the review at Spithead, quoted from one of our own admirals the remark, "This review means peace," and the same idea was expressed by spectators from every country and by many newspapers. The history of England proves that this is true. Since her naval supremacy was fully established by Nelson's victories over the fleets of Napoleon, her navy has not known a war. The bombardment of Alexandria was an unnecessary experiment, not a real battle. It was a chance to try the new rifle without danger. Officers have grown gray in her service without seeing an engagement. Her commerce has extended until the carrying trade of the world is largely in her hands, and her territory has expanded until her subjects are found in every part of the globe, but on the ocean she has been at peace for nearly a century. This has been due partly to the discretion of her commanders and partly to the discretion of her enemies. The English navy has meant peace, and peace not only for Englishmen but for the citizens of other lands as well. When Bismarck was urged to attack England he is reported to have answered in substance, "Why should I attempt to weaken England, when wherever her flag floats the German and the Englishman have the same rights and are treated exactly alike."

But you will say that England has had peace because

her navy is so large, and that to secure the same object we must follow her example. I might in reply point out that we have been equally at peace, though our Navy has been small and our Army insignificant. I might suggest that no great nation has shown the least disposition to quarrel with us for certainly thirty years, although we have not been armed for war. I might dwell upon the fact that their great armaments and their mutual jealousy place every great power under bonds to keep the peace with us, for war with us would lay them open to attack from others. These answers are all good, but this also must be considered. If our peace depends on naval supremacy, we must build much faster than foreign powers, so that we may overtake and pass them in the competition. The attempt to do so would at once arouse their fears and stimulate their activity in building ships. It would be a radical change in our established policy that could not fail to excite jealous suspicion. It would naturally occur to men that such preparations must mean war, for we have peace without them, and if war must come, it might seem easier to deal with our Navy before our plans for its enlargement were complete, than to wait until our superiority was established.

In a word, our action would invite attack, and so far from securing peace would insure war. There is no more Utopian dream than that two equally powerful fleets can exist together without conflict, or that England and America can proceed harmoniously with such missionary appliances to civilize and Christianize the world. The lion and the lamb will lie down together when two great Anglo-Saxon nations go hand in hand to conquer, and agree upon the division of the spoil. The lessons of Christianity are not taught by bayonets and cannon balls. In those communities where men go armed, quarrels are more frequent, and hence we have laws against carrying weapons. Human nature is the same in nations as in men. The best way to insure

peace is not steadily to contemplate war, nor do we win the confidence of our neighbors by constantly considering how we can most completely ruin them.

Our interest, like England's, is to preserve the public peace for every reason. To the great police force of the world we must contribute our share, and we shall do so willingly, but we do not need a great Navy to protect our rights, to defend our shores, or to make good our claim to the respect of the world. If we are willing to be just, we are strong enough to fear not, and I have no doubt you will join with me in the sincere hope that our Navy, like the English, may always mean peace, and be needed only to make it sure that the decrees of international courts will be unquestioningly obeyed.

I can not close better than by repeating the words of Lord Russell at Saratoga, in his speech on international arbitration:

What indeed is true civilization? By its fruit you shall know it. It is not dominion, wealth, material luxury; nay, not even a great literature and education widespread—good though these things be. Civilization is not a veneer; it must penetrate to the very heart and core of societies of men.

Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for woman, the frank recognition of human brotherhood, irrespective of race or color or nation or religion, the narrowing of the domain of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice. Civilization in that its true, its highest sense, must make for peace. The abiding sentiment of the masses is for peace—for peace to live industrious lives and to be at rest with all mankind. With the prophet of old they feel, though the feeling may find no articulate utterance, "how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace."

