

serve to make it just if it does not so conform.

Just governments rest on conformity with the laws of God.

Which is another but more solemn way of saying so undisputed a thing as that a just government is one which conforms to justice—as if this answered or even touched the question fairly put to the Outlook: If governments do not derive their just or rightful powers from the consent of the governed, from whom or what do they derive their just and rightful powers? To say from God, answers nothing, for no one who believes in God as the source of all righteousness, justice, goodness and truth, disputes it. What we want to know is, admitting all this, how are governments in a practical and natural way best and most fully in the long run brought into conformity with the laws of God, in the absence of a duly accredited representative of the Almighty living upon the earth in the flesh. And for the Christian there can be but one answer. It cannot be done by consulting the opinion or the will or the wishes of one man or one class of men; it must be in consulting all, for God is no respecter of persons, and on earth he is to be found in the conscience of the poor and lowly as much as in that of the rich and mighty. If God has any other way of manifesting himself in the world in this year of grace, except through the conscience of men, and of no one man above another, we have not heard of it. And the conclusion inevitably follows that governments derive their just powers, their rightful powers, their God-given powers—so far as they can acquire such powers in an imperfect world—from the consent of the governed, from the people, in whom God is to be found, so far as He is to be found at all upon the earth. And these powers obviously cannot, therefore, be obtained in any other way. And when the Declaration of Independence sets forth such a doctrine, it sets forth fundamental Christian doctrine, and when Dr. Abbott refers to that document as embodying an “exploded philosophy,” he comes near to repudiating his own religion—let alone the politics of the fathers.

Dr. Abbott, indeed, approaches close to an admission of the truth, for he says that

a righteous democracy is simply one way of ascertaining what are the laws of God, and of conforming the life of the community to them.

But is there any other assured way or more certain way in the long run, of ascertaining those laws, and bring-

ing government into conformity, except through democratic government? Is there any other way within reach of human society of so perfectly consulting God as through the conscience of the people, not one or several, but all—the general conscience, freed as far as it ever can be found of the individual warp and twist of interest or pride or prejudice or sin or hereditary defect? Dr. Abbott does not point it out. We conclude that there is no other way; and the conclusion from this is that his repudiation of the “exploded philosophy” of the declaration is utterly and un-Christianly wrong.

It must have been exceedingly embarrassing for Dr. Abbott, at just this stage of his discussion, to be confronted with something he had said 12 years ago on the same question. It is picked from one of his published sermons as follows:

There are not wanting Americans who would take the keys from the people and give them to the Anglo-Saxons. Ask the Chinaman, the Indian and the negro how this violation of the divine law works. Mankind is not fit for self-government. That is true. But mankind are better fitted to govern themselves than any portion of mankind, however selected, are fitted to govern any other portion of mankind. Democracy rests on the fundamental truth that man as man—not royal man nor aristocratic man, nor priestly man, nor Anglo-Saxon man, but man as man—was made in the image of God, and to man as man are given the keys of political, as of natural, dominion. Whenever, wherever and howsoever this divine order is violated, the result is always disastrous.

And so it comes about that Dr. Abbott convicts himself of entertaining un-Christian doctrine in his present campaign against the cardinal principle of democratic government. He does not need our word for it; he has his own word.—Editorial in Springfield (Mass.) Republican, of Oct. 8.

A DEFINITION OF IMPERIALISM.

Let us first consider what it is not. Imperialism is not necessarily the maintaining of an emperor or of imperial forms. Those who suggest this are trying to throw political dust into the eyes of the people.

Nor does imperialism necessarily involve an abridgement of the citizen's rights. The Englishman possesses as much freedom as the American, and, with the sole limitation in the choice of his ruler, enjoys an equal share of constitutional rights. But his queen is an empress, his country arbitrarily rules subject races without their consent, and he is consequently living under the reign of imperialism.

The Century Dictionary gives as one definition of imperialism: “The principle or spirit of empire.” In other

words, any government conducted according to the principles or spirit of an empire is a government of imperialism. Let me illustrate: President McKinley's message to congress (December 6, 1897), contained the oft-quoted paragraph:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That, by our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.

What did that mean? It clearly meant that forcible annexation might be right according to the moral code of monarchies and empires, but that it is a crime according to the code of morals which should govern a republic. In other words, forcible annexation is not republicanism; it is imperialism.

Still another illustration: Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, in his “Life of Benton” (page 266), says:

No one would wish to see any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken the lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors. We, wiser in our generation, have seized the waste solitudes that lay near us, the limitless forests and never-ending plains, and the valleys of the great, lonely rivers; and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession; and a score of years after each conquest we see the conquered land teeming with a people that is one with ourselves.

What does Mr. Roosevelt mean? Evidently, that the peopling of unoccupied or sparsely settled territory is republican expansion; but that the arbitrary seizure of thickly populated lands against the consent of the conquered race is European imperialism.

An early American poet, in an ode to Columbia, brings out the same contrast:

To conquest and slaughter let Europe aspire;

Whelm nations in blood and wrap cities in fire;

Thy heroes the rights of mankind shall defend,

And triumph pursue thee, and glory attend.

The arbitrary imposition of external laws on a people sufficiently numerous to constitute a nation is imperialism. The assumption by any nation of the right of adjudging the measure of self-government sufficient for any other nation is imperialism. The clause in the republican platform referring to the Filipinos: “The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law,” breathes the very essence of imperialism.

The government of men without their rightful participation in the governing legislative body—the enforcement of taxation without representa-

tion, the coercive imposition on a governed race of less favorable laws than those enjoyed by the governing race—this—or what we are now doing to the people of Porto Rico—is imperialism.

The claim that one people can sell another people without their consent; the arbitrary seizure of thickly populated lands for professed selfish or unselfish purposes; the attempt to enforce unfounded sovereignty by military power; the murdering of thousands of human beings because they are inspired with the republican virtue of desiring their independence; all this—or what we are now doing in the Philippines—is imperialism.

The spirit of true republicanism should engender a deep realization of the destined equality of all men in their rights and privileges—a passion of freedom for ourselves and for the whole human race as well—a conviction that men and nations of men belong to themselves and are entitled to their own untrammelled pursuit of happiness—and an eagerness to start other races on their national course with the rich blessings of full emancipation and independence.

The theory that one man, because he is whiter or stronger, has title to greater rights than another; the willingness, for glory or for profit, to hold another race in subjection; the readiness by force to exploit lands and foreign peoples; the relegation of sovereignty and of government to the arbitrament of might instead of the forum of right—this is imperialism.

LOUIS R. EHRICH.

Colorado Springs, Col., Oct. 11, 1900.

"THE SPOILIATION OF INDIA."

In the Nineteenth Century for July, 1883, Mr. J. Seymour Keay published an article entitled "The Spoliation of India." He had lived there 20 years, and, therefore, writes as an eyewitness. He backed up his statements by citing the government's own figures, taken from blue books, reports of commissions, evidence before parliamentary committees and other like sources.

He summarizes the situation by saying:

Our countrymen are ruthlessly maintaining a system of organized extortion, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit.

His article drew forth one from the celebrated Miss Florence Nightingale in the next number of the same review, in which she mournfully admits the terrible force of his arraignment and seeks to arouse the British public to a sense of its "Indian stewardship." She says:

He examines, one after another, the great departments of Indian administra-

tion; the army expenditure, the land revenue, the civil courts, the police, salt, opium and spirituous liquors, and adduces evidence to prove that the institutions we have set up are unsuited to the people of India, and that their great cost is with difficulty provided by means of excessive taxation. . . . So miserably poor are these our Indian fellow-subjects, after all these years of our rule, that 40,000,000, or, one-fifth of the whole population, go through life on insufficient food, while it is officially admitted that upward of 6,000,000 of men, women and children have died from actual starvation during the last seven years [common years, not famine years].

Then she appeals to her fellow-countrymen—

on behalf of 200,000,000 of law-abiding and inoffensive fellow-subjects, who are unrepresented and unable to help themselves or even to make their voice heard.

Writes Mr. Keay:

India is charged large sums for military depots in England and for British warships cruising in eastern waters. Sir Charles Trevelyan, testifying before a parliamentary committee, thus explained the reason: "We charge Canada, Australia, the Cape of Good Hope and the whole round of the British colonies, nothing. Why should we charge India anything? Canada or Australia would not hear of it, but India is at our mercy, and we can charge her what we like!"

The controller general of Indian accounts says: "In the Madras revenue department 109 Europeans receive more than half as much as 10,000 natives. The average salary of a native is £20 a year (\$100); the average salary of a European is £2,200 a year (\$6,000)."

Let nobody suppose that these Hindoos are underpaid because they are ignorant and incompetent. They belong to one of the most intelligent, keen-witted races in the world.

The cost of the army quartered upon India is something frightful. Mr. Keay says:

It is candidly admitted that a great part of it is unfit for active service, and has no other *raison d'être* than simply to furnish appointments for its European officers. Sir Charles Trevelyan in his testimony said: "They have more regiments than they know what to do with. They know not where to put them. They have been retained, not for any real use they are of, but owing to the embarrassment of having such a large number of European officers thrown upon the hands of the government."

The salaries and perquisites of European officers "reach the enormous total of £2,500,000 (\$12,500,000) yearly."

Here is the case in a nutshell, as put by Mr. Keay:

A law-abiding people, who, under a simple government, would need but a very small army to preserve order, are heavily taxed to support two costly armies to watch each other, that they may furnish appointments for their European officers; the taxation produces discontent; the discontent necessitates a large army; the large army requires more European officers; this necessitates further taxation; this requires a larger army and more European officers to suppress

increased discontent. The nearer the people arrive to despair the more of their slender resources is demanded by their European masters.

Mr. Keay continues:

These people are getting poorer every year, instead of richer. Yet we have steadily increased their taxation in the last 40 years from £19,000,000 (\$95,000,000) to £50,000,000 (\$250,000,000) annually. Lord Lawrence (he whose monument bore the simple epitaph: "He tried to do his duty"), after 32 years' experience of India, testified before the finance committee: "The mass of the people in India are so miserably poor that they have barely the means of subsistence. It is as much as a man can do to feed his family, or half feed them."

The average income of the people of England is £32 (\$160) per head. The average income of the people of India is £2 (\$10) per head, of which wretched pittance we extort 6s (\$1.50) as taxation. In India none are exempt from grinding labor. The expectant mother works among the rice or sugar cane as long as she possibly can; the nursing mother carries her infant with her to the fields and lays it down close at hand on a mat or in a hollow tree.

In spite of the poverty of the people, small hesitation has ever been felt as to the means of satisfying the horseleech cravings of the Indian government.

Government officials must be compensated on a scale of princely magnificence. The viceroy, Lord Curzon, who has donated \$3,000 to the famine fund; is paid \$125,000, just two and a half times as much as the president of the richest republic in the world. The other officials on the civil list are maintained on the same sumptuous scale out of the taxes.

One contrivance for raising tribute is the salt tax. It is a government monopoly, guarded by the most stringent penal enactments. By this means the government, says Mr. Keay,

succeeds in levying a tax of about 3,000 per cent. upon the value of all the salt consumed by 250,000,000 of people. They compel the poorest class to pay them no less than two shillings and sixpence (about 62 cents) for every pennyworth of salt.

This monopoly is guarded with exemplary severity. A member of the Madras civil service tells this story:

A laborer in Madras built himself a hut. He found the earth floor strongly impregnated with saline particles. He scraped up some of the dirt, separated the parts as well as he could, and put the salt he had collected outside to dry. This was observed by a revenue collector, and the man was proceeded against. He was imprisoned and was condemned to receive some lashes.

Mr. Keay tells of a case which came under his own observation. A wretched peasant had stealthily hollowed a little basin on a desolate piece of seashore by scooping out the mud with his hands. He tended it at night, letting in sea water, which the hot sun quickly evaporated. In three or four days a thin crust of salt was formed.