

from the burden of taxation, and of levying the taxes on the sources of the income rather than on the income or the property itself, is an attempt in the right direction.

"To the extent that the single taxers are showing the iniquity of the personal property tax and the essential injustice of our present methods, there is a substantial agreement between them and the economists.

"But, whereas, the single taxers desire to have all taxes on the land, the ordinary economist will supplement this land tax by a tax on inheritance in the hope of reaching in that way some of the forms of privilege.

"So far, however, as the next step in tax reform is concerned, the reduction and the final abolition of the individual tax on personal property, there is a substantial agreement between the economist and the single taxer.

"Let us not look too closely into the fundamental theories of private property. Let us be willing to unite on a practical scheme of tax reform."

Among the letters was that of Hon. Charles Francis Adams, who wrote in part:

"I am, after long and deliberate consideration, a thorough believer in what is known as the 'single tax;' that is, in the system of raising all the revenue required for the economical administration of public affairs from ground rent. In this connection, however, there is one point I wish, now and always, to emphasize. While the principle at the basis of public revenue from ground rent is correct, it must in my judgment be very carefully connected in the legislative mind with the two following principles: First, the exclusiveness of that tax; second, that the amount to be raised shall be only what is required for meeting public expenses necessarily incurred under an economical administration of affairs."

#### NO COLOR LINE IN HAWAII.

The Literary Digest of December 14 says that "According to the Honolulu correspondent of the Boston Transcript, the color line is something that in Hawaii is absolutely unknown. 'Black and white and yellow and brown,' he says, 'are on a social equality.' The news of the Booker T. Washington dinner incident caused no stir there, where 'American, Hawaiian and negro sit down at the same table with Japanese and Chinese, and with never a thought of the proprieties.' The social conditions, continues the correspondent, 'are probably the most peculiar of anywhere in the United States.'" The Literary Digest then quotes the following from the Transcript correspondent:

The Hawaiian has, it is true, a skin of somber hue, but the darker the

color the prouder he is of his social status. There are innumerable wealthy natives here who move in the best society circles, and the issuance of the "Blue Book," for the first time, a few days ago disclosed that the "Four Hundred" of the city was made up of both black and white and yellow and brown.

The most prominent attorney and the best speaker in the islands is a negro, and he is much in demand upon every public occasion. This is T. McCants Stewart, who is also prominent in the high councils of the republican party, which is due not only to his own undoubted ability, but also because of his color, which gives him a powerful influence over the natives. There are four score at least of Chinese citizens, and the like, who move in the best society, and who are rated at anywhere from \$10,000 to \$3,000,000 when wealth is taken as a factor. The hospitality of the famous Ah Fong family is well known, particularly among army and navy officers, who have often been their guests.

The Japanese are also no small factor in the prosperity of the islands, and there are many with large accumulations of wealth. There is not the slightest social distinction made upon their own account, though they very rarely entertain. Among the Hawaiians, however, there is the greatest rivalry for social distinction. Princess Theresa, who is the wife of Delegate to Congress Wilcox, by her official position, claims the honors. Ex-Queen Liliuokalani is still the recognized leader among her own people, and Mrs. Wilcox's claims are disputed by several other ladies. Princess Theresa is the real leader of the home rule party, which is dominant in local politics, and is said to far exceed her husband, the delegate to congress, in her ability to control the party.

There are in all hardly more than 10,000 whites in the city of Honolulu, and a good part of that number is made up of transients, who cannot be called citizens. The prominent society people are among the descendants of the old missionaries, and they mingle freely with the other nationalities in a social way. The social peculiarities of the place are further augmented by the unlimited number of queer marriage mixtures. A man's color here is no index to his nationality. Hawaiian, Chinese, American, French, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish and African blood are so intermingled that an attempt to accurately distinguish one from the other would be absolutely impossible.

#### IT'S UNWORTHY OF US.

The message of President Roosevelt was accepted as an able one, coming from a president in the midst of situations brought about by others than himself. In his remarks under the caption: "The Monroe Doctrine," he quotes from President Monroe in these words: "The American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power." Mr. Roosevelt follows this up by saying: "In other words, the Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil."

Now, if the career of Great Britain as a colonial nation has been beneficial as a whole wherever she has exercised such policies (and in certain instances, at certain periods she has not been the very worst), what objection did President Monroe have, and what has President Roosevelt now, to England, for instance, exercising colonial rule over some of the turbulent South American countries, such as Venezuela and Colombia? Is not the answer clear, that both these presidents believed that: These South American countries can work out their own governmental problems better than "foreigners can for them, who are not in touch with their wants or surroundings? Yet, it will not be doubted but what more "stable" governments would be the rule were certain "European powers" to be in control at such times as "anarchy" and revolution take place in some of the countries mentioned to our south.

These people, and every people, are entitled and capable of self-government to the extent of their needs. Their requirements are not of the same standard as are ours; and are never likely to be. If, therefore, as President Roosevelt says in his message, "the peoples of the Americas can prosper best if left to work out their own salvation in their own way," why cannot that same broad, fair minded and true statesmanship extend to the Philippines?

How does it happen that the Asiatic legacy of Spanish rule and civilization is inferior and less capable of "working out their own salvation in their own way" than the legacy of Spanish rule in South America?

To maintain and defend the American proposition—the Monroe doctrine—as applying to the South American countries, we are practically at no cost at all; to maintain and force

the European proposition in the Philippines, we are spending millions upon millions of dollars; and sacrificing the lives of American soldiers in numbers that should stagger us for the "benefits" we receive. These lives are forfeited, these millions of money are being squandered in the Philippines against the Rooseveltian policy in South America, "to work out their own salvation in their own way." In other words, the president stands for independent self-government in South America, but "colonial" government in the Philippines.

This war can never be compensated in the lives and treasure that have been forfeited in carrying it on, as was the civil war. That war had for its end and aim, "one united country." The continuance of the Philippine war means that at least one-half of the countrymen here are opposed to it. While the Filipinos will continue to fight their "banditti" warfare indefinitely. It will instill an inborn distrust and hatred for Americans. What a prospect from a financial standpoint! As to the deaths of American soldiers, in which cause are they falling—like the revolutionary soldier fighting the principle of "taxation without representation," and "tariffs levied on necessities," or, like the Briton in South Africa, for "territorial aggrandizement and power?"

England to-day has a more defensible cause in fighting the Boers than we have in fighting the Filipino! For England had certain suzerain authority over the Transvaal according to treaty. But we never for one moment had any rights over the Filipinos; not one, except those established at the end of a cannon's mouth; and have since those "rights" were created done all we could to deny them the privilege of "working out their own salvation in their own way."

LEE H. GOULD.

251 The Arcade, Cleveland, O.

#### WAS EMERSON AN ANARCHIST? For The Public.

While we are discussing the wisdom of passing laws against those who preach a higher conception of human society than that based upon government sustained by the bayonet, let us take a look at that brightest of America's literary stars—that smile of the nineteenth century—Ralph Waldo Emerson. Indeed, for giving expression to the following thoughts, Emerson would be brought under the ban of all the bills now proposed in congress.

How will the following suit those who believe in the divine right of governments to rule?

In dealing with the state, we ought to remember that its institutions are not aboriginal, though they existed before we were born; that they are not superior to the citizen; that every one of them was once the act of a single man; every law and usage was a man's expedient to meet a particular case; that they are all imitable, all alterable; we may make as good; we may make better.

The state must follow, and not lead the character and progress of the citizen.

Nature is not democratic, nor limited-monarchical, but despotic, and will not be fooled or abated of any jot of her authority by the pertest of her sons; and as fast as the public mind is opened to more intelligence, the code is seen to be brute and stammering.

The old, who have seen through the hypocrisy of courts and statesmen, die and leave no wisdom to their sons.

Every actual state is corrupt. Good men must not obey the laws too well. What satire on government can equal the severity of censure conveyed in the word politic, which now for ages has signified cunning, intimating that the state is a trick?

Love and nature cannot maintain the assumption; it must be executed by a practical lie, namely, by force.

The growth of everything in nature—man as well as plant—is made possible and facilitated by individual effort alone. One cannot confer mental or physical power upon another. Such can only be attained by self-effort—self-exercise. The only virtue that government ever expressed was in removing the bonds that prevented the free exercise of liberty in the individual citizen. "Want of liberty, by strengthening law and decorum, stupefies conscience." The individual liberty of a people can as well be destroyed by the economic conditions of society, as by decrees promulgated by despots with that object boldly expressed. This has in a great measure been accomplished in America, and it has dulled the American conscience so that it fails to comprehend the enormity of its crime in the orient—a crime which, if attempted even 25 years ago, would have resulted in the annihilation of the party attempting it.

Laws, if of any value at all, must express the general average sentiment of those living under them. And the question must necessarily follow that if the law does express such sentiment, would that sentiment express itself in the actions of the people without the law? "Could not a nation of friends devise better ways?" says Emerson, and continues:

On the other hand, let not the most conservative and timid fear anything from a premature surrender of the bayonet and the system of force. For according to the order of nature, which is quite superior to our will, it stands thus: There will always be a government of force where men are selfish; and when they are pure enough to

abjure the code of force, they will be wise enough to see how these public ends of the post office, of the highway of commerce, and the exchange of property, of museums and libraries, of institutions of art and science, can be answered.

Whether laws and governments are cognizant of the fact or not, the individuality of the citizen will express itself in proportion to the power and genius of that citizen. If the citizen be of mean quality, then he covertly acts and expresses his desires. He does under cover what he fears to do in the open. If his wisdom and courage are in keeping with his desire, then we have a Cromwell, a Henry or a Washington. Hence we see (again quoting Emerson) that "all laws, but those which men make for themselves, are laughable." And again:

Hence, the less government we have, the better—the fewer laws, and the less confided power.

Now the lower degree of "less" is least; the lower degree of "least" is nothing, and government disappears. So with "fewer laws and the less confided power." The logical conclusion from such premises must be the absence of law and the disappearance of power.

We live in a very low state of the world, and pay unwilling tribute to governments founded on force.

Observe this estimate of those who long to rule:

Senators and presidents have climbed so high with pain enough, not because they think the place specially agreeable, but as an apology for real worth, and to vindicate their manhood in our eyes. This conspicuous chair is their compensation to themselves for being a poor, cold, hard nature. They must do what they can.

To educate the wise man the state exists; and with the appearance of the wise man, the state expires.

Fear, Craft and Avarice  
Cannot rear a state.

The power of love, as the basis of the state, has never been tried.

It is to be questioned whether those who prate so much upon the divinity of government and the respect due to those in authority, could ever form so lofty an ideal as a state based upon the "power of love." Yet true civilization shall not arrive; true liberty will not abide; true progress shall not be; true manhood and divine womanhood shall be unknown, and the greatest happiness and joy unrealized until the "power of love" shall be the foundation of human institutions.

When the church is social worth,  
When the state-house is the hearth,  
Then the perfect state is come,  
The republican at home.

L. J. QUINBY.

Omaha, Neb.

If all else fails, the railroad managers might quietly abolish the state of Minnesota.—Buffalo Express.