

were compelled to agree, and to put it into the law, that at the end of the war the old limit of 25,000 should be resumed. The war is now practically ended, and, according to the terms of the law upon which the army was increased to 61,000, the war department ought to be arranging to reduce it again to 25,000. But just at this moment a new law is pushed through, a law which makes our peace army not less in number than 50,000, and empowers the president to raise it to 100,000 if he wishes to. He is reported by administration papers as expressing a desire for the full 100,000 army limit. An American standing army of 100,000 men is, therefore, now in sight.

Why this increase? We are no longer at war. Porto Rico makes no demand upon us for a greater military equipment. Cuba can be set up in business as an independent nation without it. For what purpose, then, is the army to be increased to four times its recent peace footing? The ready answer may be found, in part, in the dispatch of troops to the Philippines. What for? To preserve the peace there? No. The Philippine republic is preserving the Philippine peace everywhere except at Manila. There is no disturbance in the archipelago except what we are making. Why, then, do we send troops, more troops, and yet again more troops to the Philippines? There is but one explanation. It is not to preserve the Philippine peace, not to fight the Spanish war or any phase of it, but to enable the president to make a new war, an unauthorized war, a war of conquest against the Filipinos.

But that is only part of the answer to the question. The other part may be found in the rejection of Representative Cummings's proposed amendment to the army reorganization bill. He proposed that the president should not be permitted to send troops into a state to preserve the local peace, without a written request from the appropriate governor. His amendment was defeated. There was

no alternative. To have admitted such an amendment would have nullified a prime purpose of the measure. For one thing, a large standing army is needed by the plutocratic elements of the country, as a police force. State lines are to be obliterated, local government is to be ignored, the president with a great army behind him, subject to his arbitrary will as commander in chief, is to be raised to a position of irresponsible power. As President McKinley now assumes to govern Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines arbitrarily, by the force of a mere military machine, so, in the evolution of which the army reorganization bill is one of the processes, he or his successor will yet assume arbitrarily to rule our own states, even in such purely local matters as the suppression of domestic violence and the administration of domestic law. Already his friends call it "treason" to oppose his will as to the conquest of the Philippines; how long before he, with this vast military machine behind him, will arbitrarily punish all opposition to his will as treason?

We speak of the armaments of Europe as if they were burdensome; but if this army reorganization bill should become law, and the army be increased to the maximum of 100,000 men, no European state would be under a heavier military burden in time of peace than the United States of America. The secretary of the treasury estimates that \$144,000,000 will be needed for the army alone for the fiscal year beginning next July, and that \$47,000,000 will be needed for the navy—a total, without counting pensions, of \$191,000,000 a year in time of peace. Compare that with Russia's war budget in 1898, of \$148,640,191; with Germany's in the same year, of \$141,175,350; with France's in the same year, of \$123,517,681; with England's in 1897, of \$88,152,750; and with Austria's in 1897, of \$86,083,024. We are to lead them all. Which nations will hereafter be the typical victims of militarism, the nations of Europe or the United States?

It is true that the army appropriation asked for by the military committee of the house is only \$90,000,000—\$54,000,000 less than the estimate of the secretary. This reduction is accounted for by the explanation that the secretary estimated upon an army of 150,000 men, instead of 100,000. But does anyone suppose that the comparatively modest sum of \$90,000,000 will cover the expense? Is there any doubt that a large deficiency appropriation will be asked from the next congress? And even if that be not done, \$90,000,000 for the army and \$47,000,000 for the navy make \$137,000,000, which is not very much less than the war budgets of Russia and Germany, and considerably more than those of France, England and Austria. Besides, there are huge river and harbor appropriations to be charged to our military budget, as well as the pay of retired officers and nearly \$150,000,000 in pensions. Altogether, American military expenses in time of peace, are to make those of the warlike powers of Europe seem Lilliputian by comparison.

Once, upon the floor of the house of representatives, John Randolph of Roanoke rebuked a particularly atrocious sentiment, by exclaiming: "I envy the man who can entertain that sentiment neither his head nor his heart." A similar retort might be made to the newspapers, professors and preachers who are now urging the United States to seize the Philippine islands and govern the inhabitants arbitrarily, in the face of our national principle that governments derive their just power only from the consent of the governed. These worthies ignore the moral argument, and urge this national stultification upon the ground that we have more than once been guilty of the same stultification heretofore in our history. Theirs is an argument on a par with what a man might make who, being tempted to steal, should shove the eighth commandment aside upon the plea that his father, his grandfather,

and even his great-grandfather who had made an engrossed copy of all the commandments, violated it on occasion. The question for the American conscience is not whether our nation has in its history always been true to the principle of self-government, but whether the principle itself is right.

At the 250th anniversary of the execution of King Charles I., celebrated on the 30th by divine right leagues in England, a floral shield from Americans was conspicuous among the tributes. This American tribute to royalty bore the following peculiarly American legend: "America Remembers Her Martyred King." It is not long since such a performance would have been shocking to American sentiment; but our "rulers" have so far receded from our political ideals within the past nine months that it would not be unreasonable to suspect that this tribute emanated from the precincts of the white house itself.

The editor of *Cubano Libre* may be "incapable of self-government," but he has a knowledge of industrial conditions in this country that the average American voter does not possess. "We do not want anyone to invest capital in Cuba except the natives," says this Cuban savage. "America is proof of what monopolists can do in ruining a country." When the American workman learns enough to echo the words of this Cuban journalist we shall see the passing of the "trust."

In criticizing the work of Mrs. Eddy, the founder of the Christian Science philosophy, a St. Louis professor—Prof. J. M. Dixon, of Washington University—whose article appeared in a recent number of *The Independent*, says of her:

The writer has evidently never passed through the education—so thoroughly wholesome, so vitally requisite, and yet, to sentimental minds, so hard and unpleasant—which makes an author examine, criticize, and define his terms before using them.

It is fortunate for the university professors of "economics," that they are

not expected to pass through this "thoroughly wholesome" and "vitally requisite" education. Yet it would do them good.

The disciples of Henry George in Boston have adopted a unique method of propagating the doctrines of their apostle. They proceed upon the theory that the most efficient work can be accomplished by converting leaders of opinion, leaving to them the task of converting their followers. Pursuant to this theory, the Massachusetts Single Tax League, the president of which is William Lloyd Garrison, a son of the old abolitionist, gives three or four banquets in the course of each year, to which representative men in special fields of thought and work are invited. The latest of these banquets took place on the 17th of last month, when some 200 people attended. The guests were representatives of the various charitable and philanthropic organizations of the state. Father Huntington, the Episcopal priest and a son of the distinguished Bishop Huntington, of Central New York, delivered the address. At the conclusion of the address, short speeches on both sides of the subject were made, and questions asked and answered. Father Huntington's leading point was that the single tax contemplates the adjustment of social conditions to divine law. Among the men who have expounded George's doctrines for the Massachusetts Single Tax league on these occasions, besides Father Huntington, are ex-Congressman Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, Thomas G. Shearman, of New York, the Rev. S. S. Craig, of Toronto, and the Rev. Charles D. Williams, dean of Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland.

A recent sale of real estate in Boston calls attention to the remarkable fact that the annual rental of the building and its total tax valuation are almost identical in amount. The building is assessed at \$30,000; its annual rental is \$29,000. What kind of building can it be that rents for as much per year as it is worth alto-

gether? This riddle is solved when we learn that the comparatively valueless building in question rests upon a site worth about \$430,000—the price at which the property, inclusive of the building, has just been sold being \$452,000. The property is known as 443 Washington street. Its area, 1,955 square feet, could be multiplied by 20 without equalling an acre of farming land. This land, therefore, not counting its improvements, sells for about \$11,000,000 an acre—the value of over 5,000 improved average Illinois farms.

Unless Gov. Roosevelt interferes, a woman will soon be legally killed by electricity in New York. It is doubtful if he will interfere; it is certain that he ought not to. If the death penalty is a proper one, there should be no distinction of sex. If not a proper one, its infliction upon a woman may awaken a dormant public sentiment against it. At any rate it is not one of the functions of an executive to determine whether a penalty is proper or not. It is his function to execute the law as he finds it.

Delegates from farmers' organizations in Illinois are arranging to organize a farmers' party. A declaration of principles has been adopted which explains the motives and purposes of the new party. After declaring that all men are created equal, and asserting that "the rule of minority classes is contrary to the spirit of our institutions and destructive to our rights," this declaration announces that the only free and just government "is that in which the law making bodies are composed of direct representatives from such industries or occupations as have a majority of the votes in the congressional and legislative districts." Inasmuch, therefore, as agriculture is the chief industry of the United States, the new party proposes to unite the farmers of the country for the purpose of sending representatives of their industrial class to congress and the legislatures. The obvious objection to such a party is that it proposes to thrust one class out