

The Treaty Plan Growing

A recent bulletin, issued by the Hague Tribunal, reports unanimous agreement upon a plan for the conciliation of international disputes.

The report begins: "On behalf of the First Committee, which is unanimous, I have the honour to submit to the Assembly the draft resolution concerning the procedure of conciliation in international disputes.

"The First Committee was not able, in the course of its numerous meetings, to give satisfaction to all the hopes and opinions expressed during its discussions.

"Since then several treaties, which are known as the 'Bryan Treaties,' have been concluded. The first of these was a treaty between Great Britain and Brazil, signed, I may add, by the distinguished M. da Gama, to whom I have the honour and pleasure to pay a tribute here. Next came the treaty between Sweden and Chile. In addition, I may remind you that Switzerland and Germany also have just concluded a convention dealing with conciliation in international disputes." etc.

It is interesting to know that the plan embodied in the Thirty Treaties negotiated by the United States with nations representing three-fourths of the world in 1913 to 1915 is spreading. Great Britain has followed the plan in a treaty with Brazil and Sweden in a treaty with Chile. Switzerland and Germany have recently concluded a similar convention.

Investigation differs from arbitration in that the conclusion is not legally binding but has a persuasive force resting upon the merits of the recommendations. This is as far as it is possible to go at present. There are vital questions that cannot be submitted to a binding arbitration but all questions can be submitted for investigation before a resort to war. W. J. BRYAN.

WHY NOT?

On another page will be found a press report of a speech made by Congressman Upshaw, of the Atlantic district, Georgia, in which he appeals to the president and cabinet to sign a total abstinence pledge for the benefit of the example it will set to the nation. It is a good idea. If the president and cabinet will join in a total abstinence pledge, the news will be carried around the world and do more to answer the wilful misrepresentation of the wet papers than anything else could do. King George announced that he would not drink intoxicating liquor during the war. That was a good start and had a good influence, although it would have been more effective if his total abstinence resolution had covered his entire life.

But Mr. Upshaw's suggestion should be carried farther. Why would it not be well for each cabinet officer to have a pledge book and ask all the employees of his department to join him in a total abstinence pledge?

And why should the vice-president not have a total abstinence pledge book headed by himself containing pledges of all the United States senators?

And the speaker. Why not a book containing the pledges of the speaker and all the members of congress, and why not books in all the states containing the pledges of governors, state officials, members of the state legislature and so on down to county officials, city officials, etc?

In another place attention is called to the work that the churches and the schools can do in rallying the people to total abstinence. Mr. Bryan brought the matter before his Sunday School class at Miami on the Sunday before New Years, and more than a thousand of those in attendance joined him in a total abstinence pledge. It is hard to overestimate the salutary effect of a total abstinence sentiment expressed in such pledges and put back of the enforcement law. W. J. BRYAN.

The ship subsidy is at the point of death. It will have no chance in the next congress, and the great tide of opposition promises to overwhelm the dying efforts of the shipping trust in this congress. If "Coming events cast their shadows before," the administration should certainly be able to see the shadow cast by the late election, which is a past event.

Not a dry Democratic member of congress defeated for re-election in last November and over two-thirds of the Democrats voting dry. Where is the evidence of a wet gain?

a sense of responsibility to Him. At least, that is the TENDENCY, and since the so-called theistic evolutionists borrow all their facts from atheistic evolutionists and differ from them only in the origin of life, theistic evolution may be described as an anesthetic administered to young Christians to deaden the pain while their religion is being removed by the materialists.

When the Christians of the nation understand the demoralizing influence of this godless doctrine they will refuse to allow it to be taught at public expense. Christianity is not afraid of truth because truth comes from God, no matter by whom it is discovered or proclaimed, but there is no reason why Christians should tax themselves to pay teachers to exploit guesses and hypotheses as if they were true.

The only thing that Christians need to do now is to bring the enemies of the Bible into the open and compel them to meet the issue as it is. As soon as the methods of these atheists, agnostics, and Darwinists were exposed they raised a cry that freedom of conscience was being attacked. That is false, there is no interference with freedom of conscience in this country and should be none. Christians will be just as prompt as atheists to oppose any attempt to interfere with absolute freedom of conscience. The atheist has just as much right to deny God as the Christian has to believe in God; the agnostic has just as much right to profess ignorance in regard to God's existence as the Christian has to profess his faith in the existence of God. The right of conscience is not menaced in this country, it is inviolable.

Neither do Christians object to the teaching of atheism and agnosticism by those who believe in these doctrines. Atheists have just as much right to teach atheism as Christians have to teach Christianity; agnostics have just as much right to teach agnosticism as Christians have to teach their religion. Let it be understood that there is no attack either upon freedom of conscience or upon anyone's right to teach religion or irreligion. The real issue is whether atheists, agnostics, Darwinists and evolutionists shall enjoy SPECIAL PRIVILEGES in this country and have rights higher than the rights of Christians. They dare not CLAIM higher rights though they now ENJOY higher rights and are contending for higher rights.

When Christians want to teach Christianity, they build their own schools and colleges and employ their own teachers—Catholics build Catholic schools, Protestants build Protestant schools. Every Protestant branch of the Christian church builds its own schools for the propagation of its own doctrine. This is the rule and there is no protest against it.

WHY SHOULD NOT ATHEISTS BUILD THEIR OWN COLLEGES AND EMPLOY THEIR OWN TEACHERS IF THEY WANT TO TEACH ATHEISM? WHY SHOULD NOT AGNOSTICS BUILD THEIR OWN COLLEGES AND EMPLOY THEIR OWN TEACHERS IF THEY WANT TO TEACH AGNOSTICISM? Only a small percentage of the American people believe that man is a descendent of the ape, monkey, or of any other form of animal life below man; why should not those who worship brute ancestors build their own colleges, and employ their own teachers for the training of their own children in their brute doctrine? There are no atheistic schools and there are no agnostic schools—why should there be if atheists and agnostics can save the expense of building their own schools and the expense of employing their own teachers by using the public schools for the propagation of their doctrine? They even make their living by teaching to the children of Christians a doctrine that the parents reject and which they do not want their children to accept. As long as the atheists and agnostics have the same rights as the Christians, what complaint can they make of injustice? Why do they ask special favors?

If those who teach Darwinism and evolution, as applied to man, insist that they are neither agnostics nor atheists but are merely interpreting the Bible differently from orthodox Christians, what right have they to ask that their interpretation be taught at public expense? It is safe to say that not one professing Christian in ten has any sympathy with Darwinism or with any evolutionary hypothesis that takes from man the breath of the Almighty and substitutes the blood of the brute. Why should a small fraction of the Christian Church—if they call themselves Christians—insist upon propagating their views of Christianity and their interpretation of the Bible at public expense? If any portion of the people could claim the right to teach their views at public expense, that right would certainly belong to a large majority rather

than to a small minority. But the majority are not asking that their views be taught at the expense of the taxpayers; the majority is simply protesting against the use of the public schools by a MINORITY to spread their views, whether they be called atheists, or agnostics, or are merely teaching their interpretation of the Bible.

Christians do not ask that the teachers in the public schools, colleges and universities become exponents of orthodox Christianity, they are not asking them to teach the Bible conception of God, to affirm the Bible's claim to infallibility, or to proclaim the deity of Christ; but Christians have a right to protest against teaching that weakens faith in God, undermines belief in the Bible and reduces Christ to the stature of a man. The teacher who tells a student that miracles are impossible because contrary to evolution is attacking the Bible; what right has he to do so?

Our schools are intended to train the minds of students, but back of the mind is the heart, out of which "are the issues of life." Religion deals with the Science of How to Live, which is more important than any science taught in the schools. The school teacher cannot cram enough education into the mind to offset the harm done to the student if his life is robbed of faith and his ideals are brought down to the basis of materialism. It is high time for the people, who believe in religion to make their protest against the teaching of irreligion in the public schools under the guise of science and philosophy.

A resolution without penalties will be sufficient—a resolution passed by the legislature declaring it unlawful for any teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee, director, member of a school board, or any other person exercising authority in or over a public school, college, or university, whether holding office by election or appointment, to teach or permit to be taught in any institution of learning, supported by public taxation, atheism, agnosticism, Darwinism, or any other hypothesis that links man in blood relationship to any other form of life.

We are not dealing with criminals, for whom fine or imprisonment is necessary, but with educated people who have substituted a scientific guess for the Bible and who are, in the opinion of orthodox Christians, attempting to use public schools for the propagation of doctrines antagonistic to the Bible or to the interpretation of the Bible commonly accepted by professing Christians throughout the United States and the world. Fines and penalties are not only unnecessary but would, if included in legislative measures, turn attention from the real issue which is THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF ALL IN MATTERS OF CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

The right of the taxpayers to decide what shall be taught can hardly be disputed. Someone must decide. The hand that writes the pay check rules the school; if not, to whom shall the right to decide such important matters be entrusted? W. J. BRYAN.

DEMOCRATIC HARMONY IN NEBRASKA

The Democratic party in Nebraska is more thoroughly united and more completely harmonious than it has been before in many a year. It is one-hundred per cent for law enforcement and one-hundred per cent progressive. Local influence marred the completion of its triumph at the polls but there is no doubt that a large majority of the people of Nebraska stand back of the things to which the Democratic party is pledged. Governor Bryan has the enthusiastic support of the entire party in the carrying out of the program announced by him in the campaign, endorsed at the election and reiterated in his inaugural address.

Nebraska ought to be a Democratic state because it is the champion of the things that the people of Nebraska need. It is the champion of the interests of the masses whether they live upon the farm, work in the factory or bring the producer and consumer together through the various lines of merchandise.

The criminal element in Nebraska constitutes a very infinitesimal portion of the population, and the number of those who profit by special privilege and governmental favoritism is almost as small. The average man is the real man in Nebraska—the common people are the controlling people. The Democratic party speaks for them and will defend their rights and interests. It is entitled to their support.

W. J. BRYAN.

Henry Ford says that the best cure for unrest in this country or any other country is a job that requires six days' attention every week. If he will couple with it the statement that it carries with it a living wage he will not find any general disagreement over his proposition.