

tion. What is the object of the Bucklin amendment which menaces the welfare of Colorado? It simply provides that any county in the state may be permitted to raise its revenues as a majority of the voters may determine. It means majority rule in local affairs. This the Republican fears and takes the position that majorities are not competent to manage local affairs.

But even if under home rule in taxation, which the Bucklin amendment would allow, the people of any or all the counties of Colorado should adopt the Australasian tax in place of the present property tax, how would all real estate investments be injured? As taxes on improvements would be abolished, investments in real estate improvements certainly would not suffer. On the contrary, such investments would be benefited. The only kind of real estate investments to be injured would be investments in vacant land for the purpose of monopolizing it. But that would not be prejudicial to the true interests of Colorado. It is not investments in land, which is already there, that Colorado needs; but investments in improvements, which would utilize the land and are not already there. The latter kind of investments would be encouraged by the Bucklin amendment; for whenever its permission was availed of by the people, improvements would be exempt from all local taxation.

An agitation appears to be in progress among orthodox Jews, who observe Saturday as Sabbath, to secure the legal right to pursue their regular vocations on Sundays. Regarding this right, Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists are in the same category as the Jews. The restrictive legislation upon these religious sects has been sustained by the courts by the most absurd reasoning imaginable. Conceding that the legislatures cannot make laws in the interest of any religious worship whatever, and therefore cannot legalize any sect's holy day for religious reasons, they have decided that laws forbidding labor on Sundays are police regulations for the preservation of

the public health, and not religious enactments. It would be as reasonable to enforce generally by law the Dunkard rite of feet washing as a police regulation in the interest of the public health. These Sunday laws clearly violate the rights of religious worshippers whose holy day is not Sunday. Bound by their own religious convictions to abstain from labor on one day in the week, and by other people's religious convictions to abstain on another, they are put at a peculiar disadvantage by unwarranted legislation. It may be said that the Sunday laws violate the rights also of persons who recognize no holy day; and that, too, is true. While a regular weekly rest day is doubtless a valuable social inheritance, and everyone who desires should be protected in its enjoyment, it is a very different matter to enforce by law its observance upon those who object, no matter whether they observe another rest day or not.

When Senator Beveridge, of imperialistic ambition and fame, spoke before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in session last week in New York, he gave voice to the following extraordinary composite of pagan piety and pinchbeck patriotism:

The flag and the cross are alike in one respect. They never retreat. You may temporarily close a church here and a flag may be withdrawn there, but only in order to advance more permanently their interest. They have one common purpose—the cross to advance Christianity, the flag to make this Christian country the greatest power on earth.

The religion which breathes through that sentiment is akin to the piety of the profane Rhode Island colonel in the civil war, of whom it was told in Harper's Magazine that upon being informed by his adjutant that the chaplain of a neighboring Massachusetts regiment had baptized 25 converts the previous Sunday, exclaimed: "Order out a detail of 50 men for baptism next Sunday. No blankety-blank Massachusetts regiment shall get ahead of ours, even in religion!"

EDWIN L. GODKIN.

No one who believes in maintaining moral standards in public life could wish to have the death of Edwin L. Godkin pass unnoticed. For Mr. Godkin was one of the few champions of civic righteousness who have become distinguished in this generation of materialistic utilitarianism.

In many respects we disagreed with him. In some respects the disagreements were fundamental and irreconcilable. His perceptions of moral principle often differed from ours. But that he had moral perceptions, discerned with intelligence and adopted with sincerity, by which he was guided and for which he fought, was evident to all who read his trenchant reviews of current events. For this we should honor his memory though we had differed from him at every point.

Mr. Godkin had the courage and the vigor of his convictions. He has left behind him no evidence of any disposition to minimize anything in which he believed, from fear of consequences either personal or logical; and he was capable of indulging that righteous wrath at essential wrong and deliberate wrongdoers which is as necessary to a sound character as the spirit of toleration toward accidental wrong and unwitting offenders. Good people forget too easily that the considerate: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!" was no more characteristic of the life of the Galilean than the wrathful flagellation in the temple.

Nordid Mr. Godkin flabbily reserve his wrath for the sin and let the sinner escape. He realized that evil is done by individuals, and that if you would bring it to the bar of human justice you must bring it there in the person of an individual. It is as necessary to make criminals unpopular as it is to make crime abhorrent. And this is as true of crime against public rights as it is of crime against private rights. Accordingly he was always ready with his potent and dreaded, "Thou art the man!" He did not content himself with denouncing public theft; he also denounced public thieves. He was not satisfied to denounce vicious public policies; he denounced just

as relentlessly faithless public servants who, with malice aforethought, promoted those policies.

It was in these respects that Mr. Godkin rendered his best service. At a time when respectable rascals were outraging the truest ideals of public life, when hypocrites in high places were giving an air of piety to public crime, when teachers were inculcating the morally destructive doctrine that righteousness is a plaything of time, place and circumstances, Mr. Godkin held aloft what he believed to be the standard of immutable moral principle.

What if he may have been now and then mistaken? What if he seemed to be intolerant? His mistakes were those of the wolfhound thrown off the scent; his intolerance was that of the upright judge dealing with high-handed crime. With all their mistakes and all their intolerance, the New York Evening Post and the New York Nation, which Godkin edited so long, have been among the most efficient agencies for civic righteousness in this country.

"THE HONOR OF THE ARMY."

We hear much just now about "the honor of the army." So did France when the Dreyfus episode was on.

Imperialistic tendencies always parade in military fashion. When Rome was passing from republic to empire, the legions demanded patriotic worship. When Bonaparte was rushing France backward into absolutism, the "grand army" was his shibboleth. To William of Germany the army is the most sacred thing in the realm next to himself. And now that our own country has plunged into imperialism, denunciations of criminal acts committed by army officers upon inhabitants of the distant country they have been sent out to conquer and subdue, are smothered by demands that we respect "the honor of the army." We, too, are thus invited to set up a military fetish for permanent adoption.

Before we joined the procession of world power imperialism, an appeal

to refrain from criticising public policies or military cruelties, out of respect for "the honor of the army," would have produced a popular anticlimax. Regular armies were hated for their historic associations as the tools of despotic power. Our people have always detested them.

It is true that volunteer armies, raised for particular emergencies and to be disbanded when the emergency was over, have commanded and deserved popular respect. As applied to volunteers for a defensive war the "honor of the army" is a phrase full of patriotic meaning. And defensive wars are the only kind we ever waged, with one infamous exception, until President McKinley discovered that conquest is our destiny and learned from the old slaveholding oligarchy that our destiny determines our duty. But "the honor of the army," as applied to regular troops, means in any country what it means in all countries. It means in the United States what it means in France, in Germany, in England, in Russia, or wherever else a regular military force is disciplined into that unquestioning obedience which makes it a fit implement for "the man on horseback."

In France "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of Chauvinism, and a verbal capsule for such iniquities as those of the Dreyfus persecution. In England "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of jingoism; it palliates the devastating reign of the British conqueror in South Africa. In Germany "the honor of the army" is the modern catch-phrase of the almost obsolete doctrine of divine right. In Russia "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of absolutism. In the United States this same phrase now rolls smoothly off the tongues of imperialists as justification or excuse for barbarities that are shocking to the unmilitary mind. Johnson's definition of "patriotism" as the last refuge of a scoundrel, might be fairly paraphrased in a definition of "the honor of the army" as the ready refuge of a Christian savage.

Honor is not the peculiar attribute of armies. Honor is as honor does. We don't speak of the honor of the fire department. Yet fire departments are at least as useful as standing armies and the service as dan-

gerous. We don't speak of the honor of the police force. Yet a police force is at least as necessary as a standing army and its honor as important. Then why should we speak of the honor of the army? Why should we defend it against charges of crime by parrot talk about its honor? Isn't all this solicitude about the "honor of the army" borrowed from the manners of those well dressed scoundrels of the eighteenth century who could stick a man as a butcher sticks a pig and cared nothing for their debts unless they were gambling debts, but who were forever prating about their "honor"? The honor of the army is not assailed by charges of crime. It can be assailed only by its own dishonorable acts. The question must always be, not whether the charges are shocking, but whether they are true. Whenever accusations of such dishonorable acts are answered with confessions, accompanied with denunciations of the accuser as an assailant of "the honor of the army," there is danger ahead.

History teaches that nothing is more dangerous to the liberties of a people than popular reverence for "the honor" of a standing army. That is one of the essential poisons of militarism. "It is needless to say," writes Goldwin Smith, in his recent admirable essay on "Commonwealth or Empire," "what is the relation of militarism to political liberty. It has been the same ever since the military power enslaved Rome." And the advance of militarism among us may be marked by observing the attitude of our people toward our regular army.

If they regard "the honor of the army" as something which cannot be questioned they are far gone in militarism. If politicians make a fetish of "the honor of the army," these politicians think the people are far gone in militarism, for politicians keep their ears to the ground. But if the people hold our army to the same accountability that they would hold our fire departments, our police forces, our legislators, or any other public servants, and do so with such emphasis that the politicians can make no mistake, then they are still safe