

THE ILLUSTRATED BEE

Published Weekly by The Bee Publishing Company, Bee Building, Omaha, Neb.

Price, 5c Per Copy—Per Year, \$2.00.

Entered at the Omaha Postoffice as Second Class Mail Matter.

For Advertising Rates Address Publisher.

Communications relating to photographs or articles for publication should be addressed, Editor The Illustrated Bee, Omaha.

Pen and Picture Pointers

DURING the week Omaha was visited by one of the most distinguished soldiers on the roll of the United States army, Lieutenant General Adna R. Chaffee, now chief-of-staff of the army. General Chaffee is the second man to wear the insignia of his high office who has come up through all grades from that of enlisted man, and who has served with credit to himself and the army in every capacity. His life story has been told before in The Bee and will not now be repeated. Something might well be said, however, concerning his present position. When it was determined to reorganize the army, after the experience of the war with Spain, those in authority did not stop half way. All American tradition was abandoned and a fresh start made.

Some desultory work had been done along the lines on which a general staff is supposed to operate, but it had been in a perfunctory and to a large extent experimental manner. Now that the staff has been made a feature of the army organization, it has entered upon the active work of preparing plans and devising equipment, to the end that, should the United States again be required to take the field, it will not find itself in the humiliating position that confronted the people on the breaking out of the Spanish war, when the volunteer forces had to be sent out with obsolete equipment, and the little handful of regulars was almost as badly off, while the fact that the old-fashioned powder was used made even our friends among the nations smile, and its use aided the enemy to direct his deadly fire against our men. This matter of guns and powder was only an item in the general unpreparedness the country was in at the close of thirty years of profound peace.

It is not the spirit of militarism that has led to the reforms in the army, but the exercise of ordinary prudence. No one doubts the mettle of the American soldier; his like is not found elsewhere in the world, but the American soldier is not to be sent again into the field, handicapped by foolish adherence to tradition. Since the close of the war with Spain the world has been given two startling examples of the advantage being ready gives to a fighting force in the field. The Boers were ready when they began the war with Great Britain, and the Japanese were ready when the present hostilities with Russia were opened. Once at least before this lesson was exemplified, in the case of the war between France and Germany. Von Moltke's celebrated remark, "Drawer 27," has become a classic among military men. It may not be that the United States organization will ever reach the perfection that has been shown by the Japanese, where military service is compulsory, but it is certain that the next time the army takes the field it will be under far more gratifying conditions than existed on the occasion of the last assembly of the forces that fight under Old Glory.

In the very nature of things the work of the general staff is secret. Some outward exhibition of its activity is shown in the changes made now and then in equipment or distribution of forces, but the great mass of its investigations, deliberations and labors must necessarily remain in the archives of the army at Washington until such time as they will be needed. It is not violating any confidence in stating that the work is being done in thoroughly systematic manner, by scientific soldiers who have well learned their trade of fighting. General Chaffee has at present the direction of this work and brings to it a mind equipped by long experience in the army for the exigencies that arise and the problems that must be solved. He is surrounded by men who know their share of the work thoroughly, and while the general staff isn't filling many newspaper columns with reports of its achievements nor using many magazine pages in a discussion of theories as to the various problems that arise in connection with an army in the field, it is quietly fulfilling its mission.

More Than a Foot

The sultan was very angry. "They can't make me shell out by pointing a gun at me," he hoarsely announced. "Won't you meet the parties?" the visitor mildly inquired. "No," thundered the commander of the faithful. "I tell you they can't make me stir a foot by pointing a gun at me!" "But, your ineffable highness," persisted the visitor, "this is a 12-inch gun!" The sultan reached for his turban. "That's different," he said.—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Stockman's Homestead and Grazing Range

THE industrial condition which governs throughout more than 400,000,000 acres of western public grazing lands has been described many times recently in articles discussing the question of the proper disposal of these lands. In general, the situation is everywhere the same—temporary occupation without ownership or legal possessory rights, by stock men, of that public domain whose purpose is to provide room and opportunity as long and as fully as possible for the nation's rapidly expanding population.

Mindful of such an important utility for our public lands, any damage to this national asset must be considered, virtually, as a sacrifice of national territory, inasmuch as its impairment means the loss of so much foothold and working room for prospective settlers. Yet exactly this has been the result of the misfit application of existing land laws to western conditions. These laws, virtually inoperative in a grazing country, have necessarily been supplemented by the unwritten law of the range, framed and enforced by those strong enough to take and hold possession for a brief term of years.

The result of such occupation is, usually, that excessive numbers of animals are put upon this free pasture, the profits are run up as quickly as possible while yet the range remains free, and then, when the grass is gone, when the plains and hillsides are converted into gullied barrens, and oftentimes, when the profits of the first years are canceled by the losses of later ones, the nation's ruined estate is abandoned to the tender mercies of the next and more ruthless occupant who may still find something convertible thereon.

The effect of this unregulated and destructive tenure varies greatly with those conditions of soil, topography, rainfall, heat and frost which affect the endurance of a grazing country. More favored districts in more northerly, humid or elevated situations still retain an important fraction of their primeval value, but in portions of the southwest, where the soils are sandy and easily washed, where the rainfall is light and often untimely, where the hot, dry climate causes enormous evaporation, and where, consequently, the effects of unregulated grazing are most destructive, many great areas of formerly grassy country may be safely stated to be capable of supporting not one-tenth of the stock that once ranged there.

It may be assumed, probably without exaggerating the loss, that the public grazing ranges of the west now average not more than half of their original value—lands, too, which can never be irrigated and for which there is no possible use but as grazing territory. Differently stated, this means that the United States, for want of proper laws to govern its public domain, has suffered a loss equal in effective value to, say, 200,000,000 acres of grazing lands—an area greater than the state of Texas or equal to a strip of territory 230 miles wide extending from the Rio Grande to the Canadian boundary. It is evident that only the wreckage of western grazing values remains to be legislated for and that the problems of the now depleted range are largely those of reconstruction for a failing country, occupied by more or less conflicting interests—by cattle, sheep and goats, by large companies and by small individuals.

There are few remaining to defend the old order of "free grass for all;" for this regime, satisfactory enough when there was grass for all, has, with the failure of the ranges, demonstrated its own ruinousness.

The problem confronting range interests at this time is to devise land laws which shall enable a maximum population to support itself in a pastoral country; and to make these laws so flexible as to apply to all grades, both best and poorest, of grazing lands, harmonize all kinds of stock interests thereon and provide for the often unexpected development, through irrigation, of agricultural lands within formerly purely grazing districts.

The existing conditions are those of a country reduced by overgrazing and bad management to a fraction of its possible value and requiring to be fenced, reseeded, repaired and protected in order to even partly restore that value.

Practically the only proposals thus far made to remedy existing conditions are to lease the public lands in blocks at stated rents, or to issue permits to individuals to run stated numbers of animals upon specified portions of the public range.

The unsatisfactory nature of these proposals is attested, in part, by their repeated rejection by one or another faction of those concerned, and for reasons quite evident when the merits of the measures are considered. Lease or fence laws permitting the control of large bodies of land on the basis of competitive bids are usually favored by the wealthier and better established stock raisers who would be at an advantage under such laws, and are earnestly opposed by the small men who would be exterminated through their operation. Horizontal lease laws have been proposed providing for the leasing of all grazing lands at the same rate per acre

of rental. When it is considered that different grazing districts may easily require all the way from three to sixty acres to support a single cow the unjust discrimination against the more desert ranges of a horizontal rate per acre lease law is too evident to require discussion.

The leasing idea, nevertheless, has a good foundation in the fact that it recognizes that in order to place the grazing industries on a stable basis stockmen, like farmers, must have control of the land upon which they operate; but methods have not yet been proposed for an open and equitable division of grazing lands among applicants therefor.

The permit system also, in one form or another, has many advocates—possibly largely for the reason that this method has been put into practice on forest and Indian reserves and its results are known to those who would expect to take advantage of it. The permit system, however, is practically no better than free range with a tax added to the stockman's expenses and a more or less unsuccessful attempt on the part of the government to regulate the number of animals in a specified district. As under the free regime the stockman is not protected by assurance of permanent or long continued tenure of range, he consequently desires to get the whole value out of his concession while it lasts and often yields to the temptation to place more animals upon his territory than his permit calls for. The destructive effects of the permit system as they are to be seen on certain Arizona reservations are not reassuring as to the good results of this method in practice.

It is doubtful, in brief, that a satisfactory method of disposal for western grazing ranges and their use as such has been devised and we naturally turn at this time to Australia for suggestions. This country, which is, and always has been, more a pastoral than an agricultural region, for the last seventy-five years has been making and remodeling its laws relating to the disposal of crown lands to settlers. The fruits of this long experience are of unusual significance to us at the present time. As they now stand the land laws of various of the Australian states present the following sensible features: First, grazing lands are divided according to their capacity to carry stock into as many as four classes and settlers are permitted to occupy smaller or greater allotments of territory according to its quality. Second, these lands are occupied under long tenure leases, with renewal privileges, which give practically permanent control to the stockmen. In addition to the motive thus created to improve their leaseholds they are also usually required by law to fence and otherwise improve their holdings. Third, the classification of lands and their allotment to settlers is done by boards of commissioners acting for the government with a view to correct judgment and equitable division of the public lands.

These are the leading features of those laws which have resulted from the better part of a century of Anglo-Saxon experience in a pastoral country.

The operation of these laws with reference to the development of pastoral industry is stated to be highly satisfactory. Vast areas of semi-desert lands, divided into comparatively small holdings, are legally occupied for long terms by stockmen who, prompted both by law and their own best interests, improve their holdings. Thus it is that in Australia an immense pastoral country has been fenced, substantial improvements are installed, provision is made against famine in dry years, animal pests are exterminated, poisonous plants are eradicated and an era of improvement has apparently been inaugurated directly due to a recognition of the fact that the Anglo-Saxon must have proprietary interest in land if he is expected to improve its condition.

In unhappy contrast to the upbuilding of pastoral Australia is the reverse process everywhere evident in our own western states. The spoliation which has resulted, inevitably, from the lack of laws having for their object a saving administration of the range country, has resulted in a gradual but sure decline of its carrying capacity. In some districts, especially where under stress of overgrazing the soil is easily eroded by rainfall, this damage can never be repaired; in others, restriction of grazing, reseeding and other remedial measures may effect a large measure of restoration.

As to what these remedial measures should be in the United States, there is, of course, great difference of opinion, influenced in part by the interests of those concerned and in part by ignorance of the problem itself.

Successful grazing range laws must of necessity rest upon two kinds of knowledge—knowledge of the range itself—the forages that it bears, their habits of growth and reproduction, their food value for animals, the classification of grazing country into different grades, and the carrying capacity and endurance of these different kinds of range. This is a subject the study of which within the past few years has been vigorously entered upon by various economic botanists, especially by

certain of the state experiment stations and by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The second sort of knowledge required is that derived from legislative experience in dealing with purely grazing lands elsewhere. The results of such experience are to be found in Australia probably more than in any other modern country.

Australian experience, considered together with the traditions of our own land laws, points to the practicability in the United States of the stockman's homestead or long term leasehold in pastoral districts. The homestead idea, long-tried and well approved in this country, is, briefly, that a settler shall be granted enough territory to afford him a living—enough and no more.

As applied to the Mississippi valley, a homestead meant 160 acres of land, this area being found in the average instance sufficient for a farming family. But when the tide of immigration pushed west of the 100th meridian into the semi-arid regions, it was found either that 160 acres with water was worth a great deal more, or that 160 acres without water was worth vastly less than that same area back in the Mississippi valley.

The far greater value of irrigated lands has been recognized and provided for under the terms of the Newlands act, and, according to the productive capacity of the lands developed by the reclamation service, the settler will be granted a greater or less portion adequate for his support.

Continuing the application of the idea, why should we not apportion grazing ranges on precisely the same principles, granting a sufficient acreage for a sufficient time to afford the small stockman the necessary territory to support the herd whose increase shall give him a living income, and protecting him in his tenure for a sufficient length of time to create an incentive for the maintenance and improvement of his range.

In Australia from 1,280 to 40,000 acres of grazing lands, according to quality, are thus leased, at rates proportionate to value, for terms of from fourteen to forty-two years. Many benefits are experienced under these provisions. Sheep and cattle wars are rendered impossible since each interest is confined to its own territory. Cooperative arrangements are entered into extensively where cooperation permits of more economical management of large adjoining leaseholds. Grazing leaseholds are operated in connection with cultivated farms; and humane methods of handling stock are rendered possible.

The operation of the grazing leasehold plan implies the creation of a suitable means for classifying grazing lands according to their productive capacity, and designating the various areas in different districts which will support, without destruction of the range, the income producing herd of the small stockman.

Proper provisions for residence upon and improvement of holdings should be made, insuring good faith of occupants and varying with conditions in different districts.

Co-operation should be recognized and provided for in districts where the sparseness of the range, the scarcity of water and the comparative costliness of fencing makes it advisable for neighbors to act jointly.

Provision should be made for the renewal of a long-tenure lease by the original holder provided the land remains purely grazing country; but in case of possible artesian or irrigation development provision should also be made for throwing the leasehold open to more intensive culture.

On these and other concurrent lines, as seems to have been demonstrated by the Anglo-Saxon sheep and cattlemen of Australia, it should be possible to fulfil the purpose of our public domain and place upon it a maximum number of American citizens secure in their rights to sufficient territory to secure a living for themselves.

Tucson, Ariz. R. H. FORBES.

Trading Off Love Tokens

A society man whose perfect dancing is the envy of all the men he knows and the admiration of all the women, stopped on Charles street the other day to greet an acquaintance.

"I'm amusing myself this morning selling old jewelry," said the society man.

"Old jewelry! Whose?" queried his acquaintance.

"Why, the returned love tokens of a lot of girls I know. Things they have given men whom they adored for a brief season and with whom they exchanged gifts of jewelry, which, like the cat, 'came back' when a coolness ensued.

"But the funniest part is their reasons for parting with these souvenirs of affections—they want the money to buy mementoes for other men who have supplanted the first in their changing affections. Hence my mission to the pawn shops and dealers in old gold." He drifted away to seek a sign of three balls, humming the waltz that was played at the Spielgartenfest and jangling in his pockets the love tokens, some of which were worn as pledges of never-dying affection on that occasion.—Baltimore Sun.