

these treaties with us—Great Britain, France, Italy and Russia. Great Britain and France signed on the 15th day of September, 1914, a month and a half after the war began, and Russia signed on the first of October, two months after the war began. Italy signed before the war commenced. Three belligerent nations—Germany, Austria and Belgium—have endorsed the principle but have not yet signed treaties. Germany was the sixteenth nation to formally endorse the principle embodied in these treaties. My contention is this, that if this plan was good enough to offer to all the world—and we have never withdrawn the offer—if it was good enough to be embodied in the treaties we have made, and to be endorsed in principle by the other nations that have not yet signed treaties, it is good enough to use with any nation before we go to war with that nation.

If we use the treaty plan and it fails to bring a peaceful settlement, or if we fail to use the treaty plan and reach a time when we must decide either to go into this war or to postpone final settlement of the dispute until the war is over; if we are compelled to choose between these two alternatives, I believe it will be the part of wisdom TO POSTPONE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE UNTIL AFTER THIS WAR IS OVER. In suggesting this I am simply applying to international affairs a principle that is applied in our courts every day. Our courts postpone hearings in the interest of justice, and if, by postponing the final settlement of a dispute until this war is over, we can secure a settlement without war, I think it is worth postponing. The only difficulty we have had in regard to any dispute with either side has been the fear of the EFFECT OF THE SETTLEMENT ON THIS WAR. When this war is over, that difficulty will be removed and I think the chances are many to one that we can reach a settlement without a resort to arms.

But there is another contingency which should be considered. Suppose it were impossible or were believed to be impossible to secure a settlement after the war without a war; suppose the question were simply this, that we must have a war to settle the dispute and that the only thing we had to decide was whether we would have it now, while this war is on, or after this war is over. If we were compelled to choose between those two alternatives, I believe it would be the part of wisdom to have our war after this war is over. Why? In the first place, we would still have on our side the POSSIBILITY of a peaceful settlement after the war was over. Second, we would be free to act as mediator and help to bring this war to a close before we entered our war; and, third, if we have to have a war, it will be our war with the single nation with which we have the dispute and we can have something to say about when to go into it and when to come out and the terms of the settlement; but if we go into this war, it is not our war, it is everybody's war; if we go into it, we can not come out till the others do and while there we must fight for the things they fight for, and God forbid that this nation shall ever entangle itself in the quarrels of the old world or put an American army and an American navy at the command of a European monarch to be used in settling his quarrels with other European monarchs. The first point, therefore, that I ask you to consider is this, that we shall not go into this war. I shall not attempt to present all the reasons, I shall simply present three and those very briefly.

The first is that we can not go into this war without imposing a very heavy burden upon many generations yet unborn. If we go into this war, we can not go in in a stingy way or as a miserly nation. If it is manly to go in, it will be manly to play a man's part and be prodigal with men and money. If we judge the possibilities in regard to our expenses by what has already occurred in Europe, we must know that we can not possibly take part in this war without contracting an enormous war debt. In less than two years the countries now at war have added to the war debts of the world a sum about equal to all the war debts that had come down from all the wars of history until this time.

In the second place no man can tell how many men it would cost us. If we go into it, what will be our quota? One hundred thousand men? It would be more likely to be half a million or a million. If I know the sentiment of the American people, they are not willing to make this sacrifice in either blood or money for any cause that has arisen in our disputes, with either side thus far.

The third objection is, that we would forfeit an opportunity that never came to any other

nation before, since time began. We are the greatest of the neutral nations; we are the nation to which the world is looking to act as mediator when the time for mediation comes. If we go into this war, no matter what the cause, no matter what the excuse, no matter what the pretext, we step down from that high position and turn over to some other nation this unprecedented opportunity.

And more than that, we are next-of-kin to all the nations that are at war. They are blood of our blood; they are bone of our bone; not a soldier boy falls on any battlefield over yonder but what the wall of sorrow in his home finds an echo at some American fireside, and these people have a right to expect that we will remain the friend of all, and in God's good time play the part of friend.

Some nation must lift the world out of the black night of war into the light of that day when peace can be made enduring by being built on love and brotherhood, and I crave that honor for our nation; more glorious than any page of history that has yet been written will be that page that will record our nation's claim to the promise made to the peacemakers.

This is the day for which the ages have been waiting. For 1900 years the gospel of the Prince of Peace has been making its majestic march around the world and the philosophy of the Sermon on the Mount has become more and more the rule of daily life. All that remains is that this moral code shall be lifted from the level of the individual and made real in the law of nations; and this, I believe, is the task that God in His providence has reserved for the American people. And now—how much time have I left?

The Chairman: Well, I have followed you and not the time.

Mr. Bryan: Thank you—a very gracious rejoinder.

Let me say just a word about the false philosophy, as I regard it, that some ask this country to adopt. We have in this country a propaganda for what they call preparedness. It ought not to be called preparedness; it is unfortunate that a word with such a distinguished lineage and such high character should be dragged down to so base a use. It does not accurately describe it, because there are two kinds of preparedness, and those who ask you to adopt ONE kind have no right to insist upon monopolizing the meaning of that word. The question is how best to prepare against war. My objection to the plan which is suggested and described by that word preparedness, as it is used by the friends of large appropriations, is that it will not prevent war but will provoke war, and in proof of this, I point to the fact that the war in Europe was preceded by a period of preparation such as the world never knew before. If preparedness would prevent war, there would be no war in Europe, for they had spent money lavishly preparing. One side prepared on land and the other side on sea. Why did the side that prepared on land not prepare on sea? Because it thought preparation on land was more effective. And why did the side that prepared on sea not prepare on land? Because it thought preparation on sea was more effective. Each thought it was prepared, and when the war began, those best prepared went in first; after them others followed as they could prepare, and if we had been as well prepared as some now ask us to be, we would, I believe, be in the war today, shouting for blood as lustily as any of them.

This false philosophy that has brought Europe into this war will, in my judgment, bring into war any nation that adopts it. Europe has built its hope of peace upon a false foundation, upon the foundation of force and fear; the only hope of peace that these European nations have had rested in the belief that each could terrorize the other into peace.

It is a false philosophy; if you want to see how false it is, try it on a neighborhood. The big questions between nations are settled by the very same rules that we apply to neighborhoods. I will show you what this philosophy is, and then you can judge whether it can be expected to bring anything else except war.

Suppose nearby you have two farmers living side by side, good farmers, well-meaning farmers who wanted to be friends, and suppose they tried to maintain peace on the European plan, how would they go at it? One would go to the nearest town and buy the best gun he could find, and then he would put a notice in the paper saying that he loved his neighbor and that he had no thought of trespassing upon his neighbor's rights; but that he was determined to defend his own rights and protect his honor at any cost, that he had secured the best gun in the

market and that if his neighbor interfered with him, he would shoot him. Then suppose the neighbor went to town the next day and got him a better gun and, with the same frankness, consulted the newspaper and put in a similar notice explaining that he loved peace as well as his neighbor did but that he was just as determined to defend his own rights and protect his honor and that he had a better gun than his neighbor and that, if his neighbor crossed his line, he would kill him. And suppose then the first man, when he read that notice, went to town and got two guns and advertised that fact in the paper, and the second man, when he read it, went to town and got three guns, and so on, each alternately buying guns. What would be the result? Every undertaker in that vicinity would go out and become personally acquainted with the two men, because he would know there would be at least one funeral in that neighborhood. That is the European plan. One country gets a battleship and announces that it can blow any other battleship out of the water; then a rival nation gets a dreadnaught that can sink the battleship; then the first nation gets a super-dreadnaught; then they go to the dictionary and look for prefixes for the names of their battleships as they build them larger and larger; and they make guns larger and larger and they equip armies larger and larger, all the time talking about how much they love peace and all the while boasting that they are ready for a fight.

Go back to the time when they commenced to pass laws against the carrying of concealed weapons and you can get all the material you want for a speech on preparedness, because the arguments made in favor of carrying revolvers can be put into the speeches made today in favor of preparedness, without changing a word. Did you ever hear of a man who wanted to carry a revolver to be aggressive? No, it was just to protect his rights and defend his honor, especially his honor, but they found by experience that the man who carried a revolver generally carried with it a disposition to use it on slight provocation and a disposition to provoke its use by others. For the promotion of peace, every state in this union has abolished preparedness on the part of individuals because it did not preserve peace. It provoked trouble, and unless we can convince ourselves there is a moral philosophy applicable to nations that is just the opposite of the moral philosophy applied to individuals, we must conclude that, as the pistol-toting man is a menace to the peace of a community, so the pistol-toting nation is a menace to the peace of the world.

That is my view of this philosophy and I remind you that the concessions that the President has made are not to be taken as the measure of this preparedness program, neither are the concessions made by congress. When you discuss preparedness as a program, you must take the program that is presented by the military and naval experts; namely, two billions to get ready with and a billion and more than fifty millions to keep ready with. That is four times what we are now spending.

Our military and naval experts tell us that we must now add to what we are already spending on the army and navy, to get ready for imaginary wars, a sum equal to the entire amount that we spend for the education of all the children of this country.

This is the program and it is only intended to get us ready to compete with the navies and armies of the world AS THEY NOW ARE. But do we not know that, the moment we start out to thus vastly increase our preparedness, the other nations must enlarge their preparations because we do? And then we must increase ours because they do. If they can scare us when they are not preparing to fight us, can we not scare them when we do prepare? And if we scare them and make them prepare, will not that scare us some more and make us prepare more; and won't we scare them again, and they us again, and we them again, etc? Where is the end except bankruptcy? The plan they now propose is a plan that would enormously add to the taxes of the country and would, in my judgment, make this nation a menace to the peace of the world. The question we have to decide is whether we shall adopt the false philosophy that has led the whole world into war, or whether we shall improve this supreme opportunity to appeal to the world to adopt a different philosophy. Never in 1900 years have the Christian people of the world had such an opportunity as they have today. Nineteen hundred years ago Christ and Pilate stood face to face. Pilate represented force; Christ represented love. Force triumphed; they nailed Christ to the tree and those who

(Continued on Page 13)