

those remaining will have to bear the burden of the war tax. Consequently they will be poorer customers, and we shall lose some of the advantages we formerly had in trade. The same will be true of the South American trade diverted from European countries to the United States. Anything so obtained, over what should come to us economically, will be an injury to those countries, and will be reflected again in the curtailment of the demand of European customers for American goods.



One nation may advance temporarily at the expense of another, one industry may be promoted at the expense of another; but every positive and lasting gain will be made with, not at the expense of, other nations and industries. The same social law that governs individuals governs groups of individuals. And just as the individual serves himself best when he helps his fellow most, so the nation that does most for others will do most to enrich itself. The expense of guiding, aiding and counseling Mexico during her recent troubles amounts to many million dollars. Is there any one so blind as not to see that our moral, spiritual and economic growth in consequence are worth many fold what they have cost? When statesmen see this, and when an enlightened public opinion holds them to the mark, nations will have done with protective tariffs and standing armies, and will undertake to do as friends what they have heretofore tried to do as enemies.

S. C.



Popular Government and War.

Because France is a republic and Great Britain a monarchy in name only, a correspondent figures that the war must have had the approval of the people. It should not be necessary to remind a resident of the United States that republics can go to war without popular consent. Within the past few months the question of war or peace with Mexico lay with the President alone. Fortunately he happened to be a peace advocate. A militarist President would have decided differently. Perhaps the European people did favor war, but it is certain that they were not consulted. Another correspondent refers to England's volunteer army to show that the burdens of war have been voluntarily assumed. But soldiers do not bear the entire burden. Wives, mothers and children are not usually asked to consent. In Canada the consent of the wife is required and has prevented many enlistments, but Canada is exceptional. Owners of commandeered property do not voluntarily surrender it, nor is there any volunteering in the matter of taxation. Still another correspondent

claims that England's guarantee of Belgian neutrality morally obligated it to commit the immoral act of waging war. That brings up the question concerning what a government may rightfully do and what it may not do. The things which no government may rightfully do are those which constitute violations of individual rights which it was organized to protect. Such an infringement is a treaty binding it, under certain circumstances, to force citizens, regardless of their wishes, to risk their lives and surrender their property as is done in warfare. For this reason no existing treaty offers a valid excuse for any of the belligerents. Treaties should be sacredly kept when they contain no pledge to do wrong. It is different with a pledge to commit murder or help in its commission.



It has furthermore been said that to deny a government's right to coerce soldiers and commandeer property will render it defenseless. Those who urge this reasoning forget that widespread indifference on the part of citizens as to what becomes of the government, indicates that it is not worth the sacrifices necessary for defense, or at least that the citizens do not hold it to be so. A government justly entitled to defense need not hesitate to leave its citizens free in the matter of military service.

S. D.



Unwise to Pay Blackmail.

It is regrettable, if true, that four rich citizens of Brussels have agreed to pay the forty million dollars war tax levied on that city by the invaders. It would have been better to refuse to pay, and to defy the predatory commander of the conquering army to show the world just how much, or how little, civilization he has within him.

S. D.



Restricting Food Exportations.

A petition to President Wilson is in circulation in certain parts of the country calling upon him to ask Congress for an embargo on food exports. A condescending concession is made by these petitioners that the President, in trying to establish a merchant marine, is acting according to his light; but the demand is made that he give over trying to find means to export our "bumper crop," and instead, stop such exportation. The argument runs to the effect that the war in Europe is not of our making, that if the people there run short of food it is nothing to us, and that therefore we should

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