

(E) p. 17 14/16

*From Montagu White*

J. LEVINS

# THE Alleged European Coalition

AGAINST THE

## United States

DURING THE

## Spanish-American War.

---

*By T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.*

---

Reprinted from  
DONAHOE'S MAGAZINE,  
March Number.

---

Published for the AMERICAN RAAD, for the Assistance of the South African Republic.  
George W. VanSiclen, President, 141 Broadway, New York.

GAF

## THE ALLEGED EUROPEAN COALITION

AGAINST THE UNITED STATES DURING THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR.

BY T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.

During the late war and since its close, dispatches regarding England's attitude toward the United States have been constantly appearing in a large number of British and American newspapers. These dispatches were sent out with the view of creating the impression that France, Germany and Russia were ready to intervene in the interest of Spain, and were held in check only by the knowledge that England would array herself on our side in the event of such a contingency.

Acting on the theory that a lie, if told often enough, will in the end do duty for the truth, a small but noisy group of Americans are constantly referring to these statements in support of their contention that out of pure gratitude we should support England's position in South Africa, become her ally, and relieve the tension of her present isolated situation in Europe.

A great deal of maudlin sentimentality has been uttered since the beginning of this pro-British campaign in the United States, which has been anything but flattering to our national pride.

What has been the object, I ask, of this subserviency to a European power which has been always our consistent and untiring enemy? Why should American citizens be so anxious to credit England with a part in our victories during the late war,

and attribute to her moral support, the achievements of our army and navy? How insufferably truckling in spirit appear citizens who make use of a statement, branded time and again, by the highest authorities, as a falsehood, which has the effect of exhibiting their country before the world as a protected weakling.

It is my intention in this article to show that this so-called coalition was not of continental, but of English manufacture; that it found its origin in papers notoriously under the control of the British Foreign office, for the purpose of working an unscrupulous imposture upon the credulity of the American people. This fact I will prove by the unanimous voice of the Ambassadors of the Powers directly concerned, by the statement of our Secretary of State, John Hay, and also by the reiterated statements of our own Ambassadors accredited at Paris, Berlin and St. Petersburg. I will show that at no time during the war with Spain did England decline to join the other Powers in a move for intervention. I will show that no such action on the part of Great Britain ever took place, and that the impeachment of the continued friendliness of the other Powers is due to a carefully-planned conspiracy of the pro-English news agencies. At no time was there a purpose on the part of the great Powers to interpose against the United States, so that

there was never an occasion for such a demonstration of English friendship as has been so assiduously presented. The story, although very widely circulated and generally accepted as a fact, is nothing less than a pure fabrication, and for the truth of history, as well as for the removal of the groundless reflection upon the attitude of the European Powers, it should no longer be accepted as a part of the records of the war.

The Ambassadors and the other high authorities I quote do not give merely their personal opinions, but the facts learned during their visits to Paris, Berlin and St. Petersburg.

I feel that it is but simple justice to these Powers that the consistent friendship they maintained to the United States throughout every period of the war, and continue to maintain toward this Government, should not be obscured by the fiction as to the exceptional friendship of the Government of Her Britannic Majesty.

Upon the outbreak of the late war, England set to work the springs of her journalistic machinery in the European Capitals to prejudice continental opinion against the United States. At the same time, in order to fan the flame of whatever disaffection existed toward America she insidiously spread rumors of an understanding between Washington and London.

The leading correspondents at the European capitals are Englishmen, and most of the news passes through London to America. The correspondents were instructed to carefully select for transmission here the utterances of the most rabid anti-American newspapers, papers which have al-

ways had the reputation of being suspiciously close to the English Foreign Office. This journalistic campaign is an old trick of John Bull, and has been frequently worked before, but in no case so flagrantly or so successfully as during the Hispano-American war.

Every ridiculous canard cabled from London, purporting to represent Continental opinion, was published here with startling headlines, while the views of reputable newspapers were hidden away in the most obscure corner. Our papers seem to have fallen into the trap so cleverly laid, and joined with eagerness in the British campaign of palaver, buncombe, and hypocrisy.

The "Literary Digest," an impartial review of the newspapers of the world, said, upon this point, during the early stages of the war:

"Owing to the want of a direct cable, the news from America to Germany and vice versa passes through English hands, and the Germans accuse the British of making unfair use of this advantage. As for the Associated Press it is asserted that the agency supplies numberless falsehoods regarding Germany and that denials are generally ignored."

This fraud and cheat upon the public mind early showed its fruit, because continental criticisms of the United States increased in direct ratio to the wave of manufactured English emotion in our behalf.

Responsible papers in Germany and France were not inimical to the United States. During the second month of the war, cabled despatches appeared in the New York Herald which seemed to indicate that England's game was being seen through. I quote from an editorial in that paper, which was forced to admit that the

origin of continental hostility to America was mainly attributed to the British agencies. The Herald says:

"The fact is noted that England is accused of having incited the present unpleasant feeling between France and the United States, and it is curiously significant that the German press—as noted in a special cable despatch from Berlin to the Herald this morning—similarly charges the correspondent of the English newspapers with inciting antipathy between Germany and the United States."

The special Berlin correspondent of the New York Journal says:

"Diplomats here emphatically express their irritation over the persistent reports, emanating from English sources, of strained German-American relations."

Mme. MacGahan, the well-known Russian correspondent, says:

"In this present instance, the Vienna agencies are obviously working in concert with similar agencies in London, with a view to convincing the United States that they have not a friend on earth save England. But what use has the United States of anybody's friendship in the present emergency?"

Finally, let me say that the correspondents of London papers here continually cabled to the Continent every article hostile to Russia, France and Germany for the purpose of arousing irritation against us in those countries. When we recall the insulting and abusive attitude of a large element of the American press against these Powers during the Spanish war we should not wonder that there is a bitter feeling in some parts of Europe against us. The marvel is that it is not stronger.

#### THE ATTITUDE OF FRANCE.

France, it was said, assumed the initiative looking for a concerted action of the Powers, and because Spain placed her interests and subjects under the protection of the diplomatic and consular agents of that government, additional color seemed to be lent to the fiction. But what was the

attitude of the late lamented President, of M. Cambon the French Ambassador to this country, and M. Hanatoux, the then Minister of Foreign affairs, during the period of these alleged continental negotiations? We have the authority of our ambassador, General Horace Porter, in interviews, public addresses and communications to this government, that France adhered to the strict line of neutrality and that reports to the contrary were malicious fabrications. In regard to the alleged coalition, M. Cambon and M. Hanatoux, as well as General Porter, denied in the most unqualified terms any knowledge of such a proceeding. President McKinley has been outspoken in his commendation of M. Cambon for the tact, delicacy and wisdom with which he handled the difficult negotiations during the war, and leading up to the signing of the protocol.

Upon his return from the preliminary meeting of the Venezuelan Arbitration Committee in Paris, Mr. Justice Brewer was interviewed:

"From the public men I have met in France," he said, "and from others, I have heard nothing but the most cordial feeling expressed toward the United States. So far as I have been able to judge from my visit the French are quite as friendly toward the United States as the English."

Le Clair, one of the chief journals in Paris, discussing England's relations with American affairs, and the unfriendly attitude of the United States toward Germany, throws the responsibility on the English press saying:

"We know the experience of the London papers and postmasters in this kind of work, and cannot forget that in the begin-

ning of the Hispano-American war, we also were the victims of the misleading information of these sheets whose lies and calumnies almost succeeded in deceiving the American public opinion. At the present moment, Germany is the victim of British journalism, which ably seconds the Foreign Office's efforts to embroil the United States with European Powers for the purpose of associating more closely America and England."

The aftermath of this propaganda of slander and deception is seen by the views given in the Herald, by a French diplomat. The New York Herald says under date of January 16:

"A distinguished French diplomat, who has given careful study to the history and political economy of the United States, this morning gave his explanation of the French state of mind on the subject.

"If France were convinced," he said, "that the United States had an independent policy of its own, it would applaud, but the French see in America only a docile pupil of Great Britain. We should like to see the seas divided, not united, under the Anglo-Saxon flags against the world, and that is why thoughtful Frenchmen regret that the United States should quit its isolation of the days of Washington."

#### THE ATTITUDE OF GERMANY.

Germany was the victim of the news bureaus of England for a considerable time during the war, and for that reason I shall discuss her attitude toward us at greater length.

In the memorable debate which took place upon this subject in the Reichstag, Herr von Bulow, the Imperial Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, directed attention to the relations of amity which have existed for upward of a century between Prussia and this Government.

During our Revolution, Frederick the Great refused to permit the passage of the Hessians hired by George III., through his Dominions, and he was one of the first European

sovereigns to recognize the independence of the American colonies. He was also one of the chief promoters of The League of Neutrals, formed by the Northern Powers to apply pressure upon the British Government to sign the peace of 1783. During the Rebellion when Louis Napoleon tried to bring about a joint intervention on behalf of the Confederacy, Prussia and the other German States made no secret of their friendship for the United States, and German capitalists subscribed for large quantities of our bonds at a time when the people of Great Britain were lending money to the seceding states. During the Commune of 1870-71, Germany placed the lives and property of her subjects located in France, under the protection of our representatives.

In addition to such proofs of amity we have 20,000,000 people of German extraction in our Republic, a far larger number than belong to the mythical Anglo-Saxon race.

During the early weeks of the war, owing to the persistent attacks inspired by British influences, appearing in a section of the American press upon the German Government, Herr von Holleben, the German Ambassador, called twice upon the President and protested against the systematic impeachment of the good faith of his government. This unusual departure in diplomatic procedure was subsequently repeated on more than one occasion during the later developments of the war, and at each visit President McKinley warmly assured Dr. Von Holleben that he and his cabinet were perfectly satisfied with the attitude of Germany, and were not at all influenced by the irresponsible utterances of the sensational and sub-

sided press upon both sides of the Atlantic.

The Hon. Andrew D. White, our Ambassador to the Court of Emperor William, had peculiar facilities for discovering the feeling of the Kaiser's Government, and in notable speeches delivered in Leipsic and Berlin, he vigorously denounced the statements appearing in certain newspapers as absolutely baseless. He was equally emphatic in his declaration that no combination, organized or individual, had been attempted by any Continental Government for the purpose of interfering with or neutralizing the force of the United States' position in the Hispano-American war.

So bitterly were the attacks upon Germany by American newspapers and public men resented by the American colony in Munich, that they held a meeting on January 24, 1899, and denounced the anti-German expressions used in the press and House of Representatives. It was decided at this meeting to draw up a protest and send it to the government at Washington, accompanied by a declaration that no animosity against America existed in Germany.

The Neuster Nachrichten, in commenting upon this protest, expressed a deep sense of its regret that the credulity of the American people should be exploited to such an extent by the sensational press and Anglo-maniacs of the United States.

The Kolnische Zeitung, in its issue of January 30th, 1899, commenting upon the assertion of General Woodford that Continental Europe was ready to interfere with the plans of the United States, except for England, said: "The idea that there was

any European anti-American coalition is a mere figment of the imagination. Certainly Germany, France and Russia, from the very outset of complications, resolved to maintain the strictest neutrality."

Finally, we have had the debate in the Reichstag, to which I have previously alluded, in which the members of all political parties vied with one another, and with the ministers of the government, in expressing goodwill and friendliness toward our government and our country.

There is no doubt that Admiral Von Diederichs in the Philippines displayed a want of tact and an officiousness that was altogether unnecessary, but the moment the Kaiser was made aware of the situation he relieved him of his command and substituted his own brother Prince Henry. What further reparation could the German Emperor have made?

#### RUSSIA'S POSITION.

And now I shall discuss the attitude of Russia.

Not once, but several times has Count Cassini, the Russian Ambassador, denounced the fiction of the so-called European concert. I quote from his latest interview, held at the Russian Embassy, in Washington, on November 12, 1898. The Ambassador after a vigorous protest against the foreign-interference lie, which the English press, and the Anglo-American Alliance promoters had been using to further their scheme, continued:

"At no time was there a purpose on the part of the great Powers to intervene against the United States. No appeal by Spain to limit the claims of the United States has been made to

Russia or to other foreign governments.

"America needs not the friendship of England to become a great power. She is a great power! England needs the friendship of America—that is why she speaks as she does now. England wants America to help her to her schemes, and America will not let herself be used, I am sure. During your war with Spain, though the contrary has been urged, yet I know as a fact that at no time was there any purpose of the Powers to check America's plans or advances upon the Philippines.

"England did not refuse to join for intervention, because I say that no one wished to intervene."

Count Cassini is corroborated by no less an authority than our Ambassador at the court of the Czar during the Spanish war, the Hon. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, who at present holds a portfolio in the cabinet of President McKinley. In an interview had with him by a representative of the Associated Press, Mr. Hitchcock denounced emphatically the stories current since the beginning of the Hispano-American war that Russia was a member of a coalition of Continental Powers which would have intervened in the dispute had not England refused to join them.

"These stories are utterly unfounded," said Mr. Hitchcock. "There has never been a single item of proof produced to substantiate them, and, on the contrary, Russia has been most friendly towards the United States and has manifested that friendship during the past years in many ways, of which my position forbids me to speak."

In the North American Review for March there is an article from General Alger in which the following appears:—"Two years ago, when under the not too friendly observation of some of the great powers, we were discharging our duty as the guardian of liberty and humanity in the Western hemisphere, Great Britain stood conspicuous among the nations as our friend. Nor was her cordial sympathy valueless. She remained strictly neutral, but her whole attitude toward us was so unmistakably friendly that its influence in preventing what might have occurred in the way of European intervention will never be capable of full measurement."

This statement from the late Secretary of War, was immediately challenged by numerous members of the general public, and to correct misapprehension, General Alger has been compelled to dictate a statement to the press explaining what he meant.

"The British Government," he says, "so far as I know, never did anything actually to warrant my statement. We knew of their friendship to us by that which perhaps cannot be expressed in words. It was a feeling that if any trouble should arise by reason of an appeal by Spain for the Powers to aid her the British Government would not permit us to be embarrassed. I state distinctly that there was no evidence of any attitude of the sort on their part; that it was a belief. I would not say the matter was discussed in the Cabinet meetings. I am simply giving my own impressions and my firm belief. I have simply spoken for myself."

Is it any wonder that a well-known continental diplomatist should make the following observation: "Of all the goose food that has ever been distributed, that of Great Britain's alleged protection of the United States against a European coalition is by far the most ridiculous!"

The Hon. John W. Bookwalter, formerly Governor of Ohio, a brilliant man of affairs and ideas, was in Russia during the war and was allowed to go everywhere, to see everything, and

to take any number of photographs. "The United States will commit a woeful mistake," he said, "if they fail to retain the friendship of Russia, the great world-power of the future. Everywhere I found the kindest, most friendly feeling toward America, and heard everywhere expressions of satisfaction over America's success in our war with Spain. Wherever I went everything was thrown open to me simply because I was an American. I distrust the friendship of England, and advise above all the cultivation of friendship with France, Germany and Russia."

I have reserved until now what is possibly the highest corroborative testimony I have quoted upon this subject, the testimony of a man who above all others should have been acquainted with the sinister intentions of the Powers and the friendly spirit of the government of the octogenarian sovereign of England. I refer to an interview with Colonel John Hay, our Ambassador to the Court of St. James during the Spanish war and our present Secretary of State. Upon his arrival in this country, the following categorical question was asked Colonel Hay, and I give both question and answer verbatim, from the *New York World* of September 22, '98.

QUES.—*"You mean to state positively that there was no combined or individual attempt on the part of Germany, France or Russia to humiliate the United States by taking sides with Spain?"*

ANS.—*"I certainly do. Nothing of the kind occurred."*

About the same time in the leading newspapers of America appeared an interview with William T. Stead, the

well-known British journalist, whose opportunities for diplomatic information on the continent are well recognized. Speaking of the alleged combination of the Powers he said: "I am afraid I shall have to prick this bubble, much as I should desire England to have assumed the position so generally attributed to her. She did not have the chance to do so, as no attempt was made by any of the Powers to interfere with the United States. This fact I have learned by inquiries at the Foreign offices in Paris, London and Berlin; and men of all parties disavow the whole story."

Henry Labouchere, M. P., the editor of *London Truth*, and other British journalists of distinction have frequently ridiculed the story.

Against this weight of testimony nothing has been advanced by the believers in this mythical coalition of the Powers, but an anonymous article which appeared in a second-rate London publication, called the *National Review*. This magazine is edited by a Captain Maxse. It is generally believed in the United States that the article was inspired if not written by an Englishman named A. Maurice Low, who has had some connection in Washington with English and American newspapers for some time past. Mr. Low is an avowed and militant supporter of an Anglo-American Alliance, and is a firm believer in the new-fangled notion that the Anglo-Saxon race must rule the world.

The proof of the pudding lies in the eating and the best index of English opinion—private and governmental—may be found in contemporary British newspapers and magazines. Let me append a few extracts from the



representative English journals during the Spanish war:

Here is *fraternity* from the *St. James Gazette*:

"If American intervention goes farther now in an aggressive, insulting attack upon the mere existence of European sovereignty over the island, our sense of justice compels us to sympathize with Spain, and a straitwaistcoat would seem to be a useful article for outside powers to provide for a country which, like Greece in the Cretan question, wanted to bite off more than it could chew without any consideration for the disturbance of other people's interests."

Here is "Hands across the Sea," from the amiable *Saturday Review*:

"We are told that America represents the cause of civilization, humanity, progress, while Spain represents mediaeval barbarism and cruelty. We should like a little better evidence of the proposition. In Cuba itself there is anarchy and devastation, but we do not know that the invasion of the island by American filibusters and carpet-baggers will constitute an improvement. . . . Wipe out both countries and their achievements tomorrow, and which of them would be mourned by civilization? Should we miss most the oil and the corn and the iron and the pigs, or the poetry of Calderon, the art of Velasquez, the immortal fiction of Cervantes? All these would be regarded as 'back numbers' in New York or Chicago, but the world will remember them; and what will it care to remember about America?"

April 28, 1898, the *N. Y. Herald* had this from London:

"The trend of English sentiment toward Spain is becoming so pronounced as to be a generally recognized fact. All resident Americans, even American diplomats are compelled to admit it. Although the government's friendly attitude is unchanged, it is questioned whether a majority in Parliament is not now Spanish in its sympathies, although a week ago practically unanimously partisan for the United States.

"A straw indicating the direction of the wind is shown at a popular music hall in London, where nightly pictures of the American and Spanish war ships are

shown by the kinetoscope. The American war ships are only moderately applauded; the Spanish most enthusiastically."

During the first week of the war, the *Literary Digest* analyzed the situation in the following language:

"The majority of British comment is adverse, though it is admitted the Britons cannot well refuse to side with us as a people speaking the same language. The *Home News*, London, thinks 'it must be confessed that the general sense of England is that Spain in this particular crisis is entitled to considerable sympathy. If Spain sins in misgovernment, the United States offends in its absurd pretensions to control the fortunes of the whole American continent.'"

Then follows a quotation from the *St. James Gazette*:

"But there are ways of doing things; there are decencies to be observed; and our American friends must permit us to point out that they have, when it was possible, done everything in the wrong way and failed to observe the decencies. They have conducted their diplomacy as they conduct their party struggles—by loud talk, by threatening, by exaggeration, by 'bluff.'"

On April 30th, the day before Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet at Manila, the special correspondent of the *N. Y. World* cabled his paper as follows:

(Copyright, 1898, by the Press Publishing Co., New York World.)

(Special Cable Despatch to The World.)

"London, April 30.—There is no strong sympathy with the United States here beyond a certain limited circle of advanced radicals. The bulk of feeling is hostile to the extent of desiring that the United States may find the subjugation of Cuba a tougher job than she expects.

"Certain newspapers, like the *Chronicle* and *Daily Mail*, are endeavoring to evoke friendly sentiment for America, but the bulk of even the *Liberal* press is decidedly tepid in its sympathy, while the *Tory* press is either coldly critical or actually hostile.

"Although it would eminently suit the exigencies of the present government, in view of the threatening aspect of affairs

in the far east, to countenance the idea of a rapprochement between England and the United States, the ministers have found so overwhelming the mass of feeling among their own supporters in favor of an observance of the strictest neutrality that any friendly tendency on their part has been completely arrested.

"Any observer who mixes among Englishmen representative of the different classes cannot fail to be struck by the almost total absence of any spontaneous manifestation of good will toward the United States in the present contest. Whether the progress of the war will produce any change remains to be seen, but that is the actual existing state of feeling."

The N. Y. Tribune is one of the most offensive English papers published in the United States. Yet here is its view of English feeling three weeks after the Manila victory. I quote from an article by its special correspondent in London, who is an undisguised Anglo-maniac. In the Tribune of May 22d, 1898, he says:

"One hostile quarter is Oxford. I have learned from a trustworthy source that only two or three of the influential educators there are in sympathy with the United States. The dons and students by an immense majority are hostile critics of American institutions, and are outspoken in their hope that Spain will administer a large measure of discipline to inflated American pride.

"Another stronghold of anti-American feeling is the West End of London. Especially is this true of the exclusive and 'smart' sets, whose prejudices and sympathies are against everything American.

"There is also a disposition, especially among merchants and lawyers, to regard America as a spoiled child, who needs the restraints of persistent snubbing and a long-deferred whipping. There is more of this feeling in England than Americans can well imagine."

The special London correspondent of the N. Y. Sun cables his paper on the same date:

"There is no longer any doubt that Spain has obtained at least temporary financial relief and is now spending money

quite freely, a large part of this being disbursed by the Spanish commission which has its headquarters in London. Indeed, the chief source of Spanish supplies is English, and most of the arrangements for recoaling and revictualling Cervera's fleet were made in London. Agents here have made arrangements for getting coal aboard the Spanish fleets from several points in the West Indies, and especially from a Venezuelan port. Large quantities of explosives have been shipped recently from English ports to Cadiz via French ports."

A correspondent writing from London, in the "Mail and Express," at the same time says:

"It is impossible for anybody living in the heart of London, and moving in every direction as I do, not to be aware that there is a strong popular feeling for the cause of Spain. Personally I have no belief in any intense affection between this country and the United States. All the chatter about cousinhood and brotherhood and blood, is the merest cant. I suppose there may be about 5 to 10 per cent. of the American population of English descent, and as a nation they use the English language, which they speak and spell in a most unsavory fashion; but the masses who elect Congressmen and Presidents are all of foreign extraction. Though necessarily civil to us for the moment, they are not our friends; and should they succeed in their present enterprise, we shall soon be made aware of the fact in disputes over West Indian matters and nastiness about the Alaskan boundary."

On May 25th the Associated Press cabled the following to the United States:

"London, May 25.—In the newspapers today there are several striking instances of anti-American feeling. While the majority of the papers allude with pleasure to the references to the Queen in yesterday's celebrations at New York and Tampa, the Morning Post has allowed to appear in its columns a violent denunciation of the United States, from the Hon. Stuart Erskine, a brother of Baron Erskine, who alludes to America's 'present immoral warfare against Spain,' and asserts that the sentiment of the country which is worth having is for Spain.

"The fund being raised by the Countess Valencia, wife of the former Spanish Ambassador here, for the relief of the Spanish wounded, has received several important aristocratic additions, including gifts from Lady Clanwilliam, and the Duke of Wellington, who sent \$500.

"The Saturday Review pursues its attacks upon America, and the following extract will indicate the tone of its comments:—'American action unfortunately suggests the attitude of a huge and boastful bully attacking an effete but gentlemanly old roue, with whom one cannot help sympathizing, especially when the bully, not content with thrashing his feeble old opponent and stripping him of his valuables, bellows out with tears and protestations that he does it unwillingly and with the highest moral purpose.'

So bitter was the feeling at this time against our country in England that even Joseph Cowen, the radical leader, denounced us in his paper, the Newcastle Chronicle, as "brutal."

#### "COMMON LANGUAGE AND SAME LITERATURE."

In another article the Saturday Review says:

"It is a question of manners. We are all disgusted with those raw, vulgar, blatant Americans, who scour Europe in search of their self-respect and cannot conduct a mere legal case with decency."

Here is a Scottish view:

#### "UNION OF HEARTS."

The Edinburgh News says "the Yankee is thirsting for blood. He will perhaps get more of it than he bargains for before he is done with the Cuban business." The Newcastle Chronicle admits that Spain is fighting for her own, whether she was successful in managing Cuba or not.

#### OUR "KITH AND KIN" IN CANADA.

In Saturday Night, Toronto, several columns are filled with effusions like the following:

"We do not care to be made to feel that only their Christianity and humanitarianism prevent the Yankee mob from making a light lunch of us. In the squares before

the New York newspaper offices, where thousands read with swelling pride news of the capture of a wood-scow, one felt the strength of the terrible predatory instinct of a people who worship money, conquest, and an ability to crow as the owners of the earth. I admit that I was in a state of belligerency, and little as I care for Spain and her institutions I felt a prayer rising up from my heart to the great God of war, to the Lord of battles, to Him who supervises this universe, that in time, which sets all things even, the United States may be taught a lesson which it will never forget."

I quote the following interview which appeared in the N. Y. Tribune last October:

#### "PICTURES OF PRESIDENT MCKINLEY AND AMERICAN WARSHIPS HISSED IN LONDON MUSIC HALLS."

"J. W. Snell, of Toledo, Ohio, arrived from Europe yesterday, and is staying at the Gilsey House. When seen there he said: 'There is a marked contrast between the present manner in which the English treat Americans and that in which they treated them only a short time ago. I was in London in April, 1898, after war had been declared between this country and Spain, and that England was not only unfriendly to us, but also underestimated and was grossly ignorant of the strength and power of the United States was everywhere in evidence. The daily papers had many of them a distinctly hostile tone, and none of them a particularly friendly one. The yellow journals—for yellow journalism exists in England as well as in America—were publishing pictures representing the relative strength of the navies of the world. You know the sort, a huge ship representing Great Britain, then one considerably smaller representing France, etc. The United States came way down the list with something that looked like a rowboat, while Spain was placed well above her. I went to a theatre at this time, where they had a mutoscope or vitagraph or some other graph pictures, and there the hostility to America was marked. They showed a number of American and Spanish pictures, the first being received with chilly silence and the latter with applause, but the thing came to an end, in so far as I was concerned, when they hissed a picture of President McKinley,

after wildly cheering one of the Queen Regent of Spain. That settled me and I left, but I heard afterward that the American pictures had been withdrawn on account of their unpopularity.

"As soon as the English recovered their breath after our victories there was nothing too good for the Americans; they were blood kindred; they asked you to dinner and put you up at their clubs, and only to state in London at that time that you were an American was to insure yourself the best of good things without expense to yourself. For me, while I like the English, the contrast was too sudden, and I doubted the entire cordiality of the good-fellowship extended, when I remembered that only a short fortnight before I had sat in an English theatre and heard an English audience hiss the portrait of the President of the United States of America."

While the President of the United States and our navy were exposed to the insults and contempt of the English press and the London mob, the foremost journals of the fatherland upheld our policy, Germany's best newspapers showed scant sympathy with Spain. To sustain the truth of this statement I refer to the files of the Frankfurter Zeitung; Weser Zeitung, Bremen; Neueste Nachrichten, Munich; Koelnische Zeitung; Berliner Tageblatt; Berliner Neueste Nachrichten, and many other newspapers of their class.

Blood is thicker than water, in the Saturday Review:

"The United States is socially sordid to the last degree; its courts and civil institutions are corrupt, and it has shown the world the depth of public depravity into which a civilization is capable of descending."

Our cousins in the country north of us spoke of us through the Hamilton Times in this appreciative spirit:

"While some Canadian papers show a disposition to play the lickspittle and try to curry favor with the organs of the bullies across the line, the war organs do not

spare the feelings of Canadians in the least. Many of them openly boast that the war to capture Cuba and the Philippines is to be followed in due time by giving effect to the Monroe Doctrine by seizing Canada, Jamaica, etc., a threat which quite naturally elicits notes of defiance."

The Literary Digest sums up British opinion as follows:

"Is England with us? That part of the British press which has proven itself most influential during the past few years certainly is not. Our sympathizers are the papers which promised to aid Armenia and backed Greece, The Daily Chronicle, Leader, Manchester Guardian, Advertiser, etc. Government organs like The Standard, sit on the fence. Confirmed Conservatives, such as The St. James's Gazette, side openly with Spain. Journals which are compared by continental papers to our American 'Know-Nothing' press abuse us in the most unreserved manner, such, for instance, as The Saturday Review."

The Associated Press sent from London, April 29, 1898, this:

"Individual opinion and the sympathies of a large majority of the British are undoubtedly anti-American. This is evident to every one having any intercourse with the people."

These are samples only: the British papers even after Dewey's victory, as I have shown by quotations, teemed with sneers and abuse of America. It was only after the results of the war began to dawn on the brain of Britain and the colossus of the West began to loom up big and serene, that the government of England woke to the necessity of getting in out of the rain, and of capturing America for an ally. Then began the propaganda of falsehood and imposture, the use of false telegrams, the fabrication of bogus conspiracies, the manufacture of a tender and effusive affection for the new, strong world-power. Every British agency went to work with a will; banking and stock ex-

change agencies toiled nobly; the cables were heavy with taffy from London and laden with fabricated hatreds from Europe. Evidently England imagined that the ears of Americans were longer than their memories. She needs us now; she needs anybody she can get; let us be wise as strong and simply say, "John! Your fraternity is beautiful and does you credit, but this is our busy day; we have troubles of our own; we are not in any alliance mood this week."

A brief time ago an article appeared in the N. Y. Sun which intelligently and truthfully set forth our relations and those of Russia in the civilization and development of our respective hemispheres. If, of late, our foreign policy is viewed with suspicion in Russia, Germany and France, it is the result of the belief prevailing in these countries that our international relations are now conducted under the direction and in the interest of England. I commend this extract from the Sun to those persons whether in the government or outside of it, to whose fulsome ebullitions and irresponsible speeches we may charge a large proportion of the distrust in which our government is held upon the continent today.

"The Russians and Americans have now behind them three generations of effort substantially identical in aim and in achievement; both have before them a manifest destiny containing much that is in common and nothing that conflicts. Russia has been and is the great civilizer of the Old World, as the Americans have been of the New, reducing again to the uses of the human race vast territories that had been for centuries sacrificed to the savagery of a degenerated barbarism. In the Eastern Mediterranean Russia, in obedience to the dictates of a human heart, sensitive to pulsations other than those of a loom, has twice poured out her

blood and treasure to rescue fellow-creatures from the knife of the butcher and the cord of the ravisher. Throughout the whole of this career, alike in that part of it which has dealt with the redemption of territorial areas, and in that part dealing with the redemption of the human victims of fanaticism, cruelty, and lust, Russia has had one single, steady, consistent opponent. Splashed to the thighs with innocent blood, England has barred the way."

#### CONCLUSION.

The vain-glorious chatter of Anglo-Saxonism against the world, indulged in by a group of silly persons, may result in arraignment the world against the English-speaking races and the flattering delusion that the United States and Great Britain would be irresistible even against a European combination is the sheerest buncombe and nonsense. Those persons, who have been thoughtlessly or maliciously attacking the Continental Powers and impugning the good faith of their governments, have incurred a grave responsibility.

Something should be done to clear the atmosphere of this maudlin bald-erdash, and to place our country before the world in her true light. Too much mischief has been caused already by post-prandial orators, sensational preachers, et hoc genus omme, on this side, prating about alliances and our international relations. These utterances are eagerly seized upon by English ministers and politicians and dished up to the Continent as the practically unanimous sentiment of the American people. It is notorious that they have been utilized as a club to pound the doors of every chancellerie in Europe. Every observer of international affairs is aware that the position of England has been materially improved by the talk of an An-

P63/1214

glo-American alliance, and that her backbone has been strengthened in South Africa, the Orient and Egypt. Our Anglo-maniacs have given her reasons to believe that she is no longer isolated. The lightning change in the foreign policy of Salisbury's Cabinet in the last year has been the most remarkable event in the history of governmental polity within this generation, and it is solely to be attributed to the diplomatic leverage England has availed herself of as a result of the so-called entente of the "Anglo-Saxon" race.

I am convinced that the sooner some responsible American statesman makes a ringing address in the vein of the new diplomacy, repudiating the suggestion of an alliance with any power, the better it would be for our country. It would put a stop once for all to British intrigue and silence the vaporings in England and America. The responsive gushings have become nauseating and the whole subject to speak mildly is a deuced bore. But above all, it would decrease the elements of uneasiness and distrust in regard to us which prevail on the Continent and restore the old ties of friendship which have undoubtedly been weakened by the sycophancy and foolishness of many of our own people.

Why at present, any more than in the past, should we interweave our

destiny with that of any part of Europe, and entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European rivalry and interest?

Under a beneficent Providence our country is free and self-sufficing, needing no foreign countenance, no exterior props and no alien intervention.

The policy that has served it thus far, and kept it free and untrammelled from foreign intrigues, should be the policy in the future, as it has been in the past. Only persons hostile to the Republic, criminally blind or sentimentally foolish, advocate a change in that position. If, under the circumstances, we should wantonly, rashly and gratuitously commit ourselves to a policy friendly to the power in Europe that is hated and distrusted by all the others, national disaster and disunion would be within measurable distance.

The persons who have publicly invited such a peril and endeavored to make sentiment in favor of such a fatuous policy are a disgrace to American manhood, American citizenship, and American patriotism. Even though ignorance be their plea, they are dangerous enemies of our Government at a moment when, in view of our new responsibilities, it needs the loyal support of every man who has sworn to maintain its high ideal, its cause and its flag!

T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.