

too exacting in our demands of a country like Mexico. Conditions that in a rich country like the United States keep labor almost at the point of bare subsistence, in a poor country like Mexico force labor below the point of independent subsistence, and compel a resort to arms. It is not that the Mexican is by nature warlike, but that economic conditions make a life of peace impossible. Should the Constitutionalist government restore economic conditions to a normal state, peace and quiet will follow; but should it fail to remove the economic evils, then it will have to make way for one that will.



The Mexican Constitution of 1857, to restore which has been the professed aim of the Constitutionalist party, is one of the most liberal ever written. But, as Carlyle said of the Constitution of the French Revolution, it will not march. The difficulty lies in the fact that no man has yet arisen in Mexico who has been able to protect the people in the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, without depriving the classes of their privileges. Diaz solved the problem by suspending the Constitution. Madero undertook to make the Constitution march, but the classes overthrew him. Carranza promises to do what Madero attempted, but Villa distrusts him. Privileged classes are loath to surrender their privileges; and there is a subtle influence in the Capital city that dissipates the resolutions of the camp. It may at this distance seem a small matter that Villa should insist upon Carranza's carrying out the agreement of Guadalupe, but his cruder mind may argue, false in one false in all, and conclude that if his chief will not observe a military pact he will not enforce the Constitution. Villa is willing that Carranza shall be provisional president now, if he will agree not to be a candidate at the election; or that he may be a candidate at the election, if he will give up the provisional presidency. But since the control of the election machinery is the strongest point in the candidate's favor Carranza hesitates to accept either alternative. This, however, is distinctly a Mexican affair. We may regret the necessity for further fighting, but pressing troubles of our own bar us from meddling with those of Mexico.

s. c.



What Menaces Mexican Peace.

Mr. Guterrez de Lara, in his work on "The Mexican People," tells of enactment by the Mex-

ican congress in 1857 of a law of which the following is the first article:

The right of property consists in the occupation or possession of land, and these legal requisites cannot be conferred unless the land be worked and made productive. The accumulation in the hands of a few people of large territorial possessions which are not cultivated, or made productive, is against the common welfare and contrary to the principle of democratic and republican government.

For the practical application of this sound principle, the Mexican people have just passed through a bloody revolution. The break, or threatened break, between Villa and Carranza is, at bottom, due to suspicion that plans are afoot to deprive the people of the fruit of their victory. Refusal to furnish satisfactory evidence of the groundlessness of these suspicions is the one thing that will bring on another civil war. Permanent peace can be assured by making secure the right of every Mexican citizen to the use of Mexican soil.



The application of the principle of the land for the people will not be a hard matter, if the will to do so be not lacking. The holding of large territorial possessions in an unproductive state can easily be prevented through public appropriation of the rental value of land. This will not only free the land, and open opportunities for employment to all who want them, but will make unnecessary all taxes on labor or its products. The income from land values will provide ample public revenue. Upon those who block the adoption of such a measure must rest the responsibility for another period of bloodshed and revolution in Mexico, should that calamity actually occur.

s. d.



Undiplomatic Diplomats.

In view of the repeated indiscretions of foreign representatives to this country, and the absolute failure of the negotiations that preceded the breaking out of the European war, a doubt arises in some minds as to the fact of the vaunted superiority of the old-world plan of training diplomats, as compared with the American method of selecting them from the people. A man who devotes a lifetime to doing one thing becomes proficient in the technique of that one thing; but he not infrequently loses thereby his sense of proportion, and so fails to adjust his learning to the practical affairs of life. If international relations be a sparring for points by the representatives of individual sovereigns, then the technical training is the essential requirement; but if representa-

tives are sent abroad for the purpose of acquainting the people of foreign countries with the nature and desires of our people, it is evident that a man coming directly from the people may be a better representative than one who has spent his whole life in the artificial atmosphere of embassies. Possibly there may come with the changes that follow this war an overhauling of the diplomatic service. It is conceivable that there might be an international understanding as to salaries paid and expenses incurred, similar to the limitations of expenditures of candidates for office in this country. There has been altogether too much flunkyism, and too little democracy. Questions of etiquette and social precedence have been allowed to overshadow the worth of nations and the rights of man.

S. C.



Heroes and Dogs.

The cartoonist's inscription under a sketch depicting a file of green soldiers in charge of a drill officer, "In war you're heroes, in peace you're dogs," is too true. One would think he had entered a different age to follow the files of the newspapers before and after the breaking out of the war. The English press seemed to have been afflicted with the worst lot of bullies and loafers for fellow citizens that ever burdened a nation. They had no sense of justice, no regard for property rights, no feeling of patriotism. But a change came, as in a night. The loafers and bullies were whisked out of the country and their places were filled by sturdy English yeomanry. The men who had been such a vexatious nuisance to their "betters" had suddenly been discovered to be the bone and sinew of the country. It is no longer

"Tommy this, and Tommy that, and 'Chuck him out, the brute,'"

but it is

"'Savior of 'is Country,' when the guns begin to shoot."



Some of the better class of English papers have been quick to realize the changed conditions; and while a few of the class organs continue to abuse working men for their lack of patriotism, the really representative journals are disposed to view the matter from the working man's point of view. The London Daily Herald, the Nation, and the News and Leader, in particular, have been most appreciative of the situation—the last two no less than the first, though the Herald is the personal organ of George Lansbury, and is devoted espe-

cially to the cause of the common people. The point made by these papers is that a man's a man, that the war is fought in behalf of all, and that all must share in its burdens. And sharing in the war's burdens does not mean the giving of life or limb by the working man, and the sacrifice of a percentage of his wealth by the rich. The point most strongly emphasized is that the man in the ranks must neither himself become an object of charity, nor feel that his family will be helpless at his death. If crippled in mine or mill he receives compensation; if killed, his family is pensioned. This much must be accorded him when he enlists in the army. Both the Herald and the Nation are bitter in their denunciations of the self-appointed committees that are busying themselves in collecting funds for the widows and orphans of men killed in battle. This, they insist, is a government duty. The government has become the employer, and it must treat its employes at least as well as it requires private employes to treat them.



The Nation, after quoting the Manchester Guardian's account of the difficulty the soldiers' wives had had in securing allowances, declared:

The whole system of charity must go. It is infamous that the wives of these men should have to seek help from the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families' Association or from anybody else. If these men are heroes facing the German legions or when they are picking up the German sailors out of the sea under a heavy gun fire, let their wives be treated as heroines, not as mendicants or paupers. . . . Every soldier's family ought to have at the very least a pound a week from the State. . . . Mr. Lloyd George is to speak next week. Let him tell the nation that the men and women who are making its name glorious by their courage and self-sacrifice are not to be treated in this obsolete and hateful spirit; that they are not to be left to the chance charity of philanthropists and employers, and that the State, which is eager enough to fly the noble flag of democracy, is going to accept the obligations that attach to the simplest conception of a democratic civilization.

However this war may result, and whatever may be the shifting of international boundaries, it is quite clear that there will be a marked and distinct change in the relations of the "masses" and the "classes." The heroes of war will not again be the dogs of peace.

S. C.



The Guilty Belligerents.

A correspondent desires an expression of opinion concerning the attitude of those English papers which have declared against peace until a complete victory for the Allies will have been won. There is the same condemnation due these papers