

out God he is merely a machine. He has a body which can do certain physical work for society; but a man's body is as useless as a brute's body except when under intelligent direction. Man can be more destructive than a brute if he has no conscience to restrain him. The mind can direct the body so that its energies will be employed along useful lines, provided the mind itself is under spiritual control, and that brings us back to faith in God.

Upon belief in God rest all the uplifting influences in life—consciousness of responsibility; comfort in the assurance of God's presence; prayer, through which the heart is opened to divine suggestions; and the future life with its rewards and punishments. When man's hold upon God is loosened he falls, and there is no bottom to the pit into which he plunges. Last week's Talk dealt with the sins of sensualism in which Israel was steeped; today we have the secret of Israel's downfall—it began in the ignoring of God.

Is it possible for a nation like the United States to fall? Yes, it is possible for any nation to fall if it forgets God.

Some argue that because a nation is composed of individuals it must, like the individual, have birth, infancy, maturity, and then decline and death. This is not only a gloomy philosophy, but a false philosophy.

While those living today are in control, the nation is composed of generations rather than individuals. As one generation passes off the stage another appears. Death, therefore, is not necessary; continual progress is possible. As there is no reason why any future generation should be weaker or worse than this, there is no reason why this nation should be any weaker or worse than it is now.

On the contrary, in a Government like ours, which belongs to the people and which represents the virtue, intelligence and patriotism of the people, the Government ought to grow better and better, provided the people improve in virtue, intelligence and patriotism. Our nation is improving; within 15 years it has brought the Government nearer to the people by the popular election of Senators; it has made taxation more equitable by the levying of an income tax; it has abolished the legalized saloon, and it has called woman's conscience to the aid of man's judgment in the conduct of the Government. We have many problems to solve, but we will solve them—wrongs to right, but we will right them.

Our Nation is now leading the world toward peace and international justice. Why? Because it trusts God, the author of virtue, the instructor in intelligence and the source of the altruism that makes patriotism possible. Our Nation is aiding the world as no other nation ever did. Its ideals are drawn from the Bible; its measure of greatness is Christ's measure—it serves the world.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people."

BRITAIN GIVES EGYPT WHAT IRELAND WON

Special Washington correspondence to the Philadelphia Public Ledger by Frederic W. Will, under date of March 3, says: Not essentially to grant "independence" to Egypt, but to buttress the quaking walls of the British Empire is regarded in Washington as the real motive of the termination of the British protectorate over the land of the Pharaoh. Viewed in that light American and Foreign diplomats pronounce the action just taken by the Lloyd George government as historic and far reaching in character. What Ireland has won, Egypt has now achieved and India is not likely much longer to be denied. That, in Washington's opinion is what Great Britain's decision means. It is, in other words, less a gesture of generosity than a shrewd measure of self-preservation.

Virtually all of the burning questions of European and Asiatic politics are wrapped up with the Egyptian situation. In the Near East the spectre of more war between Greece and Turkey, with its incalculable possibilities of embroiling greater powers, again terrifies the chancelleries of Europe. The menace is a direct outgrowth of what Mohammedan India considers the "perfidy" of David Lloyd George. The dominating portion of India which is Islamic and acknowledges the spiritual sovereignty of the Caliphate, or Turkish Empire, has not forgiven, and will not forgive, the British prime minister for agreeing in the treaty of Sevres, after the World War, to assign Thrace to Greece. Indians declare they possess a solemn promise from the British government that such "home-lands" of Turkey would not be severed from the Islamic realm. Great Britain is not in position to undo the treaty of Sevres and keep her promise to her

hundreds of millions of Mohammedan subjects in India. Her inability to do so, as Mr. Sastri, India's representative at the Washington conference, publicly said on repeated occasions, is the primary reason for the growing spirit of revolt against British domination in India.

Thus some authorities feel that the British government, with its invincible genius for compromise, seeks to appease the Mohammedan universe with Egyptian "independence." The people of Egypt, like the Islamic population of India, are loyal to the Caliphate, even though Egyptian soldiers fought under allied banners in the World War, after the Turks assailed the British on the Suez Canal.

Whether the termination of the British protectorate over Egypt originally intended as a war measure, and so notified to the United States Government in 1914 will appease either the Egyptians or their Indian coreligionists, remains to be seen. Near Eastern authorities in Washington consulted by the writer today were inclined to be skeptical. They declare the declaration made by Lloyd George in the House of Commons on Tuesday bestows anything but "sovereignty" or "independence" upon Egypt. By reserving to "British discretion" the defense of the Suez Canal; the protection of Egypt against all foreign aggression or interference, direct or indirect, and the protection of Egypt's foreign interests and foreign minorities Near Eastern diplomats say the British retain an exceedingly firm grip on Egypt. The scheme at the time it was proposed by the Milner commission and rejected by the British Cabinet was likened to the Platt amendment whereby the United States retains certain jurisdiction over the foreign and defense affairs of Cuba. The relations between the United States and Cuba, of course, are not approximately either as delicate or as extensive as those which prevail between the British Empire and Egypt.

British authorities here do not conceal the necessity of a strong British hand over Egypt's foreign relations and particularly over the Suez Canal. That celebrated waterway, bequeathed to Queen Victoria by her adoring Disraeli as the most priceless achievement of his premiership, is as vital to the integrity of the British empire as the Panama Canal is vital to the national security of the United States. Cut the Suez and you sever Britain's imperial jugular vein. Place it unrestrictedly at the disposal of a vengeful Egypt ready perhaps some day to ally itself with an aggrieved Turkey and a sullen India and Britain would take the first step, as many of her sons think in the direction of imperial suicide.

That is why David Lloyd George has determined to "watch his step" on the Nile. The thorn of Ireland having been removed from the British side, as the wily Welshman of Downing street thinks, Egypt for itself and for the immeasurable possibilities dormant India is next to be pacified. If the Egyptians accept the pipe of peace London has offered Cairo, there can be little doubt India next will be asked to smoke from the same briar—the Englishman's favorite instrument. The spirit of self-determination is abroad through George V's globe girdling domains. Statesmen of vision in London know it cannot long be suppressed. That is why the Prince of Wales celebrated the wedding of his sister Princess Mary, in far-off Bengal instead of pomp-filled Westminster Abbey.—Copyright, 1922, by Public Ledger Company.

DEMOCRATIC HOPES

W. J. Bryan says that it will be a Democratic year and that the country will elect a Democratic house of representatives in the fall. He may be right, although he ought not to be. There is a tradition and a political habit which support his prediction, but the habit can be overturned by a fight, which the Republicans are probably willing to make.

Election sometimes go on judgment and sometimes on sentiment, and they may go on sentiment in just such off year elections as will be had this fall. When people are out of patience and out of sorts they vote against whatever is in.

If they do not like the conditions in which they find themselves, they vote their discontent. A vote against the dominant party is a way of saying that the voter does not like the relation between his income and outgo. He is hard up and he is an anti. He is against whatever is because his contact with it is not profitable and he'll change his vote to change his luck.

The United States is a land of milk and honey compared with the rest of the world, but there is a great deal of unemployment, wages have been reduced and are being reduced, rents have remained high, the purchaser does not give full credit to the readjustment which has brought

lower prices, taxes have not been brought down perceptibly, and the farmer's pocketbook is flat.

These are bad signs for the dominant party, and it does not matter how much responsibility it attached to the party in control before or how many causes of stagnation are unavoidable or beyond reach of remedy. The head to throw the brick at is the head of a congressman of the dominant party.

The administration can point to a good record and to plans undertaken in good faith and sound judgment to make corrections. The budget reform and the economies introduced will cut out the waste of government and will be reflected in taxation. The happy and contented republic is one in which the voters pay out little and take in much, but such republics cannot have expensive wars. We did have an expensive war and are paying for it, but we'll acquit the Republican party of responsibility for the fashion in which the war bills were run up.

We also will credit the Republican administration with averting another war bill. That achievement is a big one, appreciated most by people who realize how forbidding were the conditions developing in the Pacific and how they were heading into another war. The Washington conference has given the country a guaranty of peace, and it also has permitted the world to get off the stilts of armament.

This achievement will appeal to thinking people as the greatest which could have been expected of an administration in its first year. The administration is pledged to such relief as can be given the farmers, and undoubtedly is in earnest about it. It would be foolish politically to be otherwise.

The administration also is pledged to such constructive work as the St. Lawrence seaway, which is for the stimulation of the midwest.

Conditions as they stand are probably adverse, as Mr. Bryan says, to the party in control, but they are not beyond analysis and betterment. At this stage it would be bad to divide congress and take the house away from the party which is endeavoring to get the country back in shape. The Republican party ought to be continued in authority and responsibility, and even discontented voters may see that a vote of discontent is not so good as one of reason.—Chicago Tribune.

SAYS REFORMERS LUCKY NOW NOT TO HANG

(From Jefferson Co., Wis., Union.)

We have to admire a man for being a good sport even if he is on the wrong side, according to our personal belief. Here is a letter from William Jennings Bryan in response to the hot roast we gave him last week.

Villa Serena, Miami, Fla., Feb. 1, 1922.

Mr. H. L. Hoard,
Fort Atkinson, Wis.

My Dear Mr. Hoard:—Thanks for clippings sent. The criticism is mild compared with some that I receive. To be forgotten after two hundred years is much better than to be hung now. They used to hang reformers, now they simply defeat them for office or make rude remarks about them—a welcome improvement.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

The coal operators say that before they can reduce the cost of fuel to the consumer there must be a reduction in the wages paid miners. When it is considered that the average price of coal to the domestic consumer is now around \$12 to \$14 a ton and that the miner himself gets only a fraction of that amount, it would seem that it would be fairer to hunt out some economies elsewhere along the line before hitting at the miner. We venture to say that if the miner did the work for nothing, there would be many cases where the consumer would never find it out.

Every time a citizen rises to remark that taxes ought to be reduced, somebody retorts that economy must be managed with care lest it weaken the government's capacity for necessary service. Just as in the old days it was unsafe to trust the amendment of the tariff law to anybody but its friends, now the theory is that the job of cutting down the expenses of government should be placed in the hands of those who cause the expense.

The movement of the wets to secure the privilege of getting a mild tippie in the form of light wines and beers is not heralded as an effort to get the saloon back again. In fact, they strenuously deny it. It might not be a bad idea, however, to inquire what name it is proposed to call the places where it will be sold?