

political atmosphere as planets through space; that each co-ordinate department—executive, legislative and judicial—would hold each of the others in equilibrium. But President Taft, if correctly reported by Edward G. Lowrey in Harper's Weekly of June 3rd, must have abandoned the co-ordinate theory if he ever held it. When asked about the trust decisions, he said, as Mr. Lowrey reports him, that whatever had been his opinions as expressed in one of his messages to Congress, "he abandoned them when the Supreme Court spoke." If this does not mean that Mr. Taft subordinates the Executive to the Court, what can it mean; and if the Executive is subordinate to the Court, how can the two be co-ordinate?

+ +

### Legitimate Business versus Big Business.

Through men like Robert Moran, of Seattle, the legitimate business interests of the country are beginning to see that their prosperity is not with Big Business but with the labor interests, of which they themselves are part. In other words, the true industrial line is not between employer and employe; it is between producer and parasite.

+

Mr. Moran cannot be denounced by Big Business as a wild-eyed radical whose ravings are to be ignored while Big Business keeps on plundering legitimate business. He has been Mayor of Seattle, he was founder of the Moran Brothers Company of Seattle and its head until its sale to the Moran Company, he was a large employer for many years and is a man of wider than Washington State influence. Writing on harbor improvements at Seattle, in the Railway and Marine News of that city, issue of June 1, Mr. Moran denies that Seattle is in need of any further great public improvements. "She needs not the destruction of capital, in the construction of harbor works that will not be required for a hundred years hence." What she needs is factories, he explains, and to get them she must work out a plan "to take the speculator in raw land out of the deal," some such plan as that of Vancouver and "other places, to stop taxing productive labor and put taxes on vacant land."

+

Quite as encouraging to legitimate business as Mr. Moran's declaration, is its editorial approval by the Railway and Marine News, an old established business periodical, which agrees that harbor improvements beyond the present needs of

Seattle "are land speculation and debt-creating schemes pure and simple," and that many business men know it but "haven't the nerve to come out and say so, as does Mr. Moran." It quotes approvingly another letter from Mr. Moran in which he truly says: "Manufactures and agriculture make commerce and produce wealth; they never made hard times; you can lay that up to the gambler, and in that profession the speculator in raw land stands in the foreground in Seattle. He is a parasite in every industrial community, and there is only one cure, taxation." To appreciate Mr. Moran's thoroughly sound position, it might be better to identify land speculation as an interest maintained in greater or less degree by many persons having also productive interests, than to personify it. Land speculators as a distinct class may not be very numerous or very wicked anywhere; but land speculation is an enormous and industrially destructive interest everywhere.

+ +

### Coming! Coming!

Mr. Roosevelt's almost excellent editorial on "Arizona and the Recall of the Judiciary," in The Outlook of June 24th, testifies to an awakening as great and as sudden as that of the Irishman who in the story knocked down the Jew. If Roosevelt trots along at the rate he is going now, he will be abreast of Bryan in a year or two. And let us assure the admirers of his democracy who have been unable to see Bryan's under its prairie label, that we intend no odious comparison. Roosevelt really does seem to be advancing out of democratic phrase-making with shirt-sleeve ex-emplifications, into the open day of "the real thing." Though he still alludes to opinions of others than his own crowd as "the whim of the mob," he does truly seem to be improving.

+ + +

## THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN THE PHILIPPINES.

I.

In an issue of The Public some months ago\* we referred editorially in these terms to the Declaration of Independence in the Philippines, ten years ago or thereabouts:

*"The Declaration of Independence was suppressed in the Philippines by American decree."*

That assertion appears to have been erroneous.

+

At the time of publishing it, the fact as stated

\*Current volume, page 4.

had a place in our recollection like that of John Adams's prediction that the anniversaries of the Declaration would be celebrated generation after generation with the ringing of bells and the explosion of Chinese crackers. So clearly did it recur, as a fact of common knowledge, as to seem to us to need no confirmation. But we were soon advised by Mrs. Celia Baldwin Whitehead, of Denver, that the assertion had been denied by a gentleman to whom she quoted it in a controversy over American imperialism.

Since that time, Mrs. Whitehead and *The Public* have been searching separately for the truth of the matter. Both her search and ours having come to an end, we now set forth the result for the purpose of properly correcting our own error and in the interest of the truth of American history in the Philippines.

## II.

We begin with Mrs. Whitehead's experience.

+

She first wrote to the War Department, supposing that to be the quickest way of getting the information she wished. In reply she received the following from the Bureau of Insular Affairs:

February 6, 1911.

**Madam:** Replying to your letter of the 31st ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the reading of the American Declaration of Independence is not prohibited in the Philippine Islands. On the contrary I might say that just shortly after the Americans took over the government of the islands, a pamphlet was prepared which contained the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, in English as well as in Spanish, and several thousand copies of it were sent to the islands, where they were distributed throughout the schools. The pamphlet was also translated into several of the native dialects and distributed in a similar manner.

Furthermore, the Philippine Government has commemorated the signing of the Declaration of Independence by providing that the Fourth of July shall be one of the public holidays of the islands, and the day is celebrated there in a manner similar to that in which it is celebrated in the United States.

+

Obviously Mrs. Whitehead could not regard that letter as satisfactory. In fact she did not, for she wrote again. The reply to her second letter was as follows:

March 7, 1911.

**Madam:** Your letter of the 24th ultimo has been received. If the reading of the American Declaration of Independence in the Philippine Islands was ever prohibited the bureau has no record of it, and furthermore I have made inquiries of officials of the Philippine government who have been in the islands

practically since the date of American occupation and they can not recall any prohibition of the kind.

In the May, 1902, number of the *North American Review* there appeared an article in which it was claimed that the reading of the American Declaration of Independence in the Philippine Islands had been prohibited. The claim was not supported by any information as to the source of the prohibition, or when it was issued, and a search of our records disclosed that we had never received, or been advised, of any order, circular, or other document which contained such prohibition.

To the best of my knowledge and belief the reading of the Declaration of Independence has never been prohibited in the Philippine Islands. Certainly such action would have been diametrically opposed to the efforts which were made by the government just after American occupation to bring to the attention of the Filipinos the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence which were mentioned in my letter to you of February 6th.

+

Following the clue disclosed in that letter, Mrs. Whitehead procured a copy of the *North American Review* for May, 1902, and found the article alluded to. Its author was Andrew Carnegie.

Thereupon Mrs. Whitehead wrote to Mr. Carnegie for further information, enclosing the two War Department letters and asking their return. In due time the letters came back, but alone.

She then wrote this letter to Mr. Carnegie:

Denver, March 30, 1911.

Dear Sir: I am much puzzled at receiving, this morning, the letters from the War Department, which I sent you, unaccompanied by any reply to my inquiry regarding the matter of which they treat. Of course I realize that a mistake has been made somehow by somebody, because any other supposition involves an unbelievable discourtesy. But I can not imagine how the mistake arose. Did I not make myself understood in my former letter?

I am sorry to trouble you with this matter, but I never like to give up a quest until I find that for which I am looking, or am convinced that it cannot be found. Will you be so kind as to let me hear from you on the subject?

No reply to her courteous and surely not unimportant request of Mr. Carnegie has ever been received by Mrs. Whitehead.

+

After waiting in vain a reasonable time to hear from Mr. Carnegie, Mrs. Whitehead wrote as follows to President Taft:

Dear Sir: I am sorry to trouble so busy a man, but when I begin a quest for information I dislike to give it up. In the present instance my search seems narrowed down to you.

What I wish to find out is this: Did you or any of your subordinates, while you were in command at the Philippines, at any time prohibit the reading

of the American Declaration of Independence? Was such prohibition ever promulgated?

Please do not refer this to the War Department. I have two letters from the Bureau of Insular Affairs declaring there is no record of any such thing. The second of the two letters said that a statement of that kind was made in an article published in the North American Review of May, 1902. I looked up the article, which is entitled "The Opportunity of the United States"—a most excellent plea for home rule. It was written by Andrew Carnegie and a portion of it reads as follows:

"We prohibited the reading of the Declaration of Independence in the Philippines last Fourth of July. To the incredulous reader let me repeat this fact. It is on record and acknowledged by our officials.

"We can imagine the first thought of so good a man as Judge Taft and so good an American as he has been hitherto when this was suggested to him: 'Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?' But, alas, he did it."

Twice have I written Mr. Carnegie asking for the exact sources of his information. No reply do I get, so I have decided to apply at headquarters for a settlement of the question.

Did Mr. Carnegie make up that story out of whole cloth and offer it for publication in so reputable a journal as the North American Review? That seems incredible; and yet, if he has the knowledge I am seeking, why should he refuse to impart it? An early and explicit answer to my letter will be a favor.

Mrs. Whitehead's letter to the President bore the date of April 26, 1911. His reply is as follows:

May 25, 1911.

My Dear Madam: In reply to your letter of April 26th, the President directs me to say that he never, while in the Philippines, prohibited the reading of the American Declaration of Independence; that none of his subordinates made such a prohibition, so far as he knows; that no such prohibition, so far as he knows, was ever promulgated; that he has made an investigation and, so far as he can learn, there was no such prohibition; and that the files of the Manila newspapers show that the Fourth of July, 1901—the day referred to by Mr. Andrew Carnegie in his communication in the North American Review of May, 1902—was celebrated in Manila by the reading of the Declaration of Independence and by patriotic speeches.

+

With that letter, signed officially by the Secretary to the President, Mrs. Whitehead's search came to an end.

### III.

Meanwhile, we had been making a search of our own and through other channels.

Upon the denial of our statement regarding the suppression of the Declaration, we supposed we should need do nothing more than refer to The Public files for verification. To our surprise we found no verification there.

(Something of historical importance and relevancy to the subject under consideration we did find, but of that farther on.)

Failing to find specific verification in our files, we made inquiries of various people regarding their recollection. Often, though not invariably, we got assurances of a recollection identical with our own; but none with any authoritative references.

So far as we now know, or have been able to ascertain, no actual suppression of the Declaration of Independence ever took place, in the Philippines, nor was its publication in any form ever prohibited there at any time in terms. And not only does our statement that "the Declaration of Independence was suppressed in the Philippines by American decree" appear to have been erroneous, but we have found no record indicating that there may have been any such suppression, except Mr. Carnegie's unsupported statement in the North American Review.

### IV.

To any fair reader, however, it must seem as it does to us, that there must have been some kind of foundation for Mr. Carnegie's assertion, even if he does maintain an apparently inexcusable silence on the subject now.

It is hardly thinkable that he would have made the assertion falsely and out of whole cloth. Nor is it probable that such an assertion over the signature of a man so widely known as Mr. Carnegie, in a magazine of such standing and circulation as the North American Review, and so near to the time of the alleged occurrence, would have gone unquestioned if it had been wholly without foundation.

+

That there was at least one substantial foundation for it, we discovered upon searching The Public files. This was the matter parenthetically alluded to above as of historical importance and relevant to the subject here under consideration.

It was a decree, issued under the authority of the United States government, November 4, 1901, and printed in full in the fourth volume of The Public at page 718. Section 10 of that decree is as follows:

*"Until it has been officially proclaimed that a state of war or insurrection against the authority or*

*sovereignty of the United States no longer exists in the Philippine islands, it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate, orally or by writing or printing or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands or their separation from the United States, whether by peaceable or forcible means, or to print, publish or circulate any handbill, newspaper, or other publication, advocating such independence or separation. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,000 and imprisonment not exceeding one year."*

✦

Now, it may be that the American Declaration of Independence does not in strictness fall within the proscription of that decree. For the Declaration does not advocate in precise terms "the independence of the Philippine Islands" nor "their separation from the United States." It advocates only in general terms the independence of any people governed as the Filipinos then were. Whether in such matters the general does not include some of its particulars, would therefore have been open to administrative interpretation, had some all too literal military subordinate "pinched" somebody for publishing the American Declaration of Independence in the Philippine Islands.

But let us ask what man of common sense and a prejudice against paying \$2,000 worth of fine and lying in Philippine jails for a year—what American anti-imperialist traveling through the Islands, for instance,—would have ventured to circulate copies there of the American Declaration of Independence while that decree remained in force, without first getting a special dispensation from the man highest up?

That decree and its observance—over-prudent though the observance were—may not improbably have generated and fostered the mistake to which Mr. Carnegie gave publicity in 1902 and into which we fell in 1911.

V.

In the files of *The Public* we find the following articles with an historical bearing upon the subject, more or less direct:

**Suppression by Gen. Otis of a play, "For Love of Country,"** because it referred to independence.—*The Public* of March 31, 1900, vol. ii, number 104, page 1.

**The sedition decree under which it might have been imprudent to publish the American Declaration of Independence without a special dispensation.**—*The Public* of February 1, 15 and 22, 1902, vol. iv, pages 675, 718 and 723.

**Fourth of July in the Philippines.**—*The Public* of July 6 and 13, 1901, vol. iv, pages 199, 217; and *The Public* of July 12, 1902, vol. v, pages 209, 215.

Any further verified contributions to the question thus raised by Mr. Carnegie's apparent error of 1902 and our adoption of it in 1911, will be gladly received and used for the purpose of establishing the whole truth.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### ECONOMIC CONTRASTS.

Providence, R. I., June 20.

The World Almanac gives the population of Chicago for 1900 as 1,698,575, and for 1910 as 2,185,283, being an increase of 28.7 per cent. The population of New York City in 1900 was 3,437,202 and in 1910 was 4,766,883, being an increase of 38.7 per cent. As it has long been the boast of the good people of the western city that the freer life and more vigorous society of that breezy burgh was bound to overtake the eastern metropolis, is it not time to take note of the facts expressed in the above figures?

A less percentage on a smaller quantity, is not likely to outrun a larger percentage on a greater quantity. This assertion is safe unless Chicagoans have discovered some new sort of calculus.

Has Chicago acquired a spirit of retrogression? Will the next census show that the fate of Iowa is to be repeated in the history of our city? Land in Iowa has increased in value in spite of a declining population. In Chicago the small increase in population has been attended by a large increase in the value of land.

Does increase in land value have a tendency to keep people away from Iowa and Chicago? Does New York use a larger percentage than Chicago of the land within the corporate limits? Would a higher tax on vacant land in Chicago cause its owners to part with it at a lower price, and thereby facilitate its use? Would such higher tax on the value of vacant land permit a lower tax on buildings, stocks of goods—on business generally—and thereby encourage men to locate in Chicago? Would such procedure afford some hope that the aforesaid boast may be realized?

Is there the remotest reason for such hope in the present situation? Would the Initiative and Referendum be handy tools for use in changing the existing tax laws? Is there ground for belief that the Lorimer-Deneen-Sullivan-Hearst-Harrison combine will exert their utmost energies to secure those same tools, or use them to the end that Chicago shall achieve its rightful destiny? Or, may we look for more taxes on industry in Chicago, that it may become more and more uninviting? Not even protection calculus can induce 28 per cent to overtake 38 per cent.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

✦ ✦ ✦

Being of a hopeful disposition, we believe the time may come when we shall have individual door knobs.—Chicago Record-Herald.