

globe. Without it we shall soon be everything which is the direct reverse."

Jefferson writing to Madison said:

"If it remains much longer in its present state of imbecility we shall be one of the most contemptible nations on the face of the earth."

And Hamilton said:

"There is scarcely anything that can wound the pride and degrade the character of an independent nation which we do not experience."

The result of this deplorable state of anarchy was that Washington with other idealists advocated:

1. An indissoluble union of all the states under a single federal government, with power of enforcing its decrees.

2. That the people must be willing to sacrifice some of their local interest to the common weal; must disregard their local prejudices and regard one another as common citizens of a common country with identical interests in the truest sense.

#### THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

This international anarchy, the common danger and general disorder of the country, finally moved certain leading men in the different states—most of them, including Washington, of that class known as idealists, of whom some of what Bacon calls the "seeming wise" statesmen speak so flippantly—who appreciated the danger of the situation, to actively confer and finally arrange for the different states to send representatives to consider and discuss the situation. These representatives came together in a convention at Philadelphia, known as the constitutional convention, and, after much debate, prepared and submitted to the states for adoption the constitution of the United States.

This constitution was finally adopted by the states, though its adoption was not by all of them at once. By its adoption individual nationalism was abandoned and refuge and safety sought and found in the ark of collective nationalism and a league of nations. This was achieved primarily through a revival and reorganization of the old friendship and friendly co-operation based upon common ideals of ordered freedom, which brought these states, when colonies, together to fight the Revolutionary war.

Under this collective nationalism provided by the constitution, that friendship between the states has grown and solidified until through more than a century of peace and liberty this league of nations has grown to be the most powerful, the most intelligent, the most human, the most kindly, the most reasonable, and the most united people in the world, while Europe under continued unregulated individual nationalism has fallen prey to anarchy. And the chief magistrate of this league has been called and has gone to this European political hospital to attempt to bind up the wounds and restore the mangled and broken remains of its political body, where he has been and is daily being greeted with enthusiasm and kindness almost amounting to affection by the peoples of these nations and their statesmen and rulers, because he is the acknowledged enemy of individual nationalism and the spokesman of a collective nationalism which will prevent a return to the old order and thereby establishing a guarantee of peace.

#### PRINCIPLE WORKED SUCCESSFULLY HERE

It is but to look on one picture of Europe, and then upon the other of the United States, for even a wayfaring man to reach an intelligent conclusion. This league of nations job has been done once successfully, why can it not be done again? The principle has been tried and has worked successfully here; why can it not be applied and made to work successfully elsewhere? The units to be assembled for the structure are the same elemental human traits of friendship, hope, love of peace, and yearning for ordered freedom which are the fundamentals, that when organized, will form the framework of a league of nations.

Instead of holding back and speculating about whether and how this league can be formed we should "go to it" and tackle the job. If Columbus had tried first to fully satisfy himself of the success of his undertaking he would never have made the venture and discovered America. If the delegates from the colonies which met in Philadelphia before the Revolutionary war had waited to satisfy themselves of the result, or work out the details, they would never have fought and won that war, would never have issued the Declaration of Independence. Nor would those other delegates who met

after that war in the constitutional convention at Philadelphia to consider a remedy for the deplorable conditions of anarchy then existing among the original states ever have constructed the constitution of the United States.

Something had to be done, and done at once, and they did it. They backed their knowledge and judgment of the past, as well as the possibilities which inhered in the facts of human nature, and the ideals of the people, and went promptly and boldly forward to the accomplishment of the task that proved to be the greatest enterprise of all time. Civilization is born of the experience of men, and is perfected by experience, as are all human institutions.

These framers of our constitution and first great league of nations had but a flickering light from out the past to guide their efforts. We, however, have for our guidance the great headlight of their example, and the success of their work, our own league of nations. We have only to apply and suitably adjust to the world the human principles which its founders used in building our constitution. The word constitution comes from two Latin words, con, "together," and statuens, "placing," meaning "placing together, setting up, as in a frame or body of essential parts."

Let us examine the human principles in the constitution, quoting its preamble. Read it with care, weighing each word:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do hereby ordain and establish this constitution of the United States."

#### BUILD WORD CONSTITUTION

With these human principles, supported by the yearnings for peace which come to us on winged voices from the uttermost parts of the earth, as an incentive, build your world constitution, your league of nations, as Washington, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Sherman, and the other great idealists, enemies of doubt and doers of deeds, built the constitution of our country.

What is good for the whole is good for every part, the common good reacts, and each part is benefited by the welfare of the whole. Friendliness and goodness in person or nation are the immediate jewels of their souls. Their grow with practice and nourish themselves. A nation without friendliness and goodness is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing, a thing for treason and spoils, and is already diseased and doomed.

There was never a change for the better in human affairs and government that good and wise men were not found to oppose it, and to prophesy disasters which never happened, for time is humorously reckless of the reputations of prophets. It is our limited vision and uncertain thoughts, controlled too often by words, that people our mental darkness with hobgoblins and spectres.

The real government will not be permanent unless it rests upon ideals. The world must not compromise with this situation. Some one has said that compromise was "a good umbrella but a poor roof." It is a temporary expedient and almost sure to be unwise statesmanship. Government becomes more nearly perfect as it approaches Christianity.

In conclusion let me quote from Lincoln, who once said with his uncommon sanity: "I haven't much opinion of a man who isn't wiser today than he was yesterday."

#### BRYAN STANDS BY WILSON

William Jennings Bryan, in a statement given to the press, makes it clear that he stands on the same platform with President Wilson and former President Taft in support of the league of nations. He suggests amendments to the proposed covenant that would preserve specifically the Monroe doctrine, enlarge the proportionate voting power of the United States and make it clear that each member nation might decide for itself whether it would support the decrees of the League's general council. While pointing to imperfections, Mr. Bryan urged that they should not be allowed to lead to rejection of the plan, not be allowed to lead to rejection of the plan, declaring that risks to be run in accepting the league were less than those involved in rejection and returning "to the old ways of blood and slaughter." He said that the league idea, "the greatest step toward peace in a thousand years," was taken from the thirty arbitration treaties negotiated by the United States while he was

Secretary of State. It was not to be expected, he said, that so great an idea would be made perfect in detail in so short a time, and added that while President Wilson had done the best he could he would be helped by intelligent criticism from the American public.

While Mr. Bryan's suggestions in his opinion would improve the constitution of the league of nations, he does not make the imperfections that he finds a cause for its rejection by the United States. Unlike Senator Lodge, and those who agree with him, Mr. Bryan would if he were a senator, vote to accept the covenant, if it was presented to the senate in the shape it was given to the public.

The fact is, that President Wilson and other members of the peace conference were desirous to form a more perfect covenant. President Wilson said, when he presented the proposed constitution of the league to the Plenary Council in Paris for its consideration. "I can conceive that many of the decisions we make shall need subsequent alteration in some degree." When he landed the other day in Boston, one of the opening sentences of his address was, "I have come to report progress." When he met the Committee on Foreign Affairs of Congress at the White House dinner, he was quoted as saying that he "hoped the draft of the covenant would become effective without radical changes," and that he "did not expect that the league project would go through without change," although he feared, "amendment of its vital features would be difficult."

When the covenant was presented to the Plenary Council Lord Robert Cecil of Great Britain said it was "a good omen that this document had been laid before the world before being finally enacted, so that the people everywhere could advise upon and criticize it." Prime Minister Lloyd George, after a moving appeal for a remedy as against war, said, "I do not know that this will succeed, but if we attempt it the attempt will be a success."

Premier Orlando of Italy spoke of the birth of the right of peoples as having appropriately taken place in France, which was "a happy omen for beginning these debates." M. Bourgeois of the French delegation suggested two amendments, said: "We do not present this plan as something final, but only as the result of an honest effort, to be discussed not only by this conference but the public opinion of the world." Baron Makino of Japan, endorsing the plan, served notice that at the proper time he intended to present certain amendments which he hoped would receive favorable consideration. M. Lou Tseng Tsang of China expressed his country's desire to participate in future discussions, and M. Hymans of Belgium proposed an amendment.

Mr. Bryan says that the covenant as it is: "is the greatest step toward peace in a thousand years," just as President Wilson has in effect declared. Both Mr. Bryan and President Wilson are on record as believing that the covenant could be improved, and it will be improved if President Wilson can secure its improvement. Both these patriotic democrats are supported by former President Taft and are bitterly opposed by Senators Lodge, Penrose and Reed, and by other men and newspapers that are trying to defeat the approval of a league of nations by the senate.

These are destructive critics and will have no influence on the delegates to the peace conference. They are making the league of nations a foot-ball for politicians.

We have had admissions from representatives of all the great and two of the lesser powers that the covenant is to be discussed and possibly amended. Nobody claimed that it was either perfect or final. It was held that in its main features it would if adopted save the world from such another catastrophe as it has recently experienced. Yet some senators assailed the whole proposition with oratorical bludgeons. We have had few more shameful exhibitions of unthinkable partisanship and spleen in the United States than the venomous uproar which greeted the first practicable essay towards enduring peace.—Springfield, Ill., Register.

The law of supply and demand is not being enforced any better than the law against combinations in restraint of trade. During the war facilities for the production of steel in the United States were more than doubled. Yet you know where steel is. Why even the refusal of the railroad administration to place orders for needed replacement did not have any effect upon the price of the product!