

## CHINA AND THE PHILIPPINES.

BY THE EDITOR.

WHEN the United States requested the powers to give a definite promise of an open door policy in China, they did so mainly on the ground of abandoning all interference in Chinese politics. The Russians have taken their share of Chinese territory in Manchuria, the English dominate the Yang tse kiang valley, the Germans have taken Chiau Chow as a fair compensation for the lives of two banished Jesuits, the French and the Italians are clamoring for Chinese provinces, and so it was but natural that the United States, too, should receive their sphere of influence. This, of course, would mean the end of China and the division of its coasts among the powerful nations of the world.

To prevent this course, which does not seem very promising to either of the parties concerned—neither to China, which would be sliced up nor to the powers, for the commerce of each one would then be limited mainly to its own provinces,—Lord Beresford proposed the plan of leaving China undivided and of having its integrity guaranteed by the powers, on the promise of keeping it open to the world's trade. The United States of America pushed the plan because it is in their interest. We are not in a position to acquire more territory than has been forced on us and if we go out empty-handed, we should at least have definite and unmistakable guarantees of this open door policy; otherwise, considering future conditions and the probable expanse of our trade in the far East, it would be folly not to take part in the division. Our Chinese trade has been constantly growing, and even now our interests are not less there than those of the other European powers concerned, perhaps with the exception of England. If our business and industries are not crippled by internal strife or party legislation, our interest in Chinese trade should be steadily on the increase, and might in time surpass even that of Great Britain, for the geograph-

ical situation of America as lying between Europe and Eastern Asia is the most favorable for the purpose.

Thus, the offset which the United States are expected to pay for the pledge of the European powers to maintain in China an open-door policy in their various spheres of influence, does not consist in keeping the door open in the Philippines but in abstaining from taking part in the general spoliation of China.

Nevertheless, it would be very unfair if we, the United States advocated an open door policy for China where we actually do not have any possessions, while we would close the doors in the Philippines; and it appears to me that even if the United States were not actually pledged to follow this same open-door policy in the Philippine Islands, they would be in honor bound to pursue it as far as possible. And it is interesting to see that the United States are making arrangements for being assured of such an open door policy in China while they are anxious to preserve the Chinese wall of so-called protection that separates the United States from the rest of the civilised world. So we are willing to have the doors opened in the Philippines provided they remain shut at home.

First let us look at the question from the legal side. That the clause enjoining uniformity of all taxes and duties refers to the United States and not to dependencies which may temporarily or even permanently come into possession of the nation, has been demonstrated from a legal point of view beyond a shadow of a doubt by Mr. Roscoe C. E. Brown. The islands ceded by Spain to the United States are at present *de facto* our dependencies, whatever Congress may later on decide as to their future fate; and as such they cannot be, nor have they as yet been, treated as parts of the United States themselves.

Should the Philippines become a federal republic of the United States in such a way as we have advocated, it would by no means follow that thereby they would possess the right of regulating the import duties, harbor taxes, foreign representation, etc. None of the States of the Union exercise these rights which are specially reserved to Congress and the government of the United States. In Germany the kingdoms of Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, the Grand Duchy of Baden are independent sovereign states, and yet they do not exercise the right of regulating import duties, or of sending representatives to foreign governments.

Thus these rights might in the case of the Philippines as well be reserved to a federal commission, or be directly managed by the United States government. But it seems fair that they should

be attended to in concurrence with a commission consisting of men representing the business interests of the Islands; for after all, it seems to me desirable to allow the home government of the Philippines to regulate their own affairs, including the imposition of duties, as they see fit. We ought to allow them to regulate their own commercial relations with the outside world according to their own wishes. We call attention to the fact that the English dependencies enjoy the right of taxing the imports even of their mother country. All that can be claimed is that home government does not as yet necessarily include the regulation of import duties.

There would be another way of allowing the Philippines to be a federal republic of ours, and yet keep the door of their commerce open to the whole world, and this would be by pledging the Philippine government at its instalment and from the beginning through a constitutional clause to such a course, as a condition of receiving the recognition of the world. In a similar way Japan was pledged to an open door policy by Commodore Perry; and the Japanese themselves are agreed on the result as having been most favorable to the development of their country. An open door policy in the Philippines would mean an assurance of Philippine prosperity.