

European nation except England and France. They are now double those of the German Empire, despite the belligerency of the German Emperor and the far greater dangers to the German people from hostile neighbors. Every additional man-of-war we build and every fortification we erect, instead of bringing dismay to the upholders of militarism abroad, furnishes them with a welcome and effective argument for the further strengthening of their power. This country is made relatively no stronger, and the burdens upon the people are made heavier throughout the world. The plea that these military appropriations are in the interests of peace is refuted by the whole tenor of history. "To keep the peace prepare for war" is the maxim of militarism. "To keep the peace prepare for peace" is the maxim of democracy, as well as the maxim of Christianity.

The moral decay of a large and influential school of American "journalism" was strikingly indicated by the newspaper attitude towards the recent prize-fight between those eminent ruffians, Messrs. Fitzsimmons and Maher. This particular display of the noble art of pugilism was made by stealth just over the border-line between Texas and Mexico, the officers of the law having driven the fighters out of Arkansas and Texas. That decent and intelligent public opinion was vigorously opposed to the fight is sufficiently indicated by the fact that there were arrayed against it the Governors and Legislatures of two States and a strong sentiment in Congress, and that even the Mexican Government, out of respect to the wishes of the United States, adopted preventive measures, although there is no law against prize-fighting in Mexico. When Fitzsimmons and Maher finally succeeded in evading the law and defying public sentiment, the "great metropolitan newspapers," instead of denouncing the offensive affair, called into requisition every power they possess to magnify and exploit it. Not content with describing it, they lied about it and printed impossible pictures of it, and fell to quarreling among themselves as to which editor had succeeded in telling his readers the "biggest story" of the event. At least two of these journals hired, or allege that they hired, the successful pugilist to pose before the camera, and printed for the delectation of their readers huge pictures of the noble athlete in various pugilistic positions, including that in which he thinks he stood when he struck his winning blow. Such "journalism" as this is not only vulgar, but lawless as well. As long as this school of journalism is dominant, just so long will newspapers and the men engaged upon them be treated with the distrust which many people feel toward modern journalists and journalism.

The English Liberals were very freely criticised, and with sound judgment, because they attempted in the last campaign to combine so many issues. They had committed themselves to four distinct leading issues, each one of which ran a sharp dividing line through their constituencies. If they had concentrated on any single question they might not have carried the country, but they would not have been defeated by such an overwhelming majority. The Conservatives, however, do not seem to have learned the lesson which the elections taught the Liberals. The Queen's Speech promises as many reforms and hints at as many projects as were contained in the famous Newcastle programme. In fact, the things which the Conservative Ministry propose to do are almost as the sands of the sea for number. The Conservative programme includes a promise for the relief of the voluntary schools, steps toward the housing of workers and toward helping the aged poor, the promotion of freehold occupancy, combination to insure

workers some kind of relief from the burdens of agriculture, security for improvements made by agricultural tenants, cheap land transfers, cheaper access to markets and the opening of new markets, just and amicable settlement of labor disputes, the avoidance of overcrowding, full attention to the needs of London, and the preservation of universal peace. It will be interesting to watch the course of events in the light of these promises. It looks very much as if the gentlemen in the Ministerial boat had set all the lines which could be tied or held, and baited them with every kind of bait which any manner of fish cares for.

Liquor-licensing reform in England has just received an extraordinary setback at the hands of Lord Salisbury. In the last Parliament it was urged against Sir William Harcourt's local veto bill that it was too revolutionary, and it was repeatedly asserted that only moderate measures had any chance of becoming law. As soon as the new Parliament met this year, ten of the Bishops of the Church of England waited on Lord Salisbury to ask the Government to take up several measures dealing with licensing, which the Church of England Temperance Society and the more conservative school of licensing reformers were anxious to see adopted by Parliament. One was for the closing of public-houses on Sunday; another for the registration of social clubs; a third for the prohibition of the sale of drink to children; a fourth for a shorter day for public-houses; a fifth for additional restraint of habitual drunkards; and a sixth for the constitution of new administrative local authorities to see that the licensing laws are enforced. As compared with the demands of licensing reformers of the school of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, these measures are moderate in the extreme. Lord Salisbury, however, would have none of them, and told the Bishops so in the blunt language for which he is noted. His only excuse for not promising some help was that for the peace of the present Government the question was best let alone. The disappointment of the Bishops was extreme. They had expected a cordial reception, and at least the promise of a Royal Commission. They had been so sure that they would succeed that the Bishop of London had been on the point of withdrawing a private measure, dealing with some of the questions raised, which he had already introduced into the House of Lords.

Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria has not been raising himself in the eyes of the world of late; he has come rather to occupy a very despicable position, and the suspicions which gather around the death of Stambuloff will not soon be forgotten. Prince Ferdinand is evidently willing to pay any price which the success of his plans exacts, and among others he is ready to sell his religion; for that is what the so-called "conversion" of the infant Prince Boris by baptism into the Greek Church really means. A more flagrant travesty of a religious ceremony and of religious conviction has not been seen for many a day than this exchange of religions in violation of the promise made at the time of his marriage to bring up his children in the Roman Catholic faith. For the sake of Russian support Prince Ferdinand has broken his family ties and has turned his face away from Europe. "The West," he says, "has pronounced its anathema against me. The morning light of the East illumines my dynasty, and casts its rays over our future." Under this flamboyant speech is hidden apprehension of the just retribution for an unrighteous deed. In his speech in Parliament the Prince had the impudence to say that he "had made a sacrifice so great, so cruel, and striking so deeply into his heart, as to find no parallel in history."

He did not mention that the same lack of humor which permitted him to use these words had made it possible for him to endeavor to work the Pope into his scheme, and to secure from Rome a dispensation by which he hoped to reconcile the faith he has always held with the faith to which his son is now, by an ironical use of the phrase, said to be converted. If Ferdinand had had the honesty to say that for reasons of state he had concluded to change the faith of his family, the world would have at least respected his courage and frankness.



Is Arbitration Practicable?

It is practicable to constitute a permanent tribunal for the settlement of all disputes between the United States and Great Britain. If not, why not?

Are there not questions that cannot be submitted to arbitration? No more between Great Britain and the United States than between New York and Massachusetts. A hundred years of success have demonstrated that there are no questions which cannot be more safely, justly, economically settled by the judgment of a court than by wager of battle. The argument that there are questions of national honor which cannot be arbitrated is a reproduction in a new form of the old argument in defense of the duel. But the duel has been abolished, and the honor of gentlemen is better secured than by the pistol and the sword. The argument that a nation cannot leave to arbitration the protection of its own citizens is a revival of the argument that a husband cannot leave to the courts the protection of his wife and his children; and the answer is that their rights are better protected by law than by war. We are asked if we would leave to a court the question whether the purchase of Louisiana was legitimately concluded. Certainly, if that question were raised: as every individual leaves to the courts the question whether his own title-deeds are adequate or not. In fact, such a question would not be raised. The mere existence of an honest and impartial tribunal prevents fraud or force from assailing rights which but for such a tribunal might be assailed. No international court would have transferred French Alsace to Germany against the will of its inhabitants.

How could the decisions of such a tribunal be enforced? Exactly as the decisions of international tribunals are now enforced. For a century, question after question between England and the United States has been submitted to arbitration. There has been no sheriff to enforce the decisions of these tribunals, and none has been needed. National honor has sufficed. National honor will continue to suffice. The people of neither country would go to war to resist the decree of a tribunal of their own choosing. For evidence is the fact that neither country has resisted such decree in the issues of the past.

Is force never to be used? There are two cases, and only two, which justify resort to force. The first is when there is no law; the second, when law is defied by the lawless. In a newly settled territory, before courts of justice are established and police are organized, each man must protect himself by force when attacked. In an old, settled State, if a mob undertakes to set law at defiance, it must be resisted and quelled by force. What is now proposed is to abolish the first occasion of war between civilized nations, as it is abolished in all civilized communities; to provide law where none now exists; to leave as the only justification for war a refusal by the nation to submit to the law which it has itself invoked. In fact, between England and the United States there would never be another war,

or rumor of war, if once a tribunal were created to which controversies could be, as matter of course, submitted.

Is an international tribunal practicable? Let the questioner ask and answer another question: Is war practicable? Is wager of battle between nations any better than between individuals? It substitutes might for right, and gives victory to strength, not to justice. And with what result? Ask Marengo and Austerlitz, Magenta and Sadowa, Metz and Paris; ask a population decimated by the long Napoleonic wars; ask the widowed, the orphans, the childless; ask the European peasantry, impoverished by the burden of an intolerable tax—one-third going to pay the interest on debts incurred in past wars, one-third to pay the cost involved in preparation for possible wars in the future. Imagine, reader, that one-third of your income was pledged to pay interest on money you had borrowed and sunk in fighting your neighbors on either side of you, and one-third more in keeping your home and factory armed against anticipated attacks from them—how would life prosper with you? That is the condition of Europe to-day. That is the condition into which the military spirit is unconsciously seeking to plunge the United States.

And war is as inefficacious as it is costly. There is one question, and only one, that it ever settles: the question of authority. It determines that the authority for the Colonies is vested in the Colonies, not in the English Parliament. It determines that the supreme authority for the United States is vested in the Nation, not in the State. But other questions settled by war remain unsettled. Waterloo determines that France shall be monarchical—and it is a Republic. The Crimean War determines that Russia shall have no foothold on the Mediterranean Sea—and she never was so near the consummation of her patient ambition as she is to-day. For one purpose, and for one only, is war legitimate: to enforce law. One question, and one only, can it determine: where resides the authority to make law. The substitution of law for war as a means of settling all controversies between these two great Nations would be a splendid consummation of a splendid century, and would lead on by rapid processes to an international tribunal for all Christendom.



The Salvation Army Troubles

The division in the Salvation Army is the inevitable result of the attempt to organize and maintain absolutism in a democratic age. The Salvation Army is by the very principles of its order an autocracy. Its Commander-in-Chief is an absolute despot, though he may be a consecrated, conscientious, and benevolent despot. In our time, and certainly in our country, such a despotism can be maintained only in case he who possesses the authority exercises such discretion in wielding it as to allow large liberty to departmental and other subordinate heads. Local self-government is inherent in American institutions. It has in this country modified the Roman Catholic Church, revolutionized the Mormon Church, and affected even the Jesuit Order. The Roman Catholic autocrat and the Jesuit autocrat have been wise enough to perceive the necessity of flexibility in organization, and have allowed it. General Booth has not been wise enough to perceive the necessity of such flexibility, and therefore his organization has suffered fracture.

We say suffered fracture, for this is the fact, however strongly on the one hand the English representatives of the autocracy deny it, however strongly on the other hand Commander and Mrs. Booth disavow any intention or desire to produce it. They had the practical sagacity to