

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

thousand eight hundred men for the northern mines, meaning that they had changed their working forces about eight times in one year. Does that not signify that the miners were actually on strike?

Mr. Welborn says: "It was planned outside of the state of Colorado, led by outsiders and financed from the outside." As one who had something to do with the planning, I can say that the greatest of the plans were made inside the companies' properties by the men working in the mines, and the most valuable suggestions came from that source. "Led and financed from the outside." What does this speak for the way they conducted business and treated employes when outsiders could step in and advise and finance men struggling for their rights? Does it not show that all hope of the miners themselves bettering their conditions was crushed by their employers, so that they welcomed the assistance of their fellow-workmen in other parts.

His statement as to why the strike was brought about is ridiculous. How could any set of men bring about a strike so great as this in a non-union field if there was not something radically wrong; something for which the men themselves saw the need of a strike to remedy that condition?

He speaks of men who would (in his opinion) have left the employ of the company had it recognized the Miners' Union. He leaves the inference that the Mine Workers came into the State a little over a year ago, when the facts are headquarters have been maintained in this State for from ten to fifteen years.

Why does he not tell the number who were compelled to leave the employ of his company because suspected of union membership just prior to the strike? In one day sixteen men went to the Mine Workers' office at Trinidad and said they were fired because they were suspected of being members of the union. Of the sixteen only one was a member. So bitter was the company against the union that the minute a man was suspected he was discharged, and the union had but to report men as being members who were not, and who would not join, to have them dismissed from the companies' employ.

That the effect of the union's demand would be the discharging of his loyal employes is not the truth. We point to other States to convince him that miners who worked in those States prior to unionizing of the mines are still working there.

The Miners' Union is not trying to build a ring around a few thousand coal miners, keeping others from making a living in that business, but perhaps Mr. Welborn, being used to the idea of monopolizing things for the few, cannot see that any other institution could exist for any purpose save that of monopoly.

He says that the men are opposed to the acceptance of the truce proposals, etc. There is no doubt but what they would sign petitions saying they were opposed to this, just as did the miners before the strike sign petitions saying that they did not want to strike.

He speaks of "our duty" to protect the miners now at work. Had one-half the effort been made previous to the strike against the injustice and robbery of the employers employing these miners that is now being made, or claims to be made, toward protecting them

from an imaginary enemy, there is little doubt but what there never would have been a strike in Colorado with all its attendant evils.

One of the coal company's attorneys before the Congressional Investigation Committee laid great stress upon the assertion that men have the right to work for whom they pleased, what they pleased and when they pleased. The witness asked whether this same attorney would consent to his exercise of that right on the following day by appearing at the attorney's office demanding a job carrying law books from the office to the court room at \$5.00 a day, working four hours per day and only working every other day. The attorney ceased questioning on this golden right of the American workmen to work for whom, when and for what he pleases.

E. L. DOYLE.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, December 1, 1914.

The Labor War.

That the President has no power to seize the Colorado coal mines was the substance of an opinion rendered on November 25 by the solicitor of the Department of Labor and by officers of the Department of Justice, to whom had been referred the resolutions demanding such action of the American Federation of Labor. President Wilson announced on November 29 the appointment of a commission through which future differences between operators and miners may be settled. The commission consists of Seth Low, former mayor of New York; Charles W. Mills of Philadelphia and Patrick Gilday of Clearfield, Pa. In a statement explaining the appointment of this commission, the President recounted the futile efforts made by the Government to bring peace, from the beginning of the trouble to rejection by the operators of the three-year truce proposition which the miners had accepted. This act of the operators, the President declared, the country regretted. He had waited in the hope of a change in their attitude which he now feared to be in vain. He does not feel at liberty to withdraw the Federal troops under the circumstances and states further:

I have, therefore, determined to appoint the commission contemplated in the plan of temporary settlement, notwithstanding the rejection of that plan by the mine operators, and thus at least to create the instrumentality by which like troubles and disputes may be amicably and honorably settled in the near future, in the hope—the very earnest and sincere hope—that both parties may see it to be not merely to their own best interest but also a duty which they owe to the communities they serve and to the nation itself to make use of this instrumen-