

son to inquire whether he is disinterested, for the judge, by universal custom, is prohibited from acting in a case in which he has a personal or pecuniary interest. I am sure you will agree with me that the influence of the journalist will be increased in proportion as he wins public confidence; the journalist who conceals a selfish interest while he advises the public to his own profit—such a journalist violates the sense of justice which God has placed in every human heart.

Another suggestion: In line with what I have said it seems reasonable to suppose that the signing of editorials and of news reports would contribute both to accuracy and to the reputation of the writers. It is one of the injustices of the present system that the men who furnish the literary ability—the editorial writers and newspaper correspondents—often live in obscurity, while the corporation from which they draw pay reaps an unfair profit from their genius.

The signature of the writer would serve as a sort of copyright and give to the man of ability a proprietor's interest in his own work, besides giving to the writer's words the additional weight that character adds. The identifying of the journalist with his work would also raise the ideals of newspaper life; a man who acts in the open is more apt to be careful and conscientious than one who acts in the dark. The journalistic ideal will not be what it ought to be until the editor asserts the right to make his utterances represent his own conscience and judgment. The man who boasts that he can write on one side of a question as well as on the other, ought not to have influence on either side. The citizen can not afford to say that which he does not believe, whether he says it with his voice or with his pen; and journalism can not afford to require a surrender of the ideals of citizenship.

Just one other suggestion. There is a marked tendency toward so-called independence in our large papers. This independence is usually defended on the ground of a superior patriotism. The reason generally given by the so-called independent journalist for not making his paper a "party organ" is that he desires to be free to take the position which public interest demands. In some cases this claim to independence may be asserted with sincerity, but, like all good things, it is sometimes made a cloak for ulterior purposes. While party action is not always controlled by party affiliation, still there are a comparatively few citizens who do not lean to one side or the other of the line that divides great parties and the man who really thinks that he can write on public questions without bias is more apt to deceive himself than those who read what he says.

If the proprietor of a newspaper desires to make his paper really independent, he will, I think, find it necessary to make it bi-partisan rather than non-partisan; that is, he will find it better to present BOTH sides than to attempt to maintain a position of neutrality between the parties. I have for some years been hoping that some large newspaper would make the experiment of giving both sides of each political question in editorials written and signed by representatives of the various parties. For instance, instead of feeding his readers with a political salad, made up of principles and policies selected by him from the different parties, he might try the plan of presenting both sides so that his readers can make the selection themselves. I believe that such a plan would prove acceptable to the readers, if, as I contend, the general public has confidence in its ability to weigh arguments and to make its own decisions upon matters of government.

I feel that this is the proper place and an opportune time for these observations and I have such faith in the final triumph of all that is true that I submit them with confidence to the discriminating public which is represented here. I beg you to take them in the spirit in which I offer them; reject them if they do not commend themselves to you; if you approve of them, carry them with you to the wide constituency to which your journals speak.

Allow me, in conclusion, to express my gratification at the honor which has been bestowed upon Guatemala in the selection of one of her distinguished citizens as the head of this International Press organization. I remember with pleasure that Guatemala was the second nation to endorse the peace plan which, being offered to all alike, has now been accepted by thirty nations representing three-fourths of the population of the world. Guatemala was not only the second of the nations to sign this kind of a treaty with us but was the first to exchange rat-

ifications. Guatemala is not a large nation, but as we approach the era of perpetual peace, the small nation is destined to play a larger part in the world's affairs than it has done under the reign of force. If you will turn back to the Book of Books you will find that lessons have been drawn from the weak rather than the strong. For instance, Solomon asks us to consider the ant—not some powerful beast, but a tiny insect—"Go to the ant thou sluggard, consider her ways, and be wise." And Christ, when he desired to express his solicitude for his people, said, "How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathers her chickens under her wing, and ye would not." When the sword, the emblem of war, is beaten into the plowshare, the emblem of peaceful production, then the small nation can enter into honorable rivalry with the great nations, for then the rivalry will not be in suppression and destruction but to see who can hold highest the torch that lights the way for all.

WOMAN'S INTEREST IN PEACE

(Abstract of address delivered by William Jennings Bryan, at the Panama Pacific International Exposition before the International Conference of Women Workers to Promote Permanent Peace, July 7th, 1915.)

When a nation is at war it has a right to command the support of all its citizens, and no one need doubt that, in such an emergency, our people would give such support with loyalty and unanimity. The very fact that this support would be demanded and given makes it the more imperative that the people shall freely express themselves on questions at issue BEFORE a state of war is reached. It is not only the privilege but the duty of the people to speak while they can speak with propriety. The government acts for all the people and in a republic it may always be assumed that the executive carries out what he believes to be the will of the people—in the case of our present executive no one who knows him will for a moment doubt his desire to give true expression to the wishes of his constituents.

But how shall the wishes of his constituents be made known to him? If congress was in session the trend of public opinion would be indicated by resolution or other form of expression, the right to declare war being specifically vested in congress by the constitution. But congress is not in session, and there is no organized expression of public opinion which can be presumed to accurately reflect the popular mind. The utterances of the newspapers are ordinarily regarded as an index of public sentiment, but it must be remembered that there are many newspapers and that they differ in two very important respects: First—the dailies, having more frequent opportunities than the weeklies to impress upon those in authority the views which they express, are apt to have an influence out of proportion to their numbers; and, second, that the larger newspapers are not as close to the masses as the smaller dailies and weeklies. In considering the weight of newspaper opinion it must also be remembered that the editors who write about war speak for THEMSELVES and not, necessarily, for their readers. It is not fair, therefore, to proportion the weight of editorial opinion according to the size of the circulation. If we wish to be just to all we must give equal consideration to the opinions of those who read the papers and to the opinions of those who publish papers, remembering that the reader of a paper has as much right as the editor to give his opinion to public officials.

I have felt it worth while to bring these matters to your attention in order to emphasize the right of every citizen to an opinion in a matter so important as war; and in considering the rights of citizens I need not add that woman is a citizen. Woman is not only a citizen in theory but she is, as a matter of fact, interested in every subject with which the government has to deal. She shares in all the benefits that flow from good government and she also bears her portion of the burdens which bad government brings upon the people. The world is turning more and more to the opinion that, since woman can not escape from the results of government, she should not be excluded from the enjoyment of those rights by the exercise of which she may participate in shaping and directing the course of the government.

Nowhere is her interest greater than in those

matters which relate to war, and I appreciate the opportunity which this meeting affords to call attention to woman's interest in peace.

Woman is interested in peace first—because war may take from her the sons whom she has reared. I need not, in this presence, emphasize the mother's affection for her son—nothing furnishes more convincing proof of the truth of the Bible declaration—"Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The child is the mother's treasure; it represents her most precious gift to society. Her life trembles in the balance at the child's birth; her nervous energy and force are expended upon it; she endows it with her love. From a third to a half of the average woman's life is devoted to her children—no wonder that her affection for them is measured by the amount which she gives to them and does for them. It would be unjust to require her to remain silent on questions which may lead to war and thus leave the field of discussion to those less interested than she in the maintenance of peace.

Second: Woman is also interested as a wife, since the war may call not only for her sons but for her husband also. When a woman links her fortunes with the fortunes of her husband and they together establish that unit of society which we call the home, she becomes vitally interested in any demands that may be made upon her husband, especially in demands which may involve the surrender of his life. The greater part of the burdens of war fall upon the woman—it would be difficult to overstate that portion of war's weight which woman, whether mother or wife, is compelled to bear. If death comes to a man upon the battlefield, his suffering is but for a moment, while his glory endures; to the wife, however, the suffering is prolonged, for she is not only bereft of her companion but is compelled to bear a double burden in the care of the children. Has she no right to a voice in determining the standards which shall be invoked in international affairs? Has she no right to protest against the attempt to define national honor in the same terms that individual honor was defined when dueling was the custom? Under the duelist's code of honor, the husband could not consider the welfare of his family; he must avenge an insult with his life or be branded as a coward. Must we adopt as the standard of national honor that false standard of individual honor which was repudiated when the practice of dueling was prohibited?

In deciding what is necessary for the maintenance of national honor, woman not only has a right to a voice, but she is in duty bound to give expression to her views, or she may suffer the penalty of having her rights over-riden and her interests disregarded by those who, either because of a special interest, or because of a mistaken view, have a false impression as to what national honor requires.

Third: As a member of society, woman, even when neither mother nor wife, has her responsibilities to bear, and those responsibilities she can not ignore.

And how can woman's influence be exerted for the prevention of war? In many ways. She can express her views at such meetings as this and in other public places; she can join in petitions to the executive; she can address individual appeals to those in authority; she can contribute to a better understanding of what war really means; she can point out the difference between the soldier as we see him on gala days and at parade, and the soldier on the battlefield. And she will not overlook the evil effects that follow war, the hatreds that are engendered, which become the cause of other wars. Neither can she overlook the postponement of industrial, economic and social reforms, due to the increased burdens placed upon industry and to the diverting of attention from domestic to international problems.

I need not remind those who are gathered here that woman can be largely useful in proposing and supporting the means by which war may be averted. Our government has at hand the machinery for maintaining peace with honor, machinery which the other nations, as a rule, have not as yet adopted for their intercourse with each other.

We have treaties, thirty in number, made with as many nations, and these nations exercise authority over three-fourths of the population of the world. These treaties provide for the investigation of every dispute of every character and the contracting nations are obligated not to declare war or begin hostilities until the investigation is completed. These treaties give a period of not to exceed a year for this investigation, and it is believed that the investigation, by