ence courses is that only a small percentage of those who take the individual correspondence course finish it. Studying in a group, with laboratory work and a leader, seems to stimulate the interest and add a social feature which leads the members of the group to follow the work conscientiously and complete it. Experiments with free correspondence courses show that, while many individuals gain advantage from them, many others, because the material is furnished free, do not feel the same obligation to complete them as they do when they pay a substantial sum of money for the instruction.
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DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

OW may we be sure that as a nation we will never bow our neck to such a yoke as Europe has fitted her neck to? If we compare the culture of our own land with that of the most advanced countries of Europe, we find that we are no more advanced in art, in university progress, in science, in appreciation of civic beauty, in education; our land is no more dear to us than France to the Frenchman, or Germany to the Germans. On the other hand, we are no less enthusiastic over our flag, no more aggressive in our belief of the divine right of our country to be regarded as the best and strongest in the world. Yet everyone who is thinking of this monstrous battle of nations (in which the interest of so many of us is deeply involved through friendship and affection) stoutly affirms that such fury of warfare could not be possible between America and any sister nation. At least, we insist that we would never send our men to be slaughtered upon such vague, futile, irreverent pretexts as these European countries have employed to destroy the flower and beauty of their land. If this is a fact, if we firmly believe that we are immune from such conflict as this, then to amount to anything our convictions must be based upon some very definite and important reasons.

In what way, great or small, are we differing from the five nations that just now have elected to smite the heart of their womankind with death and disaster? As far as we can see into this intricate problem, the difference lies in the experienced individuality which comes to a long established democracy and which cannot possibly be inherent in any other form of government. The whole aim of a monarchical government is to mold the people into one mind, dominated absolutely by one personality. The better the German as a citizen, the more blindly and completely will he receive a royal edict, whether it gives to him power and influence or takes from him life. This is equally true of the Russians and Austrians, in a less degree of Englishmen, and of course to a far less degree of the French, who are the least anxious to enter into the present conflict.

It would seem to me, as a layman and not a student of social economy, that the great hope for peace in the future is through the power of every democracy to develop her citizens as separate individuals. Just so long as a nation feels that its government is in the hands of one appointed by God, so long as the effort of the monarch himself is to dominate a people, to have a government of one idea, then the one idea must at times overwhelm the people for good or for evil. If it chances to be for war, the people have been trained to succumb as a body, even to welcome the incredible and devastating condition because for some mysterious national reason it may be good or inevitable. A democracy, on the other hand, with all its faults, trains the people each one to think for himself, it separates a nation into many atoms, each atom self-centered, intelligently interested in all the other atoms, and so far as possible working in unity with the whole body. I cannot picture the United States going into a large, terrible, overwhelming war unless the people themselves thought that war a good thing for the nation, a good thing for the separate individuals making up the nation. No government policy, no desire to extend territory, no dissatisfaction with the petty annoyances which are bound to come (even through friendships with other nations) could, in my estimation, shake America out of her stolid, sure belief that peace is the best thing for each man, and hence, the best thing for the nation. And nothing short of an injury to the nation, which would lessen the welfare of each individual, would, it seems to me, make a call to arms in this country at all universal or satisfactory. Fortunately for the country also, just at present we have a President who is thoroughly democratic in his point of view. He is quiet, wise, and sure. He is an individualist, at the same time
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impersonal in his judgment of what is best for us as a whole. He is not a man who wishes to impose his judgment upon the people, and yet is a man who would never for a moment sacrifice his judgment to the whim of any person or party that wished to sweep the country for personal ambition or traditional patriotism. He is truly a man of the people, and we cannot honor the people more than by saying this.

It may be that such freedom as our long established democracy furnishes to each citizen will bring about a certain selfishness, a certain very personal attitude toward large questions of national welfare, but even though this may be true of many, the chances are that it will not prove so with our greater men. They will become self-centered, but not selfish; individualistic, but not petty. And, after all, the point of view of the intelligent individual in a free country is very likely to cover the point of view of the mass of his associates; because in such a country as America what is good for the most intelligent, the most considerate of our citizens, is mainly good for the majority, often for the whole.

Hence we can easily see that if any foreign power were to attack us in clever, insidious ways, wishing to invite reproof from us, it would not be in the power of the President, or his wish, for that matter, instantly to respond by imposing warfare upon the nation, sending the young men out by the thousands to be slaughtered. The question would come before our legislature, before our governors, before our public and private clubs; it would be talked of the length and breadth of the land. And if the people preferred security, national advancement through their own effort, peace at home, a continuation of our prosperity and development, they certainly would arrogate to themselves the privilege of having these good things. In other words, it does not seem possible to me that any devastating war would ever sweep through this country unless in some way the actual welfare of the nation or the freedom of the individual sect menaced. It would have to be a righteous war in order to kindle in the hearts of our democratic young men a resolve to sacrifice the joy and happiness that our kind of a nation holds for her people; there would surely have to be a greater motive than broadening our territory, resenting impertinence, or revenging ourselves for past slights.

I wonder very much if possibly the progress of peace which we have so longed for in the last few years, and which France, as well as America, has so earnestly striven for, is perhaps only to be gained through the living sincerely according to true democratic principles. Is it not possible that this very war among the monarchical nations of Europe may not be a step up long and bloody pathways to the kind of government that will make war impossible and result in the development of some phase of democracy throughout the world?

It has been suggested by Dr. Frank Crane of the New York Globe that Europe's re-establishment will come in the form of a federation of states. In other words, that we shall have the United States of Europe as we have the United States of America—a European Congress of Nations. Thus all the long preparations for war in Europe and all the terrible battles which are being fought, for small and futile reasons, would become civilization's own method of progressing toward a mammoth, enlightened democracy. For nature has very strange ways; what does not please her she changes abruptly and cruelly, or obliterates, as she sees fit, and her strength is great enough to crush not only principalities, but whole worlds if she feels that they are standing in the line of what she has decided to institute as progress. She may not only move men but mountains, and the geography of the world is shifted at her beck and call.

Sarah Bernhardt, perhaps the greatest French woman of her generation, through that extraordinary intuition which has been part of her greatness, said recently: "The only way in which I can face this terrible war is to believe that we are fighting for eternal peace." No greater thought has been uttered, no greater hope has been put forth by any ruler, statesman or peacemaker, since the beginning of this struggle. It is possible that all Europe is fighting for eternal peace, and as citizens of the greatest present democracy of the world, we can but believe that such peace will only be found through a government of the people by the people, a government which makes for the individuality of her citizens, individuality which cannot exist without personal wisdom, a wisdom which will never mass itself into blind acceptance of orders which make for the destruction of the welfare of the land.
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We can all see back easily to the time when war at least seemed essential to a nation; there were no methods of protection for a country beyond personal combat. The men of a land were compelled to protect their families and the happiness of their families by their personal strength and prowess, and this being the case, and the purpose being one born of devotion and self-sacrifice, war at such times in our history was not without its compensation. It developed qualities that were important in the progress of a race, it safeguarded the permanent peace of the land. But these days have died out as absolutely as though they had never existed. Today warfare has become a purely mechanical thing. It is a question of science, not of personal courage or prowess. The nation with the biggest gun is the master, and all that we ask of our youth is that they have the moment’s courage that walks into the mouth of a cannon; possibly not even the courage, merely the blind faith in the wisdom of their rulers “by divine right.” If we look into the psychology of this we see that we are doing two terrible things to a country when we put warfare on a mechanical basis and feed our machines with our people. In the first place, we are destroying the intelligence of our people if we teach them that such a thing is right or good; in the second place, we are breeding, for what we call the protection of our nation, the most futile, useless type of humanity, a type that need not have wisdom, or strength, or courage, that need merely live long enough and dully enough not to run away from the mowing machines of the enemy. How shall we thrill our schoolchildren with patriotism, love of humanity, understanding of physical courage and spiritual sacrifice, if we put out the fires which we thus kindle with high-priced, high-power explosives to satisfy the greed and vanity of our “kings”?

Again, as I have said, the remedy seems to me to rest with the spread of the finer democracy. We must train our children wisely in this matter of warfare, insist upon the fact that the country may only be sacrificed at the wish of the country for the benefit of the country; we must learn to recognize the tremendously vital and increasing comradeship of all peoples, we must refuse to be fired into fury and antagonisms by man-made boundaries between humanity; we must believe that brotherhood cannot be restricted by a nation’s selfishness, and thus we will grow to see clearly that men cannot stand arrayed against their friends and comrades, without sacrificing their right to progress, their spiritual development and their age as factors in advancing civilization.

LET the armies of construction go forward. As the bugle call of the armies of destruction resounds through the cities of Europe, let the call of a higher patriotism be heard in the cities of America. Let us build up rather than destroy. Let us have vision to see beyond the clouds of the present into a future which nothing but our own blindness can obscure. In the hardships to American industry resulting from a great European conflict, let our cities act as the nation’s balance wheels. If unemployment threatens, let not public improvements halt. The credit of our municipalities is sound. It is wiser to build roads than to open soup kitchens, and real patriotism prefers the laying of water mains for the living to the digging of graves for the dead. Let the armies of construction go forward.—From The American City.

CHURCH organs are made in this country. But in many cases certain parts of the mechanism, including the stops, are imported from Germany. An American organ manufacturer whose German supplies are cut off by the war is going to take a $30,000 organ to pieces in order that his workmen here may learn to duplicate the German stops.

Here is a hint for the whole country. Now is the time to fill the place of the “foreign-made article” and hold it.

The National Association of Manufacturers has started a nation-wide campaign to induce industry in this country to jump to its opportunity and supply American consumers with some of the commodities which Europe can no longer send us. A confidential bulletin is being prepared for American manufacturers describing lines of foreign goods known to be cut off and urging them to seize the chance to provide American-made substitutes.

Let us see if Yankee enterprise is too prosperous and middle-aged to bestir itself. The possibilities are incalculable.—From The Evening World.