

## Mr. Bryan's Lecture

[The following report of an interview concerning Mr. Bryan's lecture on "The Causeless War," appeared in the Hutchinson, Kansas, News, of August 26, 1915.]

Napoleon Bonaparte ate fried onions for breakfast and made war.

William Jennings Bryan eats fried onions for breakfast and makes peace.

The reporter intercepted the great pacifier just as he was about to enter the Bisonte hotel dining room this morning at 8:30 o'clock. The former secretary of state said he would talk while waiting for his breakfast.

It was then that the fact was discovered that the Commoner has a trait of the Conqueror—a fondness for French fried onions, for, of course, Napoleon always took his French fried.

"Is there anything special I could have prepared for you, Mr. Bryan?" enquired P. J. Maguire, manager of the hotel, "there is plenty of time before your train."

Nebraska's most famous son said: "If it's not too much trouble, and if there is plenty of time, I'd like to have a plate of French fried onions."

Then he ordered a breakfast of coffee, sliced tomatoes, lamb chops and graham muffins. He afterwards added soft boiled eggs.

### WHAT BRYAN LECTURES ABOUT

After glancing at a morning paper for a few minutes, Mr. Bryan turned to the reporter and asked:

"Now, what was it you wanted to ask me? What would you have me talk about?"

"Peace and war, anything you may say."

"I am speaking on 'The Causeless War' in my chautauqua work, perhaps you had better ask me what arguments I am using."

"All right," assented the reporter.

The former cabinet member settled himself a bit more comfortably in his chair, and then began his interview, speaking with clearness, even between bites after his breakfast was served.

### THE TRIALS OF NEUTRALITY

"The address which I am delivering begins with a description of the war as it is, and its injury to neutrals," said Mr. Bryan. "The war is without precedent in the number of men engaged, in the cost of carrying it on, and in the destructiveness of the implements employed. Its burdens fall upon neutrals as well as belligerents, trade is interrupted, new systems of taxation are resorted to, and neutral nations, instead of being able to devote their time to domestic questions, are kept busy trying to keep out of the war."

"We are maintaining neutrality, but our rights are being violated by both sides, although neither side wants to injure us, the injuries which we suffer being incident to the fighting of the war they are waging against each other."

"The second part of the address is devoted to the false philosophy out of which war has grown, namely, the doctrine that 'might makes right.' This doctrine violates the moral law on which we rely for the protection of life and the safeguarding of property—it also leads to the endorsement of the doctrine of retaliation and is the inspiring cause of the new propaganda of preparedness."

### PREPAREDNESS WILL PROVOKE WAR

"Preparedness as now preached will provoke war instead of preventing it. If preparedness becomes a national policy, it must be put into operation by those who believe in preserving peace by force and fear and these are the ones who are now attempting to fasten on the country the duelist's standard of honor. The preparedness now advocated is so expensive that the country would not bear the burden unless convinced that we were in danger of an attack, and this leads to the naming of other nations which are described as enemies and as planning war with us. This preparation, therefore, involves the preaching of the gospel of hatred as a national policy, and this would make the people anxious for war by the time they were ready for war."

"Then, too, we could not prepare against any particular nation without stimulating that nation to prepare against us. This rivalry would compel alternate increases until both nations would be overtaken by bankruptcy, financial and moral."

### TELLS THE WAY OUT

"The third part of the address deals with the way out, or the road to permanent peace. The

prospect of peace in Europe does not lie in annihilation of one side by the other, or in the dictation of terms by the victors to the vanquished, but rather in the bringing of the countries together in a spirit of friendship and fellowship that they may co-operate in working out the destiny of Europe.

"Our nation is the nation to act as mediator, and must remain in a position to take advantage of this opportunity when the time comes. Our 30 treaties furnish us with the machinery for keeping out of the war. They provide for the investigation of all questions, a year's time being allowed to the investigations. We have treaties with four of the belligerents, Great Britain, France, Italy and Russia, and the principle has been endorsed by Germany, Austria, and Belgium. If, however, we should fail to secure the settlement of any dispute, it would be better to postpone the final settlement rather than to enter this war; first, because there would be no difficulty in securing a peaceful settlement when the war is over, and second, it would be better for us to have our war by ourselves, if we are going to have any war, rather than to become involved in the quarrels of Europe."

### NO MAN KNOWS THE COST

"No man could say how much it would cost us in men or money to take part in this war. More than 2,000,000 men have already been killed, and we would have to play a man's part if we entered the war. I do not believe that the American people would be willing to send several thousand young men to death to prevent Great Britain from interfering with our commerce with neutrals or to avenge the death of a few Americans who went on ships which they should not have taken into zones that they knew to be dangerous."

"It is as much the duty of a citizen to avoid dragging his country into war as it is the duty of the nation to protect the rights of its citizens. But greater than the objections based on the number that might be killed, or the money that might be spent, is the objection based upon the fact that we cease to be neutral whenever we become a belligerent. If we enter this war, we must turn over to some nation an opportunity such as may never come again—the opportunity to claim the promise made to the peacemaker. And by going into this war, we will also throw away the chance to use our influence in finding a way to apply to international relations the code of morals that we now apply as between individuals."

### THE PEOPLE DESIRE PEACE

"I am sure that the American people desire a peaceful settlement of all our disputes, and they should make their wishes known to the senators and members who will have to vote on the declaration of war."

### "CAN YOU BEAT IT?"

The Kansas City Star is forging to the front as a jingo. Its latest claim to distinction is based upon the discovery of a new argument in favor of preparedness, namely, that the danger of war with Germany being passed, we can now get ready for war without having any reason at all—we can now prepare just for the pleasure of it, and to give the builders of battleships and the manufacturers of arms and ammunition a market when the present war is over.

### IS IT RETALIATION?

When Mr. Taft was president he opposed a tax on incomes—an effort was then being made to put a tax on LARGE incomes. Now he advocates a tax on SMALL incomes to pay for preparedness; is it possible that he is retaliating on the voters with small incomes because they were against him and his policy?

Evidence continues to accumulate to prove that the world does move. The New York state constitutional convention is seriously considering adopting a short ballot proposition, in which the governor shall make all appointments except the lieutenant governor, comptroller and attorney general.

Those republicans who have so thoroughly convinced themselves that the country is in the grip of hard times will save themselves quite a shock if they continue to refuse to look at the bank clearings, the railroad earnings and the bank reserves of gold and currency.

Speaking of preparedness; if the excited lead the excitable, will not both fall into bankruptcy?

## War and Anarchy

On another page will be found a cartoon by McCutcheon—one of his best. It represents War and Anarchy—and they look the part. On the breast of War is written "Might is Right," while on the breast of Anarchy you read the same doctrine—"Dynamite is Right."

Where will you draw the line? If might makes right in international affairs, by what logic will you convince the anarchist that might is not right in controversies between individuals or between the individual and his government? When we adopt the doctrine that might makes right we are ready to violate the commandments: Thou shalt not covet, thou shalt not steal, and thou shalt not kill, for there is but one code of morals. When this code is repudiated by nations it is difficult to retain it as a guide for individuals. If we sow the wind we must expect to reap the whirlwind.

W. J. BRYAN.

### WAR AND DUELING

It is impossible to bind the nations to keep the peace. Enduring peace must come by persuasion. It can never come by compulsion. Every peace scheme of a federation of states, an international arbitration court, and the like, will be futile so long as the nations individually believe their highest interest in a given case requires war. Dueling persisted long after it was forbidden by law under heavy penalties. Any man's highest interest is his own self-respect. When his self-respect, reacting to the dominant opinion of the community, required him to accept a challenge, he fought regardless of law.

Nobody saw the stupidity of dueling more clearly than Hamilton, or its cruelty—brought home to him by the death of his son. Yet he met Burr at Weehawken, because to have refused—prevalent opinion of his time and class being what it was—would have cost him something dearer to him than life. A man like Hamilton, reacting to that state of opinion, would have fought regardless of any law or penalty. Short of physical restraint, it would have been impossible to bind him to keep the peace. Time soon came when prevalent opinion rejected dueling as merely stupid and brutish; when the duelist was regarded not as a man of honor but as a troublesome fool. When that state of opinion prevailed no law was necessary to prevent duels.

Certainly nothing has been made clearer in the last year than that European nations still believe their highest interest in given cases requires war. As long as that idea prevails it is impossible to bind the nations to keep the peace. Time will come; we firmly believe—and in the not very distant future—when war will be rejected by civilized nations, just as dueling has been by individuals; not because it involves loss of life and money, for many things richly worth while involve loss of life and money, but because under modern conditions it is stupid and futile, always defeating itself; always costing more than can be gained by it. Reducing military operations to the mere police status of restraining a Haiti or a Mexico will then come about of itself.—Saturday Evening Post.

Governor Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania is reported to be organizing a machine in that state that has for its object the unhorsing of Boies Penrose and the sending to the next national convention of a delegation pledged to support Brumbaugh for president instead of Penrose. If Brumbaugh can do that he will have added a considerable number to the list of those who still believe in miracles.

### WHY NOT NATIONAL HIGHWAYS?

Instead of doubling our expenditures for the army and navy, why not use the extra money on national highways? The time has come for the United States to develop a system of national highways—permanent hard roads which will connect all sections of the country and form the arteries of trade and travel. The states can extend these highways to the counties and the counties can complete the system. In time these roads will lift the mud embargo and bring our people nearer together—an advantage socially and politically, as well as economically. The democratic congress soon to assemble should take the initiative by creating a national highway commission to report upon the plan and cost of such a system as will meet the needs of the present and future generations.

W. J. BRYAN.