

plank advocating the establishment of a large permanent debt represented by interest-bearing bonds, this platform would make a very good one for the republicans. And that suggests a question. If the democrats ought to adopt a republican platform, why not become republicans and have done with it?

NATIONAL EXPANSION.

We must be prepared, as the war with Spain draws to a close, to encounter a tremendous movement for the acquisition of new territory. In various ways, this movement is already making itself felt.

Puerto Rico, we are told, must be made a spoil of war, and as "the inhabitants are incapable of self-government" we must take permanent possession and set up there a complete colonial establishment. The Hawaiian islands have long been ours for the asking, and now the war affords an excuse to ask. Off in the far Pacific are the Philippine islands, which, having been captured, must be retained, so we are urged, if for no better purpose than as a penal colony for American convicts. All this is not only advocated by the jingo press generally, but so important a personage as Senator Elkins—and he is a very important personage when matters of this kind are under consideration, for the same reason that the vulture is of importance when carrion is a subject of dispute—gives it his enthusiastic sanction. Our foreign policy is to undergo a radical change, he says, and not merely the Philippines and Puerto Rico and Hawaii must be ours, but we must even acquire a coaling station in the Mediterranean. He would have us launched at once upon a career of national expansion in which we should rival England and throw a deep shadow over the continental nations.

But a more important personage in this connection than even Elkins, more important because as the London Daily Telegraph truly says he "is credited with shaping the policy of the administration more than any other man," has pronounced in favor of the expansion idea. Indeed, he goes beyond Elkins. He would not be satisfied with expanding our territory, but insists upon treating the

new domain as a possession—attached to the union, but not and never to be of the union. Senator M. A. Hanna, for it is to him that we refer—whom else could be meant as the man who "is credited with shaping the policy of the administration more than any other man"—was interviewed in the London Telegraph of May 11, and in the course of this interview he said that "when the time comes, our policy will be made clear, to the effect that statehood is to be restricted to the present limits of our nation and is not to be extended to territory separated from the country, even when it is so close as Cuba." Yet he was sure that new territory would be acquired and our whole foreign policy reversed.

From Mr. Hanna down to the little hangers on, it is evidently understood among all jingoes that we are to take advantage of the war—which by the way they opposed as long as they could see in it only a measure for freeing a subject and outraged people—that we are to take advantage of it to seize upon outlying territory and go into the subject and outrage business on our own account. Not exactly on our account either, but in our name and on account of the land grabbing interests which really own this country and are sighing for new countries to conquer.

This is a policy which Americans must promptly denounce before the United States is committed to it. We have gone into the war not to conquer new territory for the benefit of land grabbing "sooners." Our object is to free Cuba. Incidentally we shall be justified in driving the Spaniards off this hemisphere. So, incidentally we shall be justified in driving them out of the Philippines. And by Spaniards let us explain for the benefit of careless readers, that we mean the Spanish government. We have no hostility to Spanish men and women. They are in our eyes like all other men and women, whether Philippine islanders, Cubans or Americans, common brethren made in the image of one God. But while we may drive the Spanish government off this hemisphere and out of the Philippines, we have no right to make ourselves the proprietors of the people whom we find in any part of the world which has been claimed as Spanish

territory. For our own sake, we should be unwise to annex those more or less distant parts of the world to our own country; and alike for our own sake and for the sake of the people there, we have no right to make ourselves their masters. Not only would that be an invasion of their natural rights, but it would be in contravention of our established policy of recognizing the natural right of all communities to govern themselves.

Back of this itch for territorial expansion is as we have already intimated a hunger for land. That he who owns the land owns the people who must live upon it has come to be a well-recognized principle of monopoly. The monopolists themselves recognize it better than anyone else, and land grabbing has become the substitute throughout the civilized world for slavery. No man wants great quantities of land merely for the land. It will yield him nothing unless he works it, and he cannot work much of it himself. He wants it so as to command the labor of others by withholding land from them unless they will work upon starvation terms. When men work upon starvation terms, the employers of men can thrive. Through the ownership of land, then, the virtual ownership of men is secured. And it is in order that some of our citizens may exploit the people of Cuba, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico and of the Philippines—not only those who are there, but those who may be colonized there from here—that this great expansion movement is being put under way; put under way not by a conscious conspiracy, perhaps, but in obedience to that impulse which runs through the sensitive nerves of monopoly as electricity through a wire.

"Expansion" is only a pretty name for monopoly. Shall we stand silently by, then, while the blood of our brothers and sons is used to fertilize the idea? Now is the time to speak, before shrewd schemers succeed in playing upon patriotic sentiments to the further undoing of American democracy.

CITIZEN SOLDIERY.

Incidental to an adverse comment last week upon the increasing demands for a large standing army, we

advocated a militia system under which every able-bodied citizen should, during a certain period of his life, be required to serve pretty much as well-disciplined national guardsmen voluntarily serve now. To the compulsory part of this proposition objection has been raised, for which reason it may be worth while to give the matter more than incidental attention.

Let it be understood at the outset that in the compulsory feature of this proposition there is nothing new. Nor is it in any sense an innovation in our country, at least in theory. In most if not all the states every able-bodied man between the ages of 18 and 45 years is theoretically a member of the militia force. Compulsory law exists, then, though it is not active; and all that is needed to carry out the proposition we make is that the law should be so improved as to put the existing militia theory into practice in a sound way. We recognize, of course, that this is no affirmative argument for the proposition. It is offered only by way of removing the kind of objection which conservative minds would most likely interpose. But affirmative arguments are not lacking.

So long as democratic governments are surrounded by hostile forces, arrangements for military defense are necessary. By the philosophical anarchist this premise might not be accepted, but by most of those whom we now address it will be. The question that arises, then, is what form these arrangements should take so as to be least objectionable from the democratic point of view and most effective in the military sense.

Broadly speaking, they may take any one of three forms. We may maintain a standing army of hirelings. We may foster the national guard system as we now know it. Or we may improve and enforce the militia law which in theory compels every able-bodied man to qualify himself for defensive military duty.

The standing army theory is incompatible with democracy. No nation can long maintain a standing army and remain democratic. The military defense of a democracy must be entrusted to citizen soldiers, to men who are not only citizens, but who

follow civil pursuits, and who in their interests, associations and thought continue to be of the masses of the people while they acquire their military training. For present purposes this point need not be argued.

Similar reasons to those which condemn a standing army, though less pronounced, also condemn the national guard. Though its membership is drawn from the masses of the people and continues in civil pursuits while in training, yet the clubbish character of the organization tends to segregate its members into a class apart. National guardsmen lose their interest in great measure in civil concerns, and acquire peculiar interests in military concerns. While they go through the motions of citizenship, and thus differ from the soldiers of a standing army, they nevertheless have the instincts of soldiers rather than of citizens. They are as a class completely out of tune with the un-uniformed herd.

Nothing is left, then, for us to do, if we are to maintain a military force at all, but to organize and train the militia. And this organization and training must be compulsory. To make it voluntary is to do what we are already doing under the national guard system. It is to establish military clubs, entirely out of harmony with popular sentiment, and as ready almost as a standing army to follow the fortunes of the first dictator who may come along. Service in war need not be made compulsory. For that we may continue to rely upon volunteers. But training must be made compulsory, so that every citizen may in time of need be a possible volunteer, and so that while in course of training none may submerge their sense of civil obligations in a distinctly military spirit.

And what is there more objectionable in this sort of compulsion than in compulsory jury duty, or the compulsory attendance of witnesses upon trials? Nothing that we can see. To concede that there are common rights to be defended, is to concede that there are defensive duties to be performed. This would justify, in defensive war, even a draft. Certainly then it justifies compulsory military training, so that the common duties of military defense may be effectively

performed by those who are drafted or volunteer.

Of course we are speaking of the rank and file. For military service in the higher offices, professional education and exclusive service are usually desirable, though the career of the principal officer of our army, Gen. Miles, goes to prove that the former at least is not always necessary. But if we had a citizen soldiery there would not be the same objection to professional officers as there is now. With a citizen soldiery to train, professional officers would have no opportunity to develop those snobbish tendencies which are so notable a feature of the military profession so long as the rank and file may be treated, not only while in the ranks, but at all other times during their term of service, as inferior beings.

A citizen soldiery is, we repeat, the military bulwark of a democratic nation. But it must be a true citizen soldiery—a soldiery composed of the whole people of the given age. Its privates must not only be taken from the citizenship, and at the expiration of their term of training return to the citizenship, but they must throughout that term be of the citizenship—the legal equals in every respect, except while actually engaged in military work, and solely with reference to military duty, of even the highest military officer in the nation. And not that alone. This citizen soldiery must be so organized that it will acquire no military instinct of the clanish species.

Such a citizen soldiery is impossible without a system of compulsory military training—not like that of Germany in a standing army, but as part of or supplementary to concurrent civil duties. If we are to have a military arm at all, we must choose between a militia system perfected along these lines, and the extinction of democracy through a standing army of hirelings or through the hardly less dangerous and much less effective system of military clubs which we call the national guard.

THE PRICE OF WHEAT.

Leiter's speculations in wheat have brought down upon him the anathema of many a man who has found, in obedience to the rule that the price