

of harassing and deadly guerrilla warfare. Our troops are winning daily victories—decisive victories, the reports have it—yet each succeeding day they have to win another “decisive victory” not far from where they had won a “decisive victory” the day before. Truly we have entered upon a career of national shame, which promises also to be for our soldiers a long drawn out career of inglorious suffering and death.

Senator Mason’s complaint that he was “buncoed” by the imperialistic party in the senate appears to have more back of it than he has revealed. The gist of his complaint is that promises were made that upon the ratification of the treaty, one of the resolutions declaring against imperialism should be voted upon. But the promises appear to have been much more to the point. On the day before the treaty vote, Senator Perkins, in an interview sent to the Chicago Record, used this language:

I have been assured by republican leaders in the senate and by republicans who stand high in administration circles that it is the intention after the treaty has been ratified to urge the passage of a resolution declaring that the United States will deal with the Philippines exactly as it is now dealing with Cuba, and that the Filipinos will be assured of a stable independent government as soon as they are prepared for it, the United States to reserve a coaling and naval station in the islands, with a commercial arrangement advantageous to our trade. This statement has been made to me positively and directly by several gentlemen in whom I have the utmost confidence and who are high in the councils of the administration. With this understanding several senators who have been opposed to ratification of the peace treaty will vote for it to-morrow.

How honorably meant were those assurances, the proceedings in the senate on the 14th disclosed. The Mc-Energy resolution was then taken up. Unless this resolution is designed to satisfy the Louisiana sugar planters with assurances of a protective tariff between our own country and our outlying provinces, it is meaningless, as an examination of its text in our news department will demonstrate. An

amendment was offered, however, which would have put this nation right before the world and its own conscience. The amendment disclaimed any imperialistic purpose. But upon that amendment there was a tie, which the vice president decided in favor of imperialism. That is the way Mr. Perkins’s “republicans who stand high in administration circles,” kept their faith.

Congressman Cannon, chairman of the committee on appropriations of the lower house of congress, has startled the country with his estimates of the treasury deficiency we are soon to face. Secretary Gage had placed the deficiency for the year ending next June at \$112,000,000; but on the 9th, in warning his party in the house against improvident appropriations, Mr. Cannon said that Secretary Gage’s figure was too low. By Mr. Cannon’s estimate, the deficiency next June will not be less than \$179,000,000 inclusive of the \$20,000,000 to be paid to Spain pursuant to the treaty. Exclusive of that item, the deficit will be \$159,000,000.

Judged by these deficiency estimates, the Dingley law has been a total failure as a revenue raiser, or else imperialism has already begun to cost us dear. To be sure, we became involved in a war which was not contemplated by the Dingley law; but the expenses of the war will not much exceed the amount realized from war bonds. War expenses and war bonds may therefore offset each other. So it appears that the tax receipts under the Dingley law, though supplemented by tax receipts under the war revenue law, will fall short of meeting ordinary government expenses up to June 30, 1899, by \$112,000,000 according to Secretary Gage’s estimate, and by \$159,000,000 according to Mr. Cannon’s estimate. Whether the fault for this is chargeable wholly to Mr. Dingley’s tariff law, or partly to Mr. McKinley’s imperialistic policy, it is chargeable altogether to the plutocratic regime which now controls the federal government.

All other objections aside, this condition of the treasury would not encourage men of genuine public spirit to increase the standing army to 50,000 and empower a thriftless administration to increase it in discretion by 50,000 more. Yet the lower house has passed with a hurrah a bill of precisely that character, and through administration channels it is announced that the president’s clique in the senate intends to jam it through. For that purpose a special session is to be called if necessary. But the people are not to be allowed to suspect that the special session is for the purpose of establishing a large standing army. To mislead them the appropriation bills at the present session are to be held back. Senatorial opponents of the standing army measure have been warned that unless they allow the standing army bill to go through, no appropriation bills will be allowed to pass. Thus the president will have an apparently legitimate excuse for calling a special session, in which the standing army measure may figure nominally as an incident but in truth as the prime object.

Advocates of a standing army play upon the national desire for a drilled military force for defense. But what we need for defense is not a standing army. Standing armies oppress; they do not defend. The people defend. For that reason it is important not that we have a standing army, but that all the people have the benefit of military education and drill.

Chancellor McCracken, of the New York University, when speaking last week at the national military convention, indicated the true military principle for a republic. He said that we do not want a large standing army, but we do want the 80,000 men that every year leave the high schools of this country competent to drill companies. That is precisely what we want. And if imperialism continues to advance, and a standing army begins to menace popular liberty, we shall want it for nothing more urgently than to furnish drilled citizens to fight the standing army itself.