

criticism of the government's action in regard to pensions. And if we are to believe some of the critics the apathy regarding enlistments is in large degree due to the unsatisfactory condition of the pension scheme now in practice. But once the question of pensions is raised as a right of the men and a duty of the government there seems to be no place to stop, short of placing all men upon a plane of equal footing as to sacrifice for country. If a country is to maintain its independence, if its government is to survive, if its institutions are to be preserved, the question arises as to how much each citizen is to contribute.



When a laboring man gives his life in defense of his country, and leaves his family helpless and dependent upon charity, he may well be said to have contributed his all; whereas a man with wealth who has at the same time paid a certain amount of taxes has made no such sacrifice. The critics are pointing out that the laboring man who returns from the war a cripple has been deprived of his power to earn a living; but the man of means who returns, even when disabled to the same degree, enjoys an income that prevents either himself or his family from suffering privation. Hence, the point is made that the sacrifice of the two men is very unequal. And the conclusion seems unescapable that if the demands of service made on the citizens by the state is to be impartial the state must call upon the rich for the same proportion of their possessions as it does upon the poor. And if it takes all from the poor it must take all from the rich. Naturally the government is not at present prepared to go this length; and so, instead of using the present wealth of England to carry on the war, they are resorting to the time-honored expedient of making loans, which simply means the transference of the larger part of the financial burden to the shoulders of future generations.



Nothing of the future, either in men or in materials, will be used in this war. It is the present men and the present wealth that will be consumed. The idea is to use the men without paying for them, but to pay for the wealth used. Hence, the prosecution of this war means the piling up of another great war debt, which will be paid by the people of the future. This means nothing more nor less than that the heirs of the present owners of wealth will enjoy incomes from the bonds now issuing, while the heirs of the working people will be compelled to pay those incomes.

One of two courses is open to countries like England, either they must resort to conscription, or so reform their pension system as to remove the present gross inequality in the sacrifices of the citizens. If the statesmen shall ever arrive at the point of making the sacrifices absolutely equal, or if the people shall insist upon such equality, wars from that moment will cease. When governments take the wealth of the rich with the same freedom that they take the lives of the poor, the Peace Court of The Hague will be exalted, and even questions of honor and national integrity will be gladly submitted to arbitration. S. C.



The Strongest Defense.

"Nations which have been built on force have died. Those which have trusted in armies and fleets have gone down. Why do not the nations learn that righteousness is mightier than dreadnaughts?" In these few words, Secretary of State William J. Bryan at Chicago on November 29 presented a powerful argument which can not be refuted by all the clamor of jingoes and militarists, and by all the pleas for increased armies and navies. The establishment of justice at home by any nation—something none has yet done—will make its destruction too great a calamity to the outside world to be favored by the most selfish. Justice in dealing with foreign nations will remove whatever other danger there may be of provoking an attack. Armies, navies and fortifications are poor substitutes for such defense.

S. D.



How to Stop Violation of Neutrality.

The placing of orders for war material by foreign belligerents with American concerns will probably result in lodging of protests with the State Department, if this has not been already done. That such shipments should be prevented seems clear enough. But in undertaking such prevention, care must be taken that it actually result in prevention of bloodshed. Otherwise it will have no object. If an armed individual should protest on grounds of humanity against giving of arms by a third party to an unarmed person whose life he threatens, there will be nothing gained by heeding the protest, should the protestor continue to threaten his defenseless antagonist. So if one belligerent nation protests against securing of arms by its antagonist from the territory of a neutral nation, the heeding of the protest should be made to depend on prompt accept-