

to distrust the purpose of the American people by the executive officer at the head of the nation.

In his manifesto, or by whatever name a document may be called which was without authority of law, giving instructions to our troops to take possession of these islands, not as against Spain but as against the inhabitants themselves, even before their session had been accepted by the senate, is the cause of this distrust which rightly led the inhabitants under their chosen leaders to take measures for holding the American troops within the narrow lines around the city of Manila, as they had previously held the Spanish troops which oppressed them. They hold them there today, and having bravely met them in the open field when attacked with maxim guns and repeating rifles, even though in part armed only with bows and arrows, they have retired a few miles into the jungle, where our troops cannot follow them.

We are told by advices received today that "a more difficult problem than that with which the governor of the Philippines is confronted at the present moment it would be difficult to imagine, for unless the natives recede from their position the situation in a nutshell amounts to this: The Americans must either fight and subdue the rebels or withdraw from the archipelago."

Now, what does that *fight* mean? It means this: In the effort to prevent the establishment of a stable Philippine government by the consent of the governed our troops must enter upon a campaign in more unhealthy places than were met in the French campaign for the conquest of Madagascar, where there was little or no resistance to their march from the sea to the capital of the island. They landed from the army and navy 12,800 men, of whom 2,000 were acclimated colonials. Yet in a campaign of ten months 4,200 of that number died while nearly all the rest were disabled. One regiment leaving the ships with full ranks lost 60 per cent of this number by death, and not one single man reached the objective point of the march. Why this useless sacrifice? Why this immolation of our young men to disease and death? Why this slaughter of men who have already established a government?

But President McKinley asks:

"If in the years of the future they are established in government under law and liberty, who will regret our perils and sacrifices?"

I reply all will regret the perils and sacrifices incurred when according to all the evidence before us the man who was aided by us to return to the Philippine islands in order to lead his people and to establish a government under law and liberty has already established it upon a constitution unequalled in its terms, supported by state papers, of which the declaration of Aguinaldo, printed in The Trans-

cript of the 16th, might have rightly represented the claims of the rebels of New England when they protested against the unlawful acts of George III. These Filipinos, who are termed rebels, are resisting the same wrongs that the rebels of New England resisted at Lexington and Bunker Hill. Who brought on the collision with these forces? Their leader says in his protest that it was the president of the United States. Read his solemn words in resistance to the proclamation of President McKinley through General Otis instructing him to assume the government of the Philippine islands throughout the whole area:

"I solemnly protest, in the name of God, the root and fountain of all justice and of all right, and who has given to me the power to direct my dear brothers in the difficult work of regeneration, against this intrusion of the government of the United States in the sovereignty of these islands. Equally I protest in the name of all the Philippine people against this intrusion, because when they gave me their vote of confidence, electing me, through unworthy, as president of the nation—when they did this they imposed on me the duty to sustain to death their liberty and independence."

President William McKinley says the Philippines have become entrusted to our hands and to that great trust we are committed. "Congress can declare war, but a higher power decrees its bounds and fixes its relations and responsibilities. The president can direct the movements of soldiers on the field, and the fleets upon the sea, but he cannot foresee the close of such movements or prescribe their limits." Not foresee? Why not? Not prescribe the limit? Why not? Was it not in the power of the commander-in-chief of the forces of the United States to refrain from inciting resistance, by not assuming powers which had not been conferred upon him; to forbid slaughtering thousands but poorly armed with bows and arrows in part and mowing them down with repeating rifles and maxim guns? Was it necessary to establish peace and order and respect for property among the Filipinos, to shell and burn their villages without giving women and children the opportunity to escape? Is it true that the head of a great nation and the commander-in-chief of its forces "cannot anticipate or avoid the (such) consequences, but he must meet them?" As well might Herod have said that he could not avoid danger to the Roman rule without slaughtering the innocents. Perhaps that was his excuse.

The president says that the second alternative was that these islands should "be left to the anarchy and chaos of no protectorate at all." Then why did we take Aguinaldo back to the islands, enabling him to become the chosen leader and then desert him after he had estab-

lished a protectorate over the lives and liberty and property of his fellow countrymen? The president asks, could we "have left them without government and without power to protect life or property?" Surely not, whoever proposed such a dastardly act? They had established a government; they had power to protect life and property. They have proved it at Iloilo and throughout the great part of their domain, and they had attempted "to perform international obligations essential to an independent state" by submitting to the executive of this country and to the military officers in command at Manila the forms of a constitution, their protest and their declared intention to maintain peace and order by their own consent in documents unequalled, in the judgment of those who are entitled to judge, in the history of such transactions.

In this singular address, the head of the nation after having taken the most aggressive action without authority of congress, now throws upon congress the whole responsibility. He himself declares that, "Every present obligation has been met and fulfilled in the expulsion of Spanish sovereignty from their islands." But he further declares, "We are doing our duty by them with the consent of our own consciences and with the approval of civilization." Is that true? Is there a man in this community who can claim to possess a conscience who has not been shocked by the slaughter of thousands of men arrayed in defense of the same rights of self-government for which our ancestors arrayed themselves against the despotic rule of George III?

The president says, "While the war that destroyed it (that is, the Spanish rule) was in progress we could not ask their views." The war had ended, and yet we did not ask their views. He further declares, "Nor can we now ask their consent?" The consent of whom, the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands? What is the alternative if we may not now ask their consent? The alternative is the policy of criminal aggression in which we are now engaged in forcing a government upon them without the consent of the governed at the point of the bayonet and under the withering slaughter of the maxim guns.

The president says, "It is not a good time for the liberator to submit important questions concerning liberty and government to the liberated while they are engaged in shooting down their rescuers." Rescuers forsooth! Are we rescuers when we are forbidding them to establish liberty and self-government and when we are liberating them by death in slaughter of thousands under the name of rescuers?

The president says that he is sure that it is the purpose of this people "to do what in good morals is right and just and humane for these peoples in distant