

the civil war such appointments were unavoidable, but there is no excuse for them now. They are gruesome acts of favoritism; gruesome because they trifle with the lives of men of genuine patriotism who have volunteered where volunteers are needed—in the ranks. It cannot be inspiring or reassuring to these volunteers, who have lives to lose, to see the names of inexperienced civilians, having nothing to recommend them but their family relationship to politicians, in the list of military appointments. The military office for a civilian to begin to hold in time of war is that of private; and if the civilians who are seeking office were really anxious to serve their country, they would show their sincerity by enlisting. Then if they proved themselves worthy of commissions, no one would criticize; while, if they gave no such proof, they would do no harm.

The law which a few states have enacted compelling candidates who have been nominated for office by two or more organizations to go upon the official ballot as candidates of only one, is a "gang" law. It is clearly intended to restrict opportunities for independent voting. No matter which party may be responsible for it, this law is in the interest of political rings and bosses. Since we have party columns on official ballots, it ought to be possible for third parties to effectively indorse acceptable candidates of either of the older parties. But that cannot be done under the law to which we here refer. Partial fusion of any kind under that law is impossible. To make a fusion, one of the fusing parties must absolutely surrender its identity. If a republican or a democratic candidate were indorsed by a reform organization, he would have to decline either the nomination or the indorsement. Such an objectionable law is possible only where party rings have been able to efface from the Australian ballot system its most valuable feature. That system contemplates the arrangement of names upon official ballots in al-

phabetical order, party affiliations being indicated by putting the names of parties after each candidate's name, descriptively, as it is done in Massachusetts. With a system of that kind there would be no temptation to pass such a law as we have described above. But when party columns were forced upon the Australian ballot reformers by "gang" politicians, the way was opened for political tricks like that of the law against fusions. Instead of facilitating independence in politics, this law interferes with it; instead of weakening party machines it strengthens them. It should either be repealed outright, or be made ineffective by the adoption of the Massachusetts system of the alphabetical ballot.

#### LOOK AHEAD.

The time has fully come in the progress of the war when peace men, those who believe in peace for a deeper reason than mere desire for quiet—who believe in it as the complement of liberty—should see the wisdom and importance of at least suspending their denunciations of the war. So long as there was any possibility of averting war, they would have been false to their convictions not to have opposed it vigorously. But all such possibility has now gone by. They can no more prevent the prosecution of the war, nor bring it to an end before it shall have been fought out, than pigmies can move mountains. The war is a fact. It is a fact, too, which men who believe in liberty and who love justice must soon consider in connection with political, industrial and social questions infinitely more vital than the question of war or no war. By ignoring this fact, and isolating themselves from the current of popular thought, they only fritter away influence that might be extremely useful when those questions come up for adjustment.

To such men, the experience of the democratic party in the civil war ought to be a salutary lesson. By opposing the prosecution of that war, after war had become inevitable, the democratic party threw away all possibility of effectively participating in the settlement of the great questions

which the war left over. As to many of those questions—the ones, for example, which related to the centralization of power, to the substitution of nationality for federation, and to the development of monopoly—the democrats were right. But so completely had they discredited themselves with public opinion, that they were powerless to prevent the spirit of monopoly and centralization from playing at will upon the harp strings of patriotism. Had the democrats recognized the palpable fact that there was a war, and that it was not and must not be allowed to be a failure, but must be fought to a decisive victory for the permanency of the federation and the abolition of slavery, the subsequent history of this country would have been happily different from what in some respects it has been. The possibilities, at any rate, of the expansion of national power and the contraction of individual and local liberty, would be far less than they are.

That there is a jingo spirit in the present war is true. But the war is not all jingo. Very little of it is jingo. Yet it may become thoroughly jingo if the aggressively anti-jingo element, forgetting that liberty is more important than peace, identifies itself in public estimation with Spanish barbarism and tyranny. Such streaks of jingoism as there are in the war, cannot be eliminated by characterizing the war itself as a jingo expedition. To the average mind this is an untrue characterization. Never before in the history of our own or any other country have the people gone into war with so little soda water patriotism. Yet they have not lacked enthusiasm of the serious kind. On the whole they have acted like men conscious of engaging in the performance of an awful duty. But let the men who despise soda water patriotism once create a widespread impression that opposition to the war is identical with opposition to what the war represents in the public mind, and jingoism will have full sway in settling the questions which the war will leave behind it.

And such questions as they, in their significance if not in their immediate bearings, will be!

At the forefront we shall have to meet the question of Cuban independ-

ence—of the right of the people of that island to work out their own liberties in their own way. Already the god Jingo has raised his head and demanded that Cuban independence be sacrificed upon the altar of “national expansion.”

Then there will be the question of the disposition of the Philippines. Whether to sordidly sell those islands to some European nation; or to languidly hand back the inhabitants to the merciless cruelties of the Spaniards who have outraged them for three hundred years; or to ambitiously appropriate the islands to ourselves in the interest of “national expansion;” or, with a sturdy love for liberty, to take advantage of our opportunity to empower the Philippine Islanders to establish a government of their own and work out their liberties in their own way. Such are the forms which that question will probably assume.

Both questions are full of significance with reference to our own freedom. Just as we move in their settlement in the direction of liberty or of authority, so will we move in settling our own home questions. If we aim to extend greater freedom to others whose destiny has by the fortunes of war fallen under our control, we will for the same reason—because our sense of liberty is expanding—seek greater freedom for ourselves. Our treatment of Cuba and the Philippines will indicate whether our ideas of liberty are advancing or receding.

Even the question of perpetual peace will be in evidence. It is possible to bring the principle of peace into public contempt by identifying it with stubborn opposition to a particular war already raging, which commends itself to sober men who believe in peace with liberty.

Peace men have a higher mission than to isolate themselves when war is on. By doing so they strengthen the arm of the jingo expansionist, and give aid and comfort to the monopolist who, to subjugate his fellow citizens, plays upon the “patriotic” passions which war easily excites. The true mission of the peace man is less to oppose particular wars than to conserve his influence for the things that make for peace.

And in doing this, peace men must

remember that they are dealing with men and not with automatons, and that they must affect public opinion if they would accomplish results. But how will they affect public opinion if they persist in identifying what they stand for—methods of establishing liberty, and things that make for peace—with opposition to a generous war for the peace of a war-racked neighboring island and the liberty of its inhabitants? They will affect public opinion with reference to those things pretty much as the “copperheads” affected it with reference to the grave questions of local self-government that were left over by the civil war.

We shall soon need the influence of peace men who believe in other things than peace, in adjusting questions of greater importance to mankind than the question of one war more or less. But if they maintain their present attitude, we shall find their influence when it is needed all worn out with futile opposition to a public sentiment that is now unalterably fixed. In that case, jingoism, “national expansion” and monopoly, well identified with a war for liberty and peace, would have clear sailing; and the war, instead of being as it might be made, a stride in the direction of justice and therefore of peace, would give new masters to Cuba and the Philippines, strengthen the power of monopoly in our own country, and still further postpone the era of universal peace.

#### THE HOAR AMENDMENT.

Unless the lower house of congress refuses to concur in a joint resolution passed by the senate on the 10th of May, the legislatures of the several states of the union will soon be called upon to ratify or reject the following proposed amendment to the federal constitution:

The term of office of the president and vice president of the Fifty-sixth congress shall continue until the fourth day of May, in the year 1901, at noon; and the fourth day of May, at noon, shall thereafter be substituted for the fourth day of March as the commencement and termination of the official term of the president, vice president, senators and representatives in congress.

Meantime the people should consider the propriety of such an amendment, with a view to influencing the

action regarding it of their respective legislatures.

The object of this amendment was explained in the senate by its author, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, as being two-fold. What he termed the lesser reason for it is that as the people have come more and more to desire to witness the inauguration of presidents, a less inclement day than the 4th of March usually is should be selected for that event. But he stated the more important reason for the change to be that as the second session of congress now lasts only from the first Monday of December to the 4th of March, which is too short a time within which to give proper attention to the appropriation bills, that session ought to be extended as the amendment proposes.

To describe the amendment as vicious might be harsh; but a very much milder term would not fit the case. On the surface it appears to be of slight importance. For that reason alone it should be rejected. The cumbersome proceedings for amending the constitution of the United States should never be invoked for trifling purposes. But this amendment is worse than trifling. Not only would it arbitrarily extend the terms of senators, and of the president and vice president now in office, for two months beyond the period for which they were elected—a petty objection, perhaps, though one that ought not to be incurred except for an important purpose not otherwise attainable—but it would put a serious obstacle in the way of securing an amendment which, while meeting the graver reason offered for this, would recognize one of the great principles of democratic government that we now ignore.

Under the existing system to which the amendment in question relates, the president does not take office until four months after the people have called him; and representatives in congress, though they nominally take office within four months after election, do not do so in fact, except when an extra session is called, until 13 months after. These long intervals between the election of public servants and their entry upon their duties tends to separate them from the people and to weaken the voice of the