

"Protection" might well find it possible to attack such a policy, and in view of developments at home and abroad it may seem advisable to them to call for "Participation" in affairs beyond our borders that vitally concern us.

Such an aggressive course of action has the danger of all propaganda urged at a time when the electorate is inclined to be cautious, yet it fulfills the present need of the Republican party for an issue that faces the future. Any possibility of success would require an aggressive leadership. It would not permit a nomination made in convention from a group of favorite sons. Of necessity there would be a pre-convention campaign of determination, enthusiasm, and, toward the end, of little un-

certainty. To captain such a campaign a nationally-known leader would be essential; one more popular, if possible, than his program. Necessarily he would have a broad grasp of world affairs. To fulfill the demands for such a leadership none of the younger Republican leaders has thus far displayed capabilities. To remake the Republican party by captaining this campaign there appears at present but one possible candidate. All are agreed that this candidate has in years past manifested both conservative and liberal Republicanism. His nomination upon an issue he has done so much to make prominent, a vigorous foreign policy, points a future for the Republican party.

EDGAR E. ROBINSON.

Freeing Alaska from Red Tape

IN a recent message to Congress President Wilson said of the Alaskan railroad that it "is only thrusting in the key to the storehouse and throwing back the lock and opening the door. How the tempting resources of the country are to be exploited is another matter. The resources must be used, but not destroyed or wasted; used, but not monopolized under any narrow idea of individual rights as against the abiding interest of communities."

This is the keynote of our new policy in Alaska. Instead of allowing the vast riches of that great territory to be exploited at the haphazard will or whim of individuals and corporations intent only upon quick and large profits for themselves, we have set our faces to the task of developing Alaska and its resources in a large, sane and conservative manner suited to the magnitude of the interests at stake.

Practically all the land and the natural resources of Alaska are still the property of the people of the United States. Until now we have only protected these riches against monopoly and waste, and the most cumbersome departmental machinery has sufficed. Hitherto we have done little more in Alaska than keep a few policemen stationed at closed doors to prevent breaking and entering. Now that we are to open the doors we need more than a police force.

Our work there now is to be broader and more complex. Mineral and other resources must be opened to use. The lands must be opened to settlement. There must be such administration of the laws as will give prompt and ready assistance, unhampered by red tape and unnecessary delays, to honest settlers, while protecting fully the rights of the nation against monopoly, fraud and waste.

There must be provided new and simple machinery for the successful working out of our program of improvement. There must be organized administration of the highest efficiency in order that "the abiding interest" of the people of the United States may not only be fully protected and conserved, but that the development of resources and industries incident to the opening of the territory may be encouraged and regulated with justice to all, and along lines carefully calculated to give the greatest lasting good to the greatest number. The new policy is not to invite a few men to exploit the cream of Alaska's riches, but to develop all the resources and possibilities of the territory harmoniously, for the best interests both of the people who go to Alaska and the people of the United States who own this great public domain.

Alaska's problems are largely peculiar to Alaska. Our present system of government there is heterogeneous. Instead of one government in Alaska we have a number—interlocked, overlapped, cumbersome and confusing. There is a government of the forests, a government of the fisheries, one of the reindeer and natives, another of the cables and telegraphs. There is a government for certain public lands and forests, another for other lands and forests. Each of these governments is intent upon its own particular business, jealous of its own success and prerogatives, and all are more or less unrelated and independent in their operation.

Division of authority and responsibility under this system, combined with the effort to direct administration at long distance in compliance with general regulations designed for the United States as well as Alaska, naturally results in much red tape and confusion. Especially is this true with respect to the administration of the laws for the disposal

and protection of the public lands and natural resources. There is one procedure for making homestead, mineral and other land entries within the national forests; another procedure for making such entries in lands outside the forest reserves. Water power and power sites within the forest reserves are leased and operated under permits from the Forest Service—there is question whether authority exists for disposal and leasing of water power elsewhere in Alaska. A citizen who desired to lease an island for fox farming carried on a correspondence with three different Departments for several months in an effort to learn which had jurisdiction and authority to make the lease. It was finally decided that none of them possessed this authority.

Vast areas in the forest reserves of Alaska are entirely untimbered but are held under the regulations of the Forest Service, while timbered lands in other sections are unprotected. Timber in the national forests is sold at auction, under rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture. Timber of lands outside these reserves is sold under wholly different rules and regulations, made by the Department of the Interior.

It has taken as long as three years for patent to issue in uncontested land claims in Alaska, after final certificate was issued, merely because of the lengthy procedure involved in securing the proper filling out of papers.

In filing a homestead location notice the homesteader in Alaska, on unsurveyed land, must stake his claim and in his notice describe it by metes and bounds, with reference to government monuments, trees, rivers and other permanent landmarks. This location notice is filed with the recorder of the district. Before making entry the homesteader must go or apply to the Surveyor-general, whose office is in Juneau, for a survey. If there is no contest or protest, the Surveyor-general appoints a deputy to make a survey of the homestead claim. This survey is made at the expense of the homesteader. After the survey is completed it must be approved by the Surveyor-general and then taken by the entryman to the land office of the district in which his claim is located. Notice and a plat of the claim are posted on the land and printed in the local newspapers. If there is no contest against final proof on a homestead claim, the Register and Receiver of the local land office pass on the proof and issue a final certificate. If there is a protest, the proofs are sent to Washington and a field investigation is ordered.

The field division headquarters of the General Land Office for Alaska are at Portland, Oregon. Four special agents of the Land Office Field Service are kept in Alaska, and additional agents are sent into the territory as they are needed. Orders

for field investigations of land claims are sent from Washington to Portland and forwarded from there to the agent in the field in Alaska. If the papers are received early enough in the season and the special agent who receives them has not too much other work, the field investigation may be made the same year it is ordered.

If there is no protest against a final proof or after a field investigation has been made of such proofs, the claim and proofs are sent to the Land Office in Washington, to the Geological Survey, for such data as that Bureau may have concerning the nature of the lands involved in the claim. The Geological Survey notes upon the application whether the land in question is listed as mineral or non-mineral and whether it is shown by the geological records to contain coal, petroleum, mineral or thermal springs or reservoir or power sites, etc. Following the receipt of this information the Land Office in due time may grant a patent for the land.

It will be seen that in the event of any question arising over an entry which prevents the local Register and Receiver from issuing a final certificate, the papers in a homestead case after final proof is offered must make at least two round trips between Washington and Alaska before patent can issue. If there is a contest or any complication arises out of the claims, this long-distance correspondence may be almost indefinitely extended.

Two cases, taken at random from the files of the General Land Office, are typical of the red tape which at present hampers the progress of Alaska.

Walter H. Marrett built a house and established residence on a homestead claim near Haines, Alaska, in April, 1902: His claim was on an unsurveyed and unreserved portion of public land. In 1908 an official survey was made and recorded. In March, 1909, Marrett filed at the Land Office at Juneau an application to enter the lands embraced in the survey. In December, 1909, Marrett went to the Land Office at Juneau and completed his final proofs. The papers were then sent to Washington, but there is no record of any action being taken during the following year. In December, 1910, the Commissioner of the Land Office referred the claim to the Geological Survey, asking information as to whether any coal or petroleum deposits were embraced in the entry. Patent was finally issued on May 25, 1911, three years after the survey had been made, and nine years after residence had been established.

Mrs. Mary A. Dabney, of Seattle, Washington, had a somewhat similar experience. Her claim was located on September 24, 1906; a survey was made in September, 1908, and approved by the Surveyor-general in January, 1909. Application for patent was made in March, 1909. There was

no protest and no conflicting claim. The papers were sent to Washington in August, 1910, and nothing further was heard of the case for nearly two years. The entry was finally patented in October, 1913.

There is also much confusion and division and duplication of authority and responsibility in the protection of the fauna of Alaska. For example, an agent of the Bureau of Education recently discovered evidence of wholesale slaughter of walrus, and reported it as menacing the food supply of the natives and their dogs. He had no authority in the matter, and his report, sent to Washington, was forwarded to the Department of Agriculture, where it was discovered that the killing was illegal but there was no machinery available for effectively preventing such slaughter.

While this patchwork system of administrative machinery has answered well enough while the government's policy has been merely to keep the door shut and discourage development, it will not answer under the new policy. To secure effectiveness we must eliminate all unnecessary delays, together with the red tape and the confusing and confused machinery now in use, and substitute machinery that will be direct, prompt and certain in its action.

To this end we should have a single Development Board, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The salaries should be sufficient to enable men of ability to devote themselves exclusively to the work of the board, which should have its headquarters in Alaska. The board should make its reports and be directly responsible to a single Cabinet officer, the Secretary of the Interior, whose department is most closely identified with Alaskan affairs and probably best equipped by experience and organization to handle such matters.

The board should do the work now done in Alaska by the General Land Office, the Forest Service, the Road Commission, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Education and the Secretary of the Interior. It should also take over part of the work and authority of the Bureau of Fisheries. It should have charge of the protection and control of game, fur-bearing animals, public lands, mineral deposits, coal, oil, gas, hot springs, timber lands and timber, together with the work of education among the natives and the supervision of the reindeer industry. It should control the work of the Surveyor-general's office. It should have authority to succeed the Department of Agriculture in supervision of the agricultural experiment stations in the territory or to supplement these stations with demonstration farms for the benefit of the homesteaders.

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary of the Interior.

Roman Eagles on the Wing

ITALY is a peace-loving state. The Italians are a practical people, shrewd enough to detect the trickery of those who clothe their greedy private designs in the national glory. So said the pacifists of other countries when it was reported in 1911 that Italy was preparing for a descent upon the one remaining fragment of Turkish dominion in north Africa. The most energetic press campaign failed to give an appearance of reality to Italy's alleged grievances against Turkey. It was impossible to make the sands of Tripolitana and Cyrenaica appear a brilliant prey, or to make campaigning against a semi-barbarous foe seem glorious. Twenty years earlier the Abyssinian enterprise had ended in inglorious failure, chiefly because the Italian masses refused to respond to the vulgar imperialistic aspirations then in vogue throughout Europe. Furthermore, by 1911 anti-militarism and anti-imperialism had found organized support in the then powerful Socialist party.

And yet the Tripolitan War proved to be popular, except in the industrial north, deprived of its Turkish market. The general strike promised by the Socialists failed to take place; indeed, the Socialistic masses showed themselves not less enthusiastic than the bourgeoisie in their support of the government. The militarists had discovered a potent formula: "The Roman eagles are again on the wing." Tripoli might be as barren as the pacifists asserted, but would the flight of the eagles end with Tripoli? What if this were a first step toward the hegemony of the Mediterranean, the reconstitution of the Roman Empire?

A grandiose dream, which no Italian statesman openly avowed. At the time of the Tripolitan War the prospects of Italy seemed modest indeed. The best of northwest Africa was in French possession, Egypt, in British; an equity in Syria and Anatolia had been acquired by the Teutonic powers; Russia was reaching toward the Dardanelles. How solid these interests were was made clear by the action of the powers in holding Italy back from an attack upon the European and Asiatic coasts of Turkey. But time is on the side of Italy. The position of other powers in the Mediterranean is precarious, dependent on understandings and alliances. Italy's position is defended by her own superabundant vitality. She alone can provide men to garrison and develop the neglected lands of the Mediterranean littoral. Her population is more dense than that of any other European state not primarily dependent on commerce and industry, and it grows steadily denser, despite the annual half million of emigrants shipped across the Atlantic.