

Freedom is the only universal social solvent. Capital must be freed from the toll of monopoly by throwing open the resources of the earth, and Labor must be freed from the obsession that Capital is its enemy. When both come to realize that their interests are mutual, and that each is preyed upon by monopoly, then will they have set their feet in the way of harmonious cooperation, not alone as between an individual corporation or firm and its employes, but as between all firms and all employes. Neither the labor problem nor the capital problem can be solved by a removal of the oppression to any part. It is the problem of humanity; and its solution requires the setting up of universal freedom.



Psychology and the Farmer.

Whether or not prosperity would come if business men "only thought so," all doubts will be removed if the estimate of the June crop report is realized. Railroads may haggle over rates, manufacturers may tremble before foreign competition, and bankers may sulk in their counting rooms, but when the farmers harvest that crop of 900,000,000 bushels of wheat, 1,216,000,000 bushels of oats, and other food stuffs on the same generous scale, the wheels of industry will start up in spite of all the croakers. It is no longer a question of starting prosperity, but of devising ways and means of preventing another set of special privilege beneficiaries from strangling it when it does start.

s. c.



One Recourse Left.

When Congress, in 1909, refused to amend the law under which the oil companies were gobbling up the oil-bearing lands of the public domain, President Taft sought to save a part of the people's patrimony by withdrawing from entry 3,000,000 acres in California. This act on the part of the Executive was thought at the time to have provided an enormous supply of oil for the use of the navy, at the same time withholding enough from the clutches of the oil trust to modify its excessive charges. But Judge Maurice T. Dooling, of the United States District Court of San Francisco, has rendered a decision setting aside the President's order, and restoring to the control of the oil companies lands estimated to be worth from \$300,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000.



This may be good law, but it is very poor political economy. That our forests, minerals, and water power should in the past have been given with-

out compensation into private hands is not so strange; that was the world's policy. But that such a thing as the giving of the California oil lands to the oil trust should have occurred at this time seems incredible. It serves to show how far our statesmen are from sanity. Fortunately, however, we are not without legal redress. No court has yet had the hardihood to deny the right of the State to tax. The title to the people's oil lands may pass into the hands of the oil trust, but the people still retain the right to tax them. Nor is this right limited beyond the power of the people to change. Not only can they levy a tax of one per cent, but they can raise the limit to four, six, or eight per cent. And by means of this right of taxation it is still in the power of the people to recover what its heedless legislators have allowed to be alienated. Let a little of the spirit shown in barring alien ownership to California lands be devoted to taxing into the treasury the annual value of the oil companies' lands. It is now up to Californians to demonstrate to the country that their intense opposition to Japanese ownership of California land is due to an honest desire to conserve American institutions, rather than to a display of bigoted prejudice.

s. c.



A Tory Advocates Land Confiscation.

Readers of the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 1 must have rubbed their eyes in astonishment. In this extremely conservative organ, owned by Charles P. Taft, one of the nation's big landed proprietors, the leading editorial of the day was a vigorous shout for confiscation of land. In anticipation of objections the Times-Star recites how the Indians were robbed of land, and triumphantly asks "Did you ever hear of anybody seriously proposing an apology to the Red Man or a return to him of any stolen land?" To still further strengthen the case of the land-grabber, it tells how "Only a few years ago we grabbed considerable land from Spain. In 1848 we grabbed a large chunk from Mexico." Then it asks about the result and triumphantly answers "Can any human being in his right mind doubt that that territory has been more useful to humanity under the Stars and Stripes these past sixty years than if it had been allowed to stagnate under the conditions that have prevailed south of the international border?"



The Times-Star was only thinking about forcible annexation of Mexico when it made that argument. It did not realize that, once granted, the