

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