

order that this sentiment may counteract the influence of that portion of the press which is insisting upon a course which may, if adopted, lead us into war.

To understand what this war really is, take the number actually killed thus far—more than two millions of men, and the number wounded, more than five millions of men—and compare this enormous loss of life with the population of one of the larger states; this will give you some idea of the sacrifice in life. Look back over the last hundred years and recall the expressions of sympathy which have been called forth by floods, and fires, and epidemics which came through accident or lack of information. Nobody wanted to bring these afflictions upon the country, and yet the nation has mourned. The loss of life in any of these disasters—yes, the loss of life in all of these combined—has been insignificant as compared with the loss of life which can reasonably be expected to come to this country if we take part in this war. What will be the sum of the people's sorrow if by the nation's voluntary act so great a calamity is brought upon the country?

If you would know what the cost of this war is in dollars and cents, remember that the expenditures now amount to something like four hundred millions a week, a billion and a half a month, or 15 billions in ten months. Within the last few days one of the belligerent nations has voted a credit of five billions to carry on the war; another has announced the loan of a billion, two hundred millions—loans are the order of the day now; they are mortgages placed upon the future for money to be squandered in the present. What would be the pecuniary cost to this country if we engaged in this war? The jingoes are already insisting upon an immediate appropriation of five hundred millions to put the country in a state of preparedness, a million more than the cost of the Panama canal. What would five hundred millions do for this country if expended in establishing waterways connection between the Lakes and the Gulf?

One of the eastern newspapers a few days ago suggested that congress ought to be called together at once to vote a billion dollars to create a war fund. War is a high-priced luxury—it costs fifty thousand dollars to produce a modern cannon. Measure this sum by the price of mowers or cultivators, or by the cost of reclaiming arid lands, and see how much more expensive it is to destroy than it is to produce.

The last battleship launched, the Arizona, cost fifteen millions of dollars. Compare this sum with twenty-three millions, the entire amount appropriated last year for the department of agriculture—more than one-half as much spent for one battleship as we give to the department which guards the interests of the farmers of the nation.

Those who are demanding war do not represent the American people—they do not represent the farmers who constitute nearly one-half of the population; they do not represent the laboring men, who, with the farmers, constitute something like two-thirds of the population of the country; and they do not represent the business men who buy from, and sell to, the farmers and laborers, or those engaged in transporting the products of the country. These four classes constitute not less than eighty per cent of our entire population; these do not desire war, for upon them would fall the burden of conducting it. They would also have to furnish the soldiers and they would have to pay the taxes to supply the funds for war.

Second—Why should we have war? Is it to prevent interference with commerce? While we should employ every diplomatic means to prevent interference with commerce, we must always bear in mind that the injury which is done is an unintentional injury—that is, the countries that injure us do it, not out of unfriendliness to us, but because they think that the action taken is necessary to success in the struggle in which they are engaged with other belligerent nations. The injury to us is incidental to the conflict and not an attack upon us, and at the most it is small in comparison with the cost of the remedy which the jingoes propose. If we can not, by diplomatic means, secure the redress which we believe our exporters deserve, we can employ the plan proposed by our treaties which will allow time for passions to subside and for reason to resume its sway. If necessary we can postpone final adjustment until the war is over and then recover the damages which we have suffered. We are not without a remedy—we have remedies which are adequate, but the jingoes will be satisfied with nothing but blood letting.

But let us consider our dispute with Germany. It involves not so much interference with trade as destruction of life. This raises a more serious question, but it must be remembered that Germany's action, too, has not been taken out of hostility to us, but is founded on the belief that her methods of warfare are necessary for her own protection. We do not agree with her; we believe that the methods employed are cruel and inhuman, and we have so stated, but is there no remedy except war? Must we insist upon war with a nation that does not want war with us? We can offer some protection to our citizens by preventing their taking the risks that those took who sailed on the Lusitania. When we assert that an American citizen has a right to go anywhere on the high seas, we can not mean that we intend to relieve him of the exercise of ordinary care or that he is at liberty to drag his country into war by assuming unnecessary risks.

The sentiment of the American people would not support any such doctrine. If the government can demand of its citizens the surrender of their lives to carry the nation THROUGH a war after it becomes involved in war, may it not rightfully demand of its citizens that they shall so conduct themselves as not to draw the country into war? If a mayor can keep the people off the streets during a riot, can not the federal government keep the people out of the war zone while the belligerents are shooting at each other?

The treaties which we have made with thirty countries cover every question. Why not apply them to Germany as we are pledged to apply them if the same controversy arises between us and Great Britain, France, Russia, or Italy? To go to war to avenge the death of less than 150 Americans, whom Germany had no desire to kill, would be to send a thousand times as many more to meet those who went down with the Lusitania.

What definition of national honor shall we accept; one which compels us to enter into a fight with mad-men? A definition which would compel us to engage in war to prevent things which we can better prevent by peaceful methods? The farmers of the nation will answer, no.

Third—How can the opinion of the people reach the president? A multitude of ways are open. If you will read the papers that have been demanding war, you will find that their subscribers are answering the editorials in the letters which are being published; this is an indication of public opinion. The country weeklies are near to the people; they are a better index of public sentiment than the large dailies—send marked copies of them to the White House. Resolutions are being passed at public meetings—these are being forwarded to the president. Petitions also can be signed and sent to the executive. But there is an easier way—each citizen has access to the White House through the mails. A brief letter of a few words on a postal card will suffice to register an opinion. The sentiment of the country can be summed up in a few sentences: The people do not want war! The people do not believe that any adequate cause for the war exists. While the people will support the president in any war which may come, they will also gladly support him in any efforts which he may make to secure a peaceful settlement of any differences which we now have with the belligerent nations, or which may arise in the future. The people prefer to apply the peace treaty plan rather than the jingo plan. The people believe that it is better to postpone if necessary, the final adjustment of difficulties until peace is restored, rather than join in a war which is not only causeless but seemingly endless.

No one can speak for all the people, but if each one speaks for himself the voice of the people will be heard, and, being heard, will save this nation from the possibility of war and keep it in such a position of neutrality as will enable it to perform its high mission of mediator to the warring nations and peacemaker for mankind.

THE MEANING OF THE FLAG

(Address delivered by William Jennings Bryan at Independence Day celebration, Panama Pacific International Exposition, Monday, July 5th, 1915.)

If an American citizen is ever inclined to boast of his nation's past, present or future, the temptation comes to him most strongly on this day when he celebrates the anniversary of his country's birth. That the temptation often overcomes

those who speak on the Fourth of July is proven by the fact that we have a phrase which is used to describe a type of speech occasionally heard on this day; it is called "spread eagle oratory." The material for such boasting is easily at hand. We have an illustrious ancestry in those who, when the principles of representative government were not popular, declared those principles to be "self-evident truths," devised a superior form of government and inaugurated a new political system. They possessed in an eminent degree all the qualities which are to be found in those who have earned the right to be called great. They had rare intelligence; a true sense of justice, and confidence in both the right and the capacity of the people for self-government; they had also the courage to proclaim and to defend these principles. They deserve our reverence as well as our gratitude.

If one's thoughts turn from the past to the present, he finds that this country, a world power for more than a century, is more of a world power today than ever before. We are the diplomatic clearing house of the world; our ambassadors and ministers are representing nearly all the belligerent nations in the countries with which they are at war.

If our minds turn to material things we find a development unexampled in history, and at its very height today. We produce and consume, it is estimated, more than twice as much as any equal population. This, the greatest of all expositions, daring in its inception and incomparable in its completeness, is a fair illustration of what our development makes possible.

But we would poorly employ this day if we occupied ourselves with self-congratulation and the passing of compliments. A glorious past is valuable only insofar as it stimulates to worthy endeavor, and present importance is only helpful insofar as it brings to us a clearer consciousness of the responsibilities which opportunity imposes.

Lincoln, in his memorable speech at Gettysburg, spoke of the unfinished task which lay before those whom he addressed. Each generation finds unfinished tasks awaiting it, and, no matter how satisfactory its progress, leaves tasks unfinished when it gives way to a succeeding generation. The work of civilization is never finished; the product of human hands is never perfect.

I know of no better way to celebrate this day than to consider with you the work which lies before us, if we are to prove ourselves worthy of those to whom we are indebted for the legacy which we enjoy. More is to be expected of us than of any other nation, past or present, because no other nation has received so largely from preceding ages or from contemporaneous nations. Our population is made up of the enterprising and ambitious of the Old World, and these, bringing with them the accumulated experience of all countries, contribute toward that public opinion which shapes our destiny.

Then, too, we have another advantage, the value of which can hardly be over-estimated. We are less hampered by tradition and precedent than the nations beyond the ocean; we have, therefore, been more free to profit by the lessons of experience.

Precedent is of great value but it has its limitations. Like almost every other good thing, it has an admixture of alloy. Precedent may be likened to the law of gravitation, in that it is necessary to stability and also in the sense that its influence is felt everywhere and always. But it is like the law of gravitation also in that it only exercises full control over that which is inanimate. Every living thing is in constant antagonism to the law of gravitation; not an advance can be made until there is both will and strength sufficient to overcome the force that draws all bodies toward the earth's center. The tiniest insect that creeps upon the ground triumphs over this all pervading force every move it makes, even the slender blade of grass records a victory when it lifts itself toward the sun.

And so with precedent; it is devoid of life; it is the force that must be overcome before any old burden can be lifted or any new step taken. Precedent follows the paths that are familiar and resists all innovation. Precedent expresses itself in the language of forebodings; it relies upon memory and all of its decrees are in the same language; "I find no record of this having been done; it, therefore, should not be done."

Progress, on the other hand, relies upon faith and aspires to that which never was before. Precedent looks backward and says "I fear;" progress looks forward and says "I'll try." Precedent knows what has been and considers only