

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

life went it would have seemed to the world, like a beneficent institution, established and patronized by God himself. Gladstone was not one of the leaders who convict the world of its institutional sins and lead it on to repentance and conversion.

Yet it must not be understood that Gladstone's life was a useless one, or that his species of usefulness had no effect upon the world's forward movement. Though he cut no new paths, acting only as a guide in the beaten paths, his face was turned forward, not backward. Belonging to the same general type of leader as Disraeli, since neither lived ahead of his time, he differed from Disraeli in this, that while Disraeli led away from new paths, Gladstone led toward them. In no sense a leader of the first type which we have described above, never even tempted to get out of speaking distance ahead of the popular sentiment of his day, he was nevertheless always on the alert to bring up the main body to the support of an advancing sentiment when the main body was ready for it.

Gladstone's work was that of a great politician. As such he will live in history. But if the lesson of history may be trusted, those who expect his name to fill a large place in it, would, if they could live a few generations hence, be immeasurably surprised. Men have lived in Gladstone's day who while they lived were hardly known except to be despised, men with whom Gladstone would not have deigned to consult upon any public question, whose names, when the history of the time comes to be written by posterity, will be better known than Gladstone's. This will be not because they were abler men or better men. It will be because the part which Gladstone played in the world's onward movement was, in comparison with theirs, a secondary part.

BELLAMY.

Edward Bellamy, whose death is noted this week, was an important contributor to the social agitation which has been in progress during the past two decades, and upon the continuation of which depend the possibilities of economic freedom and social justice. His story, "Looking Backward," has been most influential

in fixing attention upon the inequalities that are generated and perpetuated by existing economic conditions and institutions.

But Mr. Bellamy's well-meant method of reform has been but superficially accepted. That is because it is itself superficial. It appeals merely to people who, when anything goes wrong, exclaim: "Let us make a law against it!" Though these people are numerous enough, they lack the directness of aim necessary to the accomplishment of beneficent results. Only when shrewd men with axes to grind make use of the impulses of such people do their numbers count in producing results; and then the results are anything but what they would desire.

It is to this ill-considered impulse to remedy evils by restrictive laws, under the manipulation of self-seeking and far seeing men, that we are indebted for our protective system. "Work is scarce and wages are low; make a law!" that is the cry. And the self-seeking protectionist exclaims: "Of course, make a law! and what more sensible law, what law more directly calculated to remedy the evil, than one which keeps foreign goods out of our market and gives all American work to American labor?" Therefore, a protective tariff, with its intensification of the evils which American workingmen suffer, but with great plunder for the shrewd men who know how to avail themselves of impulsive demands for restrictive laws.

Mr. Bellamy's response, however, to the people who, feeling some kind of wrong, but unable to locate the wrong except in its surface manifestations, cry out for a law, was not of the selfish-shrewd order. He became the honest exponent of their cry by proposing a law, or a system of laws, for the reformation of the awful social conditions which he so graphically described.

This system comprised a new plan of society. Ignoring the laws of nature which operate in social life, he evolved a social scheme from his own inner consciousness. Mr. Bellamy might be likened to a man who with great power should describe the ugliness and barrenness of a worn-out peach orchard, and then by way of

remedy, instead of proposing to set out new peach trees and by guarding them against their enemies allow them to grow according to the order of nature, should propose to whittle peach trees out of pine sticks and decorate their artificial leaves with green paint. The fundamental objection to his constructive teaching is that he tried to invent a social system, instead of trying to discover and apply the natural laws of social growth.

But he did one man's work, in making thousands see the injustice of things as they are. If his method of reform was artificial and superficial, there are many nevertheless to whom he brought a realization of existing injustice, who will be neither artificial nor superficial in their search for a remedy. He is not to be ranked with Gladstone as a political leader; nor yet with George as a pioneer, though he was of the pioneer rather than the political type of leader. But his name will be remembered as that of one of the men of this dying century who honestly endeavored to hand down to those who might come after him a better world than he received from those who had gone before.

NEWS

The center of interest in connection with the war is still in the West Indies. But at the hour of writing there is no absolutely trustworthy news. The cable companies have been forbidden to accept or deliver telegrams regarding the movements of the fleets, except to authorized officials of the government or with the permission of the censor. But rumors have been abundant and of such variety as to meet any demand. They culminated on the 24th in reports of the utter destruction of the Spanish fleet, but at great cost to the Americans, including the sinking of the New York and the Iowa, with Admiral Sampson, "Fighting Bob" Evans, and all hands. This rumor, like most of the others, was accompanied with the explanation that it was "unconfirmed." There was no truth in it.

Commodore Schley's squadron, which was at Key West when last week's issue went to press, left there on the 19th, since which time it has