

harvested in 1914 than in any year in our history, the apple crop was greater than ever before, and there was an almost unexcelled production of cotton and of oats, barley, rye, potatoes, tobacco and hay. But in spite of the greater diversification of crops and of an increase both relative and absolute in the output of important products, our agriculture as a whole does not begin to keep pace with the growth in our numbers. In fifteen years there has been no considerable increase in our corn production, and in the same period, though our population has increased by over twenty millions, there has been a substantial decline in numbers of our cattle, sheep and hogs. The country would seem to be rapidly approaching the time when, unless something is done for agriculture, America will cease to be a food-exporting country.

THAT doughty prophet of law and order, *American Industries*, in announcing the "opening of the bomb-throwing season in New York," suggests its old and infallible remedy for all forms of unrest and social discontent. "Put an effective muzzle on the leaders" and social peace is automatically attained. It is very logical. Meet the illegal vocal literary violence of individuals with the legal armed physical violence of the State, and the "imbecile rank and file" will leave off being incited and rally to the standard of such champions of order and peace. Incidentally, will the American ever get over that incorrigible itching to stop the mouths of those who say things which are unpleasant for him to hear?

THE English Parliament after a session of only two weeks has adjourned, not to convene again until February second. Never before have such large crowds been present at its opening. It is generally admitted in London that the people were particularly eager to welcome some official public discussion of the problems confronting them. That discussion during the present session has been confined largely to the spy danger, recruiting in Ireland, censorship of the press, the management of recruiting stations and soldiers' pay. Not the least remarkable element in the situation has been the thoroughgoing cooperation on the part of the Opposition. In view of the strong censorship that exists over war news in England, and the perhaps growing restlessness over the Irish attitude, it seems to Americans unfortunate that Parliament could not have kept open for a longer period because of its psychological effect upon the people. Their desire for undiluted truth from the front and their feeling about England's unpreparedness for war

Pacifism vs. Passivism

HOW far the existing naval and military establishment of the United States is sufficiently equipped, manned and organized is a matter of fact which could have been settled by an exhaustive and impartial inquiry. It does not involve the fundamental problems of peace and war. But the fundamental problems of peace and war have been raised by the manner in which the proposed investigation is being discussed and by the reasons for which it is being opposed. The dogmatic pacifists will not have the question of the military preparedness of the United States even considered. They stigmatize any increased military and naval expenditure, no matter what its purpose and limits, as viciously militaristic. They are seeking to identify American pacifism with a policy which amounts practically to disarmament, even though the rest of the world goes armed to the teeth. So far as they succeed, they will be doing more than our militarists have ever done to prevent an effective ideal of peace from becoming a really leavening influence in American foreign policy.

The dogmatic pacifism of Bishop Greer and the *New York Evening Post* is derived from the doctrine of non-resistance. Bishop Greer frankly declares that the only way effectively to prevent or diminish war is never to fight. Peace and war are irreconcilably antagonistic terms. Sincere pacifists must consequently oppose war under all conditions and for any purpose; and they must stand like a rock against any preparation for war. If such an interpretation of pacifism is true, the friends of peace would have every reason to be profoundly discouraged. It would hand the world over to the militarists. It would establish militarism in the very constitution of society. The militarists, too, believe in an irreconcilable antagonism between peace and war, but they interpret the antagonism as an argument for war rather than for peace; and they are right. If the only sincere way of acting on behalf of a pacifist conviction is an uncompromising individual and national refusal to fight, then peace is an unattainable ideal. The people who were willing to fight in order to get what they wanted would continue to fight and would continue to get what they wanted. The people who were unwilling to fight in order to get what they wanted, even though they were in a numerical majority, would have to reconcile themselves to the great denial. At best they might be allowed to occupy a few isolated retreats in a jungle of warring powers. The beasts of prey would rule.

The moral values expressed by the words peace and war are not irreconcilably antagonistic. The

Ages, not because our forbears refused to fight, but because they fought for increasingly justifiable purposes. Force cannot be eliminated from life. All that can be done is to moralize and rationalize its employment. If a really civilized organization of society is not sustained by an effective exercise of force, it will soon perish from the face of the earth. Take the critical and decisive case in our own national history. In 1860 William Lloyd Garrison advised his fellow countrymen to act upon Bishop Greer's theory of peace and war. The erring sisters should be allowed to depart in peace. Yet if the South had been allowed to depart in peace, slavery would have been indefinitely perpetuated on this continent, and both the North and the South would have been fastened to a malignant form of militarism.

A nation does not commit the great sin when it fights. It commits the great sin when it fights for a bad cause or when it is afraid to fight for a good cause. Peace is one of those good causes on behalf of which fighting continues to be necessary. The effective power for peace in the world at this moment is not the American people, who are sitting safely and comfortably by their firesides and denouncing the perverted Europeans for the brutality and carnage of the war. The effective friends of peace are the Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans and Russians who are fighting without rancor the battles of their country, but with the determination that all the suffering and bloodshed shall not have been paid in vain—that the war shall be terminated by a treaty of peace which shall make in favor of a less predatory international organization. They may not, it is true, succeed in accomplishing a decisive result, as did the North in 1865. Neither one side nor the other may claim exclusively to represent the interests of a better international order; and this consideration relieves the friends of peace in other countries from any obligation to participate in the struggle as a whole. Nevertheless the war is the first great international conflict in the history of the world which has come explicitly to involve the possible future suppression of militarism. The opportunities for diminishing the probability of war rest far more with the belligerents than with the neutrals. Even though the peace conference be held in Washington with Mr. Wilson as its president, the American nation can contribute nothing substantial to its outcome. The one opportunity which this country had of testifying on behalf of an ideal of peace and of having something to say about the issue and effect of the war, vanished when its government failed to make a vigorous protest against the invasion of Belgium.

Pacifism must, then, be sharply distinguished

intentionally promoted. The chief instruments of an effective peace propaganda must be nations equipped for the accomplishment of their national purpose. The responsibility is theirs. They cannot shift it to an international organization which does not exist, or hand it over to subsidized peace societies. Passivism merely makes it easy for militarism. It repeats in the larger region of international politics the error which the advocates of *laissez-faire* used to make in domestic policies. Passivists are erecting national irresponsibility into a dogma, and seeking to accomplish by moral exhortation a result which requires for its accomplishment the moral exercise of force. The result of the error would be the same in both cases, the triumph of the predatory power or interest. A modern nation which wants the world to live in peace should not be content to keep the peace itself. It must be willing and ready, whenever a clear case can be made out against a disturber of the peace, to join with other nations in taking up arms against the malefactor.

The Reformer

WHILE the reformer is earnestly discussing his "social responsibilities" and his "national cooperation" and his "sound and fundamental political ideas," it is a bit difficult for him to keep his ear to the ground. Through some friend he may, however, catch an echo of what other people are saying. They will be saying very little about sound and fundamental political ideas, and a great deal about whether he is sincere, whether he is sane, and what there is in it for him. The reformer will feel as if somebody had struck his ugly fist through a painting, or walked whistling into a shrine. Such questions are not asked in a kindly world. Yet for some reason people do continue to ask them. They come into the parlor with their muddy feet and cast ruffian's doubt upon the assumptions of public virtue.

These are the people who are not answered when the reformer tells them he feels sincere, regards himself as saner than most, or that he has sacrificed much. Nor are they answered by turning the tables with some elaborate question about what *is* sincerity, what *is* sanity, where is the hair-line which divides the normal from the abnormal, and so on. The reformer seems to be doing things other people don't do, to be meddling and fussing and worrying about things others let alone. All this poking the head into other people's kitchens, this trying to scrub other people's children, this trying to make life miserable for Charlie Murphy,