

# The Peace Mission

Mr. Bryan's reply, given at Washington, D. C., September 18, 1915, to the committee representing a number of foreign language newspapers—published in this country and circulated among the foreign born element:

Gentlemen:  
I appreciate very much the honor you do me in suggesting that I visit Europe in the interest of peace. During the last three months this suggestion has come to me from several sources, but heretofore it has come from individuals who felt only a general interest in the subject. I appreciate the reasons which give to you a special interest in the restoration of peace. In the first place the foreign born citizens of this country share personally in the sorrow caused by the ravages of war among their relatives and intimate friends in the countries of their birth. Then, too, they feel more acutely than the native born the antagonisms which have been aroused in this country by expressions of sympathy—sympathy which, quite naturally, goes out toward the countries from which they come. This situation must continue to embarrass them while the war lasts and they, therefore, long for the return of that unity of feeling which existed before the war broke out and which will come again when peace is restored. The foreign born element of this country also understands from experience the heavy burden which the policy of preparedness has thrown upon European nations, and can not fail to note the use which is being made of the war to support the demand for larger expenditures on the army and navy. These special reasons explain the eagerness with which the members of your committee, and those whom you represent, look forward to the end of this unhappy conflict.

I need not assure you that I share your desire for peace and am willing to do anything in my power to hasten it. The service that any one person can render in such a matter is, of course, small, but each one is in duty bound to do what he can, and I am willing to do my part. Whether it is wise for me to undertake a trip to Europe is a question which I am not now prepared to decide and I am sure you will allow me to take the matter under advisement. Even if it is impossible to exert any influence towards the hastening of peace, a trip to the neutral countries might give me information that I could use in the work which lies before us here, namely, the maintaining of neutrality and the prevention of a preparedness that provokes rather than prevents war.

It is possible also that I might contribute something towards the extension of the peace plan to which our country is committed, and to which I confidently look upon as a powerful influence for the prevention of war. Among the thirty nations that have already entered into these treaties, are four of the belligerent nations, namely, Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy. The fact that we have treaties with these nations enables us to carry on our diplomatic disputes with them without any of the sensationalism that has attended our correspondence with Germany. Germany, Austria and Belgium have endorsed the principle, but have not yet signed treaties. As this treaty plan was offered to all the nations and has not been withdrawn, I take it for granted that our government would gladly enter into treaties with Germany, Austria and Belgium similar to the treaties we have with the other countries, and such treaties would silence the jingo press and, to a large extent, remove the excuse which has been used for the propagation of the doctrine of greater preparedness. Having great faith in the plan and having negotiated the other treaties, I might be able to present the case more strongly in personal interviews than I was able to do by diplomatic correspondence, and now that the advantages of these treaties have been made more apparent it is possible that Germany, Austria and Belgium might be willing to enter into such treaties. I mention these, as matters worthy of consideration and shall myself give them weight in reaching a conclusion.

If I decide to go it will be, as already indicated, at my own expense, and, not as the spokesman of any special group, but rather as the representative of the peace sentiment of the United States which includes a vast majority of our people. If I go it will not be as a partisan of either side, but as one friendly to all, with freedom to go wherever it seems best to go, and to

say whatever it seems wise to say, with a view to contributing to our own nation's security and toward the peace of the world.

## COST OF WAR TO THE WHOLE WORLD \$52,500,000,000

A London cablegram, under date of Sept. 25, follows: Chancellor McKenna's remarkable figures on the cost of the war to England, totaling over \$7,900,000,000 and \$10,000,000,000 in dead weight by March next, are eclipsed by the estimate of the cost of the war to the world put forth by Edgar Crammond, one of England's most noted statisticians.

His figures are based on such authorities as Henri Masson, of Belgium; Yves Guyot, of France; Monsieur Barriol, of Russia; von Renault and Riesser, of Germany, and the Austrian minister of national defense.

He gives for the first year of war the direct cost at \$17,000,000,000 and \$50,000,000,000, the direct and indirect cost to the belligerents.

On the same estimate the cost to date is approximately \$19,500,000,000 and the indirect cost \$52,500,000,000. Taking the countries seriatim the cost is as follows:

Countries	Direct	Indirect
Belgium . . . . .	\$ 185,000,000	\$2,450,000,000
France . . . . .	2,770,000,000	5,165,000,000
Russia . . . . .	3,000,000,000	4,000,000,000
England . . . . .	3,540,000,000	6,400,000,000
Germany . . . . .	4,690,000,000	13,875,000,000
Austria . . . . .	2,810,000,000	7,510,000,000

He takes no account of Japan, Turkey and Serbia.

The cost to the central empires is \$28,885,000,000. The remainder is chargeable to the allies. Property and other losses are estimated as follows:

	Capital loss	Property loss
Belgium . . . . .	\$ 2,000,000,000	\$1,150,000,000
France . . . . .	1,750,000,000	800,000,000
Russia . . . . .	1,500,000,000	2,000,000,000
Germany . . . . .	4,400,000,000	4,450,000,000
Austria . . . . .	2,500,000,000	5,000,000,000

Germany's loss includes: Manufactures, \$3,375,000,000, and agriculture, \$1,090,000,000. The daily cost to the various belligerents is as follows:

England, \$25,000,000; France, \$12,500,000; Germany, \$22,500,000; Russia, \$12,500,000; Austria, \$6,250,000. England's enormous wealth in investments abroad is expected to greatly outlast any effort at home or abroad on the part of Germany.

"But," says Guyot, "in five years this vast drain on the world's finances is calculated to put three-quarters of the world in pawn, and leave the United States as the only solvent nation."

### MR. BRYAN AT DALLAS

Is William Jennings Bryan helping out the country in keeping the peace, and is he performing a useful service in the direction of effectively helping to subdue the jingo spirit to be found in some sections? The opinions of some Dallas representative citizens may be of interest to Commoner readers. A reporter for the Times-Herald, Dallas, was given the following expressions on Monday:

General M. M. Crane: "I consider it exceedingly fortunate for this country that Mr. Bryan and the president are in such hearty accord, as is indicated by his lecture of Saturday night, from which one can only judge that there is no important difference between them. Mr. Bryan now being out of the cabinet is in a much more advantageous position to aid the president with the people than would have been possible had he remained in the cabinet. In his lecture I feel that he has brought to the attention of the people in a most graphic and convincing manner the horrors of war, and its terrific expense. As I understood Mr. Bryan he is not opposed to moderate preparedness, but is opposed to extravagant expenditures, and anything that verges on militarism."

Otto H. Lang, acting mayor, said: "Mr. Bryan expressed my views exactly. Preparedness for the possibilities of a war is much more effectively accomplished through improving the conditions of the masses of our people than through large expenditures for munitions of war, and armament, to be stored away for a possible use. It would be vastly better to have good roads, a greater number of good schools, and things of a similar nature which will afford our country greater possibilities for mobilization, and for an effective, well educated soldiery, than to expend vast sums for armament. I believe Mr. Bryan

is doing a great service towards counteracting the military movement, and is accomplishing a work which it is absolutely necessary someone should accomplish. I am glad to note that there is no apparent break between Mr. Bryan and the president."

Mr. John J. Simmons says: "I have not always agreed with Mr. Bryan's political views, but in this case I can not see why every patriotic citizen should not unqualifiedly endorse his position. Mr. Bryan is more correct now than in any position which he has taken since he first made his entrance into public life. I was delighted with the lecture, which exceeded my expectations. The sentiment of universal peace is a noble one, and warfare belongs only to antiquated ages. It is a relic of barbarism, and the people of this country for the most part, I believe, regard it as such."

M. W. Florer, president Dallas Press club, says: "I consider the lecture by William Jennings Bryan on Saturday night the best of any that I have had the pleasure of hearing him deliver. I am heartily in accord with his views on peace. He was at his best, and certainly pleased his audience exceptionally well with his subject. The members of our Press club are congratulating themselves at having given to Dallas such an interesting and successful affair."

N. T. Blackwell, editor Cotton Oil News, says: "I consider it a most masterful plea for peace, and an unanswerable argument against preparedness as urged by the satellites of those who have battleships and munitions of war for sale. His resignation from the cabinet has proven an assistance rather than a burden. He can serve the administration far better by going to the people with his great message, than he could as a member of the cabinet."

George McBlair, representing the Texas National democratic convention committee, says: "I am inclined to the belief that the cordial reception which was given Col. Bryan both at Hillsboro and at Dallas has been gratifying to the great Commoner."

### IMMIGRATION DECREASES

A Washington dispatch, dated Sept. 25, says: The United States department of labor has just issued a statement which shows strikingly how the war in Europe has interfered with immigration.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the number of immigrants reaching this country from Europe was less than one-fifth of the number that came during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, which was prior to the war. The tide of immigration from Europe fell lower during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, which was prior to the war. The tide of immigration from Europe fell lower during the last fiscal year than at any time since 1899.

The following table shows how European immigration has sloughed off during the war period, the comparison being for the fiscal year, 1914, and the fiscal year 1915:

	1914	1915
Austria . . . . .	134,831	9,215
Hungary . . . . .	143,321	9,296
Belgium . . . . .	5,763	2,399
Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro	9,189	1,403
France, including Corsica . . . . .	9,296	4,811
German Empire . . . . .	35,734	7,799
Italy, including Sicily, Sardinia	263,738	49,688
Russian Empire and Poland . . . . .	255,660	26,187
Turkey in Europe . . . . .	8,199	1,008
England . . . . .	35,864	21,562
Ireland . . . . .	24,688	14,185
Scotland . . . . .	10,682	4,668
Wales . . . . .	2,183	1,007

The total number of immigrants from all of Europe during the fiscal year 1915 was only 197,919, as against 1,058,391 during the fiscal year 1914. The number of immigrants from the German Empire was only about one-fifth of the number that came in the year before the war started, while the immigration from Austria and Hungary dwindled to about one-sixteenth of its former volume. England's continued mastery of the seas is reflected in the immigration statement.

The unanswerable reply to the contention that the United States should adopt the Swiss method of universal military training is that this country is not so located that it is necessary for its citizens to be prepared upon short notice to defend its borders from armed invasion by a neighbor. And without that menace being constantly before the people it would be impossible to enforce such an order in a real democracy.