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The Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League was held November 26, 1910, at the office of the Secretary, 20 Central Street, and adjourned to November 29, at the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club, No. 3 Joy Street, Boston.

At two o'clock the meeting, which was an uncommonly large and enthusiastic one, was called to order by President Moorfield Storey, who asked for the

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

The past year has been, from a philosophical point of view, one of the most eventful periods in the history of the Anti-Imperialist League. The attitude of a prophet who plumes himself upon the fulfilment of his prophecy is not an agreeable one, but in this meeting of the "school of prophets" it is a pious duty to consider together the fulfilment of the prediction, made by the founders of the League, of the result sure to ensue were the national crime then in contemplation to be perpetrated. Imperialism at home, with its assumptions of increased executive power, its disregard of the sanction of the courts, and progressive centralizing of authority, has been advocated and proclaimed in such high quarters and in so open and sweeping a manner as would have been impossible before the past decade of colonial administration. The condemnation of individuals as promoters of imperialism may be unjust. They are to a considerable degree doubtless creatures of the environment and the conditions. But the mantle of charity can by no effort be stretched so as to cover the responsibility of the creator of these conditions, who was, according to Senator Hoar's tremendous arraignment, the author of American imperialism.

Imperialism has developed into a definite claim for a permanent colonial policy. President Taft reconciles this policy
with his professions of attachment to the Filipinos, inasmuch as he assumes that they would be a happier people as permanent colonists of the United States. Thus, though bound by his pledge that a pro-forma opportunity of independence at some distant day should be offered them, he finds it not inconsistent to do everything in his power to promote the sale of their lands to foreign exploiters. When the time comes, in the course of the two or three generations suggested by Mr. Taft, to make the proffer of independence, the prevailing influences of course will prevent its being listened to, or there will be nobody to whom the proffer can be made!

What is a more obvious foundation for imperialism than the conquest of foreign peoples and their government as subject colonists: in all history its creator and minister?

It is extremely improbable that the heady and passionate elements of character which have marred the career and crippled the influence of a notorious American citizen, originally possessed of high ideals of purity and of civic righteousness, would have developed into New Nationalism, without the intoxication of the Navy Bureau and San Juan Hill.

The modification of the tariff between the United States and the Philippine Islands was carried through the Congress by every political artifice of cajolery and intimidation familiar to the practical politician who believes that the end justifies the means.

The policy of throwing the Philippine lands open to purchasers and the general development of the islands by American capitalists immediately followed the passage of the tariff bill, a policy persistently contended for by the President of the United States when Governor-General of the Philippine Islands and ever since.

One important obstacle stood in the way. By the Organic Act of the Philippine Islands, a measure carried through by Senator Hoar after his long and powerful protest against the annexation of the archipelago proved vain, it was provided that not more than sixteen hectares of land should be sold to any one person and not more than one thousand and twenty-four hectares to any corporation or association of persons.

The purchase of the friar lands was seized upon to give an opportunity for the exploitation of the islands. The plan was inaugurated in the archipelago, but some misgiving having been
felt lest the authority of the local government might be an insufficient sanction, it was resolved to resort to the Attorney-General of the United States for an opinion to justify the sales of these friar lands in quantities suitable for large investors. Such perfect assurance, however, was entertained of the nature of this opinion, that action was taken and sales of land were effected before Judge Wickersham's deliverance was made. Here began a campaign not yet ended, in which the very life of the Filipinos was contended for by their friends, against the persistent efforts of the Administration. An opinion was given by the President of our League ably controverting the Attorney-General's convenient decision, and a campaign was undertaken in Congress led by the Hon. John A. Martim of Colorado, the Hon. James L. Slayden of Texas and the Hon. J. Harry Covington of Maryland, to stop the sales of land, to cause an inquiry to be made into those sales which had been already made, and, if possible, to cancel them. Pleas were also made for the Filipinos by the Hon. Thomas P. Gore of Oklahoma, in the Senate and the Hon. Robert N. Page of North Carolina, in the House. An elaborate search was made through more than forty-one thousand pages of Philippine documents in order to disclose the steps which had been taken in regard to the Philippine land sales, a few of the results whereof, chosen at random, are here briefly epitomized:

The reasons for acquiring these friar lands were entirely political, as all of the recent insurrections had broken out on the densely populated friar estates, and the sole purpose of acquiring them was to divide them up among the tenants and other Filipinos, selling them at reasonable prices and on long time, thus making peaceful, contented citizens out of dissatisfied tenants. In the testimony before the committee of Congress there was not a line or a word spoken by any witness which suggested that any portion of these lands was to be used for exploitation purposes.

Within five months from the passage of the Organic Act by Congress, July 1, 1902, the Philippine Commission was appealing to Congress to raise the 2,500 acre limitation on crown lands which could be sold to corporations to 25,000 acres, in order that the islands might be exploited with gigantic sugar corporations. This clamor for exploitation continued from year to year until 1907 on the plea that there was plenty of land both for the natives and for the exploiters. Having failed to secure the consent of Congress to exploit the crown lands, the Philippine
government took the bit in its mouth on June 3, 1908, and repealed the limitations which it had provided for the selling of friar lands and announced that hereafter it proposed to sell them regardless of limit as to area.

Where 20,000 native tenants are compelled to pay an average annual rental of $1.30 an acre, the Havemeyer sugar exploiting syndicate is enabled to purchase outright a 55,000 acre estate on annual payments of 32 cents per acre.

While under the amended friar land law of the Philippine Islands, the purchaser of friar lands is given twenty-five years in which to make his payments, on several of these estates the average rental charged the native is in excess of the interest on the purchase price plus one twenty-fifth of the purchase price, or, in other words, the natives are charged more rent than they are supposed to have to pay in annual payments in order to purchase the land.

After appropriating 100,000 pesos of public funds to loan to agriculturists who had lost everything and were unable to put in their crops, rules and regulations were issued whereby these loans could be made only for the purpose of cultivating sugar cane in certain restricted areas where the tenants were compelled to furnish the cane to certain mills located on estates which had been taken possession of by the Manila Railway Company, the Speyer syndicate of New York.

Sixteen resolutions of inquiry in various forms were introduced by Mr. Martin, one by Mr. Slayden directed to the Secretary of War, and one by Mr. Covington directed to the Attorney-General. They were reported after reference by the Insular Committee to the House, and the last two resolutions were passed with some amendments. It was apparently the Administration's intention that Mr. Martin's searching inquiries should be hung up with no further consideration;—that which the Committee on Insular Affairs had given them being relied on to placate any dissatisfaction which might be aroused during the last Congressional campaign by their total neglect. In the very last day of the session and in its very last hour Mr. Martin procured recognition for the consideration of a resolution ordering the House Committee on Insular Affairs "to make a complete and thorough investigation of the Interior Department of the Philippine government touching the administration of Philippine lands and all matters of fact and law pertaining thereto, whether the same are to be had in the United States, the Philippine Islands or elsewhere," with the usual powers of
such a committee, the expenses to be charged to the contingent fund of the House. This action was effected by an alertness, a presence of mind, and a command of parliamentary usage not often excelled. It is agreeable for us to know that in obtaining recognition Mr. Martin had the able assistance, without which after all he might have been unsuccessful, of the Hon. Samuel W. McCall.

In regard to the whole question of exploitation, the testimony of President Schurman of Cornell University, former Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and of Dr. David P. Barrows, once the devoted Superintendent of Education there, is important:

April 9, 1910.

I was heartily in favor of the policy championed by Senator Hoar, and embodied in the act of 1902, limiting the area of sale of lands in the Philippine Islands. In the absence of such limitation the lands would have been sold in large blocks to individuals or corporations, and the Filipinos would have had imposed upon them all the evils of monopolies and trusts from which we are suffering in the United States, without the means of protecting themselves against those evils which we enjoy from the right to choose Representatives and Senators to make and repeal our laws.

I suppose that the people and Congress of the United States have the power to do anything they like with this Philippine question. But while it is glorious to have a giant's strength, it is tyrannous to use it like a giant. And the subjection of the Filipinos to capitalistic domination, however we may cloak the business in terms of trade and commerce, is oppression and cruelty of the same order as the most despotic empires have ever practiced on subjugated and dependent peoples.

I hope, therefore, that the Philippine act will be so amended as to bring the lands purchased from the friars under the same restrictions as that act imposed upon the sale of all other lands in the Philippine Islands. If this is not done, and if these friars' lands are sold in large areas to individuals or corporations, we shall have officially abandoned the policy of the "Philippines for the Filipinos" which we have proclaimed as established by the United States since the islands came under our sovereignty. The Filipinos would feel that we had betrayed a most sacred trust, a trust involving the welfare and economic
independence of seven millions of people, for whose destiny we have become responsible.

J. G. SCHURMAN.

July 8, 1910.

I should not wish to be understood to favor the general leasing of public lands in large holdings, especially to foreign investors. On the contrary, I think that the great effort now being made by Governor-General Forbes to attract heavy foreign investment is fraught with danger, and it seems to disregard the important fact that the splendid economic development which the Philippines had from 1835, when they were opened to foreign trade, was accomplished without the investment in productive industry of foreign capital. The money that built up the industries of the islands was made in the islands and the fine properties developed there were, with few exceptions, owned by natives, residents or settlers.

Spain's laws for utilizing public lands, forests and mines in the Philippines were framed about 1880 and were scientifically conceived in the public interest. They were far more enlightened than the extreme individualistic system of the United States, which many seek to have introduced into the Philippines.

There is a "conservation problem" in the Philippines, and its solution must be wise or the future opportunities of a rapidly multiplying population will be sacrificed. The government's first duty is to the small farmer or "peasant proprietor" and to the young native merchant and manufacturer, who are just coming into evidence with the maturity of a class educated in the public schools. The building up of these classes and their encouragement and education is a far more important endeavor than the attraction of foreign capital or the pursuit of a policy of quick returns.

DAVID P. BARROWS.

The plan of the land sales so far has not worked out altogether smoothly and to the satisfaction of the purchasers. The labor question is a very vital one. The American governor of Mindoro, where a Mr. Poole had acquired fifty-five thousand acres of the friar lands, prepared a flaming advertisement for the English and Spanish newspapers "urging the Filipinos to emigrate to that island of prospective sugar," which reads:
“Attention, Filipinos! Come to Mindoro! Become independent farmers, and earn enough to support your family. There are large areas of public land in Mindoro suitable for agriculture, which can be obtained by purchase, lease or by right of homestead. If you prefer to earn enough first to enable you to build a house and buy animals, you can obtain employment on the sugar estates at thirty-five cents a day.” The gist of the matter lies, of course, in the last paragraph. If the Filipinos without capital or ability to become independent farmers could be lured thus to a remote province their employment on the sugar estates would be likely to be practically enforced employment!

Within a very few days the dispatches from the Philippines tell us that reported bloodshed in the islands is caused by labor troubles. It is said that the Filipinos are indolent and resent any effort to compel them to work, and that the outbreak resulted from too vigorous measures to meet this condition, taken by foreigners owning plantations. Between these lines what an eloquent appeal!

Happily the debate in Congress and the stringent resolution of investigation has had its effect. Commissioner Worcester and other officials are said to be coming home prepared with eight tons of documents to meet the inquiry. Meanwhile the Secretary of War in his last remarks at Manila said: “In regard to the friar lands, at the time of making contracts for other sales of large amounts it was not supposed that there would be any opposition. The principal idea was to reduce the bonded debt as rapidly as possible. Now that opposition has declared itself, and the affair is being investigated by Congress, no large sale of these lands will be authorized until the situation is entirely cleared up.” That this state of things may continue is to be most earnestly hoped by the friends of the Filipinos. As an independent letter in the Evening Post of New York said a month ago, “American capital is being invested here to such an extent that independence is not in the slightest degree a present menace, and the more capital comes the farther off is independence.”

Mention was made in our last report of the libel suit against the native organ of independence, El Renacimiento, for a thinly veiled attack upon one of the Commissioners under the name of a “Bird of Prey.” The suit prevailed. The paper was sequestrated and the property of its representatives seized. El Renacimiento was immediately succeeded by La Vanguardia,
representing exactly the same views, though presenting them with some added caution,—and by a paper called El Ideal, which is the organ of the "Nacionalistas."

In this connection it might be well to add that it comes to us from most trustworthy sources that a multitude of the American officials in the Philippine Islands, from high to low, are engaged in private business, necessarily more or less compromising for government employees, so that the committee's investigation, if sufficiently thorough and far-reaching, may justify the point of view if not the methods of the unfortunate newspaper.

It was purposed to hold an Anti-Imperialist conference at the Plaza Hotel in New York last year, but owing to various engagements of persons who had desired to attend it, a conference by mail was substituted, resulting in the adoption of the following petition to the Senate and House of Representatives. This petition was signed by a large number of prominent citizens in the United States,—bishops, lawyers, educators, including the presidents of leading universities and college professors, editors of newspapers and men of affairs. It was presented in the Senate by the Hon. William Murray Crane.

March, 1910.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled:

The undersigned, citizens of the United States, believing in the principles upon which our Government was founded, and satisfied that the experience of the country during the last ten years has fully justified our faith, hereby respectfully and earnestly urge:

First. That Congress shall declare in unequivocal terms the purpose of the United States to grant their independence to the Philippine Islands;

Second. That in order to secure the Filipino people in the enjoyment of their independence the Government shall endeavor by treaty with other nations to procure the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to insure for them such a position as under like treaties is now enjoyed by Switzerland, Norway and other small countries;

Third. That Congress shall make no change in the law which will enable foreign capitalists to exploit the islands for their own pecuniary benefit, or will establish there the trusts from
whose oppressive control the people of the United States are struggling to free themselves at home;

Fourth. That measures shall be adopted at once which will enable the Filipino people to develop their country for themselves and with their own capital, and which will reduce the crushing burden of taxation to which they are now subjected by the expenses of the insular administration.

We urge these things because we believe that they are right, and that the substitution of arbitrary power for government by the people under our flag indicates a steadily increasing tendency away from free government, which should be resisted and stopped. It is clear that the people of this country know little of the facts, care little what is done in our dependency, and are tired of their colonial adventure. While these conditions exist the interests of the dependency must suffer, and no one can doubt that these conditions are likely to be permanent. We feel that every American citizen who is opposed to the policy of colonialism should make his opposition known, and should insist on learning all the facts, believing that were these known the policy would be abandoned.

With race problems, labor problems, taxation problems at home, let us not remain supine while we are being committed to the creation of like problems in distant colonies, problems which will remain to be a constant source of trouble and expense until the country does what we urge it to do now: that is, leave every people free to govern themselves.

There are no truer words than Lincoln’s:

"Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God will not long retain it."

The petition being circulated in the Philippine Islands excited the most fervent and widespread interest. Meetings were held during the summer and early autumn throughout the islands in every province and almost in every pueblo. In these meetings the Filipinos expressed their gratitude to the introducer and signers of it and prepared innumerable petitions of their own. A report of one of these meetings illustrates the enthusiasm of the people:

"It was held in an immense field with a temporary platform of bamboo for the speakers. The weather was threatening and there came on a furious storm in which the speaker was repeatedly interrupted by peals of thunder. Several times he at-
tempted to break off that the people might seek shelter from the shower, but each time he was prevented by shouts of protest, and the meeting continued in spite of the thunder, lightning and rain."

Digests of some of these memorials are appended:

The Joint Memorial of the Nationalist and Progressive Parties.

They join in urging the continuation of Chinese exclusion, and protest against the sale of public lands to corporations or large holders, pointing out the responsibility of the government toward the Filipino tenants of such lands. They also join in urging that the proportion of Filipinos to Americans in the public service be progressively increased.

Petition of the Nationalists of the Province of Iloilo, signed by the presidents of the local committees.

Fourteen years have passed since the Filipinos first attempted to throw off the Spanish yoke. Although defeated on the field of battle by the Americans, the Filipinos have never lost hope. Since the inauguration of civil government in 1901, they have been proving their capacity for self-government, and this proof has been especially clear in the work of the Assembly; and the Nationalists of Iloilo ratify the declaration of the Assembly in favor of independence on the following grounds:

That a government should rest upon the consent of the governed; that the Filipinos have proved their capacity; that the United States, which has always stood as the defender of liberty, can not consistently deprive another nation of its freedom; that the trusts are already getting a hold in the islands; that if the influence of the moneyed interests prevents independence, and the islands are delivered over to their exploitation, the promises of the United States will be violated. The differences between the two races are so profound, as to forever prevent complete understanding or the establishment of an acceptable government.

Therefore, we solemnly reiterate the statement that for the Filipinos there is but one question, the question of independence. Our demand is based upon justice and humanity.

Liga Popular Nacionalista.
Manila, August 29, 1910.

The League bases its petition for immediate independence
on the historic precedent of Cuba, which, with one third the territory, population and resources, had no greater claim to independence. The wealth of the country is sufficient, and steadily increasing. The people are laborious and peace-loving. The percentage of criminals to the law-abiding population is but eight to each ten thousand, as compared with thirteen in the United States. Under American control they have had ten years of practice in government, including five provincial and two national elections.

The League protests against the law proscribing the Philippine flag, and the limitations placed upon the playing of the national march; against the inequalities of the civil service, in which the average salary of the American employee is P3,225.63, and of the Filipino only P914.03; against the American intolerance of the Nationalist party; against the inadequacy of currency in circulation, P40,337,982 in relation to the taxes, P42,000,000, resulting in usurious rates of interest, which frequently rise as high as sixty percent per annum. It protests that the Filipinos are overtaxed, and that American impatience to realize improvements is laying too heavy a burden upon the resources of the country.

An illustrious American, Daniel Webster, has said that however light may be the yoke of foreign domination, it is impossible that the subjugated people should be happy. And this, Mr. Secretary, is indeed the truth, for however light may be the yoke of American domination as compared with Spanish, the Philippine people are, nevertheless, increasingly discontented as they realize more and more the fundamental impossibility of happiness under a colonial form of government.

Memorial presented by the Nationalist Party to Secretary of War Dickinson, Manila, September 4, 1910.

This party, organized in 1906, counts among its members about eighty-one percent of the voters, sixty-six out of the eighty-one deputies to the Assembly, and twenty-three out of thirty-three provincial governors. It asks for immediate independence on the ground of proved capacity for self-government, and as being in accordance with American principles. This Memorial takes up the argument in favor of independence under four heads.

I. The fact that the Filipinos organized a popular government of their own indicates their capacity for self-government.

A glance back over Philippine history shows that the early
Spanish government was altruistic in spirit, and in many ways admirable, developing a people homogeneous in character, and with high political ideals. The failure of the Spanish government to realize that the era of tutelage had reached its natural end resulted in the insurrection of 1896. In 1898, when the entire archipelago, with the exception of Manila, came under Filipino control, a simple but adequate popular government was established, with an elective congress and local government by town meeting. It is extremely important to understand the democratic character of the government thus established in order to appreciate the ideals which the Filipinos, uninfluenced by foreign pressure, endeavored to embody. This government was universally recognized, and rested upon the consent of the governed.

II. The Filipinos have demonstrated their capacity for self-government under American control.

The Americans have endeavored to establish a democratic form of government and to improve conditions, both moral and material. In this effort they would have failed, had it not been for the intelligent co-operation of the Filipinos. To this co-operation is due the maintenance of public order, the very marked progress in public education, peaceful elections, success in municipal and provincial government, and in the administration of justice. But especially has this co-operation been successful in the case of the Assembly, notwithstanding that it was composed mainly of Nationalistas, the party of the opposition which had hitherto been excluded from active participation in the government.

III. A consideration of alleged objections to granting independence.

It has been claimed that violence and disorder would result; yet so law-abiding is the temper of the people that the revolution of 1896 to 1899 is the only general disturbance in the history of the islands. Ladronism disappeared under Aguinaldo's government, and would doubtless disappear again under a native government, with the right to bear arms restored to the people.

The ignorance of the people, and the lack of a common language has also been urged. That there is a considerable percentage of illiteracy is a fact lamented by none so deeply as the Filipinos themselves; but illiteracy does not necessarily imply stupidity, lack of civic responsibility, or defiance of
authority. Moreover, this objection is disappearing; there are probably 700,000 children and young people in the schools, public and private. The diversity of dialect is no greater than in several European countries, and the only real basis of hostility between Christian and non-Christian tribes is a religious one, which disappears with the separation of church and state. "Caciquism," about which so much has been said, is no more than a manifestation, in much milder form, of the abuse of power which, in the United States is so apparent in the corruption of politics. As for lack of experience, experience comes only from practice. The Filipinos might well be as successful as the Americans claim they have been in their colonial administration, in which they had had no previous experience. And a native government would not have to contend with those difficulties which arise from race prejudice, intolerance, arrogance, misunderstanding, and lack of co-operation.

IV. The indefinite retention of the islands endangers independence. The Taft policy produces doubt and confusion and bad feeling on both sides, making efficient administration impossible. It makes the introduction of foreign capital a menace instead of a blessing and is responsible for much misfit legislation and for the continuance of economic distress.

The persistent desire of the Filipinos for independence is rooted deep in their remembrance of that brief space of time when they experienced the joy of holding their interests and their future in their own hands. Then it was that they learned how light is the yoke of self-imposed laws, how close and loyal the co-operation between government and people of the same race, working together for the common good. They abandoned the vices of the oppressed, and assumed the dignity of free men. It was this experience which strengthened them to resist to the utmost the new domination. They can never forget the little time of their happiness nor look upon the present regime as other than temporary, nor give up their hope sometime to realize their plans for a prosperous and progressive country of their own.

These and other petitions were presented in great numbers to Secretary Dickinson. There was a general stir of popular feeling in the islands connected with these petitions; perhaps also the extraordinary reception given to the patriotic Philippine Commissioner, Mr. Quezon, which took place at the same time and more than rivalled that of the Secretary of War, excited
Mr. Dickinson to wrath, for on an important public occasion when he was interpellated in regard to the aspiration of the people for independence, he is reported to have said: "Let me tell you that the Philippine people need not hope for independence, now or ever!" Doubtless the Secretary repented of this intemperate and thoughtless utterance as soon as it was made, and at all events neither Mr. Dickinson nor the Administration of which he forms a part is likely to be the arbiter of Philippine independence.

Undoubtedly, however, he betrayed the disguise maintained in higher quarters and revealed the truth that the exploiter and his patron, who love the acres of the Filipino people, care nothing for the Filipino nor for his liberty. While the Filipino entreats that a promise of independence shall be made which will warn off the trusts and syndicates and will steady the aspirations of his people, the investor would relegate the question of independence to the indefinite future or dispose of it altogether. Thus, the Hon. W. Morgan Shuster, formerly of the Customs Service in the Philippine Islands, in a paper which he read at Clark University and later at Lake Mohonk says: it is not enough that the Administration openly favors a long continuance of our sovereign rule: "Capital . . . . is not in the habit of acting on mere expressions of opinion in matters so vital to its safety . . . . I believe that a declaration at the proper time by Congress of the United States that our sovereignty will not be withdrawn from the islands for a period of at least fifty years . . . . would go far to reassure those who are at present deterred by the comparative uncertainty in which the future of the Philippines is veiled!"

Yet, in a larger, a national view, it seems that the American nation is at last turning away from the bitter fruits of imperialism. It will not be long, when the effects are recognized, before the cause is detected. The first President of the League, well-learned in the course of political events, believed that the independence of the Philippine Islands would only come with the fall of that party which was responsible for their malevolent assimilation, and although all the great men of that party were opposed to the early assumption of imperialism, its contemporary leaders, with but few exceptions, have accepted the disgraceful situation with acquiescence or indifference. There is great hope now that we may be permitted to show the people
the wrong and the dangers of the position and that they may be induced to retrace, before it is too late, the steps by which they have been led away from the old paths,—so that they may say with Vaughn Moody, that great poet whom we can ill spare, since he loved his countrymen and loved liberty so well:

"Tempt not our weakness, our cupidity!
For save we let the island men go free,
Those baffled and dislaureled ghosts
Will curse us from the lamentable coasts
Where walk the frustrate dead.
The cup of trembling shall be drained quite,
Eaten the sour bread of astonishment,
With ashes of the hearth shall be made white
Our hair, and wailing shall be in the tent;
Then on your guiltier head
Shall our intolerable self-disdain
Wreak suddenly its anger and its pain;
For manifest in that disastrous light
We shall discern the right
And do it, tardily.—O ye who lead,
Take heed!

Blindness we may forgive, but baseness we will smite."

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Executive Committee has held without interruption its stated fortnightly meetings, at the first of which Mr. Albert S. Parsons was elected chairman.

The Committee has elected from time to time as Vice-Presidents of the League the following persons: Professor John Dewey, of Columbia University, New York; Professor Starr Willard Cutting, of the University of Chicago; the Hon. James Simons, of Charleston, South Carolina; the Rev. A. A. Berle, of Boston; Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, of New York; David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University; the Rt. Rev. Charles D. Williams, Bishop of Michigan; the Hon. John A. Martin, of Pueblo, Colorado; Dr. Francis H. Rowley, of Boston; and Mrs. Fanny Garrison Villard, of Dobbs Ferry, New York.

MEETINGS.

The President delivered an address at the adjourned annual meeting of the League, November 30, 1909, under the title of
"A Year's Progress," which was afterwards published in pamphlet form.

March 10, 1910, a luncheon was given to the Hon. Manuel L. Quezon at the University Club by the Executive Committee and other members of the League.

Professor Frederick Starr, of the University of Chicago, delivered an address at the Twentieth Century Club on October 1909.

DOCUMENTS.

"Speech of the Hon. Pablo Ocampo de Leon delivered at a Popular Banquet given in his honor in Manila, P. I., October 2, 1909.


"A Year's Progress." Annual address by Moorfield Storey, President of the Anti-Imperialist League, at the Eleventh Annual Meeting, November 30, 1909. (2,000 copies.)

Letter from the Philippine Chamber of Commerce. (2,500 copies.)

"Buried Hopes." El Renacimiento, Manila, December 9, 1909.

"Hurrah for Idleness!" El Renacimiento, Manila, December 11, 1909.

"The Limitation of the Amount of Land Which may be Acquired by Individuals and Corporations in the Philippine Islands." Opinion by the Hon. George W. Wickersham, Attorney-General, December 18, 1909. (2,000 copies.)

"Farewell." El Renacimiento, Manila, January 15, 1910.

"New Invasion of the Philippines." La Vanguardia, Manila, February 25, 1910.

"A Petition of Sundry Citizens of the United States for Philippine Independence," presented by Hon. William Murray Crane, of Massachusetts in the United States Senate, March 16, 1910. (2,000 copies.)

"Limitation upon Individual Holdings of Philippine Lands." Remarks of Hon. Samuel W. McCall, of Massachusetts, in the House of Representatives, March 22, 1910. (2,000 copies.)
“Exploiting the Philippines.” Speech of Hon. John A. Martin, of Colorado in the House of Representatives, Friday, March 25, 1910. (5,000 copies.)

“Exploiting the Philippines.” Speech of Hon. John A. Martin, of Colorado in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 29, 1910. (1,000 copies.)

“Philippine Opinion.” La Vanguardia, Manila, March 31, 1910.

Editorial, from La Vanguardia, Manila, April 6, 1910.

“Why Faith Dies.” La Vanguardia, Manila, April 6, 1910.

“As Others See Us!” La Vanguardia, Manila, April 6, 1910.

“Naval Appropriation Bill.” Speech of Hon. James L. Slayden of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Friday, April 8, 1910. (2,000 copies.)

“The Philippines.” La Vanguardia, Manila, April 15, 1910.

“Filipino Mass Meeting.” La Vanguardia, Manila, May 12, 1910.

“Philippine Affairs.” Speech of Hon. Manuel L. Quezon of the Philippines, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, May 14, 1910. (2,000 copies.)

Editorial from La Vanguardia, Manila, May 13, 1910.

“Sugar Trust Invasion of the Philippines.” Speech of Hon. J. Harry Covington, of Maryland, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, May 21, 1910. (2,000 copies.)

“Perverted Philippine Policy,” by Erving Winslow, Secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League, published in the National Monthly, May, 1910. (100 copies.)

“The Demand of the Filipinos: Independence.” Reprint from Unity of June 30, 1910, with letter from Professor Frederick Starr.


“Agriculture and Independence.” El Ideal, Manila, July 5, 1910.


And numerous other extracts from Philippine journals, manifolded and sent to American newspapers, in which they were reproduced, thus placing them before the eyes of many hundreds of thousands of readers.
NECROLOGY.

During the year the League has lost the following Vice-Presidents:

Professor William Graham Sumner, of Yale University, was the author of "The Conquest of the United States by Spain," a tremendously telling argument against the imperial policy of the United States which was one of the earliest as it has been one of the most useful documents in our library. Professor Sumner remained to the end a most faithful champion of our cause, and his loss to the League is very great;

Mr. Samuel Langhorne Clemens, author of "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," employed in the cause of Anti-Imperialism and in behalf of the Filipino those wonderful weapons of satire which were so absolutely at his command, and the members of the League were able to appreciate what is not yet justly understood: that, more than a brilliant humorist, he was a passionate and zealous reformer;

The Rev. William H. Scott, of Woburn, was of immense service in holding his race loyal to the cause of its brown brothers over the sea, and in opening its eyes to the wrong-doing of the party which was its traditional friend in former years. He was a singularly sweet and lovable person and his place has not been filled;

The Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, Bishop of Rhode Island, towering in moral force as in stature above his fellow-men, regarded Anti-Imperialism as chief among the many moral causes in which he was so profoundly interested and which he did so much to promote;

Professor William James, of Harvard University, the sad echo of whose name not only reaches the continents of America and Europe but is heard with grief in Asia, where the Filipinos knew him as their wise and faithful friend, will be missed because of the important influence he exerted in promoting their liberation and the independence of their country;

Mr. George Laban Paddock, of Chicago, took part in the first mass meeting called in the city of his residence to protest against the crime of the United States in the Philippines, and he remained a great force for right and justice in the rapid movement of the life of a busy city,—which tends to forgetfulness and oblivion:

The Hon. Alfred A. Putnam, of Uxbridge, orator, essayist, poet, lawyer, and judge, was well-known to us all and affec-
tionately known to many. He was a frequent attendant at our meetings, and while possessed of the most cheerful temperament and sunny disposition, his whole soul kindled in burning words against every phase of the criminal aggression and forcible retention at which we protest.

ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.
Francis A. Osborne,
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The Anti-Imperialist League in Account With

Report Of The Treasurer.
In presenting his annual array of figures, the treasurer desires again to thank most heartily the devoted, untiring men and women who for years, with very little to encourage them, have sustained the work of the League, with an earnestness, a liberality and a self-sacrifice beyond all praise; and whose splendid faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and of the American doctrine of human rights and liberty, has remained unshaken through these many years of hope deferred. And today the treasurer can add to his thanks his hearty congratulations. For the first time, since the ratification of the ill-omened Spanish treaty, our optimistic faith is supported by substantial political facts.

Most of us perhaps hardly realize yet the immense significance for our cause of the sweeping Democratic victories in the recent elections. Whatever may be our individual political faith, we must consider that the Democrats, as a party, have from the beginning opposed the taking and holding of the Philippines. A majority of their senators voted against the iniquitous treaty which gave us the islands. In all their subsequent national conventions, they have taken strong and unequivocal ground in favor of an immediate promise of independence for the islands. In 1900, they even proclaimed the question to be the paramount issue of the campaign. If they come into power they can hardly discard such a cardinal and long-maintained article of their faith.

The Republicans, on the other hand, as a party, though with many honorable individual exceptions, have favored and supported the Imperialist policy. A Republican president took the islands; a Republican senate, with only two dissenting Republican votes, ratified the treaty of cession; the present Republican president,—able, amiable and estimable gentleman as he is,—is more firmly committed to the policy of indefinite retention of the islands than any public man in the country. The Republican national conventions have never said one definite word as to the final fate of the islands; and have certainly never given any clear hope of absolute independence even in the remote future. Tired as I believe many of their leaders are of their un-American experiment, and glad as they would certainly be to be relieved of the burden, party pride and consistency will necessarily prevent their making any move themselves in favor of Philippine independence. The cause has absolutely nothing to hope for from the Republican party.

And now comes the great political tidal wave of this present
month, and, for the first time since the Spanish war, the Democrats have gained partial control of the government. They have the House of Representatives by a large majority. Their strength in the Senate, it is alleged, is enough to control that body with the aid of insurgent Republicans. And, if we may credit the political prophecy of Secretary Knox in his speech in Ohio, before the elections,—a prophecy which possibly now he would like to qualify,—that “as the twig was bent in 1910, so would the tree be inclined in 1912,” we may fairly hope for a Democratic President, in two years more.

In the meantime, the course of imperialism has been checked. The House of Representatives can block any measures of further exploitation, or any legislation that would tend to make future independence more difficult. They can institute exhaustive and critical investigations of the management of the islands. They can pass themselves, and possibly can induce the Senate to join them in passing, the pledge of independence, demanded by the Filipinos, and long promised by the Democrats. And thus they can prepare the way for the fulfilment of that pledge, which can and, I believe, will be undertaken when the whole government passes into Democratic hands.

Such is the brilliant prospect before us. We gaze from afar on the splendid temple of human liberty,—in which is enshrined the immortal Declaration of Independence—looming on the horizon. But we have yet a journey before us, ere we can pass through its portals,—a journey for which the vision is an inspiration.

Let us remember that the Philippine question had no actual perceptible influence in deciding the elections. Congressmen are very human. There are questions much nearer home in which millions of people are interested, which will absorb much of their attention. They will not be disloyal to their anti-imperialist principles, but party platforms, we must remember, have many planks. We can hardly blame them if they wait, as to the Filipinos, for pressure from those most interested. We, the members of this League, have been for years the special advocates of Filipino independence, and it is for us to improve the opportunity, and to bring and keep the issue prominently before Congress and the country. Already there is talk of a gathering of representative Democrats, to plan the policy of the party. We should if possible be represented there. We should, in every way, by correspondence, through the press, by conferences, perhaps by public meetings, rouse the country
again on this old but ever new question. And to do this (and here I come to the point that appeals to a treasurer's mind) we must have money,—money,—money;—more if possible than ever before. We can not hope to carry a great cause to victory by an expenditure of $2,400 a year. The cause needs to be properly financed, and we appeal for help to all who believe in the old American doctrines taught in the Declaration of Independence.

I am well aware that these appeals are not needed by the patriotic, devoted friends of the cause who are gathered here. They have long done enough, many of them too much. But, if, by chance, my words should fall on the ears of any who believe in the cause but who have never yet given it financial help, or who have wearied in well-doing, from a feeling that the cause is hopeless, I invite them earnestly to look with us on the inspiring vision,—visible now to others besides the prophets,—and they will surely wish to have their share in the glory of the coming triumph.

We have had a glimpse of our Promised Land; shall we not go forward boldly and well-equipped, to possess it?

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR.,
Treasurer.

The chair appointed Messrs. Samuel R. Fuller, Howard A. Carson and James H. Bowditch, a committee to distribute, collect and count ballots for officers.

The resolution which follows was introduced by the Executive Committee and unanimously adopted with great applause.

The Anti-Imperialist League, assembled for its annual meeting, desires to protest against the choice of the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Lodge opposed the most enlightened and patriotic statesmen, even of his own party, and notably his distinguished colleague, the Hon. George Frisbie Hoar, by urging the acquisition of the Philippine Islands, and he has persistently refused assent to the frequent and urgent appeal of the inhabitants for a promise of independence. During the eighteen years of his service in the Senate he has said and done nothing in favor of human rights, but has consistently supported an aggressive policy in dealing with foreign nations and the extravagant expenditure for ships, forts and like purposes which such a policy
entails. As friends of human liberty and peace among men we oppose his re-election.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Anti-Imperialist League:

“What of the night?” What are its signs of promise? These are the questions which we naturally ask after twelve years of struggle in behalf of those great principles, which the founders of the Republic one hundred and thirty-four years ago declared to be self-evident truths. Believing that our fathers were right we cannot doubt that these principles must in time prevail. The words of Emerson, “This old Bible if you pitch it out of the window with a fork comes bouncing back again,” may well be applied to the Declaration of Independence with unquestioning faith. To doubt were to doubt that this is a moral universe.

None the less it is pleasant to see one’s faith justified, and the year which has passed has furnished abundant evidence that our cause is gaining. Imperialism—the theory that one man, or one group of men, or one nation has the right to deal with the lives and property of other men or nations without their consent, is beaten back on every hand. Unjust privilege, whether political, religious or commercial, everywhere fights a losing battle. Monarchy in Portugal after enduring for centuries has fallen with hardly a struggle, and a radical republic has taken its place whose first step is to banish the ecclesiastical orders. In Spain the power of the people is felt every year more clearly, the political power of the Church is waning, and no one can tell how soon the example of Portugal will be followed. China is waking up and with the adoption of parliamentary government comes the feeling of the people that China is a nation and not an aggregation of provinces. As a result the great country which a few years ago seemed likely to be divided among the nations of Europe no longer invites their attacks. England finds the task of ruling India more and more difficult, while at her own door she is reaping the fruits of her misgovernment in Ireland. Her legislation in the seventeenth century destroyed the prosperity of Ireland in the interest of English landlords and English manufacturers, and created the poor and ungovernable country which has vexed her rulers ever since. As a result, after years of bitter struggle she finds that she must let Ireland either govern itself, or govern her. Today the Irish can make or unmake the English ministry, and are likely to retain this power till Home Rule is granted.
Not only this, but the privileged classes of England at home find their privileges in peril, and the only question is how much they can save. Taxation will break up their great estates, and their veto on legislation cannot long be maintained. The historian must note that the denial of self-government to Ireland more than any other single thing insures their defeat. Thus "the whirligig of time brings round its revenges" and the slow-grinding mills of the gods bring the works of injustice to nought.

Our own experience teaches the same lesson. Four millions of men and women without voice or vote, regarded as mere chattels with no human rights, dominated the politics of this country for forty years, and plunged us at last into civil war with its legacy of ruined lives, enormous taxes, bitter hostility between fellow-citizens, political demoralization and a race problem which can never be settled until the absolute equality of the colored race as citizens and as men is fully recognized. Neither power nor wealth can perpetuate injustice.

On the other hand it is interesting to look at France. Fifty years ago men used to speak of the French as incapable of self-government. Their republics seemed ephemeral, and always ready to fall at the touch of a Napoleon. Now after forty years the French Republic has shown itself as strong as any government in Europe. It has dealt successfully with the grave complications caused by the case of Dreyfus, it has encountered and overcome the improper influence of the Catholic Church, and lately it has shown rare strength and courage in dealing with organized labor. A government of the people supported by the people now stands as a model in Europe.

If we look at home we have equal cause to rejoice. The party of imperialism and unjust privilege, of Philippine conquest, of high tariff with its children the trusts, of foreign aggression and the "big stick", has been thoroughly beaten, and its leaders have been driven from public life or shorn of their power. The Democratic party controls the House of Representatives, and may soon control the Senate. We confidently expect from them such action as they promised in their last national platform. Here is its language:

"We condemn the experiment of imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in an enormous expense, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our nation open to the charge of abandoning the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the
nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philip-
pine islands as soon as a stable government can be established,
such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guaranteed the
independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands
can be secured by treaty with other powers."

We could not frame a better statement than this of the prin-
ciples and the policy which we advocate. We do not doubt that
the American people in their hearts believe in these principles,
and will rejoice to support this policy. The Democratic party
will be true to its traditional faith and will be backed by the
people only if it lives up to its professions.

In the Philippine Islands the demand for independence gains
in strength with years. The Philippine Assembly insists upon
it. The Filipino delegate urges it with convincing eloquence
in the House of Representatives. Secretary Dickinson was met
by an overwhelming mass of petitions in favor of it when he
reached Manila a few months ago, and as an impartial English
observer said recently in a letter to the London Times, "So far
as there are any political parties in the Philippines, their creeds
differ only in the degree of their professed animosity to
American domination, and the urgency with which they de-
mand independence."

Does it not seem inconceivably strange that the govern-
ment of the United States, the first and greatest of modern republics,
should set itself against the whole tendency of the times, should
turn its back upon all the principles which we have upheld
during our whole national life, and attempt to deny the
Filipinos that inalienable right of self-government which we
have always proclaimed to be the birthright of man? Judging
by all human experience, is it not clear that in such an attempt
the United States is bound to fail?

We are teaching the Filipinos English. We enable them to
read our history and the words of our great statesmen. As a
result Mr. Quezon, in his address to the House of Representa-
tives last May, is able to say:

"In the language of that great apostle of human freedom
Daniel Webster—

'No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power, no
matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not im-
posed by the voice of his own nation, and of his own country,
he will not, he can not, and he means not to be happy under its
burden.'

"These words to us, Mr. Chairman, are freedom's text and ral-
lying cry. We feel their truth deep in our souls for it is the vital spot of our national hope."

What is the answer to such a cry? We must obliterate on the pages of American history all that tells of the Revolution, all that would remind us of the battle against slavery, all our expressions of sympathy with the Greeks, the Hungarians and other peoples who have fought for freedom, all the burning words of Adams and Jefferson and Lincoln and Sumner, the Declaration of Independence, the Gettysburg speech, in a word all that makes our history worth knowing. We must strike from their pedestals in our national Hall of Fame all the men who have led the great battle for human rights, or say that their words were false. How else can we answer the demands of the Filipinos backed by our example and our teaching? Can we pay such a price for the Philippines? What shall it profit a man, or a nation, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? The soul of the United States is our faith that "all men are created equal" and are endowed with the inalienable right of self-government. What will be our fate when we lose that?

Is it surprising that the Englishman to whom I have alluded is struck by the facts that we celebrate with great ceremonies the Fourth of July, and that our bands play every day "The Star Spangled Banner" and other American patriotic airs, which the children are taught to sing? What must this celebration and the words of these songs say to the Filipinos? "Oh long may it wave o'er the land of the free" must taste strangely in a Filipino mouth. Let my Englishman tell us what he saw and heard.

"Three weeks later, on July 25, Manila was again en fete in honor of Mr. John M. Dickinson, United States Secretary of War, who had arrived in the islands on the preceding day. As one part of the festivities a body of 5,000 Filipino school children sang American patriotic songs, massed in a huge open-air grand stand. Among the songs was "Hurrah for the Red, White, and Blue," which, by a curious process of appropriation, the American people has of late years come to cherish as one of its most popular and most distinctively American national airs. The 5,000 children were dressed some in red, some in white, and some in blue; and they were so seated that the whole grand stand made one great American flag. At the close of the proceedings the children stood up and gave three cheers for the Secretary of War, 5,000 childish trebles shouting in unison
“Heep! Heep! Hoorra!” in the queer clipped speech of the Oriental. It was very pretty; and afterwards I spoke to one of the leading Filipino public men and asked him what those children, down in their little hearts, really thought of the flag which they patterned so charmingly and waved with so much enthusiasm, and there was no hesitation in his reply:—

‘They hate it—every one of them! The Americans will tell you that that is not so; but I tell you that every child is taught at home to hate the Stars and Stripes. The Americans know nothing of our nature; they never will know anything. We are Orientals, and we do not show our feelings; and, therefore, you will hear that the mass of the people is indifferent and has no real yearning for independence. It is not true. We wave the flag because, for the present, we must; and we hate it more and more.”

Is not this inevitable? We undertake to teach the Filipinos American ideals; to make them over on the American pattern, to turn Asians into New Englanders. We tell them “that all men are created equal” and that “governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed” and they learn the lesson readily. They had learned it before we landed. They knew our history and our national principles. Yet when they say, “Why are not we in our own land equal to you?” and “Why should our government not derive its powers from our consent?” we swallow the very ideals that we undertake to teach and reply “we are a superior people and therefore must govern you without your consent.” Is not this fatuous? Well may the Filipino answer in the words of Emerson:

“United States! the ages plead—
Present and Past in under-song—
Go put your creed into your deed,
Nor speak with double tongue.

For sea and land don’t understand,
Nor skies without a frown
See rights for which the one hand fights
By the other cloven down.”

President Taft said some years ago:
“The people of the United States have under their guidance and control in the Philippines an archipelago of 3,000 islands, the population of which is about 7,600,000 souls. Of these 7,000,000 are Christians and 600,000 are Moros or other pagan
tribes,” (a population let me observe in passing three times as large as Denmark’s, larger by nearly two million than that of Switzerland and Denmark combined, larger than that of Sweden and Norway combined, and larger than that of Belgium or Holland when these figures were taken). Mr. Taft proceeded, “We may very much better rely on the good sense and virtue of the American people rightfully to solve the problem of dealing with the islands.”

The mere existence of good sense and virtue do not insure the wise solution of any problem unless they are applied to the question, and they cannot be applied unless their possessors understand the facts and are interested in dealing with them. Knowledge of the situation and interest in it are essential. What do the American people know of what is done in the Philippine Islands? We have the official reports which are made periodically, and which state the official view of the situation, but otherwise there is an almost impenetrable veil between the Filipinos and the American people. We learn now that the two houses of the Philippine Assembly are in a deadlock because they cannot agree upon the choice of the two resident commissioners which the Philippine Assembly is authorized to elect and send to the United States. These commissioners have no power and no vote. They are intended merely to speak for the Filipinos, and for this purpose have seats in the House of Representatives. They are the only channel through which the Filipino people can reach the Congress and people of the United States. The representatives of the Filipinos should surely have the right to select these, but as a matter of fact the Upper House of the Filipino legislature which consists of the Philippine Commission, including the Governor-General, controls their choice. The men selected by the United States to govern can dictate who shall speak for the people whom they govern. What a mockery of representation! The Filipinos cannot say what their rulers disapprove. When we remember that the American Commissioners have the ear of the Government at all times,—what can they justly fear? Such a power destroys the chance of just criticism by the governed, and if ever a less high minded and upright commission takes the place of the present one the consequences may well be disastrous. Give the Filipinos at least an unrestricted right to speak. Strike but hear.

Of that daily information as to what is done, by which public opinion is formed and made effective we get nothing. If the
people demand it the newspapers would supply it. Unhappily the people are tired of the islands, and do not wish to be reminded of them. We are in a false position, and we know it, so we try not to think of our duties and the rights of this unhappy people.

Still from behind the veil some facts occasionally make their way, and thanks to the courage and persistence of Mr. Martin, of Colorado, certain unpleasant facts connected with the administration and sale of the so-called friar lands have been brought to light, and are soon to be investigated. I am glad to say that the Governor-General of the Philippine Islands is as conscientious and honest a man as the country contains, and is giving his life to the task which his country has laid upon him with self-sacrificing devotion. No one can say in his favor what I will not gladly admit. None the less must we criticize his policy when in our judgment it is wrong.

For many years, and especially during the time when the great West was inhabited only by a few scattered Indians, the American people believed in a policy which is now outgrown. Wishing to attract population, to build railroads, to discover and develop natural resources, we made large gifts of public land to men who would embark their capital in opening up and improving the country. Our national treasures were so abundant that they seemed inexhaustible, a fund which should be spent freely to increase the population and promote the prosperity of the country. The adventurous capitalists made large fortunes and others were attracted by their success. We did not at once recognize when the necessity ceased for offering large rewards to those who would undertake doubtful enterprises. The policy of spending our capital was adhered to, and only when many had grown rich out of the public resources without risk, did we wake to the fact that our expenditure had been reckless and must stop. We have now reached the era of conservation, conservation of lands, of water, of minerals, of franchises, of all that belongs to the public. But there are many who have not accepted the new doctrine, who feel that the way to make a country prosperous is to offer capital large rewards, and thereby to promote agriculture and manufactures with an enlarged field for labor, and it would seem that this outworn creed had its disciples among the rulers of the Philippine Islands. They are perhaps not to be blamed for believing what we all believed twenty years ago, and yet they are clearly wrong, and their error is very dangerous.
If the purpose of government is to produce sugar, hemp and tobacco their policy may be right. If it is to produce men, a prosperous and contented people, it is absolutely wrong.

When the Philippine Islands were taken they presented no such problem as the Great West presented in 1860. Here were no great areas of fertile land which men were anxious to occupy and there make their homes. The population of the islands was large and the fertile land largely occupied. No large number of Filipinos were seeking new homes in the islands. The danger was that non-resident capitalists would buy up the land and get possession of the natural resources, so that we should have a system of absentee landlords controlling the fields and the means by which the natives of the islands could live. To guard against this unfortunate result we carefully limited the amount of public land that any individual or corporation could hold, and by section 75 of the Organic Act forbade any corporation engaged in agriculture from owning or controlling more than 1,024 hectares of land, and made it unlawful for any member of such a corporation or the corporation itself from being “in any wise interested in any other corporation engaged in agriculture or in mining.” In a word we adopted the policy of “conservation” at the outset, and as the debates in Congress show, for the very purpose of preventing the exploitation of the islands by American or foreign capitalists.

One of the most serious problems which confronted us arose from the ownership of very large and valuable tracts of agricultural lands by certain religious orders and the discontent of the natives, who resided on and cultivated these lands without any hope of owning their holdings. To meet this difficulty the Philippine government was authorized to acquire and convey lands “subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in this act” and to exercise this power in respect of any lands “which on the 13th of August 1898 were owned or held by associations, corporations, communities, religious orders or private individuals in such large tracts or parcels and in such manner as in the opinion of the Commission injuriously to affect the peace and welfare of the people of the Philippine Islands.” This language makes it clear that Congress thought the ownership of large tracts by individuals as dangerous as the ownership by associations or religious orders. To pay for this land the Philippine government was authorized to issue its bonds and the price thus became a charge upon the Philippine people, to be paid principal and interest out of the taxes which
they pay. Surely if any land can be said to be the property of the Filipino people and be held for their benefit, it is land for which they pay with the sweat of their brows.

We are left in no doubt as to the purpose of making this purchase.

The first report of the Taft Commission says:

"It would avoid some very troublesome agrarian disturbances between the friars and their quondam tenants if the insular government could buy these large haciendas of the friars and sell them out in small holdings to the present tenants, who, forgiven for the rent due during the two years of war, would recognize the title of the government without demur and gladly accept an opportunity, by payment of the price in small installments, to become absolute owners of that which they and their ancestors have so long cultivated."

A year later the Commission says—

"As it has already stated in its former report, the commission believes that the transfer of the property and its sale in small holdings to the present tenants on long payment might be effected without loss and that this solution would be very satisfactory to all the people."

When the organic act was before the Committee, Secretary Root appeared as a witness and said:—

"The political situation is such that, at what we may find to be a fair price, it is undoubtedly wise for us to buy, and then to turn around and vest the titles to these lands in the tenants at a reasonable price (giving them good long time, of course, to pay, so that instead of paying rent they will be making partial payments on the purchase), and then use that money to retire the obligations given to raise the original purchase price."

A few weeks later, Mr. Taft, then Governor of the Islands, was before the same Committee and said:—

"Mr. Maddox. If I understand you, from what I have heard you say I gather that you think it would be cheaper for the United States to undertake to buy these lands than to restore them to their owners?

Governor Taft. I do; what I mean is, if we buy the lands we put the title of the Government between the friars and the subsequent disposition of the lands, and that then the Government may, by liberal terms to the tenants, enable the tenants, by payments strung over a long number of years, to become the owners of the land. The payments can be arranged so that
not much more than the rent would nevertheless pay for the land."

and Senator Lodge in supporting the bill in debate said:—

"The second object of the bill is to help the development of the islands; and yet, as the committee felt, to help that development only by taking the utmost pains that there should be no opportunity given for undue or selfish exploitation. The opponents of this legislation have dwelt almost continuously—when they have spoken on this bill—on the point that it is intended to open the islands to exploiters, to syndicates, and to carpet-baggers . . . . But these exploiters, these syndicates, these carpetbaggers, who march back and forth through the speeches of Democratic Senators like the scene-shifter's army, have as little reality as the air-drawn dagger of Macbeth."

*I* * * * * * *

"I have had many gentlemen come to me who desire to invest money in the Philippine Islands who say that the bill is so drawn that it is impossible for capital to go in there to any large amount."

The bill was carefully amended by inserting in various sections the words "subject to the limitations and conditions contained in this act," and each of the sections 63, 64 and 65 which give the government of the Islands the right to acquire and sell the friar lands contains these words. Section 15 of that Act expressly empowered the Government of the Philippine Islands to provide for "the granting or sale and conveyance to actual occupants and settlers and other citizens of said islands of such parts or portions of the public domain other than timber and mineral lands of the said islands as it may deem wise, not exceeding sixteen hectares to any one person, and the sale and conveyance of not more than 1,024 hectares to any corporation or association, and it was further provided that the grant or sale of such lands should be contingent on actual occupancy improvement and cultivation of the premises sold for a period of not less than five years during which time the purchaser or grantee cannot alienate or encumber the land or title thereto.

Section 65 which provides for the sale of the friar lands expressely says that all such lands "shall constitute a part and portion of the public property of the government of the Philippine Islands" and if there is any important distinction between "public property" and "public domain" it does not occur to me. But whether there is or not, in either case sales cannot be made except under the limitations and conditions of the act. Among
these limitations were distinct limitations on the quantity of land which could be sold to an individual or a corporation. Whether we examine the act itself, or read the debates, or consider its purpose, the intention to prevent the sale of these lands in large parcels to foreign exploiters is clear.

Yet the Attorney-General of the United States last December gave an opinion that the limitations on the power to sell did not apply to the friar lands, and acting under this opinion sales of very large tracts have been made to persons closely allied with the Sugar Trust and other large producers of sugar not residents in the islands. It is certain that the Insular Bureau was not frank in answering resolutions of inquiry, and there is much in the circumstances surrounding the purchases and in the agents employed, which gives the transactions a disagreeable look, but as the whole matter is to be investigated, and we hope honestly and thoroughly, it is right to withhold our judgment till we have heard all the facts.

It is apparent however that the policy of letting the natives acquire these lands has been frustrated and that foreign capitalists have been given much more favorable terms than have been granted to the Filipino tenants, unless there is some answer to the statements which Mr. Martin made on the floor of the House of Representatives and which he compiled from statements furnished by the officers of the Government.

He said:—

“As has been seen, on June 30, 1908, after having occupied the islands for ten years, our officials in the Philippines had issued sale certificates on friar lands to but 446 out of the more than 60,000 tenants of those lands, and these 446 sale certificates cover but 1,600 of the 400,000 acres purchased from the friars.”

“The reason why so few sales have been made seems to be disclosed in two paragraphs of the 1908 report of the director of lands. In this report he says (vol. 2, p. 248):

‘Applications to purchase small parcels continue to be received. These applications range from 5 hectares to as small as 16 centares. (One hectare equals 2.47 acres; 1 centare equals 1.2 square yards, or one thousand-two-hundred-and-fourth part of an acre; 16 centares equal 19 square yards, or one two-hundredth of 1 acre). As was stated in last year’s report, these small parcels can not be sold at a reasonable value per hectare without incurring loss to the government.
It is manifestly a poor business proposition to make a sale simply for the sake of making it, where the government stands to lose anywhere from forty pesos to eighty pesos. In last year's report it was shown that the survey of homesteads and the necessary office work entailed would cost the government about fifty pesos for each homestead, a clear loss of thirty pesos, after deducting the entry fee of twenty pesos received. It was shown that free patents would cost the government about thirty pesos each, with no receipts. It is manifestly necessary, therefore, that at least part of this should be recovered on sales and leases, and that these should be made at a profit.

'The practice has been inaugurated in cases where application to purchase ranged around one, two or three hectares to inform the applicant that the land applied for has been appraised at a certain figure, and that figure is placed at an amount that is calculated will at least cover the expenses in connection with the sale if made. The sale of a small parcel, including advertising charges, office work, and survey, will not fall below eighty pesos. In an application to purchase one hectare the appraisement is fixed at 100 pesos, and in an application for a larger or smaller area the appraisement is fixed at a price per hectare proportionate to the above amount. The practice is probably an arbitrary one, but it seems the only way out of the difficulty. An applicant is not always awed at a large price, however.'

"It is extremely doubtful if in the disposition of our public domain the gross receipts have begun to cover the field and administrative expenses connected therewith. At all events, those expenses have not been the determining factor. The theory has been that the public domain belonged to the people, and the policy has been to give these lands to the people, regardless of the field or administration cost.

"The policy adopted by the American Government in the Philippines is contrary to the purpose and intent of Congress, and it seems pitiable indeed that when a native seeks to purchase even one hectare—two and one half acres—out of the 60,000,000 acres of public lands, which did not cost the Philippine government a penny, he is informed that the land he wants
has been appraised at 100 pesos—$50—and that he must pay that amount if he acquires it. The enormity of such a practice only is appreciated when we consider the extreme poverty of the natives, the betterment of whose condition furnished the sole reason or excuse for purchasing these lands.

"Under Spanish rule the customary wage of the natives for twelve to fourteen hours a day was fifty cents per week. General Hughes testified that if they got this pittance they were satisfied, but that the trouble arose from the fact that frequently they did not get even that amount. The wages on sugar plantations are said to have increased to just under sixteen cents per day, or $4.16 per month, or less than $50 a year. No wonder there have been made but 219 sales when, to acquire a two and one-half acre tract, the government requires from the native every penny he can earn, if he works every day for a whole year. The fact that for wild land the government charges the native $20 per acre, while for the same class of land it charges the Havemeyer syndicate $6.60 per acre, would seem to indicate pretty clearly the land policy of that government.

"It seems that during ten years of American occupation of the Philippines 665 of the 8,000,000 natives succeeded in purchasing 15,331 acres of government land on ten years' time, while in one day the Havemeyer syndicate acquires 55,000 acres on nineteen years' time."

Mr. Martin quotes the official report as to the disposition of the Tala estate and thus describes it.

"First, the Tala estate consists of 6,696 hectares, or 16,539 acres. The director of lands reports that 20 per cent of it, or 3,307 acres, is occupied by natives, none of whom have been able to secure a sale certificate. The director reports that 466 leases on lands in this estate have been executed. The leases cover 735 hectares, or 1,815 acres, the average size of the parcels leased being 3.9 acres. The amount of annual receipts contracted for from these leases is 4,235 pesos, or $2,117.50 for the 1,815 acres, or $1.17 per acre. Under the arrangement described by the director of lands the man who leases the unoccupied portion of the estate with the privilege of purchase takes up certain portions of it at given periods, and as he takes these portions over he agrees to pay an annual rental of 15 cents per hectare, or six cents per acre, on such portions as he does not crop, and 75 cents per hectare, or 30 cents per acre, on such portions as he takes a crop from. The Philippine government paid $112,054 for this estate, or $6.77 per acre and four per cent
interest on this amount for four and one-half years from the date of purchase to June 30, 1908, would bring the cost to $8 per acre on that date. It thus would appear that the new tenant, who options the whole estate, pays a less amount per acre on the land he crops, than the interest the Philippine government pays on its bonds amounts to on the cost of that particular land to date, while the Philippine government continues to pay a like amount of interest per acre on the balance of the estate on which he holds an option. In other words, four per cent interest on the cost of the land to date amounts to 32 cents per acre. The new tenant, the wealthy man who eventually is to buy the estate, pays two cents per acre less than the government's carrying charges, while the native tenant pays $1.17 per acre, or nearly four times the amount of the carrying charges. Certainly one is paying too much or the other is not paying enough, and in either event the exercise of this sort of favoritism to the exploiter and driving hard bargains with the native tenants whereby but little over one-half of them on this particular estate have been induced to take out leases, presumably on account of the high rental charged them, is not in sympathy with the intent of Congress when it passed the act authorizing the purchase of these lands for the sole purpose of dividing them up and selling them to tenants in small parcels at a low price and on long time."

One more quotation to complete the picture:

"Considerable portions of the land on the estates located in the Provinces of Laguna, Cavite, and Cebu have been leased in small parcels to native tenants, and it might be presumed that such areas as have been so leased will continue in the hands of native tenants of the Philippine government. But the director of lands stated that whenever a native tenant gives up the government lease the big tenant has the option to take over the lease at the same rental the small tenant had been paying. On the Tala estate, which the director cites, the little tenant is paying $1.17 an acre, while the big tenant is to pay but 30 cents per acre. It might appear that the big fellow would not care to take over the little fellow's lease at $1.17 an acre, or nearly four times the rental per acre the big fellow has to pay. It should be understood, however, that while the Philippine government refuses to sell the little tenant the land he lives upon, as soon as the big fellow succeeds to the lease of the little fellow the big fellow acquires the right of purchase on a basis
which, at 4 per cent on his money, will represent a cost of but 32 cents an acre per annum.

"The process can be made both simple and expeditious. The big fellow owning all the surrounding land can make life a burden to the little fellow, can refuse to hire him, or refuse to pay a fair price for his cane or rice. When the little fellow defaults on his rent, the government can bring suit and dispossess him. The big fellow then can take over the lease at $1.17 per acre, and immediately he purchases the land of the government and reduces his annual interest charge to 32 cents per acre. After a few years the big fellow will be in complete and undisputed possession of every acre on the estate, and then he can make his own terms to native tenants.

"Apparently to facilitate the matter of dispossessing these ignorant, defenseless, penniless wards of the Nation within eight days, whenever circumstances or the interests of a big tenant might require, the Philippine government passed an amendatory act on May 20, 1909, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"Provided, that the failure on the part of the occupants to state their desire to lease or purchase said lands shall not be understood to mean that they do not desire to acquire them. In case of such failure it shall be the duty of the director of lands, or his agents, to enjoin such occupants to state their desire in writing within the period of eight days from the date of such injunction, and their failure to do so shall be understood to mean that such occupants do not desire either to lease or to purchase said lands."

Here we have the clear purpose of Congress, and a policy that was wise and benevolent defeated by the officials charged with the duty of carrying it out, and it might well have been accomplished without the knowledge of the American people. It only shows what is possible and where the danger lies.

Doubtless the officers of the Government thought they were doing wisely, and perhaps like our last President they think poorly of lawyers and of laws which stand between them and what seems to them right, but this tendency whether found at home or abroad must be firmly resisted, for it is the essence of imperialism. Suppose any one had risen in the Senate and proposed by law to buy the land which the religious orders were using for the cultivation of sugar, to pay for it with the money of the Filipino people, and then to sell it to the Sugar Trust or
its allies. No one would have had the effrontery to suggest this. Senators and Representatives vied with each other in their efforts to make such a thing impossible, and yet it has been done under the law framed to prevent it, or would have been done were it not that the purchasers of these estates in violation of law have acquired no title to the land so purchased, and spend their money in improving it at their peril.

Bearing upon our flag the motto of our President—"The Philippines for the Filipinos" and under his own administration, we are establishing in these unhappy islands the very trusts which we are seeking to break up in the United States. We have seen the fraudulent practices of the Sugar Trust disclosed and punished. Proceedings to dissolve it are just now to be instituted. Yet the same Attorney-General who seeks to destroy it here, where it is directly under the eye and control of the government, gives it life and fresh opportunity in the Philippine Islands, where its operations can be conducted with far less danger of discovery and punishment. What is dangerous to American citizens at home is far more dangerous to Filipinos on their remote islands, where they have no power, but little capital, and slight ability to resist so powerful an organization. If the policy of conservation is good at home, it is good in the Philippines. If the trusts are dangerous here, they are more dangerous there where they are absentee oppressors. In the name of common fairness why unload on the Filipinos the evils and burdens which we will not carry ourselves?

Let us hope that the investigation will be unsparingly thorough, and if the facts are creditable to the administration and the suspicions are proved unjust, no one will hail the result with more pleasure than I. But we must have the facts.

Whatever may be the merits of these particular transactions, we are opposed to the policy of introducing American or foreign capital into the Philippines, and of offering capitalists inducements to make investments there. Every such investment so clearly forges a new link in the chain which binds us to the islands, that we cannot acquit the administration of a purpose to delay or prevent independence in this way.

The other day in The Nation appeared this extract from a recent letter written by a government employee in the Philippine Islands, a college man who earned distinction in his undergraduate days as an able student and who has won promotion in the Philippine service by his executive ability.

"You have doubtless been reading a little of the visit of
Secretary of War Dickinson to the islands. His coming was known well in advance of his arrival, of course, and you can hardly imagine the wild anticipations with which the Filipino political leaders looked forward to the visit. They had it all planned out that the Secretary was to look around a little, scourge the American administration, and then reach into his pocket and gracefully extract and hand to them "Philippine Independence," as a little memento of his visit.

"Of course it is unnecessary to add that the Lincolns and Washingtons and Websters of the Philippines were sadly disillusionized. Their newspapers are bewailing the affair yet. What made their disappointment especially keen was that they had such a magnificent petition for la independencia all made out, with thousands of signers from every province, and then it fell so flat!

"You will infer that the political horizon is pretty dark, but it must not be imagined also that we Americans oppress our minds very much with the doleful situation. We go on about our work and think about it as little as possible. It really doesn't matter very much what the natives think or do about politics. American capital is being invested here to such an extent that independence is not in the slightest degree a present menace. And the more capital comes the farther off is independence."

This is the official view. "It really doesn't matter much what the natives do or think about politics." The 7,000,000 Christian inhabitants of the islands described at the Lake Mohawk conference by Hon. James F. Tracey, formerly a member of the Philippine Supreme Court, "as a bright, capable, ambitious and likeable people," able enough to administer their own provincial and municipal government, to furnish the Chief Justice and a majority of the judges in the Supreme Court, and four members of the Philippine Commission are really regarded as a negligible quantity in their own country, and in dealing with their own affairs. What amazing insolence! Such an attitude insures disaster.

The incurable vice of our position lies in the fact that we are in the Philippine Islands solely because we claim to be superior in wisdom, strength, virtue and civilization to the inhabitants. Upon this assumed superiority rests our whole claim to rule them against their will. Every American whether in official station or private life shares this feeling; and consciously or unconsciously shows it. Such an attitude is most offensive
and fatal to any real sympathy between governors and governed, without which no government can hope to succeed. We have no right in the islands, and the longer we stay the wider will be the gulf between the Filipinos and ourselves. The present relation costs both nations dearly, not merely in money but in character and self-respect. It cannot endure, and no financial ties can do more than make the separation more difficult and costly. All the money invested in slaves could not save slavery, and it will be equally powerless in the Philippines when the hour and the man come. He who seeks to build any enduring edifice, financial or political, on the permanence of our rule in these islands is doomed to lose. The stars in their courses fight against him. We are there without right. Every day that we remain is a fresh wrong, and adds to the cost, which we or our children will ultimately pay. We turn to the Democrats soon to be in power and say—You must deliver us "from the body of this death."

DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN said in part:

In Mexico, the long era of lawlessness and disorder came to an end with the rise of Porfirio Diaz. Mexico was then financially strengthened by the seizure of the properties of the religious orders. It was politically strengthened by the alliance of the administration with the railroad companies, and other foreign agencies of exploitation. The railway lines radiated from the city of Mexico, enabling Diaz to send troops to any quarter. There were no cross-lines, not even wagon roads, and power was concentrated making riot and rebellion impossible. The alliance with money established credit. It gave Mexico the "psychological reserve" which is the pride of the Bank of England. It made Mexico orderly, with credit in the markets of the world at the cost of the freedom of her people. We have therefore today, orderly Mexico, and barbarous Mexico, safe Mexico and Mexico in chains, according to the view we take of the picture.

The men of enterprise have not yet established credit in the Philippines. There is no Diaz there with whom they can ally themselves—nothing but Uncle Sam. When the chains of credit are established, and the Philippines are ready to take care of themselves under the guidance of the Invisible Empire of Finance, there will be no longer any need of the aid of Uncle Sam. We may then expect that the Filipinos will receive their independence.
The REV. A. A. BERLE, D. D., spoke as follows:

Mr. President:

It is a great satisfaction to congratulate the League upon the
great and substantial progress which has been made in the last
twelve years. I really believe that it would not lie against me,
as it did ten years ago, as a disqualification for an important
pulpit, that I was a member of the Anti-Imperialist League! The
main contentions with which this organization began its
existence have been confirmed and the general public so far as
it is interested and informed upon Philippine matters holds
practically the views which this League has stood for in the
last dozen years.

This found for me striking confirmation in the recent Lake
Mohonk Conference where I heard views expressed and admi-
sions made by officials and teachers in the Islands, for which
years ago men were called opprobrious names. More than ever
we are confronted with a problem, the answer to which is not
to be found in anything but first the promise, and then the
restoration of independence to the Filipino. Discontent is
deeper and more widespread than ever. Dissatisfaction with
the American occupation pervades all ranks of the Filipinos and
the intelligent demand for independence is steadily increasing.
The advance in intelligence by means of the schools has only
served to educate the children as well as the parents in the in-
justice of our position and to stimulate unhappiness and unceas-
iness under American rule. There will be no meeting this
steady advance of intelligent understanding of the wrongness of
our attitude and the just demands of the Filipinos for independ-
ence, unless we can devise some way of stopping the Filipino
mind from thinking. Independence alone will be able to pacify
this ceaseless quest for justice.

For us in Massachusetts events have furnished an oppor-
tunity to strike directly at one of the leading figures and in
some respect the most damaging opponent of our cause in the
United States Senate. We can do no better thing than to
organize public opinion in Massachusetts and make certain the
prospective defeat of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. More
dangerous even than the Senators who are openly allied to the
predatory interests which are exploiting the Philippine Islands,
his is a menace to the cause of liberty and justice because he
furnishes the veneer of polite learning and the prestige of the
“scholar in politics” behind which these vultures prey
upon a helpless people. His defeat will serve to give notice to
the other states of this Union that Massachusetts has again re-
sumed her leadership in liberty interests and has again marched
to the forefront of humanity's best desires. We must increase
the output of informing literature which gives the public
knowledge of affairs in the Islands, a great need for which
almost every speaker at the Lake Mohonk Conference pleaded,
and we must endeavor in the immediate task here, to make
every legislator in the Massachusetts legislature feel that his
vote in the matter of the election of the United States Senator,
will be visited with prompt approval or disapproval. For the
first time we have this concrete question placed within striking
distance and we should fail in our duty to Massachusetts and to
liberty if we did not perform our task.

The HON. ROGER SHERMAN HOAR, who had to leave
carly in the meeting, asked permission to report in print.

Fellow workers for liberty: Elevated to sudden prominence
by the decision of my constituency, I feel it a great privilege
to have the added honor thrust upon me of addressing this
organization of true Americans. It is hard to say many words
about our cause, for the hearts of all of us are so full that much
that any speaker could say would be mere repetition. Never-
theless, in a few words I can tell you why I am an Anti-Im-
perialist.

No matter how much a person is interested in any cause, he
can usually find, upon analyzing his sentiments, that there is
one single determining fact that is really responsible for his
position. This fact in my case is that now apparently unim-
portant document, 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 those 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."

What do I know about Philippine conditions? I have never
been there. Suppose some specialist in Philippine affairs, re-
senting my inexperienced interference, should tell me that the
Filipinos are incapable of self-government; I should reply that
all men are created equal, and that we should guarantee them equal rights, at least for the future, if not at present. Suppose my inquisitor were to mention the great improvements made in the islands by the use of, and for the benefit of, American capital; I should reply that the inalienable rights of the Filipinos were more important than the exploitation of the islands. Suppose that my inquisitor were further to call my attention to the splendid government that we have instituted in the Philippines; I should reply that truly great governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Of course we hear much talk to the effect that the Declaration of Independence was a mere political platform. Mark Hanna said of political platforms that they were like train platforms, meant to get in by, but not to stand on. Perhaps if this country were to write a political declaration of independence at the present day, it would read somewhat as follows: “We have the power to enforce the following theories: that all men are created unequal; that we, the superior class, are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights and duties; that among those are the subjugation, government, and exploitation of foreign territories. That to secure these special privileges, governments are instituted among men who do not want them, deriving their powers from the fact that we are strong enough to back them up.”

I am enough of a reactionary to believe in the Declaration of Independence, as written. I am progressive enough to believe that personal rights are more important than the unjust extention of American capital.

A person doesn’t have to travel to the Philippines to understand the Declaration of Independence or to be a follower of the Golden Rule.

The Committee which had been appointed to distribute, collect and count ballots, reported that the following officers for 1911 were unanimously elected:

President
Moorfield Storey.

Treasurer
David Greene Haskins, Jr.

Secretary
Erving Winslow.
Executive Committee

Albert S. Parsons
James H. Bowditch
Gamaliel Bradford
Frederick Brooks
Edward H. Clement

Charles Fleischer
Edwin Ginn
Albion A. Perry
John Ritchie
Frank B. Sanborn

Fiske Warren
President, Treasurer and Secretary ex-officio.

Vice-Presidents

ALABAMA.
Prof. Edgar B. Kay, Tuscaloosa.
Prof. H. A. Sayre, Tuscaloosa.

ALASKA.
Martin Harrais, Esq., Chena.
John Ronan, Esq., Fairbanks.

ARIZONA.
Frank P. Trott, Esq., Phoenix.

ARKANSAS.
Hon. U. M. Rose, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA.
Prof. Jacques Loeb, Berkeley.
C. F. Lummis, Esq., Los Angeles.
H. C. Newbold, Esq., Haywards.
Hon. Warren Olney, Oakland.
William H. Rogers, Esq., San Jose.

COLORADO.
Hon. Moses Hallett, Denver.
Hon. John A. Martin, Pueblo.
Hon. T. M. Patterson, Denver.
Hon. John F. Shafroth, Denver.
Hon. C. S. Thomas, Denver.

CONNECTICUT.
Rev. Prof. C. M. Mead, New Haven.
Dean Henry Wade Rogers, New Haven.
Hon. Charles F. Thayer, Norwich.

DELAWARE.
William Canby Ferris, Esq., Wilmington.
Hon. Richard R. Kenney, Dover.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
Dr. W. A. Croffut, Washington.
Samuel Gompers, Esq., Washington.

FLORIDA.
Hon. Thomas M. Shackleford, Tallahassee.

GEORGIA.
Hon. James H. Blount, Macon.
Hon. W. H. Fleming, Augusta.
Gen. James Gadsden Holmes, Macon.
Hon. Peter W. Meldrim, Savannah.
Hon. Hoke Smith, Atlanta.

IDAHO.
Hon. Simon P. Donnelly, Lakeview.

ILLINOIS.
Miss Jane Addams, Chicago.
Francis F. Browne, Esq., Chicago.
Prof. Starr Willard Cutting, Chicago.
Frederick W. Gookin, Esq., Chicago.
Prof. William Gardner Hale, Chicago.
Prof. Ira W. Howerton, Chicago.
Dr. William Morton Payne, Chicago.
Louis F. Post, Esq., Chicago.
Mrs. Alice Thacher Post, Chicago.
William M. Salter, Esq., Chicago.
Mrs. Edwin Burritt Smith, Chicago.
Prof. Frederick Starr, Chicago.
Charles M. Sturges, Esq., Chicago.
Prof. A. H. Tolman, Esq., Chicago.
Sigmund Zeisler, Esq., Chicago.

INDIANA.
D. S. Burson, Richmond.
Hon. H. U. Johnson, Richmond.

IOWA.
Hon. Horace Boies, Waterloo.
Hon. William Larrabee, Clermont.
Hon. Cato Sells, Vinton.
Hon. Henry Vollmer, Davenport.

KANSAS.
Hugh P. Farrelly, Esq., Chanute.

KENTUCKY.
James G. Howard, Esq., Lock.

LOUISIANA.
Prof. James Hardy Dillard, New Orleans.

MAINE.
President George C. Chase, Lewiston.
Dr. Seth C. Gordon, Portland.
Hon. Luther F. McKinney, Bridgton.

MARYLAND.
Hon. John V. LeMoyne, Baltimore.
Hon. George L. Wellington, Cumberland.
MASSACHUSETTS.
Magnus W. Alexander, Esq., Lynn.
Rev. A. A. Berle, Boston.
Samuel Bowles, Jr., Esq., Springfield.
Col. C. R. Codman, Brookline.
Rev. C. F. Dole, Boston.
Thomas B. Fitzpatrick, Esq., Boston.
Francis J. Garrison, Esq., Lexington.
President G. Stanley Hall, Worcester.
Hon. J. M. Head, Boston.
Hon. Roger Sherman Hoar, Concord.
Prof. Lewis J. Johnson, Cambridge.
Hon. George W. Kelly, Rockland.
Henry W. Lamb, Esq., Brookline.
Edwin D. Mead, Esq., Boston.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Boston.
Hon. R. M. Morse, Boston.
James P. Monroe, Esq., Boston.
Hon. Herbert C. Parsons, Greenfield.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, Boston.
Dr. Francis H. Rowley, Boston.
Dr. Patrick J. Timmins, Boston.
Hon. Winslow Warren, Dedham.
MICHIGAN.
Charles S. Hampton, Esq., Detroit.
Charles Humphrey, Esq., Adrian.
Rt. Rev. Charles D. Williams, Detroit.
MINNESOTA.
Frederick G. Corser, Esq., Minneapolis.
Hon. John Lind, Minneapolis.
MISSISSIPPI.
Hon. John S. Williams, Yazoo City.
MISSOURI.
John P. Herrmann, Esq., St. Louis.
MONTANA.
Massena Bullard, Esq., Helena.
Andrew Dunsire, Esq., Kalispell.
Edward Scharnikow, Esq., Deer Lodge.
NEBRASKA.
A. J. Sawyer, Esq., Lincoln.
Rt. Rev. Arthur S. Williams, Omaha.
NEVADA.
Dr. J. J. Sullivan, Virginia City.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.
Hon. Henry F. Hollis, Concord.
NEW JERSEY.
Ralph W. E. Donges, Esq., Camden.
Hon. Francis E. Woodruff, Morristown.
NEW YORK.
Everett V. Abbot, Esq., New York.
Rev. Richard W. Boynton, Buffalo.
Andrew Carnegie, Esq., New York.
R. Fulton Cutting, Esq., New York.
Charles Stewart Davison, Esq., New York.
Hon. Louis R. Ehrich, New York.
Austen G. Fox, Esq., New York.
Henry Hentz, Esq., New York.
William Dean Howells, Esq., New York.
Hon. Thomas Mott Osborne, Auburn.
Mrs. Fanny Garrison Villard, Dobbs Ferry.
Oswald Garrison Villard, New York.
NORTH CAROLINA.
President L. L. Hobbs, Guilford.
NORTH DAKOTA.
A. C. Reinecke, Esq., Fargo.
OHIO.
Hon. John J. Lentz, Columbus.
Hon. Rufus B. Smith, Cincinnati.
Edward Stang, Esq., Cincinnati.
Charles B. Wilby, Esq., Cincinnati.
OKLAHOMA.
Dr. D. H. Patton, Woodward.
OREGON.
James Hennessy Murphy, Esq., Portland.
H. B. Nicholas, Esq., Portland.
Col. C. E. S. Wood, Portland.
PENNSYLVANIA.
Dr. W. Horace Hoskins, Philadelphia.
Frank Stephens, Esq., Philadelphia.
Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, Philadelphi.
Herbert Welsh, Esq., Philadelphia.
RHODE ISLAND.
Hon Lucius F. C. Garvin, Lonsdale.
Edwin C. Pierce, Esq., Providence.
SOUTH CAROLINA.
Willie Jones, Esq., Columbia.
Hon. James Simons, Charleston.
SOUTH DAKOTA.
Hon. Levi McGee, Rapid City.
Joseph B. Moore, Esq., Lead.
Hon. Richard F. Pettigrew, Sioux Falls.
TENNESSEE.
Hon. John Wesley Gaines, Nashville.
TEXAS.
Frederick Opp, Esq., Llano.

WASHINGTON.
C. G. Heifner, Esq., Seattle.

UTAH.
Hon. A. S. Johnston, Union.
Hon. John E. Stealey, Clarksburg.

VERMONT.
Major F. W. Childs, Brattleboro.

WISCONSIN.
William George Bruce, Esq., Milwaukee.

VIRGINIA.
President George H. Denny, Lexington.

WYOMING.
Hon. John C. Hamm, Cheyenne.

A letter was received from the Hon. Louis R. Ehrich, which was, in part, as follows:

New York, November 25, 1910.

It is easy to run with the shouting crowd, or to speak out in the heat of political campaigns; but the readiness to stand with a seeming small minority, and the steadfastness to defend a principle in the face of apparent national indifference, bespeak a depth of conviction and a sense of public duty which must command the admiration of discerning men. We Anti-Imperialists realize that our Republic has committed a gigantic crime; that we not only decimated a trustful people whom the chances of war had brought into friendly alliance, but that we sinned against the very spirit of our Republican faith in denying to them that opportunity of self-government which we had proclaimed as the right of mankind. We have sullied the name of Democracy! We have clothed the Republic in the robes of despotism appropriate to the spirit of monarchy. Under such unfortunate conditions a happy omen must rest in the fact that the nation still contains some men, however few, who clearly recognize our national recreancy; with whom there is "no variability nor shadow of turning;" and who, season after season, and year after year, make public appeal that a great wrong may be righted, and that this great experiment of self-governing mankind shall not imperil its own future or besmirch its own political integrity by denying to others that which it has cherished as its own highest prerogative and blessing.
You are earnestly asked to hand this, after reading, to some other person who will also give it careful consideration.
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The Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League Nov. 29th, 1913, was adjourned to Dec. 8, 1913, when it was prefaced by a luncheon at the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club, 3 Joy Street, President Moorfield Storey presiding.

INVOCATION BY THE REV. A. A. BERLE, D. D.

Almighty God our Father who art in Heaven, we give Thee thanks for the love of liberty and the practice of freedom which are the permanent hope and heritage of mankind. We give Thee thanks for the noble men, living and dead, who have steadily kept before the eyes of the world this enduring hope and who in dark days and bright days have held to the faith that was in them and pleaded the cause of human freedom at home and abroad. We thank Thee for the promise of the fulfillment of their prayers and hopes and the rising tide of liberty throughout the world.

We ask Thy blessing upon Thy servant the President of the United States, praying that he may have the courage, wisdom, insight and power to administer impartial justice, at home and abroad, to those who need his protection: That his health may be precious in Thy sight and he may be, with all in authority, the instrument for the spread of liberty. Accept, we pray Thee, our thanks for those tokens of encouragement by which our hearts are cheered in the gathering today, and make us wise custodians of the truth that we may pass it on, unimpaired, to the generation following. Hear us as we pray as our Master has taught us to pray:

Our Father who art in Heaven hallowed be Thy name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven; Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses as we have forgiven those that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the Kingdom and the Power and the Glory, forever and ever. Amen.
Mr. President and Colleagues:

Every occasion of great joy to mankind has its serious undertone. And certainly mere exultation does not befit a triumphal epoch in a great cause such as no humble human efforts could have reached,—however earnest and prolonged. We must be indeed overwhelmed rather, in view of what is fairly reckoned as the “beginning of our end,”—Philippine independence, with a sense of shortcomings, of failures in judgment and in temper—of our own unworthiness, which may sometimes have hindered rather than helped forward the divinely inevitable establishment of right and justice;—as we gratefully say today: “What hath God wrought!”

And it is with a serious mind likewise, before repeating to you some of the birthday greetings, which living voices are exchanging among us, we recall that “we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses.” As the hearts of the faithful are lifted up with memory of past and with hope for future blessings, by the recitation in their sanctuaries of saintly names, let us call the roll of our departed “shining ones” that we may rejoice with trembling but with high resolve, inspired by such exemplars to run with patience the race that is before us, to the end.

George Sewall Boutwell:
    first President of the group of our founders (primus inter pares) upon whose like we shall not look again.
Francis Ellingwood Abbot,
Edward Atkinson,
Gamaliel Bradford,
Francis Fisher Browne,
Donelson Caffery,
John Griffin Carlisle,
Theodore Ledyard Cuyler,
Patrick Ford,
Benjamin Harrison,
Thomas Wentworth Higginson,
George Frisbie Hoar,
William James,
Abby Adeline Manning,
George Gluyas Mercer,
Charles Eliot Norton,
Patrick O'Farrell,
William Jackson Palmer,
Mary Pickering,
Hazen Smith Pingree,
Horatio Potter,
Emil Preetorius,
Thomas Brackett Reed,
Carl Schurz,
George Frederick Seward,
John Sherman,
Edwin Burritt Smith,
William Graham Sumner,
John Joseph Valentine.
Hermann von Holst and
Grover Cleveland,

who being dead yet speaketh, in words that are being fulfilled in our ears:

January 12, 1903.

"I have never hesitated to condemn the entire expansion business from beginning to end. Perhaps it may be remembered that I opposed the suppression of the Hawaiian government, and prevented the annexation of the Island as long as I remained President . . . When a large number of the voters of the land feel this question it will be dealt with as a party issue in something more than a perfunctory way. In the meantime and in anticipation of that period the anti-imperialists should formulate in plain, distinct terms, just what in its present condition they claim the government should do with and for the Philippine people and this should be a proposition that will wear."

Let us pass on to some of the good words of our absent colleagues and friends testifying to their feeling today, when our great question is at last dealt with as a party issue.

Sir William Wedderburn, England:

Please accept my hearty congratulations on the declaration regarding Filipino independence, reported in your welcome letter, with its inclosure. The result of their labours must indeed be gratifying to the members of the Anti-Imperialist
League. It is also a great encouragement to those who desire self-government for India that Dr. Wilson's government should have given so notable an example of unselfishness in world politics. We must do our best to urge the British people to follow a lead which has come at a most opportune time.

Hon. W. J. Bryan, Secretary of State, Nebraska:

Give my compliments to the members of the Anti-Imperialist League and express to them my gratification at this country's declaration of its intention to ultimately grant independence to the Filipinos. Had this promise been made in the beginning it would have saved enormous expenditures and prevented foreign misconception of our Nation's purpose. The President has rendered a signal service to the country in promising this independence to the Filipinos. Your Society is to be commended for its devotion to this purpose and it is to be congratulated on the victory that has been won.

Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, North Carolina:

It was demonstrated by the clash of arms that this Nation could not be half slave and half free. It is equally impossible for it to be part self-governing and part colonial. Wherever men read the Declaration of Independence and imbibe with the teachings of Jefferson, they will aspire to the right to govern themselves. The highest duty of our Republic is to be not only the beacon but the friend of all whose desires are toward liberty, equality and independence.

I have long thought that the American policy in the Philippines was contrary to the spirit of American institutions, and, in common with all others who look to the hastening of the time when the Filipinos shall govern their own country, I was gratified at the appointment of Hon. Francis Burton Harrison as Governor General. His record incarnates the attitude of anti-imperialists and his instructions show the earnest desire of the administration in Washington to lead the Filipinos into the ways of safe and efficient self-government at a time that will best conserve their welfare.

Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Illinois:

May I rejoice with you over the encouraging evidence that the United States is at last in the way of redeeming its lost democracy by restoring to the conquered people of the Philippines that self-government which has been bought at so great
a price in the United States, which is the laudable ambition of all people, and the due of all self-directing and self-respecting people? "Possessions," "Dependencies," "Conquered Territory," "Dependent People" are words that have no place in the dictionary of democracy. I hope that the work so well begun by President Wilson will be carried to a successful issue, and it is the duty of all those who hate tyranny and distrust imperialism to do everything in their power to uphold the President's hands and hasten the fruition through proper legislation.

Hon. Cyrus Cline, Representative, Indiana:

I give my warmest endorsement to any step looking to the "end of the beginning" of our cause. I have the fullest faith in the new Governor-General. Let no advocate of ultimate Philippine Independence slacken in his efforts to liberate this people, now held in violation of every basis of American Liberty.

Hon. Francis E. Woodruff, New Jersey:

Especially for those who have taken part in the struggle for the right since the very inception of the Philippine question it is an unexampled pleasure to feel that at last we are at the "beginning of the end." For if during the coming regular session President and Congress will join in the national pledge of ultimate independence called for by the Democratic platform, and in the Jones bill, instead of the "fixed date" which is violently opposed, there is substituted a "fixed requirement" (such as maintenance of law and order for one or more years), which would be less opposed and would in effect be equally binding in the United States, then "La Independencia" will surely very, very quickly, as nations go, have become an accomplished fact.

Andrew Carnegie, Esq., New York:

I beg to state that there are in my opinion encouraging signs of wise policy being pursued in the Philippines hereafter.

Prof. Jacques Loeb, Rockefeller Institute, New York:

It goes without saying that every lover of freedom and justice will be delighted with the new course in the Philippines. I hope the time will come when the suppression of the weak among nations and social groups will be impossible.
Henry W. Lamb, Esq., Mass.:

The Philippine policy of the new administration accords with both wisdom and justice and it is noticeable that the objections raised against it in certain quarters arouse no popular response. The Anti-Imperialist League has done well to keep its cause alive before the American people.

Pres. G. Stanley Hall, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.:

The steps that the new administration of our national government under President Wilson has already taken, looking toward self-government and the evident disposition to go further in that direction in the Philippines, fills me with sincere satisfaction. The steps already taken in themselves are certainly sources of congratulation, whether or not they issue in complete autonomy of the islands.

Pres. Robert Ellis Thompson, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

I rejoice to know that the next annual meeting of our League will be an occasion for rejoicing over the progress of the cause of national righteousness. But the League must not relax its efforts until the last American soldier has quitted the shores of the Philippines. There are still great perils surrounding the Filipino people and President Wilson will not always be at the head of our affairs. National vanity and individual greed will still suggest the retention of the island under our rule. But "its the first step that costs," and that first step has been taken.

Rev. A. A. Berle, Mass.:

We have a right to be happy because after all these years our cause is seen to be the only way out.

William Canby Ferris, Delaware:

Allow me to congratulate my comrades of The Anti-Imperialist League on the fresh impulse which our movement has received from the fact that at last a worthy successor of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson has become President of The United States of America. A man of crystal sincerity; he has told the country what he intends to do and so far no act of his has shown that he is either weak or insincere. A man of straightforwardness and tenacity of purpose; every act and every appointment of his has been a fulfillment of his
openly declared purpose. Inheriting from his predecessors the incubus of a conquered province and the necessity of governing by military force a people deprived of the right to govern themselves; he has shown that no sophistry can blind him to the treason to our own Constitution and Republican form of Government involved in using our own army and navy to rule a foreign and alien race, against their own will and in spite of their efforts to escape from our control. Although revolution is in the air, and the situation is one of immense difficulty, the future is radiant with hope for the Anti-Imperialists; and for the sincere believers in the right and the ability of the people to rule themselves.

Hon. James L. Slayden, Representative, Texas:

Do you feel as happy as I do over the fact that the goal for which we have been striving since 1899 is in sight?

We have survived the epithets, "little Americans," "Scuttlers" and so on, and have kept our self-respect, have adhered steadfastly to a high purpose and now have the administration with us.

The House will certainly stand by the policy of independence for the Filipinos and I hope that the Senate will. On one point I am very clear, and that is, if at any time in the last fourteen years the Congress could have voted on this question, disassociated absolutely from partisan politics, a resolution to grant the Philippines complete independence would have carried with an overwhelming vote.

Let us get the question properly presented now and, possibly, we may have a spontaneous, non-partisan recognition of the American doctrine that just government is only possible with the consent of the governed.

Judge Edward Osgood Brown, Illinois:

I heartily felicitate the Anti-Imperialist League upon the declared policy of the present national administration in regard to the Philippines and upon the excellent appointments which give proof of the earnest and sincere intentions of that administration to carry out this policy.

The lane has had a turning nearer than I expected a year ago. I think our prayers have been heeded and our country is turning back to its early ideals of liberty.
Hon. John A. Martin, Former Representative, Colorado:

I am still deeply interested in the Philippine question and am keeping informed as to developments. I was particularly pleased with the appointment of Francis Burton Harrison as Governor General, because I know by association with him that he is in favor of independence as soon as practicable and that meanwhile he will advocate and put into execution, measures tending to fit the Filipinos for and experience them in self-government. I was also pleased with the declaration of President Wilson's Philippine policy made through Mr. Harrison when he assumed the office of Governor General. During the latter part of my stay in Congress and when it became apparent that there would probably be a change of party administrations in Washington, I had reasons to fear that our performances would not nearly measure up to our promises, but this danger would appear to be past and we would appear now to be on firm ground upon the proposition of the neutralization and independence of the Philippine Archipelago. I congratulate the Anti-Imperialist League upon the great progress toward this end already made and its steadfast adherence to this principle through a long period of opposition. It has kept the light burning which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

Wishing the League ultimate complete realization of its great purpose to keep this great Republic true to its fundamental principles and best traditions.

Prof. Jackson H. Ralston, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.:

We are bound to believe that under the present administration the unholy bonds uniting this country with the Philippine Islands will pass gradually but surely, the Filipinos being given an opportunity to rule themselves without alien interference while the Americans will demonstrate that they have sufficient sense of justice and self-control to remedy wrongs committed by them.

Sigmund Zeisler, Esq., Illinois:

For fifteen years, in season and out of season, The Anti-Imperialist League has preached the eternal truth that government, to be just, must derive its powers from the consent of the governed, and that self-government is better than good
government; has insisted that to impose our rule upon dependencies is not reconcilable with the traditions and principles of the American people; has ceaselessly watched and frequently criticised American rule in the Philippines and thereby diminished, if not prevented, exploitation and abuse of power; has aroused our people to a realization of the crime not less than the folly of our horribly expensive experiment in colonial government; has furnished the friends of liberty in Congress with ammunition of facts and arguments; has driven the loud-mouthed champions of the original Philippine program to take the defensive. Its views have become the views of the overwhelming majority of the people, and what it has been clamoring for these fifteen years has become the policy of the National Administration, with the result that the day of freedom and independence of the Philippines is dawning.

The Anti-Imperialist League has certainly justified its existence, and I sincerely congratulate it upon its achievement.

Prof. George Herbert Palmer, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.: I want to rejoice with you and all who have been insisting on justice to the Philippines, that President Wilson has taken so considerable, yet cautious, a step toward the independence of the islands and ourselves.

Waldo R. Browne, Esq., Editor of the "Dial," Chicago, Illinois: I trust that it is not too late, in connection with the League’s annual meeting, to offer my hearty felicitations on the promises in the political sky of an early fulfillment of the League’s noble work during many years past on behalf of justice to the Filipinos. Even those not actively associated with the League can realize something of the great difficulty of that work, and how dark the prospect of ultimate success must often have seemed. It represents a struggle comparable only with the efforts of the early Abolitionists, and will take its place in history by the side of the Abolitionist movement. At this time, when the sought-for end is at last in sight, it is the duty of every liberty-loving American to express to the officers and executive committee of the League something at least of the debt of pride and honor that he must feel in their achievement.

Hon. Andrew J. Peters, Representative, Mass.: I am writing you a word of congratulation on the very
pleasant prospect for those who are interested in the welfare of the Philippines. I have served with Mr. Harrison in the House for several years, and for the last three years have been on the same committee with him. He is bringing to the problems of the Islands the highest ideals and greatest courage.

Hon. Samuel W. McCall, Former Representative, Mass.:

The administration is making a good practical beginning on the problem of self-government in the Philippines by giving the people a more enlarged part in their government. Of course one cannot very well learn to walk unless he is at least given the chance to try to creep. I think the policy as embodied in the neutralization resolution drawn in substance by Mr. Storey and introduced by me in the House of Representatives contains the wise solution of the problem.

Hon. James Schonler, Mass.:

I heartily rejoice with you over the initial step just taken by President Wilson to give to the patient people of the Philippines that right of self-rule to which nature and their own intelligence entitled them.

I have from the very outset been utterly hostile to the national policy assumed towards those islands at the close of the Spanish war and my opposition has been freely expressed upon every opportunity.

In my own mind the main issue has been, of late, not when and how these distant inhabitants of another race might be concluded capable, as our obedient pupils, of self-government and the regulation of their own affairs under our tuition, but, rather, when and how we might ourselves, without degradation or dishonor, retreat from a false experiment of interference assumed in a distant hemisphere, so as to become once more, in fact and example, as well as in name, the United States of America.

Prof. James Hardy Dillard, Director John F. Slater Fund, Charlottesville, Virginia:

I beg to congratulate you for the good work which has been done through our Anti-Imperialist League. I am sure that all who believe in freedom and in the doctrine that true freedom can only be attained by freedom, are rejoicing in the advances toward a true policy in the Philippines.
Prof. Lewis J. Johnson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.:

I am glad to share in the League's pleasure in what seems like a genuine attempt to bring our Philippine policy into harmony with our American traditions regarding the necessity of consent of the governed as justification for government.

E. G. Kohnstamm, Esq., New York:

As a consistent and "original" Anti-Imperialist who has been pessimistic of the success of what would appear to be a great national cause but which has been kept alive only by five or ten earnest, indomitable men, backed by a few handfuls of sympathisers, I wish to express my gratification at the now probable success of the cause. My voice and pen have never had the power or ability to express my feelings at what appeared to me to be our treachery to our allies, the Filipinos in the Spanish-American war. I can only express it by saying that all my feelings were outraged, and the sentiment that this was the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave, and the Flag was the Emblem of Liberty and Freedom, were ruthlessly shattered, and I certainly came to consider the cause lost when I found myself listened to by friends with the sympathetic attention given to one who is considered "little off at the top," or who is preaching temperance in a beer garden. The salvation of the cause was in fact that political parties have to take opposite sides so the platitude, the Philippines for the Filipinos that probably few of the delegates, except Bryan ever believe in, came to be a plank in the Democratic party platform.

That is the only reason they got my vote at the last election. It may still be too early to shout that the victory is won, but the leaders of the Anti-Imperialist League are to be congratulated. May they all live to see the Philippines free and their people proving to the world that the A. I. L. was right in their estimate of them.

I go so far as to say I would rather they exterminate each other than that we, with our preaching and traditions, should hold them as a subject people. When the Filipino people put up monuments, commemorative of the success of their cause, the officers of the A. I. L. should have the first and greatest.

Prof. Albert H. Tolman, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois:

President Wilson has wisely decided to do something more
than talk about future self-government for the Filipinos. He has given them a substantial installment, and set our feet firmly upon the path leading thereto. Liberty enlightening the world is again an American ideal. All honor to our President!

It is now half a generation since the young Filipino republic was done to death by the United States. The sad story should never be forgotten. Thank God for the Filipinos! Their unconquerable love of freedom has fairly forced us to admit their right to have it. They have been true to American principles when America herself was not. We have tried to bribe them in every way by the promise of greater wealth and material prosperity if they would abate something of their demand for self-government, but without avail. They have been entirely unwilling to develop beyond the simple thought of Ralph Waldo Emerson:

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?"

I have faith that there will be no backward step upon the path leading to self-government for the Filipinos. As the poet farther tells us:

"For he that worketh high and wise,
Nor pauses in his plan,
Will take the sun out of the skies
Ere freedom out of man."

Archibald M. Howe, Esq., Mass.:

I think it worth while to encourage any advance made by our Government towards giving Filipinos the right to try self-government.

Whatever the past wickedness and folly of military and civil governors who attempted "benevolent assimilation" either by sheer force of arms or with a mixture of official dictation and supervised philanthropic pseudo-democracy it must now begin to dawn upon the thoughtful that Senator Hoar was right in asserting that the United States should have recognized as an independent government any existing political organization republican in form having power to execute however imperfectly its enactment, and that there were and now are leaders and patriots among the Filipinos able to sustain a government.

Rev. Stephen H. Taft, California:

I never voted a democratic ticket in the sixty-seven years
I have been a voter. But I have to say that next to Lincoln President Wilson is giving to our nation a moral prestige equalled by no other President.

His Philippine policy has my fullest approval.

It is cause for profound gratitude that we have an administration which refuses to be controlled by the money power.

Hon. Horace Boies, Former Governor, Iowa:

I assure you I am as grateful as you can be that a definite policy of this great nation to insure the freedom of the Philippine Islands has finally been adopted and the dishonor of our people in their dealings with so weak a nation is finally to end.

To our noble President all honor is due for the part he is taking in this act of simple justice between nation and nation, and I want to join with you and every friend of national honor in hearty approval of what he is doing.

Henry Barclay King, Esq., Georgia:

It really looks as if the cause we have been seeking for all these years is on the road to success.

The Philippine episode is the blackest spot in American annals; the sooner it is closed the sooner it may be forgotten.

We profess to be a government of the people, by the people, for the people. Are we not rather a government of the politicians, by the politicians, for the politicians? God help the Filipinos if they can’t do any better!

Prof. William E. Dodd, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois:

Is not this thanksgiving one of peculiar satisfaction to the Anti-Imperialist who sees now the beginning of the realization of his hopes as to one of the most important policies of the American government. Your persistent and wise agitation has done a good deal to bring about the result we see in the Philippines—the beginning of self-government. Anti-Imperialists have shown what a comparatively small body of resolute men may do if they have faith in their cause. Woodrow Wilson has also contributed much to his resolute idealism and to him I think we might properly direct a collective letter endorsing his policy.

George Foster Peabody, Esq., New York:

I am much rejoiced to have the recent declaration of our
Government's policy in the Philippines go as far as it did and I rejoiced with the appointment of natives to the Commission. I think it very advantageous that the sentiment in this country should continue to be educated to the wisdom as well as the righteousness of the doctrine "The Consent of the Governed."

Pres. George C. Chase, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine:

As one who has been deeply humiliated by the policy of the United States towards the Philippines and who has been eager for a return of our government and our people to the earlier policy of the United States and to the principles of the great Declaration of Independence, I have been glad to see the beginnings of a different course and attitude and an evident disposition on the part of the present administration at Washington to correct the mistakes and to right the wrongs that we have committed in our relations with the unfortunate inhabitants of the Philippines.

Hon. J. M. Head, Mass.:

I know of nothing that will afford me greater pleasure than to be permitted to express my felicitations upon the excellent prospects for a very satisfactory adjustment of the Philippine situation, upon terms creditable alike to this country and to those people.

Hon. Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Washington:

I beg permission to congratulate those who do upon the brighter skies under which the League will meet this year than at any time in its history perhaps. Those of us who remember the dark days of that Imperialist regime which began with the Cuban War, can appreciate the promise there is in President Wilson's truly democratic policy toward the Philippines. Such promises sometimes fail through no fault of those who make them, but the day of American Imperialism really seems to have past and the tones of its funeral bells to be in the air.

Hon. John F. Shafroth, Senator, Colorado:

Surely this should be a memorable gathering. The occasion should be one of joy and felicitation, for we can see in events of the past few months the promise of fulfillment of our hopes that one day justice would triumph. It is not too much to say
that through the present Democratic administration the freedom of the Filipino people will soon become an accomplished fact and the American nation will be restored to its former station of glorious destiny among the nations of the earth.

To the members of the Anti-Imperialist League there must during this happy season come the joyous consciousness of splendid victory. Through the dark years of gross materialism that dominated our national life this organization kept alive and vibrant the voice of conscience. The campaign has been nobly fought, and gloriously won.

Director Edwin D. Mead, World’s Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass.:

The Anti-Imperialist party, after the untiring and uncompromising struggle of fifteen years, has reason for gratitude and for the confident look to the future such as it has not had before at any time in this long period. The political party which is now in power came to power pledged to true American principles in dealing with its unhappy inheritance; and the recent action of the President proves that he takes the pledge in earnest. We have had the first clear declaration that our administration in the Philippines is to be controlled by the distinct purpose of preparing for the independence of the people; and the granting to them of a majority in the legislative department, where we have hitherto kept the majority to ourselves, is an honest and hopeful step in that direction.

Hon. John Sharp Williams, Senator, Mississippi:

Everybody who has taken any interest in me or my opinions has known from the beginning that I never thought "God put us in charge of the Philippines," but am thoroughly of the opinion that we put ourselves in charge of them, and that the whole missionary idea is connected with the hypocritical pretense that our duty to our own people was to get rid of the Philippines as soon as we could, and that this duty to our own people involved no damage to the Filipinos of which they had any right to complain. If we should let them alone they would be in no worse fix than they were before we took hold of them. I do not think that God ever appointed us his Globe-trotting vicegerents for the purpose of introducing so-called civilization and order amongst other peoples.

I do not know whether the Filipinos are capable of self-government or not, but I do know that we are not capable of
governing them, and that no people is capable of governing another against its will. President Wilson's instructions to Governor Harrison were excellent. Harrison's addresses are on the right line. I believe that the principles of the Democratic party can solve this problem as they can solve every other problem, provided they are faithfully adhered to.

Hon. Warren Olney, California:

It is cause of rejoicing that the American people have so quickly outgrown the lust of conquest that ushered in the Twentieth Century.

The continual hammering of the Anti-Imperialist League has helped the growth of a sentiment that will no doubt in the future control the policy of the United States.

Hon. John V. LeMoyne, Maryland:

With much pleasure I extend my sincere congratulations to the coterie of men in Boston who have fought the good fight of anti-imperialism and who have obtained at least the prospect of some degree of justice to the Philippine people and, what is more important, in diverting our own Government from the pernicious policy of trying to govern other people.

They have persisted in the good fight when some of us were ready to give up and thought it hopeless. I take off my hat and salute respectfully and say: well done!

There is a tradition that a man once succeeded admirably by strictly minding his own business. If good for the individual it should be good for a collection of individuals. This theory is generally agreed to and, by nations, is generally disregarded.

Judge James H. Blount, Georgia:

I acknowledge my obligation to you for having kept available all these years, so many of the salient historical facts and data concerning the American occupation of the Philippines, which would otherwise been long since lost sight of.

Chancellor David Starr Jordan, Stanford University, California:

Let me congratulate the members of the League and the country on the steps towards the freedom of the Philippines inaugurated from present brave and enlightened administration. We are slowly coming back to one of the first principles of our
republic, that no other kind of government in the long run for anybody is so good as self-control.

Hon. Henry F. Hollis, Senator, New Hampshire:

I shall be glad to have you convey to the meeting my continued sympathy with the cause for which it was organized, and to have you express to them my delight that definite progress is in prospect under a Democratic administration.

I am acquainted with Governor General Harrison, and I am sure that he will do all in his power to promote immediate steps looking to the ultimate freedom of the Philippine Islands:

Mr. Bryan's attitude is too well known to need comment from me. He and President Wilson are working in the utmost harmony on every subject, and Mr. Bryan's views receive genuine and ready deference from the President.

I have talked to President Wilson about the Philippines, and I am sure from his comments and attitude that he intends to carry out with the utmost good faith the declarations of the Democratic platform.

Prof. Garrett Droppers, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.:

There is no greater test of intelligence and character than to estimate justly the civilization of an alien people. The obvious way is to consider such people as inferior just in proportion as they differ from ourselves, and if they are lacking in our material power and success they are at once deemed unworthy of free institutions or for the exercise of sovereignty.

I lived for ten years in Japan and during that time the vast majority of foreigners living there, Englishmen, Americans, and others, could not be convinced that the Japanese were in any way to be considered a civilized people. Precisely the arguments that Governor Forbes and Dean Worcester have used against the Philippines were used against the Japanese.

It requires insight and sympathy to understand a civilization like that of the Filipinos. Because the peasants live in thatched huts is no indication of inferiority. The great mass of Japanese live in this way and yet Japan has shown extraordinary political and economic vigor. The attitude of Ex-Governor Forbes seems to me to have somewhat the de haut en bas quality of so many Westerners when they come in contact with a less developed economic civilization. The fact
is that there is scarcely any nation in the world in which there is not a large amount of ignorance, especially political ignorance, among the peasant class. Under the rules laid down by Ex-Governor Forbes I doubt whether many states of the United States could retain their status as states. He no doubt could pick to pieces New York, State politically and show how it was unfitted to exercise the rights of a state. I am convinced that if the Filipinos are given a reasonable opportunity they will work out their own destiny to a successful result. It should be a point of congratulation to every American citizen that the present administration is proceeding on the principle that the Philippine people are entitled to the blessing of self-government and independence.

John P. Herrmann, Esq., Missouri:

I cannot help recalling the words of Hon. George S. Boutwell, spoken for the annual meeting eleven years ago.

"We demand the abandonment of the Islands for the reason that we have no right to be there. Our title is but a slaveholder's title. We demand the abandonment of the Islands for the reason that the continuance of possession requires the infliction of brutalities heretofore unknown, even by name, to the American people. And more than all and over all other reasons we denounce the occupation of the Islands as the abandonment of the American Republic and the condemnation of the men by whom its foundation was laid.

If I have a word to say to the living or to the coming generations of our country, it is this: The cause in which we are engaged is never to be abandoned until the right shall have been proclaimed."

It was a proclamation. Yea, a great proclamation!

Eleven years in the span of life is a long period to wait "for they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness," (Matt. v, 6.), but we have not been waiting in vain.

The new era of freedom is dawning and Oh, how I could wish that at this particular meeting all the members of the league that were present at its first could be with you now.

It is fitting that our League should reward with thanks the President of our country—Woodrow Wilson, for taking the first step towards making possible the fulfillment of the proclamation of Hon. George S. Boutwell, that "WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO BE THERE."
Hon. T. M. Patterson, Former Senator, Colorado:

I have been noting with great satisfaction the progress made by the United States in doing justice to the Philippines as well as to the American people and their traditions, since the election that made Mr. Wilson, President, and Mr. Bryan became Secretary of State. It looks now as though before the present administration ends, the Philippine people will be either enjoying their independence or such steps will have been taken in Congress that nothing can defeat their independence within the next few years. Mr. Wilson's declaration at the Southern Commercial Congress on October 27th last, that "I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest," is a harbinger of the future settled policy of the United States, as well as a veiled repentance for our dealings with the Filipinos.

Your coming annual meeting should be an occasion of great rejoicing among the members of the League who will be present, and for congratulating those who have been so steadfast and unting for the league's patriotic work.

Mrs. Georgiana A. Boutwell, Mass.:

I wish to congratulate the members of the Anti-Imperialist League upon the advanced step taken by the President in the matter of independence of the Philippine Islands.

In the same official utterance of the past it has been intimated that if they, the Filipinos, conducted themselves according to our ideals, that in time not less than two generations they might become independent.

A new note has been struck. They are now promised independence in the near future; they, not us, becoming the larger factor in deciding the time.

I have thought for some years, that the one hundredth anniversary of my father's birth, would witness the independence of the Islands.

I take fresh courage and hope of a realization of his ardent wish for which he worked unceasingly.

Col. Charles R. Codman, Mass.:

I think that we may feel encouraged that Philippine independence is approaching. The first step has been taken by the administration of President Wilson. We are bound to give them a good start and then our responsibility ends.
Hon. Thomas M. Shackleford, Tennessee:

I am delighted with the declared policy of the present administration concerning the Philippines and beg to tender my hearty congratulations to the active officers and workers of the Anti-Imperialist League upon the success which is beginning to crown their efforts.

Frederick G. Corser, Esq., Lewis R. Larson, Esq., S. A. Stockwell, Esq., H. A. Humphrey, Esq., Edward S. Corser, Esq., Albert C. Jerome, Esq., of Minnesota:

The great change in the attitude of Washington toward the Filipino people as expressed by the appointment of Mr. Harrison to be Governor-General of the Islands and his words and actions since assuming the duties of office can bring only joy and hope to Anti-Imperialists throughout the land.

We of Minnesota wish we might be present at the annual gathering of those who have so long and faithfully worked for the cause and join in the cheers.

"Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the party! and see that the wheels do not mire again before we reach the end of the trip."

Prof. Alexander F. Chamberlain, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.:

Today our long and difficult struggle for real Americanism and practice to the Filipinos has been approved by the President of the United States. The word of the nation has been solemnly pledged and what is more, the action of the nation to make that word live has already begun. Filipino independence, the death-knell to the false imperialism from which we and they have both suffered, is no longer a dream. The statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson has changed all that! In freeing the Philippines he will also set America free. We Anti-Imperialists would not be human, if we did not remember that we have kept the faith in spite of all obstacles. Let us rejoice that we shall soon see a new nation of free men and friends of America born in the East!

Hon. Warren Worth Bailey, House of Representatives, Pennsylvania:

At last we seem to have come to a turn in the long lane of imperialism and this turn I hope will lead us back to those
high ideals of self-government, which were so madly deserted when the lust of conquest and power bore us away back in the late nineties. The spirit of the new freedom is breathing in the Philippine policies of the Wilson administration and as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs in the house, I propose doing all that lies in my power to bring these policies into practical effect through legislation which will restore the Philippine Islands to the Filipino people.

Horace White, Esq., former editor New York Evening Post:

To all the officers and members of the Anti-Imperialist League I send cordial greetings for the New Year. We who believe that the Declaration of Independence was not restricted to white men or to a single hemisphere, have cause to rejoice that the Government of the United States has fallen into the hands of a President and a Congress of like faith with ourselves.

President Wilson has initiated a policy in his treatment of the Philippines which cannot be reversed during his term of office. It is my confident belief that before his term expires the measures of self-government which he has inaugurated in the islands will have so vindicated themselves in the happiness of the Filipinos and in the deliverance of the United States from an unnecessary and profitless burden that nobody will wish to change.

Charles B. Wilby, Esq., Former President of the Cincinnati Bar Association:

Every real American who loves his country as the fathers made it, congratulates President Wilson upon his long step toward ending the anomalous imperialism in the Philippines for which thanks and congratulations are also due to you and the faithful ones who are working with you. Your good work must go on until we can once more celebrate the Fourth of July without shame.

The League now indeed enters upon the fruition of its labors which the great President predicted ten years ago. At our last annual meeting we looked forward to the introduction of the so-called Philippine "Independence Bill" which had been reported in the House of Representatives by the Insular Committee.
It will be remembered that in the 62d Congress the time allowed by the House of Representatives to the Insular Committee on "calendar" Wednesdays was so frittered away by the opposition that it was only possible to get the bill passed May 22, 1912, for the inclusion of the so-called "Friar lands" under the conditions of the "public lands" of the Philippines, thus restricting the areas of sale. The hopes of the author of the Independence bill, the Hon. W. A. Jones, for opportunity to call up in the 63d Congress a similar bill to that which was thus blocked were disappointed. It would have been idle to press the measure under the conditions. It could undoubtedly have passed the House indeed, but in the Senate it would have required the active support which it was obvious the President was not ready to give until the Banking and Currency Bill was out of the way.

The President's appointment of Mr. Francis Burton Harrison as Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, the instructions given to him as proclaimed at Manila, and the appointment of the new Filipino members of the Commission, giving, under the supreme veto power, native control in the upper House (the Commission) which it already monopolizes in the Assembly seem irrevocable steps to us, as to our friends, whose inspiring words just read are still echoing in our hearts, with confidence not only in men and measures but in the great laws of progress. As John Bright wrote in darker days: "there is a gradual and sensible victory being gained over barbarism and wrong of every kind." The enemy is shifting his ground with the alacrity of despair and is claiming that the President's course is exactly in line with the previous Republican policy. The "fait accompli" can be no longer denied and though it was denounced beforehand as destructive of the colonial fabric its significance is now astonishingly minimized. In fact the colonialists are actually trying to make men believe that it fits in rather well with their own design. Such "experiments" do not go backwards. Liberty means more liberty,—democracy more democracy.

How the choice of Mr. Harrison came about is not to be told. It was made by the President and behind his initiative it were ungracious to go, even were it possible. We are not to particularize indeed the work of the Anti-Imperialist League for the past year. It has done more than ever its well accustomed part to bring influence to bear through such public and private
opinion as was properly (or sometimes presumptuously) accessible. As time went on and the enemy, from whom the wise are always watchful learners, more and more openly gloated over the situation, which showed only a rapid increase of the tendencies towards permanent colonialism by great exploitation, we could only emphasize the urgency of a speedy change wherever we could do so in active correspondence.

Among the many appreciative replies received from Congressmen was that of Mr. Harrison.

"Every year I become more earnestly impressed with the necessity of our severing our bonds with the Philippines at the earliest moment practicable; not only have we no justification for holding those people in bondage but I consider the Philippines our 'heel of Achilles' in time of war."

We know that Mr. Harrison sought and obtained an interview with the President and mentioned some of those names proposed for the Governor-Generalship. It may have been then that Mr. Wilson said: "Why don't you speak for yourself John?" We know that Mr. Harrison was indorsed by Secretary Bryan, by Commissioner Quezon, and by Mr. Jones, and it is not to be doubted that his acts will be consistent with his own profession and with the wise instructions of the Executive.

Current questions have been so fully treated in President Storey's admirable pamphlet, "The Democratic Party and Philippine Independence" that much of the ground need not be again gone over. By the courtesy of Senator Shafrroth it was made a Public Document of the Senate and in this and in the original form, 3000 copies of which were given by Mr. Storey, it has been very largely circulated.

Bitter accusations against the Filipinos for alleged practice of slavery seem to have been motived by the vindictive hatred of a displaced official. What shall be said of the audacity of this man, in trying to create a back-fire by charging the Philippine Assembly with the sanction of the shreds and patches of peonage or apprenticeship which he knew the present government would search out,—thus hoping to forestall the wrath to be visited on him and his associates who had had, and failed to exert, the sole and absolute authority in the premises. It has proved but a fouling of his own nest.

We have a new recruit in our criticism of the United States as a colonial administrator, Bishop Brent, who has discovered
and who has lately testified that our whole treatment of the Moros has been a wicked failure. He proposes to immolate himself by adventuring among these unfortunate "wards" of the United States if our sovereignty continues, conducting a self-imposed apostolate in which he purposes to challenge martyrdom. There is no particular reason to apprehend any such catastrophe even now but certainly not if the good missionary will be patient for a short time and allow the joint wisdom of the new Philippine government to substitute consistent and efficient methods of administration for the inconsistent and vacillating policy of the last fifteen years. It will be remembered that while the United States was committed in the early days of the conquest to a sanction of slavery by a subvention to the slaveowners in Mindanao, Mabini, Aguinaldo's statesman, had worked out a plan for its abolition and for a peaceful adjustment of relations with the inhabitants. There was more petting by the United States as when the Dattos were brought to this country, alternating with punitive expeditions, Mt. Dajo and violent and bloody disarmament such as is going on at this moment.

In this Moro matter again Worcester has hastily discharged his venomous arrows—a little too hastily since his sham pity for the poor Mohammedans who might be transferred to Filipino rule from the sweet and easy yoke of the United States is disposed of by the good Bishop who, though politically deceived by Mr. Taft's schemes, is a man of God and a man of truth. Here is the deadly parallel.

[Dean C. Worcester on the past United States Policy.]

"Every true friend of civilization familiar with the facts must view with gravest concern the placing of legislative control over the wild tribes in the hands of their bitter enemies, who have viewed with disgust the efforts heretofore made to improve the condition of these backward people. * * * 

Governor-General Harrison assured me in the strongest terms that the results of the work for the wild tribes would be kept intact, the former policy of kindliness and justice in dealing with them would be continued."

[Rev. C. H. Brent, D. D., on the past United States Policy.]

"All that the wronged Moro knows of civilized peoples," said the Bishop of the Philippines, "is that they make magnificent weapons of destruction and that they use them for the purpose for which they were made. The Spaniard began the work and, entering upon an evil inheritance, we continued, with more perfect weapons. But the Moro is still unsubdued, and I say, more honor to the Moro! We can go on with our oppressive measures to the end of time, but all we can effect is annihilation."

The effort to make an Ulster out of the Moro province will
not succeed. Already the wise suggestion is made that a Moro native may be made governor of the province after a period of civil governorship by Mr. Carpenter which has just replaced the military rule.

Perhaps the biggest Worcester bluff is his recent accusation against rich Filipinos who are endeavoring as he says unjustly to acquire great tracts of land, dispossessing their poorer neighbors: this accusation comes from him who hastened over to the United States two years ago frantically to support the effort made to overrule Senator Hoar's wise restriction of land sales to the foreign exploiter:—from him who was judged by the Democratic members of the Insular Committee before whom he appeared in his unsuccessful attempt when they reported that the evidence: "thoroughly condemns and discredits the policy pursued in the Philippines by those whose duty it is to administer those land laws."

As we say: "Here comes the fiery Tybalt back again!" we cannot minimize the proposed crusade by Mr. Worcester with newspaper articles, lectures and twenty thousand slides. We have experienced his methods of warfare and those of his agents: we can go a little further than Judge Tracey when he published a contradiction of Mr. Worcester's slavery charges and paid tribute to him as a "seasoned controversialist." His first step doubtless will be to try to terrorize the susceptible portion of the press, silencing criticism and opposition by libel suits (or threats of them) such as that in which he prosecuted and ruined the native Manila paper "El Renacimiento."

Mr. Quezon has continued to convert opponents and inspire friends of Philippine independence by addressing many meetings. Dr. McDill at Mohonk manfully bore the banner and actually obtained a tolerant vote for the President's policy from the group of bureaucrats and ex-officials assiduously gathered there to doubt and to discourage. Among other meetings a notable one was held on Jefferson day last April in Philadelphia. Our Vice-President Dr. W. Horace Hoskins presided, and the Philippine commissioners assisted, but the principal speech was delivered by Representative Jones. The occasion as described in the local press was "a wild and enthusiastic demonstration for Philippine independence."

The Executive Committee communicated to the President the following message, March 28:
“Congratulations upon the magnificent statement given out by you concerning the Chinese loan, the first practical step in the way of fulfilling the noble ideals you had promulgated towards the restoration of the moral world-influence of the United States, impaired so gravely since the war with Spain.”

The following circular was sent to the members of the League by the Committee May 13:

“A crisis has been reached in the contest for Philippine independence. The Democratic party which has promised independence is in absolute control of the Government, and it should be made to feel that public opinion is behind it. Our opponents have organized under the leadership of ex-President Taft and Governor-General Forbes to prevent the Democratic party from carrying out its promise, and they are filling the newspapers and periodicals with specious appeals and misrepresentations of the fact. The friends of independence should rally to its support, and we urge all our friends, by letters to their Congressmen, by communications to the press, and by every means, to counteract this movement. The activities of the League are largely controlled by the amount of money which it will have for publication, and other work, and we urge our friends to help the cause in every possible way by voice, by pen, and so far as possible by contribution to the common fund.”

An address to the Filipino people from their old friends and well-wishers seemed appropriate on the occasion of the dawn of a new day for our brown brothers. It was prepared by the Executive Committee, and forwarded to the Speaker of the Assembly and the native papers in Manila. This congratulation to them on the coming opportunity, and recognition of ability to meet it was also printed in the columns of such domestic papers as were not filled with the stories of strikes, riots, political corruption, the wholesale robberies of high finance, promotion and water-logging which demonstrate our own self-governing adequacy. It is a notable fact that this document which crossed in the mails a testimonial from the Philippine Assembly on the auspicious occasion corresponded so nearly with it in its recognition of a gift which was not altogether a gift, a responsibility which was somewhat an inherent one, a duty to the Filipinos and to the world, a novitiate which had a higher hope than a merely experimental one. That we should have
thus struck hands across the sea is a common source of satisfaction indeed. This is our address:

TO THE FILIPINO PEOPLE.

Boston, October 22.

The Anti-Imperialist League sends you its cordial felicitations upon the declaration made by Governor-General Harrison on behalf of the President that the United States proposes to grant you your independence.

The work of the League began when, as citizens of the United States, half a million persons associated themselves to resist the purchase of the Philippine Islands at the close of the Spanish-American war. After the treaty's ratification it soon became clear, in spite of official efforts to obscure the truth, that you had already overthrown the power of Spain over your islands, so that, even if the United States had possessed the right to buy, Spain had nothing to sell. It was moreover apparent that the United States owed you a debt of gratitude and the fulfillment of substantial pledges made in consideration of the support which was sought from your people in the contest with Spain. The League maintained that the proper course was to treat with you as an independent people, ready as you then were to make a friendly alliance with the United States, and one of its members offered to repay the government the $20,000,000 paid to Spain for the stolen goods, and thus clear the slate.

During your long struggle for independence while you were driven to take up arms, the League refused to recognize the contest as an "insurrection," and urged that opportunity be given for truce, for negotiation or for compromise, enduring reproaches like those which were heaped upon the friends of America in Great Britain during our own revolutionary war.

After the pacification, the League hailed with gratification the signs that there remained a persistent aspiration for independence from a people made more coherent and homogeneous by their bitter experience. It fully sympathized with every movement to make the American people realize that good faith and justice should remedy the wrong done by the administration of a party which seemed unable to abandon its mistaken course. The League believed that in your freedom lay the only hope of escape from what threatened to become a dangerous colonial attachment to the Republic, so that the peaceable
means to secure it set on foot by your leaders received its hearty co-operation.

While the League thus offers you its congratulations, it ventures too a word of very earnest counsel. We believe that you should in every possible way discourage and limit that kind of development by “foreign” capital which is now openly urged by those who know, and are bold enough to assert, that such a development will prevent almost certainly the severance of the ties which bind you as a “colony” to the United States—because the “lobby” which such “interests” can maintain would be all-powerful in this country to prevent our withdrawal from the islands, while your voices in opposition would scarcely be heard, or your arguments reach the public ear.

Let the dead past bury all elements of bitterness or revenge. The League, with yourselves, adheres to the position that the United States has been false to its own great principles and to you throughout the struggle. The League, therefore, can urge sympathetically upon you patience, courage, and unremitting watchfulness over that enemy which has brought the United States to such a sore pass and which now threatens your virgin soil—the greed of capitalism! It is not mere obedience to the law which the League would advise. We urge you to remember that the future of your country is in your hands, that every evidence of wisdom, self-restraint, patriotism and love of order in your public men and your people will hasten your independence, while every instance of lawlessness, unpatriotic self-seeking, corruption or violence will delay it. You have done well in the past. Persevere until you have shown the people of the United States that the arguments of your enemies are unfounded, that education, public health, in a word, all public interests will not suffer at your hands, and so win nobly the freedom to which, like all other human beings, you are so clearly entitled.

(Signed)

MOORFIELD STOREY, President.
ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.

It is pitiful to recognize what the perversion of true history has wrought in a class of minds affected by mere reiteration. The resolution sent to the President by the Philippine Assembly “disappoints” them, in the words of an influential Western newspaper. It considers the statement that the Filipinos “have waited in patience, confident that sooner or later all errors and
injustices would be redressed,” an indication of lack of capacity to rule themselves,—going so far as to assert also that such words indicate a “profound lack of gratitude” for “the constructive work of the United States during the past fifteen years,”—fifteen years which included two years of the “constructive work” of reconcentration, the water cure and wholesale slaughter!

The President’s message to Congress gives an opportunity for a comparison which is important, as differentiating sharply the positions which some of our opponents are actually trying to confuse.

The honesty of Mr. Cameron Forbes in forcing the colonial issue to the front, undisguised champion as he is of permanent trusteeship for “weaker peoples” has won him respect in the Philippines as their only sincere ruler, while it has made our task more easy.

Let us note with suitable appreciation that in his address at the dinner of the City Club last Tuesday he graciously abandoned for the nonce however, the attitude of his late administration when he acknowledged “the imperative necessity of giving the President’s policy in the islands a fair chance.”

Mr. Forbes had based his administration on his belief, as he stated it, that “there is one fundamental thing to which the United States has pledged itself; to establish and maintain a stable government in the islands.” This might imply, and has implied, the active encouragement of conditions, making only for a stable and permanent colonial government, the development of the Philippines by non-resident capitalists.

The President’s position is based upon the belief, as expressed by the Democratic party ever since the acquisition of the “possessions” that the United States is pledged, as the fundamental thing, to “hold steadily in view their ultimate independence.” This implies as the President goes on to explain in his message that we should follow that “counsel and experience” among the Filipinos, such as urges the warning to would-be exploiters involved in the definite repudiation of colonialism and a promise of independence.

Mr. Taft stands almost alone, belying the pledge he so solemnly made to throw no obstacles in the way of fair trial of Mr. Wilson’s plans, in opposing their progress in the Philippines and passionately demanding generations of exploitation,
with independence then to be taken down from the shelf if the Filipinos desire it. How can one bear to contemplate as a guide and instructor of youth, in the great moral principles of the law, a mind so tortuous or a conscience so dulled as to permit the assertion that after such a period, when the power of the investor and the weakness of the native would be so great, the one would ever grant or the other would have any voice to ask independence? Of course permanent colonialism would be then an established fact.

We are very wishful for the speedy passage of an independence bill in terms similar to that drawn by Mr. Jones, giving an authoritative legislative sanction to the full programme of the Democratic party's platform, following its hopeful initiation by the President,—for which we extend to him our gratitude and sincere congratulations. Gaining so much, we may be patient as we assert with the confidence in other words of the great English reformer: "If we can't win as fast as we wish,—we know that our opponents in the long run can't win at all."

The Vice-Presidents of the League who have died since our last Annual Meeting are:

Judge Moses Hallett, of Colorado. He was an earnest friend to the League, whose career was distinguished by the rare union of an enthusiastic reformer's temper with a well balanced judicial mind.

Mr. Francis Fisher Browne of Illinois, the brilliant founder and editor of the most important literary review in the United States the "Dial" of Chicago: his pen was used with particular efficiency in behalf of the League since its zeal was regulated by winning and discreet temperance.

Dr. Patrick J. Timmins, of Massachusetts. Dr. Timmins was as loyal to the great racial principles of nationalism which he had learned in the country of his birth as he was to the principles of democracy which he advocated in that of his adoption, protesting with us in all occasions against their betrayal in the Philippines.

The Hon. Alfred H. Love of Philadelphia. No fitter name could have been borne by our late associate and president of the Peace Union. His whole life was love and it was devoted to peace as only to be attained through liberty. He believed that world-peace was especially jeopardized by our claim to the Philippines.
Mr. Henry C. Newbold of California. In proportion to his means Mr. Newbold was the largest benefactor by far that the League ever had. Poor in this world's goods his contributions over-passed a thousand dollars. And not poor in spirit, his faith and courage, dictated at the last by a trembling hand, added to our duty a grave responsibility to such an adherent.

Col. Patrick Ford, of New York, was ever ready to lend his newspapers to our cause in those appeals for which the "Irish World" and the "Freeman's Journal" gave such a wide and important hearing.

His heart was not lent, but given to the League from the first with all the warmth of his blood and the ardor of his temper.

The Hon. U. M. Rose, of Arkansas, was a constant supporter of the League to whom our cause was always nearest of any public movement whatever beyond the immediate duties of citizenship and of profession life. These so brilliantly performed never impaired the idealism which marked the character of this eminent publicist.

The Vice-Presidents of the League who have been elected since our last Annual Meeting are:
Mr. Francis Fisher Kane for Pennsylvania.
Mr. S. A. Stockwell for Minnesota.
Mr. R. T. Crane, Jr., for Illinois,
in succession to his father.
Mr. Waldo R. Browne for Illinois,
Editor of the "Dial," Chicago, in succession to his father.
The Hon. W. W. Bailey for Pennsylvania,
Editor of the "Johnstown Democrat," Johnstown.
Mr. William Marion Reedy for Missouri,
Editor of the "Mirror," St. Louis.
Mrs. Charles Gordon Ames for Massachusetts,
in succession to Dr. Ames.
Mr. James H. Barry for California,
Editor of the "Star," San Francisco.
Hon. Brand Whitlock for Ohio,
former Mayor of Toledo.
Prof. G. T. Ladd for Connecticut,
of Yale University, New Haven.
Very Rev. George M. Scarle for California,
formerly Superior of Paulist Society.
President E. L. Stephens for Louisiana,
of the Southwestern Louisiana Industrial Institution, Lafayette.

DOCUMENTS CIRCULATED.
[many being reprints from newspapers].

"The Interests Alert," from Boston Herald, January 23.
"Mr. Winslow’s Forecast," from Springfield Republican, February 1.
"Philippine Investigators," from San Francisco Star, February 8.
"Mr. Jones on the Philippines," Hon. Francis E. Woodruff, from Springfield Republican, February 15.
"Reply to Cardinal Gibbons," from Boston Common, April 12.
"The Cloven Hoof," W. S. Lyon, from Lewiston Sun, April 21.
Same, as Senate Document 159, 63d Congress 1st session.
"Winslow to Brent," from Springfield Republican, June 12.
"Filipino Catholics and Independence," from Lewiston Sun, August 7.
"Bishop Brent's Harvard Address," from Living Church, August 30.
"Benevolent Imperialism," from San Francisco Star, September 6.
"Winslow raps Forbes Fete," from Boston Herald, September 22.
"Philippine Slavery," from Boston Herald, September 22.
"What of the Philippines?" Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, from Irish World, September 27.
"Ultimate Independence for the Filipinos, Hon. W. J. Bryan, from the Commoner, October.
"Question of Neutralization," from Springfield Republican, October 3.
"President Wilson's Philippine Policy," from Boston Herald, October 7.
Address "To the Filipino People," October 22.

Very many applications have been received for material to be used in debates by all kinds of organizations, from colleges, schools and clubs, the question being usually: "Shall the Philippines be granted their independence or not?" We have gladly supplied a little library from our files in response, only asking a report as to the results of the debates. In every case the reply has been that the resultant vote was affirmative!

ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.
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<td><strong>13.21</strong></td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Sundries</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td><strong>32.31</strong></td>
</tr>
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**$1,918.62**

E. and O. E.

David G. Haskins, Jr., Treasurer.

Boston, December 3, 1913.

## AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

8 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., Dec. 5, 1913.

I hereby certify that I have audited the accounts of David G. Haskins, Jr., Treasurer of the Anti-Imperialist League, from Jan. 1, 1913, to Dec. 2, 1913, and I have found them correctly kept and properly vouched, and I find that he has a cash balance with the New England Trust Co., Boston, of $32.31.

GEO. H. CATF, Auditor.
Within a few days the Treasurer has received a brief note from a valued member of the League, enclosing a small check, and reading:

"Gentlemen:

There seems to be no pressing need for the work of the Society at present, so please do not send me another bill."

He evidently thinks our work is done. This is perhaps not an unnatural opinion, at least on a superficial view of the situation. For there is certainly much ground for encouragement. After long and tedious years, in which we were powerless to accomplish anything, for the cause, and in which our opponents would hardly admit that there was a Philippine question, things have at last begun to move. Governor Forbes, Secretary Worcester and the other American members of the Philippine Commission,—pronounced imperialists, whatever their merits may be,—have been recalled and the Filipinos have been given a majority of the Commission. The new Governor-General, Francis Burton Harrison, is known to be a strong anti-imperialist and was appointed on the urgent recommendation of Senor Quezon and Congressman Jones, author of the bill for Philippine independence which bears his name.

Mr. Taft is pathetically lamenting that the new Governor has demanded the resignation of several American heads of important bureaus; that he is filling some of these positions with native Filipinos; and that he is said to be taking counsel with the natives rather than with Americans in regard to the administration of the government. And last week, in his first annual message to Congress, the President said: "We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence," boldly using, be it noted, the word "independence" rather than "self-government," the ambiguous and favorite expression of the imperialists and making a statement which no former president has ever made.

All this is well and hopeful, and marks an important advance.

And yet he must be a very superficial observer or a very easy-going trustful optimist who is willing to cease work and to regard the victory as won. For, mark well, not a single step has yet been taken which would be difficult or even embarrassing for an imperialist administration to retrace. If the Republican Party were to return to power (which may Heaven forfend!) it would be quite simple and natural for them to send back Messrs. Forbes and Worcester or to send over others of
like views and to restore the control of the commission to the Americans. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor any other Republican President would feel at all bound by any views which Mr. Wilson might have expressed to Congress. Indeed, an ingenious and plausible imperialistic President might argue that there was no very fundamental difference practically between his policy and Mr. Wilson's.

The President has said, "We must move toward the time of that Independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid."

He feels that "the success of the step already taken will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow." "Step by step," he says, "we should extend and perfect the system of Self government making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their successes and their failures."

There is no kind of suggestion of any definite or approximate period of time which will be required for "thoughtfully and permanently laying the foundations" for "clearing our view for the steps which are to follow" for "testing and modifying the steps" we are to take "in extending and perfecting self-government." Except for his suggestion that we should take counsel with the Filipinos, Mr. Taft might almost accept Mr. Wilson's views, so far as expressed in this message, and claim that all these preparations and preliminaries would take a generation to accomplish.

Let us remember that the government of the United States has not yet committed itself even to ultimate independence, however remote, for the Philippines. We have only acts and expressions of opinion by the President in our favor. Congress has not acted, nor has the President asked it to act. The Jones Bill has been repeatedly and persistently postponed. While the House of Representatives is undoubtedly in favor of such legislation, there are dangerous imperialistic forces working in the Senate, in the Cabinet and in the country. Mr. Taft and all the imperialists, able and determined, backed by powerful newspaper influence, will spare no effort to prevent the passage of any legislation for independence or to render it innocuous. It is of the last importance that some measure like the Jones Bill be passed by both Houses and signed by the President. When this is done, and not before, the country will be truly committed to independence for the Filipinos and we cannot afford to waste any time. Our friends now have probably the
power, if supported by the Administration, to pass such a bill. Two years from now, it may be too late as it is at least conceivable that the imperialists, under the name either of Republicans or Progressives may recover control of the House next year, and of the Administration in 1916. The important step is to pass the bill now. We have no time to waste in experiments and in “laying permanent foundations.”

Now, in view of all this, is any anti-imperialist ready to disband the League or even to take a vacation and to trust our cause to chance or to Providence? We have much reason to feel hopeful, but only on the condition that we continue to work. We have no right otherwise to hope that God or the President will give success to our cause. Eternal vigilance, constant work, is the price of success. I am sure that I speak for the noble and patriotic and self-sacrificing members of this League when I say that our work is not yet done, and we will accept no discharge or furlough. Let us still hold up the standard of our high ideal; of the immortal Declaration of Independence and let us continue in every legitimate way to demand definite, binding, decisive action looking toward early and complete independence with neutralization of our long suffering Filipino subjects.

And let me repeat my earnest belief, always maintained through the darkest days of our struggle, that God in his own good time will surely bless our prayers and efforts with success.

DAVID G. HASKINS, JR., Treasurer.
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Anti-Imperialist League:

In addressing you a year ago I said that we might "go forward with renewed courage and with increased confidence in the triumph of our cause" since the Democratic party, pledged by repeated declarations to Philippine independence, had at length come into power.

I am now able to say, and I say it with peculiar pleasure, that our confidence has been justified. The nine months of President Wilson's administration have changed the political atmosphere absolutely, and have shown that he and his associates have a far juster appreciation of our obligations to other countries than has been exhibited by their Republican predecessors since 1898. The recognition of the Chinese Republic, and the refusal to countenance the combination of bankers who were trying to profit by its financial necessities marked the end of "dollar diplomacy." The message in regard to the Mexican situation appealed to and satisfied the conscience of the country. We cannot but sympathize with the President's attempt by moral pressure to free our Mexican neighbors from the control of a military despot, and to secure for them a government of their own choice, and we have confidence that he will do all in his power to accomplish these results. He is entitled to and should receive the cordial support of us all, for his policy is courageous and of lofty aim, and we must rejoice that the destiny of two countries is in the hands of a man whose purpose is so unselfish, although in our ignorance of the situation the way at times seems dark and the danger serious. Whenever the President has spoken on the questions in which this League as such is interested, he has expressed his sympathy with the fundamental principles of American liberty, and has given no countenance to the doctrine that the United States has the right to impose its rule upon another nation without its consent. We are breathing a new air and we are happy in the feeling of renewed freedom. We have a leader in whose principles and in whose sincerity we can confide.
The President's acts in dealing with the Philippine situation have realized our expectations. The appointment of the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison as Governor-General places at the head of the Island Administration a man whose public expressions show him to be heartily in favor of the policy which we advocate. The new American members of the Commission are doubtless in sympathy with him, and we shall therefore no longer have the island government controlled by men who are opposed to Philippine independence. Dean C. Worcester, justly obnoxious to the islanders not only because he has been an active opponent of their independence, but also because of his acts in office and the unfair methods by which he has sought to influence public opinion in this country, has retired from the Commission, and the official reports from Manila will not hereafter express the opinions of our opponents and the facts which they think it important to communicate. We may admit in justice that all men, consciously or unconsciously, are apt to magnify the evidence which supports their contention, and make light of that which helps the other side, and public officials are not exempt from this failing of our common humanity, especially when their policy is the subject of controversy. Still we may rejoice in the hope that facts which have seemed unimportant to Mr. Worcester and his associates may now be presented so that the country will have a fuller comprehension of the situation.

The appointment of three prominent Filipinos as Commissioners in place of three Americans, thus giving the islanders a majority of the Commission, is also a long step in the right direction. The Filipinos now control both branches of the legislature, and the differences between the Assembly and the Commission which have occurred during late years should now cease, or if they occur again the division will not be on racial lines. This increased power carries with it increased responsibility and greater opportunity, and we confidently expect that the Filipino Congress will exhibit such moderation and wisdom that all doubt as to the ability of the Filipino people to govern themselves will be removed. The future of their country is in the hands of the representatives, and I cannot doubt that they will stand the test.

Add to all these things the declaration of policy which was made by Governor-General Harrison in his inaugural address—"Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate
independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence, and we hope to move towards that end as rapidly as the safety and permanent interests of the islands will permit." The change in the number of Filipinos on the Commission is made "in the confident hope and expectation that immediate proof will thereby be given in the action of the Commission under the new arrangement of the political capacity of those native citizens, who have already come forward to represent and lead their people in affairs." Moreover the government which they are expected to establish "is not necessarily a reproduction of our institutions, but one which will guarantee complete security for life, liberty and property."

These words set before the Filipino people "the glorious object of entire independence." They are not held to any form of government, and steady progress towards independence is promised. There is here no countenance for the deceptive policy which begins by assuming that the islanders will be unfit to govern themselves for generations, and meanwhile proposes to bind them to us by financial chains in the hope that in time their aspirations for independence will be abandoned, and the islands become a permanent part of our territory. This declaration is a step forward which cannot be retraced, and it is not surprising that the Filipino Assembly realized its full meaning, and notified this country of the interpretation which the Filipinos place upon the message delivered by the new Governor-General. The resolution of the Assembly is as follows and should not be forgotten:—

"We, the representatives of the Filipino people, constituting the Filipino assembly, solemnly declare that it is evident to us that the Filipino people have the right to be free and independent, so that in advancing alone along the road of progress it will on its own responsibility work out its prosperity and manage its own destinies for all the purposes of life. This was the aspiration of the people when it took up arms against Spain, and the presence of the American flag, first on Manila bay and then in the interior of the archipelago, did not modify, but rather encouraged and strengthened the aspiration, despite all the reverses suffered in war and difficulties encountered in peace.

"The message of the President of the United States to the Filipino people is eloquent proof that we have not waited in vain. We accept said message with love and gratitude, and
consider it a categorical declaration of the purpose of the nation to recognize the independence of the islands.

"The epoch of mistrust has been closed and the Filipinos, upon having thrown open to them the doors of opportunity, are required to assume the burden of responsibility which it would be inexcusable cowardice on their part to avoid or decline. Owing to this, a few days have sufficed to bring about a good understanding between Americans and Filipinos, which it had been impossible to establish during the 13 years past. We are convinced that every onward step, while relieving the American government of its responsibilities in the islands, will, as in the past, fully demonstrate the present capacity of the Filipino people to establish a government of its own and guarantee in a permanent manner the safety under such government of the life, property, and liberty of the residents of the islands, national as well as foreign."

Finally we have the President's distinct statement in his message. After speaking of our duty in dealing with Hawaii, he proceeds:

"In the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid."

"At last, I hope and believe, we are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and confident tread upon it, and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it."

Here is the present promise of future independence distinct and unequivocal, and the further assurance that we shall not linger on the way.

Nay, even our enemies feel the changed atmosphere and respond to the new inspiration. Thus Bishop Brent, long a leader among the obstinate opponents of independence, who has spent a very large part of the current year in the United States arguing against it and prophesying dire ills if the policy of the Democratic party is carried out, in a recent address at Lake Mohonk said:

"I am going to speak on the subject of the National Awaken-
ing in the Philippines, and I believe that my topic, thus phrased, will at once place me in your eyes where I stand, as one who believes heartily in the coming Filipino independence, but I am going to add at once that that independence is going to be synonymous with liberty; it cannot be now or in the very near future.”

His speech was largely devoted to supporting the thesis that no people can long preserve a national existence unless they are Christian, and by preference Protestant, and in the course of it he testified to Filipino capacity in such phrases as the following:—

“While Japan was wrapped in profound slumber, and China dreaming of her ancestors, the Philippine Islands were awakened by the one touch which arouses aspiration toward nationality as a permanence.”

“Because the Filipinos have, however inadequate their belief may be, loyalty as a people to Christ, they have a hope of national self-realization beyond any people of the Far East.”

“The Filipinos are the only people in the Orient who can be called Christian.”

“The difference between the Malays and the Filipinos is the difference between darkness and dawn. So we find the extraordinary phenomenon of an Oriental people isolated in the Orient and part of the solidarity of the Western world.”

“I know no instance in history where self-government has reached so high development in a dependency.”

“It may be granted that there was a time when we needed to spur the Filipinos on toward independence, no such need now exists.”

At the same meeting Bishop Oldham spoke with greater conviction:—

“I am a believer in men as men. I repudiate the idea that certain peoples are the heaven appointed guardians of other peoples for all time. Nor can I lightly admit that any people is ‘inferior’ if by that is meant that they are essentially without quality and must ever remain unprogressive and unfit.

“I believe greatly in the intellectual capacity of the Filipino and admire his ready response to all American efforts that have been made in the first fifteen years to educate and train him for self-government. Nor does he lack in moral quality which only needs opportunity for cultivation to afford a sound base for free citizenship. Both in development of this quality and
of political capacity he has made admirable progress in the fifteen short years of the American presence. He has not only disappointed the unfavorable forecasts of those who misjudged him, but he has, on the whole, outrun the expectations of more friendly onlookers.

"The Filipino who has made good so far can only come to his full development and to the full fruition of his hopes, to the legitimate consummation of his ambitions and to the full realization of his political self-hood by being given the entire care and responsibility of the administration of his own land.

"When I speak of Philippine autonomy, then, I mean such complete handing over of the Islands to the administration of the Filipino people as would leave them entirely independent and subject to neither the control nor the advice of the American government and without any further relations with the American people except those of friendship and good will.

"Could such a goal be now safely reached, there would be great profit both to the Filipinos, if they desire entire separation, and to the Americans. To the Filipino would come the immense satisfaction of being treated as a free and developed people fully capable of self-government and of so ordering their own affairs as to take their place among the self-governing nations of the world. To the Americans would come the deep gratification of having successfully accomplished what they set out to do: viz, to fit the Filipino for self-government.

"The actual grant of independence would therefore be a crowning act bringing to completion the splendid efforts we have put forth from the beginning towards this very end."

The Bishop thinks that more time is needed and I quote his words:

"The last action of the President in putting a majority of Filipinos on the Commission is a bold venture in this direction which all friends of the Philippines will watch with intense solicitude. Many of us heartily approve it and sincerely wish that the appointees may make good.

"Give thirty more years of the beneficent training that the past fifteen have shown and we may more confidently commit an awakened and prepared people to the care of their own leaders in the pleasing belief that we had secured for all the people by reason of their own growth in knowledge and in sturdy independence of character a fair chance for real freedom under forms and leaders of their own choice. Our
stewardship will then be happily discharged; our trust be
honorably fulfilled and all the people of the Islands be set on
their way to worthy self-realization. The stars and stripes
would come home with added lustre or remain floating over a
people who had invited its permanent stay.”

But at the very end there is the old hope that if we stay for
thirty years we may overcome the desire for independence and
be asked to remain. Neither Bishop really hopes or works for
independence as an end, but both like Mr. Taft hope for
permanent dependence. Yet it is interesting to read their pro-
fessions of faith, and their testimony to Filipino capacity, and
taking what they say at its face value, to find them agreeing
with us in believing that independence is possible and desirable,
and only differing with us on the question of time. The in-
definite dependence which Mr. Taft urged becomes in Bishop
Oldham’s computation only thirty years. For this concession
we may be grateful, but it does not satisfy us. We want more.

Mr. Taft and his supporters have always opposed any clear
statement of this country’s purpose to give the Philippines their
independence. They have liked to talk vaguely of our benevolent purposes, and of the hope that in the distant future
if the Filipinos still desire it, and the people of the United
States think them fit for it, independence may be granted. But
meanwhile their policy has been to strengthen the tie in every
way, and especially not to make any definite promise, lest
agitators might be encouraged and it would become only a
question of time when the promise should be fulfilled. That
promise has now been given and accepted, and it is now only
a question of time. That is the great gain made since our last
meeting.

So far so good, but much remains to do. It is not to be as-
sumed that our opponents will abate their efforts; on the con-
trary they are well organized and abundantly supplied with
capital, they have ready access to the columns of great news-
papers and magazines, and they will continue to oppose the
policy of the Administration. They have never dared openly
to say that they favor holding the islands permanently. On
the contrary they have justified our occupation on the ground
that we are educating the Filipinos, preparing them for self-
government, and meanwhile benefitting them by education,
good roads, sanitation and like good things. They have insisted
that our benevolent purposes would require indefinite genera-
tions for their full accomplishment, and have expressed the hope that at last the Filipinos would prefer to remain under our sway. We may be pardoned for believing that the hope which they seem to cherish is really their wish, and in this belief we must receive with caution all their bland professions, and look through their words to their acts. Their attitude is as old as tyranny, and we cannot but agree with Gladstone who, as his biographer John Morley says, "was never weary of protest against the fallacy of what was called preparing these new communities for freedom—teaching a colony like an infant by slow degrees to walk, first putting it into long clothes, then into short clothes." * * * A governing class was reared up for the purpose which the colony ought to fulfil itself and as a climax to the evil, a great military expenditure was maintained which became a premium on war. During the whole of that interval they are condemned to hear all the miserable jargon about fitting them for the privileges thus conferred, while in point of fact every year and every month during which they are retained under the administration of a despotic government renders them less fit for free institutions."

The Philippine Society, "made up of those in favor of retaining the Philippines," the Fallows syndicate formed for the purpose of exploiting the Islands, Mr. Taft, Bishop Brent, Dean C. Worcester and others identified with the late administration will continue to oppose as they are opposing every step forward, and whatever they say is readily published in such papers as the Independent, the Outlook and the Boston Transcript, but the columns of these journals are closed to any reply. They deliberately present only one side of the controversy to their readers. The National Geographical Magazine gives a whole number to an article on the "non-Christian peoples of the Philippine Islands" profusely illustrated and calculated like other articles from the same author to give our people the impression that they present fairly the population of the islands. It is true that Mr. Worcester does not say so, and in every article will be found some statement to the contrary, but his attitude is so clear, he has labored so hard to present the uncivilized tribes, he has been so silent about the great majority of the people, that it is impossible to doubt his purpose. Readers are careless, pictures attract the eye, an impression is produced and qualifying statements escape attention. Moreover, Mr. Worcester is reckless in his statements. Thus in the
article to which I refer, he says: "The non-Christian peoples of the Philippine Islands constitute approximately an eighth of the entire population of the islands." In his interview at San Francisco given on November 18th, he said that they amounted to slightly more than 1,000,000.

On April 21, 1914, Mr. Taft stated that the population was "about 7,600,000 souls. Of these 7,000,000 are Christians and 600,000 are Moros or other pagan tribes" and these figures were taken from the last census.

If the 600,000 are now more than a million they have increased in ten years by some sixty-six per cent, or more. If this one million is one eighth of the entire population the 7,000,000 Christian Filipinos have not increased at all. If so where are the boasted results of improved sanitation, extermination of smallpox and other diseases? Can any one believe that Mohammedans and pagans have multiplied so rapidly while the Christian population has stood still!

Mr. Worcester in his interview criticizes the appointment of a Filipino as Director of Lands, saying that he administers some $7,000,000 worth of so-called Friar Lands purchased by the Insular Government from religious corporations in order that they may be resold to their occupants." There were about 396,000 acres worth some $7,000,000 ten years ago, but large parts have been sold, notably some 60,000 acres to a syndicate of American sugar manufacturers who had never been occupant of the land. Of these sales he makes no account, though it appeared some years ago that of the Friar plantations some had been sold entirely. The work has largely been done, but he speaks as if it were all to do.

In like manner we have been entertained with statements that our commerce with the islands has increased by leaps and bounds, and figures to prove it have been published in the newspapers, but when it is said for example that between 1910 and 1911 the imports increased enormously, we are not told that this increase in figures was in great part due to the fact that in the latter year "government supplies and free railway entries" were included, while in the former year they were not, so that the alleged increase is largely a difference in the form of statement and not a difference in fact. If it were possible within any time that I can take to tell you what the tables show, and what the real history of any class of imports is,—if I could point out how enormous are the differences between
the figures given by the Insular Bureau of the War Department and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce, you would be amazed. Let me give one or two examples. In 1908 the War Department gives the value of imports of iron and steel manufactures imported as $800,753, while the Department of Commerce gives it as $3,473,846, more than four times as much. In 1911 the War Department gives imports of agricultural implements as worth $38,440, while the Bureau of Commerce gives the value as $61,041, and like discrepancies occur wherever we look. The figures only confirm the opinion of the wise man who gave “statistics” the leading place among mendacious inventions. Mr. Taft, Mr. Worcester and the other retiring officers will continue to fill the papers with criticisms, prophecies of ill and statements emphasizing their own opinions and their pride in their own achievements. We shall be given no opportunity to refute them, and we must rely on the new officers to state the facts as they see them. Out of the conflict the truth will finally appear. I only wish now to beg you not to be disturbed or cast down by the statements of our opponents. If they were not aware that their statements will not bear discussion, they would welcome our replies. The fact that their newspapers will not give our side a hearing is a proof that they are afraid to let their readers know what we can say.

Governor Forbes is afraid of a new Mexico but the comparison is misleading. Mexico has suffered for many years under a government republican in form but in fact a corrupt despotism, and as always despotism has unfitted the people for self-government. Had the power been wielded by a body of foreign despots the result would have been the same. Men are fitted for self-government only by their own efforts, their own experience, their own successes, their own failures, and this is why we insist that the Filipinos should be relieved from government by an oligarchy of foreigners and left to learn the lessons which only freedom can teach.

Mr. Taft in a recent speech urged that to promise independence within any definite time “would be a failure on our part in maintaining the self-respect that we ought to have in discharging a responsibility that has come to us under circumstances we could not control and which we are quite able to discharge with comparatively small effort.” He added: “We shall make a serious mistake if we follow the eloquence of the
smooth-spoken Filipino politicians who are looking hungrily for
the exercise of a power which they are ill-adapted to wield for
the benefit of their own people."

I quote these remarks because they are characteristic, re-
marking as I pass that what Mr. Taft as President a year ago
described "as the heavy and difficult burden which thus far we
have been bravely and consistently sustaining" he now calls
"a responsibility" "which we are quite able to discharge with
comparatively small effort." This indicates progress. But one
wonders by what process of reasoning a sensible man can
persuade himself that the Philippine Islands came "to us under
circumstances which we could not control," when our action
from the moment when we declared war on Spain till now has
always been aggressive. No conqueror was ever responsible for
injuries inflicted on the conquered if we were not, for surely
no one forced any responsibility on us in this matter, and we
on the contrary waged a long and bloody war, killing, wound-
ing and torturing the Filipinos, destroying their towns and vil-
lages, laying waste their fields, and reconcentrating whole
populations in order to establish our sway over the islands.
What circumstances forced our destroying hands, and made us
innocent of the crimes which we seem to have committed?
Such a doctrine applied in ordinary life would empty our jails
and nullify our criminal law. When Mr. Taft warns us not to
trust the "smooth spoken Filipino politicians who are looking
hungrily for the exercise of a power which they are ill-adapted
to wield for the benefit of their own people," we are listening
to words like those used by Lord North and his supporters
about George Washington, John Adams and Alexander Hamil-
ton. Nay, more, we seem to be hearing a speech made a year
ago by Mr. Taft against Mr. Roosevelt, and we can find the
same argument in any speech made by any Republican orator
about his Democratic opponent at any time within twenty
years. We ourselves are governed by men who have sought
power "hungrily," but we do not on that account demand the in-
tervention of a foreign nation. Such arguments are not con-
vincing, they are mere statements of opinion, the common-
places of political discussion, and as such not to be regarded.
Mr. Taft is afraid that the Filipinos will fall under the sway
of an oligarchy, "an oligarchy of orators," and he thinks their
leaders are "unsympathetic with true democracy." When five
Americans govern a nation of some eight millions of men whose
representatives can make no law without their consent, is that democracy? If that is to continue for generations, is that liberty? The oligarchy of which Mr. Taft was the leader seems good in his sight, but what definition of oligarchy can he give which will not include the American governors of the Philippines. It is not strange that the Filipinos do not recognize it as democracy, or that they would prefer oligarchs of their own flesh and blood to foreigners who regard and treat them as an inferior race.

Mr. Taft hopes that the removals made by Governor-General Harrison are not "the result of a tendency toward the spoils systems." The new Governor-General naturally does not want as his principal officers and assistants men who like Mr. Worcester think that everything he does is wrong and who are in distinct opposition to his views. No sensible man in his position could hope to succeed with subordinates like these, and an old official like Mr. Taft should have recognized the necessity of change. Since however he attacks Mr. Harrison he cannot complain if we remind him that the spoils system did not seem very terrible to him when he withheld patronage from men who opposed the Payne-Aldrich bill. Opposition quickens the conscience as to other men's faults.

Mr. Taft sets up a man of straw when he says that neutralization means that "in exchange for their treaties of neutrality with respect to the islands" we propose "to guarantee to the nations of the world that law and order will be preserved, and that there will be no civil commotion in which law and order cannot be maintained."

No one has ever suggested such a guarantee. We have called attention to the treaties which preserve the independence of Switzerland and other countries, but those treaties contained no guarantee by any nation as to internal peace and order in the country affected. Neutralization means that the nations will keep their hands off and let the Filipinos work out their own salvation, as every free country in the world has done, and as every country in the world with few exceptions is now doing. Mr. Taft is a good lawyer and should state the case fairly.

Mr. Taft and Mr. Worcester think very well of their own work. They are ready to praise every officer whom they appointed, and the whole policy which they have been carrying out. They feel that no one can do the work which the officers
under the late administration were doing, and that any step which they do not approve must be wrong. They are very human, but we must not languish under their disapproval, which is broad enough to embrace all Democratic officers and all Democratic policies. Mr. Taft says that Mr. Roosevelt and he promised the Filipinos independence "from the first and have always promised it." When and where was that promise made by either of them, and in what form of words, and if it was made, why does he criticize "the present declaration of the Administration that they are looking forward to ultimate independence, and why did he oppose "a present declaration of future independence?" It is gratifying to find that he is willing to admit that the Filipinos have always been promised independence, for even he now acknowledges that the only question between us is a question of time.

We have undertaken a new policy, and it is going to be carried out. Those who are displeased may criticize and prophesy evil, but the policy will not be abandoned, and I am sure that the event will confound these prophets of ill, and re-establish our confidence in the wisdom of our fathers when they announced the great principles of freedom as "self-evident truths."

The Moros have become the objects of peculiar solicitude. Mr. Taft is disturbed by the racial hatred of Moros for Filipinos, and says: "In no respect have the Filipino educated classes shown their incapacity for just government as in their treatment of the Moros and non-Christian tribes." A strange statement about men who never have had the control of the "Moros and non-Christian tribes," which were governed by Spain till 1898, and by the Americans ever since, as the Commission has had the exclusive jurisdiction over them. Substitute for the words "Filipino educated classes" the words "American officials" and the statement is true, as the records of our occupation abundantly prove. While Mr. Taft deplores their unhappy fate the Harmony Club of America has been formed for the purpose of raising a fund of $100,000 to help Bishop Brent in "upbuilding the wards of the Nation." The call is signed inauspiciously by Bishop Fallows, whose son is the head of the Fallows syndicate, which in the Journal of Commerce is said "to be backed by Standard Oil capital." The Bishop himself visited the islands last year with his son and other representatives of the syndicate which travelled with a
representative of the Philippine Commission, and thus religion and dollars went hand in hand. The invitation to join this society begins by saying: "We are in the presence of a new and strange responsibility" to wit, the fact that in the Philippine Islands are what, with an exaggeration which I have already pointed out, are said to be "about a million wild men of the hill or Moro Mohammedans. Bishop Brent's plan is given in his own letter under date of September 1, 1913, and begins by saying that "The Moros are the only Mohammedans under the American flag. In this fact lies our chief responsibility and opportunity. The challenge of Islam is before us. Shall the crescent or the cross rule these wards of ours?"

The Bishop says that the Moros number about three hundred and fifty thousand, and in their province and neighboring territory are 150,000 pagans. He admits that "It would be futile at this juncture except in unusual circumstances to preach to the Moro. The history of his race has been such as to close his mind to Christian appeal. We must live our Christianity with him. The hospital, the school and the playground must be our pulpit." "The central aim is this: to place every Moro child under the direct guardianship of an American child or group of American children, or of parents and children." The details of the general plan are left to Bishop Fallows.

No one can criticize a missionary enterprise which contemplates influencing a people by good works and setting them an example of applied Christianity. No one can object to a plan which will make Americans, parents or children, take a living interest in the welfare of less fortunate human beings, but none the less the proposal comes from sources which make us hesitate to accept it. No wonder that the mind of the Moro is closed to appeal from Christian sources. He has thus far seen the representatives of that faith in the words of the soldier's song "Civilizing with a Krag." He has seen the United States making a treaty with him and treating him and his institutions including slavery with respect, so long as we did not wish him to support the other Filipinos in their struggle for freedom, but when that emergency had passed asserting our power in disregard of treaty stipulations and establishing over him a strictly military control. In the words of Bishop Brent himself—

"All that the wronged Moro knows of civilized peoples is
that they make magnificent weapons of destruction, and that they use them for the purpose for which they were made. The Spaniard began the work, and entering upon an evil inheritance we continued with more perfect weapons.” The Jolo massacre, the expeditions and slaughters of General Pershing are poor examples of Christianity, and will be remembered long after these Mohammedans have ceased to be under our control. It would be strange indeed if the Moros loved us. With the words that I have quoted from Bishop Brent I am in cordial sympathy, but I cannot remember that we have heard from his lips before any condemnation of the water cure, the re-concentration, the killing, burning and torturing which has placed these Mohammedans under the American flag. If the Bishop is content to abandon the attempt to hold these islands by force against the will of their people, and is willing to rely only on the spiritual weapons mentioned in his letter as a means of helping these unhappy men, I will go with him heartily, but not otherwise. I object and always shall object to that missionary enterprise in which the soldier holds the victim down while the preacher tries to convert him. For no such combination is there any warrant in the teachings of the Master whose servants these bishops profess to be. I might also remind them that here in the United States where in Pennsylvania, as well as in Georgia and Mississippi, colored men are lynched and tortured while the community approves and the perpetrators of the outrages go unpunished,—in our country where apparently law-abiding men organize gigantic conspiracies to destroy life and property by dynamite,—there are a thousand savages for every one in the Philippine archipelago, and there is room for all the missionaries that benevolent Americans can support. Head hunters are not so dangerous or so numerous as dynamiters. This country is the place in which human brotherhood needs to be taught, and I wish that the dollars now sought in order to convert or civilize a few Mohammedans might be devoted to the far more pressing needs among our own people.

But all that I have alluded to properly interpreted means progress, but now is the time to secure our wish. Mr. Taft is abundantly satisfied with the results of American occupation, and is never tired of dwelling on all the benefits which we have given the Filipinos wholly at their expense. This last fact he does not magnify, nor does he dwell upon the expense of Amer-
ican government, every dollar of which the Filipinos have been forced to pay, save what we paid our army and navy to conquer and hold the islands. The question is not however, whether Mr. Taft is satisfied, but are the Filipinos satisfied. They have received all the good things which he names. Are they satisfied with their benevolent rulers and anxious to remain under their sway? The answer is a very emphatic "No." They do not want our benevolence, and they do want their independence. The government which a nation does not like after fifteen years' trial is a failure, and some bill like the Jones bill, some measure providing the machinery and fixing the date when the islands shall be free should be passed. Thus and thus only can Philippine independence be assured. Then and then only will the question be settled and all the forces of two peoples be set in harmonious action towards a common end. When this bill passes, if those who favor it are right, the troubles which Mr. Taft and his followers apprehend will not occur. If on the other hand he is right and it is made apparent that the Filipinos cannot establish a stable government, the time of our withdrawal can be postponed. If the bill is passed our policy is fixed and everyone will understand it. Time and other details are of comparatively small importance, and can be altered if necessity requires. If the bill is not passed we shall be told that all which has been done is of no legal effect, that as our opponents now urge the President has no power to deal with territory of the United States, and that therefore any promise made by him or any officer of the United States binds no one. At the outset of this unhappy business the Filipinos received assurances from various representatives of our government, as President McKinley and his Cabinet well knew. On the strength of these assurances they levied armies, risked their lives, supplied our forces with what they needed, and did all that as friends and allies they could do to aid us, only to be told that the promises so distinctly made and at the critical time so clearly approved by the silence of the President were worthless and they were fools to believe them. One experience of this kind is enough, and the Democratic party will not fulfill its repeated promises to the country if it suffers the next session of Congress to pass without such legislation as will commit this country to Philippine independence beyond doubt or question. Our opponents are fighting for delay, they will oppose every obstacle which ingenuity can suggest. They have
free access to the press. We cannot insist too strongly that the language of the Democratic platforms is clear, and that its promise must be kept. To delay is to play into the hands of our opponents,—it is to do just what they want. The present administration must act in such a way that the burden of delaying independence must rest upon those who would keep the islands, and not leave upon the Democratic party and those who have believed its promises the burden of obtaining at some future day the action by Congress which the Democratic National Convention promised should be "immediate."

"We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established," not necessarily a government such as suits the people of the United States, but such a government as suits the people of the Philippine Islands, and because it suits them, is "stable" as no other government can be. It will not be a government which is perfect. It will not be one that Mr. Taft cannot criticize and say "all manner of evil things" about. While colored men are denied the suffrage in defiance of the Fifteenth Amendment, while Lynchers go unwhipped of justice, while night-riders are found in Kentucky, and conspiracies are formed like that of the McNamaras, while Tammany threatens New York and politicians living and dead like Quay, Penrose, Lorimer and Cox control great cities and states, it is not for us to insist that the Filipinos must do what after centuries of experience we fail to do. We cannot insist that there shall be no chance of disorder with our record of strikes, riots and civil war. It is not a petty question of mistakes and frauds, but a great principle is at stake, and the Democratic party stands pledged to its support. All "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and from no other source. That is the sheet anchor of American liberty, and until that principle is recognized and applied in the Philippine Islands and in every other region beneath our flag, the United States is false to itself, and its people, denying freedom to others as Lincoln said "deserve it not themselves, and under a just God will not long retain it." As the representative of that freedom for which America stands, the old as well as the new, we call upon the Democratic party to fulfil its promise, and not to stay its hand until the Philippine Islands are as they of right ought to be free and independent.
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REMARKS BY HON. SAMUEL W. McCALL.

There appear to be only three ultimate solutions to the Philippine problem. One is that we shall hold those islands as colonies; another that we may develop a capacity for self-government and ultimately turn the control of the Islands back to the people who inhabit them, and the third that we shall treat them as we have all other sufficiently populous territory acquired before the Spanish-American War and admit them as
States in the Union to take part in the common government of us all. I imagine no one in the country believes that we should admit them as States into the Union. I know of nobody who advocates holding them perpetually as colonies. The only remaining solution is to make it our chief aim to fit them for self-government with a view to letting them manage their own affairs. If that is true why should not Congress, which is the political department of our government, make a declaration to that effect precisely as was done in the case of Cuba? Our frank treatment of the Cuban problem has retained for us the friendship of the people of that Island. There was all the more reason why we should make the same declaration with regard to the Philippines. No other policy is admissible consistently with the principles of our Government. We believe the people should rule and are always proclaiming it. But what do we mean by that? Certainly not that our own people should rule over distant and alien peoples. If our professions or democracy are anything but a pretense and a sham they put an end forever to any claim that we should permanently govern those people nearly ten thousand miles from our Capitol. Lincoln once said: "When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man that is more than self-government—that is despotism." In my opinion the practical policy we should adopt with reference to the Philippine Islands is to make a declaration now from the political department of the government that it is our intention to fit them as speedily as we may, for self-government, in the words of Mr. Roosevelt, "after the fashion of the really free nations" and then leave them to govern themselves. In the meantime we should secure agreements with the great powers neutralizing their territory as Switzerland is neutralized in Europe so that they may be free from conquest by other nations. That policy is embodied in a resolution chiefly drawn by Mr. Story and introduced by me into the House of Representatives. Train their people for government by giving them a participation in it. If we would have them walk we must at least permit them to creep. If we are ambitious to bear the white man's burden we need not go far from our own shores to find it. We have ten million people in our own country who are American citizens and are counted in the distribution of political power that chooses our agents of government and yet they are not permitted to vote. There are countries upon this
continent for which we advertise a peculiar responsibility which are far from having governments worthy of the name. The Philippine Islands never presented an American problem, but since we have taken them let us try to solve the questions coming with them consistently with the spirit of our American Institutions.

**REMARKS BY LIEUT. EDWARD O'FLAHERTY.**

In 1890, on my first visit to the Philippines, I was a volunteer officer in an infantry regiment which I had assisted in organizing. My observations were confined to the Province of Luzon east of Manila, and to a few of the adjacent islands. We had been told volumes about the seventy or eighty “wild tribes” in the country, and I therefore was greatly surprised at the intelligence and refinement of the natives whom I saw wherever we camped, near the towns and barrios, when hiking through the hills and valleys of the war-cursed island. One of my first surprises was to find the senoritas able to distinguish between a regular and a volunteer officer of the Army.

I think the majority of the troops did not realize the kind of people against whom they were waging such a devastating war. They underrated the ability of the educated natives, and they committed unspeakable crimes against the poor, defenseless, but dignified taos, whose language they did not understand.

In those early days the insurgents and other Filipinos were called “niggers” by the Americans, and treated as beings of inferior intelligence, much too primitive to have a government of their own. A captain of our regiment was court-martialed and acquitted for temporarily hanging any peaceable native he suspected of having knowledge of the insurrectos, or their rifles. The second lieutenant of my company used to boast of the way he disposed of his prisoners on the march. He gave them over to their tribal enemies who took them back into the jungle, whence they never returned alive. I was an eye witness of one unpleasant incident during my service in Luzon. It was the attempt of a soldier to kill several women and children while they were wading the Mariquina river on their peaceful way to Manila. He fired five or six times from an outpost, but not being a crack shot, the natives escaped injury. The mother of the girls came by our station, and, in answer to my inquiry as to their safety, replied sadly, “Too mucha boom-boom.”
The war begun by the United States against the Filipinos was a war of criminal aggression and systematic misrepresentation to acquire a supposedly rich colony, and to entrench the imperial administration of William McKinley and Marcus Aurelius Hanna. For the first time in our history we forced our flag upon an unwilling people struggling for freedom. The Filipinos had then fought two wars for independence, and had succeeded in establishing a Republican government in the islands. The insurrection united them against us as nothing else could have done.

The Wilcox-Sargent journey through Luzon in 1898 proved that Aguinaldo controlled the country, that his government was running smoothly, and a few years later the Civil Commission found the natives surprisingly ready to assume control of their own affairs. Anarchy would not have prevailed in the Filipinos had the United States withdrawn in 1899. On the contrary, an orderly government of the Filipinos, by the Filipinos, and for the Filipinos, would have been evolved. The dreadful experiences of our troops in pacifying the country after the war would have been unknown, and while the natives may not have achieved the degree of educational and industrial progress we find today, their government would have been their own, the best possible government for them and free from the expensive rule of the conqueror. They probably would not have spent $2,000,000 on a single highway! Last year, on my second visit to the Philippines, in spite of all the benefits which have been purchased with the Filipinos' money, I could not help realizing that it was by deception and the bayonet we forced our government upon a brave and patient people fighting the third time for independence, and now, after training them a decade for self-government, we were unwilling to say when they should be given their independence.

It was a great surprise also to learn that the seventy or eighty “wild tribes” has dwindled to a negligible few, in a total population of some 8,000,000 natives. The official exploiter of “wild tribes” had gone out of business.

Independence for the Filipinos, under the protection of the United States, until the neutralization of the archipelago by treaty with the Powers, is the best solution of the Philippine problem for us, as it is the best one for the Filipinos. This independence and protection may well begin on July 4, 1921, the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the islands by Magellan.
With free trade in the Philippines the Powers would be vitally interested in maintaining the treaty of neutrality, and this should help make permanent to us the open door in China.

The United States must wage a relentless commercial war with the nations now pressing for the control of China. To succeed in keeping open the door of trade and commerce in Asia for our merchants and manufacturers would be far more profitable than to retain the Philippines, and attempt to establish a Monroe Doctrine in the China sea, 7,000 miles from our shores. This would serve to unite all nations against us, might involve us in an enormously expensive war, and bar us from the trade of six or seven hundred millions of people. The acquisition of expensive colonies in the Far East will never give us equal trade power with the nations now entrenched on the mainland of China. To win the gratitude of the millions of Asia, and maintain peaceful relations with the Powers, in the greatest commercial race the would has ever seen, would insure us a prosperity infinitely greater than we could win by another war in the Far East, and government by force.

As in the last century we could not exist half free, half slave, so today we cannot hold in subjection an alien race praying for independence. By gradual purchase of the colonies we could have prevented the most disastrous, the most unnecessary war in our history. Given the choice today between war and peace with slow emancipation, which would we choose?

The words home, country, independence, liberty, equality, fraternity, mean the same to the Filipinos as to us. If our flag means what our ancestors fought and died for, then the tropic star of the Philippines should be in the azure field of their own flag, not in ours.

ADDRESS BY HON. ROGER SHERMAN HOAR.

A century and a half ago, what is now our glorious country was a subject colony. Over us floated the red-white-and-blue of freedom—not our red-white-and-blue, but the red-white-and-blue of England, which stood for freedom there and oppression here. Patriotic Englishmen vowed that where once the flag had been run up, it should never be hauled down.

The Anglo-Saxon race had led the world in the struggle for freedom; yet in spite of this, the rulers in England did not recognize that the principles of freedom applied to any other nation than their own. They regarded our forefathers as incapable of self-government.
Our forefathers denied the materiality of that contention, and claimed self-government as a right. They met the question, “Are you able to govern yourselves?” with the question, “Is any man good enough to be a despot?”

Our forefathers contended that all men are created free and equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and that to maintain these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the government. And so they brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. The new nation founded a new flag and proved its capacity for self-government.

Then came the experiment of trying to exist half free and half slave. The experiment failed and the nation received a new birth of freedom. The red-white-and-blue received a new meaning as the flag of freedom.

Fifteen years ago we ran up that flag of freedom over the Philippine Islands. The party in power at that time was one that based its principles upon the proposition that even our own citizens are not capable of self-government, but must delegate their governmental powers to a chosen few. Believing thus as to their fellow-citizens, is it to be wondered at that this political party denied the right of self-government to an alien race?

Disregarding history, this political party again tried the experiment of maintaining a country half free and half slave. Again it was asserted that a flag once run up should never be hauled down. Again it was contended that a subject colony was incapable of self-government, in entire disregard of the right to self-government.

But now the party of freedom has triumphed in this country, vindicating the right of our own people to govern themselves, through representatives. It is altogether fitting and proper that from this party should come the first promise of freedom to the Filipino people.

Now the Filipinos can gaze upon the red-white-and-blue, floating over them, no longer as the flag of oppression, but as the flag of the promise of freedom.

At close of Mr. Hoar’s address meeting was dissolved.