

ey to subjugate the Filipinos, who never did them the least harm in the world. Ask them if they will have war, glory and high taxes and depend on the brute force of a large army and navy; or peace and prosperity and depend on justice and moderation. Ask them if they will have entangling alliances which will embroil them in the affairs of other nations. Ask them if they are willing to be taxed in order that large subsidies may be squandered on a few rich syndicates, for instance, Hanna & Co. (Who is the Co.?) Ask them if they will depend for the suppression of monopolies on the party which has been legislating for 40 years to create them.

Depend upon it, answers to all these questions will surely come. If they come through you, you will march on at the head of a triumphant host, inspired with a sincere love of our country—Independents who place honor and justice above party fealty and party spoils—democrats determined to defend the constitution, and who revere the teachings of the fathers.

If these answers do not come through you, but in spite of you, so much the worse for you, that is all. History will write the epitaph of the party you have led to destruction—"Weighed in the balance and found wanting."—Hon. John V. Le Moynes, in the March Jeffersonian Democrat.

MILITARISM.

For The Public.

The horrors of war have never lacked graphic depiction. Shakespeare has flashed upon them his genius. Vereschagin has flung them on his canvas. Sherman has summed them in three words. But to the absurdities and dangers of the military spirit, the root whence war springs, too little attention has been paid. In compliance with the specious maxim that peace is best maintained in preparing for war this spirit ever finds favor with many who hate its ripened fruit. Hence, partly, the popularity in America of brass buttons and striped seams, the liking for military titles, and the too ready acquiescence in martial absolutism as something that has a right to override and supersede civil law whenever trouble threatens. Befeathered militia officers thus strut prodigious, the very Sunday schools put wooden rifles in their youngsters' hands, and when official murder flames forth at Hazleton or Coeur d'Alene no adequate roar of protest follows and its authors go scot free.

And yet with the evils of militarism as it exists in Europe, turning nations into armed camps, impoverishing their people, and threatening every year to burst into such holocausts as Napoleon kindled, we are perhaps sufficiently familiar. We err in thinking, because so far we have escaped the compulsory service and the huge establishments idle in barracks, that therefore militarism in America is something different in essentials and not merely in degree. On the contrary, our military system is modeled upon that of Europe, with its rigid discipline, its servility enforced upon the rank and file, and its denial to them of the right to their own brain and conscience—so that they are compelled to surrender their reason, their ideas of right and wrong, of prudence and duty, and to become blindly obedient to others, mere automata in their hands, so much raw material for tactics and food for powder.

In Europe the system is synonymous with snobbery, arrogance and tyranny. Our freer institutions may check the growth of this brutal spirit, but there are evidences all too plenty in our military academies, in our regular army, and even in our militia, that they do not prevent it.

When a soldier can be subjected to long imprisonment for addressing by letter his commander in chief without first obtaining permission from his regimental superior; when the marriage of an army lieutenant with the daughter of a sergeant brings upon him social ostracism; when citizen soldiers can be sent to jail for inability to pay fines imposed upon them by their officers, and when a colonel of militia can string up a refractory private by the thumbs and escape punishment—to cite only a few among cases of recent years that come to mind—surely even the conservative will admit that there is room for reform.

The truth is that militarism is the very antithesis and negation of both democracy and freedom. Its existence in America is irrational and absurd in the highest degree. Walt Whitman, democracy's anointed poet, saw this when he declared:

The whole present system of the officering and personnel of the army and navy of these states, and the spirit and letter of their trebly aristocratic rules and regulations, is a monstrous exotic, a nuisance and revolt, and belongs here just as much as orders of nobility or the pope's council of cardinals. I say if the present theory of our army and navy is sensible and true then the rest of America is an unmitigated fraud.

The advocates of military training lay great stress on the discipline it enforces. True, discipline is to every one a salutary experience without which life will be a failure. But to inculcate a craven fear of punishment, a fictitious respect for rank, and a blind obedience to orders regardless of right or reason is not truly to discipline. A martinet is only a bully, and the private who trembles in his presence is not an inspiring object.

Nor is such training necessary in order that there shall be ready for service a force to defend the country from invasion or internal danger should either threaten. Such wars are wars of the people, not of professional killers, and the people can be trusted to wage them and to submit to the control necessary for effective united action without having had it drilled into them in forms subversive of their self-respect for years previously. To this American history bears ample evidence.

F. C. W.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE DECLARATION.

The following extracts from speeches made by Lincoln were quoted by the Hon. R. F. Pettigrew in a speech in the Senate January 15.

In those days our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him, ambition follows, philosophy follows, and the theology of the day is fast joining the cry. . . .

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it

might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain, and it was placed in the declaration not for that but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to bred tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack. . . .

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the declaration of independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas's view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

No man can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country.

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it; see what a mere wreck; mangled ruin, it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to the British subjects born and residing in Great Britain.

Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America, were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included, to be

sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the judge's inferior races.

I had thought the declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects. But no; it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise that, having kicked off the king and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

I had thought the declaration contemplated progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere. But no; it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonies in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some 80 years ago, the declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—only wadding left to rot on the battlefield after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth" to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present: and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate, and will even go so far as to read the declaration. — Speech in Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857.

Those arguments that are made that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class. They always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge is the same old serpent that says: "You work and I eat; you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it." Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it comes from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent, and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose

of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking this old declaration of independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it?—Speech in Chicago, July 10, 1858.

THE ENGLISH STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

The greater part of an article by George W. E. Russell, which appeared under the title of "The Revival of Imperialism." in the London Speaker of February 24.

It was not until the general election of 1874 that Mr. Disraeli, then in his seventieth year, found himself in a position where he could give practical effect to his political theories. . . . It was clear that Mr. Disraeli (who became Lord Beaconsfield in 1876) had set himself in old age to realize some of the dreams of his youth. Those dreams had long before been given to the world in novels, in which genius, wit, humor, eloquence and pathos were strangely blent with sham culture and genuine vulgarity. The Sensible Men of both parties—the men who read the Times and believe in Lord Macaulay—had agreed to regard Disraeli and all his doings as a joke. His politics and his writings were likened to "a Columbine's skirt, all flimsiness and spangles." But now that the wearer of this skirt had a parliamentary majority of 50 and was evidently determined to use it, the Sensible Men began to study his books in a desperate anxiety to discover what the Columbine believed. They then learned that the two chief factors in the state were the "Monarch and the Multitude;" that the great Middle Class which they worshiped had been destroyed by the Disraelitish Reform act of 1867; that no country could be successful which was "cursed with the fatal drollery of representative institutions;" and that Great Britain was above and before all else an Oriental Power.

Let the Queen of the English collect a great fleet, let her stow away all her treasure, bullion, gold plate and precious arms; be accompanied by all her court and chief people, and transfer the seat of her Empire from London to Delhi. There she will find an immense Empire ready-made, a first-rate army, and a large revenue. Besides which, she gets rid of the embarrassment of her Chambers! And quite practicable; for the only difficult part—