

won the support necessary to carry through his measures. But more remarkable even than this was the effect upon the opposition press, which was compelled by this same public opinion to give him more cordial support than is commonly given to any political opponent. A change, however, has come over the scene. Much of the present criticism of the opposition is lacking in that broad spirit of toleration that was so conspicuous two years ago. This may be due in large degree to the feeling on the part of the critics that the country as a whole has changed, and that the people are not now back of the President's policies as they have been, and therefore that it is safe for them to nag at him in a small, irritating way, as has been their custom with most other Presidents. Whatever the cause it is now quite evident that there is a disposition on the part of the opposition press to seize upon the little things, to ignore accomplishments, to magnify omissions, to minimize general policies, and to exaggerate the non-essential. The chief point of criticism, however, appears to be in regard to the President's stand on the military question, both as regards his policy toward Mexico, and the enlargement of the army and navy. There is a concerted campaign among the militarists throughout the country for the purpose of stampeding public opinion in favor of a great navy and a large army. This is the time for the citizen to keep his head, and not allow himself to be dragooned on account of the war scare into saddling himself with the burden of militarism.

S. C.

A Deserved Rebuff.

The right word at the right time is President Wilson's rejection in his message of the hysterical demand for bigger armaments. This demand is so senseless and so clearly depends for success upon the creation of unreasonable popular fear, that the calm discussion accorded it was far more than it deserved. No more time needed for important work should be wasted in Congress in discussion of senseless bugaboos. A sufficient answer to the whole militarist agitation is that while the task remains undone of freeing ourselves from economic oppression, there is no time available for considering anything so improbable as an unprovoked foreign attack.

S. D.

Secretary Garrison Needs Awakening.

It almost seems as though Secretary of War Garrison has never read or been told of the conduct of the militia in the coal fields of West Vir-

ginia, Colorado and other places. Had he been well posted as one in his position surely ought to be he would not have displayed such lamentable ignorance as is apparent in the following excerpts from his report to Congress:

No reasonable person in this country has the slightest shadow of fear of military despotism nor of any interference whatever by military force in the conduct of civil affairs.

It is a queer kind of "reasonable person" who does not fear something which he knows has actually happened under conditions almost certain to occur again. It seems unbelievable, yet Secretary Garrison leaves no other explanation of his words apparent than that he knows nothing whatever of the cause that led to interference by his own Department in affairs of Southern Colorado.

S. D.



A Way Out.

Admiral Fletcher testified that our navy was capable of defending the United States against any country except England; but he doubts if it could hold the Philippines as against Japan. A possible way out of this dilemma may be found in our own Declaration of Independence, which was drawn in support of governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

S. C.



Roosevelt's Latest.

If there is any point at all to Roosevelt's latest criticism of the administration's Mexican policy it is that he wants the United States to forcibly intervene. To complain about conditions and to say that for these conditions the administration is responsible, is to say—even though Roosevelt lacks the courage to openly say it—that it is the administration's duty to change these conditions. And that means intervention. He would cure the horrors of war with more war. The more one listens to the outpourings of Roosevelt, the better opinion one must have of the statesmanship and services of President Wilson.



Yet in this same criticism Colonel Roosevelt unconsciously shows that intervention is not justified. Thus he says:

We may individually sympathize, as, for instance, I personally do, with the general purpose of the program for division of the lands among the Mexican cultivators, announced by Carranza, Villa and other revolutionary leaders; but this no more justified interference on our part than belief in the wisdom of the single tax for the United States by some for-

sign ruler would warrant his interference in the internal affairs of the United States.

That is sound doctrine. It follows from it that the United States government has no right to interfere for any purpose. If it may not interfere, as Roosevelt says it may not, in order to end forever such conditions as breed poverty, peonage and a system which subjects the great masses of the people day after day and year after year to outrages at the hands of plutocratic rulers, then it surely has no right to interfere when complaint is made of similar outrages committed by revolutionists. The brutal despotism of Diaz which Huerta would have restored could not do otherwise than brutalize many of its victims. If these brutalized ones now act as brutes that is no excuse for restoring the old conditions. We hear more of the reign of terror in Mexico today than we did of the greater terror which preceded it because its victims have more influential friends. For in Mexico, as was the case in France, there have been two reigns of terror. As Mark Twain shows in one of the many grand passages in his "Yankee at King Arthur's Court," the first and greater terror in France lasted a thousand years. Its victims were the dumb oppressed peasants. The second and milder terror lasted but three years. Of the sufferings of the victims of the Great Terror little was heard or thought of, but History has much to say of the Minor Terror. When the wind has been sown it is useless to complain of the reaping of the whirlwind, while to blame the whirlwind—as, for partisan reasons, Roosevelt does—on one in no way responsible for its sowing, only reflects on the one guilty of such injustice. It is quite possible to aid innocent Mexican victims without inciting to the additional crime of armed intervention and without trying to gain unfair partisan advantage. S. D.

States Rights.

The tenacity with which certain Congressmen and Senators cling to the doctrine of States' rights, when their localities are asked to conform in some degree to the consensus of general opinion, and the alacrity with which they besiege the United States Treasury for funds to make local improvements, shows one of the requirements that goes to make a "statesman." S. C.

Mexico's Business.

The rule about minding one's own business applies to nations as well as to individuals. This information is evidently needed by those who ap-

pear mystified as to why President Wilson made no reference to Mexican affairs in his message. Mexico is outside of the jurisdiction of Congress. Its affairs can not be properly regulated by anyone but its own people. It is not interfering with our affairs. There was consequently no cause for mention of it in the President's message. S. D.

Rural Credit Legislation.

If the Bulkley bill is the best plan for a rural credit system that is now available, the President was right in saying the present session was too short to admit of a proper consideration of that subject. Matters of detail that must enter into any comprehensive system of credits should be worked out by banking experts, but matters of principle must be passed upon by the country at large. The essence of the situation is found in the need of the farmer, or landowner, in districts remote from banking centers for cheap money; that is, a means that will supply him with money at a lower rate of interest, and upon a different security from what banks will now accept. To meet this requirement the Bulkley bill proposes that bonds be issued in sums of \$100, \$500 and \$1,000, drawing such rates of interest as the government board may approve, not exceeding five per cent. To arbitrarily fix the maximum rate of interest is to set at defiance the natural laws of trade.

Credits are subject to the law of supply and demand, the same as all other commercial values; and where they vary there is a reason. Money, which represents a concrete form of credit, commands higher interest in some places because the security is less certain, and the labor of looking after the loan is greater. The banker, or money lender, can care for his money more cheaply and with greater certainty in a city than in a remote and sparsely settled region. And he will not send his money into remote parts unless some inducement is offered. That inducement is commonly expressed in higher interest. Hence the difference in the rate of interest on the commercial frontier and in the thickly populated districts, represents the difference in the cost and risk of handling money in the two places. Should the Government undertake to fix interest arbitrarily throughout the country, it would do so only at the expense of some for the benefit of others.

Again, to arbitrarily fix the rate of interest at a lower point than the commercial rate means a