

Asked for the reasons that induced him to take such an extreme attitude, patient summarized his views as follows:

I. THE GENERAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

(A) The purpose of war:

(1) It is claimed that the protection of one's country against possible invasion justifies military preparation. I agree that it is a natural and a worthy desire to protect one's country against evil. Facing the possibility of being invaded by armed forces, protection of some kind is imperative.

(2) In the event that invasion is not prevented, the citizens are confronted with the problem of defense. To defend one's country when it is attacked, is one of man's highest duties, for in defending your country you are defending your neighbor. It is claimed that adequate defense necessitates resort to arms. I believe in defense, but I will take issue with military defense under the proper heading.

(3) What may be termed a third purpose of war is the punishment of those who threaten our rights, as a means of future security.

(4) Father Macksey's essay on War in the Catholic Encyclopedia states, concerning the three points upon which dwelt in sub-headings 1, 2, 3: "The primary title of a state to go to war is: first, the fact that the state's rights -- either directly or indirectly thru those of its citizens -- are menaced by foreign aggression not otherwise to be prevented than by war; secondly, the fact of actual violation of right not otherwise reparable; thirdly, the need of punishing the threatening or infringing power for the security of the future." Then, defining what may be done in the pursuit of war, Father Macksey says: "It embraces the infliction of all manner of damage to property and life of the other state and its contending subjects, up to the measure requisite to enforce submission."

(B) The history of war:

(1) The history of man is a history of almost continuous warfare. As a Christian who claims that war is unchristian, I will divide history into three epochs, the first of which is that prior to the birth of Christ. Modern war cannot be validated by reference to Old Testament history, for the people of that era were living under a Theocracy. Father Macksey, S.J., in his essay on war cites an instance of inflicting punishment, stating: "God by revelation made the Israelites but executioners of His supernatural sentence; the penalty was within God's right to assign, and within the Israelites' communicated right to enforce. The natural law gives man the right to no such measure." God had the right, in Old Testament days, to order His creatures to go to war, and He did so. He has the right to order us to go to war in the 20th Century, but according to scripture He has ordered the opposite.

(2) It is significant that, during the life of Christ, He failed to advocate military defense of one's country. The argument "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" will be dealt with in its proper place, as other similar arguments will also be

dealt with. For the present, however, I wish to emphasize the fact that Christ's utterances recorded in the New Testament are devoid of statements permitting things military, but we do find that He condemned the use of the sword.

(3) The history of war since the death of Christ is a story of Christian slaughter -- Christians slaughtering Christians -- a series of butchery more revolting than the massacres of the early followers of Christ. Modern wars, as in the case of ancient warfare, are justified on the ground of necessity. I propose to prove that, among Christians, warfare is never necessary, regardless of what neighboring nations do or fail to do. I will prove, from the testimony of Christ that, in addition to being unnecessary, war defeats its purposes. Before presenting this evidence, however, other subjects must be disposed of.

(C) The maintenance of standing armies as a requisite of war, and the evils incident thereto:

(1) Creates a military leisure class, many of whom attempt to incite their country to war, for war brings them greater honors and more lucrative remuneration. These attempts to bring on war do not always prove futile. The officers in the American army numbered approximately 4,000 in the year 1916; they now number approximately 15,000. "The devil finds plenty of work for idle hands to do."

(2) The corruption of youth is appalling. I am unable to quote statistics, because the data I possessed is still withheld from me by the Fort Douglas prison officials. Statistics, however, are available to those not deprived of their liberty, and the figures warrant consideration of those interested.

(3) The withdrawal of virile producers from the workshop of the world, and placing them in the army, greatly interferes with the productiveness of nations.

(4) The burden of production is shifted from the young and sturdy onto the shoulders of the aged and decrepit; the latter are compelled to feed and clothe an idle army as well as themselves, in addition to providing military accouterments, arms, ammunition, etc., all of which is a wasteful expenditure of human energy and serves only purposes of destruction.

(5) A standing army is a constant temptation to profiteers, for when the army goes into action, the profits of munition makers are increased. The World War produced 17,000 new millionaires in America, enhanced the millions of those who already were millionaires, and added a goodly number of new near millionaires to Democracy's roll of honor.

(D) The effect of war:

(1) History proves that war does not protect us from attack.

(2) History is also generous in affording proof that war does not adequately defend. Germany would be better off today if she had never seen a soldier. The fate of Germany has been visited upon many nations in the past, and it will in future pay its

respects to the nations that follow Germany's blind example of trusting in the mailed fist as a means of defense. Christ said: "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit."

(3) As a means of future security, military preparation spells failure. There is not an instance in the world's history where so-called "preparedness" permanently secured a nation against attack. The greater the "preparedness" the greater the ensuing slaughter. The closest approximation to security by means of military preparation, would be to organize a force superior to that of all the other nations combined, which of itself is impossible, because nations usually keep pace with each other in the matter of armaments -- I am of course referring only to the larger nations; it is obvious that Norway could not compete with America -- and, even the one nation's force was superior to that of the rest of the world combined, that would not be a guarantee of security, for natural elements beyond the control of man often cause the defeat of a superior army.

(4) A victory of arms is not permanent. Germany was victorious in 1871, but the year 1918 reversed the situation. The history of war is a history of reversals. The Law of Compensation deals with nations as well as individuals.

(5) The success of George Washington is often pointed to in vindication of warfare. Washington succeeded in spite of warfare and not because of it. Unless Christ was a faker, it were better that America were born without resorting to the means that Christ condemned.

II. THE WORLD WAR.

(A) The reasons for and purposes of the World War:

(1) Surrounded by Russia on one side, naval England on another side, and France on another side, Germany believed that her foes conspired to destroy her, so she decided to strike first and strike fiercely in the hope of defending herself by an offensive so frightful that her enemies would become terrified and flee.

(2) Belgium's military preparedness served as a means of defending her neutrality when Germany attempted to cross her frontier. But "neutrality" and "preparedness" only checked Germany for a time, it did not stop her, the German legions went on and on.

(3) France and her allies -- exclusive of the United States -- were now in a death grapple with the Central Powers. Europe's decades of intense preparation did not prevent war, it only made it more horrible.

(B) The effects of the World War upon the U.S. until 1917:

(1) America watched and prayed -- and speeded up on "preparedness" for fear that God might not be at home when they prayed. Our commercial losses were infinitesimal as compared with the volume of and profit upon the new business incident to supplying Europeans with life's necessities and means of destruction while they fiendishly tore one another to pieces.

(2) Interference with America's rights upon the ocean was tolerated by all except the profiteers who wanted more war because

it meant greater profits. America maintained her balance, and President Wilson announced immediately after the Lusitania was sunk on May 7, 1915: "The example of America must be a specific example of peace."

(C) The attitude of the United States toward the World War until 1917:

(1) The attitude of the citizens generally was one of horror at the thought of the crime and the folly of the Europeans. Racial interest manifested itself among interested groups in the Melting Pot, but all shades of opinion insisted upon strict neutrality for America. At one time President Wilson said that he could not see how, by increasing the amount of slaughter, America would be able to settle matters any on the other side of the pond.

(2) The attitude of the powerful financial groups was one of continued insistence that America jump in and stop the fight, realizing by such a move their profits for some years to come would be secure, for, instead of "stopping the fight" they well knew that America's entrance would on the contrary prolong it.

(3) The attitude of the clergy was one of astonishment that, at this stage of civilization human beings should tear one another to pieces in pursuit of a fancied grievance. The clergy knew that one side was wrong, unjustified. There was a division of opinion concerning which side that was. President Wilson later on resolved this conflict for the clergymen and caused those who knew that England was wrong to urge young Americans to fight on England's side of the bloody controversy.

(4) The attitude of the government was, as in the case of all governments, one of expediency. On February 2, 1916, President Wilson said in a speech at Kansas City: "We can show our friendship for the world and our devotion for the principles of humanity better and more effectively by keeping out of this struggle than by getting into it." That was before election. Several months later, Mr. Wilson was reelected President because "he kept us out of war."

III. AMERICA'S DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST GERMANY AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PUBLIC REACTED TO THE DECLARATION.

(A) The attitude of the press:

(1) The capitalist newspapers were not at all backward in supporting their government in its departure from the straight and narrow path. Moreover, they warned probable opponents of serious difficulties. The capitalist press was unanimous in its support of the war, there were no slackers among the fold. The two -billion dollars that America had loaned to the Allies needed to be protected, and the "war for humanity" afforded ample protection provided it did not strike a rock.

(2) The conservative-labor newspapers, as is generally the case, did the bidding of their masters, and since their masters were greatly concerned about safeguarding that two-billion dollar loan in the interests of humanity, those so-called labor papers put forth their best efforts in support of the government.

(3) The liberal newspapers were at first divided in sentiment, and those that were opposed to the war were just a little

shy about expressing their opposition. Thru the usual methods, the owners of liberal newspapers were finally persuaded that the war was "necessary" and their mild opposition was turned into support.

(4) The radical newspapers -- practically all in the hands of non-religionists -- remained loyal, fought the battle of Christ in its material manifestation, and enjoyed the wrath of God's ministers. Many of these papers were unable to survive the secret and overt attacks of our "good" citizens and Christian officials, while such as The New York Call and The Milwaukee Leader succeeded in defying Moloch and yet living, altho the injuries sustained and the insults endured were enough to try the patience of Job.

(B) The attitude of the politicians:

Those who believed that the war was right, supported it as was proper. There were, however, a great number of office holders who knew that the war was unjustified and unchristian, yet they upheld it. A very dear friend of mine who holds a responsible position with the federal government said: "Good thing for me that I've got this job, otherwise I could not restrain myself. I would be denouncing this affair in such a manner that I would quickly land in prison." This man used to write essays on moral courage. I will say that he was less cowardly than many others, but the desire to hold on to their good political jobs resolved the mental conflicts of many who knew that the war was wrong, and they were careful to condemn the wrong in low tones and quiet places far removed from the throng that was being whipped into hysteria with falsehood and deceit.

(C) The attitude of the financiers:

These noble sires were quite complacent. The "war for humanity" would rescue the two-billion dollars that at one time appeared to be sprouting wings, and, moreover, this struggle for Democracy would not be very disastrous in a financial way; as previously mentioned, it produced many thousands of new millionaires and near millionaires. There may have been cases of financiers -- like Henry Ford for instance -- who knew that the war was wrong, but, as in the case of political jobs, the war profits served as a gentle restraint in some cases and in other cases may have helped to persuade one of the righteousness of the cause. I met a great many Christians in prison who had opposed the war, but they were poor men. If any of the rich Christians landed behind the bars because of loyalty to Christianity, they must have resided in one of the prisons that Uncle Sam forgot to guard.

(D) The attitude of the clergy:

It was a holy and just war, so the duty of the clergy was that of urging the young men of their flock to go forth and battle in this worthy cause. It did not seem to occur -- or if it did it was ignored -- that both sides could not be right, that one side must be wrong, that the clergy in both Germany and in America were goading their flocks to slaughter one another in stupid hate, whereas the remedy for the evil was not mere bullets but more love. My own pastor, Father Ryan, said: "Your brothers in Christ -- the Belgians -- need your help." But, he wanted me to slay other brothers in Christ -- the Germans -- in order to help the

Belgians. As I will illustrate under the proper caption, I could not help the Belgians in this manner, but would most certainly injure the Germans. If I am going to help one brother in Christ, I must not use an evil means, else he will ultimately be injured. This will be explained more fully in its proper place. After the manner of young ladies trying to dress nicer than their sisters and their lady friends, the clergymen were trying to outdo each other in lessons of "patriotism." With such blind leaders, it is no wonder that the blind stumbled.

(E) The attitude of the masses:

(1) The men who would not have to participate in the war were at first divided, many of them denouncing the outrage most vehemently. But the attitude of the press, the politicians, the financiers (employers), and the clergy soon won most of the dissenters over to satan's side, just as the leaders mentioned could win the masses over to Christ's side if they would attempt to do so.

(2) The mothers, sisters, wives and wives-to-be at first rebelled, but gradually the great majority of them succumbed to the wiles of the courting sex. At first defiant, they gradually receded and the first step backwards was one of acquiescence; next they became interested to the extent of wishing a safe place for Johnny since he just had to go. They were willing that he should go to the front line trench, but saw no need of it since he could serve so much better in other branches of the service. They began to denounce objectors to the war, for any opposition seemed to endanger the life of their loved one. Finally the women were satan's best recruiting agents.

(3) The lads to be used as cannon fodder had little to say, altho many of them seemed to do a great deal of thinking. A few boldly defied the government. But the vast majority prepared to make the best of a bad situation. Thousands volunteered in order to select their place of service, whereas, if they waited to be drafted they would have to take whatever they were assigned to. I talked with hundreds of those who volunteered, other hundreds who were drafted, and practically all were of one mind: "It is all wrong, but it's no use for us to try to buck the government." If the boy's relatives and friends and the clergy and the politicians and the financiers and the press were not lined up solidly against him, he might have sufficient courage to "buck the government."

IV. THE QUESTION OF SUBORDINATING ONE'S OPINION TO THAT OF THE MAJORITY.

(A) The history of majorities and minorities:

(1) George Washington was in the minority. The Abolitionists were at one time in the minority. The Prohibitionists were also a greatly detested minority at one time.

(2) In the religious field, we find that the greatest character in history was at one time so greatly in the minority that, His own disciples fled when the majority attacked.

(3) Science too, owes its birth to the Father of Progress. Suppose that Columbus and Marconi followed in the foot prints of the majority?

(4) We have observed that, in politics, religion, science, not majorities but minorities spell progress.

(B) The obligation of an individual to the State:

(1) As viewed by those who demand unconditional obedience:

(a) Religious authorities, such as Father Macksey, S.J., tell us that, the State has a right to declare war and that its citizens are in duty bound to defend the rights of the State with physical violence if necessary.

(b) Non-religious authorities, such as the Agnostic publication named "Truth Seeker," say: "Continued residence in any country must be held to imply a tacit agreement to obey its laws." I have quoted these words from an editorial in the Truth Seeker. In substance it declares: "When in Rome, do as the Romans."

(2) As viewed by those who recognize a limit of obedience to the State:

(a) Religious authorities, such as Father Fisher, S.J., tell us that, if Conscience decrees that the ordinances of God and the State conflict, God, not the State, must be obeyed.

(3) As viewed by the writer:

(a) In the case of religious authorities, I have noted that, Father Macksey's statement that a citizen should serve the State militarily in case of necessity, is nullified by his statement that, in case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for Church and State jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the State is excluded. Later, I will prove that, in the matter of war there is "direct contradiction."

(b) The "Truth Seeker" claims to stand "for absolute liberty, for a perfectly unfettered freedom of the human mind, which is now so cramped and chained by custom and creed." Blind obediences to the State will never free one from the chains of custom. Had there been a few million more conscientious objectors against war in Germany, and had they refused to obey the State, a certain Wilhelm could not have plunged the world into sorrow.

(c) My own views incline me to the belief that one should obey the State if the State orders him to do that which is good; but if the State orders that which is immoral, then the duty of the subject is disobedience. I will later on prove that war is immoral.

V. REASONS FOR OPPOSING CONSCRIPTION

(A) Because it makes a "scrap of paper" out of the Constitution which declares that there shall be no involuntary servitude.

(B) Because if there could be such an undertaking as a "just" war, conscription would be unnecessary.

(C) Because it is a dangerous weapon to place in the hands of government officials for the following reasons:

(1) By placing conscription at their disposal, you give the representatives of slave nations an advantage -- a military advantage -- over free nations, making it possible for the former to "bully" the latter, which often leads to war.

(2) In dealings with other nations where conscription is in vogue, both parties to diplomatic parleys often allow themselves

to depend upon the threat of armed conflict instead of persevering in diplomatic negotiations. Without conscription to rely upon, diplomats and rulers would exercise greater care in avoiding war.

(3) As a weapon of oppression at home:

(a) Mr. Charles T. Hallinan, Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism, informs us that Section 69 of the Wadsworth Army Reorganization Bill provides for conscription of all males between eighteen and forty-five whenever a national emergency is declared to exist. I understand that the passage of this bill will be considered after the coming election. It is almost certain of passage, for those that should oppose it are sleeping. Assuming that it becomes a law, peaceful discussion of public questions can be prevented by conscripts called to the colors in a "national emergency." Duly elected representatives can be prevented from taking office thru the same medium, in case the representatives should decide to press their claims a little farther than the expelled Socialists of New York and Congressman Berger of Milwaukee.

(b) Strikes can be crushed by conscripts as a "national emergency" the same as is done in France. This method can be used -- and perhaps will be used -- to prevent wage-earners from obtaining the product of their toil.

(c) Exploiters may exploit with impunity, and if the people rebel the conscripts can be called out as a "national emergency."

(d) The food hogs can dump produce into the river as was done a few weeks ago with eighty carloads of potatoes near Wilmington, Delaware, and if any attempt is made to prevent this wastage the conscripts will be used in the "national emergency."

(D) The final reason for opposing Conscription is because we were not allowed to vote upon it.

(1) Australia, which is not a free country, was allowed to vote upon conscription, not once but twice, and it was defeated both times.

(2) America, a so-called free country, would not allow its citizens to vote upon conscription because the politicians knew that it would be defeated.

(3) Because of the reasons stated, I for one felt it my duty to oppose conscription in the only manner left open for expression after the law breakers at Washington cut us off from the natural avenue of expression.

VI. SPECIFIC REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO THE WORLD WAR.

(A) Political or economic:

(1) The world's history proves that war benefits only the rich, that it injures only the poor. The War for Democracy produced 17,000 new millionaires in America.

(2) It is a well-known fact that wars are for commercial purposes and not in the interests of humanity. After the War for Democracy, President Wilson said at St. Louis on September 5, 1919: "The seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry. This war was a commercial and industrial war."

(3) A poor man cannot benefit from participation in a rich man's war for the same reason that a rich man cannot benefit from participation in a poor man's war.

(B) Humanitarian reasons:

(1) Mass slaughter is the very antipode of humanitarianism.

(2) The humanitarian believes in settling international disputes amicably, and nothing can be gained for his cause by surrendering himself to the temporary madness of a deceived populace.

(3) The needlessness of armies and navies in the handling of international ruptures is shown by way of contrast with cities within a state and states within a nation. If, for instance, the sovereignties composing the United States of America can get along without maintaining competitive armaments, nations can do likewise. There would however, be no need of an international policing system if the humanitarianism of Christianity prevailed.

(C) Religious reasons for opposition to war:

(1) Catholic authorities:

(a) A Catholic priest writing in the Nation of March 6th, 1918, page 296, declared that war is murder on one side at least. He said that during the World War, murder was being committed on all the battlefronts every day, and that those who killed violated the Fifth Commandment. He made it clear that, we cannot be certain which side is committing murder. I believe that both sides were committing murder. Still, granting that only one side was violating God's commandment, and not knowing what side that was, it became my duty to stay out of the game. America said that Germany was doing the murdering, and Germany said that America was doing the murdering. Which one was right? Both were right as I will presently show!

(b) In my main statement, I quoted from about twenty prayers that appear in a prayer book distributed by the Knights of Columbus, which prayers indicate the wrongfulness of war. In this summary I will mention only one: "Adorable Jesus, divine model of that perfection to which we should all aspire, I will endeavor to follow Thy example, to be mild, humble, chaste, zealous, patient, charitable and resigned, etc." Christ was anything but a warrior, and if He is the model to which we should all aspire, then we should not resort to physical violence, for He told us, in addressing Peter: "All that use the sword shall perish with the sword."

(c) Cardinal Gibbons says: "Of all the virtues that shine forth in the life of our Divine Saviour, there is none so prominent, none so conspicuous as His compassion for human suffering." Christ never expressed His compassion by means of the bayonet or cannon ball.

(2) Biblical considerations of religious opposition to war:

(a) Citations that seem to, but in fact do not, justify warfare:

(1) Christ's reference to "wars and rumors of wars"

was one of condemnation, not approbation. We find a parallel in that instance where Christ told us that scandals must come "but woe be the man by whom they come."

(2) "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" has a complement which reads "And unto God, the things that are God's." We know that Christ did not intend that we should do what is wrong if ordered to do so by the State, for that would imply that He advocated obedience to Caesar in case Caesar ordered the Christians to adore pagan idols.

(3) The obedience to superiors that is ordered in 1-Peter, 2:13 and Romans 13:1, 3, comes under the same limitations as the "Render unto Caesar" rule. That is: if the State orders a subject to do what is right, the subject should obey; but if the State orders the citizen to do what is wrong, the citizen should disobey just as the early Christians disobeyed the edicts commanding worship of the pagan gods.

(4) Christ's declaration "I came not to bring peace but a sword" is explained by a foot note in the Catholic bible to indicate that such would be the effect of Christ's doctrine because many would be persecuted for adherence to it; but, as the foot note makes plain, Christ did not intend any such evil any more than He intended that Judas should betray Him, that scandals should come into the world or that there should be wars and rumors of wars.

(5) In driving the money changers out of the Temple, Christ did not establish a sanction for war. He did not strike anybody. The chords that He brandished were evidently waved for the purpose of communicating His message to the cattle, etc., that would not understand an order to leave the Temple. Being the Temple of His Father, Christ was indignant because of its misuse, and He perhaps wished to display His wrath as an example of how He felt and would in future feel toward any desecration of the Temple. Considering the phrases mentioned, and the fact that the remainder of Christ's life was one of meekness, mildness, non-resistance, coupled with teachings that are the exact antithesis of warfare, one cannot excuse war upon the basis of what Christ did when He found the money changers diverting His Father's Temple into a den of commercialism.

(6) The instance where Christ told His disciples to buy a sword was evidently for the purpose of making certain that sword would be on hand when the time came to condemn its use, which happened shortly after. Christ would not have had to make certain in this manner, any more than He had to go thru formalities before restoring sight to a certain blind man, but the fact is He did tell His disciples to buy a sword and within a short time afterwards He rebuked Peter for using it and issued that solemn warning that will echo thru all ages: "All that use the sword shall perish with the sword." Nor can one justify modern warfare by reference to Old Testament wars, for, as Father Macksey has shown, the people at that time were living under a Theocracy, and God had a perfect right to order them to kill. We have had no such sanction since the time of Christ, no right to set aside the precepts of the Master.

(7) The statement "You can prove anything by the bible" is a colloquial fabrication that facts amply disprove. True,

the Old Testament and the New Testament contain antithetical philosophies, but, to avoid redundancy I will confine myself to the New Testament which contains the doctrine of Christianity, and I wish to affirm that these preachments blend in an harmony that will withstand the most piercing analysis.

(b) Citations that indicate the wrongfulness of war:

(1) Christ often reiterated the command to not kill.

(2) "Peace on earth to men of good will" is the antidote for war. This quotation is rendered differently in some non-Catholic bibles and reads thusly: "Peace on earth good will toward men." This latter phrase is, however, erroneous, so I will use the one that I first quoted, the one translated from the original manuscripts. So, to overcome an army we do not need an army; all that we require is good will and good works accompanying it.

(3) Christ told us that we should love our neighbor as we love ourselves, and He warned us that "this is the Law." Now, we do not love ourselves by having friends or enemies fill our bodies with bullets. Therefore, Christ forbids our showing that kind of love for others.

(4) Christ told us that we must do unto others as we wish to have them do unto us. We do not want to be warred upon; as proof of the fact, we spend billions to guard against it. Since we do not want others to war upon us, we are thereby prohibited from warring upon them. The matter of "self-defense" will be considered presently.

(5) Christ tells us that we must not resist evil; that is, we must, as St. Paul states it: "Overcome evil with good." War is evil, and to overcome this evil with the evil of war is to act contrary to Christ's teachings. We must meet war with the spiritual and intellectual weapons, overcome evil with good.

(6) Father Macksey declares that no end justifies an immoral means. According to the testimony of Christ, war is immoral, therefore, we cannot use that means to overcome war.

(7) That self-preservation is the first law of nature is not to be disputed. The best means of preservation is to follow Christ's rule of returning good for evil as set forth in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew. The weapon of love is the greatest and most efficacious weapon of self-defense. I can protect my dear ones, my neighbors, my country better and more effectively by working with Christ than I can by working against Him. All of this is explained with some detail in my main statement.

(D) The wisdom of using the Bible as a guide, with regards the question of war:

(1) While the Bible should be used as a guide at all times, I am now covering only the question of war. It was claimed that the German Kaiser was a maniac and that he had to be restrained. Granting that he was a maniac, why did the Catholic clergy of Germany urge the Catholic youths to rally to the support of the Kaiser? Joachim, one of the Kaiser's sons is a recent suicide. Medical men believe that insanity was an hereditary trait in the Kaiser's family. Herein we recognize the danger of blind obedience to a sovereign. Often the helmsman of the State is a psychosis, if not permanently, he is at least such on many temporary occasions. Whether we are sane or insane we can safely follow Christ's teachings, but it is dangerous to allow lunatics

to lead us into temptation. Col. Goodale told a crowd of conscientious objectors at Fort Douglas, when the former was delivering a Fourth of July oration in an attempt to get us to work, that it was wrong for the German conscientious objectors to not do as the Kaiser ordered them to do and go to war. In other words, the German C.O's. should have obeyed the commands of a madman. This was also the view of the Catholic clergy in Germany.

(2) Since millions rallied to the defense of the delusions that obsessed the Kaiser, it became the duty of Americans and others to rally to the defense of Christ's teachings and point out to the deluded and his followers the error of their ways in place of copying after them and attempting to overcome evil with evil.

VII. OPPOSITION TO THE WORLD WAR IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

(A) I am not familiar with the statistics covering the matter, so I do not know how many conscientious objectors there were in foreign countries.

(B) Their method of opposition was similar to that of the American C.O.

(C) The manner in which they were treated:

(1) In Germany some were shot during the early part of the war. This method proved fatal as well as useless, for it failed to curb C.O'ism. and bred discontent. Finally the Madman who was leading his people in a holy and just war had the C.O's. segregated and later discharged as mentally unbalanced.

(2) In France I understand that the C.O's. were executed for a certain period, after which little or nothing was done to them, for execution is not going to scare the man adhering to a principle any more than the knowledge of certain death will deter the soldier who believes in his cause.

(3) In England the C.O's. were imprisoned the same as in America, only for shorter periods. I believe that two years was the maximum sentence in England, while in America the maximum sentence was 99 years. I am not casting reflections on the 99 year sentence, because even in America we should be thankful for small favors. A great many American C.O's. were sentenced to death, but the death sentence was commuted; many others were sentenced to life imprisonment, but the 99 year sentence had that life sentence beat so far as length was concerned.

(4) I have no knowledge whatever concerning the other countries at war -- exclusive of the United States -- in the matter of handling C.O's.

VIII. THE HISTORY OF THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.

(A) The general nature of conscientious objection:

(1) Rebellion against God is often termed by such rebels as their "Intellectual Declaration of Independence." My opinion is that, such an action is a symptom of a very unwise dependence, rather than an assertion of independence. There are, however, many religious rebels, from the Luthers to the Agnostics. While

I question the wisdom of these rebels, still they are entitled to follow the dictates of conscience.

(2) Rebellion against parents is another form of C.O'ism that is sometimes meritorious but more often sinful. In the rare case of a parent ordering the child to do that that is wrong the child should disobey.

(3) Rebellion against the State is relevant to the issue being discussed. Jesus Christ rebelled against the Roman Empire. George Washington rebelled against England. The conscientious objector against war is rebelling against the world of militarism. In all countries C.O's. against war are to be found. The German C.O. refused to fight Americans, and the American C.O. refused to fight Germans, consequently both were loyal to the better way of settling the Kaiser's delusion.

(B) There are three classes of conscientious objectors against war: Political, Humanitarian, Religious. Their philosophy has already been discussed.

(C) There is a group of objectors that Prof. Carl Haessler often referred to as "Conscienceless Objectors" to which group he claimed to belong. I believe, however, that the "conscienceless objectors" properly belong to the category of "political objectors." According to my views, the "conscienceless objectors" are those Christians who object to one taking a conscientious stand against war.

IX. THE HISTORY OF THE WRITER'S OPPOSITION TO WAR.

(A) Opposition to war in general:

(1) For years prior to the outbreak of the European War -- that is, for many years before the year 1914 -- I opposed War by means of the spoken and printed word. My main statement gives details.

(2) Between 1914 and the time of America's entrance into the World War in 1917, I continued my opposition to war by the methods previously stated, extending the scope of my opposition whenever possible. This opposition was not so much in the negative form of opposition as in the positive form of advocating Christ's doctrine for the solving of war's problems.

(B) Opposition to the World War in particular:

(1) With disaster impending, I naturally wanted to defend my country. All persons should defend their country.

(2) I made a study of the different kinds of defense.

(3) Research and reflection impelled me to adopt the method of defense that I had advocated for so many years.

(C) Method of opposition to the World War as a means of defending my country:

(1) In compliance with the law, I registered on June 5, 1917. But, I did not register for military service. I registered for the purpose of complying with the law in so far as possible, and for the additional purpose of making the fact known that,

altho of military age, I would not serve in the armed forces. Upon my registration card I wrote down the fact that I was opposed to war, that I was a conscientious objector, and I told the members of the registration Board that my submission to the injustice of registration was for the purpose of making known my military age and my opposition and not for the purpose of signifying an intention to render military service.

(2) On registration day, I forwarded a letter to President Wilson, Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, in which I informed him of my reasons for refusing to take part in the war. I told him that prison or death or both were infinitely preferable to taking part in an undertaking where I would be called upon to either directly or indirectly kill those whom God bade us to love. A few thousand copies of this letter were published and distributed, principally in Denver. My object in distributing them was to let it be known beforehand that, if ever called for service I would not respond.

(3) On Christmas Day, 1917, I received a Questionnaire. The law provided that it must be filled out, signed, and returned to the Local Board within a certain number of days, seven I believe.

(4) On December 26, 1917, I forwarded a letter to the Local Board informing them that altho entitled to exemption from service because of a widowed-mother and wife being dependent upon me for support, I would not avail myself of this method of escape. I wanted to face the issue squarely. Moreover, filling out the Questionnaire would render moral support to the military machine by indicating what branch of the service I was most fitted for and would serve in in the event that I was called.

(5) Arrested, tried and convicted for refusal to answer the Questionnaire.

(6) Sentenced to nine months in the Denver county jail for refusal to answer the Questionnaire. This sentence still holds as the case is still on the docket of the Circuit Court of Appeals to which tribunal I had appealed because of the unconstitutionality of the Questionnaire. I was released on \$2,500 bond pending the appeal.

(7) While out on bail, the military authorities kidnapped me and began to ride me on Democracy's Merry-Go-'Round. This was on May 20th, 1918, and I have been riding ever since.

(8) Until after my trial and conviction by court-martial, I refused to work in the various prison camps. My main statement gives details. I worked from the time that my sentence was approved until I discovered the inconsistency of working even under sentence. The main statement gives details.

(9) On August 10, 1918, I was sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth.

(10) On July 13th, 1920, I began my hunger strike for liberty or death -- it was on July 13th, 1920, while in the Fort Douglas prison. Refer to the main statement for details. Without a sanity test, I was railroaded to the insane asylum on July 28th, 1920. Two Lt. Colonels and two corporals brot me from Fort Douglas to Washington, D.C. One would think that I was a dangerous citizen. Today is the 69th day of my hunger strike, which will continue to the end: liberty or death. Briefly, the reasons for my hunger

are: (a) By eating the food of those who have imprisoned me, or the food of the agents of those who have imprisoned me, I thereby help to keep myself alive in prison. (b) My imprisonment serves as an example of what will happen to those who oppose militarism in America, therefore, to help to continue my imprisonment by eating the food that is given to me, I render moral support to the military machine. (c) By going on a hunger strike for liberty or death, I thereby cease to voluntarily render moral support to the military machine. After being without food for twelve full days and part of the thirteenth day, the authorities resorted to forcible feeding. This will keep me alive indefinitely, but it is killing one on the installment plan nevertheless, for only liquid food can be forcibly fed and there is no salivation, the injury is certain but slow. The main statement covers details of my hunger strike more fully.

X. THE MANNER IN WHICH EVENTUALITIES OF THE WORLD WAR HAVE VINDICATED THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.

(A) The disillusionment of small nations such as Ireland, Egypt, India, Persia, etc., speaks for itself.

(B) The kind of Democracy that the War for Democracy brot into the world is rather anomalous. Just one thot is sufficient to disgrace the name of Democracy; and that one thot is a matter of public record; that thot is symbolized by one word: "Palmerism."

(C) The war debts of the various nations are monuments to the wisdom of our international bankers. Hundreds of millions of little children will be underfed, underclothed, undereducated as the result of paying this war debt. The bankers children, however, will not be numbered among these hundreds of millions.

(D) The War to Crush Militarism gave it its greatest impetus in the world's history. True, militarism was actually crushed; but right where it was crushed a more revolting monster raised its hideous head, and this monster has come to be known by the name of super-militarism.

(E) President Wilson claims that, unless the League of Nations is adopted we will have more and greater wars. Senator Harding, the Republican Standard Bearer in the contest that soon will decide who America's next president shall be, tells us that, if the League of Nations is adopted we will have more and greater wars. Unless America disarms, history will prove that both Wilson and Harding were right. Super-Militarism tells Humanity: "Heads I win, tails you lose" and then he flips the coin.

The foregoing represents in concise form the main reasons and opinions for the attitude that I have taken as regards the problem of war and defense. As a conscientious objector, I am only one of many. Among those who registered as conscientious objectors -- more than 6,000, I do not remember the exact figure -- only approximately 600 landed in prison. A great many of those who did not land in prison, accepted either non-combatant service or farm furloughs. The remainder were released from the various camps after the armistice was declared. All were C.O's, but different types were to be found among them, and even among those who landed in prison because they would not accept any kind of

service were to be found those who consented to perform prison labor and those who refused to perform prison labor. What is the principle that actuated these C.O's, and what is the explanation for the gradation from the point of accepting non-combatant service to that of refusing everything even the performance of prison labor? In other words, why were some C.O's. compromisers and some absolutists?

The first question should be answered first, viz: What underlying principle actuated the C.O's.? There were various types of C.O's., and among these various types there was another division because some took non-combatant service while others were absolutists. There must be some common ground upon which all the C.O's. stood. My observations incline me to believe that that common ground was one of Friendship, Love and Truth. This triune motive seemed to outweigh all other considerations and impel the C.O. to remain loyal to the ideals thus expressed. The individual is constantly, either consciously or unconsciously, endeavoring to effect an adjustment between himself and his environment, and the 6,000 C.O's. previously mentioned found themselves face to face with a problem demanding almost immediate solution. The conflict was resolved dissimilarly as has been noted by the fact that some took a certain form of service, others a farm furlough, others accepted prison, some worked in prison while some refused.

A careful analysis of the C.O. problem would require considerable time and an expression of the result of that analysis would consume more space than I am able now to devote to it. Many points have to be considered: the influence of one's relatives and friends; the persuasions of comrades and of officers in camp; the advice of spiritual or political mentors; the most expedient manner for one to attain his ideal; whether one could not accomplish more by compromising slightly thus saving his physical and mental energy for future aggressiveness; the matter of right or wrong and the ever present possibility that one may be mistaken in his attitude; the question of throwing up the sponge after the war is over and squirming out of the situation as gracefully as possible; the choice between two evils and whether it is proper to choose the greater or the lesser; and numerous ramifications of that that these only suggest. In my own case I have experienced some alterations, and I have observed a change of tactics in others. All of which would require long explanations in addition to elucidating one's original attitude. Obviously, this is a study that warrants as much space as that that I have given to a recitation of comparisons, but it cannot be gone into thoroly at this time. For instance: I refused to work up until a certain time, and that time was when I got my sentence. Then I worked until I discovered that it was inconsistent for me to work even under sentence. Five months in the dungeons, then a transfer to the open-air cantonment with the other C.O's., followed by a transfer to Fort Douglas after a little more than a month in the sub-basement of Fort Leavenworth's Fourth Wing. Arriving at Fort Douglas, in common with other C.O's. -- excepting Jacob Rose -- I volunteered to do the work incidental to my own cooking. Ten months of this and then I wrote to Secretary Baker explaining why I

could no longer see my way clear to render such volunteer services. Finally my hunger strike. These various stages of activity carried with them no small amount of reasoning or lack of reasoning whichever one may choose to call it. Anyway I always had in mind the central point, that of living my ideal and of suffering for it when necessary but always trying to avoid useless and inconsequential sacrifices.

What I have written will at least make clear that the C.O. stand is not without justification, altho the facts warrant a deeper, fuller, more careful exposition. I have attempted, altho suffering under many handicaps, to present the main reasons for my attitude. And now I must leave to other judges the question of whether my actions are those of an insane or a sane person. I wish to conclude with a prayer that God will abundantly reward all those who have suffered because of my stand, and that He will enlighten and forgive those who have persecuted conscientious objectors.