

much to transport flour and nine times as much to transport a bushel of wheat as it cost two years before.

I mention these things to show the burden that the war is throwing on neutral nations who are not to blame for the fact that there is a war in the world today.

And besides this, every neutral nation is in constant danger of being dragged into this war while it lasts; our sensational papers have, time and time again, led us up to the brink of this war and told us that we were just about to enter it.

This is the war that is going on in Europe, and this is the war that some people think that this nation ought to enter. When this war is over I hope that we shall be able to so amend international law as to write it upon the theory that peace and not war is the normal relation between nations.

At the present the rule seems to read that nations at peace can attend to their own business only so long as they do not interfere with the fight. It ought to read that the nations that fight must be careful not to disturb the peace, the commerce or the prosperity of the nations that substitute reason for force.

WONDERFUL APPEAL OF PRESIDENT

Now, this is the war that is going on across the sea. I have called your attention to some of its outstanding features and to the injury that it is doing the neutral nations, and now I call your attention to that wonderfully eloquent appeal of the President to the nations that are at war. He asked them to build peace upon a foundation that is new to them. Why? Because they built their hope of peace on a false foundation over there. The only hope of peace they have had rested on force and the exciting of fear; they have piled up taxes on their people, trying to terrorize each other into the maintenance of peace. This is the false philosophy that has made a slaughter-house out of the Old World.

And it is this philosophy that the President has asked them to abandon. If you want to know how false it is apply it to a neighborhood and see how miserably it will fail to preserve peace.

Go out into an agricultural community; you may select the best that you have. Pick out two men living side by side on farms, with nothing but an imaginary line between their land. Pick out two farmers who are honest and well meaning, and, to make it as strong as you can, take two belonging to the same church and sitting in adjoining pews under the same interpretation of the Scripture. Suppose they try to preserve peace on the European plan, how long will they go at it? One of them will go to town and get the best gun he can find, and then he will go to the newspaper office and put in a notice like this: "I love peace, and I have no thought of trespassing on my neighbor's rights, but I am determined to protect my own rights and defend my honor at any cost, and I now have the best gun that money will buy, and it is only fair that my neighbor should know that if he ever interferes with my rights I will blow his head off, in a neighborly way."

And then suppose the next day the other man goes to town and he got a bigger gun and with the same frankness goes to the same newspaper office and puts in a similar notice, and I may pause to say that that kind of a notice would always be accepted and would appear in a prominent place. He would say: "I love peace as much as my neighbor, and I have no more thought of trespassing on his rights than he says he has on mine, but I am just as determined as he is to protect my rights and defend my honor, and besides, I have a better gun than he has, and I want him distinctly to understand that if he ever puts his foot across my line I will shoot him full of holes, in a Christian spirit."

Then suppose the first man got two guns, and the second man two, and the first man three, and the second man three; and suppose they went on buying guns alternately, and every time one of them bought a new gun he put a new notice in the paper saying how much he loved peace and how ready he was for a fight.

Now, what would happen? Every undertaker in the town would be going out to get personally acquainted with those two men, for business reasons. Have you any doubt that is the way

that philosophy would work in a neighborhood between individuals? How can you doubt that that is the way it would work between nations living side by side, with nothing but an imaginary line between them?

And, my friends, if you had any doubt before, how can you have any doubt now since you have seen just how it has worked?

One nation would build a battleship and notify the world that it was ready to blow any other battleship out of the water, and a rival nation would build a dreadnaught, and advertise that a dreadnaught could sink any battleship afloat, and then the first one would build a superdreadnaught and then they would go to the dictionary and look up Greek and Latin terms, to use as prefixes for ships, as they built them bigger and bigger, and as they made guns bigger and bigger, and as they collected armies bigger and bigger, all the time talking about how much they loved peace and boasting how ready they were for war.

Now, my friends, that is exactly what has been done in the Old World; if any philosophy has ever been exploded it is the philosophy that you can keep the peace of the world by being armed to the teeth.

If you want to know the kind of philosophy upon which they have relied in Europe as their only hope of peace, just go back to the time when people carried concealed weapons in this country, and they were just beginning to pass laws to prohibit the practice. Did you ever hear of a man advocating the carrying of a concealed weapon for aggressive purposes? Never. It was only that he might be prepared to protect himself. It was defensive only, to protect his honor and his rights, and so today there is not a nation in the world that will admit that it ever built a battleship or made a gun except for defensive purposes only. That is their argument.

But in the case of the carrying of concealed weapons it was found that the man who carried a revolver, ostensibly for defensive purposes only, carried with the revolver the disposition to use it on slight provocation, and a provoking disposition to induce others to use it. After long and bloody experience we have abolished in every state of this Union the false philosophy that preparedness preserves peace.

Unless there is a moral philosophy that applies to nations that is just the opposite of the moral philosophy that applies to individuals, we must conclude that as the pistol-toting man is a menace to the peace of his community so the policy of pistol-toting among nations is a menace to the peace of the world.

PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY

Now, the first proposition that the President presents as the basis of peace is the one that shocked the belligerent nations. It was that it must be a peace without a victory. Why? Because, if the peace of Europe can only be restored by the victory of one side over the other, it can only be preserved by the same display of force that won the victory.

The President is a student of history, and he knows that you can go back to the beginning of time and that you will find that now and again some nation, at the zenith of its power, has thought that the peace of the world depended on its victory, and on its domination of the world, but the path of history is lined with the wrecks of the empires that were built on physical force.

If the world needs a lesson today, it is the lesson that the President has tried to teach them, that an enduring peace can not be built on force alone. There stands back of the doctrines enunciated by the President one of the great laws of the Almighty. God never left the vindication of His law to depend upon the strength of the victim who was injured by its violation. No. The laws of God work out their punishment in the victors, not in the vanquished only.

Why do we tell a child not to steal? Is it because we are afraid that some poor person will lose? Have we in mind the person from whom the child will steal? No. We tell the child not to steal because we love the child and we do not want the influence of theft on the character of the child.

So if we are to have a future that will be peaceful and peaceable we must not have a victory that rests on the mere physical power of

one nation over the other. If this war ends in the complete triumph of one side, so that it can dictate the terms of peace and compel a vanquished foe to accept those terms, prostrate on the ground, we must consider the effect of pride and arrogance on the victor as well as revenge on the part of the conquered.

Napoleon, one of the greatest of soldiers understood this. He said: "Peace ought to be the result of a system well considered, founded on the true interests of the different countries, honorable to each and OUGHT NOT TO BE EITHER A CAPITULATION OR THE RESULT OF A THREAT."

RIGHTS OF LITTLE STATES

The President asked them to respect the rights of little states, and that, too, is a doctrine that has not been fully accepted as yet by those engaged in this war, and yet it is a doctrine that is just as necessary to the world peace as the doctrine that the safety of a human being must depend upon his rights and not upon his size or his ability to enforce his rights.

And another: That there must be a recognition of the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That doctrine has not yet been entirely accepted by the belligerents on either side, and yet it is the end toward which the world is moving, and I believe that we can help the world more by setting them an example and showing them what people can do for their own protection than we can in any other way.

When people suggested to me that we ought to join these people of Europe in enforcing peace in Europe, my answer has been that the emphasis placed on force turns the thought away from the only basis upon which a permanent peace can rest, and that is love and brotherhood and the spirit of co-operation.

My friends, I believe that we have learned a lesson which we ought to apply to our own people. When this government was formed we were admonished by the experiences of the Old World not to leave the executive in control of the war-making power, and therefore our constitution took the right to declare war out of the hands of the president, the executive, and put it in the hands of congress.

The president in this country has charge of diplomatic relations, but when diplomatic relations cease, and we are confronted by war, the sceptre passes from the White house to congress, and the people's representatives therein determine whether we are to have war or not.

I have confidence in our President. I believe, my friends, that we have never had a president more anxious than he to do not only what is best for the country, but what the people of the country believe best for them.

But institutions are not made for individuals; they are made for mankind, and I am glad that our forefathers put the power in congress rather than in an executive, no matter how good that executive may be. But I believe the time has come to go a step further than our forefathers went. We now have more faith than they had in the intelligence of the masses of our country. And the masses know more today of what is going on day by day than our most prominent leaders did when that power was given to congress.

Since our constitution was written we have the railroads; we now can carry a citizen from one part of the country to another in less than a week, and we have the telegraph line that can carry the news in an instant, and we have the telephone that binds our shores together, and we have now universal education, a thing unknown in the ages past. Today I believe the time is ripe for an amendment to the constitution, giving to the people, except in case of actual invasion, a referendum on a declaration of war.

It is becoming increasingly necessary to submit to the voters of even our smaller cities the question of issuing a bonded debt; it is becoming increasingly necessary to submit to the voters the question of selling a franchise in a city. And, my friends, if we feel it necessary to submit to the voters the question of selling a franchise in a city, or the issue of a few bonds, is it not time to consult the voter on a question that may involve his life and the taxes that he must pay for a generation?

My friends, I have more faith in the common people of this country than in anybody selected