

The Peace Treaty Plan

If any one wonders at my earnest and persistent opposition to a declaration of war, let him remember that, after laboring for eight years to bring before the world a peace plan providing for the investigation of ALL disputes by an international tribunal before resorting to war—a year's time being allowed for investigation and report—I was made happy by President Wilson's cordial endorsement of the plan.

By his authority I called all foreign representatives to the state department on the 26th of April, 1913, and laid this plan before them, and then began negotiation with each of the individual nations. **WITHIN TWO YEARS** from that date, treaties had been concluded with **THIRTY** nations, including Great Britain, France, Italy and Russia—thirty nations exercising authority over one billion three hundred millions of people, or three-fourths of the population of the globe. Besides these **GERMANY, AUSTRIA** and **BELGIUM** formally endorsed the plan, although treaties have not yet been concluded with these nations.

These treaties were ratified by the United States senate, the vote being unanimous after the ratification of the third treaty.

As this treaty plan, offered to all the world—and the offer has never been withdrawn—gives us an honorable means of adjusting ALL disputes with ALL nations, it surely affords an honorable means of adjusting a dispute arising out of UNINTENDED injuries done by a nation which has endorsed the plan, although no treaty has yet been negotiated.

Is it unreasonable or unpatriotic to urge, as a means of preventing war, the employment of a plan used by the President, and approved by the senate, the United States and nearly all the rest of the civilized world?

Is it unreasonable or unpatriotic to urge that the people, having endorsed these treaties at the polls, should be consulted, by a referendum vote, before congress repudiates the peace treaty plan by a declaration of war?

The President still hopes for peace, and I pray as earnestly as he that Germany may do nothing to further aggravate the situation. Because it is the duty of the patriot to support his government with all his heart in time of war, he has a right, in time of peace, to do what he can to prevent war. I shall live up to a patriot's duty if war comes—until that time I shall try to save my country from its horrors.

W. J. BRYAN.

The plutocratic portion of the press is again in full cry. There has not been a year since 1898 that they would not have gladly hung Mr. Bryan for interfering with their pet privileges. Now it is the munition manufacturers who think it criminal to oppose war. They think it patriotic for the metropolitan press to demand war, but woe to the man who asks that congress consult the people who must furnish the blood and money to carry on a war.

WAR WORSE THAN DUELLING

In duelling, enemies fight each other; in war governments declare and conduct war and soldiers kill each other without any personal hatreds to satisfy.

In duelling, those who cause the duel do the dying; in war those who declare war do not, as a rule, do the fighting.

In duelling, the parties are careful to avoid injury to others; in war the combatants put an unjust burden on the entire neutral world. And yet duelling is prohibited in the United States.

"CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTS"

The "Constructive Patriots" met at Washington recently and resolved—in favor of a BIG army and a BIG navy, and in favor of UNIVERSAL military training and service—and all this in the name of PATRIOTISM. O, Patriotism, what crimes are committed in thy name!

And who led this bunch of patriots in their deliberations? Ex-Secretary Root and ex-Candidate Parker. Mr. Root constructed the republican convention at Chicago in 1912 in the interest of Wall street, and his candidate carried TWO states. Then he went back to New York and constructed a constitution which even the empire state defeated overwhelmingly.

And Mr. Parker? He constructed a Wall street democratic party in 1904 and ran behind the party vote a million and a quarter, and he tried his hand at construction again in 1912.

Constructive patriots Root and Parker never had less following than they have today. Woe to the democrat or republican who is foolish enough to follow where they lead. Whether themselves deceived or deliberately deceiving, they are blind leaders of the blind. And what impudence to call it patriotism!

"PATRIOTS MEET TODAY"

Under the above title the New York Herald announces the meeting at Washington of the advocates of a "big army," a "big navy," "universal military training," and "universal military service." Thus do the jingoes, newspapers, the traffickers in war material and the professional soldiers use the "livery of heaven" to conceal their devilish purposes. If the United States was turned over to his satanic majesty with full liberty to work his will he could not find a more sympathetic group of collaborators than the sham patriots who, pretending a superior loyalty to their country, seek to exchange the moral prestige of this great republic for the tinsel glory of a red-handed militarism. It is true that "patriots meet today"—not the Herald's crowd—but the patriots who daily meet in the field and factory—the ones who produce the nation's wealth and fight the nation's battles.

The Nebraska legislature has a bill before it which authorizes cities to adopt the city manager plan of government. The city manager plan merely means that the city elects a small group of men to determine its policy and to hire an expert to spend the public money in exchange for service. This is so like the manner in which all successful businesses are conducted that the existence of strong opposition among the politicians is not surprising.

The Sioux City Journal recently said: "It would be interesting to keep score for a year and see who is mentioned oftenest—Bryan or Roosevelt." The Journal is exceedingly complimentary to the gentleman whose political funerals it has thankfully attended quite often in the last eight years. On the editorial page of the same issue that propounded the query Mr. Roosevelt's name was mentioned five times and that of Mr. Bryan nine times.

The people of Chicago have been horrified to discover, through the activities of the state's attorney, that prominent and influential police officials have been in a close combination and conspiracy with the leaders and the most despicable members of the underworld. Yet they have repeatedly given victory to politicians whose only strength lay in their combination and confederation with exactly the same enemies of society.

The question of whether prayers are answered or not still vexes a great many persons, but nobody has been known to refuse to sign a petition to a city council or a state legislature because of any qualms on the subject.

The identity of the gent who predicted that this would be an open winter ought to be disclosed long enough so that we might ask if he meant one that is open at both ends.

The jingo papers are at their old tricks. They advise congress and the President each day as to the opinion of the public, and they denounce as unpatriotic any one who opposes their demand for war.

A Question of Honor

Some think that honor requires this nation to enter the present war. What course does honor suggest? If all must sacrifice and suffer, and if necessary die, in defense of the nation's honor, should not all have a voice in determining what is honorable? The question can not be left to the militarist alone.

It is honorable in the individual to render the largest service possible—it is honorable for him to do this no matter what criticism he has to face. The highest honor is to be won by doing the most good. The same rule applies to nations—if not, what rule does apply? It will be honorable, therefore, for our nation to postpone, if necessary until after the war, the settlement of any disputes that can not now be settled by peaceful means, if by postponement we can render the world a larger service.

Is it not honorable to save our own people from the calamities that have overtaken the belligerent nations, and at the same time be in a position to play a friend's part in the promotion of peace in Europe? Is it not honorable, also, to consult, by means of a referendum, the people who must go to war, before calling them up to the battle line?

Now is the time to scrutinize the various standards of honor proposed and select the highest, the best and noblest.

W. J. BRYAN.

A REFERENDUM ON WAR

On another page will be found Senator LaFollette's bill providing for a referendum on war. The principle is sound. If it is wise to submit to a vote of the people the question of issuing a few bonds or the question of selling a street car franchise, why is it not wise to allow the people to decide so vital a question as a resort to war?

Those who will be called upon to suffer themselves or in the loss of others, and those who have to bear the burden of taxation—these ought to be consulted before the nation is plunged into war. Senator LaFollette has worked out a plan by which the census bureau, working through the postoffice, can in a short time conduct a popular election.

INCONSISTENCY

A Madrid (Spain) dispatch says: "The Epoca recognizes in President Wilson's speech the reflection of generous and noble ideas, but asks what confidence can he have in his own words if at the moment he delivers a message of peace he encourages bills for an increase in his country's military and naval forces."

"The message," says the Epoca, "is at once an expression of its author's idealistic sentiments and an announcement of greater intervention by the United States in European politics."

We should not, by enlarging our military and naval program, raise a doubt as to our own devotion to the philosophy which the President offers as a substitute for the false philosophy which has brought Europe into this war.

A PRECEDENT

We used the treaty plan to prevent a conflict with Mexico; and we advised American citizens to come out of Mexico in order to decrease the chances of having to go to war with Mexico.

IN THE NAME OF PATRIOTISM

The jingo newspapers are constantly giving reasons why we should go to war, but they denounce as unpatriotic anyone who dares to present reasons for not going to war. And, while advocating war, they pretend to be supporting the President, who is hoping to avoid war. They misrepresent the President's position and try to put him in the attitude of desiring to enter this war. They libel the President, too, when they assume that he wants to take from congress the constitutional right to declare war, a right which belongs exclusively to congress; and they libel congress, also when they assume that congress objects to anti-war petitions from the people or even to a referendum vote by the people on such an important question. And the jingo papers do all this in the name of patriotism.

W. J. BRYAN.