THE RACE ISSUE AND ANNEXATION OF THE PHILIPPINES.

CAN OUR REPUBLIC STAND WHEN IT ERECTS A MILITARY DESPOTISM IN THE SPANISH ISLAND AND GOVERNS OUTSIDE THE CONSTITUTION AND CONTRARY TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE?

"With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." Matthew vii, 2.
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Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, in order to refresh Senators' minds, because I know from my own experience that these things pass from our memories very quickly, I ask to have read senate bill 2355.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as directed.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, introduced by Mr. SPOONER on the 11th instant, as follows:

That when all insurrection against the sovereignty and authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such persons and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to have Senate joint resolution 53 read.

The joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands, introduced by Mr. BEVERIDGE on the 4th instant, was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now I should like to have Senate resolution No. 34 read, which I had the honor to introduce myself, and upon which I will speak.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. TILLMAN December 18, 1899, as follows:

Resolved, First. That, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Second. That under the Constitution of the United States the Federal Government has no power to rule over colonial dependencies, but is restricted in its operations to States as integral parts of the Union and to Territories intended for admission as such.

Third. That the expansion of our commerce has not been, and can not be, dependent upon the adoption of a policy of imperialism, involving the subjugation and annexation of Asiatic colonies, but would in the end be hindered by such a policy.

Fourth. That we are opposed to the retention of the Philippine Islands by the United States, and that it is our purpose to consent to the independence of the Filipinos as soon as a stable government shall be established by them: and toward the prompt establishment of such government we pledge our friendly assistance.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the subject-matter of the various resolutions which have been read has been discussed very extensively throughout the United States and quite exhaustively in this body. There is a wide difference of opinion in regard to the policy that the United States ought to pursue. It is not a party question, because there are men who are earnest advocates of the policy outlined and followed up to this time by the President who would hate to be considered other than the most loyal Democrats, and there are others belonging to the party of the President—able, influential men in the councils of that party—who are just as pronounced in opposition to his policy as anybody possibly can be.

It is contended by those whom we term imperialists that they are not imperialists; that there is no danger in this policy; that the people of the United States are capable of grappling with and solving any problem of government without regard to the old ideals or principles which have hitherto controlled in our affairs. They say there is nothing to menace the Republic in this matter, and that we will move forward boldly, bravely, seizing the opportunities that have come to us, and that it would be nothing but cowardice to follow any other course.

Very few students of history will deny that we now have strange and unaccountable, almost inexplicable, utterances by men who have been trained to look upon the Declaration of Independence as akin almost to the Sermon on the Mount in its sacred character, in its office of guiding
the destinies of this country and of offering hope and inspirations to the downtrodden millions of the earth.

Mr. President, I propose to speak with a great deal of candor in discussing this question, because, as the Senator from Indiana said, the Declaration of Independence is a sacred document. I have been in the habit of discharging my duty as I see and understand it.

Before I begin to discuss the main issue that I shall present to the Senate, I wish to call attention to the propositions laid down in the Resolution which I have introduced.

I feel like apologizing to those who have come to regard the Declaration of Independence as an academic utterance, or the principles and motives which prompted that declaration as such, for having introduced a Resolution embracing any part of that immortal instrument in it. No doubt there are a great many men in this Chamber and outside of it who have come to regard Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and Adams and the other fathers of the Republic as old fogies whose men who had to deal with conditions which confronted them, and which they solved to their satisfaction, and who in this day and time would be far behind the men of our day and unfit to be leaders.

There are men on this floor who feel that in statecraft they are far superior to Jefferson and there are men outside of this Chamber who consider that in directing the affairs of a great government the principles which he laid down should no longer control. We have to-day new doctrines brought forward here and advanced with solemnity and with all the earnestness and ability that men can give to them which even if they would have caused this country to be shocked from one end to the other. And yet, Mr. President, we hear nothing in the near past but the unreserved praise for this new evangel. We find the country under the government of the people of the country controlled by the new influences which dominate our affairs, yelping in chorus in favor of these new doctrines, and there is no longer any pretense that the Declaration of Independence is a governing force in our affairs, or that the Constitution itself can apply to all people under our jurisdiction.

The resolution, as I said, embraces a rehearsal of the famous beginning to the Declaration of Independence. In regard to the equality of men, the inalienable right to life, liberty, and happiness; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and so forth. These ideas are stale and worn out, it seems, and I shall not discuss them, except incidentally. I shall illustrate some of my arguments by reference to this immortal declaration, but I will go on to the next proposition, which is that the Government can not hold territories for the purpose of governing them as colonies only, and that there is no power under our Constitution or under our laws to govern people and territories with other purpose than to create States.

That is a legal proposition about which men will differ. Men who are lawyers always differ. It is their business to differ. If all lawyers agreed, there would be no attorney on the other side and one fee would not be earned.

I lay down this broad proposition, which I will not undertake to argue out from a legal standpoint, but which rests on the basis of common sense, that the United States cannot govern any country that does not belong to the United States, and that if we have any territory anywhere above which our flag floats there the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the country go together, and if the flag goes there the Constitution and the principles underlying the Constitution and Declaration of Independence go too. If we surrender these, if we by our action by our inaction show that we have other and further power, then, Mr. President, the beginning of the end has come.

I will print in my remarks, but will not take time to read them, some decisions of the Supreme Court bearing on this question, in which, if language, the strongest, clearest, most emphatic, most undoubtedly in its meaning can convey any meaning, it is shown that according to the opinion of the Supreme Court the proposition I have laid down is not the law of the land and that Congress must carry it out. Our Supreme Court, the authorized interpreter of our Constitution, has said:

A power in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies and dependent territories over which the (the Congress) might legislate without restriction would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form. (Scott v. Sanford, 19 How., 397.)

In another case that court has said:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was acquired. These purposes are secured by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States in the Union. (Murphy v. Oregon, 124 U. S., 1.)

In still another case it said:

The Territories acquired by Congress, whether by cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects. (Shively v. Bowlby, 122 U. S., 1.)

In still another case it said:

The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States, and there is no citizen, whatever his condition or wherever he may be within the territory of the United States, who has not a right to its protection. (United States v. Moore, 3 Cranch, 139.)

And in defining the rights of the inhabitants of Territories it said:

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them, as to other citizens, by the principles of constitution and property, which restrain all the agents of government, State and national. (Murphy
The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States."

Chief Justice Marshall, for the entire court, defined the term "United States" as follows:

Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania. (Loughborough vs. Blake, 5 Wheaton, 137.)

Judge Cooley, whose commentaries are universally accepted as conclusive interpretations of our constitutional law, summarizes the doctrine as follows:

And when territory is acquired the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without revenue, but also because the use of these lands has been inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its own imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions. (Cooley's Principles of Constitutional Law, 170.)

Having given these opinions of our court of last resort, I will leave this part of my subject and pass on.

The next proposition which is involved in the resolution is that our commerce does not depend upon the acquisition of Asiatic territory, and I will only draw the attention of Senators, without going into statistics, to the fact, which can not be disputed, that of the exports of the American continent nearly 90 per cent at this time go to Europe. Our commerce in the Pacific is comparatively small.

While visions of greatness, of empire, and of untold wealth which is to flow therefrom, which so dazzled the eyes of the Senator from Indiana the other day, are in the air, and every man imagines that a new Aladdin's palace is going to spring up in that quarter of the globe which we are to march forward to and inhabit, I say to him that if I know anything about it—and I at least am entitled to my opinion, if nothing else—the nations of Europe, which has a comparatively small area and is densely populated, will call on us through their exportations in the past for our surplus agricultural products to feed their teeming millions, and that our manufactured products, if we shall become possessors of this eastern empire, will only be there if we can sell those products at the best goods at the lowest price. We need not establish in that territory a despotism which will bar out by our tariff laws the products of other nationalities, and we are reaching after a shadow while we can get the substance without any army, without any risk to our Constitution, without straining our power as a Congress, without going contrary to or being false to the traditions of our people; and I say that the flag is not necessary to be backed by bayonets in order to sell our calico and our other manufactures in that market.

Our trade with the Philippine Islands, which is the immediate subject of discussion, is comparatively trifling. The trade of the whole Philippine Islands is so small that it can cut no figure in this discussion. I think the exports and imports of the whole islands amount to something less than $30,000,000.

Of course, we are told that with the enlivening influences of American genius and money, and with the granting of franchises to certain people to exploit and to develop those islands, that commerce will double and treble and quintuple, and all that. I think that it will if we can acquire it.

Having given these opinions of our court of last resort, I will leave this part of my subject and pass on.

The next proposition which is involved in the resolution is that our commerce does not depend upon the acquisition of Asiatic territory, and I will only draw the attention of Senators, without going into statistics, to the fact, which can not be disputed, that of the exports of the American continent nearly 90 per cent at this time go to Europe. Our commerce in the Pacific is comparatively small.

While visions of greatness, of empire, and of untold wealth which is to flow therefrom, which so dazzled the eyes of the Senator from Indiana the other day, are in the air, and every man imagines that a new Aladdin's palace is going to spring up in that quarter of the globe which we are to march forward to and inhabit, I say to him that if I know anything about it—and I at least am entitled to my opinion, if nothing else—the nations of Europe, which has a comparatively small area and is densely populated, will call on us through their exportations in the past for our surplus agricultural products to feed their teeming millions, and that our manufactured products, if we shall become possessors of this eastern empire, will only be there if we can sell those products at the best goods at the lowest price. We need not establish in that territory a despotism which will bar out by our tariff laws the products of other nationalities, and we are reaching after a shadow while we can get the substance without any army, without any risk to our Constitution, without straining our power as a Congress, without going contrary to or being false to the traditions of our people; and I say that the flag is not necessary to be backed by bayonets in order to sell our calico and our other manufactures in that market.

Our trade with the Philippine Islands, which is the immediate subject of discussion, is comparatively trifling. The trade of the whole Philippine Islands is so small that it can cut no figure in this discussion. I think the exports and imports of the whole islands amount to something less than $30,000,000.

Of course, we are told that with the enlivening influences of American genius and money, and with the granting of franchises to certain people to exploit and to develop those islands, that commerce will double and treble and quintuple, and all that. I think that it will if we can acquire it.

But let me consider to what extent the milk in the cocoanut, the real subject of my speech, have we got a legal title to the Philippines? Upon the decision of that question in the minds of the American people and of Congress will turn the question as to what action we shall take.

Now, what are the facts? I shall briefly pass upon the time of the Senate to rise hearse in a general way some undisputed facts proven by the documents sent to us by the President of the United States are from General Otis's report, and I shall go as far as that in the briefest possible way.

Nobody denies that the Filipinos commenced their insurrection against Spain in 1896; that they were at war with Spain, and that after successes more or less indicative of their strength, and being in possession of the islands and hold them, or rather retain them, Spain made a treaty December, 1897, with Aguinaldo and his lieutenants by which certain reforms were to be granted,
and these lieutenants and chiefs were to leave the islands and receive $400,000 as compensation for deserting or leaving the insurrection. The people of the Philippine Islands did not cease their war, however. Aguinaldo departed, the $400,000 was paid, but the insurrection went on, and nobody denies it, because our consul said so. It went on because Spain, over their frenzied, failed to grant the reforms promised.

Dewey went to Manila the 1st of May. Fifteen days later Aguinaldo followed, brought there in an American ship; he landed; issued his proclamation; Dewey gave him arms, rifles, and artillery with which to fight the Spaniards. He acted in the capacity of an ally, under the direction of Dewey, and with his full knowledge and consent, and Dewey encouraged it. He moved forward, capturing Spanish stronghold after stronghold until he had cooped up the last Spaniard in Luzon in the city of Manila. He did that before any of our troops got there.

In the meantime he had issued his proclamation calling upon the Filipinos to elect delegates to a congress. That congress assembled; a provisional government was formed, of which he was given the dictatorship. His army participated in the siege of Manila, after General Merritt had reached there with some American soldiers. When the city surrendered he occupied part of it with his troops, and was recognized by Merritt as an ally.

The Spaniards later on abandoned the only other place they had in the islands, Iloilo, and it was occupied by the Filipinos. They had a little garrison at Zambonga and one or two other small towns on the seacoast. The Filipino republic established its authority over every foot of the territory in those islands, with the exception of the Sulu group and of the four towns I have mentioned. Its authority was recognized everywhere as, sure as the Every\_where law and order prevailed, according to the statement of our naval officers who went on a tour of inspection through Luzon; and the Filipino government was as firmly established in the control of those islands as though there were Spaniards on them. There was no looting and no fighting. There is no doubt that Aguinaldo could have captured Manila, if Dewey had permitted it, before Merritt got there.

Well, what are the legal points involved there? That Spain's colonists revolted against her before we declared war; that they drove her troops into Manila and established a government of their own; and all before the United States had even thought of claiming the islands; because if we read the report of General Otis, we will find that those people had been encouraged to hope for self-government. They had been promised that the government of the United States had no selfish or sinister purposes; that the war had been begun because we loved humanity and liberty; and the only friction that arose between Aguinaldo and General Merritt's successor, General Otis, was from the suspicion Aguinaldo had that we might leave the islands in the possession of Spain when the treaty was made, and thereby they would be endangered by the possession of fortified places which were held by Americans and surrendered when the Spaniards returned to try and reestablish their authority.

I was here a very brief extract from the first letter that General Otis ever wrote to Aguinaldo. The city of Manila surrendered on the 12th of August. Merritt was relieved in a very few days later, and Otis took his place. He found an unanswered letter from Aguinaldo making some inquiries as to the purpose of this Government and protesting against yielding up positions which his army held. After Otis had had time to familiarize himself with the conditions, I will read what he said in a letter dated September 8. Now, Senators, listen here:

"Permit me, General, to assure you that I fully appreciate the difficulties under which you labor in your endeavors to carry out the dictates of the wishes of your people. I have already expressed myself in former communications. I am fully convinced of your wish to hold in harmony with the United States, and to preserve the integrity of the United States forces and government of Manila, and that you deplore, with me, any precipitate action that may disturb that harmony and friendly feeling. I have been fully aware that all unpleasant incidents which have occurred, and to which I alluded in my former letter, were due entirely to irreconcilable differences and unwarranted action of subordinates, and I am constantly called upon to correct misconceptions and to punish offenses which they have wantonly committed.

I made a mistake in getting hold of the wrong letter. That is one I intended to read later on, but it shows that Otis felt that Aguinaldo at heart had no purpose to bring about any conflict and that he was not complaining captiously.

Here is the letter I intended to read in regard to Otis's pledges or promises to this man in his first official communica-
tions, which are remembered. Senators, this was there as the Governor-General of the of the United States, our representative with full authority to do as he pleased or as in his judgment was best for this country. Here is what he wrote to this man September 8, 1898:

"Rather than see the ships of the Navy of the United States controlling the navigable waters of these islands and its Army devastating their territory, I would greatly prefer to advise my Government that there is no longer need to send more of its troops to this section of the country and that those whom it holds waiting on its Pacific frontier can be remanded to their homes or employed elsewhere, as it may determine."

People will say that Otis had no authority to bind the United States officially, or to bind any authority, but here he was expressing that feeling as one which actuated him and the American people. He did not know the President was going to change his mind.

But I will go back without further touch-
ing the point as to our sad faith. Without adding to the mountain of evidence produced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Turner] in his speech on that subject, without appealing to the equities in this case, we will come down to the legal principles of international law.

First, the Filipinos had revolted and were fighting for their liberty before we declared war with Spain. Second, they had conquered the archipelago and had possession of it. Third, Aguinaldo's authority was recognized throughout it except in the Mohammedan islands in the south. I might—but I will come to that later if I do not forget it; I believe I will do it now for fear I may forget it—I might ask the question why, in dealing with those people, we selected the barbarians, the savages, the Mohammedans, who practice polygamy, to treat with pacifically and to bribe or buy their allegiance, and took the Christians, who acknowledge the same God as we do and the same Christ, as the targets for our bullets, under the plea that they must submit abjectly and absolutely to whatever we told them?

If, as some people proclaim, and I have grown a little accustomed to the reticulation of the sentiment, we have gone into a partnership with God in this business; why did we not recognize those who acknowledge His Son and treat with them as one Christian people should treat with another rather than present to their bosoms our bayonets and say, "Get on your knees; surrender your liberties, your lives, your property, and all you hold dear to the dictation of our people without any guarantees, or we will shoot you to death?"

Aguinaldo sent his representative, Agoncillo, here in October, 1898, I think it was. He begged and pleaded with the President for some recognition, some indication as to the attitude of the President was. Aguinaldo himself, being the representative of his people and having their confidence and love, their dictator, if you please, with absolute autocratic power, as this correspondence shows, was forced to do certain things and to maintain an attitude of resistance, because his own soldiers would have shot him to death if they had felt that he was willing to have the United States authority substituted for that of Spain. No autonomy or recognition of the aspirations of the Filipinos for self-government was allowed.

But to get back to the proposition; these people had conquered their liberties from Spain before we conquered Manila. We helped them. We had good reason to give us any more title to their property or to their land than it did the French when they helped us in the Revolutionary war. The legal status was that the Filipinos had a government of their own, and we had only Manila. The treaty of peace came! we made a demand.

The President went West; he held his ear to the ground, so the newspapers stated; he was appalled everywhere on his way in Iowa, Illinois, and other Western States when he spoke about the flag having been planted on lands watered by the blood of our soldiers and asked who would "tear it down." He thought he was doing a popular thing. I cannot believe he thought he was doing a right thing.

So he demanded that the islands should be bought, giving $20,000,000 for something that Spain did not possess, which Spain could not deliver. Spain's right, title, and interest, that was, was passed to us. That is the legal status.

Now, what is the legal result? Did we get any title? I say no. I could not get any property in this city or in any other place on such conditions. I have got to go into court; I have got to have delivery follow the deed; I have got to prove that the property belonged to the man who sold it. We can not prove Spain's title. We therefore simply bought what Spain did not have—the legal title to the Philippine Islands—and we have conquered those islands at the point of the bayonet. So whatever title we now possess rests upon conquest and conquest only. Here is an undoubted authority as to the law of the case.

Chancellor Kent, in his Commentaries, volume 1, page 178, referring to territories added or acquired, said:

Full sovereignty can not be held to have passed by the mere words of the treaty without actual delivery. To complete the right of property, the right to the thing and the possession of the thing must be united. This is a necessary principle in the law of property in all systems of jurisprudence. * * * *

The general law of property applies to the right of territory no less than to other rights. The practice of nations has been conformable to this principle, and the conventional law of nations is full of instances of this kind.

In a treatise on international law by Sir Shurston Baker, just published, at Boston, by Little, Brown & Co., at page 61, that author says:

In modern times sales and transfers of national territory are not made by treaty or by some solemn act of the sovereign authority of the State. And such transfers are not made without the consent, express or implied, of the inhabitants.

At page 355 the same author says:

The rule of public law with respect to the alienation of the inhabitants of a conquered territory is, therefore, no longer to be interpreted as meaning that it is absolutely and unconditionally acquired by conquest, or transferred and handed over by treaty as a thing assignable by contract and without the assent of the subject.

On the contrary, the express or implied consent of the subject is now regarded as essential. He is a complete legal person, &c. &c. &c.

We have only got the color of a claim, but no title. Are those people, then real bel? I have not noticed that word being used so much in the dispatches recently. They are now called insurgents. But if they were insurgents, against whom did they rise? Spain. They never rose against us. We began war on them by shooting down one of their men. The President issued his proclamation in De-
cember, six weeks before the ratification of the treaty of peace, proclaiming his purpose to annex and control those islands absolutely. He had no law for it; he had no authority for it, for the treaty had not been ratified.

Congress was in session and had not told him to do it, yet men contend that we have a perfect title to the Philippines; that there is nothing in the constitution of the Filipinos that they had won their liberty and the control of their country with their arms. It is contended that we are rightfully putting our authority in force and extending it over those people and those islands because the United States does not treat with rebels. It only buy alliances from savages and polygamous Mohammedans! God save the mark!

Mr. President, suppose we acknowledge, for the sake of argument, that we own the Philippine Islands; that our title is good; that whether it is good or not, we have made it good today: that we have de jure facto if not a de jure title that nobody disputes except the guerrillas who are now out there killing an occasional American soldier and still struggling for liberty.

Senators, do not forget, when you come to consider this question and determine it, that we brought Spain, the mistress of those people, to her knees in sixty days after the declaration of war with the use of only 15,000 of our troops and of our Navy, but that this Filipino war has cost us the lives of 2,000 American soldiers, $200,000,000 in money, and the use of 60,000 men for over a year, and those men who are fighting there for the love of liberty, who have forced us to display this power and spend this money, have proved that they are worthy of liberty, whether we give it to them or not.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] expressed some very queer ideas about liberty. He said that self-government is a sacred thing. I should not quote his exact language now, because I am going to read just what he said directly. I have some arguments here, put into words which I have selected, where I have said exactly what I want to say, no more and no less, and I will come to it directly.

I wish to allude in passing to the proposition that self-government, as understood by historians and all the peoples who have fought for that inestimable blessing, is a government of your own people—not a republic, not a government by ballot, not any special form of government, but a government of Germans by Germans, of Frenchmen by Frenchmen, and so on. That is self-government. A people who want to have an empire or a dictatorship or a limited monarchy or an autocracy have a perfect right to live under it. It does not gall like a foreign yoke.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senate think that the government of the Czar of Russia is self-government?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is Russian Government.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But is it self-government?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is self-government to the extent that it is satisfactory to the Russian people. No one else has any right to complain.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I fear the Senator has misread my speech. The Senator has said that his interpretation of self-government was a government which was by—

Mr. TILLMAN. By one's own people, one's own kindred.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is the government of the Czar of Russia self-government?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is not, according to our standard.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well.

Mr. TILLMAN. And there is no self-government in Europe, according to our standard, of England. France has not got it, although it is in the form of a republic, because she is really an oligarchy. Switzerland has it. I beg pardon; I should have said that Switzerland and England were the only two self-governing nations in Europe recognized by our standards.

I want to direct the Senator's attention to one thing in his speech. He said that Aguinaldo was capable and honorable, and I do not know how many other good adjectives the Senator applied to him, but he concluded by saying he was a Malay Syilla, not a Filipino Washington. I will quote him accurately when I come to make up the record, but I now direct his attention, and the attention of the country and of the Senate to the fact that the scheme of government which the Senator would have set up and which he stands for, which the Senator from Wisconsin stands for, and which the President of the United States stands for, is you all repudiate it—is one which Aguinaldo could have carried out to perfection, because he has in his own person the very attributes of the kind of autocrat that you would put there under our flag.

Here is the description given by the Senator from Indiana of the Filipino leader:

Aguinaldo is the highest type of subtlety and the most constructive mind that race has yet produced. Aguinaldo is a clever, popular leader, able, brave, resourceful, cunning, ambitious, unscrupulous, and masterful. He is full of decision, initiative, and authority, and had the confidence of the masses. He is a natural dictator. His ideas of government are absolute orders, implicit obedience, or immediate death. He understands the character of his countrymen. He is a Malay Syilla; not a Filipino Washington.

I will show later how well he would have fitted in the Senator's scheme when I come to that.

Mr. President, for sake of comparison, look at Mexico. For fifty years she was the laughingstock of the nations because of the inability of her people to realize what it was to elect anybody to govern
them. One military chieftain after another seized upon power, revolution followed revolution, and the United States was compelled to call in a dictator—Díaz—peace, good order, prosperity, happiness have come to those people, because he possessed in himself the capacity to restore law and order and to maintain a government which was equal in its application to all and free from tyranny and just what was needed. He alone has given his people what Aguinaldo would, I believe, give to the Filipinos if he had an opportunity.

Therefore I deny, I repudiate—and I love our institutions as much as any man—the pretension that we must have a Procrustean bed and cause all people to lie on it, whether they are long enough to fill it out or too long and have to be cut off. And with this stench of dirty, low, rogish politics we have in two of our largest American cities—one under Democratic and the other under Republican rule—I would have none of it, and if it is the condition to stand up and boast of our institutions as alone worthy of imitation and that they must be adopted by everybody who comes in contact with us.

But we had a great dream, a profit, of wealth, and of the inestimable blessings which would flow to the American people by the possession of the Philippine Archipelago as the doorway to the East. If you take the money we have spent and put it out at interest, it would yield a far larger sum than any possible profit that will ever come to us as a people. But I do not hesitate to assert that the expense of holding the Philippine Islands will be tenfold any sum possible to obtain from them as revenue.

Some franchises may be granted to sugar planters, tobacco growers, cotton growers, or rice growers; some contract laborers may be imported from China who will work—for the Senator from Indiana says the Filipinos will not—who will be driven by the whip, as the slaves were in the South before the war, and as they are now driven in Hawaii, to develop the rich lands of which we have heard; and there may be teeming imports coming to our country from such labor thus employed and protected by our bayonets, and the few will reap the benefits. Those bayonets must be supported by taxation, and the taxation will be paid by the laboring classes of the United States, the common, every day citizens. The benefit of the wealth will flow into the coffers of the capitalists or corporations who go out there and invest their capital, but the everyday taxpayer of the United States will never see one dollar's profit from the Philippine Islands.

Yet if their products will come in competition with the products of the Southern people—cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar. They must be admitted free or we shall establish a barrier between the two parts of the United States. If they are admitted free, those States where those products are raised are to suffer and be ruined for the benefit of the capitalists who will import those products from their plantations in the Philippine Islands. We must control the territory of the Philippines.

There is one other aspect of this question which must appeal to any thinking man, and that is the question as to whether we can maintain the Monroe doctrine in the Western Hemisphere, warn off trespassers and fight and beat off any nationality in Europe, or any combination of nationalities, who dare to come on this continent and establish any of their despoticisms or governments, whatever they may be. Can we maintain that doctrine after we have invaded the other hemisphere, have occupied territory, and stand ready to participate—for it is no use to deny it, it is the purpose fully outlined in this Chamber in more ways than one and at more times than one—to participate in the partition of China whenever that comes.

We have become a "world power." We are to create a big navy. I am in favor of the navy enough to warn all people off from this continent and keep them off of it; but if we are going to undertake to warn others outside of our preserves and then claim the right to invade their area of jurisdiction and territory, the beginning of the wars in which we shall be involved and the cost of those wars in life and treasure, the probable consequences of surrendering a tenable position for one full of danger and always inviting attack, should at least give Senators pause and make them stop and think and consider calmly whether the game is worth the candle; whether we have a title to the Philippines; whether we have made a mistake, and if so, what we ought to do.

Mr. President, I now approach a phase of this question which is very unpleasant because it deals with the, personality of men, and I would not willingly wound the sensibilities of any of those who, like myself, are charged here with governmental responsibility. Those of us who from the very beginning have opposed this policy have appealed and argued for what we conceived to be right, that our Government should pursue the only course which to our minds was honorable and just, have been met with accusations of treason, have been charged with lack of patriotism, and the Senator from Indiana has not even hesitated to tell us to our faces that we are responsible for the war and its consequences. His ignorance of the facts may explain his effrontery and in part excuse it. He said:

A Mexican opposition to war has been the chief factor in prolonging it. Had Aguinaldo not understood that in America, even in the American Congress, even here in the Senate, he and his men were supported; had we not known that it was proclaimed on the stump and in the press—of a faction in the United States that every shot that his misguided followers fired into the breasts of American soldiers was like the volleys fired by Washington's men to the bay—sides of the U.S. Constitution, the U.S. Government, and George, his insurrection would have dissolved before it entirely crystallized.

Then again he said:

I have stood on the firing line and beheld
our dead soldiers, their faces turned to the pitiless Southern sky, and in sorrow rather than anger I say to those whose voices in America have been those misguided native on whom our soldiers down that the blood of those dead and wounded boys of ours is on their hands and some of all the years can never wash that stain away.

Mr. President, if Senators on this floor and patriotic Americans throughout the country—thousands of them belonging to the party which elected Mr. McKinley President—have felt it their duty to protest against the inhuman and dishonorable conduct of our Government if they have believed that the Stars and Stripes were being disgraced and that the United States was waging a war of conquest upon a liberty-loving people, I ask that Senator in God's name would be as weak. He has his opinions on this subject. So have we. He has a right to speak those opinions without question anywhere. So have we. Are Senators and citizens to be forced men to speak the truth? Must we close our eyes and shut our mouths to all the grave dangers to our institutions by reason of this policy? Must we be accused of disloyalty to the flag because we declare our belief that in prosecuting this war it is in disloyalty to the Declaration of Independence? I repel with scorn the charge coming from any source whatever that I am not as loyal to the flag as any man on this floor, and if it is sought to locate the responsibility for the blood that has been spilled I am ready in this presence to speak what I believe and to declare the truth as I see it.

There are three classes of men in the United States Congress, those who are honest and independent, those who are corrupt, and those who are merely weak. When first I came to this Capitol I thought there were as many of the one class as of the other. A closer view and fuller acquaintance has taught me that the really corrupt men are few in number, but the weak ones are in a large majority. I do not hesitate to assert that when it was first proposed to annex the Philippines a majority in both Houses of Congress were opposed to it.

After the President went on his Western tour his own misgivings and doubts were pushed aside, and he felt that he was doing a popular thing in demanding that Spain should cede us the islands. Then, by the instrumentalities that are so well understood in this Chamber and in the other Chamber, in the use of which he is not alone, because they were alike characteristic of his predecessor, Executive influence was brought to bear; the party whip was cracked; the men who thought the Filipinos ought to be let alone, we exercising some kind of a protectorate over them and getting such advantages as we might need in our business, as a naval power and as a commercial power—those men, I say, surrendered their independence as Senators and the treaty was ratified.

Party was everything; principle was nothing; everything for Republicanism, nothing for America. There were some honorable exceptions among the adherents of the President; and, Mr. President, if there are any men in this Chamber whom those Republicans here who, in spite of all the threatening lightning that were flashing around their heads, stood steadfast as the advocates of that policy which was alone honorable, patriotic, and in accordance with fairness and justice, had joined with them, there, was still lacking the two-thirds vote necessary; the President's hands were tied unless the treaty was ratified, and his proclamation of annexation would have no authority and would have died. Where did he get the votes, and how?

If you want my opinion as to whose hands are red with the blood of American soldiers and those of Filipinos—men, women, and children—who have been slaughtered like cattle, look around and call to mind the men who made those strong and eloquent pleas, those earnest protests that floor in opposition to the treaty, and even gave personal pledges to their fellows as to how they would vote. Those are the men who, whether from corruption or from weakness or both, gave the President the legal excuse which he needed. But with those Republicans all lined up and some Democrats who, from purity of motive or from honesty of belief, had joined with them, there, was still lacking the two-thirds vote necessary; the President's hands were tied unless the treaty was ratified, and his proclamation of annexation would have no authority and would have died. Where did he get the votes, and how?

I impugn no man's motives; I have no proofs of corruption and I want none; but whether the President be most to blame or whether the crime rests on his dupes and subservient party depends I say, with all the emphasis of my nature, that I and none of those who voted against the treaty are responsible for the the spilling of one drop of this innocent blood that has been shed, and I will not endure patiently and without resentment any such accusation. With all the party influence that the treaty Spain's rights, whatever they were, were opposed to us, and as the President had determined six weeks before that the islands should be brought under the rule of our Government and issued his proclamation to that effect without any authority of law, the impartial historian will declare that he is primarily responsible for the war, responsible for the loss of the lives of our soldiers, responsible for the inhuman and devastating conflict that has followed, and that he obtained the permission which was necessary through the cowardice, venality, or weakness of men in this Chamber.

Therefore I say to the Senator from Indiana:

Thou canst not say I did it; never shake Thy gory locks at me.

I stand by the record as it has been presented in this Senate, the documents sent us by the President himself, and the report of General Otis. The record of speeches made in this Chamber will sustain every assertion I have made, and the
American people can not be deceived any longer unless they want to be.

I have left to the last discussion of that phase of this subject which is most important and vital—the race question. It is well known that the people who inhabit the Philippines belong to what we call the colored races, and the most perplexing and disturbing factor in the whole question arises from this fact. The number of these people is approximately six to ten millions, and the Senator from Indiana, who has spent some time in personal investigation, asserts in the most positive manner that they are unfit for self-government, and he gives us some very strange and unaccountable reasons as to why this is so. I say unaccountable because the Senator comes from a State and belongs to a party that in the very recent past held very different views in regard to the capabilities of the blackest and lowest type of the colored peoples.

I pause here to state the necessity I feel for speaking with absolute candor and frankness. It is not pleasant to open old wounds; moreover, I think that they are ashes—of those dead passions which brought on our great civil conflict, but Mr. President, coming as I do from a State where this race question has been the cause of untold misery and woe, and which for thirty years has been and is now the paramount issue; remembering the wrongs that have been heaped upon my people, the sons of Revolutionary sires, who suffered more and endured more in the cause of liberty in that struggle than those or any other State, and feeling the race question in its broadest sense, as we know it, may be likened to the “worn that dieth not,” that it is a new “irrepressible conflict” that can not be shunned, but presents ever growing and ever formidable dangers—I must speak my thoughts though I die for it.

I will not join the Senator from Alabama, who is not in the Chamber, in the assertions made in his speech on the Pittsfield resolution:

I was a soldier of the Confederacy, and while I have always regretted the necessity that put me under arms in open hostility to the flag of our common country, I feel as every Confederate soldier feels, that it is a peculiar honor that we were the only white men ever called upon as soldiers to defend the white race against a fanatical attack of so-called reformers and the deliberate organization of ambitious politicians, who forced us into war by their cruel desire to put negro slaves on a political and social footing of equality with us.

I do not believe any such thing. The war had no such origin. The condition in regard to slavery and the ceaseless agitation had embittered the South against the North and the North against the South. Secession and belief in State's rights, for which the South has always contended, precipitated the conflict. The North fought to preserve the Union and to free the slaves, and the South fought for self-government and the inherited belief in the justice of holding slaves as property.

The Declaration of Independence was the slogan of both sections. The North contended that the Declaration embraced the Negroes, while the South, remembering that Jefferson had been a slaveholder, contended that it did not. I was only a boy of thirteen when the great struggle began; but who can forget, even though a child, the angry outbursts, the battle cries that had led up to the bloody contest? Amid the storm and stress of the battles, the question, Who were the people of the United States, seemed to become the embodiment of all that was best and noblest in Northern civilization, and even in American civilization, who stood as the great apostle of liberty? Whose words of fervid eloquence marshaled the Northern hosts? Whose high moral purpose, whose grandeur of character and greatness of soul, sustained those hosts in adversity and defeat? Who stood like a colossus towering above the smaller, meaner men who surrounded him, and who must ever stand above them, commanding the admiration and love of all true men everywhere? Who? Abraham Lincoln; and I from South Carolina tell you so and feel honored in doing it.

Whatever motives may be attributed to others, whatever of selfishness or ambition that entered into the calculations of others, I here declare it is my belief that he never had a thought in connection with the whole subject nor uttered a word that did not have its inspiration in the purest patriotism and the noblest aspiration for humanity. He did not consider the Declaration of Independence an academic question. It was to him a religion.

Now, after all the bloodshed, what have we as a people gained? What has the conflict left to us? Although this city is filled with monuments erected to the brave men who bared their bosoms to the storms of shot and shell from Confederate rifles and cannon, though the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution were declared to be necessary to secure the fruits of this victory for liberty in the Union, and were said to be the fruit, the gathering in, the perfecting and solidifying of the structure of liberty; although no honest man will deny that the words of Webster, “Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever,” had been the inspiration which filled the Northern armies and under Lincoln’s leadership won the fight; although we now have a nation whose States are cemented together with blood, it is a Union only; the spirit, the vitalizing essence, love of liberty, appears to have died and little remains of Webster’s and Lincoln’s ideas.

We have come, within forty years from the beginning of that great struggle, to have a leading Senator on the floor of this Chamber, a man who stands high in the councils of the dominant party—the party of Lincoln, of Sumner, of Phillips, of Seward—declare that “Governments derive their just powers from the consent of some of the governed.” Another Senator, he from Indiana, whose brilliant speech has been heralded by the Imperialist press as
the slogan of twentieth-century Republicanism, makes this declaration:

Let men beware how they employ the term "self-government." It is a sacred term. It is the watchword at the battle stations of ten years of the struggle for the peninsula of liberty, for liberty does not always mean self-government. Self government is a method of liberty—natural, simplest, best—and it is acquired only after centuries of study and struggle and experiment and instruction and action. This is the progress of man. Self-government is no base and common thing, to be bestowed on the merely undisciplined. It is the degree which was the graduate of liberty, not the name of liberty's infant class who have not yet mastered the alphabet of freedom.

Ah, Mr. President, has it come to this? If we attacked the Filipino leaders and their followers, those men of affairs, men so strong in the faith of the right of men to govern themselves after our great example that, although illly armed and without artillery, it has required 60,000 American troops over a year to drive them from the field, and even yet they have not surrendered, but have adopted a guerrilla warfare—if these are not fit for self-government under our kindly tutelage; let me ask of those Republicans here who in part are responsible for it, and who were and are now in absolute sympathy with it, how dared they give the control of the Southern States into the hands of negroes as being fit not only to govern themselves but also to govern white men? How dared you do it? If the Filipinos are children, why did we send the ex-slaves of the South? How dared Republicans appeal to the Northern masses to compel the South to grant the negroes a free vote and a fair count when it involved negro rule pure and simple?

One Sunday morning, while stopping over in Indianapolis, the beautiful capital of the Senator's State, I walked out to take some exercise, and had only gone a little distance from the hotel when I came on a square upon which the street entered at the corner, and in the center of it is one of the most artistic and beautiful structures in stone I have ever seen—the State's monument to its dead. While costing, I am told, something in the neighborhood of a million dollars, I approached and read on one side, chiseled into the stone, this legend:

TO INDIANA'S SILENT VICTORS, WAR FOR THE UNION, 1861-1865
14 regiments of volunteer infantry.............. 170,776
14 regiments of volunteer cavalry........... 21,905
27 regiments of volunteer artillery........... 10,886
Indiana volunteers in the Navy............. 2,130
Total Indiana volunteers engaged in battle........... 210,407

Killed and died:
Commissioned officers.................. 652
Noncommissioned officers and enlisted men......... 23,794
Total killed and died.................... 24,446

For the purpose of comparison I will give the figures from my own State of South Carolina: Total number of officers and men entered, 71,083; died in battle, died from disease, died in prison—total, 5,495.

I took the trouble to compare the patriotism of the two sides to the quarrel as evinced by their willingness to die for what they fought. The voting population of South Carolina is 900,000 in round numbers. Ninety thousand or voters or their substitutes did not volunteer. They were not needed; no one could suppose. Now for the deaths. The percentage of deaths in Indiana was 11½; in South Carolina, 22, nearly double. I will make no comment on this, Mr. President, other than to remark that I believe the men on both sides thought they were right, and the South Carolinians, true to their State motto, "Animis opibusque parati," "Ready with our lives and fortunes," died for their convictions. No man can do more, and I pity the narrow souls who would charge them with being rebels or traitors. As did South Carolina and Indiana, so did they all. The embattled South, and the embattled North, and the issue was thought to be saved.

That issue, as I have stated, was whether all men are created free and equal, including the negro. But for that there would have been no secession; but for that there would have been no war; and while I have acknowledged in the fullest sense that the Union sentiment caused the Northern people to pour out their blood like water to maintain it, do not forget that the issue was the equality of man and liberty in the Union. Is the question settled? Did the 24,000 men from Indiana who offered up their lives for the Union and liberty believe that in thirty-five years the party of the men of the party whose principles they died for would come back to believe with Stephen A. Douglas that the "Declaration of Independence was intended only for white men?"

Did they believe that Lincoln's famous utterance, "The Union can not exist half slave and half free" would be forgotten, and that we would have Senators here contending for the right of Congress to govern indefinitely in absolutism 10,000,000 people under a form of government that to be "simple and strong," a government of force resting on principles and ideas entirely foreign to those for which Lincoln died? Were the fruits of the war mere Sodom apples, to be turned to ashes on our lips within the generation of the men who fought in that struggle—men who were as earnest, honest, and patriotic in sustaining the Government as any men ever were? Have we got Sodom apples as the fruit of that great contest?

Are the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to be nullified in their essence? How is it they have their purposes in the South? Are they for home use only? Is the flag to become again a "haunting lie" and float over a military despotism first in the Philippines and later at home? Was the memorable conflict between slavery and freedom useless? Have
we gained nothing? Is the commercial greed which dominates in our councils and coerces the President to do his bloody and horrid work in order to impose a new "league with death and a covenant with hell" in the interest of oppression akin to slavery? In order to do all these things must we "camp outside the Constitution" and give the old interpreters of the Southern slaveholders to the Declaration of Independence, and nullify all preceding and decisions of our Supreme Court? Did this nation offer up of its best and bravest upon the altar of liberty the blood of seven hundred thousand men, and spend and destroy five billions of treasure that we might have a "government of the people, by the people, for the people," to find that in the brief span of one man's life the sacrifice was vain, the civil war a mistake, and that the colored race has no rights we are bound to respect at home or abroad?

Says the Book, "O ye hypocrites, ye hypocrites!" Hitherto the South has enjoyed a monopoly in and the odium of shooting and hanging men of the colored race. Have the Northern people grown envious and do they seek to emulate our example? The South has had no choice, and much of the blood of negroes shed by white men is the direct result of the attempt to place that race in control of our Southern States. The irresistible conflict between liberty and slavery destroyed slavery, but it has left to the South an irresistible conflict between intelligence and ignorance, between vice and virtue, between leniency and despotism. We inherited our race problem. You are going out wantonly in search of yours and of the nation's. The sins of our fathers are being visited on the children to the third and fourth generation. The ill consequences of having been bred in an atmosphere of slavery cling to us like the shirt of Nessus in our attempt to throw off the yoke and go forward with progress. But have we not enough of "I debased and ignoble people" in our midst, and those who seek by conquest, without any right other than a shadowy one, to incorporate 10,000,- 000 more colored peoples?

If the North is jealous of the South's "bad eminence" in the murder of colored people, is it not strange, is it not passing strange that almost the only protest against this infamous policy of the President comes from men from the South who are representatives of their States in this Chamber? We know whereof we speak. We are in contact with the race question at close quarters and have been and will have to continue to be. You know not what you do.

We are tied to the "body of death," represented by the presence in our midst of a debased and ignorant race. We are doing the best we can. Can we incorporate a larger number without increasing the danger to our institutions, especially when it is boldly avowed that they are in it for self-government? Is there any reason either in policy or in morals why the already hard task and hopeless future of the blacks of the South, the burdens under which they bend, should be increased by having the "sullen, silent people" of the East brought into direct competition with them in the cultivation of cotton, rice, and other subtropical products? Do the imperialists worship at no shrine except that of Mammon?

I mean you men who believe in this new policy. Is the dream of empire in the East and of the wealth that is to flow into our coffers therefrom to drive the nation onward in its downward course, unchecked by any memories of the past, without any regard for the rights and interests of our own people, black or white?

In the rice and sugar industries in Louisiana and South Carolina the labor, which represents three-fourths of the cost, is black, and it is these men who will suffer most.

The Senator from Indiana would have the subjugation of the Filipinos thoroughly performed. His heart is hard as flint, although his face is as tender as that of a smiling girl. Personally I know he is a genial and pleasant gentleman, a man whom I like, and he comes from a State where there are such monuments to the dead who offered up their lives for liberty as should be an inspiration for the love of liberty, and I say it is astounding, Mr. President, that a man coming from such a State should dare get up here and offer such a scheme of government for any people anywhere under the Stars and Stripes as he did.

I beg you to remember that he did not trust that marvelous memory of his, because we all know, at least those of us who have made speeches—and we sometimes talk ourselves—that those flowing periods and those beautiful sentences and that rhetorical beauty and finish and glitter did not come from any well into which he can dip a bucket and draw it out at will. [Laughter.]

Listen to the programme to be followed. He read it, mind you, showing that he either had not had time to commit it to memory or he wanted to be exactly sure of every word. Announcing, as he did, that he was doing it at the request of men at both ends of this Capitol and leading Republicans everywhere, knowing that the papers had stated that he had conferred with the President and again, I say his theory or his plan of government stands and will continue to stand as that which the Republican party proposes for the government of the Philippines.

I say, further, that while he was candid enough to throw off all disguise, having been a baby or having been born during the war, and remembering nothing about it except a vague and indefinite idea of glory; never having been through it, even in part; (although I was not in the army, I know what there is in the way of suffering and tears and blood), he, I say, came here at the end of the nineteenth century, when we are blossoming, so to speak,
for a new franchise; and what is it that he offers us in the way of government? Listened, I can not conceive that any of you caught the full import unless you have studied it:

And so our Government must be simple and strong. Simple and strong! The meaning of those two words must be written in every line of this legislation, realized in every act of Philippine administration. Let me give an instance: the Philippine office in our Department of State; an American governor-general in Manila, with power to meet daily emergencies; possibly an advisory council with no power except that of discussing upon the theory of or developing the council would be the germ of the legislature, a school in practical Government; American lieutenant-governors in each province, with a like council about him; if possible, an American resident in each district and a like council grouped about him; frequent and unannounced visits of the principal governors to the districts of their province; periodical reports to the governor-general; an American board of visibility to make semiannual trips to the archipelago without power of suggestion or interference to officials or people, but only to report; a committee to the Philippine office of our State Department; the establishment of import duties on a revenue basis, with such discrimination in favor of American imports as will prevent the cheaper goods of other nations from destroying American trade; a complete reform of local taxation on a just and scientific basis, beginning with the establishment of a tax on land according to its assessed value, of the raising of abundant money for Philippine and Oriental use; the granting of franchises and concessions upon the theory of or developing the resources of the archipelago, and disposed of by sale, but upon participation in the profits of the enterprise—

A new socialism—

the formation of a system of public schools everywhere, with compulsory attendance rigidly enforced; the establishment of the English language throughout the islands, teaching it exclusively in the schools and using it, through interpreters, exclusively in the courts, a simple civil code and a still simpler criminal code, and so on to all the islands except the Sultan of Sulu, Mindanao, and Panay.

These latter, I suppose, belong to the Sultan of Sulu. We have bought its allegiance—

American judges for all but smallest offenses; gradual, slow, and careful introduction of the best Filipinos into the working machinery of the government; no promise whatever of the franchise until the people have been prepared for it; all this backed by the necessary force to execute it. This outline of government and situation demands as soon as tranquillity is established, until then military government is advisable.

And I ask Senators to remember the description he gave of Aguinaldo and see how he fits the place of governor-general, and he had already organized just such a government in many respects.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Wolcott], who took issue with the Senator from Indiana the other day, committed himself to a proposition in general terms. While criticizing our young friend he recognized the necessity for force. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Speirs], who had a bill introduced which I read, turns the whole thing over to the President and as to Congress, we know he has got no use for us in carrying on the Government. It is not our fault, because we obey orders anyhow—at least Senators on the other side do. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, if you will take that scheme, that plan, that outline, and analyze it, what is the first thought that will come to your mind? That Nero or Caligula prepared it as memorandum for a Roman general sent to be a newly conquered province. Under such a scheme despotism, backed by force, you have soldiers at every turn, to be supported by the people and in bulk. Mr. President, that scheme is the one that will be followed unless the American people shall cast off their wrath, like Uncle Sam did at the Gridiron dinner Saturday night, and march up to the new emperor, Mr. McKinley, and take his crown and purple robe off, and tell him it is time for this foolishness to stop. Mr. President, it never ought to have started. But there is time yet for us to retard our steps.

In addition to this scheme outlined by the Senator from Indiana with such fullness, and to show whether we are drifting, I saw in yesterday's paper, that the Committee on Puerto Rico had decided that wherever in the bill before this body for the government of that island the word "conquered" occurs, it was to be stricken out, and that law, if it be a law, will allow those people to be governed by Congress, and the guaranties of the Constitution are to remain in a condition of paralysis. Why, Puerto Rico has not been in insurrection! Puerto Rico even stood Spain's tyranny without complaint, and its people are peaceable and obedient. What is the matter with Puerto Rico?

I do not know, but from the source that the amendment came I judge that there is tobacco in Puerto Rico, and that there is some similar tobacco in Connecticut, and for that reason the Constitution shall not be extended over Puerto Rico. I will be obliged if some one will tell me where Congress gets such power. I have been innocent and foolish enough to think that whatever the United States bought or conquered belonged to it and came under the flag and the Constitution both; but the Constitution will not apply to Puerto Rico if this committee has its way. The reason is that under the Constitution, if the Supreme Court does not retrace its steps, our excises and taxes must be uniform everywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States; and therefore we cannot put a tariff against the Puerto Rico tobacco for the protection of the Connecticut seed and its posterity.

Mind you, that is a mere guess. I hope I will not do anybody from Connecticut any wrong by charging that this scheme emanated from any one of senator certainly a startling proposition, and Puerto Rico as to be governed just as Spain governed it.

According to the best reports, we have already done to death anywhere from
Mr. President, is it any source of satisfaction to those who gave the President the excuse for this war, who backed him in it, to know, as I will now tell them, that during the three hundred years of Spanish domination the Spaniards never put to death one-half that number? Yet the President proclaims that it is the providence of God and in the interest of liberty, law, and order. I recall the famous saying, I do not know who was the author of it, probably it may have been Suwarrow, that "order reigns in Warsaw".

It was a dispatch sent, I think, to the Empress Catherine; if not, it could have been. Order in Warsaw meant that that devoted city had been taken by assault; that it lay in ashes, or the largest proportion of it, and that nearly all of its inhabitants, men, women, and children, had been put to the sword. We have heard that order reigns in Holio. We know that that once flourishing city, a large proportion of it, is now in ashes; and in many parts of the Philippine Islands there is no description at all adequate or that will give us a clearer idea of the situation than that contained in Byron's line:

He makes a solitude and calls it peace.

Now, here is the most astonishing part. I do not know that I ought to say anything about it after the crushing answer of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar], but I have to do it to round out my thought. The Senator from Indiana, after giving us the outline of the plan of government for these islands, said:

Such a government will have its effect upon us here in America, too. Model administration there will be an example created by ourselves for model administration here; and our own example is the only one Americans ever need. It is not true that charity begins at home. We know that it begins abroad and ends in its full glory in the home. It is not true that perfect government must be achieved at home before administering it abroad. There is a suggestion, an example, and a stimulus for the best government at home. It is as if we projected ourselves upon a living screen and beheld ourselves at work.

The government we set up, this despotism propped by bayonets, is to be a school in which Americans will learn how to govern so well they will be brought back to improve on our own boasted self-government.

The Senator quotes Scripture. We are urged as follows:

Cust thy bread upon the waters, and after many days it shall return unto thee.

With what measure ye mete, it shall be meted to you again.

We are going to measure out good government, propped by bayonets, as I have, and seen negro militia march by your door threatening the lives of your wives and children. You do not know what it is to have bayonet rule. God forbid you ever should. But are we going to have any peace in the Philippines? Is the conquest of those islands going to be perfect? There is some talk that now they will hang these scattered bands if they catch any of them. Those gentlemen and it is said that they are mere robbers.

Why, Mr. President, during the Revolutionary war, when Great Britain's armies overran the entire State of South Carolina
from the mountains to the sea; when there was not a foot of territory that was not occupied by British troops and all the whigs had to hide in the woods or to cross over into North Carolina or into Georgia; when Marion, the “Swamp Fox,” and Sumter, the “Gamecock,” and the other men who fought and continued to fight were hiding out and making their little expeditions against the redcoats with 30, 40, or 100 men, they were guerrillas. They were like these Tagals.

Is it proposed that we shall forget everything of our own history that is noble and ennobling in order to carry out this damnable programme? The Tagals having once tasted of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, having had a taste of liberty—freedom from Spanish rule is my definition of Tagal liberty—having, as I say, had that taste, are they going to quietly subside and become the simple, cowardly, peaceful, submissive creatures that they were before?

All history teaches us to the contrary. Bruce and Wallace in Scotland,Tell in Switzerland, William of Orange in Holland, Kosciusko in Poland, the only one who failed, and last but not least—no, possibly the greatest of them all—Oom Paul Kruger and his little band of Dutch in South Africa give the lie to the proposition that these men will quietly submit and become the abject slaves even of the great United States. They do not want our liberty. They want their own liberty, worse than ours though it may be. And remembering that the death of Leonidas and his 300 spartans inspired the Greeks with such courage that although the struggle seemed hopeless and very few of the Grecian confederates were willing even to dare make the fight, the Athenians, with the few auxiliaries inspired by his deathless example, fought the battle of Marathon and drove the Persian hordes, twenty times their number, back to Asia.

Nobody expects the Tagals to drive us out. They do not know the hopelessness of attempting to get their freedom. No brave people ever did calculate as to whether they would win or not, and not brave people ever will.

Right here I want to say: that the blood of the American soldiers is as dear to me as anybody. I pity, from the bottom of my soul, the officers and men of the American Army who are out there doing this dirty work because they have to obey orders. But I love to believe, and I do believe, with Byron that—

- Freedom’s battle once begun, Beseath’d by bleeding sire to son, Tho’ baffled oft is ever won.

Mr. President, as one who loves liberty and loves his country and believes that its true greatness lies in clinging to the ideals of our fathers, I protest against the continuance of this unholy war. Let us be rid of the dangers and pitfalls that lie in the course we are pursuing. Let us remain true to the precepts of the great founders of our Government.

What is it our duty to do? First, stop this war. How? By telling those people that we do not want to have them governed after our methods. By saying to them, ‘Come together and piece up the government you had, or any other you now want. We will warn Europe and all other oppressors off your shores.’

That will be some recompense. We can protect them against outside interference. We can retain whatever territory we may need for a naval station. We could make a compact with them which would give us any advantages we might desire or need in the way of commerce. We could have done this a year ago much easier than we can now, but it is not too late to do right. It is never too late to do right. If we do not, if we continue our bloody tyrannical course, if we say to them you must submit to the last man, and there must not be a man left in those islands who declares or claims that he is not a subject of the United States, we may establish peace. We can, I suppose, suppress and repress and continueto kill and murder, for it is murder. We had no right there at the beginning—I mean in the way we have undertaken. We captured Manila from Spain, and that we had title to. Spain ceded it to us. We can retain it if we want to in law and in morals. But the balance of the islands are not ours, and they never were ours in any legal aspect or sense. I repeat what I have already said, that if the civil war was not a mistake, if it was not a hideous blunder and crime, let us stop; because if that war was for freeing the slave and establishing in this Government the principle that equality and liberty the Union were its purposes, this Filipino war is a war of conquest and nothing else, and is a crime in the sight of God and man. [Applause in the galleries.]