

be, free and independent.' If that were true, then, unquestionably of the Filipinos, who had conquered their entire domain with the exception of a single city, who had an established and orderly government, who had a capital with a parliament of whom more than one-fifth were graduates of European universities, and who deserved special consideration because of their having bravely fought in co-operation with our own troops, it could have been said with a thousand-fold more force and more truth, that 'they are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.'

Responsibility for our Agents.

"On June 30, General Anderson sailed into Manila harbor with the first contingent of land troops. The next day he had an interview with Aguinaldo. He writes: 'Whether Admiral Dewey and Consuls Pratt, Wildman and Williams did or did not give Aguinaldo assurances that a Filipino government would be recognized, the Filipinos certainly thought so, probably inferring this from their acts rather than from their statements.'

"Within a few days, Aguinaldo called on General Anderson. He had begun to grow suspicious of our designs. General Anderson makes this statement:

"Aguinaldo asked if we, the North Americans, as he called us, intended to hold the Philippines as dependencies. I said I could not answer that, but that in 120 years we had established no colonies. He then made this remarkable statement: 'I have studied attentively the constitution of the United States, and I find in it no authority for colonies, and I have no fear.' It may seem that my answer was somewhat evasive, but I was at the time trying to contract with the Filipinos for horses, carts, fuel and forage.'

"Is it not a shameful record? Five representatives of this great, proud nation had, by word or implication, led the Filipinos to believe they were fighting for their independence. By virtue of such belief they fought with us side by side, as Dewey said, 'against a common enemy.' The president and the state department had been fully acquainted for a period of over three months with the national beliefs and hopes of the Filipinos, yet took no steps to undeceive them. Is not an honorable nation, like an honorable man bound by its agents? And especially, if it has full knowledge of the assurances given and has abundance of time in which to rectify such assurances if they are false, would not its long maintained silence constitute acquiescence in the ratification of its agents' actions? And if, still further, the nation accepted valuable services from the deceived parties, even to the risking of their lives and their property, would it not, in the forum law and of conscience, be forever estopped

from making denial of the agents' authority?

All Left to McKinley.

"After the outbreak we naturally looked to congress to declare the nation's purpose. Under full republican control congress basely refused to announce any policy. The war, with steadily growing dimensions, continued during the summer and autumn of last year. In December congress re-convened. The president's message speaks of 'the sinister ambition of a few leaders of the rebellion,' and says:

"From the earliest moment no opportunity was lost of assuring the people of the islands of our ardent desire for their welfare and of the intention of this government to do everything possible to advance their interests.' How much this reminds us of the message of George III, when speaking of the American revolutionists, he says: 'I am desirous of restoring to them the blessings of law and liberty equally enjoyed by every British subject, which they have fatally and desperately exchanged for the calamities of war and the arbitrary tyranny of their chiefs.'"

"During the six months' session congress continuously refused to intervene, sanctioning our Philippine policy by implication, and leaving to the president perfect freedom or policy of action. Is not this extraordinary? Is it not almost incredible? The greatest of Americans from Washington down have pronounced against the dangers of distant possessions; the sainted Gladstone counselled us against them; the truest friends that America has in England today—James Bryce, Henry Labouchere and John Morley—have warned us of the perils and the evils of a colonial policy. Every great English historian—Macaulay, Freeman, Froude—all have declared its folly, its wrong and its elements of danger. Our whole history and the very spirit of our institutions are opposed to it. As our historian, Bancroft, says: "The words 'sovereign' and 'subject' are unknown to the constitution. There is no place for princes with unlimited power, or conquering cities, or feudal chiefs, or privileged aristocracies, ruling absolutely with their correlative vassals or subjects.' Nevertheless, under the influences of that political 'thrift which follows fawning' and of what a distinguished writer on our institutions has called 'the fatalism of the multitude,' this great American nation of seventy-five million souls, in an untried, adventurous policy wholly violative of our traditions and ideals—has been content to follow the leadership of this 'unerring master of economic problems' who has never been permanently right on any great public question, who was a pronounced 'free silver' advocate five years before his election, who championed the most shameful financial legislation that ever

disgraced our statutes, who said in December, 1897, forcible annexation was a crime and committed the crime in December, 1898, and who in December, 1899, declared that free trade in Porto Rico was 'a plain duty' and then made a discount of 15 per cent. on plain duty within three months thereafter!

American Sympathizers.

"Chairman Wolcott tells us: 'If it were not for the hope held out to Aguinaldo by American sympathizers, the insurrection in the Philippines would long ago have ended.' Thank God for that, if it be true! Wrong, oppression, and tyranny have always hated critics. When we were fighting for our own liberties, a few noble Englishmen stood out in advocacy of our rights. Of these Lord Mansfield said in the House of Lords:

"I am far from bearing any ill-will to the Americans. * * * I dare say their heat will soon be over, when they come to feel a little the consequences of the opposition of the legislature. Anarchy always cures itself; but the ferment will continue so much the longer while hot-headed men there find that there are persons of weight and character to support and justify them here.'

"And Mr. Grenville declared in parliament:

"The seditious spirit of the colonies owes its birth to the factions in this house. We were told we trod on tender ground; we were bid to expect disobedience. What was this but telling Americans to stand out against the law, to encourage their obstinacy with the expectation of support from here? Let us only hold out a little, they would say; our friends will soon be in power.'

"Let us remember that today, not only in America, but even in old England and throughout the civilized world, the treasured names are not those of Grenville, of Mansfield and of North, but of those men who loved their country too well to defend its iniquity, and whose memories are therefore wreathed in imperishable glory, the names of Burke, of Fox and of Chatham.

"Voicing my own sentiments, I declare that, if need be, I shall fight this Philippine crime so long as life shall last. The crisis presents the alternative between national self restraint and justice, which shall lift us to a higher plane of civilization, and national lust and oppression, which will soil and corrupt the very soul of the republic. It is the choice between the imperialistic spirit of Napoleon, who taught 'everything for the people, but nothing by the people,' and the republican spirit of Lincoln, who said that 'government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.' Realizing the countless blessings, which God has so lavishly poured on this race of American freemen, reverently crossing the threshold of the new century, we