

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FRIENDSHIP AND BROTHERHOOD.

Oberlin, Ohio, November 2, 1914.

Phillips Brooks has said: "There is no culture, no method of progress known to men that is so rich and complete as that which is ministered by a truly great friendship."

The undersigned deferentially dissents.

Friendships are bi-personal. Their very nature—the reason of their being is that two natures find between themselves reciprocation of ideas or ideals. These ideas, or ideals, may or may not affect the community in which they exist. And a great friendship is impossible of community participation therein for the reason that their being great friendships excludes, or may exclude, all relations to community well being. Therefore it is clear that friendships may exist without being in any sense an influence for good to others or to the community. Friendships, per se, are personal ideas or ideals multiplied by two—beyond this they may or may not affect communities.

On the other hand, the sense of a community is impersonal. It is a consensus of consciences. And a community sense which banishes or precludes injustice to the least of its members is a far greater "method of progress" than personal friendships. To desire and contend, to strive and spend for the establishing of justice among men; to fight with logic based on self-evident truth against monopoly and inordinate greed, and for the joy and justice of equality of opportunity in mother earth—this is infinitely greater than personal friendships—an infinitely completer "method of progress" than the greatest friendships in the world. The Man who came up out of Galilee sought to discover no great friendships. With Him the brotherhood of man dwarfed all other earthly relations.

J. A. DEMUTH.



ONLY A TEMPORARY SUSPENSION.

Rochester, N. Y., Nov. 5, 1914.

The reference on page 1038 to the suspension of the Vorwärts in Berlin leaves the impression that the suspension was permanent. As I understand, it lasted only a few days. The paper agreed to omit references to the class struggle for the present on the ground that all Germans are united and party differences dropped during the war, and the military suppression was thereupon canceled. I am stating the facts from memory and am not sure about details.

While I agree heartily with The Public's opposition to war, its arguments seem a little dry and rationalistic, appealing to common sense and utility, as if people were swayed only by forces that can be stated in syllogisms. It does not seem to do justice to the great social passions of solidarity and patriotism, which go wrong and then wreck nations. This bourgeois rationalism seems a limitation of the Single-tax movement, with which I otherwise agree.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

WORLD PEACE AND THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

Mt. Vernon, Ohio, October 26.

The late address of Mr. Mann in the House of Representatives is suggestive of commercial statesmanship and should class the speaker with those who for private gain would counsel government to do that which government would not permit done unto itself.

If the Philippine Islands are to be "the fighting grounds of the future," if "conflict between the states and the Orient, commercial or otherwise, is inevitable," why insist upon holding to or remaining within the "fighting" zone? "If the great population of China" will not permit us and our goods "to come to their shores" unless at the same time we shall not "shut out" their people and their goods, who, in all honesty should or would blame them? And it is possible that Mr. Mann truly voices the American mind when he insists that the United States is in such "position" that such a jug-handled sort of proposition "cannot be abandoned" that its ethics of justice is such that the wrong must be maintained and that, as he suggests, the United States must be possessed of "the power to enforce" the wrong? Is that his idea of fair play?

If China and possibly the other nations mentioned as looking covetously toward the islands, are "sleeping," why waken it or them—or, better yet, why seek to enforce a wrong which will surely waken and arouse just anger? Why through an unjust policy seek to take from the people of the Orient that which is rightfully their own—the nation engaging in entangling alliances—seeking to force unnatural assimilations? Is it possible that the peoples of the western hemisphere have already grown too numerous for the lands assigned to them by the decree of the gods? Must the aborigines ever be driven from their own homes and lands?

Cannot Mr. Mann and those who contend for and seek to enforce injustice (economic or other) see that such demands can only be likened to killing the goose that lays the golden eggs; that when commercialism has captured the trade of another country, the capturing will produce the same conditions and results as do robber bees when they attack and subdue a weaker colony, the honey bees joining the robbers, all migrating to the one hive—that of the robbers? And can such advocates hope that man, robbed and defeated, will act with less acumen than does the honey-making little bee? To do so is nature's law. Then why advise and urge a policy which would prevent? Why a policy of protection, a policy which will steal the laboring chances of a foreigner, a policy which will drive a people from their homes, and then legislate a forbidden harbor? Are the states to reverse their declarations of 1776?

Why look forward to possibilities "100 years from now," and, foreseeing "the inevitable conflict," not so legislate as to void the predicted "possibilities"? Is that the policy of statesmanship? Why overlook "the principles which ought to guide us?" Why not legislate for permanent world peace in so far as the Philippines are concerned, and so as to allow every race of peoples to retain that which is their own?