## UNIVERSAL PEACE AND THE LAND QUESTION.

Few, if any, books on the question of universal peace between nations go so thoroughly to the bottom of the causes of modern wars as does a book recently published in Swedish by Mr. Johan Hansson, and entitled "War and the World Strife of Money" (Krigen och Pengarnes Varldskamp, A. B. Ljus Forlag, Stockholm). It is to be regretted that a book of this type was not originally written in a language in which it would have reached a greater circle of people interested in the question of peace, because it is the work of a careful student and a keen investigator; an extended review will, therefore, probably be of interest to the readers of the REVIEW

As the motto of his book, the author has selected Ellen Key's words: "The question of peace is closely allied to the question of social regeneration, because it is to-day in the first place the economic interests which cause wars." With this as a text, he logically follows the chain of evidence until it shows us that the most formidable enemy of peace, and the most frequent cause of war, is to be found in the economic maladjustment which makes nations no less than individuals fight for an existence which their ignorance and folly make miserable and uncertain.

In the introduction to the book the author shows how most of the well-known workers for universal peace have tried to appeal to the powers that be on mere sentimental grounds. He shows how they have entirely ignored the causes of war, and how they have not even cared to investigate or point out these causes. To them, it appears, war is an evil which can be abolished by a mere appeal to the nations not to fight, because of the misery that always follows in the path of war. As well might we conceive of a humane soul appealing to the aviator about to rise in the air not to fall because if he does he might hurt himself. It is gratifying, however, to note that a great many, particularly German, writers have realized to what an extent modern causes of war are of an economic origin; but, on the other hand, many of the apostles of peace where

there is no peace, have so thoroughly ignored the economic origin of the causes of war, that they base their arguments against war on the proposition that it would be so much easier to solve all the vexing economic and social difficulties besetting nations, if only this one question of peace were settled first; because, then, they say, all that energy which is now devoted to war and destruction, could be used for the most useful purposes. This is all true, in a certain sense, but even if such a thing could be conceived of as the establishment of universal peace without the previous settlement of economic wrongs, would not all the benefits derived from peace go largely into the always open pockets of the landlords?

The method of solving economic questions by first establishing universal peace, is a case of putting the cart before the horse. The true solution is to solve the economic problems first, in which case it may be found, surprising as it may seem, that the war question disappears automatically, or nearly so. It is the scramble among the world powers for a "market" that is to-day the most frequent cause of differences between nations. And this cause has already created the great powers, which now seem ready to measure strength with one another. This is not a mere theory. The imperialistic interests in any nation will themselves admit it, and they seem to consider the obtaining of new "markets" as a virtue, no matter what be the means. The reasoning is about as follows: We must have new markets for our growing industries, we must find opportunities for the surplus capital of the country; we must find markets to sell the goods our workmen produce, else there will be no work for them. Expansion in territory is necessary for a growing and energetic nation. The diplomatic and military forces of our country must be used to force our goods on new markets; the only way in which this can be done permanently, is to annex territory. However expensive and dangerous this political game may be, it is necessary to the existence of the nation. The imperialistic political tactics, according to the views of the old school economist, is not a matter of choice, but a matter of necessity.



England is the most instructive example of all that the economic reformer claims in regard to the relation between economic maladjustment and war and its causes. The territory controlled, directly or indirectly, by England, has more than doubled since 1866. The area of the mother country is now less than one per cent, of the area controlled by it, and its population is hardly more than one-tenth of the population of the whole empire. Russia and Germany have closely followed the example set by England, and the United States and Japan have, during the last ten or fifteen years, proved themselves apt pupils. The whole planet is divided between half a dozen world-powers, and with the increased tension, due to industrial expansion, a crisis of immeasureable consequence is bound to come. ready an opportunity to observe the results of this territorial and commercial expansion, is offered in the attitude of Germany and England; economic and commercial rivalry is here the only cause of enmity. The differences between the world-powers to-day are all of a commercial nature, Most of the recent wars have been commercial wars, and if we try to find the real underlying causes, we would find them, not so much in the ultimata which have preceded the declaration of war, as in the conditions which mark the treaty of peace.

In order to see the cause of the economic maladjustment which produces national rivalry for markets, let us study the development of England as an industrial nation. In the 15th and 16th centuries, England was exclusively an agricultural nation. The land was cultivated by a generation of free farmers, who leased the land from the lords. The owners of the soil themselves cared little for agricultural or industrial pursuits; this, however, changed as England began to be prominent in commerce and shipping. The exploration of new continents, and the colonization of America, had a marked influence on the development of the industries in England. The lords began to realize the value of their landed property. They began to take a direct interest in production. wool industry at this time commenced to flourish, and the lords found it more profitable to produce wool than to let their

tenants till the soil. Many of these latter were therefore forced off the soil. The common lands were enclosed and annexed to the large domains, and in many other ways the English agricultural worker was forced off the land. Thus, during six years, from 1814 to 1820, did the duchess of Sutherland force 15,000 people off her landed estate of 794,000 acres, in order to provide room for 131,000 sheep.

This, however, made possible the great industrial "progress" of England. The people, forced off the land had to seek the factories in the cities. Competition between the workers kept wages down to the lowest level. The cheap labor again encouraged new enterprises. Production increased with enormous rapidity, foreign markets became necessary. England was to be the work-shop of the world; the colonies were to be the principal customers, and other nations were to take the surplus production. The impoverished people could consume so small a fraction of their constantly increasing production, that new markets had to be gained by force. The increase of wealth in a few hands was remarkable at the same time, At present, more than one-half of the land in England and Wales is owned by onethousandth of one per cent. (0.001 per cent.) of the population.

During the last 40 years, not less than 5,000,000 acres have been transformed into parks and game preserves. More than one-half of the tillable area of England-is not cultivated. Consider these facts side by side with the fact that in 1801 from 20 to 25 per cent. of the population in England lived in cities, in 1891 72 per cent., and to-day about 80 per cent. In 1881 there were 1,000,000 farm workers in Great Britain. In 1901 there were but 700,000. It is estimated that between 12 and 13 million people in England live on the verge of starvation, while one million depend on charity.

In order to keep the wheels going in the factories, the outside market must be the principal consumer of England. This was all very well as long as other nations were not highly developed, industrially. But when Germany and the United States loomed up as great industrial nations, the question became acute where the new



markets were to be found. And as we continue on the road of economic folly, the conditions become more and more formidable. The only solution then is war.

The war is not a bloody war at first. It starts with the building up of a tariff wall, and the income from this beautiful "protection" of the workingman is used for battleships and fortifications. After a while, the tariff wall, which is intended to give at least the home market to the country's industries, becomes insufficient. Then the real war comes.

Free trade would do a great deal to eliminate the immediate causes of war, but there must be a more thorough-going economic reform to eliminate economic causes of war altogether. We said above that the only solution was war, but it is not the only solution; in fact, it is no solution at all; it is only an explosion.

The purpose of the war is to create new markets. The real solution is also the creation of new markets. These markets, however, are not to be created across the sea, among people of another tongue or race, necessarily. This market can be created at home. Give the right to the God-given earth back to the people who created its value; abolish the privileges held by the few to exploit the many, and the people who produce will themselves be the market, and the very best market too, for the goods produced. Give the land to those to whom it belongs, and the market will be created antomatically. The greatest cause of modern war will be eliminated; the intelligence of the people will be raised; free trade will make a better understanding between nations possible, and a condition will be created which will make war between England or Germany or the United States and Japan as remote and impossible of conception as a war between New York and New Jersey.

This is not the idle dream of the idealist, the peace lover merely; it is the proposition for peace that places peace on a practical basis. It is the practical solution of a practical problem as it will one day be applied by a practical people.—Erik Oberg.

