

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1909.

The Week.

Mr. Pinchot's address of Monday contained undeniably words of warning. He evidently believes that the work of conservation is endangered. With much intensity of language he spoke of schemes to defeat the ends aimed at by the Forestry Bureau and to fasten the clutch of corporate hands, by secret and unlawful means, upon what should be kept for the general use and enjoyment. We take it for granted that Mr. Pinchot can produce the evidence for his charges, and that it will be laid in due time before the Congressional committee that is to be appointed to look into the whole matter. There need be no doubt that public feeling is now such that it will stand by any official who seeks to beat off from government lands all dishonest and greedy intriguers. It will be wise, however, for Mr. Pinchot and all who are heartily with him in his important work, to perceive that the whole difficulty does not lie in self-seeking and fraudulent opposition to the conservation policy. There is an antagonism which is honest. In many of the Western States the people feel that their legitimate development is hindered by too narrow restrictions upon the preëmpting and use of public lands.

This Western point of view was well set forth in the speech which Representative Mondell of Wyoming made in the House the other day. As printed in the *Congressional Record*, it had the caption: "Shall the People or the Bureaus Rule?" That suggests the line of argument. Mr. Mondell spoke with good knowledge of conditions in the public-land States, and affirmed with energy their determination to administer their own affairs without any "Federal landlordism." His speech dealt specifically with the water-power question. Over non-navigable rivers in the States, Congress has no control. The waters of all natural streams are State property. This was fully recognized by Secretary Ballinger in his proposal that the Government should not alienate, but only lease temporarily, lands which may be used for power-sites. As the right to use the

water itself can be conferred only by the State, the Secretary urged that the States should be asked to "transfer to the United States" the "necessary water-rights" to go with the permits for the use of the abutting land. Against this, Representative Mondell protested with the utmost earnestness, and declared that such Federal control would not be tolerated, first, because it was without Constitutional warrant, and, secondly, because "the people of these States have clearly and definitely assumed and do now exercise full and complete control over the use and distribution of water, and can manage their domestic affairs better than they can be managed for them." This whole policy of conservation must be written in statutes which the wayfaring man can understand, which the trickster cannot violate without incurring swift and adequate penalties, and which the Administration can enforce as the deliberate will of the people.

Postmaster-General Hitchcock's annual report shows that he is alive to the necessity of increasing the postal revenues, but it offers no clear-cut plans for reform. The chief sources of loss are the rural delivery routes and the low rates on magazines, to which Mr. Taft referred in his message. Mr. Hitchcock's suggestion that distance zones be established for the magazines, with varying postal rates, will scarcely prove practical. And if it did we should see the magazines moving to the centres of their circulation. Interference with printed matter of as great educational value as these magazines will hardly be possible without arousing violent popular feeling. But an inquiry into the prices paid to the railways for carrying second-class matter might be profitable. A more hopeful field would seem to be the rural delivery routes, into which branch of the service, as Mr. Hitchcock admits, serious abuses have crept. The loss here is no less than \$28,000,000 a year; but when Mr. Hitchcock touches this, he touches politics. The extension of the routes has been due largely to favoritism, so that often in thickly settled communities, in which the rural delivery would pay, there is none, and in the sparsely settled regions repre-

sented by some influential Congressman, rural delivery is general. Here, too, Mr. Hitchcock has no definite suggestions, though he is certain of making considerable savings by readjustment and modernization. In that direction seems for the moment to be the best hope of cutting down the deficit of \$17,479,770.47.

Ohio Republicans are saying to themselves with a mixture of apprehension and complacency that their State bids fair to be the chief political battlefield next year. This is partly because we have an Ohio President again, and partly because, if Gov. Harmon is reëlected next November, he may easily become the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1912. It is felt that it would be a serious blow to Mr. Taft's prestige if his party were to lose his own State before his term was half over. And despite the condescending Republican talk about the need of a strong and respectable Opposition party, there is a natural dread of making it so strong and respectable under the leadership of Judson Harmon that it would stand a good chance of carrying the next Presidential election. Hence the present flutter in Ohio. Its Republican citizens are not a little elated to see their State again made "pivotal" in the old absorbing way, but cannot repress a fear lest their party's fortunes should turn the wrong way on the pivot.

The setback to the anti-liquor movement in recent local elections in Massachusetts and elsewhere has led, according to the *Chicago Inter Ocean*, to a renewal of hostilities between the Prohibition forces and the Anti-Saloon League. In a circular issued by the chairman of the Associated Prohibition Press, the argument from Massachusetts is driven hard. In that State, as a whole, an aggregate majority of 26,000 has been registered for no license within three years. Yet in the election of two weeks ago four cities with a population of 220,000 deserted the no-license column, while only one city with 32,000 population entered it. The argument proceeds:

Were the same tremendous amount of energy, enthusiasm, money, and political

wisdom and experience which has been lavished in these local contests now to be focussed upon the adequate and sufficient goals of State and national prohibition, backed by an organized political uprising of the people who believe in it, the liquor traffic would see a nation-wide doom within twelve months. With the seesaw activities of the present hour, nothing permanent will ever be accomplished.

In other words, communities that have once declared against liquor and want to change are to be kept in the straight and narrow way by majorities elsewhere in the State. How far such a system carries an unwilling community towards real prohibition, Portland in Maine and Atlanta and Savannah, Georgia, are still with us to testify.

It would be unfair to hold President Taft responsible as yet for the plan of a new government for Alaska which is now being outlined in the newspapers, since he has not officially recommended it. Yet there are marks which indicate his interest in it. The government foreshadowed is based on the Philippine Commission, for there are to be nine councilmen or commissioners, of whom a minority, four, are to be elected; Mr. Taft's plan is, according to report, a "strongly centralized government administered by comparatively few men." We need not discuss now whether the only alternative left in dealing with Alaska is this abandonment of the democratic theory of government, and even the historic form for the administration of a Territory later to become a State; but we must point out the danger accompanying our departure from republican forms in the Philippines. When we first took our rash plunge into Imperialism, we heard much of benefit to our own political life to be derived from governing others for their unadulterated good. But here is about the first case we can record in which the Philippine experiment has affected home conditions, and it is in quite the wrong direction. People scoffed at the idea that ruling by generals or by commissions in Cuba, Porto Rico, in Panama, and the Philippines could react on our own political ideas, but now we see that it may. Congress will, we trust, be careful not to adopt any plan for autocratic government in Alaska without the most careful consideration of what this means and whither it leads.

According to cable dispatches from

Hawaii, "Prince Cupid" has committed the unpardonable sin of attacking Gov. Frear of that Territory, charging that official with falsehood and with holding his office "solely in the interest of the sugar planters." This incident will probably end, the dispatch says, in the "elimination of natives as representatives in Washington," "Prince Cupid," or Mr. Kalanian'aole, as he is officially known, being now Delegate to Congress. The Prince did not even stop with this denunciation, but treasonably declared that the administration of public lands had not been in the interests of the people, but of the sugar planters. "We must do something," he declared, "to get the land back among the people." This treason to the sugar planters merits, we submit, a much worse penalty than mere deprivation of office. Bread and water for forty days in solitary confinement strikes us as about the proper punishment for questioning the divine right of capital in Hawaii to continue to control the islands and to exploit the natives precisely as it sees fit.

If Cook is insane, that is a matter for regret and sympathy on the part of his personal friends, and a matter of interest from the standpoint of the alienist and the psychologist; as a public figure, he ceased to have any interest whatever from the moment that his claim was proved to be fraudulent. It is absurd to treat his case as though he had won great honor in other ways, and afterwards committed acts which were ascribed to moral defects, but which might be explained on the ground of mental disease. Cook had no title to the world's attention except the performance that is now exposed as a preposterous hoax; and whether the fraud was committed by a man who was altogether sane or by a man who was more or less insane, is surely a matter possessing very limited interest. When it is further borne in mind that Cook's past, as shown up in the course of the inquiry, is quite in keeping with the fraudulent and money-grabbing propensities exhibited in this matter of the Pole, a last touch is put to the absurdity of giving him any further attention as a serious subject of public concern.

If a Roman draughtsman had accompanied Caesar's legions to Gaul, and there set down with fidelity the semi-

barbaric warriors, the weapons they bore, the horses they rode, the whole circumstance of aggressive civilization beyond the Alps, we should treasure his work, quite irrespective of any precious quality as art. The faithful picture of the winning of the West by the late Frederic Remington is marked by a singular vivacity and comprehensiveness. His curiosity was unbounded, he lived the life he depicted, and enthusiasm supplied a technique suitable for his peculiar sort of stalwart expression. His business was with action. To convey the vivid sense of taut muscle in man or beast he willingly sacrificed what he rightly regarded as the smaller qualities of harmony and surface. Emphatically the illustrator, the sheer energy and zest of his workmanship make it in every way more important than much that passes as exquisite. He was one of the very few able artists of our time who managed never to be clever, preferring instead a quite magnificent audacity in truth-telling. It is not necessary now to pass upon his copious production as art. Presumably, it will mean a little less to a generation for whom Col. Cody and Col. Roosevelt will be half-forgotten legends. But we cannot imagine a time when a lover either of art or of humankind, happening on a portfolio of Frederic Remington's designs, will not find them tonic. Without him posterity would be at a loss to know what the West looked like, for no photographs have the drastic facility that dignified alike his casual scribble in a notebook and his finished group in bronze.

That a little learning is a dangerous thing is a maxim which finds illustration in many ways. One of these is the readiness with which the mass of easy-going up-to-date people accept as a finality what they are given to understand is the latest word of "science"—whether in history, philology, ethnology, physics, biology, or what not—as to the worthlessness or error of the results obtained by the great men of former days. In his address at the opening of the Palmer Physical Laboratory at Princeton, printed in the current number of *Science*, it is pleasing to find Dr. Elihu Thomas laying down the law in one such case. Speaking of Franklin and the lightning rod, he says: "In these later years it is not unusual to meet

with statements of discredit or denial of the efficacy of this simple device. There seems to be a tendency among the uninformed to regard it as an old-fashioned and useless if not a dangerous contrivance." And he proceeds to assert with emphasis that, while ignorant or dishonest lightning-rod men have made worthless installations, "the Franklin rod when properly installed undoubtedly secures practical immunity from lightning damage"; and, furthermore, that the best vindication of Franklin is found in the "reliance placed by the trained electrical engineer upon the provision of an easy path for the electricity of lightning to reach the ground." There are a hundred directions in which there is altogether too much of a "tendency among the uninformed"—and among the well-informed, too—to accept with cheerful alacrity the verdict that this or that achievement of the past must be thrown into the scrap-heap.

It is good news to hear from Washington that Zelaya is not to escape us, after all. We had begun to fear that this miscreant, being on Mexican soil, might avoid trial for murder by our Government. Hence we are really relieved to learn from Washington dispatches that Mr. Knox is not worried; that he can bring Zelaya to the bar at any moment. The State Department knows just what it can do, there being so many precedents for putting on trial in his individual capacity the head of one sovereign state for behavior unsatisfactory to another sovereign state. What is the last precedent? Why, Abraham Lincoln returned to Spain a slave-ship captain, a subject of Spain, who fled to this country. What analogy could be closer? All Mr. Knox will have to do will be to write to President Diaz: "Dear Diaz: Please deliver Zelaya to the United States troops at El Paso and let us reciprocate at any time. We expect to try Zelaya at Pittsburgh for his cruelties committed in Nicaragua. With best New Year's wishes, Knox." Seemingly, in international law the Pittsburgh lawyer is hereafter to be as famous for ingenuity as the Philadelphia lawyer has long been.

Not the least unfortunate aspect of the Nicaragua mixup is the growing strain upon our relations with Mexico. It

is disappointing that, only a few months after the elaborate show of friendship between Presidents Taft and Diaz on the banks of the Rio Grande, the two countries should have fallen into a state of mutual irritation. Mexico is angry and anxious, and shows her resentment by constituting herself Zelaya's protector in the hour of his adversity. Our own State Department thereupon loses its temper and, looking about for something to quarrel over, hits upon the case of an American citizen who has spent five months in a Mexican jail under a criminal indictment, without being brought to trial. How about it, asks our State Department, in a tone of moral indignation peculiarly appropriate in a people who, like ourselves, do not know what is meant by the law's delay, or the occasional miscarriage of justice. Certainly the *Civis Americanus sum* has never been sounded so sonorously as during these last few weeks of excitement in the Caribbean.

Belgium under King Albert I enters upon a phase of her national career that may be full of high interest for the world at large. To the peoples and politicians of Europe there is new food for speculation in the presence of a sovereign of known German sympathies on the throne of one of the two little maritime nations that German Imperialistic ambition is supposed to have marked ultimately for its own. Outside of Europe, interest will lie in the rôle that Belgium under her new King will now play in the Congo. Up to the present the Congo has been a stain on the national honor of Belgium, without the compensation even of material profit. It remains to be seen whether the new régime will succeed actually in accomplishing what has been so loudly claimed in behalf of the late King—the planting of the roots of civilization in the heart of the Dark Continent. It is a splendid opportunity offered to a small nation. The Congo colony, because of the low stage of civilization its inhabitants have reached, because of the great administrative difficulties it offers, is more peculiarly a white man's burden than almost any other possession of the European nations. High testimonials have often been paid to the efficiency and devotion of the Belgian civil service in the Congo. They were excellent men in the clutch of an evil sys-

tem. These men should now have an opportunity to show what they can do when they work, not for rubber, but for civilization.

It is impossible for Americans to point to assassination of high officers of government as a product of despotic conditions exclusively, in view of our own record of Presidential assassinations; but when three such events are given in the telegraphic dispatches of a single day, and all of them are based on essentially similar conditions, the concurrence is too striking to be passed over. The blowing to pieces of the chief of the secret police in St. Petersburg is but the latest incident in a long story of desperate revolt against intolerable despotism; the killing of the Prime Minister of Korea, as of a British chief magistrate in India, is a manifestation of a state of things that is more recent. But in all three cases, the fundamental fact is the same—the unrest of the people of our time, whether in Orient or Occident, under conditions which are a denial of the right of self-government. It is well to take note of such indications of the state of mind of subject peoples and remember them when smooth things are prophesied of the future of our own relations with the people of the Philippines.

Mr. Wu Ting Fang's promise that he will be with us again fifty years from now gives the people of the District of Columbia and the entire American press something to look forward to. Mr. Wu's entrances and exits as Chinese Minister at Washington constitute one of the most legitimate and real subjects of permanent newspaper interest. He has been in the flesh the imaginary traveller from China or the Indies whom eighteenth-century writers were fond of making the vehicle of satire against European civilization. The tone in which the Chinese diplomat's acts and sayings have been chronicled shows plainly that we credit the bland and open-eyed observer from the East with a sense of humor equal to our own. If Minister Wu carries out his intention of living two hundred years and comes back as Minister at Washington in 1959, may it be as the representative of a constitutional, well-governed, and prosperous China to a free, self-governing, dis-Aldriched and un-Cannonized United States.

ECONOMIC SCIENCE IN AMERICA.

The American Historical Association and the American Economic Association are celebrating in New York this week the twenty-fifth anniversary of their formation. That the Historical Association should date back only a quarter of a century seems surprising, in view of the extensive pursuit of historical study from an early period of our national life; but in the case of the Economic Association, the foundation of the society was almost coeval with the beginnings of important and widespread activity in our country in the field whose cultivation it was designed to promote. Indeed, when the formation of the American Economic Association was proposed, twenty-five years ago, few persons realized that there existed in America a body of earnest and able students of economics adequate to maintain such an association. And in fact such a body of economic scholars and investigators in our country had at that time existed only a very few years.

Great as have been the material changes in America in the past three decades—the applications of invention, the growth of wealth, the concentration of industrial and financial power—there has been quite as striking a change in the development of specialized learning. In every department of research there has been, since the foundation of the Johns Hopkins University in 1876, a radical change of the status of American science and scholarship as related to the intellectual activities of the Old World. Before that time, with the exception of the work here and there of some isolated man of extraordinary powers, America was content, in nearly every field, to be a receptive follower, leaving to European investigators the task of maintaining the advancement of science and the progress of scholarship; now, in almost every branch, she contributes, at least in quantity and in many instances in quality also, her full share to the great stream of scientific research and publication. It might have been thought, *a priori*, that economics would naturally be an exception to this rule; that, in view of the prominence of economic factors in the making of our history, the study of such phenomena would have attracted adequate attention at an earlier date than other branches of inquiry; but this was by no means the case. On

the contrary, there is perhaps no department of research which—aside from the work of a few notable individuals—had been more completely neglected among us. And among the very few exceptions that did exist, two were of the kind that eminently prove the rule; for the work of both Henry Carey and Henry George, whatever may be one's judgment of its merit or its value, was precisely of the kind that does not spring from a general or systematic cultivation of scientific study.

In the common advance of specialized study that has taken place in America, no department of inquiry has shared more conspicuously than economics; indeed, it may be doubted whether there is any other subject in which so marked a development has been shown. And this is not surprising; for in the case of economics there has been present an incitement special to this province. Thirty years ago, with the exception of the currency and the tariff, there were no economic problems felt by the nation at large to be pressing. Labor questions there were, to be sure; but they had not assumed anything like the definiteness of the questions of to-day. Our national resources still seemed inexhaustible. We were only beginning to realize the scope and significance of corporation problems; the giant combinations of capital that are in the forefront to-day were in the future. Our people were still predominantly agricultural; and Socialism was only dimly thought of as a question that might some day come home to us. With the growing complexity of our conditions and the growing urgency of economic questions of every kind, there has been a demand for a vast amount of close study, both of general problems and of specific conditions; and the publications of the American Economic Association bear witness to the fact that this demand has been worthily responded to by the professors in our universities and by other students.

It would be a mistake, however, to attribute solely to these practical demands the growth of economic study in our country. In the domain of theory there has been a notable activity; and several of our writers have won high international recognition in this field. Indeed, it is interesting to recall that, in its early years the American Economic Association interested many chiefly for

its attitude toward the controversy, then at its height, between the "orthodox" English political economy and the views of the German "historical school." It was soon made plain that the Association was not to be identified with any dogma or faction; and the controversy itself now seems a vague and distant memory. As to the work of American economists in general, it may fairly be said that some of them have pushed the refinements of theoretical analysis as far as they have been carried anywhere, while others have gone into the most painstaking and laborious examination of concrete facts. If some of this labor, in both directions, has passed beyond the limits of what is profitable, that is but the price which must always be paid, in this world, for the energetic and whole-hearted promotion of any large object.

There is one important aspect of the growth of scientific study of economics in our country which is too gratifying to be passed without mention. This is the utilization of the services of trained economists in the carrying on of government work, and the influence that has been exercised by them on the course of legislation and administration. With professors of economics drafted into the public service for such tasks, as the straightening out of the finances of Porto Rico and San Domingo, the investigation of tariff schedules under the provision of the new tariff act, the organization of the work of the National Monetary Commission, and other things too numerous to mention, the epithet "academic" will hardly any longer be applied to our scientific economists as a term of reproach. But these governmental appointments by no means furnish a measure of the practical influence that our economists have been exercising. The remarkable development of governmental efficiency in the State of Wisconsin, in its dealings with corporations and in other matters, is a signal example of the kind of thing we have in mind. And, aside entirely from governmental activities, there is the influence of our economists upon the formation of public opinion on the great questions of the day, an influence which is sure to be manifested in increasing degree as the years go by. It is a national gain that, at a time when we shall need all the resources of trained intelligence and impartial investigation