

OBJECTIONS TO AN ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND.

On the subject of a closer alliance with England, now much talked of, encouraged by her, and advocated by many of our own people, I wish to say a few words. I think we shall do well to remember our early experience with her, and scrutinize somewhat carefully her present motives. We wish to maintain amicable relations with England and to avoid "entangling alliances." It is also far more agreeable to approve and applaud than to criticize and condemn. We acknowledge that no country contains more illustrious statesmen, broader philanthropists or more earnest Christians than England. It is when we consider her as a governing power, when we weigh her methods in the scales of justice and righteousness, that we not only withhold our approval, but we emphatically condemn.

History, written and unwritten, records that England long ago became dissatisfied with her place and progress among the nations. She was ambitious. She desired supremacy in the world. How should she obtain it was the problem which she set herself to solve. It could not be by agriculture, for her country was small—she could not raise her bread. It could not be by manufacture, for she was dependent on other nations for much of her material for that. It must, therefore, be by finance. Thereupon she devised and executed plans which, whatever their effect on others, have made her the arbiter of nations, for "whoever controls the money of a nation controls its liberty and its destiny."

How she accomplished this need not here be detailed.

For proof that England absorbs the wealth and vitality of any people so unfortunate as to come within her power, we have only to recall the history and observe the conditions in Ireland, in India and in Egypt, and to consider her recent willingness to stand as guard—to practically hold the hands of a weaker nation—while "the unspeakable Turk" inflicted terrible and unmerited punishment! And this while the cries of the sufferers and the appeals of the humane in her own and in other countries were ringing in her ears.

We need not inquire by what right England obtained her Indian possessions. There are those who remember the Sepoy rebellion, when intelligent, educated, native soldiers, revolting against an oppression no longer endurable, were chained to the mouths of cannon and blown to atoms!

If one is interested in knowing what relentless, merciless, mercenary oppression means, let him read "Spoiling the Egyptians," written by J. Seymour Keay, an Englishman who lived in Egypt and India. Much of the small book is compiled from the English blue books. In its preface the author says: "It must be remembered that nothing is reported here which could be concealed." The American edition was published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, who, in their preface, say:

The author's statement, which is based line upon line on the authority of the official documents, constitutes one of the most damning arraignments that has ever been made of the acts of a Christian nation, and throws light upon some, at least, of the causes of the bitter hatred of Europeans which found such fatal expression in the massacre of Alexandria.

Many years ago I had the pleasure of meeting Hon. Mr. Matson, soon after his return from India, where he had been our American consul general in Calcutta. I had just read "Spoiling the Egyptians," and asked Mr. Matson if he believed it possible that a civilized nation could practice such heartless atrocities. I can never forget the emphasis with which he replied: "Madam, the English language does not contain words that can adequately express the oppression practiced by English officials on helpless natives wherever they have the power."

I will mention one example only of several which Mr. Matson cited as evidence, namely, the obliging of the natives to buy imported salt, while their own hills contain enough to supply the world for centuries. He said: "If a poor native were seen licking the salt (for which he was famishing) out of the earth he would be shot as if he were a dog."

This I regarded as an extreme statement; but recently I have seen an article in the New York Sun, from which I quote, inferring that it may have been literally true:

Among the resolutions discussed at the meeting of the last Indian national congress, held at the end of December in Madras, hardly any were of greater importance than that asking for a reduction of the duty on salt. In India salt is a government monopoly, and, next to the land revenue, is the most productive source of income from taxation, opium being third. * * * There is not another article of general necessity that is more heavily taxed, and for protecting the state monopoly, not one in which a more rigorous set of regulations is enforced even to the extent of being oppressive. According to competent medical authorities the public health and the stamina of the poorer classes of the Indian population are injuriously affected by the restricted use of salt, due to its excessive taxation. The high price of even the coarsest and commonest kinds is alleged to be responsible for the serious epidemics

that have thinned the stocks of cattle in India in recent years.

From good authority I quote:

That the principle of the opium war [waged to force the trade on China] was utterly wrong, and that the leaders of thought in China were absolutely right as to its effect, has been generally admitted, even by Englishmen; yet so great is the power of commercial greed that a royal commission has reported favorably within the present decade on the Indian export of opium. The government revenue that comes from the demoralizing drug is the all-sufficient justification for the traffic.

On the subject of a closer alliance with England, I quote approvingly Judge Tarvin's utterance on what the Jeffersonian democratic American platform for 1900 should declare:

Against Imperialism. * * * Against any alliance with England—that a monarchy and a republic cannot be linked together—human freedom and human slavery cannot march side by side. * * * Colonial dependencies are the life-blood of England, while they would mean the death of free government in the United States. No English soldier ever fought for Liberty, or died for Freedom.

England seems to have verified the truth of what Sophocles said twenty-five centuries ago:

Nothing in use by man for power of ill can equal money. This lays cities low. This drives men forth from quiet dwelling place. This warps and changes minds of worthiest stamp, to turn to deeds of baseness—teaching men all shifts of cunning and to know the guilt of every impious deed.

—Mrs. Susan Look Avery.

SIXTO LOPEZ ON AGUINALDO.

An extract from a letter written by Senor Sixto Lopez, a member of the Filipino diplomatic service, dated 41 Woburn place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900, and addressed to Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, United States army, Washington, D. C. The letter is in answer to a circular of questions addressed by Gen. Wheeler to "Eminentes Filipinos." We reprint from City and State, of Philadelphia.

QUESTION II. OF GEN. WHEELER'S CIRCULAR.

If the Americans had abandoned the islands, would Aguinaldo have been acceptable to all the tribes, or would some have opposed his government, causing revolutions and other conflicts?

ANSWER BY SENOR LOPEZ.

Gen. Aguinaldo not only "would have been acceptable" but has been accepted by what you term the "tribes." Practically all the islands sent emissaries declaring their loyal support to Aguinaldo and his government. Even the Igorrotes, and the Moros of Central Mindanao, who never submitted to Spanish rule, have acclaimed our president and government, and the former have sent gold dust to Aguinaldo to assist in the prosecution of the present war. In addition to this, the provinces of the archipelago have elected representatives—in some cases