

TRUTH, JUSTICE **New York American Editorial Page** PUBLIC SERVICE

Saturday, September 1, 1917

The President Has Presented a Formula of Peace Terms Which Can Be Accepted by Every Self-Respecting Nation and Which Ought to Lead, and We Think Will Lead, to Early Negotiations

In his reply to Pope Benedict, the President has published to the world a formula of peace terms which should end the war, and which **WILL END THE WAR**, if the allied Governments show good sense.

The President's formula is this:

NO PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

NO DISMEMBERMENT OF EMPIRES.

NO ESTABLISHMENT OF SELFISH AND EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC LEAGUES.

EQUAL RIGHTS OF ALL PEOPLES — GREAT AND SMALL—TO FREEDOM AND SECURITY AND SELF-GOVERNMENT AND TO PARTICIPATION UPON FAIR TERMS IN THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES OF THE WORLD.

That is a programme which we most heartily indorse.

That is a programme which every reasonable man in America and in Europe will indorse.

That is a programme which every Government in Europe should indorse.

That is a programme which we believe every Government in Europe **WILL BE COMPELLED TO INDORSE**, whether it would or not, by the powerful pressure of the collective will of its own people.

To all intents and purposes Mr. Wilson has repeated his own formula of "Peace without victory"—the wisest of all his public utterances.

To all intents and purposes Mr. Wilson has repeated the basic proposals of Pope Benedict.

And we take pride in saying that to all intents and purposes Mr. Wilson has officially repeated the formula of peace terms which the Hearst papers, editorially, and Mr. Hearst, in signed statements, have constantly urged upon the warring Governments as the only possible bases of negotiation and of just and permanent peace.

We can see no essential difference between Pope Benedict's proposals and President Wilson's formula.

Both are in essence the formula of the Russian Democracy, the formula of peace without indemnities or annexations.

We are not concerned about discussion as to who began the war or how it began. That is a question for historians to decide—and they will doubtless be heatedly arguing the matter years and years after all of us are dead.

The vital question now is not how the war **BEGAN**.

The vital question now is how can the war be **ENDED**.

And that question the President has fairly and explicitly answered.

The war can be ended whenever all the belligerents agree to lay aside designs of conquest, agree to waive claims of indemnity, agree to establish no trade boycotts and agree that every people—great and small—shall be left to govern itself in its own way and to share equally in the economic opportunities of the world.

These propositions are the essence of justice and good sense.

Having met the expectant hope of sensible Americans by promulgating a perfectly sane and just formula of American terms of peace, the President should uphold this formula against the world—against the Central Empires and against the Entente Governments, if necessary, and the American people will back him up with every dollar and every life that is needed to make good our American terms.

Now we have ground upon which the whole American people can stand united for the first time since this war began across the sea.

We do not know what attitude those newspapers and public speakers who have abused and denounced us for maintaining that our Government ought to make a specific declaration of its objects and of the peace terms it desired Germany to accept will take toward Mr. Wilson, now that the President has taken the same view and has made a specific declaration of American demands and American terms of peace—and has agreed, word for word, with the terms advocated by the Hearst papers.

We suspect that none of these rabid journalists and street orators will go so far as to call the President a traitor, or to accuse him of being pro-German, though it is true that some of them did not hesitate to charge that Pope Benedict was secretly prompted to make his peace proposal by German influence.

But we assume that these inflamed and inflammatory gentry will draw the line at accusing the President of treasonable practices and of secret attachment to Germany, even though the President's formula of just and honorable peace terms is as like the peace terms urged by the Hearst papers as one pea is to another in the same pod.

When Pope Benedict issued his moving appeal for peace and stated the terms he thought just and honorable to all in almost the words repeatedly used by the Hearst papers, we can only reiterate that we are well content to be found in such company.

The policies advocated by the Hearst papers are matters of record.

In a signed statement which appeared in all of his papers on July 15, Mr. Hearst summed up his conceptions of a sensible and just and stable peace as follows:

"We are not fighting, or should not be fighting, for or against peoples, but for or against principles. We are fighting for democratic principles and against undemocratic principles. Therefore, we should fight against arrogance and oppression, annexation and aggression wherever we find these evils and undemocratic principles and purposes, and should not fight against them on the one hand and ally ourselves with them on the other hand."

"Our lofty and inspiring object should be to end this slaughter of the white races, this sacrifice of the white man's civilization, and to make peace on terms of justice and permanence and universal world welfare."

"Our object should not be to meddle in the internal affairs of foreign nations, to diminish the power and possessions of another arrogant and aggressive empire."

"Nor yet should our concern be so much in the empty forms of government as in the principles and purposes of government, in the objects and accomplishments of government."

"If we are fighting for democracy, let us fight with democracies for democratic objects. The people of Germany might fight FOREVER for the democratic right of themselves to determine their own form of government, but how long will the people themselves fight for the undemocratic object of a peace based on aggression and oppression?"

"How long, too, would a selfish and stupid Imperial Government in Germany last which insisted upon maintaining its policies of personal aggrandizement against the definite democratic benefit to the German people of an assured peace without annexation or indemnity and the certain democratic right to conduct their own governmental affairs according to their own concern and conscience?"

"The Kaiser's arrogant terms of no peace without annexation and indemnity should mean and would mean the loss of his throne."

"Therefore, let the great Republics of the United States and Russia, upon which the determination of this war absolutely depends, demand that both the Empire of Germany and the Empire of England make peace without annexation or indemnity; and let the United States alone, out of her great wealth, restore France and rebuild Belgium at a lesser cost, whatever it might be, than the cost of war, and with the saving of the priceless lives of her own dear sons."

"This would be a genuinely democratic programme based

on fundamental democratic principles and offered by the greatest of democratic nations.

"It would voice the views and stir the souls of the peoples of every country."

"It would bring about an immediate peace and a permanent peace based upon justice and equality and the rights of man."

"The sincerity of such a programme and the beneficial results of its accomplishment would convincingly demonstrate the truth and virtue of democracy and glorify it in the minds and enthroned it in the hearts of all the people of the world."

In these paragraphs we have quoted, Mr. Hearst specifically advocated **EVERY ESSENTIAL SPECIFICATION** of acceptable peace terms set forth by Pope Benedict and by President Wilson.

The establishment of every people's rights to freedom and self-government, no punitive damages, no annexations, no indemnities, the restoration of stricken countries, equal rights to the free use of the seas, and to access to the world's market, and the right of the **PEOPLES**, instead of the **GOVERNMENTS**, to decide the question of war or peace—these are all embodied in the proposals of the Pope and the reply of Mr. Wilson, and these were **ALL** advocated and urged by Mr. Hearst in his personal statements and arguments and advocated and urged editorially by Mr. Hearst's newspapers, by his expressed and reiterated directions.

When the policies we have advocated are thus indorsed and adopted by the head of the Catholic Church and by the Protestant President of our own Republic, we feel that our motives and our judgment and our policies have indeed received the most noble vindication that was ever accorded to a public journal in the history of the world.

We rejoice greatly that the President has thus made plain to mankind that, so far as the United States is concerned, the Central Empires can have peace without indemnities or loss of territory or surrender of their right to regulate their own internal affairs and to govern themselves as they choose, provided they will accord the same, fair treatment to others. And if the allied Governments refuse to agree to these terms, if Germany signifies its acceptance, it would be evident to all the world that the real objects of the allies were conquest and spoliation and that the United States had no place in a war waged only for the selfish purpose of giving England possession of Germany's African colonies and of Mesopotamia and Syria and Palestine and of dividing between the other allies strips of German and Austrian territory, or a concession in China, or of islands scattered here and there upon the seas.

Our Government would have no right to spend American wealth and American lives in such a quarrel as that, nor would the American people long submit to having their wealth and their lives so misspent and so wasted to such base ends.

But the President has lifted our war above such a low level with his fine declaration of our terms of peace.

There is not a word of the peace formula to which a self-respecting nation cannot subscribe.

It proposes no humiliation of any nation, no robbery of any nation, no destruction of any nation.

It proposes mutual restoration, mutual fair play, mutual observance of national rights, mutual justice and a cessation of war with mutual honor to the arms of all.

Again we say that we heartily indorse and applaud the President's message to the nations.

Again we say that we are well content to be found in such company.