

what is; progress peers into the future and seeks to know what ought to be.

Our nation has profited by precedent, but it has not permitted itself to be fettered by it, and hereafter as heretofore, it must be brave enough to mark out new ways and to achieve new victories.

There being no time for elaboration, I must content myself with speaking of things fundamental; I ask you to consider three lines in which progress has been made and along which still further progress is possible. First, we must solve aright the domestic problems which confront our generation—and we must do this not only for ourselves but that our example may help those, in foreign lands, who, while not as free as we are to set the pace, are as anxious as we that a right solution shall be reached. Every domestic problem of any importance involves to a greater or less extent a conflict between human rights and what are known as property rights. Jefferson, the most profound political philosopher who has yet appeared, and the greatest constructive statesman in the world's history, founded his entire system of philosophy upon the proposition that human rights are superior to property rights—not that property rights should be ignored but that they should never be placed above the inalienable rights of man; three of which, the right to life, the right to liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness, are enumerated in the Declaration of Independence.

Lincoln, who was not ashamed to count himself a follower of Thomas Jefferson, presented the issue in language more apt, more terse, and more epigrammatic than any employed by Jefferson in advancing the same idea. In 1859 Lincoln, in a letter expressing his regret that he was unable to accept an invitation to participate in the celebration of Jefferson Day at Boston, said: "The republican party believes in the man and the dollar, but, in case of conflict, it believes in the man before the dollar." It will be seen that his political philosophy rested upon the same foundation as Jefferson's and that he agreed with the Sage of Monticello in giving higher consideration to man, the handiwork of God, than to property, the handiwork of man. If Jefferson, the first and greatest democrat, and Lincoln, the first and greatest republican, united in supporting a proposition, it would seem to be worthy to be accepted by this generation, unless its correctness can be successfully impeached; but as this proposition is sometimes rejected in practice by those who have not the courage to openly combat it, I shall invoke the authority of one greater than either of the political leaders to whom I have referred, the teacher from whom both, consciously or unconsciously, drew their inspiration. Christ, in language conveying a like meaning, has drawn the same comparison and drawn it in favor of man as against property. In emphasizing the superior claims of the things that are spiritual over things which are material, he asks: "Is not the life more than meat and the body more than raiment?" And yet, notwithstanding the fact that this proposition, namely, that man comes first and property afterwards, is endorsed by authority which can not be controverted; in spite of the fact that the proposition is supported also by the universal conscience of the common people, we find that every important economic problem, here and elsewhere, now and always, involves this dispute as to which has the prior claim; and the precedents of history, I must admit, are largely on the side of property.

If the United States is to lead the world in the advance toward economic peace, it must be guided by this principle, that human rights come first, and must apply it to every question with which it has to deal. This does not mean that property rights are to be violated; it means, rather that respect for human rights is a condition precedent to the security of property rights. Let man's prior claim be recognized and he will see to it that the claims of property have due consideration; if man's rights are trampled upon, the rights of property will have no defender.

The second thought for which I ask consideration relates to the true measure of greatness. According to the old standard, the individual grew in importance as he was able to command the services of others; he was great in proportion as people, either voluntarily or under compulsion, labored for him. The natural outgrowth of this measure of greatness was a contempt for labor; labor has usually been regarded as a badge of inferiority, while idleness has too often been accepted as an evidence of respectability. It was a cruel theory—as demoralizing to those who ate the bread that others earned as it was unjust to

those whose toil was unrequited. It was supported by precedent, but it was challenged nineteen hundred years ago and is losing prestige day by day. No more revolutionary doctrine was ever advanced on earth than that proclaimed by the Nazarene, when, in response to a very human question, he said "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." That doctrine is growing; and today a multitude, not all professing Christians, it is true, nor professing Christians only, but, inside of the church and outside of the church, an increasing number are not only accepting this moral philosophy but are finding that, paradoxical as it may seem, there is more pleasure in giving than in receiving. He who GIVES lays up capital upon which he may reasonably expect returns, while the one who RECEIVES is running into debt—he is contracting obligations which he can not honorably ignore. Precedent supports the old theory, but progress may be estimated by the extent to which the new theory is being adopted.

Most of the sins which nations commit against each other find their source in the failure to apply to nations the moral principles which we apply to individuals. The more we consider this tendency to ignore in international matters the common rules of everyday life the more we wonder at it, because there is no other rule which can be substituted for it. To illustrate what I mean, let me ask you to consider one of the most familiar errors which we have to encounter. If anyone is asked his opinion of the commandment "Thou shalt not steal," he promptly replies that it presents a self-evident truth; and yet we know that the man who steals a small amount is, as a rule, more certain of punishment than the man who steals a very large amount. Why? There is no logic by which the fact can be justified, but we all know that the man who commits grand larceny has more apologists than the man who is guilty of petty larceny; and we further know that the stealing of any amount by an individual is more quickly condemned than the larceny of territory by nations. How many must join in the violation of a moral law in order to convert theft into patriotism?

And so with the commandment "Thou shalt not kill"; no one would risk his own reputation by attempting to defend the act of any individual who commits murder, either for money or out of revenge. By what process of reasoning then, shall we convince ourselves that the moral character of the act is changed when the killing is done on a large scale for the securing of territory, is the outgrowth of race or religious hatred, or because of family ambitions or trade rivalries?

But these illustrations are employed merely to reinforce the proposition that moral principles apply to groups, no matter how large, as well as to individuals, and the acceptance of this proposition leads us to the conclusion that the greatness of a nation must be measured by the same rule which we apply to individuals. If the individual is great, not in proportion as he takes out of the world but in proportion as he contributes to the welfare of his fellows, so the nation is great, not in proportion as it absorbs but in proportion as it gives to mankind.

We need not fear to apply this measure of greatness to our nation. It has earned its primacy by the assistance which it has rendered to the world—assistance rendered in many ways, two of which deserve special mention. First: It is giving money to worthy causes as no other nation now gives or ever has given; we are each year spending unselfishly more money per capita for people who do not live under our flag than any other people now living or whose donations history records. If you travel westward you will find scattered all over Asia religious and intellectual centers established by American missionaries and American teachers. After following an unbroken chain of these churches and schools established by American altruism and supported by American money, I found satisfaction in the thought that, if we cannot claim that the sun never sets upon American territory, we do have reason to rejoice that the sun never sets upon American philanthropy; before the orb of day goes down upon one of these evidences of America's greatness, it rises upon another.

Second: We are giving that which money can not buy; we are giving ideas and ideals. The idea is the only thing that defies monopoly; it is as free as the air we breathe and as necessary to the spiritual life of the individual and the world as air is to the human body. It is one's own fault if any other person has higher ideals than his own, for he can appropriate any ideal if he will. Ideas pass from nation to nation, and

they are more priceless than merchandise, although they can not be burdened by import or export duties, or vexed by customs collectors. Our treasury statistics do not enumerate the ideas imported or exported, and yet this commerce far exceeds in real value the commerce about which we are so solicitous. In the exchange of ideas we are anxious to have the balance of trade against us rather than in our favor, for only then can we have the satisfaction that comes from knowing that our contributions exceed the gifts which we receive.

And this brings me to the third thought which I deem appropriate to this day, namely, the methods which we should employ in dealing with other nations.

In international affairs we are compelled to choose between two opposite and conflicting theories; one is supported by the precedents of history—the other is in harmony with the principles which we are more and more applying in daily life. One of these theories relies upon force; the other on persuasion. Force has back of it the physical power of the nation and its purpose is to COMPEL. Persuasion has back of it the spirit of friendship and seeks to CONVINCe. Stated in simple terms, the program of force contemplates a consent grudgingly given as the result of coercion; persuasion contemplates an agreement voluntarily reached as the result of argument. While there may be no apparent difference in the immediate effect—for both may accomplish the same result, there is a tremendous difference if we consider years instead of days. A victory secured through threat of force is only temporary; the resentment which it arouses and the spirit of revenge to which it gives birth rob the triumph of its permanence. On the other hand, a victory secured by persuasion is lasting and lays the foundation for a co-operation which creates instead of destroys.

Some years ago I heard an illustration used by a New York divine; I repeat it because I can not improve upon it. He likened force to the hammer and love to the rays of the sun; "With the hammer," he said, "you can break a mass of ice into a thousand pieces, but each piece will still be ice," but "sunshine," he continued, "acting silently and slowly, will melt the mass and there will be ice no more." If, in dealing with individuals, "a soft answer turneth away wrath," it is no less true that the spirit which leads to negotiations will avert the feeling of hostility out of which war is born.

This nation more than any other great nation is at liberty to put God's truth to the test, and in international affairs try the efficacy of those methods which have proven successful among individuals. With an ocean rolling on either side; with a mountain range along either coast, we are singularly free from the possibility of invasion—invasion, the fear of which has led the European nations to convert themselves into armed camps. We find an incentive, too, in the fact that, having won distinction as the leader of the peace movement, we have a reputation to sustain.

And we can not overlook another important fact, namely, that we have the machinery by which peace can be preserved, while the nations of Europe, insofar as they deal with each other, have only machinery for war. We have thirty treaties linking us to three-quarters of the inhabitants of the globe, and pledging us to the investigation of every dispute before a declaration of war or the commencement of hostilities. The plan embodied in these treaties gives us an honorable means of avoiding hasty action; it gives us an opportunity to appeal to the sober second thought of those with whom we have a controversy. These treaties do not make war impossible; we can under these treaties have war if, after due deliberation, the people really want war, but they give the parties to the treaties a chance to think before they shoot.

I have brought before you these three propositions, which, if applied, will materially affect the conduct of our nation, and the meaning of our flag is determined by what our nation does. The flag represents, not what the nation WAS or MAY BE, but what the nation IS, and we who are citizens of this great republic are privileged to share in shaping the nation's policy and in determining the ideals which our flag shall proclaim to the world. No other people enjoy so great a distinction, and therefore, citizenship nowhere else carries with it so great a responsibility. This is the day of all the days in the year when it is our duty to weigh well this responsibility; This is the age of all ages when our hearts ought to be open to the summons to great service. We have reached that period in the nation's progress and that epoch in the world's