

your deportation and he sees fit to remit your sentence, will you promise that in the future you will never write articles of a similar character against any officer of the military?

R.—No, sir. I hold the right to publish anything anywhere and whenever I have proof of my statements.

C.—Your case is hopeless.

Crowder thereupon turned Rice over to the provost marshal, who placed him in solitary confinement on the 23d of January, where he remained until the 27th, when he was sent under guard to the United States transport Pennsylvania, which sailed for San Francisco the next day. Rice's experience is an enlightening example of the actual workings of American imperialism.

#### IMPERIALISM.

In the heat of the presidential campaign pure partisanship held such resistless sway that hundreds of thousands of American voters who in their hearts would abhor the degradation of the republic, closed their eyes to the signs and their ears to the warnings of a political current that is carrying us on with majestic sweep from republic to empire. Possibly they may look and listen now.

When in that political conflict they were told that McKinley's reelection would be regarded as a popular indorsement of his imperial policy, their prompt response turned upon the point of the necessity to empire of having an emperor. Because they felt not only that McKinley would not and could not make himself an emperor, but that no emperor at all would be tolerated by the American people, they were confident that the cry of "imperialism" was a mere campaign slogan.

But it is possible to have an empire without an emperor. It is possible to set up imperialism without any of its trappings. That is in fact the usual way.

When Rome passed from republic to empire the name of king held the detested place in the Roman mind that both king and emperor hold in the American. Baldly to have proposed a king would have been as fatal to Roman imperialism then, as baldly to propose an emperor would

be to American imperialism now. To thrice refuse the kingly crown, whether sincere or not, was the best of Roman politics. Yet the Roman republic was strangled by the Roman empire, and there was no king. The title of "imperator," which the Caesars adopted, was but a common expression of republican authority, as innocent then as "manager" would be now.

Nor could anyone at that time have told where and when the republic ended and the empire began. The transition was effected by a series of departures from old standards and old ideals, each of which commended itself to superficial observation as being in the interest of the republic. No imperial policy was deliberately proposed. Probably none was dreamed of even by the imperialists themselves. But more or less unconsciously they turned the current of events toward imperialism. We know how the current of a great river in the bottoms may be turned by small cuttings into the bank at a bend. The analogy holds true to Roman history. In times of stress masterful ambitions prevailed in the settlement of temporary issues, until at last an imperial current had broken through the republican banks at a bend and torn out a channel for itself. There was no conscious setting up of an empire to take the place of the republic.

It is always so. When a people are about to pass from freedom to tyranny, nobody shouts from the house tops: "Hurrah boys, let's change our freedom for tyranny!" Probably nobody desires the change, and only a few realize the tendency. What really happens is this: Things that really make for empire, but which are supposed to be desirable in themselves, are done regardless of where they may lead on to; and one step following another, the time comes when succeeding generations are awakened by sore experience to the fact that the freedom their fathers had is gone. Says James Bryce, "the greatest changes are often those introduced with the least notion of their consequence, and the most fatal those which encounter least resistance."

The history of republics furnishes a never-failing admonition to us that

our republic may pass into empire without exciting alarm by any of those outward indications with which securely established empires advertise their power. The price of liberty is now, as it always has been and always must be, eternal vigilance.

The essential characteristic of empire, in the objectionable sense of the term, is absolutism.

Whether absolute power be administered benevolently, makes no difference. The evil is in the power itself; not in the nature or manner of its administration. Benevolent absolutism is, indeed, the most fruitful seed of tyranny. Let absolutism begin malignantly, and a people accustomed to freedom will recognize it for what it is, and rising up in their might will put it down. But let it begin benevolently, and by the time the people see and feel the tyranny which is as natural to every species of absolutism as plums to a plum tree, they will be powerless to resist its aggressions. The little finger of a small standing army will then be stronger than the loins of the unorganized masses.

Neither is it important whether absolute power be centered in one man or in several. An empire ruled by an emperor, a Caesar, a king, a boss, a tsar, a sultan, or whatever other title he may adopt, is not more intolerable than one ruled by an oligarchy.

The true distinction, the only test distinction, turns not upon the number of despots or their benevolence, but upon the question of self-government or superimposed government. Whatever may be the titles of its administrators, the government that is at all times responsible to the people governed is a free government; the government that governs without responsibility to the governed is imperial.

What made Rome a terrible empire was, at first, not despotism at home. So far as the heavy hand of tyrannical government concerned him, the Roman citizen was long as free under the empire as under the republic. As between citizens, we are told that there was under the empire a strict observance of justice,

and that for the protection of Roman citizens abroad the whole power of the empire was on call. But there was utter contempt for the rights of other peoples.

Long before she was known as an empire, while republican forms were unaltered and the republican spirit still seemed vital, Rome had set out to be a world power. In this ambition for universal dominion, she succeeded; and as her sway extended she established colonies. They were of two sorts, "senatorial" and "imperial." The latter were governed absolutely from Rome, being colonies in which the "inferior" and subjugated peoples would have been dominant but for the armies of the empire that were quartered upon them; and though the former were self-governing to a degree, that was because through Roman immigration and other causes they had become submissive to the mistress whose decrees went forth from the banks of the Tiber. Superimposing her imperial government upon all, Rome held no relation whatever of responsibility to the governed in her colonies.

England has in modern times followed the ancient Roman example. Like Rome, she protects her citizens abroad with the ferocity of a she-bear defending a litter of cubs. But "inferior" peoples have no rights, as peoples, that she feels bound to respect. Again like Rome, she aspires to rule the world. In this she has been more successful than any other modern nation. Around the globe her drums alone beat a continuous reveille. And in imitation of Rome she has subjugated "inferior" peoples and attached them to her empire as colonies. Where the "inferior" peoples are in the ascendant her colonies are "crown" colonies, which correspond to the "imperial" colonies of Rome; but as the superior Anglo-Saxon immigrant secures dominion over the natives, privileges of self-government are extended and the colonies rise to the dignity of what Rome knew as colonies of the "senatorial" class.

Some of these have achieved a certain power of self-government which precludes England from holding them to her empire by arbitrary ties. Their devotion to the mother country

is no longer one of imperial power emanating from Westminster hall; it is one of imperial sentiment fostered within the colonies themselves—within the nations rather, for in all but name and international recognition the provinces of the Canadian dominion and the states of the Australian federation are independent units in the category of Anglo-Saxon sovereignties. They are essentially less the colonial dependencies of England than her military allies.

And it might almost be said that our own federal republic is becoming part of this allied group. It is at any rate following England's lead. Once a collection of British colonies, it made a successful struggle for independence, but after more than a century of bitterness toward Great Britain is now falling into line with her for an epoch of Anglo-Saxon empire.

That is the outward form that American imperialism is assuming. With an "understanding between statesmen," as Mr. Joseph Chamberlain phrased it, a preliminary understanding between British tory and American republican statesmen that has since become all too evident, the American republic has been projected upon the same career of colonial empire that Great Britain copied from Rome.

Already she has set up one "senatorial" or "self-governing" colony, in Puerto Rico, and an "imperial" or "crown" colony, in the Philippines; and over the latter her president now possesses legislative, executive and judicial powers that are absolutely without limit either as to extent or duration. Receding from her traditional policy of government by consent, she is thus following the British lead and developing a system of colonial government without responsibility to the governed.

Looking backward over the history of the past three years, we can identify the beginning of this career of colonial imperialism with the American naval victory in Manila bay. That event seems to have generated the ambition at the white house which has resulted thus far in investing the American president with more autocratic power over 10,000,000 Filipinos than is possessed

over anybody by any other civilized potentate on earth. The first published indications of this ambition appeared in the Washington correspondence of the Manchester (England) Guardian of Wednesday, May 11, 1898, page 9, being credited to Senator Hanna, the president's political and personal friend and confidant. According to this report Mr. Hanna said:

The president realizes, as we all realize, that the problem presented by the capture of the Philippines is the most important and most serious that confronts the administration and the country. To say what we will do is impossible at this time, but this much has been determined upon. We will take possession of the islands first, and discuss the disposition of them afterwards. Some sentimentalists seem imbued with the idea that we are going to give the islands back to Spain. It seems there is no probability of that. To retain them will, as the English newspapers have pointed out, necessitate a departure from the traditions of our government. Of course such a step is not to be taken hastily. In cursory talk among republican leaders I find that there seems to be very little opposition, except on the idea that some day our system of statehood might be extended to these outlying territories. I think nobody has any idea of doing that. When the time comes our policy will be made clear, to the effect that statehood is to be restricted to the present limits of our nation, and is not to be extended to territory separated from the country, even when it is so close as Cuba. All these details can be settled when the time comes. It seems to me, and must be clear to everybody, that the United States are entering upon one of the most important crises of their existence.

In the light of subsequent events those words from Mr. Hanna indicate either that our imperial plans had already been formulated, or that he is the most remarkable prophet in history. Although this programme was outlined by Mr. Hanna within a fortnight of the Dewey victory, and before we had set foot upon Philippine soil, everything has been done in precise accordance with it.

The peace commission was instructed by the president to insist upon purchasing the whole archipelago. The native government which, under the leadership of Aguinaldo, had acquired authority over all the civilized regions and driven the Spanish into Manila, was remorse-

lessly assailed and finally destroyed by the president's orders. Congress, under white house pressure, has invested the president with unlimited power over the islands. And a crown colony system there is now being set up.

We are thus superimposing upon that people a government which holds no relationship of responsibility to them. That is the imperialism of Rome. It is the imperialism of Great Britain. And it necessitates, as Mr. Hanna truly said it must, "a departure from the traditions of our government."

In the same interview Mr. Hanna hinted at that Anglo-Saxon imperialism of which this American departure from American traditions is part, as we have indicated above. He said:

We are on the eve of an alliance of the English speaking peoples of the world, which is bound to bring forth great results. I believe that this is inevitable.

Is it reasonable to suppose that in this interview Mr. Hanna was merely ruminating aloud? Is it not much more reasonable to infer that his expressed expectation of an Anglo-Saxon alliance points to one of the elements of that "understanding between statesmen" to which Mr. Chamberlain subsequently alluded when he asserted that in this informal manner an alliance actually existed between Great Britain and the United States? And is not that inference confirmed by the friendly attitude of the authorities of each country toward the aggressions of the other? British Tories applaud our invasion and subjugation of the land of the Filipinos, while American republicans palliate the British invasion of the land of the South African Boers.

That is the imperialism that is engulfing us—an imperialism in which the English-speaking peoples unite in a general policy for the conquest and subjugation of "inferior" peoples.

For a defense, the advocates of this policy are driven to appeal to the stern decrees of Fate. "Destiny determines duty," said Mr. McKinley, with the air of a Christian but the inspiration of a fatalistic pagan.

There is no other appeal. Tried

by the Christian standards of justice, or their corollaries the democratic standards of equality, this whole imperialistic programme must be put aside. By every principle of Christian government, it is a wicked assumption for any nation or any race to esteem itself "superior" in such a manner as to have a commission to superimpose its authority upon "inferiors," for the regulation of their domestic affairs. This assumption derives all the plausibility it has from the fact that the self-styled superior peoples have superior force, and from nothing else. We are able to superimpose our authority upon inferior peoples not because we are superior in any of the things that go to make men morally better or socially more useful, but solely because we are superior in the manipulation of coercive agencies. We are better than they "because we can lick 'em," as a rough and ready imperialist has put it. Reduced to its last analysis, then, the pretense that superior peoples have the moral right to superimpose their authority upon inferior peoples is a mere euphemism for the brutal proposition that the stronger have the moral right to subjugate the weaker.

That proposition is no truer of peoples than of individuals. If "superior" peoples have a right to govern "inferior" peoples, then it must be that "superior" individuals have the right to govern "inferior" individuals. And in the one case as in the other, the ultimate test of superiority must be superiority of physical power.

Our imperialists are entitled to full credit for consistency on this point. They do maintain, with more or less caution according to circumstances and their own disposition to be discreet, that the "inferior" members of a community should be governed by the "superior." This is what imperialism must ultimately and logically lead to. We cannot build up a system of imperialism for "inferior" peoples in Asia without sooner or later allowing our traditions of equal rights to be torn down at home.

This notion that the "better"

classes should govern will not bear the slightest investigation. "Government by the best" has a seductive sound, but there is no substance to the conception. There is no way of picking out the best.

Education is not a test. Some of the best educated men are the most accomplished knaves, and others are the most consummate fools.

Property is no test. All have heard of the man in Rhode Island who, having been allowed to vote one year because he owned a jackass equal in value to the property qualification, but being denied the right the next year because his "property qualification" had meanwhile died, innocently asked which had really voted the first year, himself or the jackass. This old-time anecdote probes the absurdity of the property qualification to the core.

There might be a society, to be sure, in which property qualifications could offer a reasonable test of special fitness to participate in government. If everybody's wealth were the measure of his usefulness—if, that is, he could accumulate only in proportion to what he earns—his wealth would be some sort of index to the degree of his intelligence, sanity, civic loyalty, thrift, and so on. But we have no such society. The amount of a man's wealth to-day is as a rule an index only to his degree of cupidity, and of his shrewdness in playing in a predatory game.

Similar objections apply to every other test. To determine who shall administer government only two effective ways can be conceived. One is to leave the decision to the governed; the other is to resort to force. "Government by the best," as distinguished from government by the governed, is nothing when examined but a discreetly phrased synonym for government by the strongest. It is the same concept with reference to local government as imperialism with reference to colonial government. And to a realization of this concept the American people will surely come if they allow the current of imperialistic tendencies, now daily gathering force, to get beyond their control.

Any discussion of imperialistic

tendencies would be incomplete without some reference to the influence in promoting them of the belief that by this means civilization is spread over the world.

That the feeling that imperialism, conquest, subjugation, or by whatever term one may choose to distinguish the policy of government of "inferior" by "superior" peoples, does extend civilization contributes largely to its acceptance, we are well assured. Nor do we doubt that in this feeling there is the germ of a true conception of progress. Why then should we oppose imperialism? Why not encourage the extension of superior civilization, even by means of conquest and slaughter?

If for no other reason, for the simple one that all the possible benefits of imperialism in this and every other respect can be secured in greater degree without it. The great promoter of true civilization is not military conquest. It is not conquest of any kind by means of force. The great promoter of civilization is trade. Not the trade that is said to follow the flag. Not the trade that consists in exporting without importing. Not any kind of strangulated trade. But free trade.

Left to itself, in obedience to a natural law as obvious and persistent as it is beneficent, trade penetrates from every center into every nook and corner and cranny of the inhabited globe. And as it extends, it carries with it a knowledge of the best customs and the best ideals, as well as the best goods, that the world has to offer the world. And with knowledge of what is best, comes voluntary selection of the best. Thus the best in all things conquers when trade is free to stimulate peaceful intercourse and exchange.

But this natural and peaceful and serviceable conquest of inferiors by superiors is artfully checked. With deceptive phrases about protecting trade, trade is obstructed. Nor are the "inferior" peoples the great sinners in this particular. They always give the warmest welcome to foreigners until they find that foreigners are bent upon plunder. China, for instance, did not shut herself in commercially for commercial reasons. It was because the civilized barbarian

began to lord it over her. We must turn for the worst attacks upon freedom of trade, to the statutes of civilized countries, including our own. The extent to which the spread of civilization is prevented by the deliberate policies of checking trade, can only be conjectured. But it is certain that if conquest, subjugation, imperialism, contributes at all to the spread of civilization, it does so only in so far as it breaks down the barriers to trade that our barbarous protection policies set up.

Let us drop our policy of obstructing trade, let us make bargaining as free as breathing, let us hold out this policy as an example of civilized ideals—let us do these things, and long before imperialism could slaughter enough crown colony natives to make the survivors tractable, peaceful trade will carry what is best in our civilization to the uttermost parts of the earth; and what may prove to be of more moment, will bring to us what is best in civilizations that we in our ignorant pride hold in contempt as "inferior."

By this means, too, we should make alliances for peace instead of alliances for war.

There have been dreams of annexing Canada to the United States. But Canada could be more firmly annexed by free trade than by political bonds. It is not the political federation of our states that benefits them as units in the American union; it is the free trade which that union maintains between them. Abolish our domestic trade-freedom, and there would be chaos here though the political union were preserved. Abolish the political union but preserve the trade-freedom and we should hardly be conscious of the change. Free trade between the states is the real substance of the American union. This is the alliance that makes the states one.

Such an alliance would unite us to Canada, to Australia, to New Zealand, to Great Britain, to all the civilized and all the uncivilized peoples of the world, in bonds of perpetual friendship and mutual service. It would not require annexation. It would not require subjugation. It would not require even treaties. Nothing is necessary but to abolish the trade

barriers which we ourselves have erected and maintain.

It is highly significant that this normal method of extending civilization, this Christian kind of alliance, finds no favor in the minds of imperialists. The more ardent they are for extending trade at the point of the sword the more determined are they to suppress trade by protection statutes. Though they are solicitous for military alliances, they are fearful of trade friendships. When in this country we were pleading for free trade and friendship with England, we were taught to hate the English. But now that England offers us a barbaric imperial alliance for the subjugation of inferior races, the same teachers tell us of the masterful character and the glorious future of Anglo-Saxon dominion. And to give moral color to the infamy they discourse upon the duty of extending civilization.

If it is civilization that we wish to spread, if the progress of the world is our object, we have only to become universal free traders instead of imperialistic free booters. Here is the choice. Free trade with the olive branch of peace and the horn of general plenty, or imperialism with the destructive implements and the demoralizing influences of war.

Which shall it be?

## NEWS

Alarm over the Russian occupation of Manchuria, the circumstances of which we reported last week, has been superseded for the moment by excitement over the lining up at Tientsin of a British against a Russian force of troops. The Russians claim a territorial concession at Tientsin from the Chinese government, which, about the middle of the month, was entered by British railroad builders for the purpose of constructing a siding. The Russian military authorities ordered them off. The British military authorities, with a force at this point outnumbering the Russians ten to one, ordered the construction to proceed. Thereupon both parties entrenched, within 50 yards of each other, the British flying their flag over ground claimed by the Russians, after having removed the Russian flag. Gen. Waldersee, the German commander of the allied forces in China, made