

mending evil for the good that may come out of it. It would give us much greater satisfaction to be able to attribute this rehabilitation of the Union, and this communion of all the English, to something else than a war, breeding animosities in other directions. But the fact remains that after a generation of bitterness, more or less suppressed, between the North and the South, and more than a century of hatred toward England, we suddenly find, as a result of our war for the liberation of Cuba, that a spirit of amity is hovering over the English-speaking countries.

This spirit of amity is to be cordially welcomed. God grant that the time may at last have come when a war between the United States and any other English nation will be forever impossible. The communal character and the lofty aspirations of Canada, of the Australasian colonies, and of England herself, are so like our own that no temporary irritation should be allowed again to estrange us from them or them from us.

We are really one people, notwithstanding the hypercritics who remind us of the various races which contribute to the American population. Nationality springs less from race origin than from identity of language, of laws, of institutions, of history, and above all of political ideals. And the language, the laws, the institutions, the history and the political ideals of Americans—whatever their race origin—are English. Even what historically is distinctly American has come to be English in essence. Our revolutionary war, for example, in which we fought England, produced a revolution in government the benefits of which we have shared with the people of England, of Canada, and of Australasia. Their liberty is due to the contest we waged. So true is this that Englishmen often rank the revolt of the American colonies with the rebellion of Cromwell and the revolution of William and Mary, as a stage in the progress of English freedom. Race cuts a small figure in nationality in comparison with other considerations. Gov. Altgeld was right, though thoughtless people laughed at him as if he had perpetrated an Irish bull, when he, a German by birth, referred to the founders of this government as

“our forefathers.” In the political sense they were his forefathers as truly as if he had boasted a long line of American ancestry. And by the same token, the fathers of English freedom also were his forefathers. English history, English institutions, and that love of liberty which is distinctively the English ideal, make one people of all English-speaking peoples, however conglomerate their race origin.

It does not follow, however, that we should welcome a formal alliance with England. Entangling alliances with no nation is a rule that still holds good. If a combination of nations hostile to England were made, having the destruction of England for its object, it would be short sighted in this country to stand by and see that object accomplished. Were England crushed by hostile powers, the democratic movement in the world would be set back by centuries; and our own national independence would be imperilled. As we value the advances in political freedom that have been made, regarding them as necessary prerequisites to the acquisition of economic freedom, we must be jealous to preserve them, not only within our own borders, but to the greatest possible extent within the borders of every other nation that has secured them. In an emergency, then, involving her existence, England should have the support of the United States. But to unite with England in an emergency, for the preservation of English liberty, is a very different thing from uniting with her in a general alliance, not only for the preservation of English liberty, but also for the promotion of tory aggressions. We want no such alliance.

What we do want, and what we should lose no opportunity in securing, is a treaty with England that will secure all the English-speaking peoples against the possibility in future of war among themselves. No dispute can come up between this country and England which might not be appropriately submitted to arbitration. Questions involving denials of the right to liberty are not at all likely to arise. All English countries are too much at one on that subject to give opportunity for deadly dispute. If it were otherwise, a general treaty

of arbitration should not be made. Questions between free and autocratic nations, which involve the right to liberty, cannot be submitted to arbitration. Regarding these questions there is but one appeal, and that is to arms. But other questions—the only kind of question likely to arise between this country and England or any of her colonies—may be properly arbitrated; and advantage should be taken of the new era of good feeling between England and the United States to enter into a standing treaty for the determination of all disputes between those countries in that manner.

Beyond this, no treaty looking to an alliance ought to be made. We doubt if any closer alliance would be tolerated by the American people or deemed advisable by the English. In neither country is the best sentiment inclined toward an aggressive combination.

MILITARY SNOBBERY.

The war calls attention to a condition in the American army which should make every American with democratic blood in his veins blush with shame for the hypocrisy of his country. We refer to the status of the private soldier. This is well described by a correspondent of an eastern paper—the New York Post—who writes from Tampa. He says:

Socially the regular private soldier is nowhere at all. If he enters the big hotel where the headquarters of the army are, and which is constantly full of officers, he enters it only as a messenger for an officer, and must enter it hat in hand, and go by an inconspicuous way around to the desk and present his message, and when he has had his answer, he must go out in the same way. The private soldier or non-commissioned officer cannot eat at the same public table with officers, nor drink at the same bar. This social distinction is not founded, it should be said, on the assertion of any difference of class, but on the necessity of discipline.

It is untrue that this social difference is founded not upon caste, but upon the necessity of discipline. It is founded distinctly and knowingly upon caste. Discipline requires no social distinctions.

Between the lieutenant, for instance, and his superior officers there is social equality, in so far as there is congeniality; yet the lieutenant

ant is as amenable to discipline as the socially ostracised private. Since social subjection, then, is not necessary to make officers of inferior rank obedient to the commands of superiors, neither should it be necessary to make privates obedient to officers.

That it is not necessary is demonstrated by the fact that privates and officers in militia regiments are unaffected in their social relations by the difference in their military rank. The distinctions there are military, not social. If a militiaman when off duty were not allowed, merely because he was a private, to enter a hotel in his own right, because some of his officers were lounging there; if he were obliged to behave like a lackey when he came into a hotel under such circumstances; if he were not allowed to eat at the same public table or drink at the same bar with his officers, merely because he was a private, —if in any such way he were made to suffer social indignities, the officers who thus took advantage of their military authority to play the snob, would quickly find their level, both militarily and socially, and it would be below that of the man they had offended. No militia officer who had proved himself so contemptible could remain in his regiment or retain the social fellowship of gentlemen. Nevertheless, the discipline of the militia is not so bad.

It may be said, of course, that the militia is composed of play soldiers. Let it be so. Yet no one would presume to explain that this is because militia officers recognize the social rights of militia privates. And volunteers are not play soldiers, though among the volunteers it is not regarded as necessary to discipline to make officers' lackies out of the privates.

One of the most notable examples of the utter lack of any necessity for subjecting private soldiers to social indignities in the interest of discipline is afforded by the French army. Since the French revolution the French soldier has been the equal, as to social rights, of his highest officers. Military distinctions in France neither give nor take away social rights. Such rights as a Frenchman has out of the army, he retains as a private in the army. He is no officer's

lackey. Distinctions in the French army begin and end with military functions. Yet the French army is not lacking in discipline. Just as our lieutenants, though they may eat at the same public tables with captains and colonels and even gold laced generals, though they may drink at the same bars, though they may enter the lobbies of the same hotels when off duty, and do so as men and not as mice, are nevertheless amenable to discipline, so is it with the French private.

No, it is not for reasons of discipline that the position of private soldier in our regular army is so degraded socially that the best military material of the country holds aloof from service in it. That is not the reason. The reason is that as the French army has inherited its social rights from the days of the French revolution, ours has inherited its snobbery from the days when the English army was manned by English peasants and workingmen, and officered by aristocrats who bought their commissions and regarded peasants and workingmen much as old-time slaveholders regarded what they called "niggers." The social degradation of the private in the American army is not at all for military reasons. It is for social reasons—for the same reason that colored boys are objected to as cadets and officers. We educate our army officers at West Point. They are taught there to be not only officers but aristocrats. Association with a servant affords grounds for suspicions of unofficer-like conduct, and marriage into the family of a private or noncommissioned officer is a crime. This snobish education has perpetuated itself until the time has come when self-respecting men hesitate to enlist even in the volunteer service. They dread the social indignities which they may experience at the hands of snobs with shoulderstraps, though they care nothing for the dangers of battle. Instead of promoting the good of the service, our system of degrading privates and noncommissioned officers tells against it.

If a military career were open to privates in our regular army, and they had no reason to suppose that they would not be treated as gentle-

men so long as their personal conduct was gentlemanly, the army in time of peace would fill up with Americans who would submit to discipline intelligently and willingly, not as dumb, driven brutes; and in time of war, enlistments would take the place of the selfish wire pulling for commissions which scandalizes American patriotism.

Military discipline is one thing, social snobbery is quite another. The two do not belong together, and in a democratic country the latter should not be permitted to flourish under military authority. To abolish it might bear heavily upon officers whose only titles to social distinction are their commissions, and upon privates who secure favors by turning themselves into cringing valets; but it would give us better soldiers, better discipline, and altogether a better army.

GLADSTONE.

In the world's history there are two great types of leader. There is the leader who cuts new paths, who tells the world what it ought to do and spends his energies in urging the world to do it. In his own day he is despised. But later, when the worthiness of his purposes and the greatness of his work begin to be appreciated, he is said to have lived ahead of his time; and at last, what to him was a dream becomes to those who follow him a grand reality, and his name is indelibly inscribed upon the pages of history. The leader of the other type cuts no new paths. He is never looked upon as having lived a day ahead of his time. The world does not wait until the grass is green upon his grave or the grave is forgotten, to do him honor. He enjoys honors while he lives, but when he dies his fame grows fainter as time rolls on. What he does for the world is at best to guide it in the beaten paths.

It is of the latter type of leader that Gladstone was an example. Had he lived in a country where slavery flourished, and at a time when the world had not yet been awakened by leaders of the other type to the infamy of that institution, he would have left it where he found it. It would have seemed to him, and so far as the conscious influence of his