

course, war would have been "necessary."

When the United States was preparing to fight Mexico, one of the humorous poets of the day wrote a homely protest in verse against it, a verse of which is as follows:

If you take a sword and dror it,
And go stick a feller through,
Gov'ment won't answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you.

There is something to think of in that, for the sentiment contained extended and put in more forceful shape is an appeal to man's Christian and therefore his better nature. If all men or any considerable proportion of them would refuse to fight at the behest of a ruler or a congress, of course there would be no war and arbitration might then follow. But how would this be in the case of an arrogant, insolent and greedy nation pouncing upon another's citizens, property or territory without justification and refusing to recede, make amends or even to say that it is sorry? Surely there could be nothing wrong in employing the stern agency of force to accomplish justice, and force in such a case would mean war, and the men of the land, many of whom would be slain, would have to carry it on.

This is not the trend of the *Economist* article by any means. The writer asks how, from a purely religious point of view, war can be considered necessary "if the laws of the state and government are modeled upon the laws of God, the Gospel of peace." Never, perhaps, did that little emphasized preposition occupy so important a place in a chain of words. War, under such circumstances, could not be considered necessary, because it would not only not be necessary but would not figure in men's computation and consideration at all. The Gospel of peace teaches men to do unto others as they would be done by, and with even that one golden precept lived up to, such a situation as that we have imagined above could not arise; nations would not pounce upon the property or people of others, because that is not the way they would have others do with them. And if, as would doubtless be inevitable at times, misunderstandings or complications were to arise, the same feeling would prompt the one or ones seeking a settlement to do so in a way that would take from no other what rightfully belonged to it, and the war spirit could find no place of lodgment in the midst of such a condition.

The *Economist* points out that "never with a word or an allusion does Christ recommend war." This is less than a truism, because it does not measure the full standard of the subject. Christ did more than negatively oppose war; His whole life, His every act, His spoken words were of themselves a continued, glowing dissuasion from war. Let him that doubts read with discrimination and thought the words of the Master, some of which are quoted by the publication named. "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword;" "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." While engaged in citing portions of that beautiful sermon, it might be as well to produce one somewhat more pointed and imperative—"Thou shalt not kill."

The *Economist* concludes that the

civilization of the present needs a re-established and a rehabilitated Christianity, "to reinstate the Gospel as originally preached." We agree that it does; yet the Christianity of Christ and the Gospel as He and His disciples preached it are here and have been upon the land and sent abroad to the nations for more than half a century. Perhaps there is an occulted meaning in the quoted words and the writer intended to convey that the need of the world is to give heed to the restored Gospel of Christ. If so, he is altogether right; for if mankind would turn from sinning and listen to the words spoken by the Savior and those who follow in His footsteps, then indeed would there be war no more, the sword would become a ploughshare and the spear a pruning hook.

The authority quoted engages in some excellent logic on the subject, the article in its entirety being worthy a careful perusal. But there are portions not so logical. "Surely," it says, "were the war-god divested of his blazonry and his smoke-wrapped tumult and given the venomous stiletto and the shrouding cloak of the assassin, the shoes of science and the death-rattle of the slain as his only visible and audible incitements, the magnetizing power of his eyes would die away and the people would recognize themselves as isolators and put the god to death." This is incontrovertible; as a metaphorical proposition it is unanswerable. And yet as a suggestion it points to nothing practical and therefore is as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal," or the sweet but weird and expressionless music of the æolian harp. The fact that there is a war-god means that there will be decoration and display—"the ear-piercing fife, the spirit-stirring drum, and all the pomp, pride and circumstance of glorious war." If these did not exist there would be no deadly collisions on a great scale between opposing men, and vice versa. If there were no great precipice in the Niagara river, there would be no thundering, crashing, majestic downpour of waters—waters in which so many have been swept to an awful destruction; but the precipice is there, so are the waters, and so the sublime but terrible spectacle remains year after year. It is a case of cause and effect accompanying each other, not one going ahead and the other following.

DRESS REFORM FOR WOMEN.

It will be of interest to the gentler sex to know that the National Council of Women of the United States will hold a one-day department congress during the week of the World's Congress of Representative Women, in one of the halls of the art palace, corner of Michigan avenue and Adams street, Chicago. The morning session of this department congress will be devoted to the subject of Woman's Dress, the topic to be presented from many different standpoints by eminent American authorities on this question. This session is intended to serve as an exponent, not only of the ideas but of the fashions adopted by those interested in the present improvement, and many of those attending plan to

wear costumes illustrative of the theories considered. No attempt has been made to introduce uniformity, save in so far as that follows the principles adopted by the committee on dress, which are that the clothing, from head to foot, shall be comfortable, entirely free from stiffness and constricting bonds, and that it shall be suitable to the occasion for which it is intended. Thus, street gowns are to be worn short enough to escape the dirt and dampness of the streets, head covering light enough to relieve the head from undue weight and large enough to serve as a protection from the cold or from the glare of the sun, and boots of size fitted to the foot without compressing it.

THE GREAT CITIES.

The efforts put forth by a large and respectable element in New York city to annex to it all of its immediate surroundings were doubtless inspired to no little extent by the fact that Chicago in point of population is rapidly gaining on and threatening to overtake if not surpass it. There is, however, another consideration. All cities want to be bigger than they are and bigger than any others, and with the addition spoken of New York would be the second city of the globe, only London exceeding it. As it is, it is questionable whether it ranks fourth or fifth, London, Paris and Pekin in the order named surpassing it and Berlin having within a few thousands either way of an equal number. They are also of nearly the same age.

Oscar Pyferoen, writing in a Paris paper regarding the growth of the German metropolis, says those who have not been there for a number of years can hardly imagine the progress it has been making of late. He shows it to have gone ahead at a pace only approached in the new world, perhaps only in the United States. In fact, Berlin is called the New York of the continent. Two centuries ago the capital of the elector of Prussia had not more than ten thousand inhabitants. It increased when the *dragonnades* of Louis XIV drove from France the Huguenots, who were warmly welcomed at Berlin and increased by their industry its prosperity. In 1861 the population was half a million. This figure, at the present day, is more than tripled, the figures being about 1,625,000, this in the course of thirty years; and the town, swallowing its suburban communes, has doubled the superficies of its territory. To Berlin flock all those to whom the city offers or promises means of enjoyment, all who wish to try their fortune, and still more, legions of working people who want work for their hands and wages to supply their wants.

Berlin is said to be a state within a state, as New York is; in fact, a separate government for the latter with its surroundings has often been advocated. Berlin has a yearly expenditure of 94,819,710 francs and through it more than half a million foreigners pass within the same time, altogether causing it to rank among the great states of Germany, immediately after the three powerful kingdoms and before the kingdom of Wurtemberg and the grand duchy of Baden. How can