

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 of 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.