

would like to say a word about a colleague, or townswoman, who also started for the scene of battle. I refer to Mrs. Coleman, better known as 'Kit,' of 'The Mail' (Applause.) "As you all know by her letters, Mrs. Coleman went down with the intention of going to Cuba. She got as far as Tampa. She got her papers from the War Department, authorizing her to accompany the army to Cuba. She made every effort that a human being could to accompany the army. I wish I could tell you the energy, the determination, and persistency with which she attempted to carry out the instructions of her paper to go to Cuba. But Gen. Shafter had made up his mind that a woman could not accompany the army to Cuba, and would not let her go. But it says something for her indomitable courage that she got there after all."

A voice—"Hurrah for Ireland." (Laughter.)

Mr. Ewan—"The troops went away, the transports went away without Mrs. Coleman, but she stayed in Tampa and finally got a war vessel and got where I did not get—into the city of Santiago—for about July 10, your humble servant was on the broad of his back in the village of Siboney—but Mrs. Coleman not only got to Siboney, but to Santiago, and she saw a great many remarkable sights in the city after the capture of it, and she tells me that she sent five of her letters home which never reached their destination. I am not surprised at that. The post office arrangements, like those of many other departments of the American army, broke down, and about the only thing that did not break down was the courage of the men, the Anglo-Saxon courage which did not break down, in spite of all the mistakes of commissariat, medical, ambulance and other departments." (Loud applause.)

The Chairman: "I am sure you are all pleased to have heard Mr. Ewan on his very interesting and trying experience in Cuba. We propose to make another slight variation in our programme, in order to finish up this war business at once. We have had something about the war in Cuba and we are to have something about the war in journalism. Mr. Sanford Evans will now address us on 'Should the Rules of War Govern in Journalism?'" (Applause.)

SHOULD THE RULES OF WAR GOVERN IN JOURNALISM?

Mr. Evans: "Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I took an hour or two off to try to reduce to writing a thought or two which I have had for some time. I do not know but what I should have done better, if, like my friend Mr. Ewan, I had come here without notes, and had tried to express my thoughts in a little more informal way. I found in looking over this after it was written off, that I had started in the air and had not reached the ground by the time I had reached the limit of my space. I do not know whether I will be able to convey my thoughts in the words I have prepared or not, but I trust you will look through the form of it and try to take the thought that I had when writing. It was somewhat amusing to see that these two war articles should come together. My own, of course, is used in a metaphorical sense."

"The parties to a war are drawn up in opposing camps. Their interests are mutually exclusive. They have nothing in common. Between them there is absolute antagonism. While we are told that, on one occasion during the Peninsular War, British and French soldiers bathed together in the same river, and while, perhaps more than once, the order has been given to cease firing, in order to spare the life of an enemy who was showing conspicuous courage in trying to rescue a wounded companion, yet these are rare exceptions, and do not affect the general truth that enemies are opposed in everything, and manifest their absolute antagonism on all occasions. Each strives to accomplish the object of war, which, so far, at least, as the fighters are concerned, is to

defeat and crush the enemy. The science of war is the study of how to defeat and crush the enemy, and the rules of war are the practical maxims or directions for putting the science into effect. The rules of war are the applied science of war.

"In journalism, there are many elements of conflict. There is the rivalry for public favor and patronage. This shows itself in many ways, from the printing or omitting to print certain news items to the firing of blank circulation cartridge from the heavy editorial guns. But this is insignificant, as compared with the opposition resulting from a division on questions of politics. A sound democratic government must be carried on by two great political parties. Such a condition has its rationale deep in human nature. And the majority of journals, just as the majority of individuals, must take sides either with the one or with the other. A party press is natural and inevitable. We have, then, not only ordinary competition, but also a general division into pros and cons on the political issues of the day. There is, thus, opposition and conflict. Does it follow that the rules of war should govern in journalism? My answer is an emphatic negative. The purpose of my paper is to protest, as earnestly as I am able, against that conception of journalistic opposition which identifies it with the absolute antagonism of war.

"The reason why journalistic opposition should never be allowed to develop into war a outrage is found in the fact that it is contrary to the interests of any nation to have a radical and complete split into two great sections, which split each section does its best to accentuate at all points. There exists in reality no such opposition of interests. The very fact of nationhood excludes the idea of fundamental divergence. All the citizens of any nation have, of necessity, a fundamental community of interest; and progress depends upon the enlargement and consolidation of this community. A journalist has no right to make conflict an end in itself, because he is in duty bound to make his country's interest his chief end, and his country's interest is not conflict, but community. Whatever be the private motives that lead to the publication of newspapers, nothing can absolve the journalist from the obligation to serve his country first. Being a national force, newspapers must have a public conscience. A private conscience or a party conscience is not enough. Responsibility is always commensurate with power and opportunity, and the press has national power and national opportunity. Upon it, even more than upon any other agency, rests the responsibility for national welfare and national progress. The public are informed and influenced by it, and the politicians could not long stand against it. My thought is, then, that the responsibility, which, in the nature of things, rests upon us, forbids us to make conflict, either personal or party, an end in itself, but, on the other hand, imposes the obligation to make the general interest of our country the paramount end.

"If there is to be progress, the whole people must take the same step. This is the great fact we must bear in mind. If one half of the people takes a step in one direction, while the other half takes a step in another, there is no real progress. If one-half takes a step forward, while the other stands stubbornly still, there is no real progress. The trough-water mark of a nation's life is not to be measured at the bursting fountains of its geniuses, or even at the upper reaches of the rivers of the favored, but is to be found at the broad level of the mass. If part of us dig channels to carry off the water as fast as it flows in, the level will never rise. We may vainly pride ourselves because the feeding streams accomplish nothing, but if so we seek a poor gratification at the expense of all time good.

"I, of course, recognize that there must be differences of opinion, some slow, if there is to be purity and health, but I am seeking to discover the principle that must limit these differences. It is natural that we should differ for a time on many points, but we