history when we are in duty bound to apply the highest ethical standards.

Let me present in a picture drawn from common life the lesson for today: if you see a young mother, looking with admiring eyes upon her ten-year-old boy, what compliment do you pay her son, if you desire to please her? There is one which she will appreciate more than any other—"How well and strong your boy is." She is concerned about his physical development and rejoices in his vigor and freedom from disease. Ten years later, when he is nearing the close of his college course and she is watching his every step with motherly solicitude—what message do you bring her then, if you would cheer her heart? There is one that she will prize above all others—"Your son leads his class; his mind is clear, his reasoning accurate; he is the favorite scholar in his school." Her heart will swell with pride; she knew it would be thus, but it makes her happy to hear that her expectations have been realized. Thirty years later visit that mother, when the silver threads have multiplied and her hair is white with the frost of eighty winters—what words concerning her son delight her then? That he is big and strong? No; she is not thinking of his physical strength. That he is the intellectual peer of the best in his community; no; her thoughts are not upon his mind. How can you make her heart glad? Tell her that he is GOOD; that he is the enemy of every public evil and a pillar of support to every righteous cause; that his sympathies go out to all who need a friend. Give her this message and tears of joy will fill her eyes; all her trials will be forgotten; she will have been rewarded for all her sacrifices; she will feel that she has not lived in vain.

And does not this change take place in the meaning of our flag? In the beginning it spoke of strength—a strength that achieved independence and started the nation on its superb career. And then, as our constitution inspired the making of other constitutions, and as statutes were modeled after ours, our flag proclaimed constructive genius and leadership in the science of government; but now an hundred millions labor in peace under the Stars and Stripes, while the world outside groans under the burdens of war, and brothers imbrue their hands with brother's blood. At such an hour as this, when the Old World has gone mad and the times seem out of joint, our flag must mean more than the glory of war; it must be more than a flaunting boast of intellectual power. We can not woo the world away from its woes by mental processes; they lack the warmth that the present situation demands. The heart, overflowing with sympathy and animated by good will—this, and this only, is equal to the delicate and difficult task that falls to the United States. This is the task for which a great nation has prepared itself; this is the task for which our people are ready. Is not this the message which our nation waves to the world in the folds of its flag? May the God of our fathers give us light and keep our feet in the path of truth as we strive to fulfill the high mission to which He has called our country.

JOURNALISM

(Abstract of an address delivered by William Jennings Bryan at the Panama Pacific International Exposition, before the International Press Congress, July 6th, 1915.)

Mr. Chairman, President Beteta, Ex-President Williams, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The effort which Mr. Williams made to distinguish between the journalist and the statesman reminds me of a witty remark which I heard while I was in congress. A newspaper man called me to the door of the house of representatives to ask me a question. When I showed some hesitation about answering him he reassured me by saying "You need not be afraid to trust me. I am talking to you now as a gentleman, not in my capacity as a newspaper man." It was a nice distinction, but one which is not really necessary, because there is no reason why a gentleman can not be a newspaper man or a newspaper man a gentleman. With rare exceptions, the journalists whom I have met have been both. And so there is no necessary distinction between being a journalist and a statesman. There is no reason why a statesman should not be a journalist, and really no reason why a journalist should not be statesmanlike. We have had two illustrations of this in the incoming president and in the retiring president. The address of President Beteta to which we have just listened is sufficient proof that he is not only a journalist but that he has a grasp upon the matters with which statesmen deal—no one could listen to the profound philosophy which he presented without being convinced of this. And, having known the retiring president, Mr. Walter Williams, for more than twenty years, I can testify that he is not only one of the foremost journalists of the country but also that he has dealt most intelligently with matters of government.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to participate in this important meeting of the international peace congress. None of you go beyond me in the estimate which you place upon the position and the power of journalism in this age. It is not only a great profession but it is the profession which has the largest opportunity, and, if rightfully used, can exert the widest influence. The journalist even has some advantages over the statesman if he chooses to deal with public questions in a statesmanlike way. While he is denied the satisfaction of sympathetic communion with an audience, his pen carries farther than the voice can reach and he can make his appeals more frequent and more continuous.

Whenever I have occasion to describe my work in a single word I call myself a journalist, and, having for more than two years felt the restraints which official position imposes upon utterance, I find satisfaction in being able to enter again the field of newspaper discussion. Often when reading editorials which I thought ought to be answered, but to which I was not at liberty to reply, I have recalled a story which I heard some years ago. A man went to the theatre on a pass; the play was very bad and the actors were hissed and hooted, but the man who entered on a complimentary ticket felt that the proprieties of the occasion required him to keep still. Finally, one of the audience, noticing that he did not join in expressions of disapproval, went to him and protested against his silence. "You do not want it understood that you like this play, do you?" he was asked. "NO" replied the man with the pass, "I do not like this play any better than the rest of you, but I came in on a pass; I promise you this, however, if this thing gets much worse I will go out and buy a ticket and then I'll be as emphatic as any of you." I am now in a position to criticise my brother editors as well as to be criticized by them.

In such a presence it will not be necessary to speak of the minor temptations which come to the journalist—but you will pardon a word as to the temptation which probably comes most often, namely, the temptation to attempt to win favor by writing simply to please. One is not to be blamed for finding pleasure in being agreeable, but an editor who does his duty can not always please everybody, and the effort to do so is apt to be as fatal to him as it was to chameleon of which you have probably heard. A man, visiting the home of a friend, became interested in a pet chameleon. Meeting his friend a few months afterwards he inquired about the little animal. "It is dead" said the owner. "Dead? Why how did that happen?" inquired the friend. "Well," said the owner, "It was very accommodating and seemed to take pleasure in exhibiting its accomplishments. I would put it upon a piece of red cloth and it would turn red; then I would put it upon a green cloth and it would turn green, and so on; but one day a visitor insisted that I put it on a piece of Scotch plaid and the poor little thing killed itself trying to match the colors." It is impossible for an editor to match all colors, and he will find it better, in the end, to pursue a consistent course; if he speaks frankly to his readers and establishes a reputation for candor and sincerity they will give weight to his words.

Assuming that it is your desire to increase the usefulness of the press and to see it conducted on the highest possible plane—the only means by which its usefulness can reach a maximum—I venture to suggest three things which, in my judgment, will give a larger influence to the journalist.

No one can fail to note that the weekly paper, owned and edited by the same person, exerts a larger influence in proportion to the number of its subscribers than the big daily newspapers, owned by a corporation, controlled by influences which are unknown to its readers and edited by a group of persons with whose names and personalities the people are unacquainted. The reason for this is obvious; as the strength of a speech depends, not so much upon what the man says as upon the character of the man behind the speech, so the influence of an editorial depends not upon the number of those who read it, but upon the faith that the readers have in the character of the man who writes the editorial or is responsible for it. It is hard to form an estimate of the value of an editorial unless we know the man and know that the editorial expresses the honest conviction of a disinterested person in whose uprightness we have confidence.

The way, therefore, to higher journalism lies along the line of publicity as to the real influences which control the paper. Until within a few years the people of the United States had no way of knowing who owned the papers which they read, and, therefore, no way of judging what pecuniary interest the owners had in misinforming the public. We now have a law which compels a paper to reveal its ownership and the pecuniary obligations which rest upon the paper. The law also adds a very important requirement, namely, that advertisements shall be so indicated that the reader will know what is paid for and what represents the conscience and judgment of the owner or editor of the paper. It is astonishing that it took so long to secure the information which the public is now able to obtain in regard to the ownership of papers; strange that a newspaper which lives on publicity should avoid publicity as to itself. Until a short time ago some of our newspapers were like a dark lantern—they threw light upon everything except themselves, and it was not a matter of surprise that those papers which employed dark lantern methods were being used by men who exhibited some of the characteristics of a burglar.

I do not know that it will be possible to give the public legal protection from the injury done by those journalists who put the passion for sensational news above the desire that the truth shall be stated accurately. We must trust the readers to punish this violation of newspaper ethics by giving support to those papers which are able to withstand the temptation to print "the news" before they have authentic information.

There are, however, some things that can be done by law for the protection of the public, and my experience in the state department leads me suggest that it would contribute to the welfare of the public, as well as to the standing of journalism, to require the owner of a newspaper to make known to his readers any pecuniary interest which he has in the governmental policy which he recommends. If, for instance, he advocates intervention in the affairs of another country, his readers have a right to know whether his interest in intervention is in any respect different from the public interest — that is, whether he would reap a profit while the people bore the expense. And for the same reason, if a newspaper urges annexation of territory, his readers have a right to know whether annexation would be of personal and pecuniary profit to him.

If a newspaper urges an increase in the naval and military appropriations, it is only fair that the readers should know whether the owner has a pecuniary interest in the building of battleships, or in the manufacture of arms and ammunition, or in army contracts. If a newspaper adopts a policy calculated to create friction between this country and other countries and to stir up passions which might lead to war, it is only fair that the public know whether the owner of the paper is pecuniarily interested in producing a feeling of alarm which can be used to support a demand for "greater preparedness."

And so, if a newspaper opposes effective railroad regulation, its readers ought to know whether the owner of the paper is also an owner of railroad stock; if a newspaper tries to convince its readers that a trust is an economic benefit to the nation, its readers ought to know whether the proprietor owns trust stock; if a newspaper opposes municipal ownership of municipal franchises, the readers ought to know whether his views on the subject are affected by the ownership of stock in such enterprises.

In suggesting that the public should know such material facts as would enable it to properly weigh the editorial utterances of a newspaper, I am only proposing that we apply to the newspaper the principles that have long been applied in courts of justice. If we regard a journalist as a witness and the editorial page as testimony, we should remember that the witness is always subjected to cross-examination and that the first question asked is as to his interest in the result of the case. If, on cross-examination, he discloses a pecuniary interest in the success of the side for which he testifies, that interest is always taken into consideration in determining the weight to be given to his testimony.

If we give to the journalist a still higher position and invest him with the authority of a judge to decide for his readers questions of interest to the public, then there is still more rea-