

more insistent, strengthens the opposition to the expenditure of seven hundred millions a year in preparations for war, while the peace sentiment of the country revolts against a system based on the theory that war is a necessary part of civilization.

Fifth—The profiteer will receive particular attention, especially if the issue is accentuated by failure of the Republicans to deal with the question satisfactorily. Some party must take the people's side against the middlemen, and the Democratic party is in a better position than the Republican party to do so, because the latter contains most of the profiteers.

The following remedies have been suggested, increasing in severity: First, A trade commission in each state and in each community empowered to investigate; second, the disclosure of profit on each article sold, and, third a limitation of profits, as in the case of interest on loans.

The convention is likely to deal with the profiteer also in dealing with the soldiers' bonus, which can be most easily collected by a tax on war profits.

Sixth—The convention will have to deal with the subject of private monopoly.

It is the most permanent domestic issue and the beneficiaries of all the favor-seeking corporations are massing under Republican leadership to oppose government ownership in any and every form. The Democratic party must ultimately become the champion of government ownership of all NATURAL MONOPOLIES but the corporation controlled press has so grossly misrepresented the experience of the government under war control that the opponents of private monopoly may have to content themselves with holding the ground already occupied, leaving the advance to be made by future conventions. But the Democratic convention will at least reiterate the doctrine already embodied in four national platforms; namely, that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Seventh—The labor question will receive the attention due it. The Democratic party will insist upon the toilers right to equal treatment. He is not only a citizen but he is an indispensable part of our industrial machine. He should be a WILLING WORKER if he is to give to society his maximum effort. He must feel that he is receiving justice. He must be welcomed as a co-worker and dealt with as a brother in the matter of wages, terms and rights.

Eighth—The farmer also has grievances; his interests can not be made subordinate to the claims of the commercial classes.

Ninth—The Democratic party has already entered upon a good roads program and will extend it. I hope it will extend it sufficiently to endorse a National Peaceway connecting all the states.

Tenth—I am hoping for a plank pledging the party to the advocacy of a government bulletin—not a newspaper, but a bulletin—under bipartisan control, which will give the voters, for a nominal subscription price, information as to issues before the country with the reasons advanced on both sides of each issue.

Eleventh—Woman suffrage will be indorsed, with congratulations if the amendment is ratified before the convention—with a pledge of support if ratification is not then complete.

Twelfth—Prohibition cannot be ignored. The wets want a plank condemning the prohibition amendment, but it is quite certain that before the convention assembles, they will find their case hopeless. They will then try to prevent any declaration on the subject, pledging for the "harmony" to which they would be indifferent if they could secure a wet plank. But they will not deceive any one.

The dries will insist upon a declaration in favor of the prohibition amendment which has been ratified by every Democratic state and by all but three of the Republican states. They will also insist upon an indorsement of the enforcement law, supported by more than two-thirds of congress.

The convention fights are likely to be over the treaty, the profiteer and the liquor traffic, with the chances in favor of ratification with reservations, and against the profiteer and the saloon.

W. J. BRYAN.

ABE MARTIN SAYS:

I wuz just thinkin' about the old Bryan banquet—wild lettuce an' try-colored ice cream.

Mr. Bryan on the Mandate

Any mandate is impossible. The one proposed for Armenia, if accepted, would involve us in an enormous expenditure in a time when war taxation is still so grievous a burden that Congress has difficulty in finding the money necessary to do justice to the men who served in the world war.

It would involve us in the politics of Europe, and would compel us to deal with implacable race hatreds.

It would involve us in the fierce commercial rivalry of the big nations.

But, worst of all, it would compel us to surrender a vital principle of democracy—namely, that all people are capable of self-government.

Nearly one hundred years ago Henry Clay set forth the American view on this subject in dealing with aspirations of South American republics. Referring to the old contention of monarchists that subject peoples were incapable of self-government, Clay declared it to be a reflection on the Almighty to assume that He would create peoples incapable of self-government and leave them to be the victims of kings and emperors.

All the colonial exploitation of helpless peoples is defended on the theory of their incapacity for self-government. We cannot indorse this theory. It would be injurious to the Armenians, instead of a kindness, to affirm or admit them incapable of self-government. If it were once admitted, they would never be permitted to outgrow the presumption of incapacity, because consent to their independence would encourage other subject peoples to ask for independence.

Christianity does not require us to abandon our ideas of government or to adopt monarchical forms in rendering aid to suffering peoples. American ideas are entirely consistent with Christianity.

We can recognize the independence of the Armenian republic and send as minister to Armenia a man who has faith in democracy and who believes that governments should rest upon consent of the governed. He can advise with Armenian officials when they desire advice and help them as a friend. We can be of much more service to them in this way than we can by exercising authority over them. Then, if we will ratify the treaty and enter the league of nations as the friend of all the little countries and insist on universal disarmament, we may be able to make the world safe for democracy—even for democracy in Armenia.

RATIFY AND DISARM

On another page will be found a computation made by the statistician of the National City Bank of New York, showing that the world's issue of paper money has increased from 7 billions before the war to 40 billions during the war and to 56 billions since the armistice. The debts of the world have increased from 40 billions in 1913 to 265 billions in 1920. The ratio between the gold coin of the world and the paper currency has fallen from 70 per cent to 12 per cent, and yet there are those who would continue the old program of force and terrorism.

The only hope of the world lies in the success of the League of Nations, and delay in ratification only decreases its power to save the world from war. The Republican party may be willing to wait, but the Democratic party can not afford to share responsibility for the chaos that may engulf the world while senators wrangle over the phraseology of reservations that are insignificant in importance as compared with the remedies embodied in the undisputed provisions of the league.

There are three provisions which have been accepted by everyone. The first provides time for deliberation and machinery for investigation before a resort of war; the second abolishes secret treaties; the third looks toward universal disarmament. Why not accept AT ONCE the reservations favored by the majority and make afterwards in the league any changes that may be thought necessary. Why not proceed to DISARM THE WORLD, reduce taxation and build universal peace on the spirit of brotherhood?

The laborers of the world plead for peace and brotherhood; they want the burden of militarism

lifted from their shoulders. The farmers of the world groan beneath the weight of guns and battleships; they cry out for relief. Business suffers, and the churches unite in the demand for immediate ratification and disarmament. Only the politician wants delay. Shame on the man or party that would drag the treaty into the campaign. Let the majority rule. W. J. BRYAN.

MARSHALL MOURNING AT THE BEER

Vice-President's Marshall's bid for the wet vote is ludicrous. He seems to think that the cause of the saloon needs RESPECTABILITY, and he offers himself in a religious garb. Speaking to the State Bar Association of Virginia recently, he declared himself "an old-fashioned, dyed-in-the-wool, local self-government, predestination Presbyterian Democrat, bottled in bond and guaranteed to be pure."

He announced that he was a teetotaler and added: "So far as I am concerned I pray God that no man will ever again take a drink of intoxicating liquor but the states should handle this question rather than for Washington to legislate for the morals of the nation. If a secret vote had been taken on that amendment behind closed doors, it would not have received twenty votes in the United States Senate."

No wonder the Baptist convention, which he had recently welcomed to Washington, censured him for casting reflections on the senators who voted for prohibition. How fortunate that his vote was not needed.

The vice-president seems to have outlived his time. He harks back to a day that is gone. He seems to be willing to carry his religion into the bar-room to please the drinkers, but he can not carry the bar-room into the church; he can not even bring the bar-room back into the community. But what a spectacle! A vice-president attacking a prohibition amendment ALREADY ADOPTED AND A PART OF THE CONSTITUTION. For shame! W. J. BRYAN.

BRYAN WILL BE A BIG FACTOR

Whether people like it, or not, William Jennings Bryan is going to be a big factor in the Democratic National convention at San Francisco. It will not be at all surprising if he should duplicate his marvelous performance at Baltimore in 1912. Linked with his own personal following, which like the soldiers of Napoleon, would follow their leader through hell, the strength which will rally around Mr. Bryan as the bearer of the Prohibition standard alone would make Bryan a man to be both feared and courted in the proceedings at the Golden Gate. That term "Golden Gate" will be apt to make Bryan smile. Away back in 1896, he cried out against crucifying mankind on "A Cross of Gold." In 1920 he will cry with glee as he nails his enemies at the Golden Gate. His wonderful eloquence, his mastery of platform psychology, his exhaustive knowledge of political precedents make him an almost invincible antagonist in a national convention. All his natural gifts are greatly enhanced by the present situation. In his opposition to the League of Nations without reservations he will have one set of delegates supporting him, in his fight for Prohibition he will have another set of delegates standing behind him—so at about every minute of the convention Bryan is quite apt to be the center of the contest. When Bryan laid him low in Nebraska, Senator Hitchcock said Bryan would "keep hell a-poppin at San Francisco, and it rather looks as if Hitchcock were right. Roger Sullivan is dead, Arthur Mullen has been defeated. And so Bryan's two most vitriolic enemies will not be in the fight to harass and annoy Bryan at Frisco. From the outset of the convention Bryan will have the moral issues. He has made them synonymous with himself, and back to him stand the great army of rigid church people—a mighty host on election day, no matter how sports may sniff or wets snort. His heart is in the fight, and he has the fiery zeal of a crusader. Then, too, he has always been in the forefront of the women's battle, and on a show-down today we think that Bryan has more shouting, fighting friends among women who take an interest in politics than has any other man in the country. Bryan may or may not be a candidate himself. We don't know. If he really is, the other aspirants have reason to tremble. If he is not, no man whom Bryan openly assails, can in any likelihood, be nominated at San Francisco.—Albany, N. Y., Times-Union.