

Oh, yes! Therefore, my friends, I wish for peace on you and yours."

Mr. McKinley's general tone toward the Filipinos is what he calls "benevolent assimilation." In outward seeming it is like the language of the Rev. Mr. Chadband. But in actual practice Mr. McKinley's "benevolent assimilation" seems to be conducted with solid shot, shrapnel-shell, and machine-guns.

We have already commented on the thrust of Congressman Wheeler, of Kentucky, at Mr. McKinley when he said that the president's policy reminded him of Wilkins Micawber, because the president was always "waiting for something to turn up." Turning again to the pages of Dickens, we find Mr. Micawber described as "a gentleman remarkable for his pecuniary involvements, his love of speech-making, his grandiloquent rhetoric, and his constantly 'waiting for something to turn up.'" The latter two clauses can with justice be attributed to Mr. McKinley. As for the preceding ones, it would be unkind to complete the parallel.

Still another biting reference to President McKinley was made upon the floor of the house last week by Congressman Johnson. He, too, found the president reminiscent of Dickens. To him Mr. McKinley resembles Mr. Pecksniff. This gentleman, according to Dickens, "was a moral man:"

"Perhaps there never was a more moral man than Mr. Pecksniff, especially in his conversation and correspondence. He was a most exemplary man—fuller of virtuous precept than a copy-book. Some people likened him to a direction-post, which is always telling the way to a place, and never goes there. His person was sleek, though free from corpulency. His plain, black suit and dangling double eye-glass cried aloud, 'Behold the moral Pecksniff!'"

"Mr. Anthony Chuzzlewit does not like some of Mr. Pecksniff's actions, and tells him bluntly not to be a hypocrite.

"'A what, my good sir?' demanded Mr. Pecksniff.

"'A hypocrite.'

"'Charity, my dear,' said Mr. Pecksniff, 'when I take my chamber candlestick tonight, remind me to be more than usually particular in praying for Mr. Anthony Chuzzlewit, who has done me an injustice.'"

Do not let our readers suppose that the writer is pointing these unpleasant parallels at Mr. McKinley. They are the work of the representatives of the American people in the congress of the United States. Our readers will have to judge whether they be just or unjust, but no one can deny that they are amusing. And if it be that these gentlemen have done Mr. McKinley an injustice, let the president, like Mr. Pecksniff, pray for Senator Vest, of Missouri, Congressman Johnson, of Indiana, and Congressman Wheeler, of Kentucky, when he takes his chamber candlestick at night.—Argonaut.

## MIGHT AND RIGHT: WHICH MAKES WHICH?

[By E. Farquhar, of the United States patent office.]

We have heard patriotic talk, of sound and ringing quality, took the higher ground of patriotism, too, that the country was plenty great enough to advance its greatness from within, omitting to encumber itself with an incubus of foreign acquisition. At the same time our doctrine of moderate armament has been contested by these very speakers, who have held that a liberal military or at least naval equipment was a good thing to have, whether it were used or not. Perhaps having it would prevent the use. We may any moment find ourselves in some international tangle, where a stout navy would be just the thing for enabling us to maintain an essential position, often saving a trial of arms; or bearing us through in far better shape if it came to that.

This is precisely the argument for carrying personal weapons habitually, neither more nor less. There is nothing true of the one which is not true of the other, rightly applied. It must have seemed risky indeed, when people began to disuse what had been considered so necessary, and no doubt it was the brave and strong rather than the weak and timid who first did so; but it rapidly proved that the occasions of strife abated with the implements; that even as old as Homer was the observation that "the sword draws the man," as well as the man the sword; that men were far more apt to conduct their debates in peace in reason, when the tempting means of a summary solution were out of reach.

A very important phase of human nature seems to be overlooked in this contention; a telling factor in the psychology of nations as of men. Given a power, known by every one to be of the very foremost rank in potential strength, in courage and resolution, fallen into such a complication; with the last resort at hand in full provision, great indeed would be the temptation to an overbearing style, an appeal at once to might rather than right, a general arrogance of behavior, precious to the jingo heart, and such as might indeed sweep on to victory once and again, but must inevitably league the nations against it like a fate, and leave but a question of time when it should be pulled down among them. While if it were felt by all alike that this power when once aroused would be formidable to the last degree, but that the arming would be a matter of some time and difficulty, to be incurred if necessary but avoided as long as honorable, how vastly would the chances grow of peaceful settlement, which then would almost certainly be right settlement; how nobly would the habit spread of seeking and applying

justice instead of mere force! Not the slightest likelihood of the other power presuming the more, and every likelihood of its conducting the affair in better temper, feeling no immediate pressure of "honor" to the contrary, which so often drives the weaker party into hopeless conflict. No country is better placed in every regard for such a memorable advance in international relations than the United States; nor could higher ambition move our diplomacy than to stand before all future time as the inaugurator of such a system. Weaker nations could not do the same with such effect. As surely as Christianity is truth, its principles of justice and good will must come to prevail between nations as individuals, however the clumsier body may lag behind; but Washington already marked the course in the farewell address, and bequeathed the fulfillment to his countrymen; and he was no visionary.

The immense economy of this method, the frightful waste of even attempting to keep up with the ever swift advance of art in all its military and naval application on the great scale, the perpetual disuse of most expensive armament by the next invention is no small item in the consideration. We take it to be an axiom with right-thinking men that the true use of military force in general is as that of police; and in all questions of its proportion that should be the regulating principle. If there ever was an officer not likely to undervalue the military function we might suppose it to have been General Sherman; this was his teaching in a notable discourse to an army gathering. As the police keep order in the city, by vigorous action when needful, but far more by the mere knowledge of its existence, so let fleets and armies; and as the end is secured in the one case not by useless masses drawn from work on a mere possibility no more should it be in the other. Here we have the resort of physical force occasionally needed by the individual; so with the nation.

It is such a risk! we shall hear again. Like first striking out to walk or to swim; like standing up to one's first speech; like a first suggestion to try dealing with a man as if he were honest instead of a rogue; or as when suffrage and office are first extended to intelligent classes who had not enjoyed them before. In each case there are ghastly tremors, and the sense of going off without support; in each case there is found a strength and element that upbears, not known until tried, created often by the trying, which ignorance or cynicism has missed.

Mistress—"Jane, I've mislaid the key of my escritoire. I wish you'd just fetch me that box of odd keys; I dare say I can find one to open it." Jane—"It's no use, ma'am. There isn't a key in the 'ouse as 'll fit that desk."—Punch.