

THE KEYSTONE OF THE REPUBLIC

(Continued from Page Three)

The king of Prussia, successor to the great Frederick, was a mere hog in body as well as in mind. Gustavus of Sweden and Joseph of Austria were really crazy, and George of England, you know, was in a straight waistcoat. There remained none, then, but old Catherine who had been so lately picked up as not to have lost her common sense."

These were the divine right rulers whom Jefferson knew; and, if the sage of Monticello were alive today, he could still find a large assortment of fools, idiots and lunatics on European thrones, and, crossing back home again he could find in America a newly fledged lot of shoddy aristocrats who claim the earth upon the smallest measure of desert, moral or intellectual, which you could think possible, even to climacteric impudence!

The fathers would have none of this artificial aristocracy—no shares in a social and political idiot asylum! They even sought to avoid all approach toward it. They voted down a proposition to designate the president as "His Highness," "His Excellency," etc., and fixed his title simply as "Mr. President;" and by that title he was always known until recently when the kerosene nobility of America got the title of "His Excellency" revived and now promise to make it popular.

The fathers put it into the constitution that the United States should

COFFEE SENT HER
Back to the Country.

A young woman of Bradford, Vt., made her way to a good position in a big Boston store and gave it up because of sickness at home, but it all came out right at last and she tells the story this way: "Two years ago I had to leave a position as bookkeeper in a Boston department store to go back home to take charge of the old place as mother's health seemed shattered, and what do you suppose proved to be the cause that forced me to return?"

"I found her very weak, unable to sit up all day and with a dizzy feeling if she tried to move about. She had been advised to stop coffee drinking, but as she had used it from childhood it seemed as though nothing could take its place. I had settled down to stay at the farm when one day I got to thinking over the situation and concluded to try an experiment. I got a package of Postum Coffee. It was not cooked right the next morning and we were all disappointed. That was because we had tried to make it like coffee. Next morning I had Postum made according to directions and we were all delighted. In a few days you should have seen the change in mother. Since that time we have never drunk coffee and now we all drink Postum twice a day and sometimes three times and think it superior to coffee.

"The change in mother's health since she quit coffee and took up Postum has been wonderful. She is once more able to take the work again, quite well in fact, with no more weakness and nervousness, no more sour stomach, no more trouble of any kind. To cut a long story short she is now entirely well and I am going back to Boston in a few weeks, thanks to Postum." Name given by Postum Co., Battle Creek, Mi. h.

Ice cold Postum with a dash of lemon is a delightful "cooler" for warm days.

Send for particulars by mail of extension of time on the \$7,500.00 cooks contest for 735 money prizes.

never grant any title to nobility nor any American official, without the consent of congress, accept any present, emolument, office or title from any king, prince, or foreign state. They did not prohibit Americans from marrying titles, because they did not foresee the American heiress and her market possibilities. Neither did they forbid our citizens to raise funds from American properties in order to go over the seas and spend them upon European palaces. They had no pre-science of our Astors, Bennetts, Goulds, Carnegies and Vanderbilts, and if they had they would probably have been willing to pay the bonus for the sake of the deal—realizing that "absence makes the heart grow fonder." They did not forbid ecstatic receptions, parades, military and naval reviews and processions every time some European princeling came into the country—for they could not foresee that flunkysm would ever become epidemic here! And they did not expressly forbid presidential junketing; but President Jefferson set a noble precedent in that matter. In 1807 Governor Sullivan of Massachusetts invited the president to make a tour through the northern states, and in reply Jefferson said:

"I confess that I am not reconciled to the idea of a chief magistrate parading himself through the several states as an object of public gaze and in quest of an applause which, to be valuable, should be purely voluntary. I had rather acquire silent good will by a faithful discharge of my duties than owe expressions of it to my putting myself in the way of receiving them!"

Could he have anticipated the time when a president would tour the country in special trains provided by great corporations with all expenses paid by them; when a president would be wined, dined, feted and flattered in a great regal progress by the very men who would profit most by the presidential favor—could he have foreseen these things his opinions, no doubt, would have been still more pronounced!

My friends, these things may seem, under hasty consideration, to be trifles light as air; but let me remind you that it has ever been trifles, the minute, insidious innovations of many years, that have in the past corroded and undermined the foundations of republics, giving us no pronounced sign until the superstructure, itself, was ready to topple into ruins; and it was a knowledge of this fact that made our fathers fence their great postulate of equality even in matters apparently trifling. There was a great, wise and benign jealousy; and, on this great day, we can do no better thing than to covenant with each other anew that we will oppose with all our power every approach of the false, foolish and un-American spirit of aristocracy either in matter or form.

But let us consider the doctrine of equality in another relation.

The fathers pronounced for the equality of citizenship in respect of military service.

They were opposed to a separate military class in the republic. They dreaded the establishment of a professional soldiery! They knew from their reading and their experience what woes wait upon a country where every adult civilian is compelled to carry a soldier on his back! They knew that a standing army always finally means war; that war means debt; that debt means the separation of the people into bread-winners and bondholders; and that the equilibrium of society once unsettled by the erec-

tion of a military class tends towards a further dislocation.

Hence they were, one and all, opposed to standing armies. It was one of the complaints against King George put into the Declaration of Independence that he maintained standing armies among us! Joseph Warren, the hero of Bunker Hill, thundered against it in an oration, delivered in 1772, in which with classic force and elegance, he pointed out the necessary antagonism between militarism and popular liberty. Josiah Quincy in a masterly review of the subject, emitted in 1774, and in which he brought under review the whole history of military nations, ancient and modern, showed how inevitably fixed, military establishments ever tend toward the ruin of both civic freedom and moral civilization. Jefferson opposed professional soldiery early and late; and, in many of his letters, expressed his regret that an express declaration against standing armies had not been put into the constitution; and Washington, after having spent eight years in the saddle as the commander of the American armies, and other eight years in the president's chair shaping the functions of our new government, put into his majestic Farewell Address a solemn admonition against overgrown military establishments "which," he said "under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

There is scarcely one of the great subjects which the fathers debated upon which they were so heartily agreed as they were in their opposition to militarism. Franklin was opposed to a standing army, John Dickinson, Stephen Hopkins, Benjamin Rush, John Hancock, both of the Adams, and indeed nearly every one of the most distinguished of the revolutionary leaders lifted their voices to warn posterity against the creation of a distinctly military class within the boundaries of the republic; and so emphatic and serious was this conviction that Washington and Jefferson both opposed the perpetuation of the Order of Cincinnati—a fraternal organization of the old revolutionary soldiers formed after the war.

The substitute which they offered for a standing army was a well ordered militia, a citizen soldiery. They believed that an army composed of citizens whose courage and patience would be stimulated and sustained by thoughts of the cradles, hearths and altars of prayer at home would not only make the noblest, but the most capable army that could possibly be mustered under the flag; and the commentary of a century and a quarter of national life and the examples of five great wars have proven abundantly that their views were correct. For I say here, without fear of contradiction, that the American volunteer is by far the bravest and most efficient type of soldier known to the annals of mankind. With perhaps fifteen millions of our men capable of military service and always quick to respond to the call of the country we can have no sort of need for anything but a skeleton army to occupy our arsenals and forts and train officers for possible exigencies. That was the thought of the fathers—cautious, indeed, but still sufficient for every situation known to our history, then or since!

And we are moving away from that safe conception! I do not say that our present army is sufficiently numerous, or so mercenary as to be immediately dangerous to our liberties; but there are other circumstances which are not so reassuring. We are getting the passion for arms! We are swelling with the military vanity that marks the old world! We have gone into the conquest business. We have erected a carpet-bag-bayonet

government over eleven millions of brown men far beyond our boundaries; and, today, we are whispering diplomatic arrangements with other and monarchical governments which at any time may precipitate us into a huge war in far off China! We are carrying a big club, but we are not speaking softly. On the contrary, we are swaggering both ridiculously and dangerously and almost everywhere in official circles, at least, we are abandoning the prudence and dignity of the fathers for the childish vanity and petulance of a military nation.

We can defer discussion of Filipino liberty, if necessary, but the question of our own liberty is beginning to be importunate! We have repudiated the Declaration of Independence for the sake of conquest, and we have suspended in part the authority of the constitution for the sake of carpet-bag government—and every intelligent person who is not already infected with the present rage of militarism must occasionally question if there be a stopping place and where it is!

"Ah," answers the spirit of commercialism, "but our wars and threats of war are for the purpose of extending American commerce. Our armies make for us open doors and give us access to great fields of business which prophesy unmeasured profit."

Whose profit? What share will the American common have in the conquest and spoliation of foreign peoples? Why, my friends, the story of such adventures is so old that it has become tedious through familiarity! Always and ever the common people do the fighting and foot the bills; and the army contractors and privilege grabbers do the rest. No nation given to militarism can possibly preserve any substantial equality among its citizens. The rise of the professional soldier means a corresponding subsidence of the plain citizen. The soldier has the glory, the citizen pays the fiddler!

In 1816 Jefferson said in a letter to Crawford:

"No earthly consideration could induce my consent to contract such a debt as England has by her wars for commerce, to reduce our citizens, by taxes, to such wretchedness as that, laboring sixteen of the twenty-four hours, they are still unable to afford themselves bread or barely to earn as much oatmeal or potatoes as will keep soul and body together. And all this to feed the avidity of a few millionaire merchants and to keep up one thousand ships of war for the protection of their commercial speculations!"

That was the policy and condition of England a hundred years ago and that is the policy and condition of England today! Wars in India, China, Afghanistan, Egypt and South Africa, while the British plutocrat gets richer and the British democrat gets poorer! Yet our American Tories boast of the British conquests and dependent colonies and describe that policy as something to be emulated by the American people; and would fain hurry us into the English business of snatching territory. The policy is so obviously immoral and injurious that we might hope that the people of this country would reject it without debate were it not for that streak of insanity in the average community which always creates an irrational stampede at the flutter of a flag or the pounding of a drum!

As it is we must argue, we must re-

(Continued on Page 13.)

Gen. Chas. Dick,
Ohio's famous Congressman, writes:
"There is no remedy so efficient for headache as Dr. Miles' Anti-Pain Pills. Cure and prevent. Sold and guaranteed by all druggists. No opiates. Non-laxative. Never sold in bulk. 25 doses 25 cents. DR. MILES MEDICAL CO., Elkhart, Ind."