

Russia and Italy in case of dispute. Why not adopt this course in regard to disputes with Germany, Austria and Belgium? Does any one doubt that we would with Belgium? Then why not with Germany and Austria? And, while the dispute is being investigated, is it too much of a concession to friendship to avoid new causes of dispute, by keeping Americans off of belligerent ships going into the danger zone?

3d. But suppose war can not be averted by a friendly diplomacy or by resort to the treaty plan, there is still a third way of escape. Friends, who desire to remain friends, postpone the final settlement of their disputes until their anger can cool, just as a court, in the interest of justice, adjourns trial until passion subsides. Why can not the settlement of disputes between nations be postponed until normal conditions are restored and calm deliberation is possible? Postponement would be almost certain to result in an amicable settlement. Would not that be better than war? Why should the nation allow itself to be forced into war to please militarists, manufacturers of munitions, or the jingo press that represents them?

If war must come, an unnecessary alternative, it is better to have it after this war is over—after we have helped to bring this conflict to a close, and when we could have the war with the one nation with which we have our dispute. To enter this war would be to take upon ourselves the support of European monarchs and the settlement of European quarrels. Surely no neutral American could want that nation to become a supporter of either side—a course which would not only sacrifice American lives on foreign soil, but which would sow among our own people discord which would for generations interfere with the progress of domestic reforms.

For nearly a year these views have, as opportunity offered, been presented to the President, the senate, the house and the country. Do you approve of them? If so, present them in your own language, and with such elaboration as you like to those who, as your representatives, speak for you on national questions. They desire to do what you want done. If you fail to inform them of your wishes you can not complain if a subsidized press misleads them by misrepresenting your views. If war comes you will be willing to make any sacrifice that your country may require—why not make an effort to prevent war? If peace is desirable, is it not worth while to try to preserve it? If you favor a diplomacy dressed in civilian's clothes and speaking the language of friendship—tell your representatives.

If you desire the thirty treaty plan applied to the dispute with Germany, say so to your representatives.

If you think American citizens should be kept off of belligerent ships going into the danger zone—so inform your representatives.

If you prefer postponement of the dispute, if necessary, to enlisting under the banner of a king, let your representatives know your views.

Write if you have the time to write; wire if the mails are too slow; but act at once, and continue to act until the danger of war is passed. A few cents now may save you the unspeakable horrors of this unparalleled war.

W. J. BRYAN.

THE FORD VOTE

There is no way of avoiding the significance of the Ford vote. It was an expression in favor of peace and a protest against war. Mr. Ford does not stand for any political issue; he is not identified with any economic reform. He stands for the ending of war in Europe and against a preparedness which would commit this country to the false philosophy of Europe.

A vote for Ford, therefore, can not be misunderstood, and it has already had a powerful effect upon both republicans and democrats. Mr. Ford organized his expedition to Europe in the hope of hastening peace there, without the thought of affecting the policy of this country on the subject of increased armaments.

But the unexpected has happened.

"God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform."

W. J. BRYAN.

If Great Britain had followed the example set by the United States government in dealing with confederate generals at the close of our civil war, she would not have aroused the enmities which she has by applying the methods recommended by the militarists of the world.

The Nebraska Primary

That the readers of The Commoner may know the facts, the following resume of the results of the Nebraska primary is submitted:

A prohibition amendment to the Nebraska constitution is to be voted upon next November. I advised against the submission of this amendment this year for two reasons, first because I believe it would be stronger two years hence, and second because I did not want attention diverted from national issues during the presidential campaign. My advice was not followed, however, and the issue being before us, I urged the democrats of Nebraska to take the side of prohibition, pointing out the growth of prohibition sentiment, and protesting against our party being made the champion of the brewery, the distillery and the saloon. Feeling that it was a matter of vital concern, not only to the party but to the state, I devoted nearly a month to the campaign—everywhere appealing to the members of both parties to nominate candidates committed to the amendment. This, of course, alienated the opponents of prohibition in both parties, and they retaliated by opposing my selection as delegate to the national convention—many wet republicans voting in the democratic primary to defeat me and my brother, Chas. W. Bryan, who, failing to find any prominent democrat willing to lead the fight, became a candidate for the democratic nomination for governor. The line was drawn on the prohibition issue and we were both defeated.

The vote for governor stood:

Neville, wet democrat 46,662
Bryan (Chas. W.) dry democrat 33,022

Wet majority 13,640

The vote for delegates stood:

Thompson, 47,556; Oldham, 43,159; Thomas, 42,283; Price, 41,153; Bryan (W. J.), 37,793; Piatti, 37,164; Cones, 30,819. It will be seen that I came fifth—with only four to be elected—falling 3,360 behind the fourth man. This shows that a majority of the democrats oppose the amendment, but the liquor influence is decreasing in the democratic party. When, six years ago, I endeavored to secure the indorsement of county option, I was defeated by a vote of more than three to one. Now, on a test vote, C. W. Bryan carried forty-one of the 93 counties, and received 41 1/2 per cent of the total vote cast for governor, IN SPITE OF THE WET REPUBLICANS WHO ENTERED THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARIES. I carried 65 counties for delegate.

When the liquor business is closed out in Nebraska, as it will be in November, the democratic party will again be united and ready to join the democrats of the south and west in the effort to make the nation dry.

The vote cast at the primary shows that the amendment has a substantial majority in the state. There were four dry candidates for governor, three of them republicans, and they received a combined vote of 99,176, distributed as follows: C. W. Bryan, (dem.) 33,022; Sutton, (rep.) 30,918; McKelvie, (rep.) 30,197; Madgett, (rep.) 5,039. There were three wet candidates whose combined vote of 75,108 was distributed as follows: Neville, (dem.) 46,662; Miles, (rep.) 20,020, and George, (rep.) 8,426. This gives the amendment an apparent majority of about 25,000, but as only about two-thirds of the total vote was cast, this majority should be increased by at least 12,500 more, on the full vote, and probably more, since the wets in the cities polled a larger percentage of their votes than the dries in the country.

The result, on the whole, is much more satisfactory to the friends of the amendment than to its opponents. As for myself, I was, as I told the voters in my speeches, much more anxious to see the amendment carried than I was to be a delegate, and my defeat has served to emphasize the truth of the statement which I made in every speech, namely, that the democratic organization was completely controlled by the liquor interests and that we could not hope to draw young men to our party until this domination was overthrown.

When the roll is called, Nebraska will be found on the side of the HOME as against the SALOON, and occupying her accustomed place on the firing line.

W. J. BRYAN.

"ROTTED SOULS"

Mr. Roosevelt is talking war again. This time he is giving the public his opinion of the American people—or rather that large portion that does not live on raw blood or satisfy its literary taste with jungle tales. In a preface to a book on the invasion of Belgium, he says:

"August 4, 1914, the issue of this war for the conscience of the world was Belgium. Now, in the spring of 1916, the issue remains Belgium. For eighteen months our people were bidden by their representatives at Washington to feel no resentment against a hideous wrong. They were taught to tame their human feelings by polished phrases of neutrality. Because they lacked the proper outlet of expression they grew indifferent to a supreme injustice.

"But today they are at last becoming alive to the iniquity of the crushing of Belgium. Belgium is the battle ground of the war on the western front. But Belgium is also the battle ground of the struggle in our country between the forces of good and evil.

"In the ranks of evil are ranged all the pacifist sentimentalists, the cowards who possess the gift of clothing their cowardice in soothing and attractive words, the materialists, whose souls have been rotted by exclusive devotion to the things of the body, and sincere persons who are cursed with a deficient sense of reality, and all who lack foresight or who are uninformed.

"Against them stand the great mass of loyal Americans, who, when they see the right and receive moral leadership, show that they have in their souls as much of the valor of righteousness as the men of 1860 and 1776.

"The literary bureau at Washington has acted as a soporific on the mind and conscience of the American people. Fine words, designed to work confusion between right and wrong, have put them to sleep. But they now stir in their sleep."

He did not demand war at the time Belgium was invaded, but the more he thinks about it the madder he gets. And to think that the only way to keep the soul from rotting is to kill somebody! If the Lord so made us that blood letting is necessary to keep us from becoming degenerates, why not repeal all laws against murder, so that men of Mr. Roosevelt's type may not be restrained by "conventional restrictions"? Wars are repulsive and, besides, it takes time to work up a first-class war, but ordinary homicide is cheap, or would be but for the law which enables a lawyer to collect a heavy fine in the way of a fee, even when the jury acquits. If any philosophy can rot a soul it is the Roosevelt philosophy that puts man on a level with the brute.

W. J. BRYAN.

TRUSTING THE ENEMY

It is unfortunate that on the question of fixing a time for independence, thirty democrats in the house should have chosen to trust the judgment of republicans who are opposed to Philippine independence under any circumstances.

The details of a policy should be agreed upon by friends of that policy. It is never safe to leave details to be determined by those who have no sympathy whatever with the policy.

While the fixing of a date is not absolutely essential to the declaration announcing the nation's purpose, still as a large majority of those favoring independence favored the fixing of a date, it would have been better if the minority had joined with the majority, instead of acting with the republicans at the risk of preventing any declaration whatever.

Now that the matter has been thrown into conference, it is of the first importance that the democrats should get together and present a united front in the support of the platform pledge promising independence.

W. J. BRYAN.

America first! To enter the European war would be to put the settlement of European disputes above the welfare of the American people. Beware of entangling alliances.