

sion" in this instance. Suppose Spain had won, whose work would it have been then? It is wonderful that members of the "brotherhood of man" should be enthusiastic to rob American Rachels of their sons and deplete the national treasury, and consider it "holy work." Changing the words—if God saves those who save themselves, why not leave the business to them? This idea of "God's work," "the selected son of God," "God's favorite son," inflated the egotism of the president of the United States. It was this work of the protestant church militant, and the Methodist church in particular, that turned the president from a strong, conservative, constitutionalist to a "man of war." Jehovah overruled the more lovable Father of the nineteenth century. If it is God's work to murder men without cause in the name of religion and humanity, what value has that expression "peace on earth and good will among men?" The church militant knoweth naught of that. It "came not to bring peace but a sword." McKinley is its nineteenth century Goliath. Unfortunately, the Filipinos have no David.

No Justification for the War.

Was the government of the United States justified in going to war with Spain according to the constitution? On the same ground, is it justified in its present work in Cuba and the Philippines, and in the acquisition of those islands, under existing conditions in the United States?

These questions are absorbingly interesting. They are profoundly important. As the decision is right or wrong it may be written in blood and embossed in gold or not. Let us throw courts and authority to the winds! Let us bury traditionalism in its mouldy vault! This is a man's business. Men do their own thinking. Men form nations. Men make governments. Men unmake them too.

Assuming the government of the United States to be law-abiding in intent it will find that it has paved its future path with the proverbial pavement. It will learn that it had no authority to go to war; no authority to sacrifice an American life; no authority to spend an American cent; to uphold the Cubans in anything; to remain in Cuba or the Philippines; to help either people in establishing government; to whip the Filipinos into submissive acceptance of its own government, or to take permanent possession of either Cuba or the Philippines,—either according to natural law, the Declaration of Independence or the constitution. This is said in face of the declaration that "to the victor belongs the spoils." Unless wise self-control is used they often cause violent indigestion and emesis. Might is right, but the mighty may not always do right. Remember the standards of

natural law! Might is right only when it weakens not, or imperils not, itself by its acts. Who will have the effrontery to assert that the constitutional conditions are as safe now in the United States as before the war? Congress and the president swore to uphold the constitution; have they?

Momentous events have happened and are taking place in the United States. History is being made with gigantic strides. Laws are being broken. Constitutions are declared antiquated. If all that is said is true the country is in a condition of anarchy. There is no law.

The unfitness of the ordinary representative to represent anything but his unfitness is apparent. It is maintained that "governments exist by the consent of the governed is no more true." Suppose the governed rise up and turn the government out, what then? Governments, in the true sense, do not exist with the consent of the governed. Governments exist as the deputed authority to carry out laws or conditions agreed upon by those who formed the national, state or tribal organization. They exist so long, and in such form, as those who formed the state and instituted the government consent among themselves to maintain it and no longer. Any form of government is a usurpation. It is a despotism. Despotisms stand only by the sufferance of the people.

Government and Guardianship.

It is maintained that the argument that taxation without representation is tyranny, that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, is true only to a limited extent. Women, minors and imbeciles have to undergo the burdens of our government without any voice in its control.

No one but an imbecile would utter such balderdash. Even a portion of the press upholds such imbecility. Accepting the statement that "women, minors and imbeciles" belong in the same class, is not the control of such rather to be called a guardianship than a government? Certainly imbeciles can contribute nothing to form, support, or maintain a government. How then can they have any rights in or under it? The desperate attempts of the government to defend its policy are self-evident.

If "women, minors and imbeciles" are incapable of self-government and therefore could not possibly establish a government, it is evident that if a community of such and no others could exist, it would be in a condition of heterogeneous anarchy. Were the Filipinos in any such condition even at the time of Spanish occupation? Has Spain successfully established its government in all the islands? Is it not evident that the Filipinos have been and are capable of establishing a government suitable to their conditions? That they cannot establish a government capable of resisting Aryo-

Germanic aggression is due to their weakness as a people, but not to their inability to establish and maintain a government for themselves. The comparison, then, of the Filipinos with American "women, minors and imbeciles" falls to the ground. What absurdity to compare the Filipinos with the fathers of the constitution, who forced an independent government from George III! It would be as just to compare the Cubans with the barons who forced the Great Charter from King John. They were men, not "women, minors and imbeciles." They did not require a guardian to protect them against other nations and anarchy. They tried to make a government as strong as they were to restrict them in using their might to their own injury if they exceeded the limits of their self-made law. How about their sons? Something is "rotten in Denmark," when the government usurps the law as it has in the United States. Why not let the Cubans and Filipinos stand the test of natural law as our fathers did, as the Britains, Germans, French, Russians, Romans, Spanish, Greeks, Turks, Hungarians and all peoples have had to? They assert that to be their desire! Will our action change natural law? Any government not organized and maintained by the people is a despotism. If the people do not rise and put down the government both will go under in the end.

A government cannot make a people. Humanity cannot make either men or a nation. Both find their origin in the will and power of individuals. If governments do not find their just powers, not in the consent, but in the will of the governed; if the governed do not limit the powers of the government in anything but a usurped despotism, then history is wrong and everything is limited to imbeciles except the congress of the United States and some editorial chairs. Every form of guardianship is absolute, hence a tyranny. No one would accept this as a government in any sense as applied to surviving and progressive nations.

A despotism is the very weakest form of government. An absolute despotism is apparently a strong government, but the people are weak. In reality it is a weak government. The people can overthrow it the moment they become conscious of their massed strength. Persia, Macedonia and Rome were absolute despotisms over a weak people—how long did they last? France under Napoleon I was a weak people under an extra strong despot. What did he leave it? A weak nation not yet strong enough to govern itself without dangerous dissensions. France exists by the sufferance of Europe on the basis of that delicate scale, the balance of power.

Colonial Government.

What kind of permanency will the government of the United States give to