

of schools is increasing constantly; the attendance upon the schools is increasing every year; the standard of education is rising every year. That is true in this country, in every state in this country; it is true on this hemisphere and in every country on this hemisphere; it is true in the eastern world and in every country there. Now if it be true that everywhere there is intellectual progress, if it is true that everywhere the minds of men are becoming unfettered, if it is true that everywhere people are rising intellectually and taking a larger survey of their relation to the world, it must necessarily follow that with this intellectual growth there will come a greater demand for peace; for the more intelligent a man is, the more clearly he discerns that might can not make right; the more clearly he discerns that no moral question can be settled by force and that where force settles a question it is only a temporary settlement—that, if it is settled on the wrong side it simply means that there will be accumulating protest until a new settlement is undertaken. The first force, therefore, that makes for peace is the world's intellectual progress. I might add that in these assemblies we see the evidences of this fact, because we find great educators raising their voices in behalf of peace; we find these persons who are foremost in the educational world giving of their time and of their thought for the promotion of peace. This is true not only here but everywhere. If there were no other evidence of the coming of a world-wide peace we could find sufficient proof of it in this one fact alone, that the world is growing more intelligent, and we can believe that in proportion as it grows more intelligent it will substitute brain methods for the physical force methods that have in the past been employed for the settlement of differences.

But there is another force that works for peace; it is the progress of the world toward popular government; and this is just as marked and just as universal as the progress of the world in education. All over the world you will find that the government is being brought nearer to the people; that all over the world the power of the individual is increasing; he is asserting himself more and more. First, we had the monarchs who reigned without limitation; then we had the few who ruled over the many, but year by year the heights are being brought down and the valleys are being raised and man is more and more becoming a man "for a' that." The power of the individual is an increasing power and you can not find a country that has not at this time, that has not at all times, a controversy in which democracy—and of course I do not use it in any partisan sense, but in the broader sense in which we are all democrats—in which democracy is on one side and aristocracy on the other. In this world-wide and continuous contest between aristocracy and democracy, democracy is gaining and aristocracy is dying; and with this growth of popular government there must necessarily come the discouragement of war. Kings used to use their people merely to secure fame and honor and wealth for themselves. The burden of war has always been upon the masses, and the time was when they could not protest against being slaughtered to advance some person's personal interest. But with the growth of popular government, with the increasing voice of the masses in government, there comes a rising protest against war and a rising demand that peaceful methods shall be substituted for violent methods. In war the masses bear the burden; the children of the masses die upon the battlefield, while the glories of war and the profits of war go to the very few. I say, therefore, that the second great force that lies back of this peace movement is the growth of popular government.

But there is another force, and I am not sure but it is a stronger force than either of those I have mentioned—it is the moral growth of the world. Let no one think that the world is getting worse. The world is getting better, and that is not only true here but it is true all around the world. There is more altruism in the world today than there ever was before, and there is more altruism in this country than in any other country that ever was or is today. If any one doubts the altruism in the world let him investigate what is going on. Let him stop counting his money for awhile and see what those people are doing who are spending money instead of piling it up, who are more interested in finding out what money will do than they are in finding out where they can get more, and he will learn that altruistic influences are reaching out and are girdling the world. He will find that this nation is at the very head and that this nation is spending more

money per capita outside of this country in an unselfish interest in humanity and for the advancement of the world's welfare than any other nation in the world, or any other nation that the world has ever known. But we have no monopoly on this, I only speak of our primacy, and when I speak of our nation being ahead, let no one from any other nation take offense. It is necessary that our nation shall lead to avoid a just censure, for this nation has received from the world as no other nation has ever received. If it be true that much is required of those to whom much is given, then our nation must, if it meets its obligations, give more than any other nation has ever given. Every nation in the world has contributed to a greater or less extent to our growth and to our greatness, and we would be worthy of the severest condemnation if we did not, in gratitude for what we have received, give abundantly of our abundance. I repeat that there is a moral progress in the world; there is a recognition of the doctrine of brotherhood such as has not been known.

I ran across a letter about five or six years ago that was written by Dumas some eight years before. He said that we are on the eve of a new era; that we are on the eve of the era of brotherhood; that the world is about to be seized with the passion of love; that people are going to love one another as they had never loved before. Tolstoy read this letter of Dumas, and two years after the letter was written by the great Frenchman the great Russian endorsed the doctrine and said that he, too, saw the signs what we have now. Within ten years men's Bible years I have seen evidences of it. I might give you one evidence of it.

Ten years ago we had scarcely a men's club in the churches—I say scarcely, I do not mean to say we had none at all, but compared with what we have now. Within ten years men's Bible classes have been formed in almost every church of prominence. And this is not only true of the various branches of the Protestant church, but there is progress along this line in the Catholic church as well. All of the churches are bringing their men in; they are getting their men to study. Go to the book shelves; go to the catalogues and see how many books are being written today on this one subject—the application of religion to life, and you will find that never before has there been such a scrutinizing of the individual's act—such an effort to make his life conform to his professions.

I went three years ago to the first meeting of the National Brotherhood of the Presbyterian church. They had about one thousand delegates there. At the second meeting they had about fifteen hundred and at the third about two thousand. It is only a few years ago that that first meeting was held. After the Brotherhood had been formed in the local churches all of these denominations began linking local organizations together in great national organizations. We have here one (Mr. Clark) who is identified with a great movement; I can almost say with whom a great movement is identified. I attended a Christian Endeavor convention last year at St. Paul and I found there an immense gathering representing some two millions and a half. The growth of this is significant. The growth of the Young Men's Christian Association is equally significant. I think I am entirely within the truth when I say that more money has been raised for Young Men's Christian Association buildings the last ten years than was raised in the preceding fifty years. I mention these as some of the evidences.

This peace movement is another evidence. It is an outgrowth, a symptom, an illustration, and to this awakening sense of brotherhood I look for mighty results in the spread of this movement. I would say, therefore, that back of this peace movement there are three mighty forces: the world's intellectual progress, the world's growth toward popular government and the world's recognition of the doctrine of human brotherhood.

Now, as naturally and necessarily follows, there are different ways of expressing this desire for peace; there are different ways of securing peace, of attempting to secure it, I might better say. We do not all think alike. When we agree as to the end we differ as to the means of reaching it, not only on this subject, but on all subjects. In the family—if you attend a meeting where they discuss how to train children you will find that some will believe that you ought never to use the rod; and others will tell you there has been no change from the old doctrine, "spare the rod and spoil the child," and yet they are equally anxious to improve the

child; it is only a difference as to how to get at it, how to reach that desired end.

I went to a peace meeting a few years ago and heard a speech made by an eminent scientist of Europe. He gave an argument in favor of peace that I had never heard before, and I doubt if I will ever hear it again. He said he was opposed to war because it was not in harmony with the theory of the survival of the fittest; that war killed off the strongest instead of the weakest, therefore he was opposed to it. I am glad to have anybody and everybody help in securing peace, no matter what his reason is; glad to have his influence on our side no matter upon what he bases his argument. I think more of us believe that war is bad because it kills anybody, strong or weak, but we will get all the people we can to help bring peace on the theory that it is bad to kill anybody, and when we are near to the point of getting peace there may be enough of those who think war is bad because it kills the strongest to make a majority and we will be grateful to them if they will come in and help.

So you will find two schools of thought as to the best way to bring about peace. I attended a peace meeting the other day and there was one other speaker besides myself and he spoke first. He advocated the large navy plan of bringing peace—argued that we could promote peace better by standing in a position where we could tell people that they must do this or that. Well they are honest, just as honest as we are, and they seem to be more numerous just now than we are—that is another reason why prudence would dictate that I say they are as honest as we are. I would not like to believe that there are as few people honest as seem to agree with me. I am bound to believe that there are a great many honest but misguided people who ought to agree with me. I am anxious to have these people who believe in coercing peace, who believe in peace with a swaggering accompaniment—I am glad to have them help all they will, and I hope they will help a great deal. It is barely possible that they may get the armaments so large in some nations as to make it impossible for these nations to support the expenses of war. That is possible, but there is no reason why we should not work on the other line at the same time. While these people, with all their honesty and good intent, are trying to scare the world into peace, I think some of us, at least, ought to stand for the doctrine that we may love the world into peace.

I do not want to say that those who differ from us can not find Bible authority, for unfortunately people have found Bible authority for most everything, but I find Bible authority for our idea; it is good doctrine, it comes from the highest source, it not only comes from the Bible but from Christ Himself who said, "Let your light so shine before men that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father, which is in heaven." Christ placed the emphasis upon the example, upon the influence of the upright life, and I know of no way of judging nations except to apply to nations the rules that we apply to individuals. I know of no limitation that can be placed upon moral principle. I know of no moral principle that applies to one human being that does not apply to a group, no matter how large it is. I do not understand how a nation can become great except upon the very plan that the Almighty has laid down on which to build individual greatness and it seems to me that there is an element of infidelity today in the idea that we can not afford to do right until somebody else joins with us. You can not tell what a good example will do until you set it. You can not tell, except by testing it, what influence will go out from an upright life, nor can you tell until you try it, what influence will go out from a nation that sets an uplifting example.

I believe in these international meetings; I believe that our nation ought to be represented and that we ought to try to get agreements with nations to do the things that are good, but I do not believe that this nation ought to wait for any other nation to agree to do what is right. It ought to do what is right itself. I have faith in what I understand to be the Bible plan of producing peace, or bringing it about.

Suppose we had two men here who differed as to the method of bringing peace into the world, honestly differed. I would suggest this method of testing the two plans on a small scale that we might then judge as to how they would work on a large scale. I would ask these two men to put their plans into practice. Let one of them strap revolvers around him and announce that he stood ready to avenge any in-