

with name and sentiments written thereon. As the voter entered the booth, and his identity was ascertained, the outside man withdrew from his pack the corresponding card-stub. Every half-hour a runner from the district committee-room collected the voted card-stubs, and delivered them to the proper "receiver," who promptly lined off the names from his "tableau." At the door of the committee-room were a number of sleighs, loaned for the day by well-wishers of the cause. Opposite the "receiver" sat the "despatcher." It was his constant duty to copy off several unvoted names, with addresses, upon a slip, and to despatch a sleigh to bring up the voters from the business addresses indicated. This system, steadily and quietly worked, resulted in polling the largest vote ever cast in that ward at a municipal contest, and the return of the League's candidate by a majority of 655.

The methods employed, and the results attained, in Montreal are possible, *mutatis mutandis*, in any city on the American continent. There is ample call and room for municipal-reform organizations on many lines. Good-Government clubs can do much toward exposing administrative unfaithfulness, arousing public sentiment, securing better legislation, and inducing worthy men to present themselves for municipal offices; but unless such efforts can be supplemented by other organizations, recognizing the necessity of the sanctity of the ballot-box, and prepared to engage in conflict with the "machine" on its own battle-ground, the triumph of righteousness and good government will be long delayed. Few are the cities on the American continent in which there does not exist a band of patriotic citizens sufficiently large amply to endow any working organization that can be trusted; in which there are not enough sincere, enthusiastic, determined young men to recruit an electoral league to full fighting strength; in which a lawful registry-list, an honestly polled ballot, and the ingathering of the indifferent vote, will not bring about the triumph at the polls of any just cause.

Herbert Brown Ames.

Military Drill in the Schools.

EX-PRESIDENT HARRISON'S distinguished services to his country, his eminence as a citizen, and his high intellectual and moral character, entitle what he says on any subject on which he may choose to speak to most respectful consideration. What he utters in reference to the welfare of his country may be taken without question as inspired by patriotic motives, and, as a rule, as the outcome of careful and comprehensive thought. It has been a matter of no little surprise, therefore, to many of the warm friends and admirers of ex-President Harrison to see, from his open letter published in the *JANUARY CENTURY*, that, along with many others, he advocates the introduction of military drill into the schools and colleges of the country, or, in other words, the training of the millions of American boys in the arts of war. Such a training seems to many so useless, so out of harmony with the spirit of our time,—and specially of our American civilization and historic character,—so tending to bring our people ultimately into a state of militarism like that of the Old World which is universally detested on this side of the water, that they are at a loss to know exactly how to explain the attitude taken by a considerable number of our citizens in its favor.

The first reason given in favor of the drill is that it develops the whole man, that it gives a free, erect, graceful carriage. What Mr. Harrison says of athletics, as tending to develop the body unsymmetrically, is true only of certain kinds of athletic exercises. Any one thoroughly acquainted with the calisthenic systems of the gymnasiums knows that they train every part of the body, and that, too, to movements of greater variety, and susceptible of more natural applications, than the military drill. The latter trains the body perfectly for its own purposes, and for the time being has a certain amount of physical value. But its ultimate utility to the citizen in ordinary life has been greatly overestimated. The forms and positions which it enforces are stiff and unnatural, and cannot well be maintained any great length of time. Hence the notorious fact that soldiers when they are out of the ranks are among the most careless of their bodily positions and movements. So true is this that if one should try to pick out from a promiscuous crowd of men those who had had a soldier's training, he could not do it; he would almost certainly get the wrong men. It is often assumed that the soldier's position and bearing are carried over into the ordinary citizen's life, but a little careful thought and observation will convince any one that this is not and cannot be the case. The military drill is admirably adapted to train men to a mechanical obedience to others, but it has little in it that tends to produce that voluntary control of the bodily forms and movements which every citizen, man or woman, ought to have. There are systems of physical culture now in use in many places which, at small expense, might be put into all the schools and colleges of the land, and which have already proved their great superiority to the military drill.

As to the argument drawn from our poor preparation for the civil war, one feels inclined to ask whether, if previous to that time all the citizens had had military training, the South would not have reaped as much advantage from it as the North. If the young men of the Southern States had all been previously trained to military service, the rebellion would probably have struck a blow at the Government so much more sudden and powerful as almost certainly to have succeeded in establishing the Confederacy on a permanent basis.

A nation that tries to outstrip its neighbors in war preparation, so as to have things all its own way, always finds that it has started a game at which two can play. If the plea that swiftness and suddenness of war in the future require that all our boys should have a military training is worth anything as an argument, it would require us to have a large standing army, the absence of which is given as one of the reasons why we should have the military drill in the schools and colleges of the country. A lot of school-boys drilled in military tactics, or even a great militia force trained as well as militia ever is, would very inadequately meet the emergency of a swift and sudden attack by a nation having already in the field an immense standing army. If the course of military training now recommended from several quarters is ever entered upon, its logical result will be half a million soldiers continually under arms. That has been the fact in Europe. Germany, prior to 1866, began with her citizen soldiery, which enabled her to whip Austria and then France; the result has been that she finds herself compelled to crush her people with overwhelming burdens in order to keep even with her

neighbors, who have at last shown themselves quite as shrewd as she in using the lesson which she unintentionally taught them. The people of the United States may well pause, and look the final result well in the face, before they go any further in a course so un-American and so dangerous. We are already well on the way with our navy; a great militia, into which it is thought the taste for the military acquired by the drill in the schools will lead the boys, will be the next step, and then will come the large standing army, with its burdens and its perils.

The course of safety and of honor for the United States lies in a different direction. The fear which has recently taken hold of so many of our citizens that a considerable part of our business in the near future may consist in warding off hostile nations which are to come breaking in upon us "like a thief in the night," is altogether groundless. There is not a particle of evidence that any nation whatever has the remotest idea of attacking us. We are looked upon as the great peace nation, and respected for our pacific character. We have had no war with a foreign power for over eighty years, except that with Mexico, which we brought on by our own wickedness. In building up our national greatness, we have never depended much on militia, army, or navy, except in times of emergency. We have really had none on which to depend. The United States, because of its non-military character, has done more than any other three nations toward creating that spirit of international concord and trust which is to revolutionize the world. Why, at this late period in our history, should we begin a course of action growing out of groundless fear and suspicion, and thus put ourselves on a plane with those nations whose military thraldom we have so far happily escaped?

The military drill as a training for war is entirely out of harmony with the purpose and ideals of the schools, and if introduced into them will unfortunately keep alive that excessive admiration of the soldier ideal which has been anything but a blessing to mankind. We ought to educate for peace and the future, and not for the past and war.

Benjamin F. Trueblood.

IN LIGHTER VEIN.

En Route.

I DO not know to this day why I was allowed to see and hear so much, unless it was because I wore blue spectacles on that particular journey, and you know that the wisest of us with this adornment look blind, and deaf, and often idiotic.

I know that until that day I would have told all my private affairs before a blue-spectacled neighbor, with a feeling of certainty that he could neither hear, see, nor understand me. Now, however, I know what keenness of interest and comprehension may lie behind those screens, and I am wary.

I was sitting quietly in my chair when the party came into the car, and the gentleman and lady seated themselves almost opposite me, while the daughter took the only empty seat several chairs beyond them.

I watched them idly for a moment as they settled

"The Century's" American Artist Series.

CHARLES H. DAVIS. (See page 179.)

AN artist acquaintance of mine of many years ago — an old landscape-painter of the Düsseldorf school — used to remark during the period when the naturalistic school was having full swing: "No, I don't think any landscape right which is merely a reflection of what any Philistine may see; there must be something more than *that* in it, or it cannot live. It must contain mystery. My dear boy, the fairies must dance in it." We used to think this man old-fashioned, behind the times. I speak of the time when Ruskin had inspired and Hamerton had bewildered us. It is interesting to see how, to-day, the landscape which is valued is of the kind my old friend would have admired. Cazin, Lerrole, Inness, and Davis have taught us to look for the fairy-dance in the landscape. They have made for us, not transcriptions, but translations, of nature. They have taken the commonplace of nature, distilled it in the alembic of their brain, and made it precious. Without undertaking to establish the comparative status of these men, it may be said of the two Americans that, while Inness reminds one of the music of a full orchestra, — the grand swell of sound, the sonorousness of Wagner, — Charles H. Davis makes one think of the reeds and strings of Delibes. Davis certainly must be placed in the foremost rank of the landscape-painters. His range is not so wide as Inness's, but he is possessed in eminent degree of the instinct of the subtle, the beautiful.

Charles H. Davis was born at Amesbury, Massachusetts, in 1856. He began the study of art at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and later went to Paris, where he worked under Boulanger and Lefebvre. He has been the recipient of an honorable mention at the Salon, a medal at the Paris Exposition of 1890, a gold medal of honor at a Prize-Fund Exhibition of the American Art Association, and the next year, at the same exhibition, a cash prize of \$2000. He also received the Potter Palmer Prize of \$500 at Chicago in 1888, and a medal at Chicago last year. One of the best of his pictures, "The Brook," was purchased by the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. He is a member of the Society of American Artists.

W. Lewis Fraser.

themselves. The train started almost immediately, and the first words that I heard distinctly were in the clear, somewhat hard voice of the lady as she said:

"Are n't you thankful that we have managed so well?"

After an apparent assent from her husband she surveyed the occupants of the car through her eye-glass, and, bowing graciously to some one at the other end, went on:

"There is Mrs. Telfer, of all people; I am always afraid of what she will see. She is the only woman who makes me feel uncomfortable, and I always think of her as one of the women in those 'feline amenities' in 'Life,' or 'Punch,' or wherever you see them. She watches you so — and when I am watched I always feel sure that something will be found out whether there is anything to find or not."

I settled myself shamelessly to listen, thinking,