

ment bringing the whole work of the Department into question.

It may be recalled that there has been some friction between the government and the farmers over the use of small stills for the distillation of alcohol from the refuse of the farm. The claim is made that instruments are already in existence that will enable the farmer to make a considerable amount of alcohol from vegetable matter on the farm that can be used for no other purpose. But the government claims that the difficulty of controlling the collection of excise duties from these stills is so great that they are not allowed to be used. Just what the real facts of the case are it is difficult at the present time to tell. The Government may be right, and it may be advisable to wait until further improvements have been made. At the same time the claim is made that these stills will make alcohol so cheap that it will seriously cut into the profits of the Standard Oil Company, which means an interference with the income of Mr. Rockefeller; and the deduction is made by certain people that the use of the still is prohibited by the Government at the instance of the Rockefeller employes for the purpose of preserving his income intact.

It may be that there is nothing whatever in this contention; it is not unlikely that the position taken by the Government has been dictated by the wisest consideration of all the factors. And yet from the very circumstances surrounding the relations of a public department with the beneficiaries of a private trust a suspicion has been aroused in the minds of many people, and the whole work of the Department is discredited. This is the more to be regretted for the reason that it is doubtful if any other department of the Government has such opportunities for serving the people. Farming is still our largest single industry, and it is still most lacking, taken as a whole, in up-to-dateness. The Government is doing a great work in helping the farmer, and if the best results are to be obtained there should be the closest harmony and co-operation between the men on the farm and the agents of the Department. If men who owe allegiance to an outside agent are to be taken into the Government service, and questions arise in which there is a conflict of interests between the farmers and that outside agent, it is the most natural thing in the world for suspicions to arise that will handicap the whole work. The United States Government

is not bankrupt; it is able to pay for all the service required by the people. If any private interest wishes to conduct scientific researches, it should do so upon its individual responsibility, and not in the name of the people. We know what havoc has been wrought by a partnership between the Government and private business. Let us not repeat the mistake by setting up a partnership of government and private charity. S. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SITUATION IN OREGON.

Portland, Oregon, Nov. 23.

The people of Oregon had before them at the last election 29 measures, of which 11 were submitted by the legislature and 18 through the initiative. Of these, but four passed. Two of the legislature-submitted and two of the initiative measures.

The reasons and the lessons are of interest. The tax measures submitted by the legislature, practically the same as submitted twice before, went down almost two to one. The tax measure submitted by progressive groups (sur-tax and \$1,500 exemption) went down about 2½ to one. The tax measure submitted by the reactionary group went down three to one.

The measures carried were, (1) providing that voters in Oregon must be U. S. citizens, and not merely foreigners having taken out first papers. There has been a good deal of opposition to the old provisions for many years, and at last the legislature submitted the matter. It carried by a vote of 162,159 to 39,675; (2) allowing cities to consolidate, 98,865 to 78,844; (3) prohibition, 137,557 to 99,390; (4) abolishing death penalty, 100,449 to 100,215.

Every measure providing for abolishment of offices was defeated. Every measure creating any office was defeated. Those creating offices receiving the heaviest negative vote. The proposition to create the office of lieutenant-governor went down by 50,005 to 136,540. To create a second state tax commission (one already existing), 34,203 to 136,112. The proportional representation measure was defeated by 59,769 to 133,148, and abolition of state senate by 63,328 to 122,831. The reactionary measure that would practically have restored the old convention system and hamstrung the direct primary was defeated by 25,696 to 152,542.

There were many reasons for the defeat of the progressive measures. First and foremost there was a general idea that the main thing to do was to put them on the ballot. Very little campaigning for any of them was made either before or after filing last July. There was a strong cry from the stand-pat and plutocratic press that there were too many measures on the ballot. The phrase "Vote NO when in doubt," was taken up by the privilege press and echoed by even the somewhat progressive papers until it drove the knife into everything. All that was necessary was to create doubts concerning a progressive measure, circulate some deftly woven

lie, start some baseless apprehension, and the phrase, echoed from pulpit, press and street corner, did the rest.

Two measures against which no opposition was expected and no campaign made by any person or group shows the strength of this negative vote and its blindness. One measure which was carried provided for the consolidation of cities. It received 78,000 negative votes, however. Another providing for the consolidation of a city with a county and so worded as to only apply (although general in its terms) to the city of Portland in the county of Multnomah, was defeated by an adverse vote of nearly 100,000. There was no reason for any person outside of Portland voting No on these measures, yet in the furthest and most remote county in the state a majority of 300 was given against the latter.

Allowing for prejudice against Portland, which is bitter in some sections of the State, I think that the "blind negative vote" was fully 15 per cent of the total vote cast, and that on all but three or four there was fully 25 per cent. Given such a start, prejudice and doubts are easily aroused on any fundamental measure that goes to the root of long established special privilege and makes it necessary to do something more than merely placing a measure on the ballot, and then making a few speeches in populous centers during a whirling campaign, with a score of candidates and advocates of a score of other measures to compete with.

To secure any such measure the fundamental principles must be taught, patiently, fully, personally by advocates devoted to the Cause and willing to sacrifice. And they must be backed and encouraged by organization and some means. The securing of signatures and the placing of a measure on the ballot should be merely an adjunct to the campaign, and such a campaign must be undertaken with a determination to stay with it until victory is gained.

Equal suffrage was defeated seven times by the people of Oregon. The employers' liability measure was before the legislature for six years before the people passed it. Prohibition has been forced to the front as an issue these ten years, or more.

The abolition of capital punishment by less than 300 majority is too close to be comfortable. It shows, however, that even where a measure is not an attack upon special privilege that the "blind NO vote" is large and the necessity of persistence and stout-heartedness is necessary. All honor to Paul Turner and his wife for staying with the abolition of capital punishment, although their honors will be snatched away from them, no doubt.

The singletaxers of Oregon are not organized. They never have been. They have discovered that a half-way measure will be fought as bitterly as the real thing. There are 60,000 men and women in Oregon who are not frightened at the term, and who have it in for land monopoly. There are fully 60,000 more who are frightened at the term, but have not seen the light. There are fully 50,000 reactionaries who will vote against any tax reform whatever. The task is to get the frightened ones to step forward. To do this requires a campaign that will compel the opposition to propose the compromises; that will carry the gospel of justice and prosperity to every farm house; that will reach with

individual touch every workingman and woman in the state, in city, town or country. Such a campaign would knit together these 60,000 and set them to converting their neighbors. There is no other way. If we in Oregon are not prepared to do this, then we must mark time until from some other commonwealth comes the example, and the economic pressure, that will crowd us forward whether we will or not.

The vote in Oregon means that the people will not go backward, and are not going forward until they are satisfied that it is the right thing. The prohibitionists have been defeated time and again. They were well organized and well financed. The plutes let them alone. The "Non-Partisan League"—a millionaire's organization—fought every progressive measure on the ballot and spent tens of thousands of dollars. It owns up to \$17,000. All the progressives did not have half that much put together.

The definitely and declared measure of the socialists, the "right to work" bill, received nearly 58,000 votes. That was more than any socialist candidate received, three times over. It was the first time that the party has sought to make use of the initiative as a vehicle of education.

Independent candidates were snowed under. The press gave them no publicity. The only Democrat of note to win was U. S. Senator George E. Chamberlain—re-elected. He has identified himself in the past with democratic reforms; the other candidates of the party never have in the past, did not during the campaign, and have no inclination to in the future. W. S. U'Ren was an independent candidate for governor, and the only candidate for that office outspokenly for prohibition. He was forgotten by all but a few thousand personal friends. The "dry" votes went to the utterly noncommittal "stand-pat" candidate, who also received a vast number of "wet" votes. Other independents for other offices, with and without campaign funds, received the same medicine. U'Ren is not discouraged. He has learned something. That is, the direct primary has made it very rough sledding for independents, and that publicity is the power that resides in the hands of the big daily paper.

Through divisions and a strong inclination to vote the G. O. P. straight the people are to be misrepresented by a reactionary enemy in Congress from Portland. C. N. McArthur is an avowed reactionary and makes no bones about it. He always has been. His Democratic opponent was a man of great personal powers, but his campaign was made without any suspicion of his having any Democratic sentiments approaching fundamentals. He did not attract the progressive, radical or labor elements, and the special privileged preferred one of their own pets.



The abolition of capital punishment was secured in this state by six years of desultory campaigning. It was submitted in 1912 and defeated by 20,000 majority, or more. An effort was made in 1911 to start a campaign of education, but an utterly unmoral shyster lawyer got control and dissipated the very limited funds in trips to secure evidence to save individual necks instead of for a measure to do away with legal murder. Another organization is-

sued appeals for funds, but did nothing, and time slipped away rapidly. Early in 1912 Paul Turner tried to revive the old organization, and with the undersigned and C. E. S. Wood, the attention and endorsement of a new organization was obtained from Governor Oswald West. Even then support and supporters flagged and flickered. At last Turner drew up a measure, several of us suggested amendments and modifications. The lawyers didn't like it, for it was brief and to the point and ignored some details. It simply provided: "The death penalty shall not be inflicted upon any person under the laws of Oregon. The maximum punishment which may be inflicted shall be life imprisonment."

The means to secure signatures were slow in materializing. Only by the sacrifices and work of a very few was the petition finally completed. After that everybody was absorbed in the rush of the campaign, and no organized effort was made to get out among the people. Considerable publicity was given to the measure, however, as it really did not interfere with any established privilege. Paul Turner kept at it everlastingly. He obtained an engagement to speak against prohibition during the campaign, but he also spoke for the abolition of capital punishment. Every day he went before audiences of mill hands, unskilled workers, mixed audiences of all kinds, and spoke one word for the abolition of capital punishment and ten for the "wets." He reached a class of people the "unco good" could not have approached, and he gave them arguments that appealed to their understanding. At times he got before social organizations and spoke for humanity's sake without money and without price. There are those who denounce Paul Turner. I have heard him bitterly assailed before public audiences, and I presume that he is somewhat lacking in all the angelic qualities that a reform leader should possess in order to suit other reform leaders. Perhaps if Paul Turner and his little English wife had not sacrificed and hustled and fought against hope, perhaps—somebody else would have done so. That is always said when the victory is won. It is said now. But nobody else DID come forward when it was necessary, and few at all. If it had not been for this one and that one, perhaps Paul Turner's efforts would have been fruitless to secure the measure's necessary signatures. Perhaps he undertook the task for money, or for glory, or for office; but others did not see any money, glory or office along that path—and I do not believe he will realize much of these human and passing returns.

The measure passed by less than 300 majority, it seems, but it has passed. A long fight of a few friends of man has been won.

ALFRED D. CRIDGE.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE SPIRIT OF THE SINGLETAX

Colfax, Wash., November 20.

Many of Dr. Walter Rauschenbusch's admirers among the readers of "The Public," and there are many, will disagree with him in reading into the Singletax movement a materialistic rationalism, "swayed only by forces that can be stated in syl-

logisms." The mere "abolition of all taxes save a single tax upon land values," might in itself be so construed, but in the results that are expected to flow from this material policy is something that cannot be stated in a syllogism, something ideally rationalistic.

"Strong soul and high endeavor, the world needs them now," wrote Henry George. Strong soul and high endeavor, the world found them in Henry George, and if his work has conveyed less than this message, then is it barren indeed.

Mr. Rauschenbusch's criticism is timely in warning the followers of Henry George against falling below the lofty standard of their master.

HARRY W. OLNEY.

* * *

THE MINER'S VIEW OF THE COLORADO SITUATION.

Denver, Colo., Nov. 24, 1914.

On page 1084 of *The Public*, certain statements are made by Mr. J. F. Welborn, president of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. I write to say that not only have the miners of Colorado not "the right to work" without doing so at terms dictated by the coal companies, but in addition to this, the coal companies are now and have been for some time past, preparing a blacklist containing hundreds of names to be used against those who dared to take a part in the agitation for the right of the miners to have a union. I cannot see how it is possible for Mr. Welborn to be ignorant of this.

Mr. Welborn says: "This strike was not the work of the managers of the mines or any large portion of the miners, less than 10 per cent of whom were members of the United Mine Workers of America." Mr. Welborn could tell how petitions were circulated at the mines prior to the strike by superintendents, foremen and others, asking the miners to sign this petition which stated that they did not want a strike and would not go on strike. Hundreds signed these petitions in order that they might hold their jobs until the day of the strike. Many married men sent word to our office that they would not take out membership until the day of the strike had arrived lest they lose their jobs and their families be compelled to suffer. Others would not enter their names on our books as members until they could be moved to some shelter after leaving the companies' property.

Does Mr. Welborn figure his percentage of members from the petitions signed by the miners? These miners feared that if they did not sign they would be dismissed immediately.

Was the strike not the work of the mine managers? Did not the miners ask for a conference, and could not the strike have been avoided had a conference been held? Who refused to agree to a conference? Not the miners.

I do not know the number of men that have been imported since the strike of the southern field, but regarding the northern strike, the president of the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company, whose company employs normally about one thousand men in that field, testified before the Legislative Investigation Committee that in one year they had employed seven