

not let them have any of our food, for to do so would mean that we ourselves would have to bear a part of the war burdens in the higher prices of our food. Hence, we should prohibit the exportation of food stuffs, thus keeping down the price and saving us from any economic disturbance. As we have abnormal crops this year it is conceivable that such an embargo would give us cheaper food than in times of peace.



It may be asked, however, why the farmer should be signalled out to bear the burden of this war? Food is not the only thing that is going up. A demand greater than the supply sends up the price of any kind of goods. The people of Europe have ceased other activities besides farming. All manner of wealth production has been interrupted, and the customers of Europe are turning to this country for the goods they formerly got there. This will cause at least a temporary advance in all manner of prices. For the government to step in between the farmer and his customers, and at the same time permit the manufacturer to take advantage of this opportunity would be the grossest kind of partiality. It would be to subject the farmer to the same disadvantages that the protective tariff has laid upon him. The farmer has borne the ups and downs of seasons and markets, plus a high tariff, with stoical fortitude, why step in now, and deprive him of his gain? If the people of the country wish to starve the warring nations into peace, and can do it, let them; but let them at the same time make up to the food producers what they would have received for their labor had not the Government interfered. s. c.



### Interrupting Good Work.

Immediately before the breaking out of the present war Prussia had set about adding another contribution toward Germany's new land policy. Aside from the various ventures of German cities in the direction of raising local revenue by taxing land values, there has been apparent a movement to differentiate between land and other kinds of property. Indeed, the very purpose of the bills introduced into the Prussian diet was to destroy the idea that land should be treated as if "it were tea, lumber or coal." The Government objected to the policy adopted by owners who looked upon their land as goods to be parceled out as they saw fit, without regard to the rights of the public. It was therefore proposed that the right of entail be limited, that all sales of land be submitted for approval to a public commissioner, and that the state have the right to acquire land. The Prussian

land bill was but a timid step; yet it was a step. The discussion of the question, as well as the adoption of the law, would present the land question in a new guise, and would tend to familiarize people with the true relations between land and man.



What a pity that Prussian men should have been taken from discussing policies that lead to a restoration of the land of a country to the people of that country, and set to killing Frenchmen, Russians, Belgians and Englishmen who are in the same predicament! The militarist has more to answer for than making orphans and widows.

s. c.



### A Measure of the War Madness.

It has been said that this is not a people's war, but a dynastic war, that if the people could have had their voice there would have been no war. That may have been true at the beginning of the trouble, but it may be questioned if it is now true. If the reports that are now coming from the countries involved can be depended upon, the great masses of the people are almost as much obsessed by the idea that "foreigner" is synonymous with "enemy" as at any time in the past. The autocrats doubtless started the war, but their appeals to their people have met with a quick response. The German accepts the story that the other nations of Europe are jealous of Germany's progress, and have seized upon this opportunity to destroy her. And the Frenchman has been convinced that Germany is drunk with power, and is seeking world dominion. Each is fighting not only for his country but for liberty, civilization and progress.



That there was still enough of blind patriotism left to make a considerable response to the call to arms was expected by all peace men; and it was admitted that there would be enough men coerced into joining the ranks to make a formidable war; but there was a feeling that a great many men would not respond, or that they would come to the colors half heartedly, and would seize the first opportunity to desert or surrender. This idea seemed to be borne out by the Austrians who, if reports received may be relied upon, have made a poor showing as soldiers. But this is far from true of the French and Germans. There is no doubt of the efficiency of the German army, and there has been no word received to indicate that the men are fighting with less spirit today than they did in 1870. Nor do the French, who seem

to have been overborne in numbers and in generalship, lack in patriotic fervor.



This flaring up of the old war spirit might have been received with misgiving had we been left to the declarations of militarists. But the recent action of the Socialists seems to remove the last doubt. If the reports be true, as given in the press dispatches, that the French Socialists have served notice on their government that they will withdraw all opposition until the close of the war, it means that the old spirit of "my country, right or wrong" still lives. For the Socialists, of all people, have preached international brotherhood. The doctrine of class consciousness implies the wiping out of boundry lines. Nor need the good faith of the men and women who have preached this doctrine be brought in question. The leaders believed it; they still believe it; but apparently it did not sink far enough into the average man's understanding to control his action under the present circumstances. The rank and file of the Socialist parties in Germany and France might be dragooned into service in the army, but the allegiance of the leaders leaves no doubt of the united people. When the leaders who have preached class consciousness all these years are willing to join hands with their opponents in their own country, rather than with their brethren in another country, it measures as nothing else can the extent of the present war-madness.

s. c.



#### Circumstances Alter Cases.

A ship load of Hindus a few weeks ago sought to gain entrance into Canada for the purpose of engaging in productive industry. But although they resorted to every available means, including forceable resistance to deportation, they were unsuccessful. Now ship loads of Hindus are on the way to Europe to fight in the British army against the Germans. This contradictory attitude toward the Hindus gives point to the editorial comment of The Panjabee, on the settlement of the Hindu question in South Africa, which was made on the basis that the Hindus already in the country should be fairly treated, but no more should be admitted.



Says The Panjabee of July 21:

When we speak of the settlement in South Africa, let us not forget that this essentially is the basis on which that settlement has been affected. Are we going to accept the principle here laid down by friends of the Indian community in South Africa as well as their foes? Let it be distinctly understood that we

have no particular partiality for our people emigrating to countries where they are not wanted and are certainly not welcome. But the question we are bound to ask is, why should the Indian not have the right of entry into those parts of the empire whose citizens are freely admitted into India? As we have said already, if there is to be no such thing as a common imperial citizenship under which citizens from one part of the empire would have the same rights in another part as its own citizens, the next best thing, and the only other alternative consistent with the reality of empire, is to have equal reciprocity by which one part of the empire, while according a preference to citizens from another part as compared with aliens, shall treat them exactly as its own citizens are treated in that other part. We are as firm believers in autonomy as South Africans or Canadians, but neither autonomy nor anything else can ever dispense with justice. It is as a matter of justice that we claim that India shall be an equal member of the empire and shall have the same right in regard to citizens from the rest of the empire that the rest of the empire claims and exercises in regard to its own citizens.

It is fortunate for Christian diplomacy that consistency is not an indispensable part.

s. c.



#### The Case of Captain Rust.

The case of Captain Armistead Rust shows that truly useful service is not appreciated by the so-called "plucking board" of the United States navy. Captain Rust has distinguished himself, not in work of slaughter and destruction, but in service which has been of great help in constructive work, such as the digging of the Panama canal. A report by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs shows that he cleared up much confusion regarding Panama, did valuable surveying work, and is the author of books helpful to navigators. While we have a navy at all, it would be well to encourage rather than discourage service of officers that helps useful constructive work. But the "plucking board" has thought otherwise and ordered Captain Rust's retirement.

s. d.



#### Jury Trials for Employers.

An inexcusable injustice was the refusal of the Senate to extend to employers the right of a jury trial in contempt cases, given by the Clayton bill to employes. It would be as great an outrage for a judge to summarily convict an employer in a case of indirect contempt as to convict an employe. Although laborers are the principal sufferers from government by injunction, there ought to be enough statesmanship in the Senate to see that the wrong can and should be abolished without making its abolition appear as a class privilege.

s. d.