

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1901.

Number 192.

**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 column of last page.

When the assassination at Buffalo closed the career of President McKinley and raised Vice President Roosevelt to the chief magistracy of the American republic, fairness demanded that Mr. Roosevelt's administration of this high office be not prejudged.

His previous career was hardly calculated to command for him the implicit confidence or high respect of serious and really thoughtful men. He had seemed like a patrician with the air of a moral philosopher and the ideals and ambitions of a prize-fighter. But this was not conclusive with reference to the future. Unchecked as the excessive brute energies of his youth had been by any profound sense of responsibility or the sobering obligations of an overwhelming experience, there was room for hope that in his new and exalted station he would lay aside the restless spirit of his strenuous and lingering boyhood. Such an experience as now confronted him might well have modified his impetuous disposition and turned the eager vitality of his ambitious youth into the massive strength of statesmanlike maturity. Stranger things had happened in the world's history; and it was not only fair but reasonable to await the first manifestation of so desirable a change in Mr. Roosevelt's character. The result is disappointing. Mr. Roosevelt may yet justify the patience that awaits his development, for his presidential career has only begun; but the hoped-for change has not yet come; if his first message as president may be taken as a sign.

The message, in so far as it is Mr. Roosevelt's work and not merely an insertion perfunctorily of extracts from department reports, fails to rise above the grade of a stump speech by an impassioned and irresponsible spell-binder. There is nothing of the thoughtful, dignified and perspicacious state document about it. A cowboy could not exhibit, for instance, more passionate ignorance of the philosophical concepts of government than Mr. Roosevelt does when he rails indiscriminately at anarchism and anarchists; and an undergraduate at law school would be more cautious about proposing absurd and revolutionary legislation.

Anarchy Mr. Roosevelt proposes to make a crime, subject to the jurisdiction of the federal courts. If by anarchy he means the antithesis of socialism, he would stifle the right of opinion. If by anarchists he means men like the Russian Tolstoy or the American Crosby, he proposes a legislative crime which was only once committed in this country and which made its sponsors infamous. But if he means murder and murderers he is proposing to make a federal offense of what is already a crime within the jurisdiction of courts as willing and capable of dealing with it as the federal courts would be. The difference is that in the state courts the innocent could defend themselves more easily and inexpensively than in the federal courts, and be tried by a jury of their neighbors at home instead of a jury of strangers in a distant city. The only purpose of making such crimes cognizable by the federal courts is to put the innocent in jeopardy to satisfy partisan malice, and to centralize still further the already dangerously centralized power of a federal government which is rapidly becoming imperial.

What President Roosevelt is evidently reaching out for in his demand for federal laws against anarchy is centralized power for the suppression of opinions which he and his class do not approve, and the arbitrary punishment of men whom they dislike. He aims to bring within this imperial net "the deliberate demagogue," which means the preacher of unpopular opinions; "the exploiter of sensationalism," which means publishers of what offends refined tastes; "the crude and foolish visionary who, for whatever reason, apologizes for crime or excites aimless discontent," which means men who excite discontent which men of the Roosevelt type denounce as aimless because it aims at the abolition of the valuable privileges which enable them to live in luxury by the sweat of other men's faces. These are among the "anarchists," within the purview of the president's message, and he would have them dragged into the federal courts as criminals. To accomplish that, he would have anarchy made an international crime by treaties with European powers—Germany, Russia, Turkey, and the rest. His argument—which would be amusing to constitutional lawyers but for the judicial tendency to turn this constitutional republic into a world power empire—is that "such treaties would give to the federal government the power of dealing with the crime." And the proposed crime is utterly without limitation. Confiding creatures alone imagine that federal laws against "anarchy" would be enforced only against men with knives, torches, pistols and bombs. It is impossible to draft a law such as President Roosevelt proposes which could not be enforced against labor union speakers and papers by a federal administration in sympathy with employers; against Democratic speakers

and papers by a Republican administration; or against Republican speakers and papers by a Democratic administration. The dangers of centralization from Mr. Roosevelt's recommendations for the punishment of "anarchists," a recommendation as vague as if it were for the punishment of "bad men," are too great to be invoked as lightly and thoughtlessly as the president advises.

Centralization is indeed the dominant note of Mr. Roosevelt's message. Besides urging federal jurisdiction over assaults upon federal officials, it proposes a new cabinet officer whose function it shall be to permanently governmentalize American industries—a step in the direction of socialism which state socialists in their wildest dreams could not have hoped for so soon. It recommends, moreover, the enactment of trust legislation (a constitutional amendment if necessary) which would bring the business of about every corporation in the land within federal jurisdiction. For Mr. Roosevelt would have the nation "assume power of supervision and regulation over all corporations doing an interstate business." As all corporations are in a sense engaged in interstate business, since they buy or sell or both across state lines, and as most of the business of the country is done by corporations, Mr. Roosevelt's trust remedy would culminate in bringing virtually all the domestic as well as all the foreign business of the country within the jurisdiction of the federal courts and under the supervision of a member of the president's cabinet. Were his recommendations adopted, the states would fall to the grade of counties or provinces and an era of state socialism on a national scale and of the most offensively paternal character would be less than 20 years off. Unwittingly, it would seem, he has adopted the socialistic programme. Not so unwittingly, perhaps, he has set forth a scheme of trust reform to which the trust magnates themselves have long been committed.

These evidences of Mr. Roosevelt's

continued adolescence are to be regretted. But there is that in his message which is to be regretted even more. Whatever Mr. Roosevelt's faults of character may have been, no one has ever counted "smoothness" among them. Candor always stood to his credit in every man's mind. But this message is not altogether candid. A demagogic strain runs through it. Fortunately, however, the demagoguery can do no practical harm. His disingenuousness is too crude. It is the work of a novice, of an incapable imitator. Mr. Roosevelt's display of solicitude for the wage worker is patronizing, perfunctory and clumsy. His eloquent plea for ship subsidies, in which he scrupulously avoids using the word, exposes him as trying to make peace with Senator Hanna's shipping ring without offending his anti-subsidy admirers, to whom he pays the poor compliment of supposing that they cannot recognize a ship subsidy plea without the label. His recommendation of monopolies for the Philippines for the benefit of the natives is also transparently disingenuous. Though he asserts that franchises and land grants in the Philippines for American capitalists are necessary for the welfare of the natives, whom he says we are bringing painfully up to the level of 30 generations of civilization, it is all too evident that the welfare of the natives is not the real purpose, but that franchises and land grants for American monopolists are. Altogether, Mr. Roosevelt's message must be a disappointing performance to all who hoped that heavy responsibility might have awakened him to higher ideals and the possibilities of a nobler public career.

The British ministry will doubtless be pleased to observe that President Roosevelt's message contains no mention at all of the disinterested efforts Great Britain is putting forth to make the Boers "fit for self-government." This was truly thoughtful and friendly on the part of our new president,

and Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain ought to appreciate it. Very likely Mr. Roosevelt had the British and the Boers in mind when, in commenting upon the fact that "over the entire world in recent years wars between the great civilized powers have become less and less frequent," he explained that "wars with barbarous or semi-barbarous peoples come in an entirely different category, being merely a most regrettable but necessary international police duty which must be performed for the sake of the welfare of mankind." That is really a very pretty complimentary allusion to Great Britain's international police duty in South Africa, coming as it does from the head of a nation which is doing similar international police duty in the Philippines. But how will the Boers like to be classed as barbarous or semi-barbarous?

The resemblance of the British "international police duty" in South Africa to the American "international police duty" in the Philippines is much closer, even in detail, than is commonly supposed. The fact is sharply illustrated by a recent incident in the experience of the American Transvaal league. Among the recipients of a circular from this league was an English gentleman temporarily resident in Nice. This gentleman courteously acknowledged the circular, which admonished him to help "Make England Fight Fair," and contained some disagreeable facts about British reconcentrado camps. In his acknowledgment he asked "why the American people do not act fairly by the Filipinos—grant their independence and evacuate their territory?" By so doing, he added, "they would earn a title to take other nations to task." In justification of his question, this English gentleman inclosed several news clippings from Reuter's special service, underlining the pertinent parts. These clippings indicate that the United States is doing in the Philippines precisely what Americans complain of Great Britain