

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

by a unanimous vote—to our “Asamblea,” or house of representatives. It is true that certain Filipinos, within the sphere and under the domination of the American forces, have professed being favorable to American rule. Though I do not approve it, I can quite understand their attitude. When the British troops entered Bloemfontein many of the Free Staters professed being favorable to British supremacy. But whatever may be the rights or the wrongs of the Anglo-Boer dispute. I am quite sure that those Free Staters would much prefer Boer supremacy. The Filipinos in and around Manila are in precisely the same position as are the Free Staters in and around Bloemfontein. Take your army from the Philippines and you will soon discover whether the Filipinos are in favor of American rule! It is also true that, on payment of certain emoluments by America, the sultan of Sulu has agreed to submit to American rule. I do not wish to say anything unkind about the sultan, but I am of the opinion that he was not entirely a free-will agent in the matter, and that his submission does not necessarily mean the submission of the people over whom he exercises a somewhat doubtful sway. At the time of the American revolution were there no colonists who professed being favorable to English rule? Your great liberty-loving country will hardly be proud of purchased loyalty. Much has been made of the supposed favor with which some Filipinos are said to regard the prospect of American rule in the Philippines. But as a matter of fact there is an overwhelming majority of our people in favor of Filipino rule. If you doubt the truth of this statement; if you still honestly believe that the Filipinos are in favor of American rule, let a plebiscite be taken on the question. Let it be conducted fairly and free from any threat of the sword of either Gen. MacArthur or Gen. Aguinaldo. Let chosen representatives of both parties superintend the voting which should be by ballot. You will find yourselves outvoted by a hundred to one even in the city of Manila. I cannot give you any formal pledge, but I firmly believe that Aguinaldo and all the Filipinos would be prepared to abide by the result of such a plebiscite. If your administration will also agree to abide by the result, the Filipinos will bear half of the incidental expenses. On behalf of the Filipinos I challenge you to put your contentions to this test. One of the first principles of republicanism is that the will of the people, expressed through the ballot, shall be supreme. Are the Filipinos—the

“savages,” as some of your illustrious colleagues have defined us to be—the pleaders for, and you the deniers of, the application of this principle?

To the second part of your question as to whether there will be any opposition to Aguinaldo's government, the reply is that we have never been foolish enough to imagine that any arrangement in this world would be free from opposition. Is there no opposition to President McKinley's government? Do you fondly imagine that, if your administration ever succeeds by force of arms in establishing a government in the Philippines, there will be no opposition to it? Undoubtedly there will be opposition—healthy opposition—to any government established in our country. But the opposition will not be between the so-called “tribes.” Your question implies that if there is opposition to Aguinaldo's government there will also be revolutions and other conflicts. If our government ever became unjust or corrupt; if it refused to admit that its “just powers of government were derived solely from the consent of the governed;” if it sought to thrust its will upon an unwilling people, it would deserve to be, and would no doubt be, subject to revolution. But even just and righteous governments are not always exempt from such dangers. Will any high-minded American declare that the government of President Lincoln was unjust or corrupt? Yet against it was directed the greatest revolution known in the history of the world. Your question also implies that if we ever had a civil war in our country the event would prove that we are incapable of self-government. What, then, did the civil war in America prove? Every country in the civilized world has had its revolutions and its civil wars. Revolution has been the means by which tyrants and dictators have been dethroned. America will never rule the Philippines without becoming a dictator. Give us complete franchise and the power which justly belongs thereto, and we will declare ourselves independent of America. Deny us the franchise and you will become a dictator. Under such dictatorship there will be not only “opposition,” but also an absolute certainty, sooner or later, of “revolutions and other conflicts.” If you sincerely desire the pacification of our country, leave us to ourselves. Protect us, if you will, from foreign aggression, and earn not only the gratitude of our people, but also the grandest title of which a nation can boast—the title of liberator and defender of those who struggle for national life.

Your question further implies that if Aguinaldo were removed from the sphere of operations the Filipinos would be left like sheep without a shepherd. We have every confidence in President Aguinaldo. He is the object of our highest esteem and admiration. We are prepared to follow him as long as he pursues, as he has hitherto pursued, a policy of righteousness and justice. But if, through unforeseen misfortune, he should be removed from our midst, we have other men able and willing to lead our people. Though we gratefully recognize his splendid services to our people; though we believe that he is a bory leader of men, our national existence no more depends upon Aguinaldo than does the existence of the American nation depend upon President McKinley. You have evidently taken the splendid unanimity which our people have shown toward their chosen leader as an evidence that there is only one who is capable of leading. If our people had been divided into factions or “tribes” with a multiplicity of leaders, perhaps we should have been credited with the possession of many capable men! *Verbum sat sapienti.*

THE HISTORY OF THE “CONSENT” DOCTRINE.

It is an intellectual pleasure to examine from the standpoint of history and fact the statements by which Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott's Outlook justifies itself in throwing the political philosophy of the declaration of independence into the lumber room of exploded theories. In the Outlook's recent article on the “Basis of Government” it was stated:

History abundantly . . . disposes of the sentiment borrowed from Rousseau that just governments rest upon the consent of the governed. The rest of the philosophy of Rousseau has long since been abandoned by thoughtful men; the imagined history on which he based it has long since been disproved by scholarly research. This relic of an exploded philosophy is no better worthy of our reverence because it is found inserted in a parenthesis in the Declaration of Independence. . . . Just governments rest on conformity with the laws of God. “The seat of law,” says Hooker, “is in the bosom of Almighty God.”

There are four affirmations, direct or implied, in this short paragraph, which may be considered in this order:

1. That, according to Hooker, the seat of law, or the basis of government, is in God.
2. That Jefferson borrowed the doctrine of the “consent of the governed” from Rousseau, who was the author of it.
3. That Rousseau's philosophy as a