

gered by cargoes of ammunition, whether that danger comes from possible explosions within or from possible attacks from without. Passengers and ammunition should not travel together. The attempt to prevent American citizens from incurring these risks is entirely consistent with the effort which our government is making to prevent attacks from submarines.

The use of one remedy does not exclude the use of the other. The most familiar illustration is to be found in the action taken by municipal authorities during a riot. It is the duty of the mayor to suppress the mob and to prevent violence, but he does not hesitate to warn citizens to keep off the streets during the riots. He does not question their right to use the streets, but, for their own protection and in the interest of order, he warns them not to incur the risks involved in going upon the streets when men are shooting at each other.

The President does not feel justified in taking the action above suggested. That is, he does not feel justified, first, in suggesting the submission of the controversy to investigation, or, second, in warning the people not to incur the extra hazards in traveling on belligerent ships or on ships carrying ammunition. And he may be right in the position he has taken, but as a private citizen I am free to urge both of these propositions and to call public attention to these remedies in the hope of securing such an expression of public sentiment as will support the President in employing these remedies if in the future he finds it consistent with his sense of duty to favor them.

(From statement issued after resignation as Secretary of State.)

PERSUASION VS. FORCE

To the American People:

You now have before you the text of the note to Germany—the note which it would have been my official duty to sign had I remained secretary of state. I ask you to sit in judgment upon my decision to resign rather than to share responsibility for it. I am sure you will credit me with honorable motives, but that is not enough. Good intentions could not atone for a mistake at such a time, on such a subject and under such circumstances. If your verdict is against me, I ask no mercy; I deserve none if I have acted unwisely. A man in public life must act according to his conscience, but however conscientiously he acts he must be prepared to accept without complaint any condemnation which his own errors may bring upon him; he must be willing to bear any deserved punishment from ostracism to execution. But hear me before you pass sentence.

The President and I agree in purpose; we desire a peaceful solution of the dispute which has arisen between the United States and Germany. We not only desire it, but with equal fervor we pray for it, but we differ irreconcilably as to the means of securing it. If it were merely a personal difference, it would be a matter of little moment, for all the presumptions are on his side—the presumptions that go with authority. He is your President; I am a private citizen without office or title—but one of 100,000,000 inhabitants.

But the real issue is not between persons; it is between systems, and I rely for vindication wholly upon the strength of the position taken.

Among the influences which governments employ in dealing with each other there are two which are pre-eminent and antagonistic—force and persuasion. Force speaks with firmness and acts through the ultimatum; persuasion employs argument, courts investigation and depends upon negotiation. Force represents the old system—the system that must pass away; persuasion represents the new system—the system that has been growing, all too slowly, it is true, but growing for 1,900 years. In the old system war is the chief cornerstone—war which at its best is little better than war at its worst; the new system contemplates a universal brotherhood established through the uplifting power of example.

If I correctly interpret the note to Germany, it conforms to the standards of the old system rather than to the rules of the new, and I cheerfully admit that it is abundantly supported by precedents—precedents written in characters of blood upon almost every page of human history. Austria furnishes the most recent precedent; it was Austria's firmness that dictated the ultimatum against Serbia which set the world at

war. Every ruler now participating in this unparalleled conflict has proclaimed his desire for peace and denied responsibility for the war, and it is only charitable that we should credit all of them with good faith. They desired peace, but they sought it according to the rules of the old system. They believed that firmness would give the best assurance of the maintenance of peace, and faithfully following precedent, they went so near the fire that they were, one after another, sucked into the contest.

Never before have the frightful follies of this fatal system been so clearly revealed as now. The most civilized and enlightened—aye, the most Christian—of the nations of Europe are grappling with each other as if in a death struggle. They are sacrificing the best and bravest of their sons on the battlefield; they are converting their gardens into cemeteries and their homes into houses of mourning; they are taxing the wealth of today and laying a burden of debt on the toil of the future; they have filled the air with thunderbolts more deadly than those of Jove, and they have multiplied the perils of the deep. Adding fresh fuel to the flame of hate, they have daily devised new horrors, until one side is endeavoring to drown noncombatant men, women and children at sea, while the other side seeks to starve non-combatant men, women and children on land. And they are so absorbed in alternate retaliations and in competitive cruelties that they seem, for the time being, blind to the rights of neutrals and deaf to the appeals of humanity. A tree is known by its fruit. The war in Europe is the ripened fruit of the old system.

This is what firmness, supported by force, has done in the old world. Shall we invite it to cross the Atlantic? Already the jingoes of our own country have caught the rabies from the dogs of war. Shall the opponents of organized slaughter be silent while the disease spreads?

As a humble follower of the Prince of Peace, as a devoted believer in the prophecy that "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," I beg to be counted among those who earnestly urge the adoption of a course in this matter which will leave no doubt of our government's willingness to continue negotiations with Germany until an amicable understanding is reached, or at least until, the stress of war over, we can appeal from Phillip drunk with carnage to Phillip sobered by the memories of an historic friendship and a recollection of the innumerable ties of kinship that bind the Fatherland to the United States.

Some nation must lift the world out of the black night of war into the light of that day when "swords shall be beaten into plowshares." Why not make that honor ours? Some day—why not now?—the nations will learn that enduring peace can not be built upon fear—that good will does not grow upon the stalk of violence.

Some day the nations will place their trust in love, the weapon for which there is no shield; in love, that suffereth long and is kind; in love, that is not easily provoked, that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; in love which, though despised as weakness by the worshipers of Mars, abideth when all else fails.

(From statement issued after resignation as Secretary of State.)

THE WAR IN EUROPE AND ITS LESSONS FOR US

The War as It Is

No matter by what standard you measure this war, it is without precedent or parallel. I will not call it the GREATEST war in history, for the word great implies something more than bigness. When we speak of a great institution or a great movement, we have in mind something more than mere size. There have been, I think, greater wars than this, but none that approached it in bigness. It is the biggest war ever known if we measure it by the population of the nations at war—never before have so many people lived in belligerent nations. It is also the biggest war of which history tells if we measure it by the number of enlisted men who face each other upon its many battlefields. The estimates run from twenty-one to thirty-one millions. Rather than risk exaggeration, let us take the lowest estimate; it is sufficient to make the war impressive. In fact, the number is so great that the mind can scarcely comprehend it. Let me translate it into everyday language by compar-

ing it with our voting population. We have never cast as many as twenty-one million votes at an election. That means that if all in every state who have on a single day exercised the right of suffrage could be gathered together in one place, the concourse, vast as it would be, would fall several millions short of the number now actually engaged in fighting.

More than three million have been wounded thus far. If on any part of the globe one hundred thousand persons were swept to death by pestilence, or flood, or famine, the world would stand appalled; and yet, in a little more than a year, more than thirty times one hundred thousand have been summoned to meet their God, and every one owes his death to the deliberate intent and act of a fellowman. More than ten millions have been wounded—this will give you some idea of the awful toll that this awful war is exacting in life and suffering.

It is biggest, too, if we measure it by its cost—more than four hundred millions each week. They have borrowed forty billions and spent enough to build an hundred Panama canals.

If we measure the war by the destructiveness of the implements employed, nothing so horrible has ever been known before. They used to be content to use the earth's surface for the maneuvers of war, but now they have taken possession of the air, and thunderbolts more deadly than the thunderbolts of Jove fall as if from the clouds on unsuspecting people. And they have taken possession of the ocean's depths as well, and death dealing torpedoes rise from out the darkness to multiply the perils of the sea. They have substituted a long range rifle for a short range rifle, a big mouthed gun for a little mouthed gun, a dreadnaught for a battleship, and a super-dreadnaught for a dreadnaught, to which they have added the submarine. And they now pour liquid fire on battle lines and suffocate soldiers in the trenches with poisonous gases. Inventive genius has been exhausted to find new ways by which man can kill his fellowman!

And the nations which are at war are not barbarous nations—they are among the most civilized of the earth; neither are they heathen nations—they are among the Christian nations of the globe. They all worship the same God; and nearly all of them approach that God through the same mediator. They offer their supplications to a common Heavenly Father and then rise up to take each other's lives.

The Cause of the War

And now allow me to ask you to consider the false philosophy out of which this war has grown and the natural results of that false philosophy. Before speaking of the real cause, it is worth while to note that some of the causes which have produced war in the past are not responsible for this war. There have been race wars in history—wars that have been the outgrowth of race prejudices which have sometimes extended through centuries. But this is not a race war; the races are all mixed up in this war. Saxon and Slav are allies; Latin and Frank are allies; Teuton and Turk are allies. And now, since Bulgaria has entered the war, Slav is fighting Slav, and it is not yet known whether the Greek, if he enters the war, will side with Turk or Roman. The races are inexplicably mixed.

And it is not a religious war. There have been religious wars, although we can not understand how a war could arise over a religious difference. We have learned to believe that the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience is an inalienable right, and it would never occur to us that a man would kill another in order to prove that his religion is better than the other man's religion. According to our theory, if a man desires to prove the superiority of his religion, he lives it, for we do not count a religion as worthy of the name if it does not manifest itself in the life. There have, however, been religious wars, but this is not one of them. On the Bosphorus the crescent and the cross float above the same legions; a Protestant emperor of Germany is the ally of a Catholic emperor of Austria; and you will find fighting in the same army corps representatives of three great branches of the Christian church, Catholics, members of the Church of England and members of the Greek church. The religions are as badly mixed in this war as the races.

And it is not a family war. There have been family wars—wars that have had their origin