

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VIII.

THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

BY Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK.

AMONG the great forces that have ever moved man to activity we must hasten to record the love of country. Like ocean currents or trade-winds that hasten a boat onward to its destination or drive it from its course, so life's great motives urge man on to duty, to adventure, to peril, and even to death. Said Hamlet:—

“Do you think that I am easier to be played on than a pipe? Call me what instrument you will, though you can fret me, you cannot play upon me.”¹

Yet, at that moment Hamlet was played upon by a motive of action that was greater than any physical force. The forces within him moved him. The love of home, the desire to acquire, the longing for a good name, the desire for knowledge, the hope of immortality,—all these and more are placed in man to lure him forth from a condition of ignorance and sloth, from a savage life into the paths of virtue and industry and wisdom. In his efforts to satisfy the wants that are aroused within him by these life motives the wild savage in the jungle becomes civilized man, clothed and in his right mind. Into this golden urn,—the love of country,—the poet, the orator, and the artist have flung all of pathos and eloquence. The national hymns of every land are its language, for music has poured forth its grandest notes in homage to this passion. In defense of fireside and native land, the noble Gaul went forth to death when the legions of Rome and the cruel Cæsar

¹ Act iii. Sc. 2.

were coming; while the more timid cast their jewels, and then themselves, into the flames, preferring death to subjugation and slavery.

The love of country is the racial instinct of self-preservation, and is divinely implanted in man for a wise and noble end. The savage boy that accompanied Stanley, cried with joy when he saw again the jungles that he called "home" and some tattooed savages that answered to those words, "father" and "mother" and "brother." About this sentiment, more powerful than argument or logic, because it is a native instinct that leads man forth to victory, have clustered the choicest of man's affections, the noblest of his ambitions.

Hence, conquest by the sword, from any desire for territorial acquisition, for selfish purposes, to exact tribute, or to satisfy a false notion of national glory, whether in the name of religion or civilization, is a warfare against the best instincts of human nature; and the voice that instinctively cries out in protest is nothing but the echo from a far-off and divine shore. The waves that break in ripples at our feet are the spent forces of a boundless deep, for the love of country is a divine passion. Lamartine has said, that the love of country includes all other passions. The savage loves his own country as naturally, if not as wisely, as we love our own. He will defend its borders from foreign intrusion, his hut and naked offspring, as naturally as we defend our firesides and our homes or our national integrity and honor. The racial instinct of self-preservation may vary in its moods and tenses, and it may, through ignorance, mistake a friend for a foe, as did some of the savage tribes in Africa who shot poisoned darts at Stanley and his followers, but in the last analysis the passion is one.

The love of another's country, compared with that of one's own, is like the love of another's property or another's family compared with the love of one's own. Such

a love may exist, and have the real good of that country or property or family more at heart than the one who is their natural defender or legal guardian. Such a love would naturally be open to the closest scrutiny, for its twin sister is covetousness. Covetousness desires not to serve, but to conquer. It is not love, it is lust. It has not the good of an object at heart, but the good of self, falsely so-called. It resembles the divine quality of unselfish good-will as avarice resembles the desire to acquire; as rationalism resembles reason; as credulity resembles faith; as ignorance resembles innocence; as fanaticism resembles zeal; as superstition is like religion. Hamlet held up to the face of his mother that brother who was but a counterfeit presentment of the true king; so every trait in human nature that is imperial and noble has its counterfeit that is degrading and contemptible because it is selfish. This counterfeit king may usurp the throne and may, therefore, like any vice pass for virtue, and often be mistaken for it; but in every essential quality it is wholly unlike it, both as to the motive that gave it birth, and as to its fruitage. Fanaticism is ignorance on fire; enthusiasm is energized intelligence.

The final word of patriotism, no less than of religion or of ethics, is the old commandment, "Thou shalt not covet." We approach the border-land of duty and right, when we watch the setting sun upon our own possessions or native land, and there we find those words, as at the gateway of the World's Fair, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

With this great instinct, so universal and so powerful that it has moved all men alike, civilized or savage, and in all ages from antiquity to modernity, international morality has been compelled to make a treaty of peace, and no nation to-day dares to ignore it as a theory, if not the practice, in international law. International morality is noth-

ing but the golden rule exalted into a social force and nationalized. Righteousness exalteth a nation, and its fruits are the arts of peace. Principles make international morality; the usage of nations makes international law. The one is the ideal, too apt to be a theory; the other is the real, usually the practice. One is too likely to be the fancy, the other the fact. International morality would question the right of England in India, in Africa, in Egypt,—in all of those countries where her drum-taps follow the setting sun. It would ask the Dutch to explain by what right twenty-five million people in Java are governed by two-fifths of one per cent of their number in Holland, and that for purposes of gain. It would inquire of Spain where she acquired her rights in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. International law, however, assumes that these nations have sovereign power in these remote lands, because by conquest international law recognizes sovereignty. Woolsey says,¹ that the territory of a nation, or that portion of the earth over which it exercises the rights of sovereignty, may have begun to pertain to it in a variety of ways. It may have derived its title: 1. From occupation of land which was before vacant, and from prescription public and uninterrupted; 2. From occupation by colonies, or other incorporation of land before occupied; 3. From conquest accepted as a fact, and at length ending in prescriptive right; 4. From purchase or from gift.

The Philippine question involves not only a keen discrimination between international law and international morality, but a careful study of the nature of liberty; for we must all agree with Lamartine, that civilization itself, imposed through force, is a servitude; and the first condition, in order that social progress may be accepted by a people, is, that this people may be free to refuse it.²

¹ International Law.

² Car la civilisation même, imposée par la force, est une servitude, et la

It is just here that such a wide diversity of views on the Philippine question is possible. If the American people, from motives of gain, or from desire for conquest, or even for purposes of civilizing an unwilling people, were resorting to force-power, instead of influence-power, as a means of accomplishing a selfish or even an unselfish end, the conscience and good judgment of the people would be sadly under a cloud which time and reflection would surely cause to pass away. No political party can afford to let the people find a flaw in its moral perceptions. A political party may be forgiven mistakes of judgment, but not mistakes of purpose. If, as Secretary Long says, the Philippines are an elephant on our hands, then the mistake is one of judgment on the part of our commissioners at Paris, not necessarily a cloud on the moral horizon of the existing administration.

Now it is idle to say that the American people have overlooked some plain and fundamental principles of right and justice in considering the Philippine question. The very cause of war with Spain was a righteous indignation at her treatment of the Cubans. A more unselfish motive for war could not be conceived of than led the people and the Congress to push the President into it. All civilized people condemn England because the cry of the Armenians and the Greeks in their unequal struggle with the barbarous and savage Turk went unheeded. That the strong shall protect the weak is a fundamental maxim in international morality, and the Monroe doctrine is founded on it. No one can claim a monopoly of patriotism, or wisdom, or moral character in viewing the duties and rights of America in the Philippines. The President and his Cabinet are as sensitive to the demands of international morality, no less than to those of international law, as are Edward
première condition qu'un progrès social soit accepté par un peuple, c'est que ce peuple soit libre de le refuser.—Jeanne D'Arc.

Atkinson, Andrew Carnegie, Senators Edmunds or Hoar.

The pamphlet published by Edwin D. Mead, "The Present Crisis," is most admirable in its spirit and purpose. It is a fine *résumé* of the moral precepts and political maxims at the basis of this republic that we are all familiar with, and that we should need now to recall provided our sovereignty in the Philippines had no moral basis for support. But that is the very question at issue. Hence it is misleading to quote these as if any one had forgotten them; for, in so doing, Mr. Mead begs the entire question. If President Schurman is right, then Mr. Mead is wrong; not in his precepts and maxims, for those are always true, but in assuming that they apply to the Philippine question.

President Schurman says:—

"First, the United States having assumed sovereignty over the Philippine Islands by virtue of a treaty of peace with Spain, the chief executive is engaged in establishing that sovereignty. The issue to-day is not a commercial one, although the natural resources of the Philippines are of great value, and wait only American capital for their development. Nor is the question one of political expediency or of party politics, although in its collateral branch there may be aspects on which political parties may properly divide. The question to-day is a purely moral question. The vital issue is the honor of the nation, the protection of loyal Filipinos, and the fulfilment of our obligations to the nations of the world involved in our acceptance of sovereignty.

"Secondly, the means and agencies for the accomplishment of this end must be decided by the President; and it is well to bear in mind that the President understands the situation better than any one else can possibly do, inasmuch as he is in receipt of information from a variety of sources, civil and military, and has the judgment of experts upon the facts reported. I have no doubt the President will soon effect a solution of the Philippine problem which will be entirely satisfactory to the American people. To his statesmanship and tried ability we must entrust the issue with perfect confidence."

And Mr. Isabel Artacho, a former partner of Aguinaldo, has made a statement, under oath, under date of July 19th, a part of which is as follows:—

“The present rebellion, far from aiming at the true emancipation of the country, is carried on to gratify personal political ambitions, mean and spurious affectation, in order to perpetrate with immunity, under the guise of a so-called political system established under the name of a republic, acts eminently barbarous, treacherous, and despotic, and crimes unknown in the code of penalties throughout the world.

“The present rebellion against the sovereignty of the United States of North America, while having for its professed object the absolute independence of the people of the Philippine Islands, is in reality a movement to bring the people under the most intolerable slavery—domestic slavery—and to place in the hands of an individual the sacred attributes of God, country, King.

“That the present rebellious movement does not have the support of the best elements in the inhabitants of the island, those who are free to exercise a wise and honest discrimination, for they recognize that, instead of bringing them the desired happiness and prosperity, the assumption of independence will lead to self-murder, for the state of chaos that will result will bring misery and ruin to the people.”

Secretary Long in his Home Market Club speech was not wanting in moral perception, when he said:—

“Why doubt and repine, when the time of doubting and repining is inexorably past, and when doubting and repining can now do no good? Why shall not the United States, now that these lands and tribes have been intrusted to its disposition, enter upon the trust thus imposed upon it, with the determination that, as it began by freeing them from the yoke of oppression, it will go on and insure them still larger blessings of liberty and civilization, and will so bear itself toward them that in securing their welfare it shall also promote its own, and, as always happens when men or nations coöperate in the spirit of justice and good-will, the reward shall come to both in their mutual increase? Is not that the statesmanship of the great Master who limited not his mission or that of his disciples to his own chosen people, but proclaimed that his gospel should be preached in all the world unto all nations—that greatest statesman of all time, Jesus Christ.”

Governor Roosevelt, in his speech at Ocean Grove, N. J., was not lacking in moral heroism when he said:—

“The nation is face to face with a duty that calls for heroism. We put our pick into the rotten foundations of Spanish government, both in the East and West Indies. We tumbled the building down in as righteous a war as was ever undertaken. If we are worth a place among the great nations of the earth, we must see to it that the ruins are cleared away, and the temple of justice and honesty reared in their places.

"We shall be guilty of a terrible wrong to humanity, if in the Philippines we retreat before armed savagery, instead of organizing a suitable government, which shall guarantee justice to every one, and an ever-increasing measure of liberty to those who show themselves worthy of it.

"The history of the world shows that the wrong done by the mere sentimentalist is often of larger proportions and more elastic than any other kind of wrong, and of this wrong we shall be guilty if we fail to do our task thoroughly and well.

"If the people let their representatives in Congress hamper the administration, as they did last winter, when they refused to put the army upon a proper footing, then the people have themselves to thank if the war lingers, with difficulties and dangers increased. What the people have to do is to resolve to back up the President to the full in seeing that the outburst of savagery is repressed once for all, and what is even more important, to see that these tropic islands in the east and west alike are not left to the prey of paupers and spoilsmen, but are governed primarily in the interest of their inhabitants, and, therefore, ultimately for the honor and renown of America."

We may not agree with Governor Roosevelt in his estimate of the intelligence of Aguinaldo and his leaders, for the rank and file of his army may be savages, but all the testimony goes to show that he is intelligent.

If the Filipinos were a civilized people, or even a savage tribe, having no relation to us or to other nations, in the full possession of their own land, having a government, or even a recognized head, with power to declare war or make treaties; or having at least, as ex-President Cleveland would say, a post-office address, then no one could question our duty or our opportunity with such a nation, no matter what its code of ethics or its political science might be. But Aguinaldo does not represent even one island, much less the fourteen hundred islands that are in this archipelago. He can show no authority for treating in their behalf, except that of a dictator. His domination would be fatal to personal and property rights, for which, by the treaty with Spain, our government has undertaken to be sponsor. The territory of these fourteen hundred islands is as vast as all of the New England States,

New York, and Pennsylvania. Many of these islands have never yielded to Spain or to any foreign power.

The play is not worth the candle, or they would have been subjected long ago to Spanish protection, or to English civilization in the form of "bullets, brandy, and the Bible." Notwithstanding these evil companions, the Bible, introduced even by these methods, has done its leavening work, and has civilized wherever it has gone. If forty-seven per cent of the English soldiers in India are diseased, as Carnegie says, they have been in good company to the extent that they have carried moral precepts with their immoral practices.

When we entered upon the war with Spain, our course was perfectly simple, and the President voiced public sentiment when he disclaimed any purpose of acquiring new territory. The whole issue was a moral issue,—the rights of the Cubans in Cuba. Our apology for the war was that American interests were involved. To avoid this war, how long and how patiently the President parlied with Spanish diplomacy, Spanish cunning, deceit, treachery, until the destruction of the *Maine* drove him to action, and this was done by the Congress bringing its pressure to bear upon him, rather than from his own volition. The Congress acted because, as the President said, the condition of affairs was intolerable.

Secretary Long has made such an excellent statement of the result that I will here quote it literally.

"At the beginning of the war with Spain, Commodore Dewey with the Asiatic fleet was at Hongkong. The declaration of neutrality by Great Britain made it imperative that the American admiral should sail away. Spain's Asiatic squadron was stationed only a few hundred miles away, at the seat of the Spanish stronghold in the Pacific. Military strategy made it clear, as Dewey's success soon afterward proved, that the thing to do was to strike at the heart of Spain's power in the Philippines.

"After the destruction of the fleet it was necessary for Admiral Dewey to maintain the advantage thus gained. After the conquest of the city

of Manila by the army and navy, the interest of humanity, property, and commerce made it compulsory upon the United States to maintain its authority, and thereby prevent arson, riot, and chaos, which would have followed the abandonment of the city by the Americans.

"Personally, as I have said before, I would have been very glad if the Philippine elephant had never been put on our hands. But at the end of the war the islands were in our hands, as the result of the destiny of war, and there was no other alternative for the President but to hold them, and endeavor to maintain order until their future government could be mapped out by Congress.

"In the maintenance of American authority in the Philippines, the President had in mind their future welfare and the betterment of their deplorable condition. Orders were sent to General Otis to do all in his power to preserve harmony with the Filipinos, and to impress upon them the good intentions of America toward them and their future. Notwithstanding the constant efforts of General Otis and the American officials to preserve peace and to avoid a conflict, Aguinaldo and his army of Tagals attacked our soldiers, who had delivered them from Spanish despotism. After their attack there was nothing left to do but to take aggressive measures until the insurgents surrender to our lawful authority, and keep the peace.

"I am in favor of the most liberal form of government for the Filipinos, and I have no doubt that when they have proven that they are capable of self-government a form of government will be given them which will be acceptable. Of course the insurrection must be quelled before the matter of civil government can be decided. I believe peace will soon come in the islands. The question of their future government Congress will have to deal with.

"Official reports received by the administration show that many of the best elements in the islands are in favor of American control. When the American authority has secured good order I predict a future for the Philippines which will be one of peace, contentment, and prosperity for the people there."

So far as any light may be derived, therefore, from the moral side of the question, we are in the Philippines as the logical result of a war that was begun from the most unselfish of motives,—a war in behalf of a long-suffering and down-trodden people. There is no doubt that General Weyler intended to exterminate the Cubans, and, but for our interference, would have accomplished his purpose. It is easy to say that Spain had no rights in the Philippines, and that she had nothing to deed us for our twenty

million dollars, that her quit-claim was valueless. This would seem to be the opinion of some thinkers like the Rev. Mr. Dole of Jamaica Plain. Ex-President E. Benjamin Andrews, on the contrary, says that the Philippines are as much a part of our national possessions as the State of Illinois. If we have no rights there sanctioned by international law or international ethics, then our duty in the Philippines is to withdraw, and our opportunity there is simply that of a nation that is trespassing, and we must turn about. What would be the result of such action to the Filipinos themselves? How would it affect the distributing of China?

The Chinese wall is coming down, and must now be used for scientific purposes. The Eastern question, the interests of nearly four hundred millions of people in China alone, depend upon our action. Asia is to be Europeanized. The European demands ten times as many commodities as an Asiatic. The effect of Western civilization upon the oriental is seen in the awakening of Japan. The foreign trade with Japan is \$9.60 per capita. With China it is 9 cents per capita of population. The hope of China is in awakening to modern civilization, and, while she is doing it, in the protection against Russia, which can come only from the united action of England and the United States. We are interested in the commercial conquest of China; for, if the Muscovite found the Philippines abandoned, he would seize upon them as upon the threshold to China. It is a question, if the most cruel thing that the Americans could do to-day would not be to leave the eight million Filipinos to the mercy of Russia. The Polish people could tell them what that means. Beware of Adam Zad the bear.

Morality takes deep root in principles, but principles need interpreting; hence morality must listen to the voice of wisdom. Religion and ethics rest upon intelligence. If,

therefore, we would remain and conquer in the Philippines, is that action consistent with the highest code of morals? Is it doing as we would be done by? Were the American people half savage and uncivilized, as are the Filipinos, we should be incompetent to judge of a question involving an enlightened conscience; and the world's opinion, as expressed through civilized nations, would prevail. Does England, France, Germany, or any other power, say we have no right to exercise sovereignty in the Philippines? Who interprets the world's conscience on this point? Aguinaldo?

The people of this little planet called earth are divided into groups or families called nations. Their differences have been such as are made by want of intercourse one with another. The same instincts move all alike; and when civilization fuses and melts into one common mass the European and the Asiatic, a new era in the world's history will have dawned. The divine command to each member of this great family of nations, and the savage is not exempt, is to be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. The stronger members of this family have become so by obeying this command. The arts and sciences flourish when industry and intelligence have prepared the way. The dependent, the deficient, and the delinquent members of this family group are the barbarous and savage tribes that are in slavery to their lower natures. The Filipinos are not free, and would not be were we to leave their soil. Like the Indian, they are in bondage. They have said to ignorance, "Be thou my master," and to sloth and idleness, "Be thou my king." They have not conquered space or time, as we have. The earth beneath their feet is full of wealth that the world needs, but they refuse to dig for it. Their soil would pro-

duce coffee for the nations of the earth, but they permit an insect to destroy it. Disease and death prowl through their streets by night, because they are too slothful to study and adopt sanitary measures. All the blessings of a high civilization are unknown to them. It is a question if they may dodge behind that instinct called "love of country" to defend them in their love for an animal existence, disobeying every known law of progress and development. To what extent, then, must they obey the dictates of the more enlightened members of this family group, and do their part in the work of subduing the earth? Who is the best judge of motherhood, Queen Victoria or Queen Liliuokalani?

Even if the Filipinos were united in their opposition to our sovereignty, the consensus of the opinion of civilized nations would not agree with them, knowing that our motive is not to enslave, but to set free. But they are not united. Aguinaldo cannot show his authority for resistance to our sovereignty. He is credited with being a man of superior intelligence, of great physical courage, and shrewd. He would seem to be a sort of generous-hearted dare-devil, that takes great risks and loves notoriety. He assumes to act for the Filipinos in his resistance to our authority, but he does not. There is not a shadow of doubt that he fully understands the character and purpose of the American people, but that, like all Asiatics, what is kind and gentle he interprets as weakness. He is the kind of a character to respect the Russian bear or the English lion more than the American eagle. He knows that liberty and equality are the foundation stones of this republic, that we freed the slave, that we went into the war from the noblest of motives, to free Cuba, and that we would bring to his people all of the arts of peace. American capital, intelligence, machinery, churches, colleges, and common schools. He knows that the American people are honest,

liberty-loving, and magnanimous. He knows that civil, political, and religious liberty are our watchwords. If he does not know these things, then every estimate of his intelligence is false, and he is a more dangerous and hostile enemy to the best interests of the Filipinos themselves than he is to us. He is unfit to be a ruler, much less a dictator, in his own country, and it would be cruel to let him have sway. If he does know these things, he is a selfish schemer, who wants not what is best for his people, but what he falsely imagines is best for himself. He should be overcome in such a case at all hazards and by force of arms.

Aguinaldo has grown up under the tutelage of Spanish diplomacy. His father was probably poisoned by the intrigue of the monks. Spanish methods he is most familiar with, and is trained to respect force. It would be strange, therefore, if he could adapt his mind to a political science that is illumined by the conscience, and to a friendship that seeks to serve, not to subdue.

But the Philippine question cannot hinge upon the character and motives of Aguinaldo. Whether he be a patriot or a pretender should make no change in the policy or purpose of the administration, so long as duty was made to wait on conscience, and war was made to wait on both. Under the Anglo-Saxon touch, Hawaii has become a garden spot in the Pacific. The Philippines can also be made what the President called them,—the gem of the Orient. Whatever might have been our judgment as to the wisdom of assuming sovereignty, we have done it, and our self-respect and the respect of other nations demands that we shall not climb out of the window or sneak through the alley, because some ignorant or designing Tagals, indorsed by some people at home, have seen fit to call us burglars. The coat has been made for us; but it does not fit, and we will not put it on. Let us face the difficulties heroically

and courageously,—and they are not a few, for, as Secretary Long has well said, “We have an elephant on our hands.” Here are just a few of them.

We are confronted with constitutional limitations. Suppose we acquire territory in any part of the world, and to do it lawfully, Congress must legislate for it; and the moment it does so, constitutional guarantees are operative. Life, liberty, and property are guaranteed to all. Religious freedom to Mohammedan and Christian alike; free speech; free press; the right of assembling and of petition; the right to bear arms; security from unreasonable search and seizure; freedom from quartering troops; the necessity of presentment by a grand jury on a capital charge; the right of compulsory process to secure witnesses; the aid of counsel when accused, and the right of trial by jury. Wherever the United States has territories, these rights must follow. Judge Baldwin has expressed it as his opinion, that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States must lead to the conclusion, that no conviction for crime could be had in any of our new possessions, after the establishment there of an orderly, civil government, except upon a jury trial. He also says, that to give half-civilized peoples the benefit of immunities framed by a civilized people for itself would be a serious obstacle to the maintenance there of an efficient government.

Professor Woolsey concludes,¹ that a military government is the only one possible in the Philippines. And this, he says, depends upon the inaction of Congress. Its constitutional basis lies in the fact, he says, that the United States as sovereign is responsible for the maintenance of justice and order for the defense of its territory, for the protection of its subjects' rights. The President, pending action by Congress, as Commander-in-Chief of army and navy, must act in a despotic form to secure

¹ *Annals of Am. Acad.*, Supplement, May, 1899.

peace; for it is not martial law, it is not military law, it is the will of the President. No other course is possible. A change of policy is sure to come with each change of administration, for mistakes of the party in power are always exaggerated for political reasons.

We shall have to recognize the religious liberty of the friars and Mohammedans, as England has so wisely done in India and her other dependencies, and the Spanish priests are large property owners, which is secured to them under the terms of the Spanish treaty preventing sequestration.

As to the wisdom of this venture in the Philippines from the standpoint of commercial loss and gain, the war with Aguinaldo is costing a half-million dollars a day. The expense in July is estimated at sixteen million dollars. The revenue from the islands can never repay such enormous outlays. Spain had in revenue five million dollars per annum from fifteen days of forced labor of each person; two millions from customs; one million from stamps, gambling, opium, cock-fighting; one million from lotteries. How much of this would be available to a civilized and liberty-loving people? From what, then, will our revenue come?

The Philippines are different from Hawaii, Porto Rico, or Cuba. The inhabitants are Asiatics. Foreman enumerates their virtues and their vices. They are hospitable, sober, cleanly, patient, but they are also profligate, improvident, cruel, superstitious, and treacherous. All of them are liars, even at the confessional, and they respect only force. Half of them are savages. It is impossible to rule them except by despotic power. Bryce says:—

“Probably no task has been presented to the English in India or in any of their colonies during the last fifty years so difficult as that to which Americans will have to address themselves when they become responsible for these islands, with their area of one hundred and fifteen

thousand square miles and their semi-savage and savage population of nearly eight millions.

"No enterprise of like magnitude or complexity has ever lain before the United States before; for, when she purchased Louisiana, and again when she conquered vast territories from Mexico, the area acquired was almost empty, and all of it was a temperate region, fit to be peopled by the overflow of her own population and to receive her institutions."

It is a vital question, Can the white man live and thrive in the tropics? If not, can we successfully colonize the Philippines? Mr. Kidd believes that white men cannot be acclimated in the tropics. Another vital question, Will Asiatics take kindly to a civilization, and be drawn toward what seems to us as self-evident truth? Professor Lowell thinks that we can rule the Tagals, the Visayans, and the Moros as successfully as the English have ruled India. He insists that the three requisites for a successful administration are justice, a consistent policy, and a thorough knowledge of the native character. The rule of the British in India is believed by him, as it is by most writers on political science, to be the model we must pattern after. Except as England finds a market for her goods, she derives no profit from her colonies. The question of Chinese immigration must be squarely faced. Shall we prohibit it as in Hawaii and in the United States? James Anthony Froude has expressed himself as to the government of dependencies in these words:—

"The leading of the wise few, the willing obedience of the many, is the beginning and end of all right action. Secure this, and you secure everything. Fail to secure it, and be your liberties as wide as you can make them, no success is possible."

Another vital question, Is democracy sufficiently elastic to govern dependencies successfully? Can a policy that is consistent be maintained with the possibility of a change in administration every four years? What will be the cost in troops and treasure of convincing, not Aguinaldo, for he knows it, but his followers, that we desire not to subjugate, but their highest welfare? Could not this be

accomplished more quickly, and with less loss of life and money, by a proclamation from the President, announcing to the Filipinos the same intentions that we have toward the Cubans?

In conclusion, but one practical issue is before the American people. We must support the President. No other alternative is left us, because we are responsible before the world for the protection of life and property. It is not the business of government to save men's souls, but to make good citizens and to exercise authority over those committed to its charge. Let the people know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and they will support an administration as they did Lincoln in the darkest hours of the civil war. A press too rigidly censored is not the way to do this. It is my privilege to know one member of the Cabinet personally, Secretary Gage. He once told me that when a banker from the far West confessed to him that the net result of the quantity theory of money would be to let the water out of wages, and if it were done in any other way we would have revolution, Secretary Gage replied, "Tell the people the truth, and then, if they want a revolution, let it come."

Whatever might have been our judgment as to the wisdom of assuming sovereignty in the Philippines, we have done it, and now self-respect and the respect of other nations demand that we shall assert our authority because our motives were and are pure and honest. Dewey sailed into Manila harbor to the music of bands, and we cannot now sail out of it to the music of hisses, because the inevitable issues of war demand the solution of a problem that seems difficult. There is one duty before the American people to-day, and no other duty is equal to it in importance; and that is the duty of asserting successfully our sovereignty in the Philippines, and then of convincing the world that we are absolutely unselfish in our purposes.