

But they tell you that a great mistake has been made in the matter of the Philippine Islands. I think so, too. My opinion is well known, or if it be not well known, I am willing to make it known, that I thought we should have done in the Philippine Islands exactly what we have done and mean to do in Cuba. I think that in that way we should have saved the war, we should have had the love of that people instead of their hatred, we should have had everything heart could desire in the way of glory, in the way of trade, aye, and in the American sense of the word, in the way of empire. The policy which seemed to me best for the country seemed to me also best for the Republican party. If that course had been pursued, we should, in my opinion, have had the presidential election almost without a struggle. I met the other day in New York the man whom I regard as the ablest and wisest Democratic leader in the country—the man to whom more than to any ten others President Cleveland owed his victory in two elections. I asked him what he thought of the prospect of the campaign. He said he was not yet well enough informed to make a prediction, but all the Democrats he talked with felt very confident. I said: "Suppose we had taken toward the Philippine Islands the same course that we took in regard to Cuba; what sort of a campaign should we have had?" He replied: "We could hardly have made a fight with you." I believed that if that course had been taken we should have had, with perhaps the exception of a single State, a solid North and should have carried quite a number of States at the South besides those we carried four years ago. But thinking so, I never doubted the integrity and the patriotic purpose of the large majority of the Republican party in both Houses of Congress. They were misled, in my opinion, as to the

facts. They were misled as to the character and capacity of the people of the Philippine Islands. They were misled, some of them, by a dream of empire and by what I deem a false conception of glory. But it never occurred to me to doubt their sincerity and their love of liberty. It never occurred to me to withdraw my confidence from them, whom I have known through and through, in and out, for more than thirty years, and transfer it to Mr. Bryan and Mr. Croker and the leaders of the white Democracy of the South.

My relations with President McKinley have remained unchanged and unbroken. I have watched the career of that brave soldier, of that eloquent orator, of that able statesman, from the time when he offered his life for his country in earliest youth, a life spent in the face of day, until the time when his countrymen who knew him elevated him to the foremost place on the face of the earth. The feeling on my part, in spite of this one difference of opinion, has been a feeling of unbroken confidence and respect, and on his part, if I may trust the assurances of those who are nearest to him, of unbroken kindness.

Men differ in opinion as to great concerns of public policy. Men differ in opinion as to great questions, righteousness, justice, and liberty, when they are involved in the affairs of state. Our history has been full of the dissensions of great men and the bitter divisions of good men whom their countrymen to-day, looking back, regard with equal honor and reverence. I held an opinion upon this question which I stated then as became a Massachusetts senator, and which I am ready to state now as becomes a son of Massachusetts and a son of Concord. But I cannot impute to the men who differ from me—men like my colleagues in both Houses of



Congress, men like Andrew White and James B. Angell and President Schurman among our instructors of youth; men like Edward Everett Hale and Lyman Abbott and the editors of the "Congregationalist" and the "Independent" among our religious teachers—that they are actuated by any less patriotic motives than I am, or that they are less deserving of confidence than Mr. Bryan or Mr. Tillman or Mr. Richard Croker.

What has been done has been done. What has been has been.

"Not fate itself can o'er the past have power."

Our question now is for the future.

We cannot forget that for everything that has happened Mr. Bryan is more responsible than any other man, than any other twenty men, since the Spanish treaty left the hands of the President. That treaty involved this whole question. It affirmed the constitutional power of the United States to acquire foreign territory; it pledged the faith of the people that the Congress of the United States and not the people of the Philippine Islands should determine their future fate. It purchased sovereignty over an unwilling people and pledged the faith of the United States to a foreign Power to pay for it. And when the defeat of that treaty seemed assured, with many votes to spare, Mr. Bryan, the great leader of the Democratic party, its last candidate for the Presidency, certain to be its next candidate for the Presidency, came to Washington in person, disregarding the remonstrances of his wisest supporters, and stabbed the Opposition in the back in the hour of its assured victory. I cannot doubt that he did that because he wished to keep this question open as a political issue for the campaign. He knew that the issues he had lost in a time of adversity he could not maintain in a

time of prosperity. He knew that his case was hopelessly lost, as we all knew it, unless he could keep alive this question for this election. The pretexts which he puts forth and which satisfy some of his supporters now did not satisfy them then. Mr. Mason of Illinois, who had opposed the acquisition of the Philippine Islands, had been invited to deliver an address by the anti-imperialists of Boston. He voted for the treaty, and they at once cancelled the invitation. They did not think a man worthy to be heard in Boston who had voted for that treaty. And now they claim that the man who procured its passage is worthy to be trusted with the destiny of the American people.

The excuses Mr. Bryan gives for this course seem to me infinitely frivolous and pitiful. He says that he expected that the Senate would pass a resolution declaring our purpose not to retain sovereignty over these islands, and that he wanted to stop the war with Spain, and thought it better to trust the question to our own friends than to the foreign enemy. He knew perfectly well, as every man knows, that the war with Spain was over. The commissioners of Spain had said formally that the United States must dictate its own terms, and that they were helpless to make further resistance. That communication of the Spanish commissioners had been communicated to Congress and made public. He knew perfectly well that there was not the slightest validity to such a resolution unless it passed both houses and was approved by the President. It was as I have said elsewhere, as if in the middle of the Revolutionary war some great general and political leader had surrendered West Point to the enemy and got the Continental Congress to declare that King George was our lawful sovereign, and that Parliament was our lawful legislature, and then said that after peace on those terms



he hoped to get a resolution declaring that we should some time have our independence. That treaty made it the constitutional duty of Congress to exercise sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, and according to the decision of the supreme court made it the constitutional duty of the President to reduce them to order and submission until Congress should act. It has been said by a New York newspaper that such a power has not been conferred on Congress by the constitution. It is not in the least inconsistent with it. When the faith of the American people has been pledged to a foreign government by a treaty, the treaty-making power must of necessity decide the constitutional question, just as the supreme court decides it in domestic questions. But if that be not so the question of constitutionality is practically settled for the executive of the next four years by the opinion of Mr. McKinley who negotiated the treaty and the opinion of Mr. Bryan who procured its adoption. Mr. Bryan thinks that treaty constitutional or he would not have secured the ratification. So our anti-imperialistic friends propose to-day to support a President who believes it within the constitutional power of Congress to govern the Philippine people, who advised and secured the adoption of a treaty pledging them to do it, and who must believe also that it is the constitutional duty of the President to reduce them to order and submission until Congress acts.

No, fellow citizens. If this Spanish treaty be right, President McKinley and Mr. Bryan were both right. If this Spanish treaty be wrong, President McKinley and Mr. Bryan were equally wrong. Now, what are we to do for the future? I can find no substantial difference when we come to any practical declaration of purpose between the two candidates or the two parties on that question. There are men in both

parties who say that we ought to hold on forever to this conquest. Some of them think it our interest to do it, regardless either of the desire or the character of the Philippine people. I suppose Mr. Morgan of Alabama, who, if the Democrats come into power, will have charge in the Senate of the great committee on foreign relations, is of that way of thinking. And he has the Democratic State of Alabama at his back. But in general both parties say they mean to give to the Philippine Islands self-government as soon as they are ready for it, and I do not see that one party goes any further than the other party in this respect. I do not myself like this phrase, "give self-government" or "give good government." I think the right to self-government, as the fathers said in the Declaration of Independence, is a thing that they are entitled to by the laws of nature and of nature's God. But the phrase is Mr. Bryan's and the phrase is the phrase of the Democratic platform, and not mine.

The Democratic platform gives no assurance of immediate independence. It is to come after, according to their promise, a stable form of government established by us. Now, Mr. Bryan in his speech of acceptance says not even that he will do that. He makes no suggestion of recalling our troops by executive power, or of letting the Filipinos alone, or of making them any promise by executive authority. He says he will call Congress together to do the things set forth in the Democratic platform. Now, he knows perfectly well, if he knows anything, that the Congress he will call together will do nothing beyond what the President has declared his purpose to have done. He knows very well the vast strength of imperialism among his Democratic supporters which will render the hope of accomplishing any such



purpose utterly idle and delusive. Why, the Democrats in New York have nominated for governor this very autumn Mr. Stanchfield, one of the most zealous and extreme imperialists in the country. He, perhaps, will not outtalk Governor Roosevelt; but so far in the matter of imperialism he has outtalked him. Mr. Morgan of Alabama, who will be chairman of the committee on foreign relations if the Democrats get the Senate, his colleague, Senator Pettus, who will be chairman of the judiciary if the Democrats get the Senate, are among the most zealous and thorough-going supporters of the purpose to maintain our authority over the people of the Philippine Islands. Of the nineteen followers of Mr. Bryan who voted for the ratification of the treaty about half were imperialists upon conviction.

So when Mr. Bryan says he is going to call Congress together and recommend them to carry out the Democratic platform he may as well call spirits from the vast deep. He may be more fortunate than Glendower, and the spirits may come when he doth call them. But the spirits will not do the bidding of the magician. The magician will have to do the bidding of the spirits.

There are undoubtedly many persons in the Republican party who have been carried away by the dream of empire. They mean, I have no doubt, to hold on to the Philippine Islands forever. But they do not constitute the strength of the party. They do not, in my judgment, express its purpose, and they do not constitute the strength of the American people. The Republican party in its platform, State and national, promises to give these people self-government when they are ready for it and as fast as they are ready for it.

I have an abiding confidence that these pledges are to be kept. The Republican party has kept its pledge as to Cuba,

and it will do sooner or later to the Filipinos what it has done to the Cubans. We have been in the dark as to the facts regarding this distant and strange Oriental people. But we shall know them after peace has been declared. Their leaders will come over here to tell their story to the American people, and they can go from one end of the country to the other and no man will hurt a hair of their heads, unless it be such ruffians as those who attacked Governor Roosevelt. If it prove to be true, as I think it will, that they are a civilized people, able to live, governing themselves in orderly village communities, capable of self-defence, seeking a national life like Japan, better than many countries south of us on the American continent, and they then desire their independence, do you suppose any man or any party could put forth the power of this republic to interfere with it and live? Great Britain, with all her power, all her aristocracy, and all her traditions of empire, would not venture for an hour to deny independence to Canada or Australia if they wanted it. She would not deny it in Ireland if Ireland were not at her door. And the people of the United States will never repeat the experiment of Ireland anywhere.

Which party can you trust in this matter—the party that has done everything that has been accomplished for liberty in the past, or the party which has resisted everything that has been accomplished for liberty; the party that sustained slavery, or the party that abolished it; the party that made war upon the Union, or the party that put down the Rebellion; the party that adopted the three great amendments which made every slave a free man and every free man a citizen and every citizen a voter, or the party that filibustered for days and nights against the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, which was carried by a single vote? Will you



trust the party that governs Massachusetts, or the party that governs New York City and Mississippi?

The author of the Democratic platform of Kansas City, or at any rate the gentleman by whose lips it was reported to the convention, uttered in my hearing these sentences last winter on the floor of the Senate. Let me read them:

"We took the government away. We stuffed ballot-boxes. We shot them. We are not ashamed of it. The senator from Wisconsin would have done the same thing. I see it in his right eye now. He would have done it. With that system—force, tissue ballots, etc.—we got tired ourselves. So we called a constitutional convention, and we eliminated, as I said, all of the colored people whom we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments."

When the anti-imperialist sees the smiling countenance of my honorable friend, Governor Boutwell, at one end of the Democratic line and hears this thing from Mr. Tillman at the other, I should think he would find himself something in the condition of the two tramps I once heard of who approached a farm-house in the country, and were encountered by a large bulldog. "Come on, Jim," says one of them, "don't you see he is wagging his tail?" "Yes," says the other, "but don't you hear him growl? I don't know which end of him to trust."

Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, is a brave and outspoken gentleman. He is the rising leader of the Democracy of the Solid South. If Mr. Bryan be elected there will be no man in the country, save perhaps Mr. Croker, of New York, who will be more powerful in the councils of the administration. Five Democratic States with marvellous ingenuity have just disfranchised their colored voters. Others are preparing to follow. If the thing goes on, before the end of the next presidential term ten million American citizens, to

become within half a century thirty-five million American citizens, will be disfranchised by these Democratic frauds. Not only will they be disfranchised, but you are to play the game of politics hereafter with the Democratic party which will use these loaded dice. Fifty or sixty Democratic representatives will vote on every question in which you have an interest—free silver, socialism, free trade—representing not numbers, but only fraud and usurpation.

We have two defences under the constitution. One is that if people of any race or class are deprived of the right to vote in any State, it becomes the duty of Congress to diminish the representation of that State in that proportion—a duty which every man knows will never be performed if Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party come into power. Why, he was asked the other day what he thought of North Carolina. And he answered that if you would read the Sulu treaty you would be so ashamed that you could not think about North Carolina.

The other defence is in the supreme court of the United States, the majority of whom are old men. Against that court, the great bulwark and safety of our rights, Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party have already declared war. But if there be no war, the majority of that court are old men, and it is not unlikely that its complexion may be changed within the coming four years.

The Republican party in its long and splendid history has made one mistake. That mistake, so far as it affects the past, cannot be remedied. It would have done no harm but for Mr. Bryan. So far as it affects the future, it will be remedied by the Republican party, or it will not be remedied at all. I believe that the Philippine Islands belong of right to the Philippine people; that they have a right, having



thrown off their old government, to institute for themselves a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them and not to us shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. But I do not believe it wise, while claiming this right, for that Oriental people of eight or ten millions to stand with a party or with a candidate who denies the same right to ten million Americans at home. I do not propose to enfranchise ten million Filipinos while I disfranchise ten million Americans.

I believe Aguinaldo and Mabini entitled to self-government. I believe also that Booker Washington and Robert Small are entitled to self-government. I have little respect for the declaration of love of liberty of the men who stand with one heel on the forehead of Booker Washington of Alabama, and the other on the forehead of Robert Small of South Carolina, and wave the American flag over Aguinaldo and Mabini.

Now, fellow citizens, I do not know whether these things seem important to our friends who think of leaving the Republican party. This is no waving of the bloody shirt. It is no tale of individual outrage caused by what is left of the spirit of slavery or the passion of the Civil War. It is a deliberate attempt, avowed, undisguised, to overthrow the American constitution so far as it secures to ten million Americans on our own soil political equality. It is an attempt to overthrow the principle that government at home rests on the consent of the governed. For myself, I distrust such statesmanship. I abhor such political morality, and I decline to follow such leadership.

You are not helping the cause of anti-imperialism by going into partnership with Bryanism. You cannot mix tyranny,

dishonor, broken faith, anarchy, license in one cup, and have constitutional liberty the result of the mixture. If the firm of Bryan, Croker, Altgeld, Boutwell, Tillman, and Schurz do business at the old Democratic stand, they will transact the old Democratic business. The new partners are not to have a controlling interest. They will not contribute much of the capital. They will not be authorized to sign the name of the firm.

When the new administration comes in, to whom, do you think, it will listen? Will it listen to Mr. Morgan and Mr. Pettus, with Alabama behind them? Will it listen to Mr. McEnery, with Louisiana behind him? Will it listen to Mr. McLaurin? All these men are imperialists. They are as thoroughly intrenched in the political leadership of their States as ever was Daniel Webster in Massachusetts. Or will it listen to Mr. Schurz or Mr. Boutwell, with nothing behind him? Democratic South Carolina will speak with a divided voice as to liberty in the Philippine Islands. It will speak with a united voice as to the disfranchisement of ten million Americans at home. Mississippi will speak with a divided voice about Aguinaldo or Mabini; but there will be no difference of opinion as to Booker Washington or Robert Small. There will be behind that administration a Solid South, intent on disfranchising the negro, in earnest and meaning business. There will be behind it the Populist, the Anarchist, and Socialist of the great cities, in earnest and meaning business. There will be behind it Richard Croker and Tammany Hall, intent on spoils and jobs and patronage, in earnest and meaning business. All these must be listened to, and will be. Mr. Boutwell and Mr. Schurz and the anti-imperialists will have served their purpose. They will have nothing more to do. They have made good bait. The Demo-