Afternoon, 2.30 o'clock:—Discussion on Convention Topics.

1. Questions and Discussion by Delegates.
   (a) Opened by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Berkeley, Cal.
   President State University.
   (b) Five Minute Speeches by Delegates.
   (c) Closed by Nehemiah Boynton, Brooklyn.
   Pastor, Clinton Avenue Congregational Church.

2. Special Meetings. (Hours to be announced.)
   (a) Meeting of the General Committee.
   (b) Meeting of Special Committees.
   (c) Conference on Methods.

Evening, 7.00 o'clock:—Dinner. Addresses.

1. "The League Program—A Platform upon which the whole World can stand,"
   A. Lawrence Lowell, Cambridge.
   President, Harvard University.

   Harry A. Wheeler, Chicago.
   Vice-President, Union Trust Company.

   Franklin H. Giddings, New York.
   Professor, Sociology and History of Civilization, Columbia University.

4. "What the Churches have at Stake in the Success of the League,"
   His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Baltimore.
   Shailer Matthews, Chicago.
   President Federal Council of Churches.
TENTATIVE PROGRAM

Hon. William Howard Taft, Presiding

Friday, May 26th

Morning, 10 o’clock:—General Topic, “The Platform.”

1 “The League Program,”
   Thomas Raeburn White, Philadelphia, Lawyer

2 “Force—The Support of All Law,”
   Oscar S. Straus, New York, Member Hague Court. Chairman, New York State Public Service Commission.

3 “The League Program and the Soul of the United States,”
   Edward A. Filene, Boston.
   Merchant. Director Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

4 “The League Program, Preparedness, and Ultimate Reduction of Armaments,”
   Hamilton Holt, New York.
   Editor “The Independent.”

Afternoon, 2.30 o’clock:—General Topic, “Practicability of the League Program.”

1 “American National Policies and the League Program.”
   (a) Constitutionality,
   Ex-President William Howard Taft,
   New Haven.

   (b) The Monroe Doctrine,
   George Grafton Wilson, Cambridge.
   Professor International Law, Harvard University.

   (c) Entangling Alliances,
   Talcott Williams, New York.
   Director, School of Journalism, Columbia University.

2 “The European Nations and the League Program,”
   John Bates Clark, New York.
   Director, Department of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Evening, 8 o’clock:—General Topic, “American Interests Affected by the League Program.”

1 “American Business and the League to Enforce Peace,”
   R. G. Rhett, Charleston, S. C.
   President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

2 “American Labor and the League to Enforce Peace,”
   Samuel Gompers, Washington.
   President, American Federation of Labor.

3 “American Agriculture and the League to Enforce Peace,”
   Oliver Wilson, Peoria, Ill.
   President, National Grange.

4 Address.
   Secretary of War.

Saturday, May 27th

Morning, 10 o’clock:—General Topic, “Plans for Giving Effect to the League.”

1 “Organization Plans,”
   Philip H. Gadsden, Charleston, S. C.
   President, Charleston Consolidated Railway and Lighting Company.

   J. Mott Hallowell, Boston, Mass.
   Lawyer.

   Theodore Marburg, Baltimore, Md.
   Former Minister to Belgium.

2 “Publicity Plans,”
   Herbert S. Houston, New York.
   Vice-President, Doubleday, Page & Co.
   President, Associated Advertising Clubs of the World.

3 “Finance Plans,”
   Secretary, International Committee, Young Men’s Christian Associations.
ORIGIN OF THE LEAGUE PLATFORM

THE LEAGUE PLATFORM EMBODIES IDEAS ON WORLD REORGANIZATION AFTER THE WAR THAT WERE PUT FORWARD SPONTANEOUSLY AT ABOUT THE SAME TIME IN THIS AND OTHER COUNTRIES. IT IS NOT THE PROPOSAL OF A SINGLE MAN OR COMPANY OF MEN. REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS OF STATESMEN AND PUBLICISTS, HERE AND ABROAD, HELD CONFERENCES ON THE SUBJECT THROUGH PERIODS COVERING MANY MONTHS, THE CONCLUSIONS OF WHICH, WHEN MADE PUBLIC, WERE IN PRACTICAL AGREEMENT. A COMMITTEE OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES EMBODIED NEARLY IDENTICAL VIEWS IN A REPORT WHICH WAS SUBMITTED TO ITS CONSTITUENT MEMBERS. INDIVIDUALS IN SEVERAL COUNTRIES, BOTH IN OFFICIAL AND IN PRIVATE LIFE, SUGGESTED PROGRAMS SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL, WHICH ARE NOW BEING URGED BY ORGANIZED EFFORT. THIS SPONTANEITY GIVES IT AN INEVITABLE CHARACTER AND SIGNIFICANCE WHICH GUARANTEE ITS WISDOM AND TIMELINESS.

League to Enforce Peace,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Post Card

Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, President
League to Enforce Peace
70 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.
Mr. 

of (City) 

(Street) (State) 

hereby accepts the invitation of Mr. William Howard Taft and the Executive Committee, to become a delegate to the Washington meeting of the League to Enforce Peace, to be held May 26th-27th, 1916.

(Upon receipt of this card you will be enrolled as a delegate, and delegate's ticket, together with other important information for delegates only, will be mailed you.)
Mr. Harry P Judson,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

At the direction of the Hon. William Howard Taft, President of the League to Enforce Peace, and of the Executive Committee of the League, I have the honor to call your attention to the statement of principles and plans contained in the enclosed folder and to inform you that, as one who was invited to the Independence Hall Conference of June 17th, you are entitled to be enrolled as a Charter Member of the League and to receive its Handbook which is now in press. The book will contain the addresses made at the Conference.

Will you kindly let us know, on the Return Blank enclosed, whether we are authorized to enroll your name, as stated above, and whether you wish to receive the Handbook? Our desire to remove any errors or omissions which may have occurred in the list of those who were present at the Conference leads us to ask you, also, to fill out the line regarding attendance.

Awaiting the courtesy of your early reply, I am

Very respectfully yours,

William H. Short
Secretary.
July 28, 1948

Mr. Harry T. Jackson
Office, III.

Dear Mr. Jackson:

At the direction of the Hon. William Howard Taft, President of the Board of Directors, and of the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors, I have the honor to call your attention to the statement of principles and policies of the American Ranch and Farm Operators Association, to be issued on June 17, 1948, by the Executive Board of Directors.

The statement of principles and policies of the American Ranch and Farm Operators Association will contain the aspirations of the Conference.

Will you kindly let us know if the statement of principles and policies of the American Ranch and Farm Operators Association is in accord with your views?

Very respectfully yours,

[Signature]

Secretary
LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE
AMERICAN BRANCH
Formed at a Conference in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, June 17th, 1915

An Appeal to Public Opinion

BY

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL
President of Harvard University

THE resolutions adopted at the meeting in Philadelphia in favor of a League to Enforce Peace are so concise that a proper regard for public opinion requires those who are responsible for them to explain and justify each proposition set forth. But before trying to do so it is well to remove a misapprehension by stating that the plan is not directed at stopping the present war. For any combination of neutral states to attempt to enforce peace upon both groups of belligerents would be an absurdity. The only way to intervene would obviously be to join one side or the other, and this might result in lengthening instead of shortening the war. There is little use in trying to stop a conflict after it has begun; but there is much hope of diminishing the cases where international dissentions shall hereafter lead to fighting; and it is against the outbreak of future wars that the proposed League to Enforce Peace is exclusively aimed.

The resolutions consist of a preamble, a reference to the duty of our own country, and of four articles couched in general terms. The reference to our own country states that

"We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following."

Clearly this lies at the threshold of American discussion of the subject, for if we are not ready to have the United States join such a league, there would be a futility bordering on impertinence in our resolving that other countries ought to form a league of nations binding them to certain duties which we recommend, but are unwilling to assume ourselves.

But why should the United States join a league to maintain peace over the world? Simply, because it is for the interest of every country to prevent war anywhere, and also the duty of every great country to help in doing so by all reasonable means. The present conflict has shown that the trade, the manifold interests, nay more, the safety of citizens, of neutral states are profoundly affected by war on a large scale; that neutral rights are inevitably imperiled, if not actually violated; and that there is always grave danger of being drawn into the whirlpool. It has been our tradition that the rectitude of our intentions, the absence with us of
foreign ambitions, and our distance from Europe, would preserve us from complications arising there. But with the best intentions we were at last drawn into the wars of Napoleon, and for all practical purposes we are much closer to Europe than we were then, while the European nations have extended their ambitions more and more generally over the whole face of the earth. The Atlantic takes less than a quarter of the time to cross than it did a century ago, and a few years hence it may be easy to drop incendiary bombs from the sky on New York in forty-eight hours, or for submarines in a week or ten days to destroy our coastwise shipping and shell our seaboard towns. It would be satisfactory to have some security for the maintenance of peace, or at least against the danger of a sudden attack.

So much for our interest in the preservation of peace. Our duty is, perhaps, no less clear. The meaning of war has been brought vividly before us during the past year. The acts it justifies would, if done by the individual members of a community to one another, be properly regarded as proof of a relapse into utter barbarism. Can we, or can any civilized nation, say that such things are none of our affair so long as we do not ourselves suffer from them? Civilization is a common product of enlightened peoples, and to set it backward in any progressive country impairs it everywhere. If a combination of nations would prevent the horrors of war, can we reduce the chance of success by refusing to join it, even at some expense in maintaining an appropriate military force, and at some risk to ourselves, if these be not unduly great? Both the military force and the risk would, it is believed, be decidedly less than would be entailed by a proper provision for the defence of the country if no such league existed. But that depends, of course, upon what the proposed league would be and what it is expected to do.

The first article to which it is proposed that the members of the league should bind themselves is as follows:

“All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.”

A justiciable question is one involving only issues that can be decided by the rules of international law recognized as valid by all civilized nations. International law differs from the domestic law of a country less in the nature of its principles than by the fact that there is not between nations, as there is between individuals, a superior power to compel obedience; and it is therefore what lawyers call a law of imperfect obligation. Nevertheless there is a great body of international law which all civilized countries agree ought to be observed in their dealings with one another. Of course there must be, as there are between individuals, honest differences of opinion about the facts involved in a controversy, and the fairest way to determine these is the one pursued in private suits, to submit the evidence to an impartial tribunal. There may also be divergence of opinion about the law applicable to the case, for the facts in a case sometimes present a slightly different question from any that has occurred before; but here again the fair thing, as in private controversies, is to submit to a body of judges learned in the law the application of recognized general principles to the new facts presented. By this process law grows more detailed and precise.

There is a well-nigh universal conviction today that justiciable questions between nations ought to be submitted to an international tribunal; but people differ about the terms of the
submission—whether they ought to be general, or whether in each case the nation concerned should first determine that the question is of a justiciable nature proper to submit. The resolution adopted at Philadelphia empowers the tribunal to pass judgment upon its own jurisdiction, that is to decide whether the question is justiciable or not. This would be a more important matter, were it not that, for reasons to be explained hereafter, the signatory powers do not bind themselves to abide by the decision of the tribunal, but merely to abstain from hostilities until the case has been argued and the opinion rendered. Surely if a country has any faith in the justice of its claim it ought to be willing to make a public statement, and have a public hearing, of its case, before going to war, even if it believes that the question involved does not depend upon the strict rules of international law.

There are, of course, many controversies between countries that turn, not on strictly legal principles, but on matters of large public policy quite outside of law. Such is the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that in North and South America new acquisitions of territory cannot be made by foreign powers. Such also are immigration laws, which may at any time become a serious cause of friction in several countries. To meet non-justiciable controversies of this kind the second article provides:

"All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiations, shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation."

Obviously such matters, not being questions of strict law, would require consideration by a body constituted somewhat differently from a tribunal of legal experts; but the object and method of operation are much the same. In neither case is the decision or recommendation binding upon the parties without their consent given in advance or after the report is made. This is made clear by the third article which provides the penalty for violating the terms of the League. In each case the main object is to secure delay, and thereby to give time for the formation of public opinion; to afford an opportunity for the people of the country to consider whether the question in dispute is really worth the sacrifice entailed by war; to prevent the sudden outbreak of hostilities which instantly stifles discussion in a belligerent land; and to remove the hope of advantage from a sudden attack on an unprepared foe. It is believed that although such a delay would not wholly abolish wars, it would prevent a large proportion of those that would otherwise occur, and this is as far as it seems possible to go in the present state of the world.

But, it may be asked, why not go farther and require the signatory powers, under pain of compulsion by the League, to accept the decision of the tribunal or the recommendation of the Council of Conciliation? The answer is that few if any nations would be willing to agree to this, and that the chance of the plan being adopted—none too good at the best—would be reduced to nothing. We must deal with facts as they are, and while we may cherish ideals of a more perfect state of civilization in the future, any practical plan must take account of the present repugnance of all nations to surrender their sovereignty and independence.

Most people who have thought long upon the problem of maintaining peace over the earth have come to the conclusion that the great difficulty lies in finding some sanction, that is some effective means of enforcing the obligations assumed—in this case the obligation not to take up arms before submitting the question in dispute to a tribunal or council. The vital
point, therefore, in the plan for a League adopted at Philadelphia is the method of enforcing peace. The third article provides that:

"The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing."

No sanction can have the effect desired unless it is strong enough to deter those who are tempted to disregard it; and in this case there is no use in providing for milder sanctions to be followed by others more severe in case the first prove insufficient, because wars now-a-days come suddenly, and when war has once begun the harm is done and practically cannot be undone. Punishment as a deterrent from private crime is expressly prescribed by law in order that it may be certain. The criminal law does not provide that when a man intends to commit murder the government shall threaten him with three months’ imprisonment, and if this is not effective it shall make a more severe threat up to capital punishment if necessary; nor does it provide that the public authorities shall consult about penalty necessary to deter the man from his purpose. Of course, the analogy between the security for order within a state and the preservation of international peace is imperfect, and may be misleading, but there are points of resemblance, valuable for illustration, of which this is one.

The consequences of going to war without first submitting the question in dispute to an international tribunal or council ought to be as certain to follow as possible, and ought to be such that no nation will brave them. They must not be discretionary, or left for future determination, and therefore a conference of nations to decide what steps shall be taken is objectionable. Such a conference, like the proverbial council of war, will never fight, and it is very likely not to do anything in time to be effective. Nor will any sanction of an economic nature alone be as certain to be put into full operation as an agreement to use military force, because the resistance of the interests affected will be at least as great against an economic boycott as against war, and they will be constantly striving to break it down, whereas war once declared silences opposition—a fact which any nation that thought of defying the League would not fail to note.

Moreover a prospect of immediate universal war is the one thing that would be sure to deter any country, however powerful or self-sustaining, from beginning hostilities with its neighbor. It is almost inconceivable that any nation would attack another if convinced that to do so would involve war with all the leading powers of the world. If, therefore, such a League as is proposed were formed by a sufficient number of great countries it is in the highest degree improbable that the agreement to take up arms would ever need to be put into execution; for although there may be issues on which a nation would rather perish than yield, there are none on which it would not prefer a public hearing before fighting its adversary, to fighting a whole array of powerful states without such a hearing.

Most plans for the maintenance of peace among nations start with the idea of compelling the arbitration of disputes. This one starts from a different standpoint, that of preventing sudden war by force. It is the method pursued in the case of individuals within a community. The state does not compel a man to bring suit for an injury if he does not want to do so. It merely tells him that he must not resort to force, must not take redress into his own hands,
on pain of punishment by the whole force of the community. So this plan does not tell a nation that it must submit disputes to arbitration and abide by the result, but that it must not on pain of repression by all the members of the League go to war before the matter has been submitted to an international tribunal or council. We are tending to approach the question of strikes and lockouts in the same way, and it would appear to be the right way. The two methods of approach may not in most cases differ very much in actual results, and the difference is rather one of emphasis, but that is not unimportant in the practical chance of success.

The fourth and last article declares that:

"Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in Article One."

Conferences of this kind ought to be held, whether a League to enforce peace is formed or not, for it is eminently desirable that the rules of international law should be as precise, as generally recognized, and as little open to misconception, as possible. The provision that the rules so made shall be binding unless some signatory records its dissent within a stated period does not in any way diminish the freedom of any nation to withhold its approval, but it does avoid delay and the danger of having the matter go by default from carelessness or reluctance to face responsibility. It does not abolish the veto of any country, but only a pocket veto.

The plan for a League to enforce peace is by no means perfect in conception, and still less in its provisions. No attempt, indeed, has been made to work out details, such as what shall constitute an act of war, what period of time, if any, shall be allowed for a disavowal or offer of reparation, and many other things which would require careful study in drawing up a treaty to put the League into operation. The plan merely proclaims a principle to be aimed at, and points out a road leading toward the goal; but in so doing it surely presents something worthy of attention, of discussion and of any improvement not inconsistent with its object.

**HOW YOU CAN HELP**

Action by the American Government favorable to the proposals of the League will depend on the expression of public opinion in their favor throughout the country. People everywhere are urged to join the League, to circulate its literature (sent free on application), to invite others to become members, to secure resolutions in their favor and to mould public opinion in all effective ways. Copies of resolutions adopted by organizations and public meetings should be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators representing the State in which they are adopted, and to the office of the League.

**MEMBERSHIP BLANK**

**League to Enforce Peace,**

**Hon. William Howard Taft, Pres., 507 Fifth Avenue, New York.**

Gentlemen:—I am in sympathy with the purpose and the proposals of the League to Enforce Peace, organized in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, June 17th, 1915, and wish to be enrolled as a member. (*I enclose a contribution of $.........for the expenses of the educational work of the League.*) *(Signed)*

Name ........................................................................................................ Street ..............................................

City ........................................................................................................ State ..............................................

*No membership dues are required, but contributions will be welcomed. Checks should be made payable to Herbert S. Houston, Treasurer. Both men and women are eligible for membership.
Chicago, August 4, 1915

Dear Sir:—

Your favor of the 28th of July is at hand.

I appreciate very much the invitation extended, especially as coming from Mr. Taft. At the present time, however, I am very dubious about the success of any such plan. A league to enforce peace can accomplish nothing unless it has the adherence of all the great powers. The present situation of diplomatic matters would seem to me to make any such dream a hopeless one. After the present war is settled perhaps we may have more light. I think that under the circumstances I should regard my membership, therefore, as inadvisable.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.F.J. — L.

Mr. W. H. Short,
League to Enforce Peace,
507 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 30th of July 30th is at hand.

I appreciate very much the invitation extended, especially as coming from Mr. Taft. At the present time, however, I am very glad to point the success of my own plan to the attainment of diplomatic relations with any one of the Great Powers. The present situation of diplomatic relations would seem to me to make any such green a hopeless one. After the present war is settled perhaps we may have more light. I think that under the circumstances I am bound to accept my membership in the American Peace Society as insignificant.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

P.S. 

Mr. W. H. Scott, 
Legas to Khedive, Egypt.

201 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Chicago, September 3, 1915

Dear Sir:—

In further answer to your favor of the 7th of August I beg to say that I can hardly reconsider my previous judgment. The plan of the League contemplates a union of all the great powers of the world. If any one should be left out it would not be a world league. The formation of such a league implies that all the great powers prefer peace and a peaceful development of the progress of the world to national aggrandizement attained by force. I do not believe that that is the situation or that it is likely to be the situation at any time in the near future. It seems to me, therefore, that the plan of the League is not practicable.

Fully appreciating the high purposes which you have in mind, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. — L.

Mr. W. E. Short,
League to Enforce Peace,
507 Fifth Ave., New York.
Dear Sir:

I am merely answering to your letter of the 7th
of August. I hope to say that I can safely recommend
the plan of the Lease management.
A number of all the great houses of the town.
In any case, one should be very careful to see that a right lease
is taken over and a descent understanding.
The formation of such a Lease implies that all the
hours, whether present or future and a descent development of the
business, is carried on by a descent management.

I do not believe that I am the person to the attention of any time in
the Lease Law. It seems to me, therefore, that the
faith concerning the Rent, because you have
in mind, I am,

Very faithfully yours,

H.T.I. Jr.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. W. E. Smith
Lease to Enrique Leece
221 First Ave., New York.
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11 WEST 32d STREET, NEW YORK
MADISON SQUARE, 8460

WILLIAM H. SHORT, SECRETARY
507 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
MURRAY HILL, 2060

August the Seventh
1915

President Harry Pratt Judson
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

What you say in your letter of August 4th leads me in reply to emphasize the fact that it is not proposed to suggest the organization of a League of Nations until after the close of the present war. Certainly nearly, if not all, of the great nations of the world would have to be members of any League that would accomplish the purpose we desire. We do not believe the present to be an unfortunate time to urge such an organization but on the contrary believe it to be of great importance that it shall not be left until the war is ended. If the democratic and progressive forces of the world are to have an influence when the conditions of peace are being made that are likely to form the groundwork of the life of several coming generations, careful thought and organization in advance are essential. Who can tell how different the future of the world would have been if at the time of the Vienna Congress, which dealt out the cards for the new game of statecraft which began at the close of the Napoleonic regime, the forces of democracy and progress had been ready to make their voices heard. It seems to us that the teaching of history demands that every effort be undertaken to furnish wise guidance to public opinion and to unify such opinion around right principles of action.

Our officers will all hope that you will decide to throw in your influence with our movement.

Yours very sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary
January 12th, 1943

President Reuther, Hearst Building

The University of Chicago

Office, Ill.

Dear Sir:

What you may in your letter or Advance Notice of March 1st

be in reply to some of the facts not give the impression of a League of Nations which

offer the chance of the present world. Certain it is, that in order to

make the world that many complications in the present

situation, we must have an organization that will be able to

fulfill its purpose of peace and remove the problem of

war. It is not only that the world is at a standstill and

not to be carried on in the absence of the warring nations.

Their actions in the future of the world, the economic

and cultural questions which must be faced and

solved can only be solved if the warring nations

agree to the suggestions of the United Nations, which

agreement and cooperation in the future will be

assured by the League of Nations, whose

existence will be assured by the

Yours very sincerely,

Secretary
Chicago, August 9, 1915

My dear Sir:—

Your favor of the 7th inst. is received. I appreciate the considerations which weigh with you and with the League, and will give the matter further thought.

Very truly yours,

H. P. J. — L.

Mr. W. H. Short,
League to Enforce Peace,
507 Fifth Ave., New York.
My dear Sir,

You have been a great help to me and I am enclosing a letter which I have written to you.

I expect that the committee will give the matter proper attention.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Address]

New York.
Mr. Harry Pratt,

Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

Mr. Taft and our Executive Committee hope to learn the attitude towards the proposals of our League of all those who were invited to the Philadelphia Conference of June 17th, before proceeding to the organization of State and City Committees.

You are one of the small number from whom an expression regarding them has not yet been received. We take the privilege of calling your attention to the enclosed discussion of our platform by President Lowell of Harvard University, and of asking you kindly to write us whether we may enter your name on our roll of Charter Members. We shall also welcome any criticisms of the proposals which you may care to make.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Chairman

Home Organization Committee.
Mr. Henry Tipton, Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

Mr. Tipton and our Executive Committee hope to learn the attitude toward the proposition of our section at the Philadelphia Convention if there will be need to invite to the Philadelphia Convention of June 14th. Before proceeding to the organization of the section and city committee.

You are one of the most number of whom we are pleased to have it. We take pleasure in extending our thanks to you and your company the principles of our Union. We at your pleasure. We at your pleasure to the conduct of your position or President. Your Union. Very truly yours,

[Signature]

G. E. Pomeroy
Committee on Organization Committee.
Chicago, October 11, 1915

My dear Sir:-

Your esteemed favor of the 6th inst. is received. I have had some correspondence with Mr. Short, the Secretary, and under date of August 4th explained why I deemed it inadvisable to accept membership in the proposed League. I have seen no reason since to change my mind, much as I esteem the purposes of the organization and those who are forwarding it.

Very truly yours,

H.F.J. - L.

Mr. Alton B. Parker,
League to Enforce Peace,
507 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Officero. October II, 1912

My dear Sir:

Your esteemed favor of the 5th instant.

I have read some correspondence with Mr. Sprot, the Secretary, and much of the argument, and the explanation why I cannot afford to accept the membership in the Prophecy League. I have seen no reason since to change my mind. may as I express the thanks of the organization and those who are interested in it.

Very truly yours,

P. T. C.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller,

601 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
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The resolutions adopted at the meeting in Philadelphia in favor of a League to Enforce Peace are so concise that a proper regard for public opinion requires those who are responsible for them to explain and justify each proposition set forth. But before trying to do so it is well to remove a misapprehension by stating that the plan is not directed at stopping the present war. For any combination of neutral states to attempt to enforce peace upon both groups of belligerents would be an absurdity. The only way to intervene would obviously be to join one side or the other, and this might result in lengthening instead of shortening the war. There is little use in trying to stop a conflict after it has begun; but there is much hope of diminishing the cases where international dissensions shall hereafter lead to fighting; and it is against the outbreak of future wars that the proposed League to Enforce Peace is exclusively aimed.

The resolutions consist of a preamble, a reference to the duty of our own country, and of four articles couched in general terms. The reference to our own country states that

"We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following."

Clearly this lies at the threshold of American discussion of the subject, for if we are not ready to have the United States join such a league, there would be a futility bordering on impertinence in our resolving that other countries ought to form a league of nations binding them to certain duties which we recommend, but are unwilling to assume ourselves.

But why should the United States join a league to maintain peace over the world? Simply because it is for the interest of every country to prevent war anywhere, and also the duty of every great country to help in doing so by all reasonable means. The present conflict has shown that the trade, the manifold interests, nay more, the safety of citizens, of neutral states are profoundly affected by war on a large scale; that neutral rights are inevitably imperiled, if not actually violated; and that there is always grave danger of being drawn into the whirlpool. It has been our tradition that the rectitude of our intentions, the absence with us of
foreign ambitions, and our distance from Europe, would preserve us from complications arising there. But with the best intentions we were at last drawn into the wars of Napoleon, and for all practical purposes we are much closer to Europe than we were then, while the European nations have extended their ambitions more and more generally over the whole face of the earth. The Atlantic takes less than a quarter of the time to cross than it did a century ago, and a few years hence it may be easy to drop incendiary bombs from the sky on New York in forty-eight hours, or for submarines in a week or ten days to destroy our coastwise shipping and shell our seaboard towns. It would be satisfactory to have some security for the maintenance of peace, or at least against the danger of a sudden attack.

So much for our interest in the preservation of peace. Our duty is, perhaps, no less clear. The meaning of war has been brought vividly before us during the past year. The acts it justifies would, if done by the individual members of a community to one another, be properly regarded as proof of a relapse into utter barbarism. Can we, or can any civilized nation, say that such things are none of our affair so long as we do not ourselves suffer from them? Civilization is a common product of enlightened peoples, and to set it backward in any progressive country impairs it everywhere. If a combination of nations would prevent the horrors of war, can we reduce the chance of success by refusing to join it, even at some expense in maintaining an appropriate military force, and at some risk to ourselves, if these be not unduly great? Both the military force and the risk would, it is believed, be decidedly less than would be entailed by a proper provision for the defence of the country if no such league existed. But that depends, of course, upon what the proposed league would be and what it is expected to do.

The first article to which it is proposed that the members of the league should bind themselves is as follows:

“All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.”

A justiciable question is one involving only issues that can be decided by the rules of international law recognized as valid by all civilized nations. International law differs from the domestic law of a country less in the nature of its principles than by the fact that there is not between nations, as there is between individuals, a superior power to compel obedience; and it is therefore what lawyers call a law of imperfect obligation. Nevertheless there is a great body of international law which all civilized countries agree ought to be observed in their dealings with one another. Of course there must be, as there are between individuals, honest differences of opinion about the facts involved in a controversy, and the fairest way to determine these is the one pursued in private suits, to submit the evidence to an impartial tribunal. There may also be divergence of opinion about the law applicable to the case, for the facts in a case sometimes present a slightly different question from any that has occurred before; but here again the fair thing, as in private controversies, is to submit to a body of judges learned in the law the application of recognized general principles to the new facts presented. By this process law grows more detailed and precise.

There is a wellnigh universal conviction to-day that justiciable questions between nations ought to be submitted to an international tribunal; but people differ about the terms of the
submission—whether they ought to be general, or whether in each case the nation concerned should first determine that the question is of a justiciable nature proper to submit. The resolution adopted at Philadelphia empowers the tribunal to pass judgment upon its own jurisdiction, that is to decide whether the question is justiciable or not. This would be a more important matter, were it not that, for reasons to be explained hereafter, the signatory powers do not bind themselves to abide by the decision of the tribunal, but merely to abstain from hostilities until the case has been argued and the opinion rendered. Surely if a country has any faith in the justice of its claim it ought to be willing to make a public statement, and have a public hearing, of its case, before going to war, even if it believes that the question involved does not depend upon the strict rules of international law.

There are, of course, many controversies between countries that turn, not on strictly legal principles, but on matters of large public policy quite outside of law. Such is the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that in North and South America new acquisitions of territory cannot be made by foreign powers. Such also are immigration laws, which may at any time become a serious cause of friction in several countries. To meet non-justiciable controversies of this kind the second article provides:

“All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiations, shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.”

Obviously such matters, not being questions of strict law, would require consideration by a body constituted somewhat differently from a tribunal of legal experts; but the object and method of operation are much the same. In neither case is the decision or recommendation binding upon the parties without their consent given in advance or after the report is made. This is made clear by the third article which provides the penalty for violating the terms of the League. In each case the main object is to secure delay, and thereby to give time for the formation of public opinion; to afford an opportunity for the people of the country to consider whether the question in dispute is really worth the sacrifice entailed by war; to prevent the sudden outbreak of hostilities which instantly stifles discussion in a belligerent land; and to remove the hope of advantage from a sudden attack on an unprepared foe. It is believed that although such a delay would not wholly abolish wars, it would prevent a large proportion of those that would otherwise occur, and this is as far as it seems possible to go in the present state of the world.

But, it may be asked, why not go farther and require the signatory powers, under pain of compulsion by the League, to accept the decision of the tribunal or the recommendation of the Council of Conciliation? The answer is that few if any nations would be willing to agree to this, and that the chance of the plan being adopted—one too good at the best—would be reduced to nothing. We must deal with facts as they are, and while we may cherish ideals of a more perfect state of civilization in the future, any practical plan must take account of the present repugnance of all nations to surrender their sovereignty and independence.

Most people who have thought long upon the problem of maintaining peace over the earth have come to the conclusion that the great difficulty lies in finding some sanction, that is some effective means of enforcing the obligations assumed—in this case the obligation not to take up arms before submitting the question in dispute to a tribunal or council. The vital
point, therefore, in the plan for a League adopted at Philadelphia is the method of enforcing peace. The third article provides that:

"The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing."

No sanction can have the effect desired unless it is strong enough to deter those who are tempted to disregard it; and in this case there is no use in providing for milder sanctions to be followed by others more severe in case the first prove insufficient, because wars now-a-days come suddenly, and when war has once begun the harm is done and practically cannot be undone. Punishment as a deterrent from private crime is expressly prescribed by law in order that it may be certain. The criminal law does not provide that when a man intends to commit murder the government shall threaten him with three months' imprisonment, and if this is not effective it shall make a more severe threat up to capital punishment if necessary; nor does it provide that the public authorities shall consult about penalty necessary to deter the man from his purpose. Of course, the analogy between the security for order within a state and the preservation of international peace is imperfect, and may be misleading, but there are points of resemblance, valuable for illustration, of which this is one.

The consequences of going to war without first submitting the question in dispute to an international tribunal or council ought to be as certain to follow as possible, and ought to be such that no nation will brave them. They must not be discretionary, or left for future determination, and therefore a conference of nations to decide what steps shall be taken is objectionable. Such a conference, like the proverbial council of war, will never fight, and it is very likely not to do anything in time to be effective. Nor will any sanction of an economic nature alone be as certain to be put into full operation as an agreement to use military force, because the resistance of the interests affected will be at least as great against an economic boycott as against war, and they will be constantly striving to break it down, whereas war once declared silences opposition—a fact which any nation that thought of defying the League would not fail to note.

Moreover a prospect of immediate universal war is the one thing that would be sure to deter any country, however powerful or self-sustaining, from beginning hostilities with its neighbor. It is almost inconceivable that any nation would attack another if convinced that to do so would involve war with all the leading powers of the world. If, therefore, such a League as is proposed were formed by a sufficient number of great countries it is in the highest degree improbable that the agreement to take up arms would ever need to be put into execution; for although there may be issues on which a nation would rather perish than yield, there are none on which it would not prefer a public hearing before fighting its adversary, to fighting a whole array of powerful states without such a hearing.

Most plans for the maintenance of peace among nations start with the idea of compelling the arbitration of disputes. This one starts from a different standpoint, that of preventing sudden war by force. It is the method pursued in the case of individuals within a community. The state does not compel a man to bring suit for an injury if he does not want to do so. It merely tells him that he must not resort to force, must not take redress into his own hands,
on pain of punishment by the whole force of the community. So this plan does not tell a
nation that it must submit disputes to arbitration and abide by the result, but that it must not
on pain of repression by all the members of the League go to war before the matter has been
submitted to an international tribunal or council. We are tending to approach the question
of strikes and lockouts in the same way, and it would appear to be the right way. The two
methods of approach may not in most cases differ very much in actual results, and the differ-
ence is rather one of emphasis, but that is not unimportant in the practical chance of success.
The fourth and last article declares that:

"Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and
codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated
period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in Article One."

Conferences of this kind ought to be held, whether a League to enforce peace is formed or
not, for it is eminently desirable that the rules of international law should be as precise, as
generally recognized, and as little open to misconception, as possible. The provision that the
rules so made shall be binding unless some signatory records its dissent within a stated period
does not in any way diminish the freedom of any nation to withhold its approval, but it does
avoid delay and the danger of having the matter go by default from carelessness or reluctance
to face responsibility. It does not abolish the veto of any country, but only a pocket veto.
The plan for a League to enforce peace is by no means perfect in conception, and still less
in its provisions. No attempt, indeed, has been made to work out details, such as what shall
constitute an act of war, what period of time, if any, shall be allowed for a disavowal or offer
of reparation, and many other things which would require careful study in drawing up a treaty
to put the League into operation. The plan merely proclaims a principle to be aimed at, and
points out a road leading toward the goal; but in so doing it surely presents something worthy
of attention, of discussion and of any improvement not inconsistent with its object.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Action by the American Government favorable to the proposals of the League will depend
on the expression of public opinion in their favor throughout the country. People every-
where are urged to join the League, to circulate its literature (sent free on application), to
invite others to become members, to secure resolutions in their favor and to mould public
opinion in all effective ways. Copies of resolutions adopted by organizations and public
meetings should be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to
the Senators representing the State in which they are adopted, and to the office of the League.

MEMBERSHIP BLANK

League to Enforce Peace,
Hon. William Howard Taft, Pres., 507 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Gentlemen:—I am in sympathy with the purpose and the proposals of the League to Enforce
Peace, organized in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, June 17th, 1915, and wish to be enrolled
as a member. (*I enclose a contribution of $...........for the expenses of the educational
work of the League.) (Signed)

Name........................................................................................................ Street.............................

City........................................................................................................... State............................

*No membership dues are required, but contributions will be welcomed. Checks should be made payable to Herbert S. Houston, Treasurer.
Both men and women are eligible for membership.
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LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

ORIGIN

The proposals of the League to Enforce Peace represent an attempt by a large body of men of affairs to provide an adequate remedy for the international anarchy which brought about the war in Europe and which if unchanged is certain to result in future wars. After six months of private and public discussion, about thirty men—professors of political science and of international law, statesmen and students of public questions—came together for an interchange of views. Their object was, first, to draw up a series of proposals for an effective League of Nations designed to establish and to maintain peace, and secondly, to determine what portion of this desirable program ought now to be urged upon our own and other Governments as a realizable project.

These conferences continued at intervals during three months and resulted in the formulation of the articles which were presented to the Philadelphia conference of June 17th, and which, with amendments, that conference put forward as the platform of the League. The articles as originally framed were presented to and signed by the one hundred and twenty men who joined in the call for the Philadelphia conference. These included representative business men, editors, educators, churchmen, jurists, scientists and professional men; leaders of organized labor and of the National Grange; statesmen, diplomatists, mayors of cities and governors of states; professors of international law, of political science and representatives of leading peace organizations. The three hundred men who responded to the call and attended the conference were equally representative of the country, both geographically and by reason of their personal standing. The result of their deliberations is offered to the world as an earnest attempt to find a solution for the most urgent and grave question of our day.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

ITS PROPOSALS

We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following:

First: All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

Second: All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.

Third: The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

Fourth: Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the Judicial Tribunal mentioned in Article One.

The conference, representative of all sections and interests in the United States, adopted the foregoing preamble and platform with only two dissenting votes.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

THE WARRANT FROM HISTORY

Throughout five thousand years of recorded history, peace, here and there established, has been kept, and its area has been widened, in one way only. Individuals have combined their efforts to suppress violence in the local community. Communities have co-operated to maintain the authoritative state and to preserve peace within its borders. States have formed leagues or confederations or have otherwise co-operated to establish peace among themselves. Always peace has been made and kept, when made and kept at all, by the superior power of superior numbers acting in unity for the common good.

Mindful of this teaching of experience, we believe and solemnly urge that the time has come to devise and to create a working union of sovereign nations to establish peace among themselves and to guarantee it by all known and available sanctions at their command, to the end that civilization may be conserved, and the progress of mankind in comfort, enlightenment and happiness may continue.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

PLAN

The central idea of the League to Enforce Peace may be stated in the words of its President, Mr. Taft, who has said:

"All the world is interested in preventing war in any part of the world. Neutrals are so subject to loss, to injury and to violation of their rights; that they have a direct interest in preventing war, and so direct is their interest that we may well hope that international law may advance to the point of developing that interest into an international right to be consulted before war begins between neighbors. The central basis of the plan which we respectfully commend to the authorities who shall represent our Government in any world conference that will necessarily follow the peace, is that the Great Powers of the world be invited to form a League of Peace, which shall embody in the covenant that binds its members the principle just announced, to wit, that every member of that League has a right to be consulted before war shall be perpetrated between any two members of the League; or to put it another way, that the whole League shall use its entire power to require any member of the League that wishes to fight any other member of the League, to submit the issue upon which that member desires to go to war to a machinery for its peaceful settlement before it does go to war.

It is not proposed finally to restrain nations from going to war, if they are determined to do so, nor to bind them to comply with any decision a judicial tribunal or a council of conciliation may make; but merely that before they resort to arms, thereby disturbing the social fabric and the order of the whole world, and inflicting irreparable injury upon neutrals, they shall state their case before an impartial body and before the world, and give time to have it considered on its merits.

If the controversy is of a nature which can be settled by the principles of law and equity, it is proposed that it shall go before a bench of judges. If it is one which can be adjusted only by mediation and compromise, it is suggested that it shall be referred to a board of arbitrators. In comparison with projects for a world state, it is a short step in advance that is urged; but it is one which is believed to be attainable, and which, if adopted, would make war extremely improbable."
April 18th, 1916.

President Harry P. Judson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:-

A personal invitation was sent to you recently to attend the annual assemblage of the League to Enforce Peace, which will take place in Washington, D.C., Friday and Saturday, May 26-27th. We hope that you will be able to honor us by an acceptance.

If, however, you should be unable to attend the meeting, may we ask you to appoint other delegates to represent your institution, either from the faculty or from the board of trustees. We conceive the program of the League to Enforce Peace to be so fundamental to the business, industrial and social future of our own country, and to the part it must hereafter play in international affairs, that we consider it most desirable that leaders of thought in every community, and especially in the higher institutions of learning, shall be fully informed regarding the movement.

Members of the departments of international law and political science would doubtless appreciate the privilege of attending this conference. Kindly send the names of delegates promptly to the secretary, so that further information regarding the meeting may be sent to them.

Very truly yours,

A. Lawrence Lowell

Chairman

Executive Committee.
April 1965

Mr. Ger Eri-

Mr. President:

A personal intimation was made to you recently to attend the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. We desire to present our intimation after the faculty has met to support the request of the Trustees. We continue the program of the Board of Trustees to those of us who feel that an announcement for assistance in this manner is necessary and essential to our college, and to the financial needs that have arisen. We request that you will be able to attend the meeting.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Chicago, April 24, 1916

Dear President Lowell:—

Yours of the 18th inst. with regard to the League to Enforce Peace is received. I regret that my engagements will make it impossible for me to be present in person. If some member of the faculty can go I shall be glad to make suitable arrangements.

Very truly yours,

H. P. J. — L.

President A. Lawrence Lowell,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Office, April 24, 1916

Dear President Powell:

Yours of the 18th inst. with
Letter of the 14th to the Lecture to Phonetic Pecce in receiving.

I regret that my unsatisfactory with make it impossible for
me to be present in person. I think member of the
faculty can go I shall do what to make writeable

Yours.

H.P.L. — L.

Preselected, Presented, Powell
Enrollment University,
Campus, Massachusetts.
Mr. Harry Judson Pratt,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

We are inviting you, as one of a number of men who have been carefully selected, to be present at the Washington meeting of the League to Enforce Peace, a tentative program of which is enclosed.

Already plans are taking shape, to be finally matured at Washington, which will make this one of the greatest nation-wide movements of this generation.

It will be necessary that large numbers of prominent men in all parts of the country give much time during the next year, by addresses and other forms of effort, to the national and international issues now confronting us. It is hoped that public-spirited and influential men in each and every community will, even at some personal sacrifice, participate in the formulation of an effective program.

Already over five hundred men have registered as delegates. May we not count upon your presence?

FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

[Signatures]
Mr. Edward Judson Hall

Dear Sir:

We are inviting you as one of a number of men who have long, earnestly expressed a desire to see a Washington meeting of the peace-loving peoples of the world take place and to endeavor to formulate a permanent plan for the prevention of international disputes.

Each year sees the fates of nations drift closer to the edge of an abyss of ruin.

We cannot stand by and watch the world go to destruction.

We believe that the American people are the most truly democratic in the world.

We shall ask you to stand by us in this, the most important mission of our lives.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Address]
Dr. Harry P. Judson,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

We commend to your thoughtful reading the enclosed statement, made by Mr. Taft on the occasion of a mass meeting at Richmond, Va., Wednesday evening, March 21st; and ask your hearty and continuing cooperation with the League to Enforce Peace in the work of creating a dominant public opinion that shall demand -- at the close of the present war -- world organization for righteous and permanent peace. We beg to suggest the following definite opportunities for important service:

As occasion offers, will you not speak of the proposals and purpose of the League and the hope it offers the world of a way out?

Will you not contribute to the columns that are open to your writings -- especially, perhaps to your own church paper -- discussion of the League's proposals, its progress, and the opportunity it offers to earnest men and women for service that will bear fruit into the far future?

Will you not use your influence in securing, during the next few weeks, presentation or discussion of the League's evangel of world organization for permanent peace, in as many church gatherings as possible?

It will be our pleasure to have such suggestion as you may offer as to the mutual aid we may be able to give this movement that underlies so completely the social, industrial and religious development of the future.

With warm appreciation of your interest and aid,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Secretary Other organizations Committee.

THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE DOES NOT SEEK TO END THE PRESENT WAR; IT PROPOSES THE FORMATION OF A LEAGUE OF NATIONS AFTER ITS CLOSE TO MAINTAIN PEACE BY THEIR UNITED ECONOMIC AND MILITARY POWER.
League to Enforce Peace

WILLIAM HOWARD TaFT. PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chairman

To our friends, New York.

March 30, 1917

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
The following statement was made by Ex-President William Howard Taft on the occasion of a mass meeting at Richmond, Va., Wednesday evening, March 21:

"The break with Germany and the imminence of war furnish the strongest arguments for the League to Enforce Peace, and all who support the plan should realize that they can now do more effective work even than they have heretofore.

"Preparedness is one of the watchwords of the hour. The Executive Committee of the League to Enforce Peace has pronounced more than once in favor of national preparedness to meet all emergencies and pointed out the fact that the plan it puts forward makes preparedness a necessity.

"The duty to support the President in his foreign policy is plain. The League has declared a thousand times that it is not a stop-the-war movement, and has pledged its support in the defense of civilization and the rights of our citizens.

"The reasons we have protested against Germany's ruthless submarine warfare and broken off relations with her is because her conduct is subversive of any peace that is worth having.

"As we are forced into the war, our sole purpose must be to secure the right kind of peace after the war, for ourselves and for the whole world -- a permanent and righteous peace.

"This fact is fundamental to the whole situation, and ought to be kept constantly before the minds of all our people. We are contending for a righteous and permanent peace, and for nothing else whatsoever. Preparation for such a peace is the most important part of preparedness. The President has this strongly in mind. If, through the growth of hatred and the cry for vengeance, the world should lose sight of its real purpose and come to the end of the war not knowing what it most wants and needs, and so should fail to roll the burden of militarism off its shoulders and to establish lasting peace, it would be a tragedy in the history of the world.

The League to Enforce Peace presents the elements of a program that has been recognized as having in it promise of a better future; a program that has the support in general terms not only of the President but of leading statesmen in nearly all or all of the leading nations. The latter have espoused it while their countries were at war and both they and the President are watching the growth and expression of public opinion in the United States as the deciding factor in the formation of a League.

"During the present crisis and throughout the war which is at hand, the duty of the League to Enforce Peace is to stimulate military preparedness on the one hand, and on the other to spread its gospel of world organization for permanent peace after this conflict is over."
The following statement was made by ex-President William

[Text continues]
Chicago, April 9, 1917

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 30th of March was received during my absence from the city. It has not seemed to me advisable to take up the work of the League at present, and I suppose that I have written on an average a letter a month for the last two years to the same purport. It seems to me that, as I have told President Taft in person, this work is entirely premature. We cannot tell until the war is ended what can or cannot be done in these lines.

Very truly yours,

E.F.J. - L.

Mr. E. G. Tomlinson
League to Enforce Peace
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Dear Mrs. Taylor,

I am writing to inform you of a recent decision regarding our next move. After much consideration and weighing the pros and cons of each option, we have decided to move to a different city.

This decision was not made lightly, and we understand the implications of moving to a new place. However, after consulting with our family and friends, we believe this change will be beneficial for our future.

We hope to make this transition as smooth as possible and are willing to provide any assistance needed. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you for your understanding in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE
WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT
President

WIN THE WAR
MAKE THE WORLD SAFE
by the Defeat of German Militarism
KEEP THE WORLD SAFE
by a League of Nations

ALTON B. PARKER
VICE-PRESIDENT
HERBERT S. HOUSTON
TREASURER
WILLIAM H. SHORT
SECRETARY
L. M. SNOWDEN
ASSISTANT SECRETARY-TREASURER
LYNCH, DOUGLAS & MONTGOMERY
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, AUDITORS

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
70 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
TELEPHONE CHELSEA 2624

March 21, 1918.

Dear Sir:

We want your help in a convention on "Win the War for Permanent Peace" that the League to Enforce Peace is calling in Philadelphia from Thursday to Saturday, May 16th-18th, and send you this advance announcement in the hope that you will arrange to attend.

The object of the convention is to sustain the determination of our people to fight until Prussian militarism has been defeated, confirm opposition to a premature peace, and to focus attention on the only advantage the American people are hoping to gain from the war,—a permanent peace guaranteed by a League of Nations.

A tentative program is enclosed on which we invite your suggestions.

Very truly yours,

[Signatures]
LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE
WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT
President

WIN THE WAR
MAKE THE WORLD SAFE
FOR GOOD DEEDS OF CIVILIZATION
KEEP THE WORLD SAFE
FOR A PEOPLE OF NATIONS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
A. LAURENCE POWELL

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
TELEPHONE GREEN 5-5551

March 8, 1918

Dear Sirs:

We want your help in a campaign on "Win the War for Peace" that the League to Enforce Peace is calling in Pott-Partament Peace" that the League to Enforce Peace is calling in Pott-
We hope that the League to Enforce Peace will be able to publish an outline of the League to Enforce Peace's program to win the war for peace. We hope that the League to Enforce Peace will be able to publish an outline of the League to Enforce Peace's program to win the war for peace.

The object of the League to Enforce Peace is to educate the American people to fight to win America's war, and to continue the League to Enforce Peace's program to win the war for peace.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Address]
Chicago, March 25, 1918

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge your circular of the 21st inst., with enclosure relating to the proposed Convention in Philadelphia May 16-18. I shall hope to be able to be present at that time. As I understand it, the United States is now a member of the "League to Enforce Peace," and the only way to do it is to keep on fighting until the Teutonic forces inimical to peace are crushed.

Very truly yours,

H. P. J. - L.

Mr. William H. Short
League to Enforce Peace
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City
I have to acknowledge your signal of the

statement made to you about the proposal

convention in Philadelphia May 16-19. I reply that

to agree to go back at that time. As I understand

statement of the United States to now a member of

"League for Industrial Peace" and the only way to go if

at such an altitude until the league is formed

insinuated to peace a chance.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

H.T.L. - L.

Mr. William H. Greaves
League to Enforce Peace
20 Fifty Avenue, New York City
President Harry Pratt Judson
University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill.

My dear President Judson:

We have the very good fortune to have Ex-President Taft in Chicago to talk on the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations at the Auditorium on Wednesday evening. This gives us but a notice of two days to make arrangements; consequently I trust you will forgive us if we are late in announcing that we have placed a box at your disposal. If you desire to make use of the box, will you kindly notify us by telephone before two o'clock in the afternoon, after which time we really must give the places to friends who ask for them.

We should like very much to have you present, and hope this notice does not reach you too late. We were not sure that we could reserve the boxes till this afternoon.

Sincerely yours,

George Sherburn
May 7, 1916

Dear Mr. Hathaway,

I am happy to report that I have been in receipt of your letter of May 5th, and I trust that you will forgive me for not replying sooner.

I have just received a copy of the latest issue of the 'American Journal of Public Health,' which contains an article on the subject of tuberculosis. The article is very interesting and informative, and I am sure that it will be of great value to your readers.

I hope that you will find this information useful, and I would be grateful if you could forward a copy of the article to me so that I can study it further.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Chicago, May 31, 1919

Dear Sir:

President Judson asks me to thank you for your kindness in thinking of him in connection with the box for the address by President Taft. He found it quite impossible to reply until after two o'clock on Wednesday last, and in any event it turned out that he was unable to have the pleasure of hearing President Taft. He is very much interested in the cause.

Yours very truly,

Private Secretary

Mr. George Sherburn
League to Enforce Peace
222 Monadnock Block
Chicago
May 21, 1917

Dear Sir:

President Johnson asks me to thank you for your kind offer of help in connection with the present emergency. It is extremely important to reply at once after two o'clock on Wednesday next, and I am very grateful that you were able to have the pleasure of receiving President Taft. He is very much interested in the case.
RETURN BLANK.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE,
Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, President,
507 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Gentlemen:

I am not in sympathy with the proposals of the League to Enforce Peace as formulated in the Independence Hall Conference at Philadelphia, on June 17th, 1915, and do not wish to be enrolled as a charter member of the League. I did not attend the conference in Independence Hall.

I do not care to receive a free copy of the Hand-book of the League referred to in your accompanying letter.

(Signed) Name, ____________________________

Street, ____________________________

City, ____________________________

Date, ____________________________

State, ____________________________

N. B. — Please strike out the alternative expressions in the several places where they occur above so as to make the blank state your wishes in each of the particulars concerning which information is asked for.
RETURN BLANK

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

Hon. William Howard Taft, President
39 Mete Avenue, New York City

Gentlemen:

I am not in sympathy with the proposals of the League to enforce Peace as formulated in the Independence Hall Conference at Philadelphia on June 16th, 1919, and I am not prepared to be enrolled as a charter member of the League.

I did not attend the conference in Independence Hall.

I do not care to receive a free copy of the Hand-book of the League referred to in your accompanying letter.

(Signed) Name

Street

City

State

Date

A.—Please strike out the following expression in the space or please return this form unsigned so as to enable the printers to use the matter contained without reiteration in the new form.