

in the ordeal of fire and blood to an excellence not attained by their kindred in any other part of the world. A hundred years through painful steps they have moved along a road which they have macadamized with their bones and cemented with their blood. The noblest aspirations that can fire the human heart have actuated these men—resistance to tyranny. This great republic has reached its arm across the waste of water and helped these people to their feet, given them the opportunity to organize a government and to run the race for freedom according to their capacity.

“Are we to be the great exemplars of human liberty, or are we to join the ranks of the monarchs of the world in the lust for territory, the greed for conquest, for aggrandizement, and depart from that simplicity of liberty, of freedom, of the rights of man as set forth in our declaration of independence, as guaranteed by our constitution? The fate of millions of people in the Philippines, of untold millions in America, rests upon the decision of the senate.”

The remarks of Senator Daniel are equally pointed:

“Mr. President, it is the first step that costs. Today we are the United States of America. Tomorrow if a treaty now pending in the senate is ratified, we will be the United States of America and Asia.

“I do not believe that the great body of the American people understand the significance of this treaty. I do not believe, at least if I may judge from their utterances, that many senators who are saying, ‘Vote for the treaty now and fix your policy tomorrow,’ understand what that treaty does irretrievably. That treaty fixes our policy. The rest of our policy is a mere matter of clerky detail. The treaty is the thoroughfare, and through and over that thoroughfare a million of Filipinos march into the open doorway of the American republic. More than that, 70,000,000 Americans march into the Philippine islands as the Filipinos march here.

“It is a marriage of nations. This twain become one flesh. They become bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Henceforth and forever, according to the terminology of this treaty, the Filipinos and Americans are one. I trust yet, Mr. President, that before this marriage is consummated the spirit of American constitutional liberty will arise and forbid the bans.

“Let us stay in military occupation of the Philippine islands until such time as we know more about them than we do, until we have assisted them with our kind offices and with our national prestige and with our force of arms into such destiny as may fitly and justly

await them, into such destiny as they have projected for themselves.

“What is the difference between doing that, Mr. President, and ratifying this treaty? It is the difference between planting an empire there and maintaining the temporary ascendancy of American power there.

“Naturally enough, Mr. President, ‘birds of a feather flock together.’ The Philippine treaty and a great standing army walk into the halls of congress hand in hand, one behind and close upon the heels of the other. In a military strategic point of view, no nation ever challenged fate by so unwise and unnecessary a step as to fling out the American salient upon the Asiatic coast and say, ‘Here is the place where we are willing to establish our sovereignty, and, if need be, to defend it against the world in arms.’ It means militarism to follow—its essential corollary, its necessary and its inevitable consequence.

“The men who favor the standing army today have read in the lines of that treaty the bugle call ‘To arms! To arms!’ They have seen with that treaty you can no more rely permanently and fixedly upon the American volunteer, the pride of the nation, the citizen soldier, ever ready to take his gun and go down to the shore to defend his native land; that you must have, if you are going there to maintain your sovereignty, a regular army; you must introduce the regular soldier into American life, and when he comes he will come with all the necessary consequence.

“Aye, Mr. President, through many of the speeches of those who say ‘ratify the treaty’ there runs a sense of distrust of what they are doing; there runs a sense of preference for what we propose to do. They say, ‘ratify the treaty now; come and we will talk about policy tomorrow.’

“The policy is wrapped up in the treaty. The policy is determined by the treaty. The policy that will follow is a mere minor detail. If you have military occupancy there, as you have in Cuba, you may fold your tents like the Arab and quietly steal away, or sail away, or march away, or get away any night or morning that you please.

“It is not a question of hauling down the flag. The flag now is a mere casual-visitor there. It is no more fixed there than it is fixed in Pennsylvania avenue when it sweeps down at the head of a regiment. It merely waves there over a ship and where it is carried by an American soldier. But once fix sovereignty there and its roots go down to the center of the earth like a fee-simple deed, and its stars go upward until they mingle with those in space. It is sovereignty, the most permanent act of human life,

the most fixed and immovable thing that ever nation did or could do.

“Peace, it is said, is in this treaty; peace—a pleasing name to conjure with.

Peace. ‘Blessed are the peacemakers.’ Are

our friends upon the other side sure this treaty means peace? Are they sure that the spoken word will be substantiated by subsequent facts? Undoubtedly it means peace with Spain. There is nothing else in the future but peace with Spain. There is no contingency that can revive war with Spain. There is nothing that we would do with this treaty that can affect Spain.

“Ah, but amend it, they say, and you delay. We are acting for all time, Mr. President. We are acting for immortality, not for a few days or a few weeks or a few months. Aye, would a few years be a long vestibule to that infinite stretch of time that goes with sovereignty?

“But this treaty is easily amended. You have only to substitute in respect to the Philippine islands what you have done as to Cuba, and it is done. If there are votes here to do that, it can be done next Monday. Do you think Spain will not consent? Why do you think so? There is nothing in the nature of things from which any man can fancy that Spain would not readily assent. She has done so in one case with respect to Cuba, and she did it there simply because we asked it. Aye, Mr. President, she did it in Cuba against her wishes. She wanted us to annex Cuba on account of her Spanish citizens there, for she thought that the Spaniards there and the Spanish soldiers there and the Spanish property there would all be safer and better under the permanent sovereignty of the United States than in the chance medley of military occupation with Cuban independence hovering over it. But against the wishes of Spain we said, ‘No; we prefer only a military occupation here.’”

Bryan is late in portraying the dangers of imperialism. The arguments he is now

using were thoroughly gone over in the senate over a year ago. They were advanced as strong reasons why this government should not start out in a policy of imperialism and the acquisition of remote territory. Senator Money voiced the opinion of all honest and conscientious anti-imperialists when he said: “We will have peace with Spain but war with the Filipinos.” A vote for the ratification of the treaty was a vote for peace with Spain and at the same time a vote for war with the Filipinos. It was in February 1899, the die was cast. We then decided between peace and war. With this explicit understanding as to the meaning of the treaty and its far-reaching consequences, strangely as it may seem, the influence of the “peerless leader” was exerted in