

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

whole has been abandoned by thoughtful men—not some thoughtful men, but all men who can be esteemed thoughtful.

4, That the "consent" doctrine is now without support in reason, science or the authority of thoughtful men.

While regarding Dr. Lyman Abbott and his paper with great respect, the Republican will undertake to show that every one of those affirmations is a piece of misrepresentation, due either to ignorance or to partisan zeal in behalf of the policies of the present administration.

The Outlook only half quotes Hooker. Let us quote that philosopher, who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, more fully. In his "Ecclesiastical Polity" (book 1, paragraph 4), Hooker wrote:

The lawful power of making laws to command whole political societies of men belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind soever upon earth to exercise the same of himself, and not by express commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by authority derived at first from their consent upon whose person they impose laws, it is no other than mere tyranny. Laws they are not, therefore, which public approbation hath not made so.

The Outlook refers to Hooker, who is far more of an "oldtimer," by the way, than Rousseau or Thomas Jefferson, for authority to support its doctrine that governments rest upon the "laws of God." Yet in that passage from the "Ecclesiastical Polity" Hooker not only gave equal weight to the doctrine of "consent," but in the last sentence he leaned clear over to the "consent" doctrine, as, on the whole, the preferable. For in that sentence he says that those are not laws which have not received the approbation, that is, the consent, of the people.

This remarkable passage from Hooker also reveals the falsity of the Outlook's affirmations, or assumptions, that the "consent" class of the declaration of independence was "borrowed from Rousseau," and that Rousseau was the original author of it. Just why all the American assailants of the declaration, in these days, should credit the "consent" doctrine to Rousseau, and to Rousseau alone, is a mystery, unless they think to heap odium upon the doctrine because of Rousseau's influence upon the French revolution, which was stained by some terrible excesses and failures in its early days. The editor of the Outlook, at least, ought to know better, for so learned a person ought

to be included in the very few mentioned by President Hadley, of Yale university, in his article in the August number of the Atlantic Monthly, where he writes:

Everyone knows that Aristotle divided governments into monarchy, aristocracy and democracy; very few know that Aristotle said that there was a more fundamental division of governments into those which were legitimate and those which were not, the former being based on the consent of the governed and acting in the interest of the whole, while the latter were based on the authority of a class and exercised in the interests of that class.

Aristotle lived even before Hooker; in fact, he died 322 years before Christ.

The history of this idea, which has so profoundly influenced human life, and is sure to exercise a prodigious influence in the future of the world, is highly interesting. It did not originate with Jefferson; nor did it originate with Rousseau. In writing of the development of the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which embraces the "consent" doctrine, Prof. William Graham, of the department of jurisprudence at Queen's college, Belfast, in his valuable work on "English Political Philosophy," published this year, declares:

Hooker . . . lays down in clear and express terms the future whig doctrine of Locke, which was subsequently developed by Rousseau into the destructive democracy and direct sovereignty of the people as manifested from 1789 to 1793.

Locke died before Rousseau was born. Read what Locke says about taxation, and you will find the "consent of the governed" doctrine squarely affirmed and vindicated; and taxation was the chief issue underlying the American revolution. According to Locke, they (the people)

could alter the incidence of the (legislative) power, confer more on one estate in parliament than the other, could revive the partial despotism of the Tudors, as under Henry VIII.; of an oligarchy, as during the eighteenth century; or maintain it all in the last resort in the house of commons, as they do at present. (Quoted from Graham.)

It is well known that the Frenchman, Rousseau, was a careful student of the Englishman Locke, and, says Prof. Graham, Locke's "chief conclusions were reproduced and pushed to their extreme logical limit" in Rousseau's "famous 'Contrat Social,' which supplied the groundwork of the French constitution of 1791." And Prof. Graham adds:

Other democratic constitutions have been framed in modern times, particularly in the new-formed American states, on something of the lines of the "Contrat Social," but all after Locke's time, and they may be mostly traced to his suggestions.

There is, indeed, no particular reason for thinking that the framers

of the declaration of independence were more influenced by Rousseau than by Locke. Rousseau's "Contrat Social," was not published until 1762, or only 14 years before the issuing of the declaration of independence, while the influence of Locke, the great philosophical support of English whiggism, had had fully three-quarters of a century in which to saturate the minds of the English colonists in America. There is, indeed, some internal evidence in the declaration that Jefferson was not so much under Rousseau's influence, as it is the fashion to assume. The preamble of the declaration does not say that all men are born "free and equal;" it simply says they are born equal, that is, equal before the law. But Rousseau, in the "Social Contrat," laid emphasis on the doctrine that "man is born free." If Jefferson had been largely under Rousseau's influence, why did he omit the word "free?"

The Outlook is now convicted of misrepresenting Hooker, while its affirmation that Jefferson "borrowed" his philosophy from Rousseau, who is presented as the original author of it, is seen to be wide of the truth. Its statement that Rousseau's philosophy as a whole has been "abandoned by thoughtful men" is equally ill-founded. No one can abandon Rousseau's philosophy as a whole without repudiating the fact that sovereignty of the people was Rousseau's cardinal idea, and the governments of Great Britain, France and the United States rest upon it to-day. Rousseau's idea of an original social compact, which he borrowed from Locke, and which Locke borrowed from Hobbes, is now clearly seen to have no historical basis, but there is no justification for throwing overboard the whole of Rousseau's philosophy because his idea of the origins of governments cannot be historically demonstrated, or made to seem reasonable in the light of science. Prof. Graham, who as an Englishman has no sentimental attachment to the French philosopher, and who, of course, rejects the old social compact theory, now sums up Rousseau with evident justice, in writing:

In spite of the first grand failure, the terrible results of its brief triumph (in the excesses of the French revolution), the doctrine of Rousseau and of the sovereignty of the people has largely conquered in the foremost nations; in England, France and the United States, in the English colonies, and partly in those countries where the king or monarch has granted constitutions. Moreover, a great thinker, like Kant, writing in 1796, sees a truth in the doctrine which he tries to detach, in his "Philosophy

of Right." He even declares that government by the collective or general will is the doctrine of the future.

The Outlook's implied claim that the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" is now without support in reason, science or the authority of thoughtful men to-day, is as false as its other assertions on this question. Prof. Graham is a thoughtful man, and so is Prof. W. E. H. Lecky, and both are Englishmen with no sentiment for Thomas Jefferson. Prof. Graham, in his chapter on Locke, expresses his own opinion as follows:

But though there is no proof that governments began in this way, most of them having had their origin in conquest, it is true that unless they finally rest on the unforced and willing consent or agreement of the people or the majority, they are not free governments.

Presumably the Outlook believes in free governments. Prof. Lecky, in his "Democracy and Liberty" (volume 1, page 479), says:

The best, the truest, the most solid basis on which the peace of the civilized world can rest is the free consent of the great masses of its population to the form of government under which they live.

And Prof. Lecky is no particular friend of republics or democracy.

From the standpoint of scientific sociology, furthermore, the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" has a profound significance. As Prof. Lewis G. Janes has well said:

It is a sound political philosophy, justified by scientific sociological principles, which is enunciated in the affirmation of the Declaration of Independence, that "all just government rests on the consent of the governed." This is as true . . . of the older monarchical and aristocratic systems as it is of a democratic-republican form of government. While the evolutionary sociologist recognizes that different forms of government are adapted to varying degrees of culture and social development, he also knows that an autocracy which does not rest upon the actual consent of the governed, which finds no response in the hearts of the people, but is maintained solely by military compulsion, is a tyranny, unstable in its foundations, unadapted to its social environment, and destined to early destruction by peaceful or violent means.

The present British monarchy truly rests on the consent of the governed; if it did not, the monarchy would be destroyed. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which embraces the doctrine of consent, permits the people to set up such governments as they may think are suited to their needs. But whatever the government, popular sovereignty requires that the people shall have ultimate power over it, to modify or change it, or set up another in its place. Without the consent, or, to use Hooker's word, the "approbation" of

the people, no government can endure for any length of time. The most unstable of governments is that to which the people are opposed. Jefferson's immortal declaration is essentially correct as a matter of right and as a matter of fact, and no imperialistic movement of an American political party can throw it into oblivion.—Editorial in Springfield Republican of Oct. 11.

AFTERGLOW.

I pray that Time full many years may bring
And round about us heap his flowers and snow,
That we adown the western slope may go
Clasped hand in hand, as in that joyous spring
When first together we did learn to sing
The songs of youth beside the river's flow;
The songs our hearts unto the end shall know,
If now no more the woodlands with them ring.

And we shall sit on many a golden eve
Beside the fire and dream of other days
When we were young, and laugh a wrinkled laugh.
Nor mourn nor sigh that loud the winds do grieve,
For thou shalt more than multiply the Mays,
And I the long Decembers count by half.
—"A Valley Muse," by Chas. G. Blandin.

"But you will admit that Mr. McKinley has good intentions?" pleaded the apologizer of the administration.

"Oh, certainly; I'll concede that much," said the reformed gold democrat, "but we need more than a 'New Year's man' for our president."

G. T. E.

"A sail!" shouted the lookout.
The admiral knit his brows.
"I hope it's the enemy!" he muttered.
"I have enough powder to fight a battle, but not enough to fire a salute!"

With this he folded his arms and gloomily contemplated the horizon.—Indianapolis Journal.

Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?
For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.
—Sir John Harrington.

Teacher—Who is it that sits idly by, doing nothing, while everybody else is working?

Bobby—The teacher. — Chicago Chronicle.

Pepsey—But, surely, colonel, you did not retreat when you saw the Boers approach?"

Col. Backway—Retreat? Never! I merely retired from business.

G. T. E.

"The world is mine!" asserted the count of Monte Christo. Thus is proved

the fact that not always has this earth been in the grasp of the Standard Oil trust.
G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Eagle's Heart" (New York: D. Appleton and Company) is the latest of Hamlin Garland's characteristically rugged stories of western life. With its main setting in the cowboy country, its motive is to lay bare the heart of a Rocky Mountain outlaw whose badness is mostly external and not altogether of his own making. Garland has done some of his best work in this story. The wild country and rough-and-ready civilization through which it moves from the time the hero leaves his father's quiet parsonage and becomes a tenderfoot, passes like a picture before the reader's eyes; and the characters, of which there are several besides the hero that stand out in full relief, are instinct with life.

In "The Emancipation of the Workers" (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Price, 50 cents), Raphael Buck essays the solution of both the land question and the interest question, and thereby of the labor question. His proposition is to put all economic rent into the public treasury and lend it out to the people as capital without interest. From his general discussion it would appear that Mr. Buck imagines that private land monopoly injures labor only to the extent of the amount of the rents diverted to landlords. The consequent stimulation of land speculation, the most effective cause of labor exploitation, receives no adequate treatment. In the same connection he falls into the error of regarding economic rent as a tax upon consumers, whereas it is a premium which producers bear for advantage of place. We say that he "falls" into this error, because the error has been so often shown in economic literature to be an error, that the intelligent author who bases any reasoning upon it as if it were true, without showing with great care and clearness that after all it is no error, must be presumed to have fallen into it. And in his principal point, the abolition of interest, Mr. Buck evidently thinks of interest only as a phenomenon of borrowing and lending. If interest flows from the use of capital, and not merely from loans, his plan of abolishing it could not effect its purpose. Mr. Buck disclaims being a socialist; he is certainly not a single taxer; and his individualism is of a peculiar type, though in common with extreme individualists he recognizes society only as a loose aggregation of units in which all phenomena pertain to individuals and none of them to society as an indivisible whole.

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS

for

TEN CENTS

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.