

selves to be robbed of even more by fraud and perjury without any payment whatever. The money loss matters little, but in losing title the Federal government lost jurisdiction. For a pitiful mess of pottage, or none at all, we gave away the birthright of a free people, our power to do justice, and are now asked to protect by force the private monopoly of natural resources thus created.

Here is the heart of the national conservation question. The right of the nation to control, to enforce fair treatment of laborers and consumers, rests on Federal land ownership. The Constitution gives to Congress exclusive authority to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations concerning the territory and other public property of the United States. So long as coal lands, timber lands, water power sites and other natural resources whose development requires large operations with great masses of capital and labor remain Federal property, the nation can do whatever is needful to insure justice in their working and use. So long and no longer. Therefore these resources should be held forever in Federal ownership and disposed of only by lease. This we have done with the remnant of the timber lands by the creation of national forests. This we have begun to do with water power sites by the more recent system of "withdrawals" and permits. This we have for eight years been trying to do with the mineral fuels and fertilizers.



And what has the State of Colorado done in this matter? She has fought bitterly every step in this reform, and she is fighting it now, in the very moment of her call for Federal troops to quell the insurrection bred by her own recklessness and folly. For the past eight years every one of her Senators and Representatives of both parties has joined the outcry against the national conservation policy. Governor Ammons emerged from obscurity by outdoing his fellows as the champion of private greed—miscalled "State rights"—in the disposal of natural resources. Last week he spoke for two days against the coal-leasing bill. This week he calls for Federal bayonets to pin down the fee simple titles to the coal fields that we have granted to the Rockefellers. In Colorado alone has there been a genuine widespread popular opposition to national conservation measures. Mr. Thomas himself yielded to it, and won a Senatorship thereby, after giving promise of better things. At the Public Lands Convention of 1907 in Denver, the hotel lobbies swarmed with fire-eaters, cursing the national government with a zeal and

bitterness that would have done credit to the secessionists at Charleston in 1861. When the Federal Supreme Court decided that, under certain circumstances, false swearing to obtain title to public lands could not be punished, a howl of joyous triumph went up from the press of the State and was echoed by those who spoke for the State in Congress. They demanded that the State be "let alone." Private greed had developed the East; was it fair to deny greedy Westerners equal chance for public plunder? Was not Colorado better able to control its natural resources than any Federal officer could be? Who made Federal officials more wise, more strong, more just, more efficient than those of the State?



Well, Colorado has had her way for the most part. She has for eight years blocked every effort at leasing the remaining public coal lands. She has procured a prohibition of the extension of national forests within her borders. She has gnashed on Pinchot and the conservationists with her teeth whenever the Forest Service appropriation came up for annual debate in Congress since the session of 1906-1907. She has been let alone in coal mining, and she has, of course, let private greed alone to enrich itself from the national domain. Behold the fruits of her folly. Civil war in the coal fields, wholesale massacre that spares neither age nor sex, public meetings in Denver denouncing the greedy absentee landlords, to whose tender mercies the State has been delivered by her leaders. Thomas "breaks down and cries" over the effects of his own policy. Ammons, the foe of the national forests, before the echoes of his denunciation of Federal aggression have died away in the capitol, calls frantically for Federal troops as the last hope of public order. The tears of Thomas and the helplessness of Ammons bear eloquent witness to the folly and the falsity of Colorado opposition to the national conservation policy. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked. Whatsoever a man [or State] soweth that shall he also reap."

PHILIP P. WELLS.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FREE TOLLS AND DEMOCRACY

Cincinnati, April 30.

Treaty obligations are treaty obligations. But why should a Democrat waste words talking about a treaty obligation when admittedly, without violating a treaty obligation he can do so democratic a thing as abolish a subsidy? Everybody admits

that it will not violate the Hay-Pauncefote treaty if we make the ship trust pay tolls. Why, then, dig into a mass of material to learn what Mr. Secretary So-and-So did, or thought? Why bother about the opinion of Lord High-Muck-a-Muck? Is it of any consequence that Ambassador Goldlace was of this or that view? Pass up the statement of Chargé d' Affaires Whatshisname. Save the labor of learning what statesmen, from the time of Henry Clay to John Jones thought of such matters as "neutralization." Free tolls will not violate the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. They will violate democratic principles. They will violate sound economic policy. Why worry, then? Get down to brass tacks. Are you a democrat or are you not? If you do not believe in subsidies, if you do not believe in mixing up government with business, then you cannot believe in free tolls. Free tolls is a subsidy. Everybody admits that. Free tolls would make a powerful interest dependent on government, Free tolls would make the powerful interest "take a hand" in elections. Quit all this talk. Count noses. See how many democrats of all parties there are. If you haven't got enough, then lie down. But anyhow, shut up.

ALFRED H. HENDERSON.

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, May 5, 1914.

The Colorado War.

President Wilson's proclamation ordering disarmament in the Colorado strike region and dispersing of the belligerents, did not receive prompt obedience. An attack was made on April 29 on the property of the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company at Forbes, and a fierce battle ensued. Most of the mine buildings were destroyed, seven employes of the company were killed, as also was one of the attacking party. Three hundred Federal soldiers, under command of Major W. W. Holbrook, reached Trinidad on April 30, and peace appears to have been at once established. Major Holbrook conferred with both sides and reported that he had received assurances of co-operation in restoring order. While there has since been no fighting, neither side has yet disarmed. On May 2, Secretary of War Garrison issued a proclamation calling upon individuals, firms, associations and corporations in the strike zone to give up their arms. These will be returned when order has been completely restored. Additional troops were also ordered into the district. [See current volume, page 416.]



The coroner's jury at Trinidad, investigating

the killing of women and children at Ludlow, returned a verdict on May 2 as follows:

We, the jury, find that the deceased came to their deaths by asphyxiation, or fire, or both, caused by the burning of the tents of the Ludlow tent colony, and that the fire in the tents was started by militiamen under Major Hamrock and Lieutenant Linderfelt, or mine guards, or both, on the twentieth day of April, 1914.

In the case of the men and a twelve-year-old boy who were killed, the jury found that they—

came to their death by bullet wounds in the battle between militiamen under Major Hamrock and Lieut. Linderfelt and mine guards on one side and strikers on the other, said battle held in or about Ludlow on the twentieth day of April, 1914.



A military commission appointed by Adjutant General John B. Chase also submitted a report on the Ludlow affair on May 2. The commission's finding differs from that of the coroner's jury in that it declares that Louis Tikas, the Greek strike leader, had been taken prisoner by the militia together with two other men and that all three had been deliberately shot while in custody. The report blames the coal operators, saying that they had "established in American industrial communities a class of ignorant, lawless and savage South European peasants." It further declares that the tents were set on fire through accident, but goes on to say:

We find, however, that not all the tents were destroyed by accidental fire. Men and soldiers swarmed into the colony and deliberately assisted the conflagration by spreading the fire from tent to tent. Beyond doubt it was seen to intentionally that the fire should destroy the whole of the colony. This, too, was accompanied by the usual loot. Men and soldiers seized and took from the tents whatever appealed to their fancy. So deliberate was this burning and loot that we find cans of oil, found in the tents, were poured upon them and tents lit with matches.



On April 28 a statement was given to the press by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Therein he declared that the interests he represented were merely those of minority stockholders and that all of the demands of the strikers had been granted prior to the beginning of the strike, with the exception of unionizing of the mines. This demand could not be granted because it would be done at the behest, "not of employes, less than 10 per cent of whom are union men, but at the demand of an outside body." He denied opposition to the right of labor to organize but said, "We do assert the right of an individual to work independently of a union if he so elects." If his company were to agree to the demand to unionize "all of its loyal non-union employes numbering several thousand—more than