

tion at issue is one which touches them and their homes. In a greater majority of communities where the liquor question was an issue at the election of last week, the dries won because the women voted that way. . . . We believe their position in this respect is a mistaken one. We think equal freedom is the object of sound legislation, and that goodness and order will flow spontaneously from free conditions. It is because we believe in equal freedom that we believe in woman suffrage. Women are entitled to the ballot because they are human beings and it is their own business to determine how they shall use it.



**A Press Monopoly.**

Reedy's Mirror (St. Louis), April 11.—Samuel Untermyer, in the North American Review, suggests that Congress, while it is about curbing and abolishing combinations in restraint of trade, should annihilate the Associated Press. He is right. The Associated Press is a news monopoly. It makes such conditions for services that daily journalism in the United States is become an exclusive privilege. No man can get the news for sale save upon the terms made by those with whom his entrance upon the business of dispensing news would make him a competitor. The Associated Press enjoys special rates and rebates from a public service corporation and common carrier. No paper can join the Associated Press by simply paying the cost of the news service, or paying his proportion of that cost. He can only join upon the unanimous consent of those members of the Associated Press who have already pre-empted the field into which he would venture. This news monopoly is a bad thing. The people who control the news may color it. And while members of the Associated Press are of all parties, they are still, as owners of big properties, members of one party, the plutocratic, and their servants lean to that interest in dealing with matters connected with vital economic issues other than the empty disputes of party politics. The Associated Press should be made to let every publisher in upon payment of reasonable pro rata of cost of service. But it will be a long time before this is done. Congress is afraid of the newspapers. And President Wilson is seeking no issue that will make trouble for him with all of the biggest papers in the country.



Make for thyself a definition or description of the thing which is presented to thee, so as to see distinctly what kind of a thing it is, in its substance, in its nudity, in its complete entirety, and tell thyself its proper name, and the names of the things of which it has been compounded, and into which it will be resolved. For nothing is so productive of elevation of mind as to be able to examine methodically and truly every object which is presented to thee in life, and always to look at things so as to see at the same time what kind of universe this is, and what kind of use everything performs in it, and what value everything has with reference to the whole, and what with reference to man, who is a citizen of the highest city, of which all other cities are like families; what each thing is, and of what it is composed, and how long it is the nature of this thing to endure.—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

**A PRAYER FOR PEACE.**

God of the nations, near and far,  
Ruler of all mankind,  
Bless Thou Thy people as they strive  
The paths of peace to find.

The clash of arms still shakes the sky,  
King battles still with king—  
While through the frightened air of night  
The bloody tocsins ring.

But clearer far the friendly speech  
Of scientists and seers,  
The wise debate of statesmen and  
The shouts of pioneers.

And stronger far the clasped hands  
Of labor's teeming throngs,  
Who in a hundred tongues repeat  
Their common creeds and songs.

From shore to shore the peoples call  
In loud and sweet acclaim,  
The gloom of land and sea is lit  
With Pentecostal flame.

• O Father! from the curse of war  
We pray Thee give release,  
And speed, O speed the blessed day  
Of justice, love and peace.

—John Haynes Holmes.



## THE BEST WAY TO HELP MEXICO.

By Frederick Starr.

Final Chapter of Professor Starr's Recent Book,  
"Mexico and the United States."

Should we intervene? • Must we intervene? No, a thousand times no, for their sake and for ours, we should keep hands off. Every right thinking American who knows Mexico, and who knows the points involved, must thank the President for his insistency upon maintaining peace. . We may regret the exact form of his policy, we may feel that he has made mistakes, but his fundamental principle is right—there ought to be no war—and intervention is war.

It is impossible for us to march to Mexico City, seize it, appoint a provisional President, and withdraw. There is no use of trying to deceive ourselves and others. If we go to Mexico, we must occupy the whole Republic. There is no possible alternative. To enter Mexico and occupy will take time, money and frightful toll of human life. It would be unjust aggression. Its final result would involve land grabbing. We would either hold the whole of the Republic, or we would cut

off the northern States and add them to our area. There are of course plenty who look upon this as our manifest destiny. It is unfortunate if it should prove manifest destiny, because it would spell our ruin.

To add Mexico to our republic or to add the northern tier of States would be infinitely bad for us. It would be the greatest of misfortunes for Mexico and the Mexicans. We are fond of talking of assimilation. We have never assimilated anything. We have not assimilated Arizona and New Mexico after sixty-five years of ownership. We have not assimilated the millions of Negroes in the South. We have not assimilated the Filipino, nor the Hawaiian, nor the Porto Rican. We have not only not assimilated them, we are nationally today the weaker for their presence.

To take over all or part of Mexico would be no advantage to its people, would harm us, and would profit only a handful of individuals to whom we owe no great consideration.

The war for the conquest of Mexico has been much discussed. Some claim that it would require 600,000 soldiers and a period of ten years; others claim that it could be done with 150,000 men and two years' time. This is not the actual question, but only selfish and commercial features of the problem. It is not the size of the army, nor the expense, nor the time involved which are significant. Far more important is the fact that such a war of conquest is unjust in itself. There is nothing in the conditions of the moment to excuse it. The price of war is not a mere question of dollars and time—it is more seriously a question of blood and brutalizing. A nation which issues from a war of conquest against a smaller, poorer nation suffers far more than it inflicts. Its ideals, its character, its life are lowered. How heavily has our nation paid for its inglorious war with Spain! Not only did it cost money and time and blood. Its toll of disease and weakened moral fiber is a far more serious matter; and by it we lost those ideals for which our nation stood through more than a century of independent life. This last was the heaviest part of the price.

It is no accident that our Scandinavian immigrants drift to the moraine country of Minnesota; that the Hollanders settle down upon the flat, green fields and pastures of Michigan; that the Scotch-Irish settle in our eastern hills; it is just as certainly no accident that Spaniards drifted to Mexico. They are at home in those surroundings. We never would be. We shall never fill up Mexico. Our migrations will be isothermic and latitudinal. If we should attempt the occupancy of Mexico by means of actual colonization, we should again pay a frightful price, physically, intellectually, morally. We would be changed. Is it worth while for a considerable portion of our pop-

ulation to become Mexican? We have stated the improbability of this migration taking place upon a large scale. To whatever extent it would occur, the American aggregate would lose.

The only influence active toward producing intervention and a war of conquest is the investor. We are constantly informed that we must protect American financial interests in Mexico. The investor in Mexico puts his money there because he hopes to gain a return larger than his money should produce. He has a right to do so if he chooses, but he should carry his own risk. He knows there is a risk; he has no right to ask us to carry that risk for him. If every penny of American capital invested in Mexico were wiped out of existence, there should be no armed interference on our part. Two other points affect the question. We are often told that \$900,000,000 of American capital is invested in Mexico. It is certain that much of this is fictitious value. There are plenty of companies in Mexico capitalized at \$100,000 which have never had \$20,000 actual money put in the enterprise. As Turner says, "oceans of water" in the great railway merger. We of course think of piling up claims against Mexico to the extent of \$900,000,000. How much legitimate claim would be left after a Hague Court investigated that? Again, it must be remembered that a very large amount of this American capital is invested in "tainted" concessions. Most of the foreign enterprises favored during the regimes of Diaz and Madero were never submitted for approval to the Mexican people and are not to their advantage. It is interesting by the way to notice that the Constitutionalists threaten to deal seriously with this whole matter of tainted concessions. Would that they might! But if they should, will our Government support them?

The investor in Mexico deserves no sympathy from us; to the degree that he places his money yonder, he is unpatriotic. He has a right, of course, to place his money where he pleases, yet a true patriotism and an enlightened appreciation of conditions would lead him to keep money here. There is not as yet a single State in our whole Union, not even New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio, which is legitimately developed. We have, as yet, no genuine conception of the development of any area. We have always been cursed by the fact of greater opportunity in a new section. We have drifted here and there in the hope of getting sudden wealth with small outlay of labor. It has been a great misfortune to ourselves. It has had a frightfully destructive influence upon the world at large. It will be a good thing when we are more confined in our possibilities. Real patriotism, not the blatant kind, would lead men to utilize their capital in the development of the region in which they were born.

Mexico and the Mexicans ought to work out their own salvation. It sounds well in newspapers

to say that we desire to help Mexico to solve her problems. It is the White Man's Burden. It is meddling. Mexico knows her problems as no outsider can. If they are to be solved, she must solve them. We can best help by solving our own problems, and heaven knows we have enough of these.

Mexico is what it is because of its geography, its climate, its streams, its mountains, valleys, deserts, forests. Its altitudes, its atmosphere, make a people different from ourselves. Its people are Indian, or a mixture of Indian with Spanish. The race qualities are different from ours; feeling is different; sentiment is different; point of view is different. It is impossible for us to think for them, feel for them, act for them, decide their questions. All that we need to do is to keep hands off. •

Mexico will never be at peace until a middle class arises. It has been a land of very rich and very poor, of masters and slaves. A middle class is rising; it will come. The common people of Mexico are thinking, reading, talking—more than they have ever done before. Before the conquest, Mexico was occupied by many small tribes, absolutely separated and hopelessly divided. They were ridden by their rulers and their priests. That was in the old days of paganism. Mexico of today is still a people divided. It is still ridden by rulers, and by priests. If it is to become a great nation, it must be unified. It can only be so through education, thought and struggle. Its greatest curse has ever been personal politics. In the direction of political parties with definitely presented platforms of principles, much of its hope of advancement lies. Notwithstanding the discouraging aspect of the moment, notwithstanding the Madero failure, the Juarez failure, the Guerrero failure—it has made progress, and it will make progress in these directions.

But no matter how Mexico may advance, it will never be like us—it ought not to be so. Latin America does not admire our style. She does not look northward for her patterns. James Bryce, in his book on South America, strongly emphasizes the fact that the republics to our south look to Europe for advice, direction, pattern and example. They look to Spain and Portugal, Italy, and above all, to France. There are two types of republics conspicuous in the world at present. When Mexico reaches an equilibrium, and she will if we permit, she will present a nation like the French Republic—not like the United States.



## AN ELDER SISTER.

For The Public.

She was the eldest daughter and many burdens fell on her shoulders. Her parents were plain honest people; they had managed to get three girls through High School one after another. The

three boys, as so often happens, did not develop any desire for more than a common-school education, and got jobs as soon as they could. One drove a delivery wagon, one was an office-boy, the third wore the uniform of a big hotel and sat in a row with other bell-boys under the clerk's watchful gaze. Two of the girls soon found schools, continued to study, succeeded beyond their modest hopes; the third became an assistant in the public library, studied cataloguing, began to specialize on "books for children." A hard-working young reporter recognized her worth, found someone who could introduce them, made the never-out-of-date romanti-practical courtship which lasts forever and a day. So these two were married on a hundred dollars of savings and made a most enchanting success of life, croakers to the contrary.

Then the father, whose business was with horses, road-making and small contracts, was thrown from a wagon, crippled for months, got "out of the swim," and was never again able to earn much. In a year or so the mother needed care and the two daughters who taught, consulted together. The eldest one secured a school where she could be at home every night, paid the bills and practically ran the house; the other contributed the greater part of her salary. The two of them were simply doing their duty as they saw it, and they were contented.

They especially wanted to make a home for the three boys who had somehow missed fire so far, because they were drifting, spending, getting into debt, picking up bad acquaintances, and yet lavish with promises of reform, flowing with evanescent hopes and full of day-dreams.

The elder sister studied all three of her brothers, made them a sweet and gentle home, full of quiet beauty, knew the people they worked for, strengthened her hold on them in every possible way. Two of the boys responded slowly but surely to all this affection, and began to contribute to the family exchequer, helped to read books aloud in the evening, became interested in Sarah's expense accounts and patient, cheerful economies. She began to be very proud of them.

The third brother had worked up to a place of some responsibility, and he embezzled money from his employer. Sarah rose to the situation, believing with all her heart that he ought to have a second chance. She and her sister took every dollar they had, sold their little libraries, and made up the sum needed. Then Sarah went to see the head of the firm in that quiet straightforward way which was her heritage.

"Mr. Day," she said, "You do not yet know it, but my brother has stolen two hundred and fifty dollars of your money. Here it is. He came to me and told it himself. Be good to us, let him resign and keep this matter quiet. We shall make a man of him and this will be the new start."

Of course he acceded; not one man in a thou-