

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1902.

Number 223.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Mr. Roosevelt opened his campaign for the next presidency at Pittsburg on the Fourth of July. That this was the object of his appearance there as orator of the day is generally understood. It is freely indicated, even by his own party press. And the "oration" he delivered was so much like a stump speech as to justify the suspicion that he himself regarded it as his campaign key-note.

One part of Mr. Roosevelt's speech on this occasion is worthy of special commendation. He administered inferentially a merited rebuke to the ignorance of those critics of American ideals who sneer at the "glittering generalities" of the Declaration of Independence, denouncing them as false because what they declare to be self-evident truths were not true at the time. These critics are oblivious to the fact that the authors of the Declaration of Independence were not describing conditions to be pointed to with pride; they were setting up immutable standards to be followed with fidelity. And of this important fact in our nation's history Mr. Roosevelt reminded his Fourth of July audience.

He said:

You have just listened to the reading of the great document which signals our entry into the field of nations 126 years ago. That entry was but the promise which had to be made good by the performance of those men and their children and their children's children. Words are good if they are backed up by deeds, and only so. The Declaration continues to be read with pride by us year after year, and stands as a symbol of hope for the people of all the world because its promise was made good, because its words were

supplemented by deeds, because after the men who signed it and upheld it had done theirs, the men who came again after them, generation by generation, did their work in turn.

That is the true conception of the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration is not a chart of the course we have left behind, but the pole star of our progress, which we can never leave behind unless we turn back upon our course.

It took a Roosevelt, though, to splice this sentiment and the Philippine policy together. For three years his copartisans have avoided that experiment. They dared not try to splice our declared principles of self-government to the practice of British crown colonyism. But Mr. Roosevelt was equal to it. The very strenuousness of the task seemed to excite his ambitions. It is clumsy splicing he has done, rather more offensive to the eye than none at all, but it is a splice and no mistake.

He first couples the existing independence of Cuba with the standard of the immortal Declaration, to illustrate our fidelity to its ideals. Listen:

We said Cuba should become a free republic, and we have kept our word. To have turned Cuba over to the hands of its own people immediately after the withdrawal of the Spanish flag would have meant ruin and chaos. We established a government in the islands; we established peace and order; we began to provide for the payment of the Cuban troops who had fought against the misrule of their oppressors; we instituted a public school system, modeled upon that which has been so potent a factor in our own national progress. We cleaned the cities in Cuba for the first time in their history. We changed them from being the most unhealthy to being among the healthiest cities of the civilized world. We introduced a system of orderly justice to succeed one of irresponsible and arbitrary despotism, so that any man, rich or poor, weak or strong, could appeal to courts and know that he would receive his rights.

And then, when in the fullness of time we felt they could walk alone, we turned over the government to them, and now the beautiful Queen of the Antilles has started on her course as a free republic among the nations of the earth.

Splendid! And now, of course Mr. Roosevelt goes on to explain conditions in the Philippines. How it would mean ruin to turn them over to the government of their own people now; how we must establish peace and order first; how we must establish school systems and clean the cities and introduce orderly justice (though without jury trial); and then—

when in the fullness of time we feel they can walk alone, we shall turn over the government to them, and the rich and beautiful archipelago of the southern seas will start on its course as a free republic among the nations of the earth.

But, no; Mr. Roosevelt did not say that, except about Cuba. He said nothing at all resembling that about the Philippines. He knew that his party does not intend that the Philippines shall ever slip out of our hands as Cuba did and start on their course as a free republic—not while there are franchises to grant and friars' lands to parcel out. He was extremely cautious, therefore, to say nothing which might be construed into an embarrassing pledge of independence.

Such a pledge had been made specifically as to Cuba. It was in the fateful Teller resolution, which so many of Mr. Roosevelt's political associates were inclined to repudiate. That pledge had forced us to set Cuba free. We "kept our word," one of the virtues even of brigands, and because we "kept our word" Mr. Roosevelt implies in his Pittsburg speech that in freeing Cuba—not merely in passing the Teller resolution but in obeying it—we were acting under

the inspiration of the Declaration of Independence. He implies, moreover, that our Philippine policy derives its inspiration from the same source and will culminate in the same way. But he was careful,—oh so careful!—not to say so. It would seem to be true that Mr. Roosevelt is a good deal of a poser.

That characteristic was further exhibited in what he said about trusts. All through this part of his speech he implied that Attorney General Knox, in whose city he was speaking and whom he extolled in fulsome terms, is vigorously prosecuting trusts. But what is the fact? The principal one of these combinations to be proceeded against, that of the meat packers, has been prosecuted to the extent of getting an injunction by consent of the trust. The case has been laid before no grand jury, and the packers are "stepping out from under" the injunction by organizing in the regular way in New Jersey. It is an excellent instance of what the irreverent call a "grand stand play." But with reference to the anthracite coal trust, which is admitted to be clearly within the Federal anti-trust law, Mr. Knox finds one excuse after another for inaction. Yet Mr. Roosevelt praises his official character and services with all the earnestness and not a little of the gush of an old-time swain writing sentimental verses to his ladylove's eyebrow. This is a case of words not backed up by deeds, and Mr. Roosevelt himself admits that such words are not good.

It is an astounding acknowledgment that the President makes in his proclamation of amnesty to the Filipinos who became "rebels" by the peculiar process of fighting for their own country against an alien invader. The very first clause of the preamble of this resolution reads:

Whereas, Many of the inhabitants of the Philippine archipelago were in insurrection against the authority and sovereignty of the kingdom of Spain at divers times from August, 1896, until the cession of the archipelago by that kingdom to the United States

of America, and since such cession many of the persons so engaged in insurrection have until recently resisted the authority and sovereignty of the United States. . . .

So it is now officially conceded that the American soldiers in the Philippines have been engaged in putting down an insurrection which we bought of Spain. It is the same old rebellion against Spanish law and power, beginning in 1896, two years before Dewey sailed into Manila bay, and continuing at first against Spain, and then against the United States as Spain's assignee, down to the present time. Isn't that a dainty dish of American democracy and republicanism to lay before the kings of the earth?

The irrigation law, passed at the recent session of Congress, seems to be headed in the right direction. This law provides that the money received from the sale of public lands in the 16 arid states and territories, shall be set aside as a special fund, to be known as the arid land reclamation fund and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in investigations, surveys and construction of reservoirs, canals, etc., for the irrigation of arid and semi-arid lands. The lands reclaimed, if public lands, are to be sold in tracts of not more than 160 acres, to actual settlers, with water rights, at a price sufficient to cover the cost of the works. If the lands reclaimed are already in private ownership, the water rights are to be sold at a price estimated to cover the cost of construction, but water for 160 acres is to be the maximum amount sold to one individual. Payments for land or water may be distributed over not more than ten years, and they are to be turned back into the reclamation fund, which thus becomes perpetual, except for the expenditures on surveys and on maintenance of the works while in national ownership.

This law further provides that when the payments required by this act are made for the major portion of the lands irrigated from the waters of

any of the works provided for, then the management and operation of such irrigation works shall pass in common to the owners of the lands irrigated thereby, to be maintained at their expense under such form of organization and under such regulations as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, provided that the title to and the management and operation of the reservoirs and the works necessary for their protection and operation shall remain in the government until otherwise provided by Congress.

The Secretary is directed, furthermore, to withdraw from the public domain the lands to be irrigated, and also those necessary for the construction of the works, such withdrawal to precede surveys; and in case it is decided that the projected works are not feasible, the lands are to be restored to the public domain. Power is granted to him, also, to purchase or condemn such property as may be necessary to carry out the act. Every effort was made in connection with the passage of the act to cause its benefits to accrue entirely to small home makers, and to eliminate all other profits; and it is gratifying to record that this feature was especially insisted upon by the President. No land will become available for settlement for several years, or until the time necessary for surveys and construction has elapsed. The rate of reclamation will then probably be about 200,000 to 300,000 acres per annum, slowly increasing with the growth of the fund, but having an indefinite limit of perhaps 20,000,000 acres.

It is an encouraging platform, that of the Minnesota Democracy, upon which they have nominated L. A. Rosing for governor and Frank D. Larrabee for attorney general—both of them democratic Democrats, and the latter a pronounced advocate of the Henry George system of taxation. On those subjects of local government which are now attracting attention all over the country this platform