

What the War Proves

The Washington Post has learned that a number of congressmen, estimated at fifty, are preparing to oppose the appropriations for preparedness which the manufacturers of munitions are now demanding, and it calls upon them to show themselves. It need not be impatient; not only the fifty congressmen but a great multitude of unfrightened Americans, as well as a considerable number of the unsubsidized papers, will plainly manifest their opposition, not only to the expenditure demanded, but to the theory upon which it is demanded.

The Post says:

"The European war has shown that no man can predict an era of peace. Every country that loves its honor and wishes to protect its citizens must be prepared on land and sea. Those who are against preparedness must have some substitute to offer in case a strong enemy should attack the United States. What is this substitute? Is it surrender? Let the intrepid 50 answer."

Strange that one could be so blind to the lessons taught by the European war as to see in it an argument in favor of the "get ready" policy. Does the war prove that no man can predict an era of peace? No! It simply proves that peace is not to be expected BY NATIONS THAT ARM THEMSELVES TO THE TEETH AND THEN MAINTAIN A STATE OF PREPAREDNESS ON THE THEORY THAT THE ONLY WAY TO MAINTAIN PEACE IS TO MAKE PEOPLE AFRAID OF YOU. The war in Europe exposes this theory and shows that preparedness provokes war instead of preventing it. But any person acquainted with human nature ought to have known that the theory of keeping peace by force was false; he ought to have known it even before receiving the conclusive proof furnished by the war in Europe.

The European war is the natural result of a false philosophy—a philosophy which if applied to individual life would repeal the statutes against carrying concealed weapons and equip every citizen with a brace of revolvers. The Post says that "every country that loves its honor and wishes to protect its citizens must be prepared on land and sea." Why not apply the logic to the individual and say "every citizen who loves his honor and wishes to protect himself must be armed for self defense." Why does it not lay aside the veneer of civilization and retreat into the woods? Does it not know that the disposition that leads one to carry arms is the disposition that gets him into trouble? The same impulse will lead to the same conduct, whether it controls an individual or a group.

The stock argument of the jingo is that the individual does not need to arm himself because he relies upon the protection of his government, but this argument is very much over-done. The protection afforded by the government of this country, local, state and national, does not prevent either theft or crimes of violence. The government does not furnish a guard to walk with each citizen and keep him from being molested, neither does it furnish a watchman for each man's house. It simply says that any person who violates the law will be held to accountability—it provides a punishment that is applied AFTER the crime, not a watchfulness which will prevent the crime. And has not this nation the same security? Is it not known to every other nation that we have an hundred millions of people with unconquerable spirit, inhabiting the richest country in the world, abundantly supplied with every material necessary for defense? Is not this knowledge a restraint upon other nations? Is there any nation so ignorant as to suppose that it could inflict injury upon this nation with impunity? Is there any nation foolish enough to invite or desire war with this nation? This nation has the same security against injury from without that the peaceful citizen has against injury from his neighbor, namely, the desire to live at peace with the world and the determination to do justice to all nations, and it also has the power to protect itself whenever protection is needed, and to the extent that it is needed.

Men find what they look for in this world; those who look for trouble find it—a proposition that can be verified by the examination of the police records of any city. Those who are not looking for trouble are generally able to live on terms of friendship with all about them—as

evidenced by comparing the small list of criminals with the much larger list of honest, respectable citizens.

The philosophy of the jingo is either false in its application to nations or else it should be applied to the smaller units of society down to the individual. The trouble is that the jingo has not learned that there is no limitation to a moral law. The attempt to limit the law against stealing to petty thefts has given us the reign of the pirate and the plunderbund, and so the attempt to limit the commandment against killing to individual murder has led to the riot of war. When upright men are brought face to face with the question of carrying concealed weapons they see that they can not encourage the practice without taking responsibility for the deaths that follow, and so some day the upright citizen will realize that those who, by adopting the false philosophy of Europe, encourage preparedness with the hatred and the war spirit that accompany it, must share the responsibility for the bloody tragedies to which these things lead. There is a higher standard of honor than the standard of the duelist; yes, a higher standard even than the standard of the militarist who knows of no remedy for intellectual error except the cutting off of the head of the man who errs, and no remedy for the mistakes of the heart but the stilling of the beat of the heart that makes the mistake. The higher standard is the standard set up by the Man of Galilee; His moral code may be to the manufacturers of munitions a stumbling block and to the jingoes foolishness, but it is the growing philosophy of the world.

W. J. BRYAN.

A PROTEST AGAINST PREPAREDNESS

"Chicago, Oct. 29, 1915—To the President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

"Dear Mr. President: Feeling sure that you wish to get from all sources the sense of the American people in regard to great national questions, officers of the Woman's Peace Party venture to call to your attention certain views which they have reason to believe are widespread, although finding no adequate expression in the press.

"We believe in real defense against real dangers, but not in a preposterous 'preparedness' against hypothetical dangers.

"If an exhausted Europe could be an increased menace to our rich, resourceful republic, protected by two oceans, it must be a still greater menace to every other nation.

"Whatever increase of war preparation we may make would compel poorer nations to imitate us. These preparations would create rivalry, suspicion and taxation in every country.

"At this crisis of the world, to establish a 'citizen soldiery' and enormously to increase our fighting equipment would inevitably make all other nations fear instead of trust us.

"It has been the proud hope of American citizens who love their kind, a hope nobly expressed in several of your own messages, that to the United States might be granted the unique privilege not only of helping the war-worn world to a lasting peace, but of aiding toward a gradual and proportional lessening of that vast burden of armament which has crushed to poverty the peoples of the old world.

"Most important of all, it is obvious that increased war preparations in the United States would tend to disqualify our National Executive from rendering the epochal service which this world crisis offers for the establishment of permanent peace."

(Signed)

JANE ADDAMS, Chairman.
LUCIA AMES MEAD, Secretary.
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER, V.-Sec.
ALICE THACHER POST, V.-Sec.
S. P. BRECKINRIDGE, Treasurer.

The above protest against the proposed preparedness was sent to the President by the officers of the Woman's Peace Party, with headquarters at Chicago. Other organizations should do likewise.

TWO LAWS NEEDED

1st. An act making it unlawful for a belligerent ship to clear from an American port with American passengers.

2nd. Making it unlawful for any American ship carrying passengers to clear from an American port if it carries ammunition, whether ready for use or only partly manufactured.

These two laws would go far toward keeping us out of conflict with the belligerents. Why should citizens be allowed to drag their government into this unprecedented war.

W. J. BRYAN.

Preparedness a Republican Plan

If any democrat doubts that the preparedness propaganda is a part of the republican program, let him read ex-Senator Root's speech before the Union League club of New York. He is quoted as saying:

"The war in Europe is not the cause of a movement for preparation for defense. That cause has long existed; the war in Europe is but the demonstration striking the imagination and convincing the judgment of the people of the United States upon the necessity for the adequate preparation for defense."

Yes, the republican leaders have had it in mind for a long while—the larger army for use in labor troubles and the larger navy to carry on trade wars. They have been waiting for an excuse, and they seize upon the war as an excuse.

Mr. Root is also quoted as saying that the defense program "will include a universal military service of all able-bodied men." There you have it. We are all asked to go back to frontier conditions. The people will not turn back to the old days—their eyes are looking forward. The 500,000 against Mr. Root's New York constitution will be nothing to the majority against compulsory service and European military standards.

W. J. BRYAN.

MR. BRYAN'S JOHNSTOWN ADDRESS

In another part of this issue will be found Mr. Bryan's address on "The War and Its Lessons for Us," delivered at Johnstown, Pennsylvania, on November 1st. The readers who have followed the statements made by Mr. Bryan since his resignation and the addresses delivered by him will recognize a number of passages. In the beginning he issued statements or made speeches on different phases of the subject, but as he had leisure to make a more complete review of the question he arranged the matter in logical order and for some weeks has been presenting the subject substantially in the form of the speech made at Johnstown. Those who are in the habit of making speeches will recognize the method usually employed, and see how ideas presented at different times are finally woven into a connected address.

WHO'D A BIN HER?"

A minister, visiting a family in which there were four sons and no daughters, ventured to say at the table: "What a pity one of these boys was not a girl." The oldest promptly replied, "Who'd a bin her? I wouldn't a bin her, and George wouldn't, and Jim wouldn't and Bill wouldn't. Who'd a bin her?"

And so it will be when the jingoes begin looking for a source of revenue from which to collect the amount needed for frenzied preparedness. No source can be found that will be acceptable.

WAR'S WHEEL OF FORTUNE

War has been variously described, but just now it resembles a wheel of fortune more than anything else. No matter which side turns the wheel, it is uncertain at which number it will stop. At one time Germany approaches Paris, only to be driven back; next, Russia pushes forward to the Carpathians—only to be forced back toward Petrograd. And now a drive is being made through Bulgaria to rescue Constantinople—but the wheel is still whirling, and it is a gambler's guess where it will stop. In the meantime, men die and women weep; debts pile up and hatred sows the seed of conflicts yet to come!

It was once said of a speech that any sentence in it would have been a good place to quit; is it not so with war? When will the nations turn from combat, the instrumentality of barbarism, to co-operation, the instrument of civilization? When will they learn the truth, economic as well as moral, that it is better to help each other than to kill each other? And yet there are Americans who would have this nation enter this war!

W. J. BRYAN.