

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