

would, according to the jingoes, seem sufficient to meet any present dangers would, of course, be insufficient to meet the new dangers which would arise from the increase which other nations would have to make to be prepared to meet us, if we started out to put ourselves in readiness to fight them. "Is this the face that launched a thousand ships?" asks a poet, the question being inspired by the far-famed beauty of Helen of Troy. Can it be possible that our pugnacious ex-president is fired by an ambition to so fill the sea with fighting craft as to suggest to those who look upon the portraits which will present his likeness to succeeding generations, a similar question? When Mr. Roosevelt's plan is completed, if, God forbid, it ever should be, the United States will be a vast armory, with skull and crossbones above the door, and the designing architect of the system will go in and out in uniform, with the proud consciousness that our nation no longer contains mollicoddles or weaklings.

But there is no danger of Mr. Roosevelt's organization securing a numerous following, especially among laboring men, when its real purpose becomes known, and it should be the business of the laboring men of this country to see that its purpose is clearly understood and to give to the president assurance of a support which will counteract any influence that the jingoes may seek to exert.

The other organization to which I refer is of more recent origin. In fact, it has just been born and its most conspicuous sponsor is ex-President Taft, whose devotion to peace will not be questioned. He has associated with him men who have been prominently identified with the cause of peace, men whose names give to any cause with which they are connected the presumption that it is at least not antagonistic to peace. It may be that some have been inclined to regard Mr. Taft's organization as the best weapon with which to fight the Roosevelt organization. The two men are so different in the attitude which they take toward international problems that the casual observer might conclude that the two organizations were radically antagonistic. A closer inspection, however, of the platform adopted by the Taft organization ought to leave no doubt as to its purpose, and when its plan is understood, it will be seen that its effect is to aid rather than obstruct the Roosevelt propaganda. If the purpose of Mr. Roosevelt's organization is to make preparation for war pleasant, Mr. Taft's organization may be regarded as furnishing a plausible pretext for the preparation which Mr. Roosevelt advises; the Taft plan gives an excuse for supporting the Roosevelt plan. In fact, the name indicates its military purpose. We are told that the name selected, after some debate, was "League to ENFORCE Peace, American Branch." This presents the purpose clearly enough, and a review of the speeches made at the time of organizing will remove any doubts as to the military character of the plan. One of those in attendance is reported to have complained that the report was "too militaristic"—"militarism," he said, "was to be fought with militarism." He even intimated that there was too much "Rooseveltism in it." The objections, however, were soon silenced by a speech by President Lowell, of Harvard, who is reported to have said, "We are here to enforce peace, otherwise, we have no business here at all. When you fight a forest fire you fight it with back fire. We have here a means to discourage war and that means is the threat to use force." The argument sounds very familiar. "Fighting the devil with fire" has long been a popular amusement, but the effort has never been successful. Those who advocate the policy of "fighting the devil with fire" seem to overlook two important facts; first, that the devil is better acquainted with fire than his adversaries; and, second, being at no expense for fuel, he has an economic advantage which tells powerfully in any prolonged contest.

I feel sure the distinguished men who organized the league did not fully consider the radical changes which would have to be made before their policy could be adopted. Their plan is to organize an international police force, which will COMPEL peace, and COMPEL IT BY THE USE OF FORCE. That means that we shall make ourselves partners with other nations in the waging of war. This may seem a very simple matter if we consider only the possibility of preventing war, but it is not a simple matter if threats fail and war becomes a reality.

Before we can promise to enter into partnership with other nations in future wars, we must repudiate the advice of Washington, who warned

us against "entangling alliances." The American people will be very slow to enter into any arrangement which will involve us in the quarrels of Europe—quarrels which have their origin in centuries of antagonism, in race hatreds and in commercial rivalries. If there were no other objection, this would seem an insuperable one if, as I believe, the advice of Washington is still revered.

The plan of "The League to Enforce Peace" would also involve a surrender of the Monroe Doctrine. We could hardly enter into a settlement of European disputes and at the same time refuse to allow European nations to take part in the settlements of disputes in the western hemisphere. The American people will not look with favor upon so revolutionary a change in our national policy.

But even if we were willing to repudiate the advice of Washington and surrender the Doctrine of Monroe, would the people be willing to so amend the constitution as to transfer from our congress to European nations the right to declare war? The right to declare war is vested in congress; the plan proposed by "The League to Enforce Peace" would vest the power to declare war in a group of nations in which we could not, of course, exercise a controlling influence. I am sure that it would be impossible to secure a two-thirds majority in congress for a resolution proposing the surrender of the right to declare war; and even if two-thirds of both houses could be brought to pass the resolution, there is no reason to believe that three-fourths of the states would adopt the amendment. And—strange inconsistency—this plan, which contemplates a surrender of our independence, was formulated in Independence hall!

But while any one of the three reasons given would seem to be sufficient, and while the three combined offer an unanswerable argument against the plan proposed by Mr. Taft's organization, there is still another objection which, while it may be called sentimental, is, I think, worthy of consideration.

We have sought to aid the world by example and we have the satisfaction of knowing that our constitution has been copied all over the world and that our laws are the models upon which a multitude of statutes have been written. We have been the friend of all nations and the counselor of many. To depart from this position and join a group of nations in an agreement, by the terms of which we let them declare war for us and bind ourselves to furnish our quota of men and money for the enforcement of decrees which may not represent the wishes of our people, would not be an ascent to a higher plane; it would be a descent and would impair our influence and jeopardize our moral prestige. Listen not to those who measure "world power" in units of force; we have been a world power for more than a century, and we can not afford to exchange the moral influence which we now have for the military glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

I appeal to you, therefore, to remain true to the ideals of the fathers and to be content with the glory that can be achieved by a republic which, to use the words of the great historian Bancroft, "discards the implements of terror and dares to build its citadel in the hearts of men."

Our appeal is not to the fears of men, but to their hearts and consciences. Our mission is to implant hope in the breast of humanity and substitute higher ideals for the ideals which have led nations into armed conflicts. Our religion teaches us to rely upon the uplifting power of that which is good and pure and noble. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me;" this is the higher doctrine.

It is infidelity to the spirit of our religion to cast aside this most potent of all regenerating influences in the individual, in society and in the state. I am sure that the doctrines of Him whom the common people heard gladly will still prove acceptable to the common people of today. It remains for them to make known to the president their firm adherence to the principles which have made us the foremost nation in the advocacy of peace—principles which have led us to conclude with governments representing some three-quarters of the population of the world treaties which greatly lessen the likelihood of war between us and them, by providing that every question of every kind shall be submitted to an international commission for investigation and that there shall be no declaration of war and no commencement of hostilities until this investigation is completed. These treaties reserve the right of each government to act independently when the investigation is con-

cluded, but it is the belief of those who have confidence in these treaties that this period of deliberation and investigation makes war a remote possibility.

## NATIONAL HONOR

(Extemporaneous part of address delivered by William Jennings Bryan at a meeting held in Madison Square Garden, New York, June 24, 1915, under the auspices of The Friends of Peace.)

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appreciate the more than generous words employed by your chairman in presenting me to you and am grateful for your cordial reception. I find it impossible to measure my small part in this movement by the standard which he has been kind enough to set up for the valuing of my services. It did not require much courage to resign; it would have required more courage to have remained, for I could not have remained without violating what I believed to be the requirements of duty.

I beg you to remember that in this separation of two officials there was no personal element. When history writes this page—if it deserves mention—it will be said that two men, each doing what he believed to be right, found it impossible to share responsibility together. The president could not do otherwise than he did, believing as he did; and I could not act otherwise than I did, believing as I did. There was no concealment between us; we talked the matter over as two friends should talk and separated as two friends should separate—and I am trying, on the outside of the cabinet to assist him. Actuated by the same motives, he is doing his duty as he sees it; it is my duty, as I see it, to help to crystallize the peace sentiment of this country until THE DEMAND FOR PEACE DROWNS THE DEMAND FOR WAR.

I probably do not feel as indignant as some of you do at the position taken by the New York newspapers. I am more accustomed to their abuse than you are. I have been in politics for a quarter of a century and I have never yet known the New York press to take the side of the American people on any question.

You who are not accustomed to burials suffer more from the experience through which you are passing than one, like myself, to whom burials have become commonplace. For two years and three months I have tried as best I could to assist the president in dealing with the most momentous questions that have ever come before the state department in all its history, and never—not once—has the New York press given me credit for either intelligence or honest intentions. I have been the repository of international secrets; representatives of foreign nations have called and whispered in my ear words which, if I told them, might involve their countries in great embarrassment, and because I would not take reporters into my confidence and tell them that which I had no right to tell them, they accused me of not treating the newspapers courteously. As an officer of the government, sworn to do my duty, I would not surrender a sacred trust into the hands of irresponsible editors who had shown no regard for the welfare of the American people. For two years and three months I had to sit silent while their representatives of predatory interests libeled me, day after day, and attempted to destroy my usefulness; now I am free to speak and ready to answer their misrepresentations.

Supported by the president and with his entire sympathy and active aid I had the honor and privilege of making treaties with thirty governments, which exercise control over three-quarters of all the people of God's footstool; and when I secured the signature of a foreign representative to a treaty which promised to save this country from war, not this year or next year, but for a thousand years to come, the jingo press would put the news item down in a corner in an obscure place, while on the front page they would print some slander that they thought would injure me with the American people.

And then, after spending two years telling the country that I was not fit to be there, they all at once find that I endanger the country by leaving the office which they said I should not occupy, and in which they considered me only a figure head. Ever since the first of August, 1914, they have daily told this government what it ought to do, but when I signalize my return to private life by expressing an opinion, they exclaim, "How dare you discuss matters of so