

stirred up about the war. The voice of the press has been that of a false prophet. Something has been said of "ravens wolves." American macrocephalics may think themselves some modern Canute to say to the Cubans, Filipinos, and other nations, "thus far shalt thou go and no farther." "Britannia rules the waves." Neptune bows his hoary head in salutation to the "monarch of the sea." Britannia embraces Columbia. Mother and daughter lock arms. It is to be hoped that they will not lock horns. Columbia is playing Britannia's game on the chess board of national politics. In the long run whoever plays another's game pays the dealer. In a recent speech ex-Governor Boutwell of Massachusetts expressed similar opinions, saying:

"We are indebted to the protecting power of England for our success in the war with Spain."

"Whatever benefits we may derive in the east England will share with us."

But will that be enough? Mothers are often exorbitantly demanding of children when they have been excessively indulgent. Britannia may demand that Columbia shall unite in an offensive and defensive alliance against continental nations on Eastern questions. Will Columbia be ungrateful and say no? Children often are! If not she will learn the value of "minding your own business" in national economics. Self-development is akin to self-preservation. They are fundamentals. Columbia is but a child yet. She has not cut her wisdom teeth. She knoweth not herself. Few nations do. But few individuals have graduated from the school at Delphi. Britannia has touched the hem of the garments of self-knowledge. Self-preservation based on that self-knowledge which leadeth to intelligent self-control is the acme of development of individual or state. It is the culmination of human possibility. He who walketh through the straight gate of the Stoa and arriveth at the oracle of Delphi shall find that pearl of wisdom which lieth enclosed in the folds of the napkin of ignorance.

"God's Work."

We come now to a rather delicate question of no little importance as a factor in the late war and still of great influence. Some Americans have gone so far as to assert that "the United States is doing God's work." How do they know? Job asks, "can ye by searching find out God?" Again we are told "by his works shall ye know God." Which works? Those who pretend to especially know tell us "God helps those who help themselves." Darwin and Spencer have told us that the survival of the fittest and perishing of the unfit were among the most manifest works of Nature. Certainly the truth is the paramount work of God. Humanitarians deny that might is right, but if

God helps only those who help themselves they must be mistaken. "Self-preservation is the first law of life." The law is a dead letter for those not having the might to execute it. Out of nothing, nothing can come, said Democritus. Humanity has been vainly trying to prove him in error by asserting that individuals had a right to life, to happiness and to government protection, who could not maintain themselves, hence could not be happy, and were a burden instead of supporting members of the government's constituency. Humanitarianism is largely an emotional attempt to offset or undo the will of God and the laws of Nature. While apparently conservative it is anarchistic in tendency. To such as assert that it is "doing God's work" to stand by and uphold the weak it may be asked why is might only right and weakness always wrong? Why the fittest alone survive in the march of the ages? Why the funeral pyre of the martyr is the oriflamme of truth to future and an "ignis fatuus" to contemporary generations? Why do these people say in one breath that "it is the duty of the strong to protect the weak," and in the next that "God helps those who help themselves?" Nothing can put self-maintaining power into the perishing any more than something can be made from nothing. It is this insane altruistic prestidigitation which has been and is the curse of civilization. If altruism is doing God's work the best way to do it would be to hasten the march of the miserable and suffering on the voyage of life. Animals seem to be the preferred works in the modern state. If survival of the fittest is the law by which God works, is it not doing that work to strengthen and multiply the fit rather than the unfit? The only standard of civilization is the number of self-maintaining individuals it produces. Civilization is the means man has taken to preserve himself. Monuments to martyrs are stones erected over its own grave by penitential ignorance. Humanitarianism and altruism are toll-gates on the road to progress. They check the march of civilization. If the government of the United States has been selected by God to do His work, and that work is to uphold the weak and support the perishing, can it be explained why that government attacked Spain and gave her another kick down the road to national disintegration? Is it not possible that the solons of the United States made a mistake as self-constituted agents of the Omnipotent, and kicked the wrong party? For years the weakness of Spain has been manifest in her impotency in suppressing rebellion in Cuba. The Filipinos not only held their own but gained ground. Spain's power in both places has been more nominal than real for a long time. It cannot be said that Spain was the stronger party in either locality. If either was surviving it was

the Cuban and Filipino. The Anglo-Saxon will only hasten their destruction. Spain started on the downward path of non-survival centuries since. It seems, then, that in its apotheosis of itself the government of the United States was in error. Instead of doing God's work it bullied sinking Spain still further into the slough of despond. Is that humanitarianism? If causing the youth of the country to be killed and die of unnecessary disease; if forcing mothers and sisters to weep for their loved dead; if increasing the already burdensome taxation to a strangling limit, in the nominal interest of aliens is humanitarianism and God's work, then God and Nature are in rebellion. Self-sacrifice and not self-preservation is the law. Justice has no place at home. The results of this study make evident the position previously taken, that the only popular cause of the war was the national hatred of monarchism which was taken advantage of by politicians and other malefactors, and Spain was driven out of American waters to satisfy a semi-savage American tradition.

Governor Boutwell's Views.

If justice exists among men it must be admitted that according to national law, international law, the American constitution, or her treaty agreements with the United States, Spain had given no cause for declaration of war on the part of the United States. That quite the contrary was the case in regard to the United States is universally known. Had the same actions on the part of the United States occurred in relation to colonies of Great Britain, France or Germany, war would certainly have been declared had not sufficient amends been made. In the previously noted speech of ex-Governor Boutwell he says, in this connection:

"The laxity that was exhibited by the administration of President Cleveland and by President McKinley, while the insurgents in Cuba were carrying on the war against Spain, would not be tolerated by Great Britain. Spanish-born subjects, but naturalized citizens of the United States, who had been engaged in the rebellion, were the cause of vigorous diplomatic debate, and Spain was forced to consent to the release of men who had been taken with arms in their hands while making war on her authority.

"All this was in marked contrast to the course of the government in the presidency of John Tyler and when Mr. Webster was secretary of state. In the year 1841 there were revolutionary proceedings on the other side of the Canadian line in which American citizens were taking part. In the month of September Mr. Webster prepared a proclamation in which this language may be found. 'Whereas, it has come to the knowledge of the government of the United States that sundry secret lodges