September 14,1900.

Bordeaux, France.

Mr Harry B. Kirtland,

President Harvard Republican Club.

Dear Sir;

I am most happy to assent to your proposal in regard to "Letters to a King," since there has never been a time when the study of ballatorial power was more necessary to the proper discharge of political duty and it gives me opportunity to express to the young men of the country some things in regard to present conditions which seem to me not to have been sufficiently considered.

For half a century I have been an earnest student of our political progress as well as an observer of resultant conditions. During that period the most momentous questions of our history have been uppermost in popular thought. Our national life in the latter half of the century has been more intense than ever before, and the citizen-king has been forced to consider questions of inconceivable gravity and importance. He has not always decided rightly. Moral c cowardice has led him often to avoid questions that pressed for solution and which, left undetermined, are sure to prove fruitful sources of future ills. The progress which has been made during that time in political conditions and individual liberty, however, is such as must cause every thoughtful and candid person to regard it with profound wonder and gratitude. There are many flippant souls, myoptic intellects, who cannot resist the temptation to regard the past as a lost paradise of political idealism and the present as merely a chaos resulting from an unavoidable

into which the United States has steadily fallen with each succeeding year. Some men who are even regarded as authorities on socio-political subjects, are yet given to whining about the American Republic as an "experiment", "the weakness of republics," and sometimes even snivelling about our being a "young nation." In truth we are one of the oldest of existing civilized nations. Since we declared our independence of Great Britain, we have had but one change in our form of government and that was wholly peaceful. Structurally, conditionally, nationally,--we are precisely what we were at the adoption of the Constitution, or rather at the inauguration of the first president. There have been changes of method and detail. Parties have been evolved to enable the citizen-king to express more clearly his will. Restrictions have been places on State perogative But there has been no break in the presidential succession and the political power of the general government has not been extended a hair's breath in any direction in a hundred years. The country has put down the greatest, best-organized and most stoutly contested rebellion known in history. No restriction has been put upon the political power of the various states. They still create the voter and the voter controls and perpetuates the Federal government. Only two changes have been made; the two-fifths representation based on slavery fell with slavery; in its stead, was given full representation based on population. The states were also forbidden to refus the ballot to any one BECAUSE of race or color; but for any other reason any man or class may be disfranchised by directly or indirectly legislation Massachusetts may disfranchise every citizen who cannot read Greek;

Mississippi because he cannot correctly construe the Constitution; Texas because he cannot write Choctaw or North Carolina because his grandfather was not a voter. Beyond that, not a particle of change has been made in the structure of our government.

What other civilized government can boast such continued stability? During this period the form of government in France has changed ten times. Germany is but thirty years old. Asutria, as a nation is the outcome of the Hungarian rebellion. Italy is still a later product of popular evolution. Cavour burned down many walls tobuild one nation. England and Russia are the only great powers which are now identical in structural character with what they were when our republic adopted her constitution. The citizen-king has proved himself a wise ruler, a strong ruler and an unfailing dynasty. The Republic is no longer young, but the citizen-king is forever youthful, being constantly renewed in personal character, in impulse, in environment, in brain, in conscience. He is ever changing, ever dying, ever renewing his power with fresh blood and new ideals The king is dead! Long live the king!

To-day, we are said to have a new constitutional question pressing for decision. "Does the Constitution follow the flag?" It may be gathered from the not altogether luminous statements of those who quake with dread at the ogre of "Imperialism" which their superheated imaginations have conjured up, that they mean by this aphoristic connumdrum to convey the idea that the Constitution of the United States, or the Constitution in connection with the Declaration of Independence, somehow or other garruntees to the citizens of the Uni United States, the right to participate ~~xxx~~ in the government of the

State or Nation. This is not true. The Constitution of the United States has never made any man a voter or guaranteed to any man or class of men participation in any form of government or any political act. The States create electors, voters, citizen-kings, each with in its own limits, by their own constitutions or by legislative enactments. The Congress creates electors and prescribes their privileges and qualications in any unorganized territory which is under the control of the United States and in the District of Columbia. The XIVth Amendment of the Constitution declares that "All persons born or naturalized in the United States in which they may reside." This undoubtedly includes the inhabitants of our new possessions. They are "citizens" by virtue of the fact that they occupy our territory and are subject to our national jurisdiction. They have a right to demand protection in their rights of person and property. But this does not carry with it the right to participate in any form of self-government. That right--the right to hold and exercise the power of an elector--to be one of the controlling element of our population--can only be derived from enabling legislation of one of the states of the Union or by an act of Congress, authorizing the population of unorganized territory, within certain boundaries to exercise such privilege under specified conditions. This is now and always has been, the way in which the Constitution has "followed the flag." Sometimes, as in the case of Texas, a foreign people comes and asks statehood on specific terms; again, as in the case of Hawaii an alien people ask to be admitted as an organized territory. On the other hand, as in the case of New Mexico, the inhabitants of conquered territory wait long for any organized form of self-control

and a generation of statehood. The right of self-government does not inhere in the citizen ex vi termini, but comes only through the action of Congress or the laws of a State. The Congress has absolute control of all unorganized territory and it is probable that it has power even to revoke the privilege of organization and remit territory not yet admitted to statehood to the unorganized form with with such government as the Congress may prescribe.

To have promised the Philippines self-government in any form, or even the status of an organized territory, would have been on the part of the President an act of usurpation which might well be termed "Imperialism" and which might very well have justified his impeachment. That shall be the form of government in all unorganized territory of the United States, is purely a question for Congress to determine and any pre-announcement of the same by the Executive, is a most dangerous act of usurpation constituting an unmistakable step in the direction of imperialism or a dictatorship.

For myself, I am profoundly grateful that President McKinley instead of trying to establish a hard and fast form of government for the Philippines, or seeking to forestall the action of Congress with unauthorized pledges as to future conditions, with that exquisite self-control which has characterized all his acts as president, sought first to obtain full information as to existing conditions, so as to enable the legislative branch of the government to act intelligently, deliberately and in accord with the will of the citizen-kings matured by thought and knowledge. There is no doubt that fate has thrown upon us the task of lifting up these peoples. It will be a difficult task, but the longer the final determination of

the specific means is delayed and the more gradual the grant of pow-
er to those whose present idea of liberty is merely license to de-
bauch and oppress the, the greater will be the chances of ultimate
success. In all socio-political movements, haste and ignorance are
the most certain elements of failure.

But there is another constitutional question much more grave
and dubious than the bogey of "Imperialism," which has been brought
into this campaign from an unexpected quarter. Mr Bryan has declar-
ed himself in favor of the withdrawal of all troops from the Phil-
ippines, relinquishing all control or direction in internal affairs
and confining ourselves to an external protectorate to prevent oth-
er nations from disturbing the shambles which would thereby be cre-
ted. Aside from the barbarity and inhumanity of such a proposal, it
may be well to inquire as to the constitutionality of such an ab-
surd policy. Does the Constitution confer on President or Congress
the power to make our army and navy the mere watchdogs of territoy
in which we have no interest? Does the Constitution authorize any
one to commit the United States to the maintenance and support of
the ambitions or pretensions of any ruler or usurper? A protecto-
rate is the most specious and dangerous forms of power. In the cas
case of Cuba, we were, by treaty, charged with the preservation of
peace in the islands. It is not a protectorate and it is most like
unlikely that it ever will be. If Cuba becomes an independent pow-
er, she will undoubtedly have to take care of herself--pay her own
debts and fight her own battles. The only modification of her sov-
ereignty in such case will probably be that the United States will
be a preferred creditor with notice served on all European coun-

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY 2013

tries that any attempt to secure control of the island on their part, will be regarded as a declaration of war against the United States.

There is no exercise of national power so obnoxious as the spurious force of a protectorate. It is derivable from the Constitution only under the grant of power to make treaties. But treaties can only be made between two governments and there is no government in the Filippines with which to treat. Would Mr Bryan establish an Anti-American government in the Philippines in order to have a chance to set up a protectorate? The protectorate is the most fraudulent and specious form of those "entangling alliances" which the followers of Mr Bryan are so terribly denouncing. It is the most reprehensible of the means by which Great Britain has extended her power over barbarous nations and uncivilized lands. By so-called treaties with rebellious or hard-pressed savage chiefs, she has claimed them as allies under her protection and warned all other nations from enjoyment of trade or settlement in such unoccupied territory. In this manner that the nations of Europe have "conquered" Africa. The "protectorate," the "sphere of influence" and the "hinterland," are only polite names for robbery without the cost and peril of conquest. It was by such pretended "protectorate" based on a treaty with a spurious chief of the Mosquito Indians, that England based and still bases her claim to veto the desire of the American people to build and control the Nicaraugan canal. She has has sometimes even acted upon Mr Bryan's plan of setting up a sham government to form a foundation for a protectorate. The American people are not likely in the future any more than in the past, to

take kindly to this most obnoxious form for the extension of power--a spurious protectorate of territory claimed by a foreign usurper. Our title to the Philippines os clear and we have no need to set up a man of straw--like the fictitious common-law trespasser--in order to knock him down.

There is still another "constitutional question" involved in this issue, which no young man should lose sight of. "There needs no ghost come from the dead" to assure any thoughtful person that the people of the United States will hereafter maintain much closer and and more important relations with other peoples than ever before. Commercial and industrial competition will grow sharper with each year of the coming century. Having put our hands to the plow, it is impossible to turn back. The time has past when the buyer sought the seller in the world's markets. The man who has anything to sell must seek the buyer wherever he may be. During the next few years thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of Americans merchants and drummers will go to other countries to develope and exploit new markets for American products. It is of all things most essential for the extension of our trade that they should always and everywhere be under the protection of the Great Republic. <u>The Constitution must follow the citizen</u>. Wherever he may go, he should know that the whole power of his country if need be, would be used to secure him in the full enjoyment of rights granted to others or by treaty secured to our citizens. Hitherto, with few and unimportant exceptions, the foreign policy of our government has been apologetic rather than assertive of the rights of her citizens. Like the "Jolly Beggar" we have taken cakes and cuffs with equal complacency. The

The mere indifference and neglect of our government have forced the expatriation of thousands of our most enterprising citizens. We have treated those engaged in the extension of American trade as if they were criminals, compelling them to suffer judgment of denationalization without trial and denying protection as a penalty for increasing American exports. We have been swift to apologize for fancied affronts to other nations and slow to demand reparation for wrongs to our own citizens.

For the first time in our history the world has seen during Mr McKinley's administration the army and navy promptly and effectively used for the protection and relief of American citizens suffering from violation of treaty-rights in a foreign country. This fact has probably made more impression on the consciousness of foreign peoples than even the deadly swiftness of events in our war with Spain. Peoples and nations regard with surprise not unmixed with resentment, the fact that the United States is able and willin to demand justice for her citizens with an emphasis which no nation can afford to disregard. Hitherto, the American citizen in other countries has been obliged to safeguard himself. If he could not swear just when he would bring his business to a close and return to the United States, the government has cast him off, refused him recognition and forced him to assume another nationality or remain "a man without a country" in very truth. Never again will this be true. Mr McKinley's administration has made it incumbent on all who may succeed him, to recognize the fundamental principle that the protection of the citizen in his rights of person and property, at home as well as abroad, is the chief object for which our government

~~xxxxxx~~ exists--an object which the Republic has strangely evaded in the past.

Another thing which the young voter should not fail to note in in this campaign is the very striking and unique personality of the President. There are probably very few who expected of Mr McKinley an administration so remarkable or self-control and equipoise so perfect and unique. It is beyond question, that if he were to die ~~t~~ tomorrow, his administration ~~would~~ rank both in difficulty, unprepar edness and unexpected success, next to that of Abraham Lincoln, whil his unruffled self-control fits him to rank as a statesman and a leader even beside that greatest of our presidents. In personal characteristics, he is so irreproachable that no enemy has dared to bring against him any accusation. No word of malice has passed his lips nor one which the bitterest opponent ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ could construe as such . Power has not meant to him personal opportunity. However malevolent the attacks made upon him, he has not stooped to controversy. Probably, in all our history there has not been a president in whose adminis tration there has been so little controversy or explanation. The very journals which are now assailing him as a tyrant and an imperi rialist, only a few months ago were denouncing him for not having ~~a~~ any policy. There are two ideals of a president; one makes him the leader and dictator of his party; the other regards him, in all new questions that may arise as the servant of the people. Mr McKinley has adopted the latter view and has had less to say about himself his views and wishes than any other man who has occupied the pres idential chair. As a Republican, he has scrupulously maintained the tenets of his party. When new questions arose he has waited instruc tions from Congress in all matters within its scope or followed an

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

unmistakable expression of public sentiment. He was forced by an almost universal public clamor into war with Spain. When he seemed inclined to leave the Philippines under Spanish control, he was deluged with remonstrances from every quarter. There have been no scandals in his cabinet. What he or his advisers say in secret council remains secret. Matters of the utmost moment are determined without hesitation and carried into effect without wavering. What is done is known to all: his reasons for what he does are known to himself. The circumstances surrounding his administration have been of the most difficult character, but it may be doubted if any of his predecessors have made fewer mistakes and it is certain that not one has made fewer excuses. Of what is done, he takes the responsibility and has apparently no need for scapegoats. Through it all he has remained plain William McKinley, accessible to all, fearless of ridicule or denunciation, desirous only of promoting the best interests of the American people, whether they dwell within the ancient boundaries or in the islands of the sea over which our banner floats

. The fast three years have been unprecedently prosperous and glorious. Never before did the Republic stand as high in the eyes of the world or the pride of her people. As yesterday was safe in his keeping so will be tommorrow. Of him the country may well say in mustering her meritorious sons:

"there is not one
Who has said or more has done
Than thou."

As a man, a patriot, an administrator of public affairs, a party leader, William McKinley is one whom every young American may proudly and safely emulate, no matter what his political opinions may be More than any other man except Abraham Lincoln, he has left his

mark on the nation's future--a mark which no accident of political destiny can ever efface.

I am, dear Sir,

Very respectfully yours,

Albion W. Tourgée

U.S. Consul, Bordeaux.