

the funeral pyre and give her body to the flames. Public sentiment supported the custom and no one dared to defy it; but that custom is no more—a reform has come and now sentiment supports the reform. The world has taken a step in advance, and it has been found that society can make better use of widows than to burn them.

It is still the custom in some oriental countries for a woman to conceal her face with a veil, and the custom has the support of public sentiment; but thinner veils are being worn—it is only a question of time when the custom will be abandoned. In Christian nations, woman has the benefit of society and society has the inspiration of woman's presence and co-operation, and public sentiment demands and defends this larger liberty.

The education of woman has had to make its way—at first slowly—against a public sentiment based upon the fear, honestly entertained, that education would unfit her for her work. In many parts of the world the existence of this fear, which seems to us so unreasonable, is proven by the fact that women are still far behind men in the percentage of literacy, but a change is taking place; everywhere girls are entering the schools. In the United States woman has taken her rightful place by the side of man. In our high-schools fully fifty per cent—if not more—of our graduates are girls; and those who are entering the colleges and universities are justifying the arguments which opened these institutions to them. A new sentiment has been created and no one would go back to the old system.

Another change in sentiment—another great reform deserves attention here; it is the change in the world's attitude toward those who toil. One of the darkest pages of history is that which records the wrong done to the producers of the world. The rose, blooming in beauty and smiling at the sun, would it—if it had a voice—speak contemptuously of the roots of the bush, because they do their work in the darkness and come into contact with the soil? And yet, until recent years, those who wore fine raiment and fared sumptuously have, as a rule, seemed to entertain a feeling of indifference toward those who made the raiment and supplied the table.

A change is noticeable everywhere; in no other respect is the superiority of our civilization more marked than in the consideration shown the producers of wealth in the United States. Occasionally we find in this country a worthless son who thinks that it is more respectable to spend in idleness the money which someone else has earned than to earn his own living—and public sentiment so universally condemns him that it is hard for us to understand the change that has been gradually taking place since the new standard was set up. "Let him that would be chiefest among you be the servant of all!" Who would turn back to the old system?

So much by way of introduction; let me now apply to my subject the thought which I have been illustrating. I have cited evidence of radical changes in sentiment upon important questions. I invite you to consider the change of sentiment in respect to a resort to physical force.

Dueling was at one time common in the United States. The custom was so thoroughly supported by current opinion that Alexander Hamilton, though he himself disapproved of the practice, felt that it was necessary for him to risk his life for fear a refusal to fight would destroy his usefulness in public life—he so stated in a note written just before he left home for the fatal encounter. The sentiment prevailing at that time would have branded him as a coward. Behold the change that has taken place in a century! Now every state in the Union has a statute against dueling and today public sentiment supports the man who declines a challenge instead of the man who sends it. Why this change? Because brute force is giving way before the superior influence of the mind and the heart; this it what has been accomplished by those who have taken their stand on the side of intelligence and morality. It has been a struggle—all progress is the result of struggle—but truth always triumphs at last, because the heart of man responds to nothing else so surely and holds to nothing else so steadfastly.

In the matter of war we have made less progress than along some other lines, partly because a few profit largely by war; partly because race and national hatreds have blinded many to the truth; and partly because international rivalries have been made a pretext for prepara-

tions which themselves provoke war. Examine the modern implements of destruction—rifles that kill at 4,400 yards; 15-inch guns that hurl projectiles nearly fifteen miles; shells, each warranted to burst into more than an hundred pieces; aeroplanes that drop bombs on unsuspecting cities; death-dealing torpedoes that infest the seas, and poisoning gases that suffocate on land—these are some of the weapons that men are manufacturing to use against each other! What inexcusable insanity! What a monstrous mockery of civilization! This is war as we know it, and yet those of our countrymen who see in force the only arbitrator of international disputes revel in the daily accounts of carnage, and in the name of patriotism and national honor call upon this nation to prepare itself to enter the contest!

These men do not speak the mind or the conscience of the masses—they define national honor in terms that are becoming obsolete. They do not represent either the interests or the purposes of the American people.

I appeal to you to make your views known to the president that he may be strengthened against the insolent clamour of those who ridicule peaceful methods and, as if infuriated by the scent of blood, are bellowing for war. I appeal to you to cast your influence, not in favor of either side, but in favor of PEACE FOR THE UNITED STATES and AGAINST WAR WITH ANY OF THE BELLIGERENT NATIONS. None of them desire war with us—if they injure us it is not because they want to do so, but because, like two men engaged in a street fight, they are too angry to give proper consideration to the rights of bystanders. The people of the United States are calm; they can afford to be patient. Theirs is the rational honor of a peace-loving nation, not the false pride of the bully or the braggart. As friends, when they differ, postpone the settlement of their controversy until they can consider without feeling the points in dispute, so this nation can, without dishonor, refer its disputes to an international commission, reserving, as our treaties do, the right of independent action when passions have cooled and when questions of fact have been separated from questions involving international right.

This policy contemplates no surrender of real rights; it is a policy worthy of the greatest republic of history. Our nation need not be ashamed to follow the wise advice given three thousand years ago: "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

When, in the year 1902, the Stars and Stripes were hauled down on Morro Castle, that the Cuban flag might be raised over the new republic, the Cubans, having learned to love our flag, caught it up that its folds might not touch the ground.

Inspiring spectacle and prophecy of the future! If others desire that our flag be feared, let us prefer that it shall be loved; if others would have the world tremble in awe at sight of it, let us pray that the plain people everywhere may turn their faces toward it and thank God that it is the emblem of justice and the hope of peace. I desire that my country shall maintain the national honor which such a flag represents.

## THE FARMER'S INTEREST IN PEACE

[Abstract of an address delivered by William Jennings Bryan to his neighbors at a reception tendered him and Mrs. Bryan at Lincoln, Nebraska, June 29, 1915.]

Governor Morehead, Mayor Bryan, and Friends: It is delightful to look once more into the familiar faces of the friends of more than a quarter of a century. You, our neighbors, have a home in our hearts, as I hope we have in yours. It is good of you to welcome us again and so heartily; you add to the debt of gratitude which has been accumulating throughout the years. We are looking forward with pleasant anticipations to a renewal of the acquaintances which have made Lincoln so dear to us.

We have already commenced to rest; the very sight of these boundless prairies is soothing. We are away from the excitements that come with official responsibility, and in a position to appreciate the advantages of those who live in this favored portion of the Union.

I congratulate you upon the fact that you enjoy an environment which lends itself to the

calm consideration of the nation's welfare. You are especially fortunate in that you can take counsel of the PRODUCERS OF WEALTH and do not have to be irritated daily by the PRODUCERS OF TROUBLE. It is well that you are a thirty-six hours' journey from the New York newspapers—the journalistic mosquitoes can not carry the germs of the red fever so far; it is well that you are not compelled to rely upon them for the material upon which you form your opinions.

The owners of some of the New York papers are much better acquainted with Europe than they are with the United States, and they reflect the sentiment of the Old World rather than that of the New. The Allegheny mountains are a god-send to the Mississippi valley; they serve as a sort of a dyke; they protect it from being inundated by the prejudice and intolerance of that portion of the eastern press which affects a foreign accent. The owner of one of the leading jingo papers of New York lives on the other side of the Atlantic; think of this non-resident using the columns of an American paper to libel both the native born and the naturalized citizens of this country who are helping to develop the resources of the nation, while he, luxuriating abroad, is advocating a policy, which, if adopted by this country, would waste our accumulated wealth upon battlefields as the wealth of Europe is being wasted. Some of the New York papers are owned by men who either by birth, by social ties, or by investments, are so intimately connected with predatory wealth that they can not look at any question from the standpoint of the man who earns his living.

These men who spend their time preaching the gospel of force have tried to lash this country into an uproar for war; and they resent, as if unpatriotic, any attempt to overcome their influence. They not only assume the exclusive right to define national honor and to direct the national policy, but they are presumptuous enough to attempt to instruct the president as to whom he should or should not entrust with office. As I was leaving the east, I read an editorial in a Monday morning paper warning the president not to appoint as counselor for the state department a certain prominent democrat, named by the paper, because he is of Quaker ancestry and therefore presumed to favor peaceful methods rather than warlike methods; and yet if the makers of ammunition were to get together tomorrow and select their chief counsel and recommend him as the proper person to advise the president as to the requirements of national honor, every jingo editor would join in the recommendation and insist that he represented the highest type of citizenship.

Speaking in this splendid farming section of this great agricultural state, and speaking at this time, I have little choice as to the subject to be discussed. The farmer's interest in peace naturally suggests itself as the most appropriate theme for us to consider together on this occasion.

The farmer lives his day near to nature and in the presence of those mighty forces which daily speak to him of his Creator—he is uncorrupted by that fierce struggle for wealth which makes men forget God and the duty which they owe to their fellowmen. He lives where the ties of neighborhood are strong and where the incentives to conflict are few; and he has no pecuniary interest in the industries which thrive on war. He lives for his children; to raise them aright and send them forth properly educated and trained for the responsibilities of citizenship is his chief care. He does not take kindly to the idea of sacrificing them to gratify someone's military ambition or to purchase markets. Having no purposes that need to be concealed, he does not understand the diplomacy that culminates in war. Himself innocent of harmful intent, he is not easily convinced that the world is so wicked as to require this nation to arm itself to the teeth and swagger about looking for an excuse to fight. While he is ready to give his all to his country if his country needs it, his tastes as well as his interests make him the friend of peace and the apostle of good-will.

I can not better present the line of thought which I have in mind than by asking you to consider with me three questions:

First—What would war mean to the United States?

Second—What is there in the present situation which would justify us in entering into this European conflict, and what methods should be employed for the adjustment of such differences as arise between us and the belligerent nations?

Third—How can the sentiment of the people be brought to the attention of the president in