

Lack of Appreciation.

Complaint is made in Dean C. Worcester's work on the Philippines that Americans do not understand or appreciate what this country has done for the Islands. That is true; and that is the very reason why we should not do anything for them. What right has anybody to attempt to direct the destinies of a people they do not understand, and under conditions they do not appreciate? We have but a very hazy notion of what we are doing in various parts of this country, and our efforts have been crowned with indifferent success. The troubles in West Virginia, northern Michigan, and Colorado—not to mention more—are such as should make any citizen feel that justice and order should begin at home. Civil law has broken down. military rule has been set up, and there has been great loss of life and property. There have been investigations by the press, by commissions, and by Congress; yet who shall say with confidence where justice lies? And if we can not understand conditions in our own midst, and among our own people, what hope is there that we shall ever understand conditions among an alien people seven thousand miles across the sea?



This is not to say that the work done in the Philippines is all wrong, or that the men and women who have engaged in it have done so from ulterior motives; for it is well known that much conscientious service has been rendered. But it is to say that whether that service has been wise or the reverse is entirely a matter of chance. We know that commercial interests and public officials in this country frequently join forces to despoil the people. If they will do that here where we can watch them, how much more apt are they to do it there where they are almost immune from public opinion. The only thing that we are now warranted in doing for the Filipinos is to put them as quickly as possible in the way of doing for themselves.

S. C.



Tainting the News.

An example of tainted news is the heading in the Chicago Record-Herald and other papers of April 30 to an Associated Press dispatch from Mobile, Alabama. The heading makes the false statement that "Singletax is failure in colony at Fairhope." There is absolutely nothing in the dispatch itself to justify such a heading. That only tells of the action of a dissatisfied lessee who has gone into court with a complaint that "The Singletax theory never can be carried out in any juris-

dition whose laws deny the essentials of that theory." Whether the complainant is right or not need not be discussed. If he is right then there can not have been a failure of the Singletax, since it cannot have been applied. If untrue there was no grievance and no cause to go into court. In either case the heading proclaims a mis-statement, the more harmful because careless readers will, without looking further into the matter, accept the false impression given as a true construction of the meaning of the dispatch.

S. D.



Just Judges and the Recall,

A correspondent holds the recent just decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court in the case of Alexander Scott, to be an argument against the Recall. Why it should be considered so is not clear. Because the judges in this case chose to make a benevolent use of despotic power does not prove despotic power to be desirable. A benevolent despot is not a new thing. In this case the right of a free press was involved and settlement of it depended on the votes of five men. Had they decided the case other than they did, as they easily might, it would have taken years to repair the harm. No small number of individuals should have the final say in such matters, even though they may sometimes decide right. That is one reason why the Recall is necessary.

S. D.



THE COAL STRIKE AND THE CONSERVATION POLICY.

Senator Thomas of Colorado "broke down and cried" when he recited the horrors of the strike in the mining camps, says the Washington Post. "Women and children are being killed without any opportunity to defend themselves." He "told the President . . . that the situation in Colorado was growing worse, and that Federal assistance was needed immediately." The request for Federal troops is made by Governor Ammons, by the Colorado delegation in Congress, by the coal mine owners, and by the strikers. This is interesting news to conservationists. Be it remembered that nearly all coal land in Colorado belonged to the Federal government not so very long ago, and that the nation, as owner, then had unquestionable power to lease the mines and prescribe every detail of the relations between the capitalists and laborers working them. Instead of doing so we recklessly sold much of the coal lands at \$10 or \$20 per acre, and carelessly allowed our-

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