

..A Catechism on Imperialism..

Q. Is the Philippine question settled?

A. No.

Q. How can it be settled?

A. Either by applying American principles to the Filipinos or by abandoning those principles in the United States.

Q. Why do republicans declare that the question is settled?

A. Because they do not dare to discuss the principles involved.

Q. Is it possible to have self-government in the United States and a colonial policy in the Orient?

A. Not permanently. As a man may for a while lead a double life, so our nation may for a while proclaim the principles of the Declaration of Independence here and deny those principles to the Filipinos, but the irresistible tendency to reconcile preaching and practice will ultimately compel us to stop preaching self-government here or to stop practicing colonialism across the Pacific.

Q. By what title did we acquire the Philippine islands?

A. We have no title to the Philippine islands that can be recognized or defended by American citizens.

Q. What title is asserted?

A. Some argue that we bought the islands and the people from Spain and others say that we obtained title by conquest.

Q. Did Spain have a right to sell us eight millions of Filipinos at two dollars and a half a piece?

A. No. A Spanish king had no more right to sell Filipinos to us than our president or congress would have to sell seventy-five million American citizens to the Spanish king.

Q. Could we buy the islands and then claim the people as "fixtures that go with the land?"

A. No. The purchase of cold, inanimate matter cannot be held to carry with it title to living beings possessing souls and made in the image of their Creator. To claim that the people were "thrown in" with the land would be as bad as to

buy them at so much per head.

Q. Can title be secured by conquest?

A. No. Seventy-five millions of people can no more secure title to eight millions by whipping them than a big man can secure title to a little man by whipping him. If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed then it is impossible to secure title to people either by purchase or by the exercise of superior force.

Q. Does the suppression of the insurrection change the situation?

A. Not at all. The rights of the Filipino are the same whether he is able to enforce them or not.

Q. But has our nation not promised to be good to the Filipinos?

A. Yes. But what tyrant ever promised less to his subjects?

Q. Will it not be better for the Filipino to be a subject of our government than to be a citizen under a government of his own?

A. No. Because citizenship stimulates progress, while the condition of a subject destroys hope and ambition.

Q. Could our country afford to have subjects even if it were best for the subjects?

A. No. We cannot afford to abandon our theory of self-government even if it would enable us to help people held as subjects under a colonial system. Our duty to ourselves and to the world requires our nation to assert and to exemplify the self-evident truths: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. No destiny can be higher than this and no advantage obtainable from a colonial system could compensate us for lowering our nation's ideals.

Q. How have the republicans been able to avoid the issue of imperialism?

A. At first they denied that they intended imperialism, then they said that they could not discuss the future until the Filipinos laid down their arms, and now they say that the Filipinos having

laid down their arms, the question is settled and that there is nothing to discuss.

Q. Have the American people ever indorsed imperialism?

A. No. The republicans have never gone into a campaign advocating a colonial policy. Even after the election of 1900 President McKinley declared that "no thought of imperialism lurked in the American mind."

Q. Do all of the republicans favor imperialism now?

A. No. But few republicans actually favor imperialism. If they really favored it they would boldly proclaim their belief in imperialistic principles.

Q. Why do republicans fail to protest against imperialism?

A. Because they have not studied the question sufficiently to understand its dangerous tendencies. They have faith in their party and believe that it will do right in all things.

Q. Will faith save them?

A. No. Faith without works is dead. Each republican is a part of his party and he cannot shirk responsibility for what his party does. He cannot expect other republicans to save his country, he must help save it. He ought to have his opinion on the subject and ought to express that opinion at the polls.

Q. Has the democratic party any plan for settling the Philippine question?

A. Yes. It not only has a plan, but it has the only plan that has been proposed.

Q. What is the democratic plan?

A. It is set forth in the Kansas City platform and is as follows: "Let the nation immediately announce its purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence, and, third, protection from outside interference as we have protected the republics of Central and South America." It is, in other words, to do in the Philippines what we have done in Cuba.

Q. How can a republican show his approval of this plan?

A. By voting the democratic ticket.

Our Allies.

Representatives of the administration have told the people that the Filipinos were not our allies and this statement has been echoed and re-echoed by republican organs and republican orators.

A case is pending in the United States supreme court in which is involved the right of Admiral Dewey and the men under him to certain prize money. After the battle of Manila several Filipino flatboats and other minor vessels were seized and a claim for prize money was presented on behalf of Dewey and his men. The brief filed by the attorneys for the United States government is decidedly interesting. In that brief this statement appears:

As soon as the present libellant's force was able to land and establish itself on shore it entered into friendly relations with the Filipinos and provided many of them with arms for offensive and defensive operations against the Spaniards. To treat some of the Filipinos as friends and allies and to treat others of them as enemies merely because they happened to be in the possession of small craft which might be of use to the United States was certainly not a consistent course of action and should not be upheld by a court."

Here is the distinct admission on the part of the legal representatives of the United States gov-

ernment that the Filipinos were our allies. For the purpose of avoiding the payment of what the government's representatives regard as an unjust claim, it is pointed out that the American forces first "entered into friendly relations with the Filipinos and provided many of them with arms for offensive and defensive operations against the Spaniards." And it is argued that "to treat some of the Filipinos as friends and allies and to treat others of them as enemies merely because they happened to be in the possession of small craft which might be of use to the United States was certainly not a consistent course of action and should not be upheld by a court."

To be sure it is not necessary for a student of history to read this brief to convince himself that the Filipinos were our allies. The record of our operations in the Philippines presents indisputable proof on this point. But it has been urged by representatives of the administration that the testimony that has heretofore been presented is not convincing because it was given "in the heat of battle;" but here, long after the battle has been concluded, long after "peace" has been declared, according to administration representatives, the attorneys for the government, in a calm and well constructed brief filed for the consideration of a court, present the claim that the Filipinos were our allies and assert that it is not a consistent course

to treat some of the Filipinos as our friends and allies and to treat others of them as enemies.

The record is filled with evidence showing that this people, against whom we have waged relentless warfare, were our allies against Spain. We invited them to assist us; they accepted the invitation and whatever pledges may have been made or whatever pledges may have been withheld, the fact remains that when we accepted their assistance in our operations against Spain we gave them reason to believe that after the victory was won they could depend upon being treated in accordance with American principles and American tradition.

The Philadelphia North American, commenting upon the brief filed in the supreme court, says: "Neither is it a consistent course of action, for that matter, for the government to deny, as it has on all previous occasions, that the Filipinos were received as allies by Dewey, and later to declare that they were treated 'as friends and allies.' A supreme court decision, in accordance with the government's latest contention, would hardly please the champions of imperialism."

Cummins' Interpretation.

Since the adoption by the Iowa republican state convention of that famous "no shelter to