

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 untrammled 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.

He scraped it up and started for his home with his prize. A revenue officer stopped him at the door, seized his salt, and ordered him into confinement. Wild with disappointment, he resisted the officer. As a consequence, he got five years' penal servitude.—Wm. H. Johnson, in Boston Globe of July 15.

THE BIBLE AND CIVILIZATION.

Extract from a sermon preached in St. James' Episcopal Church, Greenville, Mass., Sept. 30th, by Rev. Quincy Ewing, from the text, Judges iv, 17-22.

There is no telling to what an extent the civilization of the world has been retarded by that false view of the Bible common among Christian people, which has prevented them from seeing in their true light acts like that of Jael, the murderess; which has made it seem to them necessary for the sake of the Christian religion to defend, and attempt to justify, any and every sort of crime that appeared to have the sanction of some Biblical writer. It is simply awful to think how many times, and through what centuries, the consciences of children may have been dwarfed, or blunted, by parents or Sunday school teachers, who have thought it their duty to justify to the young minds any meanness or wrong or crime set down in the Bible, provided such meanness or wrong or crime was done by a Biblical saint, or ministered in some way to the advancement of the people who considered themselves "God's Chosen." And if a child's conscience is not permanently dwarfed or blunted, what positive moral principle can possibly be implanted in the childish mind by parent or teacher, who insists, for example, on a thorough learning of the Ten Commandments—not omitting the Sixth: "Thou shalt do no murder"—and in the next breath tells the child that Jael did a righteous act when she murdered Sisera! Moral agnosticism, if nothing worse, might naturally be expected to follow such teaching. There is very great likelihood that something worse does follow it; likelihood verging close upon certainty.

Let me illustrate: You have seen to it that your ten or twelve-year-old son has gotten careful religious instruction, either at your side or in the Sunday school. He knows, of course, the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. He is familiar with the Sermon on the Mount. You encourage him to read the Bible. Well, one day his conscience revolts, his boyish instinct for fair play is

shocked, when he opens his Bible at the fourth chapter of Judges and reads about the treacherous murder of the Canaanite general. He comes to you with his trouble, and wants to know what you think of that murder, what your opinion is of Jael. What would you say to him?

Why, supposing you shared the common opinion, that it is irreligious to condemn anything a Biblical writer commends, you would have to tell him that Jael did a good deed when she murdered Sisera, and go on to explain that it was a good deed, because Sisera was a powerful enemy of the chosen people of God; because, had he lived, he would have been a constant menace to their safety; because he was not a worshiper of the true God, but an idolater, and the welfare of the worshipers of the true God depended upon all idolaters being rooted out of the land. Perhaps, and very naturally, you would add, that God inspired Jael to do what she did—invite Sisera into her tent, cover him with a mantle, give him drink, nurse him to sleep—and then murder him!

Now, in such a case, what would be the almost inevitable effect upon your boy's character, upon his moral vision, supposing he accepted your teaching, and grew to manhood without outgrowing it? Why, this of course: His character would be Jesuitized, his moral vision would be Jesuitized. He learned from what he was taught to look upon as the sacreddest of all books, with your approval, your positive, explicit sanction, that evil might be done to bring about good; that the most treacherous and foul murder was pleasing to God, if it served to make way with an enemy of His chosen people and His true religion. What then would prevent that boy become a man from doing evil himself that good might result, and comforting himself—making himself feel good—with a sense of the Divine approval?

What would prevent him, for example, if he was a pious church member, from swindling "sinners," unbelievers, heretics, in order to get the wherewithal to contribute more largely to his church's support, or to swell some missionary fund to convert the wicked heathen? What would prevent him, having concluded—as of course he would—that he was one of God's chosen people, from committing any sort of crime against an alien people, or member of an alien race, in the name of God—contending

that it was God's will for His people to succeed, to go forward, and for other people to fail, to fall by the wayside, in the struggle for existence; and that His chosen race would be recreant to Duty and Destiny, if they did not sometime grow fat in all green fields of earth—fertilized by the blood and the bone dust of peoples wearing darker skins and serving "other gods!"

Teach your boy that once upon a time God inspired murder to hold down one race of people and help forward another; and you are preparing him to commit himself, some day, or to give his sanction to, any crime which might be defended with the plea, that it was necessary, in order to keep the line sharp and clear between the superiority of his race and the inferiority of some other. You are preparing him to be able to enter the legislature and write statutes defining murder, fixing the penalty therefor, and describing the only legal mode of executing it; and to be at the same time perfectly capable of ignoring those statutes, brushing them aside, and getting up a lynching party to torture to death some fellow-citizen of an "inferior" race for an alleged crime, which, if proven, would mean simply a short term in the state prison for a member of his own race.

Very probably the miserable murderers who broke open the jail down in Tangipahoa Parish, La., a few nights ago, and, among 12 black men suspected of burglary picked out four that they, the mob—the calm, wise, majestic mob—deemed most likely to be guilty, and dragged them out and hanged them; very probably those cowardly murderers, or some of them, were taught in their youth that Jael did a good piece of work, when she inveigled Sisera into her tent and drove the nail through his temples!

Teach your boys and girls that the Bible is everywhere throughout the word of God; that God inspired crime, or sanctioned crime, in order to hold up one religion and pull down another, or in order to advance one race of people and destroy another; teach your boys and girls that; fix it firm in their brains, plant it deep in their hearts—and they may live through a long life and never become legal criminals; they may never have to answer to the indictment of a grand jury; but the probability, I might almost say certainty, is, that they will go through life Moral Criminals—cherishing sentiments, instincts, ideas, that are the very essence of criminality!