

approbation, Sir Harry describes Tuskegee and the aims of Booker Washington. "He has brushed aside all discussion of the political claims of the Negro, and the justice or the injustice of his treatment by the South, to concentrate his own attention and that of his listeners on the supreme necessity of making the Negro a valuable citizen of the United States. He wants the Negro to become the most industrious race in the United States, to live as well as possible, to eat well-cooked, wholesome food, set forth daintily, to build no house without a bath-room, to be fastidiously neat in person and dress, to be able to do everything, but most of all to be accomplished masons, architects, carpenters, cooks, dressmakers, tailors, hatters, plowmen, gardeners, cotton-growers, poultry-keepers, horse-breeders, carriage-builders, boot-makers, botanists, electricians," etc. Surely, again, a good ideal for any race!

Among the most interesting and valuable chapters in the book are those dealing with the negro as a citizen, especially in the Southern States, and with life in the Southern States. I by no means agree with all that Sir Harry says; I should often put the emphasis differently from the way in which he puts it; I think that his judgments are sometimes too favorable, and sometimes too unfavorable; but no one can read his book without appreciating his transparent sincerity and honesty, his acuteness and quickness of vision, his courage, and his hatred of all that is cruel and unclean. He deserves the gratitude of decent citizens for his protest against the method of treatment of one of the most loathsome forms of vice in New Orleans—and he could have written in substantially the same terms of most of the big cities of the country, North or South. The "flagrant man-swine" is seen at his worst when he both causes flaunting public scandal and tramples his victims into the mire, while at the same time refusing to accept any of the punishment visited with his approval on the vice for which he is himself mainly responsible.

It is a pleasant thing to read the final judgment of a visitor so obviously endeavoring to tell the exact truth:

"Yet, with all these imperfections in the social acceptance of the colored people of

the United States—imperfections which with time and patience and according to the merits of the Neo-negro will disappear—the main fact was evident to me after a tour through the Eastern and Southern States of North America; that nowhere else in the world, certainly not in Africa, has the Negro been given such a chance of mental and physical development as in the United States. Also that nowhere else has the Negro so greatly availed himself of his opportunities. Intellectually, and perhaps physically, he has attained his highest degree of advancement as yet in the United States. Politically he is freer there, socially he is happier than in any other part of the world."

The book is of great interest and permanent value; and it should be in the library of every American who cares to devote a little thought to one of the largest of the problems of to-day.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Khartum, March 15, 1910.

THE ARMY AND THE RECLAMATION SERVICE

An editorial in the "Engineering News" for May 12 refers to a plan supposed to be in contemplation for a change in the organization of the Reclamation Service. As our readers know, the Reclamation Service is a bureau in the Department of the Interior, and is charged with the enormous task of making fruitful and habitable hundreds of thousands of acres of arid lands. Under the director and engineers of this bureau great engineering works have been undertaken for bringing water through huge aqueducts and systems of ditches to land that is unwatered by rain. This Service is extending the habitable boundaries of the country as truly as a conquering army, and is doing it in a peaceful manner that results only in increased production. No dramatic incidents or thrilling battles mark the progress of this conquest. That fact, however, does not make the Reclamation Service of any less value. Its work is done without the accompaniment of bands of music. It is none the less effective. The "Engineering News" announces that it has information that there is a plan

to put this Reclamation Service in the charge of an army engineer.

This plan, the "Engineering News" says, will be made possible if a provision in a bill which has passed the House is made law. This provision reads "that the President may, in his discretion, detail any army engineer to the supervision or inspection of any engineering work or works of construction carried on by the Government pursuant to law." It is stated that there is a probability that this provision will be modified so as to exclude other departments of Government work than the Reclamation Service. The "Engineering News" opposes this plan on the three grounds that it will work injury to the profession of engineering, that it involves the separation from the Service of the present Director, Mr. Newell, and that it is a menace to reclamation.

At first thought the plan is an attractive one. The United States supports an army. The ultimate purpose of that army is, of course, the defense of the country; but for long periods of time it is not called upon to engage in war. On the other hand, it is a great resource. It comprises a great number of men who are capable of productive work. It is highly organized and can be easily controlled and managed. Its engineering corps includes men of engineering experience and ability of high order and proved efficiency. It surely seems sensible to turn the latent power of this large body of men to such productive service as the reclamation of the arid lands of the West. The Outlook has long held that there is no reason why an army, or a navy for that matter, should be maintained merely as a fighting machine, and has regarded it as a legitimate source of pride that the army has achieved such constructive results as are now visible, for example, in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines.

The turning over to the army, however, of this particular task of reclamation would be attended with difficulties which would result in little good and much ill. It is true that the army is a directing force in the construction of the Panama Canal, and Colonel Goethals has shown extraordinary vigor and ability in directing that task. The duty, however, of directing a particular engineering undertaking like

that is quite different from the duty of taking charge of a branch of the Government involving, not merely one project, but a permanent policy with regard to a whole system and series of projects.

The idea that the army is idle and can advantageously be put to work is erroneous. The engineer corps of the army is, in fact, so heavily burdened with work that the problem is not how it can be employed, but how it can be strengthened to do the work that it has undertaken to do. Few people realize how much the engineer corps of the army is obliged to do in the improvement of rivers and harbors. The fact is that the very bill which contains this provision for adding to the engineering duties of the army also provides for an increase in the corps of engineers, in order to enable that corps to do what is already laid upon it.

Furthermore, the duty lying upon the director of the Reclamation Service is not solely an engineering duty; it is primarily an executive one. The head of that Service is as much an executive in function as the head of any other bureau. There is no more reason for looking to the army to supply an executive for this bureau than for any other bureau in the Government.

Even if, however, there were need to look for engineers, it cannot very well be explained why army engineers are particularly adapted to the task. The duties of the supervising engineers in reclamation work are similar in many respects to those of supervising engineers in commercial undertakings. Unlike most other Governmental constructions, and especially unlike military constructions, the reclamation projects raise the question of the relation of cost to income. Army engineers are accustomed, not without justification, to do their work and get the highest results with only very subsidiary regard to expense. Reclamation projects, on the contrary, depend for their success on the ability of the builders to keep down the cost of the investment to a figure which will justify the returns. It is therefore highly important that the supervising engineer in a reclamation project should have experience in drawing contracts and dealing with contractors. Furthermore, since all these projects are

paid for, not out of the general treasury, but out of funds ultimately provided by the homesteaders whose lands are to be irrigated, there is special need that the reclamation work should be carried on not according to military but according to commercial standards.

Closely connected with this fact is the further fact that the engineers in charge of reclamation projects are dealing with people not accustomed to military practices or discipline. On the one hand, there are the laborers and the higher subordinates, who do not work well under the rules which army engineers would naturally expect to enforce. On the other hand, there are the homesteaders, whose co-operation is essential for the real success of the projects, and who cannot be expected to adapt themselves to any other methods than those which people employ in ordinary business dealing.

Finally, even if all these difficulties should prove readily surmountable (which seems to us most improbable), there remains one fact that alone renders the proposed plan, to our thinking, impracticable. The engineering of the reclamation projects is specialized. Although many forms of civil engineering are involved, the work is chiefly hydraulic engineering. Moreover, it is hydraulic engineering particularly adapted to irrigation. There are many civil engineers who are especially trained in this form of engineering. On the other hand, the military engineer has no particular reason for studying hydraulic engineering for irrigation purposes, and cannot be expected to have a special knowledge of the subject. We may suppose, however, that a military engineer put in charge of a reclamation project would set to work to inform himself in that particular branch of the profession. The organization of the army, however, is such that promotions in the Service would at frequent intervals lead to the transfer of such an officer to other work, leaving his place to be supplied by a successor who would in turn have to begin a special study of the subject. We see no reason whatever for subjecting the Reclamation Service to the burden of instructing military engineers in the subject of hydraulic engineering, when the Government not only can get hydraulic engineers

from civil ranks but has already created an organization particularly adapted to the business of irrigation.

We hope that the provision to enable the President to designate a military engineer for the Reclamation Service will not become law. If it does, we hope that the President will not avail himself of the authority therein granted, but will rather give to the present Director of the Service the support to which the work he has so well done has entitled him.



THE EXECUTIVE'S DUTY

From his recent speeches President Taft has given the country to understand that he considers his duty as an executive officer to be bounded by the particular mandates of law. This has been emphasized in his comment on his power to withdraw public lands. He has declared that it is a very grave question whether the Executive has the power to make reservations *in extenso*.

Under the Roosevelt Administration in general, and in particular under the Garfield administration of the Department of the Interior in its care of the public domain, the principle was emphasized that the duty of an executive officer was not merely to do that which the law commanded, but also to do everything possible for the public welfare not prohibited by law. In this the Roosevelt Administration rested on a sure foundation. Indeed, as Mr. Garfield pointed out the other day in his Denver address, Chief Justice Marshall laid down the rule that the Constitution was an instrument for action, not a mere set of directory or prohibitory regulations. He said:

Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are Constitutional.

President Taft himself has provided us with an interesting and striking example of this interpretation. In discussing American work in the Philippines before a missionary society in May, 1908, he spoke as follows:

It is said that there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States that authorizes national altruism of that sort. Well, of course there is not; but there is nothing in