

penalty was just. This kind of retribution the Allies are entitled to exact up to the measure of their ability. But if retaliation is part of the ethics of war it plays no part in the ethics of peace. The perfectly proper military method of doing your utmost to injure the enemy should be abandoned as soon as the fighting is over. The treaty of peace should be determined by political values, and there is no value in politics as fundamental as that of according to other people the same opportunity to live and grow that we demand for ourselves. The treaty which ended the war between Austria and Prussia in 1866 was beneficent because a great politician was wise and strong enough to resist the clamor of the soldiers for terms of peace which would perpetuate the quarrel. The treaty of Frankfort was maleficent because the same politician allowed its provisions to be determined by the military motive of protecting Germany against the consequences of an enmity which had been deliberately provoked. That the Allies will be able to start Germany on a journey of political extinction we do not for one moment believe; but even if they should be able to bring the German army to its knees, they would be mad and wicked to aim at keeping the German people in anything like the same position.

Southern Prosperity

IN the end the European war may prove a boon to the South. Though it has caused acute suffering among planters, merchants and manufacturers, it has enforced an invaluable lesson. It has convinced large sections of the Southern people that they cannot build their economic life upon cotton alone.

The lesson is not a new one. For decades agronomists and economists have preached against the prevailing one-crop system. It was a wasteful use of the land. It tended unduly to depress the price of cotton. It involved a heavy expenditure for food, fodder and fertilizers. Except in the richest bottom lands of the Mississippi valley, it meant a rapid exhaustion of the soil. It was highly speculative, for it based the agricultural prosperity of a whole section upon a crop which might rise or fall because of factors beyond the South's control. Despite this preaching the South still clung in the main to its one crop. Tradition, routine and shiftlessness worked in favor of cotton. It was the one pay-crop, the crop upon which usurious storekeepers were willing to advance money. Progress towards a diversification of crops was therefore comparatively slow until the ravages of the boll-weevil, and finally the low prices due to the war, gave to it a powerful impetus. When cotton prices sank, the farmers turned to the raising of hay, corn, oats, hogs and cattle.

The result has been spectacular. According to

the latest reports of the Department of Agriculture, the cotton crop has declined about 23 per cent (from over 15,000,000 to about 11,000,000 bales). Not all this decline is due to a restriction of planting, for the crop itself has been damaged, but the net result of these two factors, aided by bad crops in Egypt and India, by better warehouse facilities in this country, and by the lending of money at low rates of interest by the Federal Reserve banks, has been to enable the South to market its cotton at leisure and secure better prices. But the most significant development has not been the reduction in the planting of cotton but the correspondingly increased planting of grain. While the cotton crop has decreased 23 per cent, the corn crop has increased 33 per cent, or 301,000,000 bushels over that of a year ago. The combined production in the Southern states of wheat, corn and oats is now 1,598,000,000 bushels, an increase of 27.4 per cent over the previous year, as compared with an increase of only 9½ per cent for the whole country. The total value of grain crops in the South amounts to \$1,330,388,000, or considerably over 40 per cent above the average annual value of the cotton crop during the last decade.

The consequence of this partial escape from the obsession of cotton is a nearer approach to normal economic conditions. Six months ago cotton was selling at eight cents a pound, and there remained unsold one and one-third million bales in excess of the stocks of a year before. Merchants and manufacturers found their business restricted and their credit impaired. To-day the South is beginning to recover. Cotton is selling at twelve cents, and corn, oats and other agricultural products bring better prices. The South is regaining from cereals and live stock a part of what it has lost in cotton. It is the first fruits of an accelerated agricultural revolution.

No revolution takes place without counter-revolution, and no progress without reaction. We may therefore expect that as soon as cotton prices again rise, the cry will be "Back to cotton." The white fibre still holds the imagination of the South, as it did in the early years of the last century when the price went up to forty-four cents, or in the 'fifties when the South believed that cotton ruled the economic and political destinies of the world. Despite possible recessions, the tendency in the South must be towards a continuing economic expansion, which will make the role of cotton culture relatively less important. Industrially the South is coming into its own. It is beginning to utilize its varied resources. A diversified agriculture, an increase in large and small-scale manufacturing, and an expansion of commerce are all steps from a specialized agricultural dependency of Europe and of the North

to a better balanced agricultural-industrial economy.

In this development agriculture must for a long time remain the chief factor. It is, of course, true that the opportunities for industrial and commercial expansion are immense. Already North and South Carolina are second and third in the manufacture of cotton, and Georgia is fifth. As many bales are consumed in the factories of the cotton-growing states as in all the rest of the country put together. The lumbering industry increases rapidly, and mining is becoming one of the greatest of industries. Birmingham begins to rival Pittsburgh, and all over the section lesser industries are growing rapidly. Mineral resources have hardly been touched, and the waterpower available for manufacturing is enormous. But even greater potentialities of progress inhere in Southern agriculture. Only a portion of the land is as yet used and that ineffectively, and vast tracts of fertile swamp land are waiting to be reclaimed. The rural population is still greatly in excess of the urban, and agricultural workers represent a far larger proportion of the total population in gainful pursuits than in any other section of the country. The chances for agricultural development easily outweigh the vast opportunities in mining, manufacturing and commerce, and what Sidney Lanier said over thirty years ago is still true to-day: "A vital revolution in the farming economy of the South, if it is actually occurring, is necessarily carrying with it all future Southern politics, and Southern relations, and Southern art, and such an agricultural change is the one substantial fact upon which any really New South can be predicated."

Here lies the crux of the problem. Farming in the South is even more ineffective than in other parts of the country. Though the yield per acre compares favorably with that of the North, the yield per family or per farm is small. The Census of 1910 shows that the product per farm is only a little over \$600 in the South Atlantic states, and a little under \$500 in the South Central states, while the yield in the North Central states is almost \$1,100. The comparison is not conclusive, but it at least suggests the startling difference between the standards of living on the farms of South and North. In 1910 the value of all farm property in the South was only \$25.31 per acre, as compared with \$40.93 in the West and \$66.46 in the North. This is more than a mere difference in figures. It is a difference in civilization.

The primary cause of this inferiority of Southern agriculture is that the farms are cultivated by ignorant labor. The South has not yet completely adjusted itself to the problem of living without slavery. So long as negroes could be marshalled and led and driven on great plantations, a reasonable degree of efficiency might be obtained, however improvident

and stupid the slaves. To-day the agricultural prosperity of the South depends largely upon the intellectual and industrial advance of the negro population. A shiftless, untrained, lazy man, be he black or white, will not launch out into new experiments, but will continue to exploit and kill his land in the bad old way. The low standard of education in the South both among poor whites and negroes, though this standard is steadily rising, is still the chief drawback to its steady and rapid progress towards better agriculture, and a higher civilization based on prosperity. The whites may draw the line ever so sharply against the negroes, but in the end the two races are tied together by that strongest of ties, common economic interests. Southern culture depends upon Southern prosperity, which depends upon agriculture, which in turn depends upon the negro. You cannot displace the negro by Italians or other European immigrants, and you cannot kill off the black men nor deport them. As the South advances, as the agricultural revolution, with its demand for higher skill, progresses, the necessity for a general raising of the standards of living and capacity of the negro agricultural population becomes more insistent.

Industrialism in its broadest sense—which includes agriculture—sets its stamp wherever it rules. In the South we already have the Southern "Yankee," who is quite as nearsightedly shrewd as was his brother of Connecticut. We have child labor, the exploitation of women, truck stores, the demand for a protective tariff, welfare work and a budding class-consciousness. But the best thing that has developed historically out of industrialism is the insistent demand in the interest of all that every child shall receive some measure of education and equipment for life. In the South this would seem to be the next step.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1915, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY PHILIP LITTELL WALTER E. WEYL	WALTER LIPPMANN FRANCIS HACKETT CHARLOTTE RUDYARD ALVIN S. JOHNSON
---	---

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.