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INTRODUCTION

The history of the relation of the Government of the United States to the Philippine Islands is perhaps the most interesting experiment in modern imperialism. It was an experiment in preparation for independence. When the United States annexed the Philippine Islands it did so in the guise of a liberator of an oppressed people from the domination of Spain. The United States proclaimed its intention to establish complete self-government in the Islands after a short period of tutelage. President McKinley instructed the Taft Commission to treat the Philippine people "with the same courtesy and respect for their personal dignity which the people of the United States are accustomed to require from each other."¹ The American-Philippine relationship has been more successful than any other which has existed in modern times between a dominant and a dependent people and this had a far reaching effect on the colonies in Asia. Asia watched whether America will put into operation her principle of the consent of the governed and of self-determination.

While the Americans fully accepted and insisted upon American responsibility for the Islands they nevertheless gave the largest possible participation of Filipino in legislation and administration and an increased measure of autonomy as enlightenment and experience advanced. After the Americans have familiarized the Filipinos with the institutions of modern

democracy and have given them an opportunity to adopt them to their own uses, the Filipinos believed themselves sufficiently numerous, compact and disciplined to begin independent life as a nation. It was insistently urged by Filipino spokesmen that a stable government existed and that the United States should redeem its pledge.

It is the purpose of this work to present President W. Wilson's interest in the Filipino people and their struggle for independence, Congressional discussions in favor and against Philippine independence and American economic policy in the Philippines.
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CHAPTER I

PRESIDENT W. WILSON'S PHILIPPINE POLICY

The acquisition of the Philippines was the greatest blunder of American diplomacy.1 The purpose of the war of 1898 was to free Cuba. The decision to send the fleet to Manila Bay was made by the Navy rather than by the President and Cabinet, and American victory there posed a problem for which neither the American government nor people was prepared. Opposition to the treaty with Spain was widespread and intense. There was a long and heated debate in the Senate. The expansionists listed the glorious tropical wealth of the Islands and made staggering prophecies about the inevitable increase in our China trade. Opponents of the peace treaty argued that to force our rule on the Filipino people was a violation not only of our war aims, but our Constitution and even of our Declaration of Independence. It would make us an imperialistic nation. Only by the most energetic efforts was the administration able to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote for ratification of the treaty. In its efforts it received help from William J. Bryan, anti-imperialist, who urged the senators of his party to vote for the treaty in order to end the war.2

1 Samuel F. Bemis, A Diplomatic History of the United States, New York, 1950, 482.
2 Ibid., 473.
During this time public opinion regarding the Philippines was forming. A year after the treaty of peace was signed at Paris on December 10, 1898, Wilson said, "It was my personal wish at the time that we should not take the Philippines. If we sent our institutions in manuscript they would suffer the same fate which befell a dress suit once captured by savages." The commercial and industrial interests of America learning that the islands lie in the gateway of the vast and undeveloped markets were in favor of keeping the Philippines. The navalists were emphasizing the military importance of the Islands and suggesting the danger to American interests should Germany or Japan annex them. Popular feeling was being aroused by the combination of the economic and strategic value of the Islands, so the United States on February 14, 1899, passed a resolution, part of which read,

```
it is not intended permanently to annex such islands as an integral part of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands, to prepare them for self-government and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.
```

President McKinley in his instructions to Secretary Root for the guidance of the Philippine Commission said, that the policy is "extension of self-government to the Philippine Islands by gradual steps from time to time.'

---


time as the people of the islands show themselves fit to resume the addi-
tional responsibility.6 The Secretary of War undertook to define even more
specifically and clearly the policy of United States toward the Philippines
in the following words:

Shortly stated, the national policy is to govern the Philippine
Islands for the benefit and welfare and uplift of the people of the
islands and gradually to extend to them, as they shall show them-
selves fit to exercise it in a greater and greater measure of
self-government.7

Mr. W. H. Taft was the first Governor-General of the Islands. His
administration throughout has been designed primarily for the benefit of the
islanders themselves. He set forth on a journey through the islands to or-
organize provincial governments everywhere and wherever possible he employed
natives in the public service. He spoke to excited and enthusiastic crowds
of Filipinos. There was never one word said about sharing the prosperity
and the natural resources of the Philippines for the mutual benefit of the
Filipinos and the Americans.8 Under Taft the islands saw the beginnings of
a system of good roads, good schools, upright judges, and honest public
servants.

The Democratic Party in their convention in 1900, when they nomi-
nated Mr. Bryan for President, made the question of imperialism one of the
most prominent issues in their platform. Although the party was defeated

6 U. S. Congress, House, H. R. 18479, Congressional Record,
63rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Monday, September 28, 1914, Vol. 51, Pt. 16, Washing-
ton, 1914, 15834.

7 Ibid.

8 Catherine Porter, Crisis in the Philippines, New York, 1942, 18.
by a million votes,⁹ the Democrats refused to believe that the verdict represented the country's final answer. Though the anti-imperialists have been the subject of much ridicule, their doctrine of anti-imperialism has influenced the national temper and opposition to expansion was expressed in the press and in Congress. The principles of the Declaration of Independence gradually resumed their rightful place in the thought of the nation and the convictions that the highest honor the nation can acquire is to relinquish the Philippines.¹⁰

Again in 1904 attacks upon what had been done in the Philippines were a large part of the Democratic campaign. While the Philippines were not an important issue when the Baltimore convention was held in 1912, it reaffirmed the party's opposition to a "policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere". It condemned "the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder," and asked for "an immediate declaration of the nation's purposes to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other Powers."¹¹ This was not a promise of immediate independence, but of immediate adoption of a pledge of independence at the


¹¹ The Democratic Text Book 1912, Democratic National Committee, New York, 1913, 30.
earliest practicable date. But if the President and Congress felt that the Philippine Government did not conform to their ideas of stability, the Islands would remain under American control for an indefinite period.

No commitment was made by Wilson during his campaign as to the Philippine policy beyond his reference to American trusteeship which he made in his official acceptance speech.

In dealing with the Philippines, we should not allow ourselves to stand upon any mere point of pride, as if, in order to keep our countenance in the families of nations, it were necessary for us to make the same blunders of selfishness that other nations have made. We are not the owners of the Philippine Islands. We hold them in trust for the people who live in them. They are theirs for the use of their life. We are not even their partners. It is our duty, as trusted to make whatever arrangement of government will be more serviceable to their freedom and development. Here, again, we are to set up the rule of justice and of right.12

The first indication of President Wilson's views did not come until after the election when in December 1912 he remarked at Staunton, Virginia, that the "Philippines are at present our frontier but I hope we presently are to deprive ourselves of that frontier."13 This was a forecast of early autonomy and showed a change in Wilson's policy as to the long term of discipline upon which self-government had to be founded. He had always believed that the United States held the Islands in trust for the Filipinos and should develop the Filipinos toward self-government and educate them according to western standards.14 This statement aroused high hopes in the Philippines

12 Ibid., 351.
14 Notter, The Origin of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson, 260.
and enthusiastic ratification meetings were held. The Philippine Assembly cabled the following message to the President-elect.

The Philippine Assembly has unanimously and heartily adopted today a message of congratulations, as well as that of the Filipino people, upon your success in the election for the office of President of the United States, and expressing its hope and confidence that your administration will redeem the pledges of the American people to recognize Philippine independence in accord with reiterated petitions of the Philippine Assembly.15

The Philippine Assembly adopted also a resolution which declared:

We believe that happily the experiments of imperialism have come to an end, and that colonial exploitation has passed into history. . . . 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. . . . We do not wish to say that there will not be difficulties and embarrassments, but we feel sure that through a conservative use of the powers entrusted to us, the Filipino people will, with God's favor and the help of America, emerge triumphantly from the test, however difficult it may be.16

The election of 1912 which gave victory to the Democrats in the United States strengthened Quezon's hopes and encouraged him in his efforts to have the political situation of the Philippines changed. When President Wilson summoned him to the White House and asked him whether Governor General Forbes should remain, Quezon answered:

Mr. President, if it is your intention to disregard the Democratic platform and merely carry on the policies of the Republican Administration, then you can find no better man for the job than Governor General Forbes. If, on the contrary, you intend to take immediate steps, as in my opinion you should take, to make good the new historic commitment of your party to grant independence to the Philippines


as soon as possible than Governor General Forbes can neither be the
spokesman for nor the executor of your policies in the Philippines.17

Since President Wilson's entire foreign policy had been that of
continuous repudiation of imperialism and the ultimate independence of the
Philippine Islands, he appointed as the new executive of the Islands a man
who had pronounced views on Philippine independence and one who was known
to be acceptable to the Filipinos. The new Governor General, the Hon. Francis
Burton Harrison, was thoroughly dedicated to the proposition that the Fili-
pinos had the right to run the Philippines and throughout his administration
he pursued a policy of Filipinization and of friendly cooperation with the
Filipino leaders.

Upon his arrival at Manila, October, 1913, General Harrison deliv-
ered a message from President Wilson, containing the most definite promise of
independence ever made by a President which began:

We regard ourselves as trustees, acting, not for the advantage
of the United States but for the benefit of the people of the
Philippine Islands.
Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate
independence. . . . And we hope to move towards that end as
rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the Islands
will permit.18

Wilson pointed out that by America's integrity, she should lead
the thinking of the world and that her mission was to carry abroad conscience
ideals and principles.19 President Wilson's message continued:

18 George A. Malcolm, The Commonwealth of the Philippines, New York,
1936, 69.
19 Notter, The Origin of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson, 103.
The administration will take one step at once and will give to the native citizens of the Islands a majority in the Appointive Commission, and thus in the Lower House of the Legislature a majority representation will be secured to them. 20

The step taken by the President was an important one because the Philippine Commission was a more powerful body than the Lower House for it controlled the non-Christian parts which comprised about one-third of the Philippine Islands. It was a step which offered opportunity to test the political capacity of Filipino leaders. The Filipinos were delighted, they were coming into their own. Many who believed that the American policy in the Islands was the gradual extension of self-government to the natives, were not surprised at the change president Wilson has made in the Commission. Filipinos were to learn self-government by seeing imported experts do everything for them in the most scientific way, but under Harrison the natives themselves were being put on the job and told to work it. "The prophesy of the evolution of a government by Americans assisted by Filipinos into a government of Filipinos assisted by Americans was fulfilled." 21 The machine did not run so well as when the imported experts were in charge, and there were accidents, but at least the natives were gaining experience in self-government.

Governor General Harrison ended his inaugural address with the following words:


People of the Philippine Islands! A new era is dawning! We place within your reach the instrument of your redemption. The door of opportunity stands open and, under Divine Providence, the event is in your hands.22

Until this time the Commission had always possessed an American majority, but President Wilson gave five out of nine seats of this body to citizens of the Philippines. Victorino Mapa of Iloilo, Rafael Palma of Manila, Jaime de Veyra of Leyte, Vicente Illustro of Batangas, and Vicente Singson-Encarnacion of Ilocos Sur. They were steady men, no radicals, no extremists, dignified, capable.23 There was, however, no effort on the part of Governor General Harrison to bring out a swarm of "deserving Democrats" and he resisted any pressure to this end brought to bear by aspirants for office or by Democratic party leaders.24 In his speech he said:

We must remember that the sole aim of the Democratic Party is not that of filling offices, but to sum up the principles for which we have been fighting the last twenty years and put them in practice. The summing up may hurt some Democrats but that cannot be helped. We must do what we promised to do, otherwise the people will have nothing more to do with us.25

In his message to Congress December 2, 1913, the President called for the perfection of a system of self-government, that responded to the needs and aspirations of the people of the Islands. This was to be done in accordance with Filipino "counsel and experience" rather than based upon

23 Berstein, The Philippine Story, 93.
American principles and practices. "We shall learn how best to serve them
and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision".
The Filipinos were not only given greater control over the operation of
their government, they were also to be encouraged to determine for themselves
the form of their political institutions. "We should more and more put
under the control of the native citizens of the Archipelago the essential
instruments of their life, their local instrumentalities of government, their
schools, all the common interests of the communities.26 This is what actu­
ally happened during the next seven years and Governor Harrison enjoyed an
unlimited degree of confidence and support of the Filipinos of all classes
and parties. The truth is that while the Wilson-Harrison policy marked no
new path it did constitute a notable landmark in the Philippine policy which
the American government has been pursuing with more or less steadiness
through fifteen years.

When the Jones bill was introduced in the House, President Wilson
in his message to Congress December 8, 1914 urged Congress to hasten the
passage of the Philippine bill.

How better in this time of anxious questioning and perplexed
policy could we show our confidence in the principles of lib­
erty, . . . and demonstrate our steadfastness in the courses
of justice and disinterestedness than by fulfilling our promises
to a dependent people.27

26 A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents
XVI, 7911, Bureau of National Literature, New York.

27 Ibid., 8017.
Again in his message to Congress on December 7, 1915, President Wilson encouraged Congress to pass the bills giving more political freedom to the Philippines.

there is no better way to be clear of embarrassment than to fulfil our promises and promote the interest of those dependent on us, to the utmost . . . . There are few measures you could adopt which would more serviceably clear the way which we wish to make good now and always our right to lead in enterprises of peace and good will and economic and political freedom.28

To the Filipinos, no president was considered more reliable, trustworthy and statesmanly than President Wilson. He would not favor any movement for international peace unless one of the conditions of such a plan be the establishment of governments only with the consent of the governed. In his speech at New York, President Wilson said:

We believe in political liberty and founded our great Government to obtain it, the liberty of men and of people—of men to choose their own lives and of peoples to choose their own allegiance.

If we have had aggressive purposes and covetous ambitions, they were the fruit of our thoughtless youth as a nation and we have put them aside. We shall, I confidently believe never again take another foot of territory by conquest.

We shall never in any circumstance seek to make an independent people subject to our dominion; because we believe, we passionately believe, in the right of every people to choose their own allegiance and be free of masters altogether.29

This repudiation of imperialistic impulses brought great joy and encouragement to the Filipinos. Although some labeled Wilson's policy as a cowardly abandonment of American duties and responsibilities in the Philippines the Filipinos had great confidence in Wilson and believed that he did

28 Ibid., 8110.
29 Ibid., 8082.
not favor the cutting adrift of peoples and mercilessly throwing them upon their own resources, but that he approved as a general principle freedom for people who strive for it. This policy was evident in Wilson's Fourteen Points and in the League of Nations, the idea of a controlling authority for colonial policy in territories which it was not considered advisable to leave entirely autonomous.

When the first Congress assembled after the approval of the Jones Act, August 29, 1916, President Wilson through Secretary of War Baker, sent to Governor-General Harrison of the Philippines, a message congratulating him and the members, on the convention of the Assembly and Senate of the islands, for the first time composed entirely of natives. Wilson expressed his confidence in this step towards self-government. "For myself, I look forward with confidence to the growth of self-government in the Philippines under this new and happier order of things and am glad to have had a part in taking the great step in advance which has now been taken.\(^{30}\)

CHAPTER II

CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDE ON THE JONES BILL

The Philippine campaign for independence was carried on effectively in the United States and in the Philippine Islands. In the United States Commissioner Quezon not only spoke in Congress but during the national conventions of the American parties he tried to have something inserted in their respective platforms favorable to Philippine independence and also intervened in the work on proposed legislation for the islands. While traveling through various states he took advantage of every opportunity to speak on conditions in the Philippines and the desire of her people for independence. The American officials have led the Filipinos to think that some day the Philippines would be free and independent. Quezon appealed to the justice of the American people to make good their promises of independence and tried to convince them that a stable government has been established.

The Philippine Publicity Bureau in the United States was managed by Jose P. Melencio, with the assistance of Maximo M. Kalaw. In their articles for the press and in public addresses, they constantly advocated independence. The hundreds of Filipino students attending the various universities of the United States were of great help in the independence campaign.  

In the Philippine Islands the Filipino leaders encouraged the people to carry on an agitation for independence and to furnish a practical demonstration of their ability for self-government.

In the United States there was no essential difference between the Republican and Democratic attitude toward Philippine independence. The attitude of the Republican members of Congress was consistent with the policy of their former leaders. During the Taft regime the policy which was followed did imply a promise of independence, when, in the opinion of Congress, the Filipinos were prepared for it. But the majority of the Republicans did not believe that the Filipinos were ready for independence at this time. They were willing to grant additional powers to them and were in favor of ultimate independence but were unwilling definitely to promise it to the Filipinos.

In the Republican plank of 1916, the Republicans declared:

> We accept the responsibility of the islands as a duty to civilization and the Filipino people. To leave with our task half done would break our pledges, injure our prestige among nations and imperil what has already been accomplished.\(^2\)

The Democrats were trying to make good their party pledges. They endorsed the provision of the Jones Bill, and reiterated their endorsement of the purpose of ultimate independence expressed in the preamble of that measure.\(^3\)

The policy inaugurated by President McKinley, secretary of State Root, and Governor Taft, had never been hostile to the Filipinos ambition

---


\(^3\) Ibid.
for nationality. After naming the members of the Commission and appointing Taft as president, Secretary Root wrote a letter of instruction as follows:

to devote their attention in the first instance to the establishment of municipal governments in which the natives of the Islands, both in the cities and in the rural communities, shall be afforded the opportunity to manage their own local affairs to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and subject to the least degree of supervision and control which a careful study of their capacities and observation of the workings of native control show to be consistent with the maintenance of law, order and loyalty.

The Filipinos were not content with kind and soothing words and just laws, but were agitating for independence. There were many Filipinos who were pressing for a more definite promise from Congress, the only body which had the power to make a promise effective. Mr. M. Quezon did not trust the promises made by various American officials, because as he told the Senate committee, "the logical result of a given policy does not always follow, and efforts are now being made to prevent that logical result from being attained."

On July 11, 1911, Mr. William A. Jones of Virginia introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, which was commonly known as the Philippine bill. It had three main provisions.

First, the preamble which stated the purpose of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established.

Second, the proposed bill extended the power of their domestic

4 Forbes, The Philippine Islands, 1945, 70.
affairs, by granting new powers to the Government and by the creation of an elective Senate.

Third, the governor-general was to be appointed by the President of the United States and had a limited veto power. The President of the United States had an absolute veto power over any bill which the Philippine Congress passed and in certain important subjects, his prior assent was to be secured before the laws relating to them would become valid. Such provisions did not relinquish any of the control or supervision which the United States had over the foreign political affairs of the Islands. 6

When Mr. Jones reported the bill to Congress, he explained that since every Philippine administration has at some time or other stated that as soon as it had been demonstrated that the Filipinos were capable of self-government, complete independence should be granted to them. This proposed bill will give them the opportunity to show their capacity for self-government. "To hold and govern the Philippines," Mr. Jones said, "was contrary to the free principles upon which our Government is founded and therefore the very thought is repugnant to every liberty-loving American citizen." 7 He also stated that the Filipinos of the civilized provinces of the Islands, who constitute nine-tenths of the inhabitants have expressed their approval of this bill and that they ask for its passage. The Filipino spokesmen insisted that a stable government now exists and that the United States should redeem its pledge.

6 Kalaw, The Case for the Filipinos, 205.
7 Congressional Record, 63 Cong., 2 Sess., 1914, 1583.]
In defending the bill, Mr. Miller declared, that the bill is "purely administrative in its features," and since it does not contain any politics it should not be considered from a partisan point of view.\(^8\) In his opinion "the American honor is at stake" he said, if "we decide Philippine affairs and Philippine questions simply to bolster up politics at home, we are unworthy of the trust that providence has given to us."\(^9\) In commenting, Mr. Fess said, that we have no interest in the Philippines from the standpoint of industry, capital, or exploitation, except as it may appear to the advantage of both American and Filipino. "But," he said, "we cannot turn them adrift to face international complications created by domestic affairs, I am frank to say we would rid ourselves of this burden at once if we could do so honorably."\(^{10}\) Mr. Humphrey was not in sympathy with an early withdrawal from the Philippines. He objected primarily to the preamble because of the fact that it was drawn so as to make the Filipinos believe "that we want to give them independence, and to make the American people believe that we do not."

That part of the preamble in which it said:

Whereas it is, as it has always been the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.\(^{11}\)

\(^8\) **Ibid.**, 15838.

\(^9\) **Ibid.**

\(^{10}\) **Ibid.**, 15852.

\(^{11}\) **Ibid.**
"No party except the Democratic Party had ever declared for independence, and since when did the Democratic Party become a majority of the people of the United States," asked Mr. Humphrey. He believed that "only those Filipinos who will govern desire independence, but those that will be governed do not." He also said that the Filipinos will try to remain under our flag when they become sufficiently intelligent to see that wherever the American flag went, it brought only good to the people under it. In complete disagreement with Mr. Humphrey was Mr. Grey who said:

Every man who has enslaved another man has enslaved him under the claim that it was for the benefit of the slave. Every nation that has conquered and subjugated a defenseless people has conquered them under the claim that it was for the benefit of the subjugated. . . .

I believe that liberty and self-government can be better taught by example than by conquest and subjugation.13

To Mr. Humphrey's opinion, Mr. M. Quezon replied, that it would be very foolish to say that the Filipino people do not want independence today and that they would not even desire it in the future when they really become capable of self-government.14

There was not very much opposition to the legislative features of the Jones bill. Even those who were against Philippine independence were in favor of giving the Filipinos a larger measure of self-rule than was allowed in the Jones bill. The Bill passed the House on October 14, 1916. Every

12 Ibid., 16615.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., 16617.
Democrat voted for it and fifteen Republicans voted in favor of it. The total was 212 ayes and 60 nays.\textsuperscript{15}

The bill, however, was not as successful in the Senate. The Shipping bill was the first measure on the program, so only a few days remained for debate on the Philippine bill. Opposition to the preamble which promised complete independence as soon as a stable government was established, was the general attitude of the Senators. The Filipinos, they said, should show faith in the American people who are always just and should not demand any definite promise. If the preamble would have been dropped out, the bill would have passed by the unanimous vote of the Senate.

The defeat of the Jones bill in the Senate in 1915 was a serious disappointment to the Filipinos. President Wilson cabled to Governor General Harrison, assuring the Filipinos that the Jones Bill had been constantly pressed by the administration, loyally supported by the full force of the party, and will be pressed to passage when the next Congress meets in December. It failed only because blocked by the rules of the Senate as employed by the Republican leaders who were opposed to the legislation and who would, yield only if we withdrew the assurance of ultimate independence contained in the preamble. This we would not do. The bill will have my support until it passes, and I have no doubt of its passage at the next session of Congress and of the whole Government of the United States.\textsuperscript{16}

The newspapers both favored and opposed the Jones bill. The \textit{New York World}, warned Congress "against moving precipitately in this matter."\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 16629.


\textsuperscript{17} The \textit{New York World}, quoted in the \textit{Literary Digest}, New York, LII, February 5, 1916, 274.
The New York Evening Post always anti-imperialist, "thinks that the freeing of the Filipinos in the next four years, will be an act more to the praise and glory of the United States than would the winning of twenty naval battles." In favoring the bill the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, said:

Our political missionary work in the islands will have had time to fructify and we can not retain them indefinitely without inviting the imputation of insincerity. No other one thing that the United States can do can lend so much moral strength to the Monroe Doctrine as our withdrawal of American sovereignty from the Philippines.

The Washington Post, generally sound on the larger national questions, opposed the bill forcibly:

No well balanced and well informed American with any regard for the Filipinos would turn them out upon their own resources at this time. The most intelligent Filipinos themselves admit that their people are not up to the task of self-government. Only a small portion of the inhabitants of Luzon are in a par with the people of certain feeble and revolutionary republics, and the others range from the plan type down to naked headhunters. Without any foundation for the erection of self-governing system, if turned loose would present one of the most pathetic failures in history ending inevitably in their absorption by some government that would not and could not administer their affairs with intelligence.

Mr. Jones reintroduced his bill in the House on the opening day of the Sixty-fourth Congress. Shortly after Senator Hitchcock presented the bill S.381 to the Senate. "To declare the purpose of the people of the United


19 The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, quoted in the Literary Digest, February 19, 1916, 424.

20 The Washington Post, quoted in the Congressional Record, 63 Cong., 2 Sess. 1914, 16129.
States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for these islands. 21 There was very little opposition to the legislative features of this bill. "The controversy over the preamble disclosed its sham character. There was already a stable government in the Philippines." 22 In the opinion of many Americans conditions in the Philippines were very satisfactory, there was little or no public discontent. The Filipinos were making splendid progress in the art of self-government, as well as in agricultural, industrial and commercial pursuits. Then, why abandon this policy for a dangerous and uncertain one. The Philippine Assembly at the same time passed the following resolution:

We again reiterate in the name of the Filipino people the national desire and purpose set forth on many former occasions. We wish to assure a stable future for our people. We desire an increase of the elements of our national life and progress. We ask yet more, and for that reason, in reiterating, as we hereby do reiterate our urgent petition for liberty and independence for the people of the Philippine Islands, we the elected representatives of the Filipino people, express our confidence that the efforts of the President of the United States to secure the fulfillment of his promises and the realization of our lawful hopes will obtain early and complete success. 23

The controversy over the preamble gave rise to the question as to what possible interpretation could be given the independence promise which


22 Elliott, The Philippines, 424.

it contained. Senator Stone said that there were at least three different policies prevailing in this country with respect to the Philippines. First, there were those who were unwilling to surrender the islands to the Filipinos. Since the Philippine Islands constituted a part of the territory of the United States, they would furnish a base for operations in the East, where we must extend our commerce and protect American interest. Similar to this view was that maintained by those who said that at some indefinite and remote period the United States should grant independence to the Philippines. Former President Taft was a distinguished exponent of this view. "In his judgment it was out of the question to talk about Philippine independence for many years to come, certainly not during this generation and that it was both idle and vicious to even discuss the question."

Second, there were those who declared that the United States should at once without any reservations or conditions abandon the Philippines and turn them over to the native people, admonishing them to take care of themselves.

Third, there were those who thought that we should grant political independence to the Filipinos, but that we should not run away and leave them at the mercy of any powerful nation. 24

During the discussion of the bill, Senator John D. Works asked if it would not be better to omit the preamble altogether. Senator Kenyon in answering the question, said that if we struck out the preamble it would be in the judgment of the Filipinos an act showing that we did not intend ever

24 Congressional Record, 64th Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, 1141.
to give them their independence. In answering Senator Jones, whether the Filipinos believe that the preamble and the declaration in it is binding upon future Congresses and the people of the United States, he said that the Filipinos understand that it is not binding in any legal sense or in anything except a pledge of honor of the United States and they believe in the honor of the United States. If we intend in the future to give them their independence, it should be stated in a way that there is no question about it. 25

Commissioner Quezon told the Senate Committee that the Filipinos would construe the preamble to mean

that it is the purpose of the United States to grant to the Philippines their independence, not when the Filipinos believe that they are ready for independence . . . but when in the opinion of the Congress we have conducted the government . . . in a way that will justify the reasonable presumption that we shall establish and maintain . . . a government that would keep order and offer protection to the rights of the people. 26

Speaking in favor of the independence bill, Senator Shafroth said, that the Philippine people are exceedingly anxious to have the word "independence" retained in the preamble, that it is more important to the peace and quiet and good government in the Philippine Islands that the preamble should be adopted than that the rest of the bill should be adopted. 27 Senator Poindexter did not have any objection to that portion of the bill which dealt with the internal administration of their government, but he opposed the unsettlement of their international relations and of the tie which bound

25 Congressional Record, 64 Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, 862.
26 Kirk, Philippine Independence, 47.
27 Congressional Record, 64 Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, 862.
them to the United States because that would defeat the purpose and the object of self-government. Akin to this view was held by Senator Simmons who said, that they can not establish a stable government in the Philippines until they are given an opportunity to establish a stable government. For much control and domination was exercised over there and this did not permit them to demonstrate their ability to establish a stable government. Senator Lippitt agreed with Mr. Simmons, that it would be impossible for the Filipino people to demonstrate their ability to establish or to carry on a stable government, so long as the United States continued to exercise its sovereignty over them. Senator Shafroth stressed the fact that the Philippine people do not care for a suzerainty or a protectorate over them by the American Government.

In further discussion on the bill, Senator Shafroth pointed out that it is generally recognized by military men that they are a source of weakness to us because it will be impossible for us to defend them since they are 7,000 miles from our base of supplies. Mr. Poindexter said, that if we maintain a coaling station and naval base in the Philippine Islands, the Americans would have to defend it, because the people would never submit to having it taken away from us by force by a foreign country.

28 Ibid., 1143
29 Ibid., 1149
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32 Ibid., 1153.
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The opinion of the American people on Philippine independence was divided. It seems to be the general conviction of a great number of American people expressed in speeches in Congress and in political campaigns that the permanent domination of the Philippine Islands by the United States is contrary to the spirit of our political institutions, which is based upon the principle that all peoples should enjoy the right of self-government when they choose, assert that right and maintain their own government upon such principles and policies as in their own opinion will best conserve their happiness and promote their progress. Many Americans were in favor of the Philippine independence, because they believed, that since for a number of years Filipinos had occupied all the positions in the local administrations and the vast majority of positions in the central government, they are able to maintain a stable government. Still others urged a withdrawal from the Philippines on the ground that the Philippines are a burden and a menace to the United States. Many admit that the islands are a source of weakness in so far as military operations by land forces are concerned. Since they cannot be protected we should abandon them irrespective of obligations assumed or of consequences to the Filipinos. Retention of the islands was sought to be justified on many grounds. That the Filipinos were not ready for independence is one of them. While some papers cited facts and authorities in support of their belief that the Filipinos were already competent to manage their own

---
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affairs, Taft, cited facts that dire consequences would follow our withdrawal from the islands now or in the near future.

As a proof that our task of educating the Filipinos is still far from finished, Mr. Taft points out that at present, under liberal franchise privileges, only about 3 per cent of the people are said to read the public press. Freed from American control, the integrating forces of a common education a common language will cease and the educational system now well started will slip back into inefficiency and disorder.35

There were a few Americans who from selfish and interested motives favored the permanent retention of the Philippines. Those, for instance, who enjoyed a monopoly of trade in certain Philippine products, such as manila hemp or American office-holders did not favor the withdrawal of American sovereignty over the islands. The permanent retention of the Philippines involved the maintenance of larger military and naval establishments than would otherwise be necessary and that means, quicker promotions in the Army and Navy, opposition to granting the Philippines their independence also came from those quarters.36 Many Americans felt, that even from the humanitarian standpoint, the only thing that the United States could do with honor was to continue its attitude toward the Philippines. Not until the children of the islands, who were being taught high standards have grown to their majority would it be safe to give the Filipinos independence. But powerful American economic interest, particularly the producers of sugar, cottonseed oil, and other commodities that feared the growing competition of duty free Philippine

35 Literary Digest, XLV, December 2, 1912, 1163.
36 Congressional Record, 63 Cong., 2 Sess., 1914, 15834.
products, were making serious efforts to secure the early political and eco-
nomic separation of the Islands from the United States. This group was
indifferent as to the welfare of the Filipinos or the obligations of the
United States.
CHAPTER III

CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDE ON THE CLARKE AMENDMENT

During the discussion of the Jones Bill, Senator Clarke of Arkansas introduced an amendment which provided that independence would be granted to the Filipinos in not less than two nor more than four years after the enactment of the bill.

In opposition to this bill Senator Colt said that we were not giving the Filipino people sufficient time in two or four years to work out this problem. Senator Borah agreed with Mr. Colt and said, that no people have ever acquired the capacity for self-government except through decades and centuries of the most grievous experience. Referring to the Filipinos he said that they have not the slightest conception of the duties, the sacrifices, and the obligations of free government. It is injustice to the Filipinos to make them believe that they are or that they soon will be fit for self-government.\(^1\)

Senator Borah regarded the legislation unwise, but in his opinion it foreshadowed ultimately what the United States was going to do and that is, give the Filipinos their independence within a time in which they would not

\(^1\) Congressional Record, 64 Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, 1437.
be prepared for self-government. Since the Philippine question was always a political question, and will be a political question, and because he saw no hope of really teaching the Filipinos self-government without a hundred years of occupation and because the Democratic party has definitely promised withdrawal, Senator Borah decided to vote for the Clarke amendment and give the islands their independence promptly. "I voted because I did not believe that they would ever be fitted for citizenship, I thought it was a menace to the republic." For the rest he believes that "they are a liability. They are a liability not only by reason of foreign complication, they are a liability because they readjust and restort and demoralize our whole conception of a republic." Senator Vardaman agreed with Senator Borah and said, "We have enough of the black virus in the body politic already to threaten the nation with mongrelization."

Senator Thomas observed that it was impossible for one people to educate another people to its standard of efficiency either in self-government or in any other sort of government. They may transmit many of their experiences and they may make a profound impression upon the governmental theories of the subject people, but the spirit of nationality is one which embraces and which is inseparable from those ideas of government which are peculiar to it and which have been evolved either through stages of barbarism.

---
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or civilization, or both into the standard which appeals to it, and which is also best and most adaptable to its needs. 6 He stated further, that no nation has any right or can fully and justly acquire any right to pass judgment upon the capacity of any other nation for self-government. "It is none of our business whether the people of the Philippines are capacitated for self-government or not and if we assume to judge, that judgment when tested by experience may prove to be worthless and erroneous. . . . One of the greatest Senators, Mr. Toombs of Georgia said,

Liberty and freedom are the virtues of those who have acquired and fought for them without ceasing, and no action can long retain them which is not at all times ready to die for them. 7

Senator Vardaman in favoring the Clarke Amendment said,

It's a God given right of the Filipino to govern himself as his best judgment may dictate and his interests demand. . . . A thousand years would not qualify the Filipino for self-government as we have it in America. . . . They are capable of maintaining a government good enough for themselves and that is what Congress is primarily interested in now. 8

On January 25, 1916, Mr. Stone submitted the following amendment to the Clarke amendment:

Immediately upon the passage of the act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located in the form of the treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence

6 Ibid., 1447.
7 Ibid., 1449.
8 Ibid., 1500.
of the said Philippines, and also to naturally obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily not to any greater extent than another, to maintain the political integrity and independence of the islands. 9

In the opinion of Senator McCumber of North Dakota the amendment had three defects. "First in the matter of securing a guaranty, second in the time of securing a guaranty third, in the five-year limitations of our interest over the islands." 10 He stated further that it would be far more easy for us to get an agreement of those nations that they would not interfere with the independence of the Philippine Islands rather than ask other nations to protect the independence of the Philippine Islands. For this reason he submitted the following amendment for the Clarke Amendment.

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to indicate to the great powers of the world the desire of this Government to extend to the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people full and complete independence will be respected by the others of the world. The President is further authorized and requested to secure from such other powers such agreements as will insure the independence of said islands, and when such agreements have been made he shall forthwith direct a convention to be held in such islands for the purpose of adopting a constitution providing for a republican form of government, as soon as such a constitution has been adopted and officers have been elected and a government inaugurated he shall, by proclamation, declare such islands and the people thereof to be a free and independent state, with all the powers of complete sovereignty. 11

Senator Shafroth objected to this amendment because it made our conduct depended upon the action of some foreign country. 12

---
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When the Senate resumed the consideration of the Clarke amendment and Senator Norris opposed it because it provided that we should retain coaling stations and naval bases after we leave the islands. "We ought to go out without any strings tied to our departure if we do not want to retain the Philippine Islands." But in his opinion we should not get out of the Philippines until we can do so with honor and credit, without any harm to the Filipino people or to our own people. In another part of his discussion Senator Norris said:

I do not believe that we have any right to govern the Philippine people without their consent. I do not believe it is right to the Filipinos to try to make them citizens of the United States and I am not in favor of keeping forever any people under our subjection unless they can at some time be made citizens free and equal with the rest of us. On the other hand, the Philippine people have a history of their own. They are a different race from us, the things that we perhaps think ought to be done by the Government they might not agree with.

Senator Newlands inquired about the phrase, "republican in form," which was as follows:

We shall, however, before completing the final steps of this withdrawal require of the Filipinos, the establishment of a stable government, republican in form, and based upon the consent of the people, duly ascertained at an election called by act of the legislature approved by the President.

We have a right to require the establishment of a stable government based upon the consent of the people but why should we require that it should be republican in form, asked Senator Newlands. "A Republic is

13 Ibid., 1793.
14 Ibid., 1795.
the highest achievement of civilization, possible only with a people of
the highest intelligence, poise and self-control." The Filipinos will make
an experiment in a republican form of government but will fail because the
people of the Orient are not accustomed to a republican form of government.
"The Filipinos are still wedded to the old cacique system of head men,
caciques, the patrons of those dependent upon them, who are ruled both
governmentally and economically; and it will take a long time for them to
evolve from that system." Would the Senator object to the elimination of
the words "republican in form?" 16

Senator Hitchcock in answering the question asked by Senator
Newlands, explained that the reason for inserting the expression "repub-
lican form of government" was that we are responsible for whatever govern-
ment is set up there. When the Philippine people undertook to establish a
government of their own they attempted to create a Republic. He further
explained that the courts of the United States have on several occasions
defined what a republican form of government was. They have indicated that
that was a political expression and that there was a latitude for selecting
the form of government, providing it was in effect the rule of the people. 17

Senator Shafrroth also mentioned that the Filipino people were
satisfied with the Clarke amendment because the Philippine Assembly imme-
diately and unanimously passed a resolution which was cabled that same day
to Washington and personally handed to Senator Clarke by Commissioner Quezon.

16 Ibid.
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The resolution read as follows:

Whereas the Clarke Amendment to the Philippine Bill now pending before the Senate of the United States specifies the conditions under which independence shall be granted to the people of the Philippine Islands, expedites the granting of that independence, and safeguards the internal affairs of the said Islands pending the granting of said independence.

Whereas, said amendment makes the independence provision of preamble more clear, explicit, unequivocal and expeditious and fixes the responsibilities which the people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands shall respectively assume before, and after the granting of said independence.

Therefore, resolved that the Philippine Assembly should recommend as it does hereby respectfully recommended the passage of said amendment by the Congress and the President of the United States.18

Senator Kenyon of Iowa made a move as an amendment that all of that part of the Clarke amendment commencing with the word "immediately" be stricken from the amendment. Mr. Kenyon's amendment to the amendment of Mr. Clarke was agreed to yeas 53, nays 31.19

On February 2, 1916, by the deciding vote of Vice President Marshall, the Clarke amendment was adopted in favor of complete independence within not less than two nor more than four years. On the Clarke amendment the yeas were 41 and the nays 41.20 The final vote on the bill as amended was taken on February 4, 1916, 52 ayes and 24 nays. The Democrats solidly voted for it while six Republicans joined with them.21

19 Congressional Record, 64 Cong., 1 Sess. 1916, 1997.
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The Clarke amendment called forth the severe criticism of ex-secretary Garrison at the time of his resignation from the Cabinet. He called it an abandonment of the duty of the nation and a breach of trust toward the Filipinos. President Wilson replied that in his own judgment "the action embodied in the Clarke amendment to the bill extending further self-government to the Philippines is unwise at this time, but that he would have to withhold his judgment until the conference and action by both houses of Congress had given final form of proposal." The President made it clear that he does not favor the Clarke amendment. This was probably due to the attitude of the citizens which was clearly indicated in the newspapers. The Democratic New York World briefly stated:

Both of the great parties have pledged the American people to Philippine independence. It is desirable to keep this promise and aspiration steadily before the people of the United States and of the islands, but definite action may well await greater harmony of opinion on the subject.

The Boston Transcript for instance accuses the Senate Democrats of taking part in a day's work of dishonor to the nation which we fail to find a parallel in the history of a self-respecting people. Only six Republican Senators voted with the Democrats to help pass the Clarke Amendment, and those were all members of the "progressive group."

Cardinal Gibbons vigorously objected to the Clarke amendment on the ground that the Philippine problem is in no sense a partisan question, but belongs to the whole American people. He declared that he is "opposed to any proposal that would commit this Nation to a scuttle policy in the Philippine

23 Democratic New York World, quoted in the Literary Digest, February 8, 1916, 424.
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Islands... I say this wholly in the interest of the social, material and moral advancement of the people of the United States." He maintained that since the people of one island had little or no relation with the people of another island they were not consulted regarding their independence. But even if a large number of Filipinos desired independence, they were utterly unprepared to shoulder the responsibility which independence would place upon them. A serious injustice would be done to many Americans who have invested their money in developing the resources of those islands if the United States withdrew from the Islands. "For the United States to reverse its repeatedly declared policy with respect to those islands would be a dishonorable act." A year later Irish Americans in Manila held a St. Patrick's Day banquet to promote Irish freedom, Manuel Quezon called on for a speech said briefly and bitterly, "We Filipinos wish for your Irishmen the same independence you wished for us."27

When the Jones Bill with the Clarke amendment reached the House of Representatives it encountered vigorous opposition not only from the Republicans but from many Democrats. Mr. Jones reported the bill to the House and explained that the purpose of the bill was to give the Filipino people a more liberal and autonomous government and that the enactment of a new organic law by Congress is a necessity. "It is stated in the view of the minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs that—

26 Ibid.
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The minority entirely agree with the majority that the Philippines should be given a new fundamental law, granting to the people a large measure of self government. 28

The necessity of a new organic law was not questioned by anyone, but there were many arguments advanced by the imperialists against granting Philippine independence. One is that the Filipinos themselves do not desire it. "It may be true that there are a few Filipinos who are willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, but there is no Democratic Party in the Philippines," said Mr. Jones. 29 Mr. Towner pointed out that only a few months ago Mr. Quezon said that what they wanted was their independence with an American protectorate. The New York Evening Post, which was very strongly in favor of Philippine Independence, quoted Mr. Quezon as saying:

I have found after talking with both politicians and those men in the Philippines that they consider a United States protectorate as a more efficient guaranty of the integrity of the Philippines and less liable to produce friction which might result in the absorption of the Philippines by other nations. Speaker Osmena believes with me. 30

This Mr. Quezon denied, but Mr. Towner stated that instances could be multiplied to show that the people of the islands who want independence desire that the United States shall guarantee their independence until they can take care of themselves. The Democratic Party of the Philippine assembled to select delegates to the forthcoming Democratic national convention. They adopted a resolution which declared:

28 Congressional Record, 64 Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, 7146.
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We denounce and repudiate as un-American, un-Democratic or cruelly unjust to the Filipino people any policy which would cast the people adrift in the dangerous sea of international politics without adequate financial resources and no protection or guaranty of their national integrity.\textsuperscript{31}

The greatest objection to keeping the Philippines was that since the islands are 8,000 miles away they are a great menace to the United States. They are so situated that they can be an easy prey to any country. It would cost millions of dollars to regain them if they were taken, and every red-blooded American would fight to hold them. Mr. Towner observed that to release the islands for fear that we might not be able to defend them would be to abdicate our position as one of the great nations of the world. It would be a confession of weakness.\textsuperscript{32} Mr. Fitzgerald made it clear that he definitely opposed the Clarke amendment.

In my opinion it is a plain violation of the pledges made by the Democratic Party in its national platform, it is inconsistent with action taken by the Democratic House in the last Congress, it is contrary to the position upon which I made my campaign for Congress in the congressional election for 1914 and it has not the approval of the great mass of the people.\textsuperscript{33}

When the vote was taken in the House of Representatives, a large group of Democratic members headed by Congressman Fitzgerald of New York voted with the solid Republican membership against the Clarke amendment which was thereby defeated. After this amendment had been stricken out of the bill, this measure was passed without a record vote either in the Senate or in the

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 7152.
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House. The Jones Bill was approved by President Wilson on Aug. 29, 1916.

During these months of debate in Congress, there was great excitement in the Philippines. A few of the richer Filipinos were frightened at the prospect of the sudden independence believing that independence would bring disaster upon the rich. But some Filipinos were willing to lose everything in order to gain independence. Manuel Roxas, a noted millionaire said, "I don't believe it, but if it did, I would be ready to sacrifice my last centavo for the freedom of my country." 34

The passage of the Jones Bill caused great joy in Manila. The Filipinos believed that the United States would carry out the promise of ultimate independence. During the war the Filipinos did not discuss the question of independence. That made some people feel that the Filipinos were satisfied with the government of the United States and do not want any change. In a statement issued to the press Mr. M. Quezon expressed himself as follows:

He flies in the face of history who ignores the fact that no people ever stop or even hesitate in the middle of the road, once they begin to struggle for their liberty. Every advance made is an encouragement to take further and faster steps.

Beginning from today we shall use this legislation to remind the American people that they have promised us independence and when the government provided for in the act is established we shall run that government in a way that will show the world that we are in fact a nation, capable of fulfilling our obligations to ourselves and other peoples, and fully competent to live an independent life . . . 35

Of the far-reaching effects of the measure, Senor Palma wrote:

35 Literary Digest, LII September 2, 1916, 545.
The independence of the Filipinos under the conditions proposed in the Jones Bill represents a notable progress, the scope and results of which in the sphere of international politics may not even be understood or appreciated today in the United States. It signifies not only an act of reparation, an abandonment of the imperialist doctrine which constitutes the profession of faith of the great powers, but also the adoption of a new dogma that implies the renunciation of acquired rights, where these rights are not founded upon morality and justice. It signifies, moreover, the noble and loyal fulfillment of all the engagements implied in the voluntary acceptance of a trusteeship for the well being of the Filipinos, and the inauguration of a new method for the peaceful and legal solution of the question of one peoples dependence upon another. It furthermore signifies the reaffirmation of the principle announced in the Declaration of Independence that peoples should always be governed by their own consent, never without their consent.36

The authority for the Philippine government was derived from the Constitution of the United States, acting through the President and Congress.37

It is an American type of government based upon the separation of the executive, legislative and judicial powers. Although the Jones Act turned the legislative branch of the government almost completely over to the Filipinos, it gave very broad powers to the Governor-General, which strengthened the American control over the executive branch in order to prevent the Filipinos from obtaining more self-government than Congress had given them in the law itself. "The much heralded autonomy act in accordance with the ordinary American canons of constitutional interpretation would have reduced rather than increased the control over their own affairs."38 Section 21 of

the Jones Act provides "that the supreme executive power shall be vested in an executive officer, whose official title shall be "The Governor General of the Philippine Islands". The law also provides "that the heads of the executive departments shall be appointed and removed by the Governor-General and that all executive functions of the government must be directly under the Governor-General or within one of the executive departments under its supervision and control of Governor-General".

For the first time in the American administration the Governor General had the veto power to protect American sovereignty and foreign rights. Should both houses of the legislature by a two thirds majority of the members pass a bill over the veto, it then went to the president whose approval or veto was final. According to the organic act, the Governor-General could veto the following bills:

1. Those bills which were manifestly unconstitutional,
2. Those which were in violation of any treaty of the United States with other nations,
3. Those which discriminate against the citizens or subjects of other nations,
4. Those which attempt to challenge or diminish American sovereignty over the Islands.

The Vice Governor was at the head of the Department of Public Instruction, which included the Bureau of Education and Health. These bureaus
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were under the control of the Presidential appointee in order to prevent the subversion of American sovereignty and the impairment of foreign rights for which the United States was responsible.44

The Jones bill, however, was applied entirely in the spirit and purpose of the preamble. The purpose of the act was to give to the Filipinos as large a control of their affairs as can be given to them without impairing the rights of sovereignty of the United States. This was an important step in the development of Filipino autonomy. Speaker Sergio Osmeña, in accepting the Jones bill said, "we can look upon the American flag not as the symbol of an imposed government, but as the emblem of a nation whose temporary guidance over the Filipino people will serve as an instrumentality of an independent life".45 In explaining the nature of the Jones Act, Senator Osmeña said, 

... the government established here is not a government for Americans but for Filipinos founded on our own civilization not a government of foreigners inspired by foreign ideals but a government of Filipinos inspired by their own culture and with the best interests of their country in view.

Our system of government is ours, truly ours, the product of our policies and of the progressive evolution of the institutions of our country the natural outgrowth of our achievements in self-government.46

With the final passage of the Jones bill, which regulated the political and economic life between the United States and the Philippine Islands, a new kind of friendship had developed. The Filipinos no longer doubted or

44 The State Constitutions, 1604.
distrusted the noble intentions of the American nation. They believed that the Americans were willing to respect the rights and privileges of those of another race just as the Americans themselves demanded in the past, that their own rights and privileges would be respected.
CHAPTER IV

AMERICAN ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE PHILIPPINE

In general, trade and commerce motivated to a large extent the Philippine acquisition, consequently, the commercial policy of the American Government in the Philippine Islands as expressed in the laws enacted by Congress was tended to improve the general prosperity of the Filipino people. The increase in the general purchasing power of the Filipino people would not only be profitable to the Americans who would settle in the Islands, but also to those who would be engaged in trade and commerce there.

Shortly after the acquisition of the Philippine Islands, certain American interests began to fear the possibility of being harmed by the competition of Philippine products. The protected industries opposed concessions to foreign goods in the home market and they also opposed the export of industries to increase their markets abroad. Many influential leaders of the Democratic Party believed that it was not only unconstitutional to impose an export tax on some of the most important Philippine exports, but that it was without doubt unfair to enact a law allowing the unlimited free entry of American products into the Philippines while denying the same privilege to the products of the Islands imported into the United States. For this reason a provision was inserted in the general tariff bill H.R.3321, which allowed
unlimited free entry of rice, sugar and tobacco from the Philippines into the United States. All manufactured tobacco, such as cigars and cigarettes, which did not contain foreign material to the value of more than twenty percent, was also to be admitted free of custom duty.

In the course of the debate that followed Representative, Mr. Luther of New York opposed the provision granting the unlimited free entry of Philippine cigars and tobacco into the United States. He said, "There is a vast army of men employed in the production of these articles in the United States, and it is unfair and unjust to compel those workers to submit to the unlimited competition of the Malayas in the Philippine Islands." He denounced the Democratic party for yielding to the influences of the Sugar Trust and the refiners, who were trying to destroy the best sugar industry by admitting free the product of the half civilized labor of Java and other countries which buy nothing from us in return.

Mr. Frederick M. Gillett of Massachusetts was also against this provision but in order to treat the Philippines fairly, he offered an amendment to retain the existing annual quota, which was in the Payne bill, of limiting the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands to 150,000,000 in order to protect our cigar manufacturers and not build up in the Philippine Islands a great industry for the manufacture of cheap cigars. He also pointed out that in the Connecticut Valley are grown the best wrappers in the world and that the best cigars are manufactured there and that the manufacturers of any

district oppose the Democratic proposition of unlimited free entry of Philippine cigars and tobacco.²

Mr. Frederick A. Britten of Illinois, one of the strongest defenders of the home tobacco industry was also opposed to the passage of the bill. To his mind, the passage of the bill would "impose a severe hardship against cigar manufacturers of this country". He proved his statement with the petition of the Cigar Maker's Union of Chicago signed by 15,000 members. The purpose of the petition was to object the free and unlimited importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands.³

Mr. Richard Bartholdt asked whether there was anything in this provision which would restrain the American Tobacco Trust from going to the Philippine Islands, manufacture all the cigars there and thereby deprive the cigar manufacturers of United States of their business. To this Mr. Britten, replied that there was nothing in this provision that would prevent the American Trust from extending its business in the Philippines and what happened in Puerto Rico, where the American Tobacco Company now controls 80 per cent of the cigar manufacturing and the leaf-tobacco industry of the islands, would also happen in the Philippines should Congress allow the unlimited free entry of Philippine cigars and tobacco into the United States. The Filipinos labored in the islands at 30 cents a day and in the United States from $2.00

² Ibid., 1328.
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to $6.00 a day. In Mr. Britten's opinion these comparatively low wages which existed there would be an incentive to erect a cheap hut in which to house that common labor in the Philippine Islands and thereby wipe out our industry out of business.4

Mr. Frank B. Willis of Ohio, another defender of the home tobacco industry, emphasized the fact that organized labor was opposed to the proposed legislation. To prove that they vigorously protested against it, he submitted the petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America which was as follows:

Legislative Committee
Ch. Makers' International Union of Am.
Washington, D.C. May 3, 1913

Hon. Frank B. Willis,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir, We beg leave to submit a few facts why the importation of duty from the Philippine Islands should be limited to 75,000,000 annually, and no more. Page 196 of the tariff bill provides for unlimited free trade with the product of Asiatic and Mongolian labor.

Yours very respectfully,
A. Strasser
Chairman

The Philippine side of the question was ably presented by Mr. Underwood of Alabama, who pointed out that nothing but selfish interests prompted
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the American business men to support the amendment.

When you consider that in all of this tariff bill, nearly every man that has been concerned in business in the United States had had his duties reduced from the present law, except these tobacco manufacturers, and that they still have a differential the difference between 35 cents a pound filler tobacco and $1.85 on wrapper tobacco, that builds up their business in the United States. It was a fair revenue basis and the committee left it alone, they should not come here, contending that these dependent people of ours in the Philippine Islands, who under the law, are compelled to give us free trade with the Philippine Islands, should be deprived of a reciprocal market in the United States.

The present law allows the importation of one hundred and fifty million of cigars into the United States free of duty today. The tobacco industry in the Philippine Islands is no new industry. It has existed for many years. It is already developed and they have had four years under the existing law to bring in 150,000,000, of cigars, the total imports for the last year amounted to 63,852,000.6

In answering Mr. William F. Murray's question as to whether the existing limitation of 150,000,000 could not be retained since only 63,000,000 cigars were imported Mr. Underwood explained,

We may leave the limit where it is, but we would leave it where it is to the shame of every American citizen. We could not honestly face these dependent people who give us free trade in their market if we close our doors to the only imports that they might possibly send here. . . . No man who understands the honor and integrity of his own country is going to attempt to make a one-sided contract of that kind with a dependent people. . . . No true born American citizen who faces this question fairly and squarely and understands the situation, will consent to it.7

In Mr. Murray's opinion it was very unfortunate to be characterized as un-American, since they have the right to stand up for the interests

6 Ibid., 1329.
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of the people they represent. He agreed that since the limit of 150,000,000 had not been reached, it is a good idea to leave it as it is, but when the Filipinos make a reasonable complaint, that trade relations with the United States are unfair it will be time enough to consider the proposition of removing that limitation of 150,000,000 cigars. When the vote on Mr. Gillett's amendment to return the existing annual quota regarding Philippine cigars imported into the United States was taken, the result was ayes 103, nayes 177.

Mr. Fordney of Michigan, offered an amendment to the Underwood-Simmons bill by retaining the provisions in the Philippine section of the Payne-Aldrich Act. This section provided that sugar, whether refined or unrefined, and tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, imported into the Philippines from foreign countries should be subject to the same rates of import duty imposed upon them by the tariff laws of the United States. The continuance of free importation of Manila hemp into the United States was also provided. Other articles, the growth, product or manufacture of the Philippines shipped directly into the United States were to be admitted free of duty with the limitations of 300,000 tons of sugar and 150,000,000 cigars from the Islands. In the course of the debate occasioned by the introduc-
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tion of the above-noted amendment Mr. Mondell of Wyoming in favor of this amendment, pointed out that the purpose of the Democratic party was to grant to the Filipinos complete independence at an early date, yet at their national convention they proposed to establish conditions under which it will be less desirable to those people to leave us, conditions under which an increased number of those people shall desire to remain bound to us and conditions under which, if separation shall come the industries of the islands shall be thrown into infinitely greater confusion than they would otherwise be.  

Mr. Mondell further explained that by the Philippine section of the Underwood bill, the Tobacco Trust and the Sugar Trust would greatly benefit because they would have the privilege of doing business in the Islands on the basis of the high wages paid here.

Mr. Forney's amendment was defeated and the original bill H. R. 3321 passed the House of Representatives. On May 12, 1913 it was referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

The debate in the Senate regarding the proposed measure was begun by Senator Newlands of Nevada who objected to the complete free trade between the United States and the Philippines. He pointed out the mistakes Congress made in enacting laws which determined the American economic policy in the Philippines. "As a result of successive legislation," he said, "we allowed the Filipinos to import into this country 200,000 tons of sugar duty free and the bill under debate proposes to allow them to import without any limitation whatever." Since the Democratic party proposed to dispose of the
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Philippine Islands, our duty was to assure the Filipinos of an independent existence, with their entire economic and governmental system separated from our own, so that when they gained their political independence, they could also start an independent economic life. Instead, he continued, "the Philippine Islands will then drift into their individual life, compelled to compete not under favored laws with this country but with the entire world—a competition which they were not able to bear before their annexation to this country." 12

Senator Joseph E. Ransdell an ardent defender of the tobacco and sugar growers, commented on the recent strictures of the President about lobbies. In his mind there was nothing improper about the activities of the sugar lobbyists, but if there has been something corrupt, as trying to influence legislation by illicit means, they should be severely punished. "Yet," he said, "I recognize the sacred right of citizens to petition the lawmakers, to make their views known and to urge in respectful arguments their ideas of proposed legislation affecting their interests." He also explained that although there was nothing wrong in the conduct of the sugar producers, nevertheless, they have done much to mold the public opinion favorable to free sugar in order to increase their selfish profits. The adoption of the provision regarding free entry of sugar would destroy the production of cane in Louisiana and enable the American Sugar Trust and other American refiners to gain control of the market, and the price of sugar. "The Government would lose $52,000,000 a year in revenue and the people would get no cheaper sugar,

12 Ibid., 1602.
except for the few years necessary to ruin the domestic producers, after which the trust and the other refiners would pocket immense profits.  

In voicing the interest of the domestic sugar industry, Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, stressed the fact, that our total trade with the Philippines was $42,000,000 and with sugar on the free list, the annual revenue derived from sugar is lost. Should this bill become a law, it would benefit only three great refineries, and in a few years destroy a great beet-sugar industry which is very valuable to the agricultural interests of the whole country and it would also damage a great and growing trade with the islands that are willing to trade with us. In his opinion, "it is not only cruel to the industries involved, but economically it is the most indefensible action that can possibly be taken in any revenue bill."  

The Boston Central Labor Union, recognizing the danger to its members in the unlimited competition of cheap cigars, were very active in their protests and appealed to Senator Lodge, who offered an amendment to the bill under discussion, to retain the annual quota of 150,000,000 cigars exported from the Islands to the United States. The International Cigar Makers' Union, together with all the local unions in the principal manufacturing cities of Illinois, likewise protested against the unlimited free entry of Philippine cigars. These organizations were greatly concerned about the pending bill, and gathered together a number of tables showing the actual  
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earnings of cigar makers in the United States, also their living expenses as compared with those in the islands, all of which were greatly inferior to the conditions in this country. In behalf of these cigar makers, both Senator John D. Works of California and Senator Lawrence B. Sherman of Illinois, strongly urged the adoption of Senator Lodge's amendment. But his amendment was rejected.16

In the course of the discussion that followed, Senator Lodge, defending the cordage interests of Massachusetts offered to amend the Philippine section of this bill, and insisted on the removal of the phrase "under a through bill of lading," Senator Lodge explained the words "that shall be conditioned upon the direct shipment thereof under a through bill of lading from the country of origin to the country of destination," were inserted in the Payne-Aldrich bill of 1909. The hemp industry was really transferred from London to New York. Should the phrase be inserted in the Philippine section of the bill it would "enable hemp to go through London, and that would undo all that has been done in that direction."17

Regarding the labor question, Senator Boies Penrose of Pennsylvania, pointed out that they were misled in their feelings of generosity toward the Filipinos. The Philippine tobacco industry "is in the course of being exploited on a gigantic scale by American and British capital . . . the benefit of unrestricted free trade will not go to the building up of the general prosperity of the Philippine Islands. It will go into the pockets of these
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capitalists." He explained further, that labor in the islands was not Filipino, but for the most part Chinese and Japanese which has brought about a competition which is destructive of American industry and unjust to the wage earners in the United States. In his opinion this was a great inconsistency because we exclude oriental labor from the United States and yet admit freely the products of that labor. He could not see why we give preference to the Chinese, Japanese and Malays, instead of the Americans. "Our cigar-manufacturing industry in this country is an old-established, extensively distributed and flourishing industry. . . . On the other hand in the Philippine Islands, industry is as yet an incipient project to exploit the oriental labor of those islands by means of large capital that is controlled by a very few men." 18

Mr. Penrose also impressed the Senators with the fact, that it is not a good policy to encourage factory industry in the Philippines. It would be better for the Filipinos to divert their attention to the cultivation of the soil and the development of the natural resources instead of working in factories, long hours under unsanitary conditions and low wages.

In view of the great difference in wages between those prevailing in the United States and those in the Philippines, Senator Penrose offered an amendment regarding the importation of tobacco from the Philippines. However this amendment was defeated by a vote of 36 to 43. 19

On October 3, 1913, the provision to the general tariff bill H. R. 3321 was adopted, the quota limitation upon Philippine products entering
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the United States were repealed, with the exception of the proviso regarding the twenty per cent foreign-material content of manufactured products of the Islands imported into the United States. President Wilson approved it on October 3, 1913, and it became a part of the general tariff law.

The Underwood-Simmons Act removed the quotas imposed by the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 because the quotas imposed on the Philippine products had never been reached. The Act of October 3, 1913 also provided that hemp and copra from the Philippines should be admitted duty free and that from May 1, 1916 all raw sugar would be admitted on the same basis on sugar from all other foreign countries. To the minds of the Filipinos this law removed practically the last advantage possessed by the Philippine Islands in supplying its chief products to the United States and put the Islands on almost an equal basis with foreign countries. They believed that such an act would severely injure the interests and economic future of their country. They considered this unfair and not in harmony with the "traditional justice and generous character of the American people."20

In view of this legislation the Manila Merchants' Association submitted a petition to the President and the Congress of the United States. In it they asked Congress to modify the present tariff law of the United States by restoring the duty on sugar and other articles that are produced in the Philippines or that they are adopted successfully to produce as will serve as an incentive to the development of industry here, the growth of commerce and the
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economic rejuvenation of the Filipino people. . . . Were there a moderate duty in that country on such articles as copra, coffee, fibers, rubber, raw silk, sugar, tea, tobacco etc., the effect would naturally be to attract capital to these industries in the Philippine Islands for other things being equal, it would be more profitable to produce them here to supply the American demand then in countries not having free access to the markets there. At the same time increased production in these islands would mean enlarged purchasing power for the Philippine people which would necessarily be reflected in a corresponding increased trade for the United States and this would serve to reduce in equal measure the balance against the United States in its trade with other tropical or semitropical countries.21

On February 14, 1916, a bill H. R. 11471 to amend an act entitled, "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government and for other purposes" was introduced in the House of Representatives.22

Mr. Collier explained that this bill repeals the free-sugar provisions of paragraphs 177-178 of the Underwood-Simmons Act of 1913. While conditions were normal, under the Underwood Tariff Act, there was sufficient revenue to take care of the expenses of the Federal Government and still permit sugar to go upon the free list in 1916. He also pointed out that when the Underwood Act had a fair trial just before the First World War, from January 1 1914 to August 1, 1914, this bill produced $17,426,008.90 more than the Payne-Aldrich Act for the same period of time. This proves, he said, that the Underwood Act was not a failure as a revenue producing measure, as the Republican Members have repeatedly attacked it, in order to discredit it and the Democratic party. But as a result of changed conditions in the world, there
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was a necessity for retaining the present duties. 23

Mr. Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, spoke sarcastically of the Democratic stand on this measure. "I am glad that the Democracy has experienced a change of heart, I rejoice that a great light has burst upon them. I welcome you, my friends of the Democracy, to at least limited membership in the Republican Party. I rejoice that at last you are with us in our efforts to maintain American industry." 24

Mr. Keating said that he would vote as a Democrat should vote, that is against the passage of the bill, because he believed that it might properly be entitled, "A bill to authorize the addition of a cent a pound to the retail price of sugar with authority to divide the proceeds fifty-fifty between the United States Treasury and the Sugar Trust." Mr. Keating also objected to the passage of the bill because he represented the State of Colorado, one of the greatest sugar producing states in the Union and promised the people that he would vote to take the tariff off sugar. He admitted that the National Treasury needed money but this did not justify the retention of the tariff on sugar because there were other ways by which the money could be secured without the violation of a platform pledge and without placing an unreasonable burden on the masses of the people. Since the "war disturbed our fiscal affairs" he said, "therefore we would be justified in compelling those
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who profit from the war to reimburse us for our loss of revenue." 25

During the debate, Mr. Kearns reasoned that the great sugar industry and other branches of American industry and labor are entitled to protection in order to meet the competition brought about by foreign cheap labor. He also pointed out that since the Democrats agree to this amendment, proves an acknowledgment of the soundness of the protective system of government which has been championed by the Republican Party. 26 When the Senate proceeded to consider the bill H. R. 11471 the Committee on Finance reported it with the following amendment:

That the third proviso of paragraph 177 of the act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government and for other purposes," approved Oct. 3, 1913, he, and is hereby amended to read as follows:

Provided further, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1920, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

Sec. 2, That the proviso of paragraph 178 of the aforesaid Act be, and is, hereby amended to read as follows: Provided that after the 1st day of May, 1920, the articles hereintofo re enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty. 27

In explaining the nature of the amendment, Mr. Simmons said, that the difference between the amendment passed by the House and the Senate was this, that the House repealed the free sugar proviso and placed sugar upon the dutiable list without any limitation as to time. The Senate committee amendment extended the time when sugar would cease to be dutiable and would become

25 Ibid., 4162.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid., 5775.
free four years later. The purpose of the Senate committee was to retain the principle enunciated in the original act in favor of free sugar.

So on the question of a protective tariff the two great political parties gradually got together. The discussion in Congress with reference to the taxing or untaxing of sugar has been largely influenced by the financial condition of the Treasury and the need of the Government for revenue. In view of the situation that confronted the United States, many believed that any party would be justified in reversing almost any position it had previously taken in order to put an adequate sum in the Treasury of the country. Since the President demanded a larger Army and Navy, Congress decided to give it to him, by making necessary an increase in our revenues. Regardless of party platforms the proposed measure was successfully piloted through both houses and was ultimately passed with a substantial majority. This bill was approved by President Wilson, April 27, 1916.

Filipino politicians, Manuel Quezon, Sergio Osmeña and the Philippine Assembly as a whole vigorously protested against the change to free trade. They feared that it would lead to a reduction in revenue derived from custom duties, about two million dollars, and that it would strengthen their economic ties with the United States if their products should become increasingly dependent on the American market, they would find it more and more difficult to achieve political independence. They, however, did not realize how this free trade policy would benefit their people. Mr. C. Forbes stated that "the result of this enlightened measure exceeded even the fondest hopes of the most sanguine of its supporters. Trade between the Islands and
the States increased by leaps and bounds. 28 Millions of dollars were in-
vested, and millions of Filipinos got jobs in such export industries as sugar,
coconut oil, nickel, cigars, and rope. Small industries like embroidery and
pearl buttons were just as dependent as sugar on the United States.

On the other hand, Filipino leaders opposed any tariff restrictions
on the ground that as long as American goods entered the Philippines freely,
restrictions upon Philippine goods entering the United States would be unjust.
They denied, however, that their desire to retain free trade means that they
have surrendered their desire for independence. They simply did not wish to
be discriminated against as long as they remained under the American flag.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

An attempt has been made in the preceding chapters to present the Philippine problem of independence from the American and the Filipino point of view. In conclusion attention is given to the progress which has been made in the Island, from 1913 to 1921. An analysis of the work of the period reveals that the United States has notably improved the conditions of the Filipinos and prepared them for independence.

Governor-General Harrison, a firm believer in liberty, came to the islands inspired by the highest of motives, as he said on one occasion that "he was here to serve the Philippines and believed that he could serve the flag and his government better by serving the interests and the aspirations of the Filipinos."

He did not conceal his purpose to put into practice the doctrine of the Democratic Party, by turning over to the Filipinos the reigns of the Government. Harrison encouraged Americans to resign by forbidding government officials to engage in private business. This led to a number of resignations. Others were encouraged to resign by the civil retirement act known as the Osmena Law, which provided that any government employee who had served for ten years would receive one year's salary. Those who had served

1 Rafael Palma, Our Campaign for Independence, Manila Bureau of Printing, 1923, 38.

61
less than ten years, but more than six years were entitled to a proportionate amount provided they resigned before June 30, 1916.² About 913 Americans and 212 Filipinos availed themselves of this privilege.³

By 1921, thirty bureaus and offices were headed by Filipinos. Americans, however, continued to be heads of the Bureaus of Education, the Mint, Prisons, Forestry, Science, Weather, the Quarantine Service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Metropolitan Water District.⁴ Taking the civil service as a whole, the number of Americans declined from 2,680 and 1914 to 614 in 1921, the percentage declined from 23 to 4 per cent.⁵ Under Governor-General Harrison steady progress was made along certain lines. The mileage of first class roads increased from 2233 kilometers to 4698 kilometers. Special attention was paid to the construction of bridges, the boring of artesian wells and the improvements of the ports. Government buildings were built, including schools hospitals and network of wireless stations was erected throughout the provinces.⁶ Statistics indicate civic progress also. "These include figures of imports and exports, post and telegraph receipts, bank resources, tonnage of inter-island shipping cleared, postal savings bank deposits, and aggregate resources of commercial banks."⁷ Governor-General

² Daniel R. Williams, The United States and the Philippines, 1924, 153.
³ Harrison, The Corner-Stone of Philippine Independence, 84.
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⁶ Harrison, The Corner-Stone of Philippine Independence, 89.
⁷ Forbes, The Philippine Islands, 1945, 333.
Harrison's policy was to seek the counsel and experience of the Filipinos. In his speech of September 1, 1916 he said:

I firmly believe that the chief Executive should consult the people through their representatives who are called upon to serve them. This is the very life-blood so to speak of self-government. It should never be possible for a Chief Executive—and it will now never be so here—to ride ruthlessly over the people he is sent here to govern without due regard for their sentiments and due consideration of their wishes.  

Governor-General Harrison was brought into daily contact with Mr. Osmeña, the leading representative of the Filipino people to consult not only for appointments of Filipinos to office but also as to general policies of administration.  

An important step which gave the Filipinos real and domestic autonomy was the creation of the Council of State on October 16, 1918 in order to aid and advise the Governor-General upon matters of public importance. This body contained the six department heads, the speaker of the House and the president of the Senate. It held weekly meetings at which administrative questions were discussed. Two men, Quezon and Osmeña, who actually controlled the Filipino government were brought to this council and whose advice Governor-General Harrison usually followed. Worcester explained the Council as follows:

Theoretically, the new Council provided for the expression of the will of the Filipino people regarding the administration of their government through officials who in their capacity of councillors to

---
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the American Governor-General, were responsible to the legislature. In reality, the arrangement put the executive power in the hands of the two men who were the absolute masters of the legislative branch of the government, and of the only political party that counted in the country.11

Governor-Harrison deliberately allowed some of his own legal powers assigned to him by the Organic Act to slip into the hands of the council of state. The Philippine Legislature also conferred powers upon the council of state in at least sixty instances which gave this body a wide measure of control over almost every department of the government.12

During these years the Filipinos were fully occupied in setting up the stable government of their own required by the Jones Act, so very little was heard about independence. When the news of the signing of the Armistice reached the Islands, the Filipino leaders gathered together to plan the next move in the independence campaign.13 The principles for which the United States entered the war, the ideas embodied in Wilson's fourteen points and the League of Nations, gave the Filipinos a powerful argument with which to reinforce their demands for freedom. Despite the absence of President Wilson a special mission was sent to the United States to make their plea for independence. The leaders of the two political parties, many members of the Legislature and prominent men in commercial life made up its membership.14

The members of the mission delivered speeches in different social functions,
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in clubs and societies. They were received in Washington by Secretary Baker, who encouraged their hopes of independence and also read to them a letter which President Wilson had left for the Mission giving assurance that the Philippine problem was not foreign to the purpose of his trip to Europe.15

My Dear Mr. Secretary:

Please express to the gentlemen of the Commission, my regret that I am not able to see them personally on their arrival in Washington.

I have been deeply gratified with the constant support and encouragement received from the Filipino people and from the Philippine Legislature in the trying period through which we are passing. The people of the United States have with reason taken the deepest pride in the loyalty and support of the Filipino people.

I am sorry that I cannot look into the faces of the gentlemen of this Mission from the Philippine Islands and tell them all that I have in mind and heart as I think of the patient labor, with the end almost in sight, undertaken by the American and Filipino people for their permanent benefit.

Very sincerely,

Woodrow Wilson16

The mission was also given a hearing by a joint committee of the two houses of Congress presided by Senator Harding for the Senate Representative Towne for the House.17 The members of the Mission presented facts and fig-

15 Palma, Our Campaign for Independence, 43.
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ures about conditions in the Islands and urged that a final adjustment of the political relation between the Philippines and the United States should be made. The mission was received with great courtesy and consideration, but since the new Congress, the majority of which were Republicans, had just convened and matters connected with the Treaty of Peace had to be taken up, nothing was done for them by that Congress.18

Governor-General Harrison in his annual report made the following statement:

It is with the deepest satisfaction that I report the continued attitude of the Filipino people to be one of complete loyalty, trust and confidence in the United States in political and commercial circles, as well as among the people of the islands generally, there exists no anti-American investment, but on the contrary a belief in the good will of the American people, and a conviction of the unselfish good faith and benevolent justice of the United States. The flag of our country is universally regarded with respect, not only as a symbol of power but of generosity and liberty.19

President Wilson assumed that a stable government had already been established in the Islands so it was time for the granting of independence to the Filipinos. In his last message to Congress December 7, 1920, Wilson asked for independence of the Islands.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf and have thus fulfilled the condition set by Congress, as precedent to the consideration of granting independence to the Islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those Islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.20

18 Palma, Our Campaign for Independence, 44.
19 Forbes, The Philippine Islands, 1928, 335.
20 A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the President XVIII, 8887.
In response, nothing was done by Congress. They preferred to wait until President Harding was inaugurated before deciding upon so important a question as that of the Philippines.

When we acquired the Philippines we announced that we were to hold the islands temporarily and for the benefit and welfare of the native inhabitants, not for our own selfish purposes. It is true that we showed selfish purposes in tariff legislation as was expressed by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in his speech on June 20, 1900, when he said, "We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of these people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first." Nevertheless we really did give the Filipinos self-government and in the Jones Act of 1916 promised them independence. Since the spirit of the Jones Act was without doubt that of self-government for the Filipino people, it was the duty of the governor-general to carry out the terms of the act with as much consideration as possible for that principle. Since the passage of the Jones Act in 1916, there was complete Filipino autonomy in the municipal and practically complete Filipino executive administration. The Governor-General and the vice governor were the only two Americans in the higher executive branch of the government.

Mr. Harrison stated that

the extension of self-government and the spread of democracy may in themselves have impaired somewhat the efficiency of adminis-


tration. If so that disadvantage is more than offset by the gain in contentment of the people, the growth of respect and friendship for the United States, and the valuable lessons in self-government secured by the Filipinos.23

However much his course may be criticized it had not resulted in preventing the progressive development of the people.24 "The Philippine Islands under the sovereignty of the United States became a monument to American good works and good will and a model for colonial dominion and administration in the world."25

23 Ibid., 88.
25 Bemis, A Diplomatic History of the United States, 421.
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A good historical, economic and political background of the Philippine Islands. The author also gives a good account of the accomplishments of the United States in the Islands.

B. PERIODICALS


The Literary Digest, New York, XLV, December, 1912, 1163.


The Literary Digest, New York, LII, September, 1916, 545.

The Nation, New York, 97, October, 1913, 350.
## APPENDIX A

### SENATE VOTE ON KENYON’S AMENDMENT, 1916

#### Yeas 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashurst</th>
<th>Kenyon</th>
<th>ransdell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham</td>
<td>La Follette</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borah</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantegge</td>
<td>Lea, Tenn.</td>
<td>Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Smith, Ariz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapp</td>
<td>Lippett</td>
<td>Smith, Mich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Wyo.</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>Smoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult</td>
<td>Martin, N. J.</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>O’Gorman</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinger</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phelan</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollies</td>
<td>Pittman</td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Poinceter</td>
<td>Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Nays 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bankhead</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Simmons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broussard</td>
<td>Johnson, Me.</td>
<td>Smith, Ga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Smith, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catron</td>
<td>Lee, Md.</td>
<td>Smith, S. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>McCumber</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Ark.</td>
<td>Martin, Va.</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gronna</td>
<td>Overman</td>
<td>Tillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hustings</td>
<td>Saulsbury</td>
<td>Vardaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

**SENATE VOTE ON THE CLARKE AMENDMENT, 1916**

#### Yeas 41

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst</td>
<td>Johnson, Me.</td>
<td>Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankhead</td>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borah</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Smith, Ariz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broussard</td>
<td>La Follette</td>
<td>Smith, Ga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Smith, S. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Lee, Md.</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>Martine</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapp</td>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Ark.</td>
<td>Overman</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flecher</td>
<td>Pittman</td>
<td>Tillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
<td>Vardaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husting</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Nays 41

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham</td>
<td>Lea, Tenn.</td>
<td>Poindexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandegee</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Pomerene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catron</td>
<td>Lippitt</td>
<td>Ransdell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Wyo.</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>McCumber</td>
<td>Saulsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>Smith, Mich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Smoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Pont</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinger</td>
<td>O'Gorman</td>
<td>Townshend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gronna</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phelan</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### SENATE VOTE ON THE JONES BILL, 1916

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas 52</th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Saulsbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst</td>
<td>Banksky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankhead</td>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkham</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borah</td>
<td>La Follette</td>
<td>Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broussard</td>
<td>Lea, Tenn.</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Smith, Ga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapp</td>
<td>Martin, Va.</td>
<td>Smith, S. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Ark.</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>O'Gorman</td>
<td>Tillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis</td>
<td>Overman</td>
<td>Vardaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Pittman</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husting</td>
<td>Pomerene</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rangedell</td>
<td>Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, S. Dak.</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nays 24</th>
<th>Poindexter</th>
<th>Smith, Mich.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandegee</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Smoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Wyo.</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt</td>
<td>Lippitt</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>McCumber</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham</td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinger</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gronna</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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