

# Meeting Conditions of Today

## LET US FACE FACTS.

When the cry of the hour is to reduce the high cost of living. When the consumer refuses to pay High Prices and at the same time demands his needs for winter at prices in line with what he has to sell—wool cotton, live stock and Grains, this company feeling it has a duty to preform to assist lower the High Cost of Living, has joined First National store's of America

### THE GREATEST COMBINATION OF STORES IN THE WORLD.

Organized to reduce the cost of living by manufacturing their own goods, this saving to the consumer all the Profits which heretofore have been retained by manufacturers and wholesalers.

Our Present tremendous stock of fall and winter goods, consisting of many thousand dollars of new, clean, seasonable and dependable merchandise is now offered at Big Sacrifice Price in this sale started by us last Tuesday Morning.

### Join the Crowds Come Prepared to Buy Your Needs.

One of the greatest needs of the country at the present time is fewer automobile drivers and more wheel barrow pushers

*The Leader Mercantile Co*  
INCORPORATED  
**WE FIT THEM ALL—MEN, WOMEN & CHILDREN**  
DRY GOODS & WOMEN'S READY TO WEAR & CLOTHING & SHOES  
ONE PRICE TO EVERYBODY  
J. E. NELSON, MANAGER

Summed up the opinion of Leading American Financiers is that if the country does not sink it will remain afloat.

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

AN ARGUMENT IN ITS FAVOR BY  
W. T. WILCOX AND A REPLY

To The Tribune:

Having been prevented by sickness from attending the meeting of the League of Women Voters on the evening of Oct. 22d and expressing my views upon the League of Nations, I have concluded to put the same in writing:

In the many articles which we read upon the League of Nations, those who are in favor of the League assume the false premise that the League of Nations will keep us out of future wars, and therefore, those who are opposed to the United States becoming a party to the League in its present form, or to any League at all, are in favor of war.

The facts are that those who are opposed to the United States becoming a party to the present League, take the position that the League will, as to the United States, be a breeder of war. That whenever the war lords of Europe start a war fire, the American boys will have to cross the ocean and help put it out, and that Article 10 of the League so requires.

I think it will be conceded that there is no danger of the United States stirring up a war whether a member of the League or not. The United States is a Nation for peace and not for war. Therefore, it is unnecessary for the United States to become a member of the League to keep us out of our wars.

Those, therefore, who advise the United States to join the League, do so with the idea that it will keep us out of other countries' wars, or that there will be no future wars. Now, the covenants of the League expressly provide that the members shall become a party to all wars recognized by the League.

I quote James B. Reed, Democratic Senator from Missouri:

"Article 10 of the League explicitly provides that we undertake to preserve against external aggressions the

territorial integrity and independence of other members of the League. That obligation may, at any time, call upon us to send our armies and navies across the ocean."

Those in favor of the present League contend that Article 10 does not so provide. I quote the language of Elihu Root, who has but recently returned from Europe, where he has spent months in associating with representatives from other countries, who are members of the League, in forming an International Court to operate as a Department of the League. He was appointed to this position by President Wilson, by reason of his recognized broad mind and legal ability. This is what he says in regard to Article 10:

"I think it most objectionable that the American people shall enter into a solemn and positive agreement to guarantee and maintain by force of arms for all time the disposition of territory and sovereignty of all members of the League. That is a part of what Article 10 undertakes to do."

It is contended further, by the supporters of the League, that notwithstanding the provisions of Article 10, that Congress alone can declare war. Therefore, if the members of the League should declare its provisions violated and war inevitable, that Congress would have the right to prevent the United States from becoming a party to such war.

Listen again to what Mr. Root stated the other day on that point: "The trouble about giving the guarantee provided in Article 10 is that the making of a treaty containing it is a solemn assurance to all nations that it is within the treaty making power and that the promise to make war binds Congress as fully as it binds all other members of our government to maintain the pledged faith of the United States. A refusal by Congress to pass the necessary war resolution would be a breach of the covenants of the League."

But you say that the League is for peace. Yes, and it also has its provisions for war. I call your attention to provisions contained in Article 16 of the League as follows:

"Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the League."

But listen to the further provision in said article:

"It shall be the duty of the Council in such case, to recommend to the several governments concerned (that is to the members of the League) what effective military, naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces, to be used to protect the covenants of the League."

If the Council in which Uncle Sam has one vote, decides that the United States should contribute two million men or more, that would be our contribution.

But listen to this provision of Article 16:

"The members of the League agree further that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article."

That means that Uncle Sam must back with his finances as well as his boys, the other members of the League, the most of whom are men and money bankrupts. That will mean the issuing of League bonds for financing the war in an amount that will make the Liberty Bond issue look like thirty cents.

Why these demands for men and money, if the League of Nations will keep us out of war? Four years ago, when the political slogan was, "He kept us out of war," and to vote for President Wilson is a vote against war, and a vote against him is a vote for war, would the people have been deceived if the President had at that time made a similar demand for men and appropriations of money?

But, as I understand it, there are forty-one members of the League who have signed up. Those who are now in the League include the most of the powers who have been the war breeders and mischief makers in the past, and those who have not signed up are separated from the United States by the ocean, except Mexico, and Uncle Sam is not particularly alarmed about Mexico.

If the League will accomplish what its friends predict, let the forty-one who are now members demonstrate that fact. But let us never obligate Uncle Sam in advance, to furnish the men and money to settle the wars across the sea. We can help, if it is considered advisable, when the time comes. But let the Congress of the United States decide how many boys

must cross the ocean and how much money we will contribute, not the Council of the League.

I call attention to the fact that this Council of the League is provided for in Article 4, and I am unable to state the number comprising the Council, but without doubt, at least eight, and it provides that it may be increased as the members of the League may decide, but at no time, will Uncle Sam have in the League or in the Council, but one vote.

This should not be considered a party question. Democratic senators, Thomas of Colorado, Reed of Missouri, and other senators, whom I consider the ablest members of that party, are against the League.

W. J. Bryan, whose Democracy has never been questioned, was not in favor of the League, as presented to the Senate, and Mr. Bryan is not taking a very active part in this Campaign. In fact, there are many who are now side-stepping on the proposition.

The unkindest thing which I have noticed in regard to the proposition, is the attempt to make William H. Taft the "goat" for the League of Nations. It was charged the other day, in a political address, by one of the Presidential candidates, the first time it was ever suspected, that President Wilson advised with Mr. Taft in regard to the important provisions of the League, and that it was really Taft's child and not President Wilson's. I wonder why it was that Mr. Taft was consulted and not some member of the President's own party, unless it was to use him as a parachute if the League was defeated.

Mr. Taft was rejected by the people eight years ago, and in my judgment, the League of Nations in its present form, will meet the same fate Nov. 2d.

W. T. WILCOX.

A REPLY.

The Editor of The Tribune, recognizing his accountability in attempting to measure swords with a master of public argument like W. T. Wilcox, disclaims any defense of the position taken by President Wilson or the Democratic party. We are certain that the United States will join the League as soon as the politicians are through with the document and it is turned over to the statesmen. We have charged the Senatorial oligarchy

with the defeat of the covenant entirely for political ends and therefore we cannot accept such evidence as that given by members of this oligarchy as worthy of consideration. Senators Reed and Root are talking only to defeat the League.

There is no question but that when the war lords of Europe start a war the American boys will have to cross the ocean and help put it out. The last war showed that the world is one family. We tried to keep out but we could not. The only way for us to stop war is to keep the European war lords from starting the fire. Neither Reed, nor Root, nor Harding have proposed a plan of this kind. The League of Nations does propose a plan and it looks good.

Article 10 of this covenant is given here in full:

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

This does not say that the Council shall order or compel but that it shall advise. The Council is composed of the representatives of the principal Allied and Associated Powers. When we adopt the League there is no question of the United States having a representative on the Council. Now here is the first paragraph of Article 5. "Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant or by the terms of the present treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting." Notice the word "all". Article 10 quoted above does not provide otherwise, so Article 5 controls Article 10. This is what it really says: "When the representative of the United States agrees to it, the Council may advise this country about war matters." Does anyone really think that these wily Senators are afraid of that?

But they argue that we will be morally bound to follow the orders of the League. If the League would issue orders that are right we would want to follow them and if the orders are not right the members of the League could never agree to issue them. We always have friends at Court.

The last war taught us that we must give our boys and our money to support one side of a great conflict. The next war must repeat the shedding of American blood and the taxing of American resources. It is all we can do to keep out of taking sides right now in the Irish-English difficulty, which is purely an internal affair. There is no use in talking about staying out of a war: we have to consider how to stop the war before it starts. The League is a fact and only needs the United States to make it function as a world-wide movement to prevent war. It may not succeed in preventing all war but it will give us the machinery which was lacking at the time the World war started.

One hundred years ago a president of this country issued a decree defying the nations of Europe. It was the Monroe Doctrine. All the stand-patters of that day got up on their toes and shouted that it would breed war but it didn't. Years later the American fleet crossed the Atlantic, sailed into the Mediterranean Sea and bombarded a foreign capitol. When ordered over to Tripoli by the President, this generation of stand-patters and political mouthers got up on their toes and shouted that it would breed war but it didn't. Again a generation later a President of the United States sent a defiance to the Mistress of the Seas in regard to the Venezuelan question and President Cleveland was told by that generation of stand-patters that it would breed war but it didn't. And now in this generation we have the descendants of the stand-patters of old and they get up on their toes and shout that the League Covenant will breed war and a lot of good loyal Americans take it for gospel because they read it in a good old political sheet and repeat it for conviction.

There is no use in confusing the question by construing the meaning we want into the articles of the League. It may be that it needs clarifying. Harding says "I do not want to clarify." Cox says "We will accept any reservation that helps clarify." These two quotations appear on the front page of the last issue of the Literary Digest. We are for the League as the best plan yet offered for preventing war, with reservations if necessary.

WILSON TOUT.