

early in the history of the country a school for Presidents in elementary economics. If there is "nothing in either of them"—protection or free trade—then there is nothing in either liberty or despotism, honesty or dishonesty, uprightness or sneak thievery. Did they teach political economy at Princeton when Mr. Wilson was president of that institution? And let us see—did not Mr. Wilson himself write a work on political economy? Did he teach in that book that there was nothing in either free trade or protection? Perhaps some of our readers can enlighten us.

THE TRUE GOSPEL OF PEACE

In these times when there is afoot a dangerous movement to inflict upon the country continental armies and even universal compulsory military service, it is well to commemorate the birthday of the statesman who in his farewell address urged us to:

"Avoid those over-grown military establishments which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican liberty."

Although Washington had been the military leader in a successful war for independence, that did not blind him to the fallacy of such arguments as his three living successors to the presidency are urging in favor of military preparedness.

Had Washington the economic knowledge possessed by some of his fellow revolutionaries—Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine, for instance—he could have shown that the best defense against aggression is a just social system. Franklin, who had imbibed from the French physiocrats the doctrine of absolute free trade and land value taxation, could easily see that there has never been a good war nor a bad peace, and to so declare himself even when at the close of the Revolution he was taking part in the framing of a treaty of peace with England.

And Thomas Paine had the wisdom to see and declare that, "if commerce were

permitted to act to the universal extent it is capable of, it would extirpate the system of war, and produce a revolution in the uncivilized state of governments."

But even without the economic wisdom of these revolutionary philosophers, Washington could see the evil of great armaments.

It happens that Washington's Birthday is the anniversary of the death of a more modern revolutionary soldier, Joseph Fels, a soldier of the common good. He fought with the weapons of peace.

Like Washington he knew the danger of such institutions as those for which the preparationists are contending. An organization known as the Navy League once sent him a circular containing 67 alleged reasons for a big navy and asking his help. His answer will serve as well to-day as when it was written four years ago.

On returning his petition unsigned, Mr. Fels wrote;

"None of your 67 reasons shows murder to be justifiable. None of them shows that it is right for a young man to bind himself to shoot his own father at the command of a superior officer. None of them justifies the wicked folly that leads citizens of different countries to kill each other merely because the rulers are too incompetent or too unwilling to settle a dispute amicably.

"Your petition is inconsistent. It contains no demand that in case of war all the diplomats whose blundering or worse has failed to avert trouble, be placed on the firing line, together with all Congressmen and Senators who voted to declare war, all editors, politicians, preachers and other molders of public opinion who helped to inflame the public, and all financial magnates who stood back of it all, pulling the strings in expectation of securing new opportunities for plunder. Of course I know that if such a provision were made there would be an end of all demand for a navy, every Congressman would oppose an appropriation, and our State Department would treat even the smallest and weakest of foreign nations with justice and courtesy.

"In spite of the large number of reasons

you give, you omit all mention of the ones but for which no navy would be wanted. Are you ashamed of them? You don't say that American monopolists had secured concessions from corrupt governments of weaker countries to rob the people, and want protection from possible revolutionary outbreaks which their oppression may cause. You don't say that increased naval expenses will give protected monopolists an excuse to demand retention of oppressive tariff taxes. You don't say that the Steel Trust, Charles M. Schwab, and others interested in contracts for battle ships, guns and armor plate, need the money.

"You do say that the navy now costs \$130,000,000 a year. You don't say that that means a tax of \$7.50 a year on every family, and that you want to increase it. You don't say that most of these families don't get a dollar's worth of benefit out of it, but that it will be the young men of such families who must do the fighting and be maimed or killed.

"I have little hope that it will do any good to tell you that demanding a navy is inconsistent with the Golden Rule. You **know** that already; but you don't care. You don't say that openly because it is not fashionable and would not be expedient. It would embarrass the preachers and church members who support your demands. Still it won't hurt to let you know how this murderous business looks to a Golden Rule advocate, and I therefore quote from Henry George:

" 'The dangers to the republic come not from without but from within. What menaces her safety is no armada launched from foreign shores, but the gathering clouds of tramps on her own highways. That Krupp is casting monstrous cannon and that in Cherbourg and Woolwich projectiles of unheard of destructiveness are being stored, need not alarm her, but there is a black omen in the fact that Pennsylvania miners are working for 65 cents a day. No triumphant invaders can invade our soil until the blight of 'great estates' has brought 'failure of the crop of men;' if there be danger that our cities blaze, it

is from the torches lit in faction fight, not from foreign shells.

" 'Against such dangers forts will not guard us, ironclad protect us, or standing armies prove of any avail. They are not to be avoided by any aping of European Protectionism; they come from failure to be true to that spirit of liberty that was invoked at the formation of the Republic. They are only to be avoided by conforming our institutions to the principle of freedom.

" 'For it is true, as was declared by the first National Assembly of France, that ignorance, neglect or contempt of human rights are the sole cause of public misfortune and corruption of government.'

" 'Here is the conclusion of the whole matter. That we should do unto others as we would have done unto us, that we respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected; it is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace.' "

THE N. Y. TIMES UNEQUIVOCALLY FOR THE SINGLE TAX

At last we welcome to the ranks of Single Tax papers the *New York Times*. It is true that this great Metropolitan journal has for a long time trembled on the brink, though printing many articles that were, explicitly or by inference, condemnatory of the reform. But at last it takes a firm position in its favor. How shall we otherwise interpret the editorial subjoined? Need we assume a covert motive and regard the article itself as a singular example of maladroitness? There is no need to do this; we shall therefore accept this remarkable endorsement of the Single Tax at its face value, with all the consequences that must follow—that the *Times* is now a Single Tax organ, that what is allowed to appear in its columns from a young man (his youth is hypothetical, of course) filling an editorial post, commits the paper and the entire establish-