

grows fat as his victims grow lean; that he is a government pensioner getting service but rendering none; that his children will succeed to his power and tax the children of his poorer friend and neighbor. He feels his own self-respect is lessened and this is a possession he hates to lose. Besides, there's the constant fear of detection. He wants the good opinion of his fellow-men, whatever their station may be, and he dreads the humiliation he would feel should they ever come to the knowledge that he has his hands in their pockets.

Unfortunately, the number of men so sensitive, so really honorable and courageous as to voluntarily relinquish their privileges, is too few to encourage the hope that any change can be brought about in this way; but with the help of those who, even though they are the beneficiaries of privilege, yet work for its destruction, aided by the spread of intelligence among the working people, it is confidently expected that the day will come when all special privileges in our community will be done away with.

CHARLES F. SHANDREW.



WAR AND TRADE.

Address of Hon. Calvin Tomkins, President National Association of Port Authorities, at the Opening of the Third Annual Convention, Baltimore, Md., September 8, 1914.

The Balance of Power and the Balance of Trade are two hoary superstitions, the primary causes of past international misunderstandings and of the terrible war now upon us. The underlying theory of the Balance of Power is that no nation or group of nations shall be permitted to exceed in military power or the material success on which such power is based, the attainments of other nations or groups of nations. This is fundamentally a policy of repression which reacts most disadvantageously upon highly civilized States equipped with complex commercial, industrial and municipal organizations, since war and the fear of war sap the confidence on which these institutions rest. Progress is retarded by the jealous fears of the peoples of less advanced states, and also by the inarticulate fears of highly civilized men and women the world over, who observe with apprehension the predatory war spirit of the dynasties of Germany, Austria, Russia and Japan.

It is safe to assume that only a small fraction of the three hundred million people of Europe wanted this war, and yet the dynasties and the secretive diplomatists did not prevent it. Following the example of diplomacy the public had come to think in terms of states rather than of the good of peoples.

The neighborhood interests of the people of the twenty states of Europe do not differ from the like interests of the citizens of our forty-eight

states. As with us a network of railways, highways, rivers and canals bind them together into one interdependent social unit. To understand why they are at war we must look back fifty years to our Civil War which was fought to maintain the Union. The immediate cause of this present war was Sir Edward Grey's failure to establish any concerted action in Europe. When every state, untrammelled by obligations to others maintains its unlimited sovereignty, war is inevitable. The principle of the Balance of Power must be supplanted by acquiescence in some reasonable concert of the great world powers, which shall impose by moral influence or strength of numbers if necessary, the obligation to keep the peace.

Our United States did this among themselves in 1864, and recently a concert of the powers of North and South America at the instance of the President of the United States took joint action in Mexican affairs and by so doing broadened the Monroe Doctrine and established the principle of a concert of powers in relation to international affairs in North, South and Central America. This has done much to mitigate European and American suspicion of the intentions of the United States.

Pan-Americanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Germanism and Pan-Japanism all alike are selfish, impracticable and disturbing international forces. The world is for all people and attempts at pre-emption by one nation must necessarily draw upon that nation the enmity of the others.

Only sovereign are uncompromising partisans of sovereignty. Citizens of the world after the lesson of this awful war shall have been learned will in the end acquiesce in some reasonable limitation of national sovereignty—some concert of action—which shall secure to them peace and justice outside as well as inside of national boundary lines. The administration's peace treaties have anticipated this intent and have blazed the way for lasting peace.

England's free-trade policy opening opportunities for trade to all people is the example which should be followed to secure international peace and good will. The beneficiaries of protection and other legal privileges foment international disturbance, pervert patriotism, prevent trade and promote war.

Opposed to the ancient prejudice against the outlander and his goods, and as the direct result of recent improvements in transportation, there has developed a great and growing sense of interdependence among the people of the world. Quick and cheap transportation has within two generations revolutionized society, made possible industrial cities of a size and importance undreamed of before, promoted commerce, the arts and the confidence on which credit rests by utilizing and expanding the principle of the division of labor,

and so getting things done where they can be done best, in any part of the world, by anybody.

The interdependence of all nations is the one great hopeful fact which is being demonstrated by the world-wide disaster of this war. Confidence, credit, transportation and exchange have temporarily broken down, but the very magnitude of the disaster shows the extent to which human relations have in very recent years changed for the better and the war perhaps marks the final breakdown of the old separatist system of restrictions.

Rome's triumphs and her national supply of corn involved a real national trade through the exploitation of her conquered provinces. England's destruction of the Dutch Merchant Marine did in the seventeenth century promote her trade, as did Cromwell's repressive industrial legislation in Ireland; but these methods of exploiting foreign peoples broke down forever when the attempt was made to apply them to the American Colonies, and by a curious irony Canada, Australia and other English Colonies now go so far as to direct their mistaken protective taxes against England and other countries alike. Recent attempts at trade preference between the English Colonies and the mother country have availed little, and like attempts to stimulate trade between the colonies of France and Germany and the mother countries have been productive of small results in comparison with the vast competitive commerce conducted between these European countries and South America, the United States and other world markets, over which no fiscal or political control exists.



The theory of the Balance of Trade may be thus stated,—that foreign trade is national and not between individuals. That each country is to be regarded as a great national trading concern, whose interests will be best promoted by expanding exports and contracting imports—gold and silver being the only exceptions. The crudities of this time-worn fallacy have to some extent become comic but its power of transmuting private trade rivalries into international misunderstandings is still a serious menace to peace as the national animosities growing out of the struggle of private English and German competitors show.

There is no such thing as national trade. Trade takes place between individuals and not between nations, and settlements are made directly or indirectly on the basis of goods for goods and not for gold and silver, in which small balances only are adjusted for convenience.

Trade must be mutually profitable or it stops. The traders of one nation can not prosper at the expense of the traders of another, and yet the accomplishment of this end is the impossible task which statesmen and dynasties have imposed upon themselves. They seek to create one-sided relation-

ships which naturally result in international animosities. Private trade rivalries are as a consequence mistakenly associated with local patriotism and it is only a step further to resort to military threats, armaments and finally to war.

The great seaports of the world are the principal points of international contact, and freedom of trade is as important to them and the countries back of them as are straight, deep and wide channels of approach, modern docks, public control of the shore fronts, railroad terminals, warehouses and factory sites.

In strong contrast to the tariff obstructed process of landing foreign goods are the civilized practices of the world relating to the transportation of goods, passengers and ideas by steamships, railroads, electricity and the postoffices. Foreign ships are as heartily welcome at all ports as their cargoes are heavily taxed at most ports. International distrust and ill-will is the necessary accompaniment of this limitation placed on the free use of the seaports of the world.

Ocean transportation of raw materials and coal has become so phenomenally cheap and regular that the great seaports are rapidly becoming the great manufacturing centers of the world and industrial wealth and population are continually being deflected from interior cities to them.

Rotterdam in Holland and Antwerp in Belgium are two great seaports serving the transportation needs of central Europe. The service they render is doubtless less restricted than it would be if, in common parlance, they belonged to Germany or France and were subject to the highly protective and restrictive laws of these larger countries. They have so far kept their independence by a reasonable regard for the commercial necessities of their stronger neighbors.

By analogy, is it not desirable through the exercise of concerted international pressure to establish a similar opportunity for unrestricted international exchange at Constantinople and the Balkan and China ports? Has not one of the great mistakes of the balance of power theory been the exclusion of Russia from access to the Mediterranean and the Pacific? Modern thought as well as trade has been shut out from her and her retarded civilization is at least in part the consequence of her enforced isolation.

If differences are to be avoided with Japan is it not fair that she should be permitted and encouraged to find opportunities for expanding her trade and national life? Foreign attempts to repress vigorous national growth are wicked and futile. It is not realities but these outgrown restrictive abstractions which drive nations to war.

Transportation improvements have made the world smaller and its parts are more dependent on each other. At the same time science has amazingly broadened individual and collective oppor-

tunity so that Malthus' dictum in its original sense does not apply to present day conditions.

Industrial expansion with its accompanying increase of wealth and population is far more important to city growth than is trade which merely passes through a city, as for example, cotton passes through Galveston. Free trade, by localizing industries at the great seaports, will benefit them as can no other influence except peace and it is manifestly to the interest of every port to become a free port.

The Panama Canal Zone ports, affected as they are with an international use, should be the first American ports adapted to this policy. Our comparative freedom from international complications, our recently acquired banking and currency system, our liberalized tariff, our great wealth and the prestige resulting from the President's magnanimous Panama Canal policy, and his concert of nations policy as applied to Mexico, and finally our carefully guarded neutrality have opportunely won for the United States a commanding moral influence in international affairs not based upon arms.

When exhaustion among the combatants shall re-establish reason in place of force, this country will surely be called upon to help bring order out of the chaos of war and hate, to help curtail the secret power of dynastic feudalism, and by its example to encourage the democratization of Europe whose people did not want war and whose dynasties and diplomats delivered them to it.



MY FATHERLAND.

By Norman N. Nacman, in *The American Leader*.

No petty bounds my land surrounds,
No kings my homage know;
No streams, nor rills, nor mighty hills,
Enslave with their mere show.

My hungry soul can find no goal,
As all this earth be round;
Beyond each sea my love flows free,
All earth as one is bound.

A traitor I! Who dares this cry?
Oh, wretched man, how poor
A soul will be that dares not see
The joys that I secure.

All earth is mine—all men divine
Embrace I to my breast—
All men to me as brothers be;
Am I not then twice blest?

Some dark, some fair, with each I share
My love, my joy, my peace;
In each I find a soul, a mind
And each will Death release.

Though strange their lays, though queer their ways,
I know their hearts beat true;

And thus did hide my tribal pride,
When men each other slew.

I bow to one, I bow to none,
My land so great and fair;
The sun ne'er sets, my land ne'er frets
For warmth, for cold, for air.

How can a man through life's short span
Spend life in hate and fear,
And cause to waste, through hate and haste,
All joys that do appear?

How long will hills, and streams, and rills
Enclose your love, your all;
Can man not see that hills must be
To answer Nature's call?

You sing of peace, you would release
This earth from pain and woe;
So come with me, my kingdom see,
Where naught but love does flow.

Who's traitor now? Whose noble brow
Shall beautify this earth?
One loving all, both great and small,
Or one his land and hearth?

BOOKS

ON MARRIAGE

Spiritual Sex-Life. A Study in Swedenborg. By Charles H. Mann. Published by James A. Bell Co., Elkhart, Ind. 1914. Price, 50 cents; postage, 5 cents.

Not merely for Swedenborgians, possibly not even so much for them as for those outside the New Church, has Mr. Mann written his study in Swedenborg. Its few controversial pages, however important to followers of Swendeborg, can not be of vital interest to others, nor the subject of their comment.

The little book—for it is only sixty small pages long—is an explanation in simple, direct phrase of Swedenborg's view of marriage as "a form of spiritual life." Not the legal or social institution called marriage has he under consideration, but that mysterious, divine, human union of one man with one woman in deepest comradeship of mutual love. "Conjugal love, notwithstanding its universality and its sensuousness, is a spiritual love." It is "a kind of spiritual life that has its beginning at the inmost of the life of a man and a woman." "From that inmost origin descending to the plane of their consciousness this spiritual life is there felt as love, and taking possession of man's external life, it makes of his natural love of sex a body in which it realizes its own life in the world." Man and woman are "fundamentally and complementally different" and only in their union in conjugal love can be realized a "full and perfect hu-