

(November 20th, 1916.)

## Democracy and Social Efficiency

BY MR. LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT.\*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 20th November, Mr. Abbott said:

*Mr. President and Gentlemen*,—I greatly appreciate the honor of being asked to speak to you to-day. I especially appreciate it because it gives me the opportunity for the first time since the European War was declared to put my foot on the soil of a country which is taking an active part in this contest for human liberty.

You know the story of the Irishman in one of our western cities who, while walking along, came across a street fight, and with the good-natured, amiable belligerency of his race crowded his way in and said, "Is this a private fight, or can anyone get in?" Gentlemen! the fight that is going on across the Atlantic to-day is not a private fight of Great Britain or France or Belgium, it is a fight that every democracy that believes in liberty ought to get into, and I wish my country were in it! You see, I am not a neutral!

One of the noblest democrats of modern times, noble in character and recently ennobled by title, James Bryce, on one occasion, advising young public speakers, said, "Never read your manuscript unless you have something very important to say." Well, gentlemen, what I would say to-day is important to me whether it is to you or not, so I am going to read it.

My subject is "Democracy and Social Efficiency." It is always wise to begin a discussion with a definition of the subject or else the discussion is apt to end in bewilderment and confusion and nothing is accomplished.

The lexicographers tell us that the word "democracy" comes from the two Greek words "demos" and "kratein," meaning "rule of the people." But I prefer Abraham Lincoln's definition. He said that democracy is "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

\*Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott is President of the Outlook Company, New York. His thoughtful address was received with more than ordinary pleasure because of the strong and consistent support given by Mr. Abbott to the allied cause.

Democracy does not mean well paved streets, fine public utilities, workmen's insurance, old age pensions, State-owned railways, splendid harbors and shipping, great universities, prosperous factories and well fed population, although many people confuse these agencies of human welfare with democracy and an efficient democracy ought to strive to possess them. But Germany has them and is not a democracy. The State of Illinois, when it gave to the country Abraham Lincoln, did not have them and it was a democracy. Democracy is a matter of spirit, not a product of material things. Democracy often makes mistakes, sometimes terrible mistakes, but the important thing is that it shall maintain the right of its citizens to exercise a free choice in government. For the right to think, the right to reason, the right to unsuppressed opinions, the right to choose his course of action are the conditions that distinguish the free man from the slave, the citizen of a true democracy from the citizen of an absolute autocracy.

But on the other hand democracy does not mean anarchy. To say that every man may do as he pleases and the devil take the hindmost is as far from true democracy as absolute despotism is. Anarchistic and irresponsible freedom is in fact a kind of absolute despotism in which each man tries to play the part of the despot. The true end of democracy is the welfare and development of each and all of the individuals of the group, or the community, or the State, or the Nation, to which the individual is related by his free choice. He must, therefore, submit himself to the rules or regulations which we call laws, framed by the community for its protection and benefit. In brief he must submit to constituted authority.

But, says the objector to democratic institutions, that is all the enlightened absolute monarch requires of his subjects. The German Kaiser simply demands that his subjects shall obey the laws he lays down for their benefit,—laws which have made Germany one of the most orderly, most efficient, most contented, most prosperous, and most powerful of modern nations. It might be said in response that, *because* of its Kaiser-made laws, Germany at the present moment is one of the most bloody, most tormented, most unhappy, most poverty stricken, and most unsuccessful nations of all history. But let that pass. Let us assume that up to the outbreak of the war Germany's extraordinary national growth, her splendid cities, her industrial prosperity, her learning, her science, her rapidly growing wealth, her various ingenious devices for

increasing the material welfare of her people, were due to the beneficent rule of the Kaiser. What I wish to point out is that all this is not democracy, but is directly antagonistic to democracy. The Kaiseristic principle is that the ruler who regulates the individual citizen exercises his authority by Divine Right and is responsible only to God. The democratic principle is that the individual chooses to obey a ruler whose authority is delegated to him by the people and who is responsible to the people. The question is not one of Republicanism versus Monarchy; it is a question of the source and responsibility of authority. Germany is an absolute Imperialism which professes an obedience to an imaginary God. England is a constitutional, that is to say a democratic, monarchy in which the King is an hereditary executive who puts into action the will of the people as expressed through their parliament. The British Prime Minister is responsible, not to King George, but to parliament and the people. The German Chancellor is responsible, not to the German people, not even to the Reichstag, but to the absolute German Emperor.

Two recent occurrences, one in your Empire and one in my Republic, have brought out in a most striking fashion the difference between democracy and absolutism. Your sister Colony of Australia has just voted against Imperial conscription. Now I am so bound up in passionate hopes for the success of the Allies that I deeply regret this. I think Australia has made a mistake. But even if it is a mistake I would far rather have Australia possess the democratic right to say whether her young men shall be drafted to this war or not than to have imposed upon her by an absolute despotism that kind of conscription which has sent free men from Belgium as slaves to work in the factories of Germany. What are Frenchmen and Englishmen, what are your Canadians, what are some of my own countrymen dying for at this moment in the trenches but to maintain on the face of the earth the freedom of choice which has just been exercised by the Australians, even in a matter of the life and death of their own Empire.

The other illustration is shown in my own country. We have just had an election for President. The candidate whom I wanted chosen has been rejected, and the candidate who I thought acted with selfish, timid, and comfort-loving neutrality in the face of one of the greatest international murders ever committed—the sinking of the *Lusitania*—has been re-elected. But, nevertheless, although my feelings are strong on this question, I thank Heaven that I live in a

democracy where sixteen millions of men, feeling deeply and even passionately on the subject, can choose their ruler peacefully at the ballot box instead of fighting with almost insane skill and with every savage contrivance known to science to impose the ruler they desire upon the rest of Europe, as the Germans are now doing.

However alluring may be the theoretical and spiritual definitions of democracy it must stand or fall by the way it works in practice. The most telling objection to it as a system of government is that it is not socially efficient. You have the story of the remark of the Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the middle of last century, when a Lincoln man was about to take his degree came and asked for advice as to what he should do when he went up to London, in the matter of allying himself with either party. It was just at the time when the Whig party was laying those foundations of democracy which have made Great Britain in our time so strong and great. He was given this answer by the Rector: "My advice to you, when you go up to London, is to vote with the Whigs, but dine with the Tories." I should be more discouraged by this objection than I am if it were not for France. France is a thorough-going democracy, so democratic in fact that not many years before the war Englishmen and Americans were often apt to think that France was going to be torn to pieces by the pulling and hauling in opposite directions of various democratic clans and factions of government. Yet to-day, a true democracy, France is proving herself to be more efficient, not merely in devoted and deathless patriotism, but in military skill and strategy and in industrial capacity than despotic Germany. If France can do this, cannot other democracies?

That reminds me of a story of Joffre, told some months ago—you may have read it. A correspondent asked him whether a French submarine would have sunk the *Lusitania*, supposing that France had been in the relation to Germany that Germany was to Great Britain. Joffre answered this way, disclosing the principle of democracy: "Our soldiers and sailors are human beings, and you cannot give inhuman orders to human beings."

I must here attempt another definition. I define Social Efficiency as that "quality which enables a group, a people, or a nation, acting in a united, co-operative, and persistent spirit, to accomplish with skill and success any work they undertake." Now, however anti-German we may be, if we are honest, we must admit that the German people have carried the idea

of social efficiency to a very high state of perfection. The German people have indeed been widely regarded as the greatest exemplars of social efficiency in modern history. Their cities are admittedly the best administered municipalities in the world. Their military establishment has proved itself the admiration of experts and the terror of combatants. Whatever may be the final outcome of the war the Teutonic peoples are to-day holding almost single-handed practically all the rest of Europe at bay.

But it is not only in military matters that German social efficiency has displayed itself. With practically only two harbors giving access to the Atlantic Ocean—Bremen and Hamburg, built on a couple of muddy rivers—the Germans had created previous to the war a merchant marine nearly equal to that of Great Britain and vastly superior to that of the United States. Industrial, commercial and financial statistics demonstrated the superiority of Germany in the production of agriculture staples, of ore, and of manufactured goods up to the outbreak of the war. Her giant strides in productive industry and commerce during the last quarter of a century are known to all the world.

What is the cause of this almost unparalleled advance? The cause, gentlemen, is social efficiency.

The German theory of democracy, for strange as it may seem they have a theory of democracy, is social; it asserts that the individual exists for the welfare of the State. *Deutschland über Alles*,—The Fatherland before all things.

"I verily believe," says Professor Kuno Francke of Harvard University, "that it is impossible for an American to understand the feelings which a loyal German subject, particularly of the conservative sort, entertains toward the State and its authority. That the State should be anything more than an institution for the protection and safeguarding of the happiness of individuals; that it might be considered as a spiritual, collective personality, leading a life of its own, beyond and above the life of individuals; that service for the State, therefore, or the position of a State official, should be considered as something essentially different from any other kind of useful employment—these are thoughts utterly foreign to the American mind, and very near and dear to the heart of a German."

The danger of the social theory of democracy thus alluringly described by Professor Kuno Francke—the theory that the State is the ultimate product and that the individual is merely

one of the component parts—merely like that insect or animal-cula—I am not a zoologist and do not use the technical term—which builds the coral reef: the coral reef is the great thing, the creature that produces it dies,—the danger of this theory is that, when carried to its extreme, it gives us military despotism. It gives us, to use the recent and admirable phrase of an English critic, autocratic and compulsory organization instead of democratic and voluntary organization.

Over against the *social* theory of democracy, which is exemplified in an exaggerated form in Germany, stands the *individualistic* theory of democracy, which is exemplified in an exaggerated form in the United States. The American believes that the State exists simply for the welfare of the individual. The danger of this theory is that, when carried to an extreme, it leads to confusion, anarchy, lack of discipline, failure to co-operate and social inefficiency. Individually—and I am now speaking for my country, not Canada—we Americans are among the most efficient, or at least the most capable, beings on the face of the globe; socially we are very nearly the most inefficient. We have many great individual inventors, many great individual financiers, many great individual lawyers and judges; but we have more homicides and railway accidents per capita, less foreign trade per square mile of territory, and fewer bushels of wheat per acre than Germany. We make the greatest fire apparatus in the world and possess the greatest individual firemen and we burn up more millions of property in a year than any two other civilized nations combined!

The fact is—and I ask you gentlemen to note that I am speaking for my own country now—we Americans don't care to work together unless somebody answers the question, "What is there in it for me"; and we don't care to do what we are told unless it suits our particular interest and pleasure. And we can prove the justice of our attitude by logic. Thus:

"A free-born American citizen is entitled to do what he chooses with the saliva he secretes; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I shall spit where I please!" And our sanitary anti-spitting ordinance becomes, if not a dead letter, at least a very feeble letter!

Men and women daily take the ferry to cross the Hudson River, and they see before them on the ferry boats this notice in gilt letters: "Spitting on the floor of the cabin is prohibited. Life preservers may be found under the seats." Really,

gentlemen, that is indicative, unconsciously indicative, of the way we obey our municipal laws.

Or:

"A free-born American citizen has the right to be sick if he wants to be; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I defy you to enforce your school vaccination law." And typhoid is still a terrible American epidemic.

Or:

"A free-born American citizen is the master of his own larynx, palate, tongue and lips; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I shall harangue a crowd on any street corner or in any public park I choose, and to hell with the police!" Yet well-meaning sentimentalists are indignant when anarchist orators are thrown into jail.

Or:

"A free-born American citizen is entitled to the earnings of his property; this railway is my property, therefore the public be damned!" And the old-fashioned railway manager used to assert that the Interstate Commission is meddling and un-American.

Perhaps you think my language is inelegant and my picture highly colored. Well, let me give you out of my own personal experience two instances which illustrate this tendency in American life to assert, sometimes with the aid of expletives, the authority of the individual or the faction as opposed to the community at large.

Two or three years ago, I happened one spring—and I may say that I don't know how much you gentlemen know about our local American politics, but I intend to be entirely free from partisan prejudice, so I will take one example from the Republican party and the other from the Democratic, while I myself am, or perhaps I should say was, a member of the Progressive party—to be driving along a section of so-called State road on the west bank of the Hudson River. It was one of two main thoroughfares between New York and Albany,—the richest metropolis in the western hemisphere and the capital of the Empire State. The road that spring had been practically impassable on account of either dishonest or inefficient construction. On this particular day a contractor, a good looking big fellow, with a gang of men and horses, was distributing little dabs of broken stone along the highway. I stopped and protested at this foolishness. "You're right," he said; "they have allowed only two hundred and fifty yards of stone between Newburgh and Vail's Gate

and two thousand yards are hardly enough. When I complained yesterday to Albany, a prominent Democratic official of the Highway Commission said to me over the long distance telephone: 'You damned Republicans built that road, now you damned Republicans can ride over it.'

This unconscious lack of perception of the fact that the holes in the road jounced the Democrats just as much as the Republicans struck me as both a humorous and a melancholy illustration of the light hearted manner, in which the American individualist is wont to ignore the general social welfare.

The second incident that comes to my mind is also connected with road building. A year or more ago in the vicinity of my home a dangerous grade crossing at the bottom of a steep and tortuous hill was abolished and a long, well designed embankment, viaduct and bridge were substituted. Each end of this viaduct was connected with a concrete or tar-finished State road. The viaduct, however, stood for more than a year with an uncompleted rough earth surface, which was washed by the rain almost to the danger point. By our State law such railway overhead crossings are constructed under the joint auspices of the State, the County and the railway. When the viaduct was completed these three authorities could not agree upon the surfacing; and the Republican county supervisors, in order to sustain their authority, carried the matter into the courts. It may be that justice was on their side, but in the meantime the community was suffering. I asked a Republican town official what we could do when the viaduct became impassable from gullies and washouts. "Why," said he, with easy good nature, "I suppose we shall have to drive around by Orr's Mills."

Think of what would happen if this kind of thing were done in Germany! Imagine the commander of the Tenth Army Corps coming to such a viaduct, finding it impassable for his artillery, inquiring of a town official what the trouble was and being told that the Herr Geheimrath Ober Bürgermeister and the Herr Geheimrath Eisenbahn Minister had quarrelled and could not agree how to finish the road, but that it really didn't matter as he could haul his big siege guns ten miles round by way of Mülhausen!

The individualist, separatist, particularist, idea of democracy displays itself not only in our villages and little municipalities but in our great political units. At a recent conference of Governors at Madison, Wisconsin, Governor Spry of Utah in an important speech on Conservation denounced Fed-

eral control of our natural resources. Federal control, he asserted, is inimical to the growth of Western communities because it discourages individual enterprise.

Of course!

The Kentucky moonshiner by the same token asserts that Federal control of whisky distilling is inimical to *his* community because it discourages individual enterprise!

We see the same error and the same danger in the political and industrial history of that product of American inventive genius, the Trusts. I am not afraid of the word Trust; what I am afraid of is the oligarchic or individualistic power of the bad trust. With all its faults,—and they have been numerous, serious and culpable,—I think the Standard Oil Company has performed a great service for mankind. When I was a boy and was sent to the corner grocery, in the village in which I lived, to buy kerosene oil, I had to be very careful to select the proper brand of oil so that the lamp on which I depended to get my lessons for the next day might not explode and burn the house down and me with it. Now, thanks to the Standard Oil Company, *anybody* can go to *any* grocery, at *any* crossroads in *any* part of the country and ask for kerosene oil, knowing that he will be given a standard product at a standard price. This is the advantage of combination. This is the basic principle of social efficiency—to have and to live up to some common standards. The way to meet the evil of the great combinations or trusts is not to destroy them, but to regulate them.

No sensible man asks that the New York Central Railroad shall be broken up into its component parts. He does not want in travelling from New York to Chicago to change cars three or four times as he formerly did before the days of combination. He prefers with great good sense standard trains, standard gauge and standard time. Combination gives us standards. All that the individual can justly and reasonably ask is that he shall have some voice in the fixing of those standards; and this he has a right to demand.

What can be done in a democracy on the one hand to promote social efficiency without permitting it to take on the intolerable injustice of bureaucratic despotism, and on the other hand to protect individual rights without letting them degenerate into individual license or hoodlumism? This in the last analysis is the problem of the trusts, of the political bosses, of the conflict between Labor and Capital, of the establishment of a just proportion between private profit and social welfare. And if democracies do not solve this problem

and others on a basis of efficiency which is compatible with human liberty, democracy will fail, and we shall all go back to barbarism, gentlemen.

Now in answering this question as to what is necessary to promote social efficiency in a democracy. I shall consider the problem as it applies to the United States and I shall speak to you as though you were citizens of my own State of New York instead of citizens of the great democratic Dominion of Canada, for to a certain extent your problems and our problems are similar and you may, perhaps, obtain some light on your own problems from such suggestions as I may be able to give you about ours in the United States.

To promote democratic social efficiency we must first have *Authority*. This we have succeeded in establishing in the United States from the legal point of view. The Supreme Court of the United States is admired and justly admired as one of the greatest legal achievements of civilization in all history. The decisions of its majority are final. Five men are thus able to determine the policy of the United States with regard to any great social or political movement. If the democracy does not like their decisions it must wait until it has a chance to elect an executive who will appoint men to that Court who will interpret the policy in accordance with the wishes of the people, or it must go through a long process to change the Constitution. This has happened in our history more than once. Twenty-two years ago a majority of the people of the United States eagerly wanted an Income Tax. A bill was passed, proceedings were even begun to collect the tax, when five members of the Supreme Court, constituting a majority of that body, decided, after one of the judges had changed his vote, that the tax was unconstitutional. Our democracy submitted to this authority without a murmur, but proceeded by a process of education and publicity to induce the legislatures of more than thirty-six separate States to amend the Constitution. The Constitution was changed. About two years ago another Income Tax Law was passed, and after nearly a quarter of a century the people have obtained what they wanted. This is a long process to be sure, but it is a process which shows that democracy can and will submit to constituted authority, provided it creates that authority itself. We must extend this idea of authority from our legal structure to our executive and administrative system, and those who believe in democracy must never cease to preach the necessity of authority in government and its complete compatibility, if properly constituted, with true democracy.

Second, we must have a patient but persistent improvement

in the standards of *Popular Education*. We must cease to think that "book-learning" alone is education. We must cease to draw a distinction between cultural and vocational education. It is possible, although, perhaps, not easy to work out a system of democratic education which shall arouse the interest and enthusiasm of our boys and young men just as their baseball, football, rowing and other forms of athletics now interest them. This is a large question which would take an entire paper by itself, and I must content myself with saying to you that I think Education is the second factor in democratic efficiency.

The next factor I would name is *Agriculture*. Unfortunately in the United States agriculture has lagged behind manufacturing. Our life comes from the soil and our business prosperity also comes from the soil. If some omnipotent being with a gigantic machine were to cover to-morrow the surface of the United States from California to New York and from Maine to Texas with a coating of asphalt, in a few weeks every financial institution and factory in the United States would go into bankruptcy and we should be on the verge of starvation. But the entire surface of New York City is to-day covered with asphalt and the banks are more flourishing there than in any other part of the country. Why doesn't the asphalt kill the bank in one case as it does in the other? Because the bank depends upon the farm and if you destroy the soil of the farm the bank is gone, the college is gone, the hospital is gone, even my newspaper—worse than all—would be gone! Something must be done to promote intensive and scientific farming, to make the small farms pay better, to make them more attractive and comfortable for the growing generation, and to make the farmer's financial share in the products of his farm larger and more just.

The next factor—there are many factors—I shall mention is *Commercialism in Politics*. Usually this is condemned by reformers. I commend it and deem it a necessary factor in democratic efficiency. I believe that young men in a democracy should go into a political life to make their livelihood precisely as they go into banking, law, medicine, teaching, or the church. But they should also go into politics as they should into medicine, the law, or the church, in order to do their share for the public good and to be paid only what they deserve for that service. The man who goes into the law purely to make money we call a pettifogger, the man who goes into medicine purely to make money we call a quack, the man who goes into the pulpit merely for the salary we call a hypocrite, and the man who goes into politics solely for what

there is in it for his pocket we call a corruptionist. But, thank Heaven, all doctors are not quacks, all lawyers are not pettifoggers, and all clergymen are not hypocrites. Why, then, need we regard professional politicians as potential corruptionists? Why can we not have all our politically ambitious young men devote themselves to politics in the spirit in which Sir Edward Grey or Theodore Roosevelt have devoted themselves to politics? Politics should be a profession, a career, and our best men should choose it as a life work in the same proper commercial spirit that they exercise in choosing banking or a trade or a profession.

The next factor which naturally suggests itself is *Political Bureaucracy*. I stand here to defend political bureaucracy, —though reformers generally denounce it,—and here is a chance for another definition. You remember the story of the little girl who said that "Faith is believing things you know are not so." If we accept such a definition of faith as that, it is useless to discuss the great mysteries of life and death and the universe which, invisible and intangible, lie outside the domain of our physical senses. So if you define political bureaucracy as a group of men banded together to employ useless red tape for their own material advancement, like some of the Chinese bureaucrats, of course it has no place in a true democracy. But by political bureaucracy I mean a group of men educated and trained in administrative work. In private industry we follow the principle of bureaucracy. A man becomes a book-keeper in a small bank in a small town; is promoted to be a higher official of that bank; is called to a larger city to become the official of a bank there; and finally reaches the very top notch of the financial world because of his training and his administrative ability. This principle of promotion and advancement in a guild, or clan, or bureau, we should adapt to democratic government. I see no reason why a young man in the country town in which I live may not choose the postal service for his career; may not become the assistant to our village postmaster, then become the postmaster himself, then be called to the adjacent city of Newburgh and become the postmaster there, then through efficiency be called to an assistant position in the New York post office, then become the New York postmaster, and so finally, perhaps, Postmaster-General of the United States. That is what I mean by political bureaucracy, gentlemen, and we have to have that. This principle is followed in Germany. Mayors there are promoted from one city to another. But the old-fashioned Yankee democrat thinks this is bureaucracy. He prefers to turn out his post-

master every four years or his mayor every two years and put a new man in who knows nothing about the work: this is democracy. It isn't! it is only inefficiency.

The next factor of democratic efficiency I mention with some hesitation for I do not want to precipitate a riot in what has been so far—to me at least—a delightful occasion. Nevertheless I consider that one of the important factors in democratic social efficiency in *Woman Suffrage*. Now, I do not propose to discuss here women's rights. Personally I do not believe that woman has a divine right to vote any more than man has. The suffrage is conferred by the community as one of the agents of democratic welfare and the community has a right to lay down the conditions under which the suffrage shall be exercised. But it seems to me that for a democracy which professes a belief in the doctrine of universal suffrage, to exclude one half of the citizens of that democracy is inconsistent, irritating and, therefore, inefficient. Whether or not it will do any good to the State to have women vote is, perhaps, a debatable question. But I do not think it is a debatable question whether it will do the women any good to possess and exercise the right to vote. We men sometimes complain of the trivial things in which women interest themselves, of their devotion to the fashion magazines and the society columns of the newspapers. And yet by law we prevent them from taking an active interest in the most absorbing and profoundly important questions that concern mankind on this terrestrial globe,—the social and political questions of government. Has not the work of women in England and in Canada during this war proved that they are interested in such questions when given the chance, and that they are capable of handling them with wisdom, skill and efficiency? Have they not for this very reason become more interesting to themselves and to you men whose companions they were designed by nature to be? I have been converted to woman suffrage, as one factor in democratic efficiency, if for no other reason, because I believe that with the right to participate in the discussion and decision of questions of democratic government women become more intelligent and, therefore, more interesting human beings, and thus better mothers, wives, daughters and companions of men. For this reason I feel bound to name *Woman Suffrage* as one of the factors of democratic efficiency.

Because no democracy can long exist in which its citizens do not have the untrammelled and free opportunity to express their choice regarding their representatives, rulers, or executives, and because this free choice can be thwarted by fear

of the powerful or suffer miscarriage through bribery and corruption, I regard the *Secret Ballot* and *Corrupt Practices Acts* as forming an important factor of democratic efficiency. In the United States, thanks to your sister colony of Australia, we now have the secret ballot. It is popularly called "The Australian Ballot." The voter, as you know, goes into a little booth and casts his ballot in secret and no other man, if he so chooses, may ever know for whom he voted or whether he even voted at all. When I cast my first vote for a President of the United States, for General Garfield in 1880, this secret ballot was not in existence. Hangers on or agents of each political party hawked the ballots of their party and handed them to you as you approached the ballot box. They were little tickets bound together by an elastic band and any one of the many party workers in the voting place could see exactly what sort of ballots the voter cast. Bribery and corruption were easy and rampant. On the whole in the United States to-day the humblest voter is perfectly free in casting his vote, but we need some improvement in our *Corrupt Practices Acts* to prevent some candidates from using the power of money in their nomination and election.

Finally it seems to me that an essential factor of democratic efficiency is what is popularly called *Preparedness*. While the chief function of a democracy is to promote the life, liberty and happiness of its own citizens within its own borders and without encroaching upon the rights of other peoples, there are also certain world duties which such a democracy must bear and perform. It must be prepared to play its part in protecting the life, liberty and happiness of other peoples less fortunate than its own. It must have ships and soldiers not merely for its own protection, but in order to be able to join with other democracies in maintaining the rights of man throughout the world. And so a nation may be truly a democracy and truly a military nation at the same time, like Switzerland or France. Militarism is a thing of the spirit, not a thing of powder and guns. There is not a man in this room who is not at heart a lover of peace, but I hope there is not a man in this room who would not, with a rage of blood in his heart, rush to give all the protection he could to a woman or a child trampled down by a band of savage ruffians. "Not a cent for tribute, but millions for defense!" is the inspiring watchword of protection for one's native land. To this motto for an efficient democracy I would add another: "Not one shot for conquest, a million broadsides for the violators and murderers of a sister democracy!"