

President Roosevelt's Famous "Race Suicide" Views.

NO SINGLE EXPRESSION of views by President Roosevelt upon any subject has been more widely quoted than his words in relation to "race suicide." And yet not one person in a hundred knows just how he came to utter them or the circumstances under which they were written. They were contained in a letter which appeared as a preface to a book called "The Woman Who Tolls," by Mrs. John Van Vorst and Miss Marie Van Vorst. The President wrote his letter after he read an article which was incorporated in the work. His letter to the author was as follows:

"White House, Washington, October 18, 1903. My Dear Mrs. Van Vorst—I must write you a line to say how much I have appreciated your article, 'The Woman Who Tolls.' But to me there is a most melancholy side to it, when you touch upon what is fundamentally, infinitely more important than any other question in this country—that is, the question of race suicide, complete or partial.

"An easy, good-natured kindness and a desire to be 'independent,' that is, to live one's life purely according to one's desires—are in no sense substitutes for the fundamental virtues, for the practice of the strong racial qualities without which there can be no strong race—the qualities of courage and resolution in both men and women, of scorn of what is mean, base and selfish, of eager desire to work or fight or suffer, as the case may be, provided the end to be gained is great enough, and the contemptuous putting aside of mere rapid pleasure, mere avoidance of toil and worry.

"I do not know whether I most pity or most despise the polished and selfish man or woman who does not understand that the only things really worth having in life are those the acquirement of which normally means cost and effort. If a man or woman, through no fault of his or hers, goes through life denied those highest of all joys which

spring only from home life, from the having and bringing up of many healthy children, I feel for them deep and respectful sympathy—the sympathy one extends to the gallant fellow killed at the beginning of a campaign, or the man who toils hard and is brought to ruin by the fault of others.

"But the man or woman who deliberately avoids marriage and has a heart so cold as to know no passion, and a brain so shallow and selfish as to dislike having children, is in effect a criminal against the race, and should be an object of contemptuous abhorrence by all healthy people.

"Of course no one quality makes a good citizen, and no one quality will save a nation. But there are certain great qualities for the lack of which no amount of intellectual brilliancy, or of material prosperity, or of easiness of life can atone, and which show decadence and corruption in the nation just as much if they are produced by selfishness and coldness and ease-loving laziness among comparatively poor people, as if they are produced by vicious or frivolous luxury in the rich.

"If the men of the nation are not anxious to work in many different ways with all their might and strength, and ready and able to fight at need, and anxious to be fathers of families, and if the women do not recognize that the greatest thing for any woman is to be a good wife and mother, why, that nation has cause to be alarmed about its future.

"There is no physical trouble among us Americans. The trouble with the situation you set forth is one of character, and therefore we can conquer if we only will.

"Very sincerely yours,
"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

"HIT THE LINE HARD," SAYS PRESIDENT TO THE "AMERICAN BOY."

OF COURSE what we have a right to expect of the American boy is that he shall turn out to be a good American man. Now, the chances are strong that he won't be much of a man unless he is a good deal of a boy. He must not be a coward or a weakling, a bully, a shirk, or a prig. He must work hard and play hard. He must be clean-minded and clean-lived, and able to hold his own under all circumstances and against all comers. It is only on these conditions that he will grow in to the kind of American man of whom America can be really proud.

There are always in life countless tendencies for good and for evil, and each succeeding generation sees some of these tendencies strengthened and some weakened, not by any means always, alas! that the tendencies for evil are weakened and those for good strengthened. But during the last few decades there certainly have been some notable changes for good in boy life. The great growth in the love of athletic sports, for instance, while fraught with danger if it becomes one-sided and unhealthy, has beyond all question had an excellent effect in increased manliness. Forty or 50 years ago the writer on American morals and luxury of young Americans who were born of rich parents. The boy, who was well off, lived too luxuriously, took to billiards as his chief innocent recreation, and felt some shame in his inability to take part in rough pastimes and field sports. Nowadays, whatever other faults the son of rich parents may tend to develop, he is at least forced by the opinion of all his associates of his own age to bear himself well in manly exercises and to develop his body—and therefore, to a certain extent, his character—in the rough sports which call for pluck, endurance and physical activity.

Of course boys who live under such fortunate conditions that they have to do either a good deal of outdoor work or a good deal of what might be called natural outdoor play do not need this athletic development. In the Civil war the soldiers who came from the prairie and the backwoods and the rugged farming where stumps still dotted the clearings, and who had learned to ride in their infancy, to shoot as soon as they could handle a rifle, and to climb out whenever they got a chance, were better fitted for military work than any set of mere

school or college athletes could possibly be. Moreover, to misestimate athletics is equally bad, whether the importance is magnified or minimized. The Greeks were famous athletes, and as long as their athletic training had a normal place in their lives, it was a good thing. But it was a very bad thing when they kept up their athletic games while letting the stern qualities of soldiery and statesmanship sink into disuse. Some of the young readers of this book will certainly sometime read the famous letters of the younger Pliny, a Roman, who wrote, with what seems to us a

curiously modern touch, in the first century of the present era. His correspondence, the *Epistolae*, is particularly interesting; and not the least noteworthy thing in it is the tone of contempt with which he speaks of the Greek athletic sports, and the divisions of an unfavorable people which it was to encourage in order to keep the Greeks from turning into anything formidable, important pastimes of the Romans, and almost as much of a fetish as in the last century, the French and German nobles made the chase of the stage, when they carried hunting and

game-preserving to a point which was ruinous to the national life. For hunting is very good as a pastime, but it is about as poor a business as can be followed by any man of intelligence. Certain writers about it are fond of quoting the anecdote of a fox-hunter who in the days of the English civil war, was discovered pursuing his favorite sport just before a great battle between the Cavaliers and the Puritans, and had better abandon sport altogether.

No boy can afford to neglect his work, and with a boy work, as a rule, means study. Of course there are occasional brilliant successes in life where the man has been worthless as a student when a boy. To take these exceptions as examples would be as unsafe as it would be to advocate blindness because some blind men have won undying honor by triumphing over their physical infirmity and accomplishing great results in the world. I am no advocate of senseless and excessive cramming in studies, but a boy should work hard and should work hard, at his lessons—in the first place, for the sake of what he will learn, and in the next place, for the sake of the effect upon his own character of resolutely settling down to learn it. Shiftlessness, slackness, indifference in studying, are almost certain to mean inability to get on in other walks of life. Of course, as a boy grows older it is a good thing if he can shape his studies in the direction toward which he has a natural bent; but whether he can do this or not, he must put his whole heart into them. I do not believe in mischief-doing in school hours, or in the kind of animal spirits that results in making boy scholars; and I believe that those boys who take part in rough, hard play outside of school will not find any need or horse-play in school. While they study they should study just as hard as they play football in a match game. It is wise to obey the homely old adage, "Work while you work; play while you play."

A boy needs both physical and moral courage. Neither can take the place of the other. When boys become men they will find out that there are some soldiers very brave in the field who have proved timid and worthless as politicians, and some politicians who show an entire readiness to take chances and assume responsibilities in civil affairs, but who lack the fighting edge when opposed to physical danger. In each case, with soldiers and politicians alike, there is but half a virtue. The possession of the courage of the soldier does not excuse the lack of courage in the statesman, and even less does the possession of the courage of the statesman excuse shrinking on the field of battle. Now, this is all just as true of boys. A coward who will not stand up for himself in a fight, or a coward who will not stand up for his country, is a contemptible creature, but, after all, he is hardly as contemptible as the boy who dares not stand up for what he deems right against the wrongs of his associates, who are themselves wrong. Ridicule is one of the favorite weapons of weakness, and it is sometimes incomprehensible how good and brave boys will be induced by the jests of associates who have no one quality that calls for respect, but who affect to laugh at the very traits which ought to be peculiarly the cause of pride.

There is no need to be a prig. There is no need for a boy to preach about his own good conduct and virtue. If he does he will make himself offensive and ridiculous. He should be a boy who should be clean and straight, honest and truthful, gentle and tender, as well as brave. If he can once get a proper understanding of things, he will have a far more hearty contempt for the boy who has begun a course of feeble dissipation, or who is untruthful, or mean, or dishonest, or cruel, than this boy

and his fellow can possibly, in return, feel for him. The very fact that the boy should be manly and able to hold his own, that he should be ashamed to submit to bullying without instant retaliation, should, in return, make him abhor any form of bullying, cruelty, or brutality.

There are two delightful books, Thomas Hughes' "Tom Brown at Rugby," and Aldrich's "Story of a Bad Boy," which I hope every boy will read; and I think American boys will always feel more in sympathy with Aldrich's story, because there is in it

none of the fagging, and the bullying which goes with fagging, the account of which, and the acceptance of which, always puzzles an American admirer of Tom Brown.

There is the same contrast between two stories of Kipling's. One called "Captains Courageous," describes in the liveliest way just what a boy should be and do. The hero is joined in the beginning as the spoiled, over-indulged child of wealthy parents, of a type which we do sometimes unfortunately see, and then which there exist few things more objectionable on the face

of the broad earth. This boy is afterward thrown on his own resources, and is forced to work hard among boys and men who are real boys and real men doing real work, and he grows up into a man. On the other hand, if one wishes to find types of boys to be avoided with utter dislike, one will find them in another story of Kipling's, called "Stalky & Co.," a story which is a study in the making of a bad boy, for there is hardly a single form of meanness which it does not seem to exhaust, or of school mismanagement which it does not seem to applaud. Bullies do not make brave men, and boys or men of foul life cannot become good citizens, good Americans, until they change; and even after the change some boys will be left on their souls.

The boy can best become a good man by being a good boy—not a good-looking boy, but just a plain good boy. I do not mean that he must love only the negative virtues, I mean that he must do the positive virtues also. "Good," in the largest sense, should include whatever is fine, straightforward, clean, brave, and manly. The best boys I know—the best men I know—are good in all the studies or their business, fearless and stalwart, hated and feared by all that is wicked and depraved, incapable of submitting to wrong-doing, and equally incapable of being any way tender to the weak and helpless. A healthy-minded boy should feel hearty contempt for the coward, and even more hearty indignation for the boy who bullies girls or smaller boys, or tortures animals. One prime reason for abhorring cowards is because every good boy should have in him to thrash the objectionable traits out of his own nature.

Of course the effect that a thoroughly manly, thoroughly straight and upright boy can have upon the companions of his own age, and upon those who are younger, is incalculable. If he is not thoroughly manly, then they will not respect him, and his good qualities will count for but little; while, of course, if he is mean, cruel, or wicked, then his physical strength and his good mind merely make him so much the more objectionable a member of society. He cannot do good work if he is not strong and does not try with his whole heart, and he cannot stand up in a contest; and his strength will be a curse to himself and to every one else if he does not have thorough command over himself and over his own evil passions, and if he does not use his strength on the side of decency, justice and fair dealing.

In short, in life, as in a foot-ball game, the principle to follow is: Hit the line hard; don't foul and don't shirk, but hit the line hard!



A BUCKING BRONCHO,
From President Roosevelt's Book on Ranch Life.

President's Talk on Eighth and Ninth Commandments in Politics.

THE two commandments which are specially applicable in public life are the eighth and ninth. Not only every politician, high or low, but every citizen interested in politics, and especially every man who, in a newspaper or on the stump, advocates or condemns any public policy or any public man, should remember always that the two cardinal points in his doctrine ought to be "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." He should also, of course, remember that the multitude of men who break the moral law expressed in these two commandments are not to be justified by the fact that they are in the clutches of the law. Robbery and theft, perjury and subornation of perjury, are crimes punishable by the courts; but many a man who technically never commits any one of these crimes is yet morally quite as guilty as his less adroit but not more wicked, and possibly less dangerous brother, who gets into the penitentiary.

As regards the eighth commandment, while the remark of one of the founders of our government, that the whole art of politics consists in being honest, is an overstatement it remains true that absolute honesty is what Cromwell would have called a "fundamental" of healthy political life. We can afford to differ on the currency, the tariff and foreign policy; but we cannot afford to differ on the question of honesty if we expect our republic to permanently endure. No community is healthy where it is ever necessary to distinguish one politician among his fellows because he is more honest than the others. It is not very numerous outside of certain well known centers of festering corruption. But the temptation to be dishonest often comes in insidious ways. There are not a few public men who, though they would repel with indignation an

offer of a bribe, who will give certain corporations special legislative aid, and executive privileges because they have contributed heavily to campaign funds; will permit loose and extravagant work because a contractor has political influence; or, at any rate, will permit a public servant to take public money without rendering an adequate return, by conniving at inefficient service on the part of men who are protected by prominent party leaders. Various degrees of moral guilt are involved in the multitudinous actions of this kind; but, after all, directly or indirectly, every such case comes dangerously near the borderline of the commandment which, forbidding theft, certainly by implication forbids the connivance at theft, or the failure to punish it. One of the favorite schemes of reformers is to devise some method by which big corporations can be prevented from making heavy subscriptions to campaign funds, and thereby acquiring improper influence. But the best way to prevent them from making contributions for improper purposes is simply to elect as public servants, not professional denouncers of corporations—for such men are in practice usually their most servile tools—but men who say, and mean, that they will neither be for nor against corporations; that, on the one hand they will not be frightened from doing them justice by popular clamor, or, on the other hand, led by any interest whatsoever into doing them more than justice. It is, of course, not enough that a public official should be honest. No amount of honesty will avail if he is not also brave and wise. The weakling and the coward cannot be saved by honesty alone; but without honesty the brave and able man is merely a civic wild beast who is merely hunted down by every lover of righteousness. No man who is corrupt, no man who condones corruption in others, can possibly do his duty by the community. When this truth is accepted as axiomatic in our politics, then, and not till then, shall we see such a moral uplifting of the people as will render, for instance, Tammany rule in New York, as Tammany rule now is, no more possible than it would be possible to revive the robber baronage of the middle ages.

Great is the danger to our country from the failure among our public men to live up to the eighth commandment, and from the callousness in the public which

permits such shortcomings. Yet it is not exaggeration to say that the danger is quite as great from those who year after year violate the ninth commandment by bearing false witness against the honest man, and who thereby degrade him and elevate the dishonest man to a level with him on the same level. The public is quite as much harmed in the one case as in the other, by the one set of wrongdoers as by the other. "Liar," is just as ugly a word as "thief," because it implies the presence of just as ugly a sin in one case as in the other. If a man lies, he is just as much a criminal as if he robs, or if he swears falsely against the honest man, he is just as much a criminal as if he swears falsely in his own defense. The difference between perjury and mendacity is not in the least one of morals or ethics. It is simply one of legal forms.

The same man may break both commandments, or one group of men may be tempted to break one and another group of men the other. In our civil life the worst offenders against the law of honesty owe no small part of their immunity to those who sin against the law by bearing false witness against the honest neighbors. The sin is, of course, peculiarly revolting when coupled with hypocrisy, when it is committed in the name of morality. Few politicians do as much harm as the newspaper editor, the clergyman, or the lay reformer who, day in and day out, by virulent and untruthful invective aimed at the upholders of honesty, weakens them for the benefit of the frankly vicious. We need fearless criticism on any point where we need criticism; but even more do we need criticism which shall be truthful both in what it says and what it leaves unsaid—the impression it designs to leave upon the readers or hearers' minds. We need absolute honesty in public life; and we shall not get it until we remember that truth-telling must go hand in hand with it, and that it is quite as important not to tell an untruth about a decent man as it is to tell the truth about one who is not decent.

"A RACE SUICIDE" WARNING BY BALLINGTON BOOTH.

THE fact that the conditions exist to the result of which President Roosevelt has applied the term "race suicide" is so well known that no words need be wasted in discussing either the justice or necessity of his observations, and the existence of those conditions must be a matter of deep regret to every true lover of this republic and of the principles upon which it is founded.

The causes, however, of the present social state are varied in character, and some of them at least may be removed through the enlightenment of certain persons and the modification of certain principles upon which they mold their actions. Wise, patriotic men and women only require to have pointed out to them the way in which they can benefit first themselves, then the nation, after which they will not only walk in this way themselves, but will by teaching the example induce others to follow in their footsteps. Allusion may be made to three or four.

1.—The erroneous idea that happiness in life can always be found in gratifying the desires for social, intellectual or scientific pleasure, and that the duties and responsibilities of parenthood will interfere with plans looking to such enjoyment.

2.—False conceptions of life as a whole, due to a variety of causes. Among them may be named novels of several types, many plays and the general views and lives of those who exist apparently for very little else than to amuse themselves.

3.—Exaggerated ideas of the "burden" that children really are in a home. This is especially true where the individuals concerned are possessed of fairly good incomes. Such persons will say that they cannot afford to have children, while they will spend enough money in a month

at the seaside to feed and clothe a family of four or five children for a year, and in a similar style, too. 4.—The ignoring of the claims of God and of religion upon the individual and upon the world. To bring up a child in the fear of God and to teach him to live a pure, upright and noble life is not only a rich reward to the parents themselves, but the conferring of an inestimable blessing upon the world at large.

5.—A determination to subordinate everything in life to the gratification of the passing desire of the hour. A man is fond of horses or amusement, or travel or science or work of some kind. He makes up his mind that he will do nothing that is likely to interfere with his indulgence in these directions at any moment. A woman lives for pleasure, or "society," or perhaps for some artistic career. In order that no ties may be formed or duties created that shall hamper her in these pursuits, some of the deepest joys of which the human heart is capable are "passed by on the other side."

But the results! Are they not very serious to the individuals, as any attempt to improve upon nature—or, as some would say, "God's plan"—always is? For he it remembered there are certain elements in the human character that parenthood alone can bring out and develop. The love of a mother is proverbially colossal in its proportions, and who will deny that love—the greatest attribute of even God himself—only reaches its supreme height in motherhood? As a father still his children, he is also written concerning the Almighty, and none can deny that few men are consciously pitiful or compassionate until they have children of their own, or draw forth those qualities.

The same is true of other qualities of heart and mind which are seldom developed in high degree save among those who are striving to do their duty by their families. They miss the joy created by the love and gratitude of children. This may seem almost mythical to people who have none, but it is a very tangible reality to those who are parents. A father or mother of even a large family who could part easily with one of them permanently—even though the child were likely to be greatly benefited thereby—would be looked upon by every one as an abnormal being. And no more striking proof of the depth and reality of this emotion is to be found than is often seen in the divorce courts themselves, where the fiercest battle is often fought not to be rid of the children, but to have them. But there is another phase of this emotion is to be found in the childless miss, too, the gratification and the justifiable pride of seeing the good results of their efforts to form character and to make their children good, useful men and women. Ask any father and mother whose children are growing up into manhood and womanhood whether they regret, or even remember, the self-denial and toil and difficulties that they have undergone in the rearing of their families. They will reply that even the very recollection of these things is largely swallowed up in the joy and satisfaction they feel in their children's successes at school and college or in business, and that they are more than abundantly repaid for all they have sacrificed for their sakes.

All this is from the family standpoint. But there is another phase of the civil and national life that cannot be patent to all who are students of city life where the residences of the educated, the well-to-do, the "American" are to be found in the quarters where the ignorant, the vicious, the thriftless and the criminal are to be found in the streets fairly swarmed with children.

MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PARTY.

Those who comprise the President's party proper, are the President, Secretary Loeb, Assistant Secretary Barnes, Surgeon General P. M. Rixey, U. S. N.; Mr. Nelson P. Webster, Mr. M. C. Latta, Mr. J. L. McGrew, stenographers; C. R. Rosenberg, representing the Pennsylvania Railroad company; H. A. Coleman, Associated Press; R. H. Hazard, Scripps-McRae Press association; Lindsay Denison, New York Sun Press association; R. L. Dunn, Collier's Weekly; George B. Luckey, Leslie's Weekly; N. Lazarnick, Harper's Weekly; H. A. Stromeyer, photographer; P. W. William, Western Union Telegraph company; J. P. Gooch, Postal Telegraph-Cable company; F. H. Tyner, R. H. Taylor, S. A. Connell, W. W. Stone, and three messengers. Secretary of the Navy Moody and Secretary of Agriculture Wilson will both be with the President and his party in Salt Lake, though they are not members direct of it.