

true that there are "good trusts" and "bad trusts." In Chicago, for illustration—and doubtless there are similar illustrations in abundance everywhere,—one family owns and manages some fifteen or twenty market stores in different parts of the city—the "Rosenheim Market House Co." Here is a *combination*, sure enough, but no one can reasonably say that the combination is injurious to anybody. Why? Because the maintenance of those stores depends upon the ability and skill of the managers in serving their customers. Were that feature withdrawn the combination would collapse. But this is not so with the Steel Trust. Why not? Because its maintenance depends not so much upon ability and skill in serving customers as upon ability and skill in monopolizing resources.

Back, therefore, of the idea that the destructive characteristic of trusts is combination, there must lie the idea of combining in such manner as to produce a monopoly. So it is really not *combination* but *monopoly* that makes the trust; and when it is said that there are "good trusts" and "bad trusts," this may be fairly translated into the true statement that some combinations are *not*, and some combinations *are*, monopolies. The combination that is not a monopoly is a *good trust*, for industrial combination is in itself beneficial; the combination that *is* a monopoly is a *bad trust*, for monopoly is essentially injurious. Now, there are very good reasons for believing that no combination can continue a monopoly long unless it is a combination of monopolies already created and maintained by law. From which it is a reasonable conclusion that the trust question is at bottom a question not so much of putting an end to unlawful combinations as of putting an end to lawful monopolies.

#### Convention Lobbying in Ohio.

When Allen Ripley Foote, the electric-power lobbyist of Ohio, invited, in the name of his lobbying organization, the Ohio State Board of Commerce, the delegates recently elected to the Constitutional Convention of Ohio to a public dinner as the guests of that association, Herbert S. Bigelow, one of the prominent delegates and one who understands Mr. Foote's purposes and methods, made the following appropriate reply:

I decline your invitation to be the guest of the Ohio Board of Commerce on the evening of Nov. 22. I can see no purpose in a gathering that would be creditable to your organization or consistent with the self-respect of the delegates. You have won

the confidence of some good people by advocating creditable measures. But you have attempted to convert this confidence into an asset of "big monopoly business" to oppose progress and to perpetuate the domination of privileged wealth. You and your organization will be engaged this winter in a reprehensible effort to induce delegates to break faith with the people, and to oppose or emasculate measures to which they are pledged and which their constituents expect them to favor. The very first thing the delegates will want to do in the Constitutional Convention will be to pass rules that will bar from the State House such influences as you represent. I think the people will expect us to clear the lobbyists out; and it would certainly ill become us now to accept the hospitality of the chief of these lobbyists and break bread with those who for their own enrichment conspire against the public good.

♦ ♦

#### American Politics and Ecclesiasticism.

Apropos of our comments upon ecclesiasticism in American politics,\* our attention has been called to a certain use in the recent elections in New Mexico, of the name of a distinguished Roman Catholic bishop. We allude to Bishop Pitaval of the diocese of Santa Fe in that State. Bishop Pitaval was quoted all over New Mexico a few days ago as saying of the "blue ballot" for more easily amending the Constitution, that if it be passed "the Constitution will become a football for political demagogues and fanatical faddists." Coming immediately after Cardinal Gibbons' sermon against Direct Legislation, and Archbishop Ireland's slanders upon American citizenship as mobocracy, this pronouncement was unhappily significant in more ways than one. But it turned out in good time that the whole thing had been a malicious fabrication. Bishop Pitaval telegraphed from New York in these words:

To the People of New Mexico: I am informed that an attempt has been made to make use of my name as head of the Catholic Church in New Mexico to further the political ambitions of one of the political parties in the Territory. If this is so, I wish to assure all true followers of the Church that such statements are entirely untrue, and that I am in no way entering into partisan issues in this campaign.

As the "blue ballot" was overwhelmingly carried at the election, three explanations are possible: the natural influence of Bishop Pitaval's denial; the resentment which a seeming effort at ecclesiastical dominion in politics might arouse; or the good citizenship and good sense of New Mexican voters. In any event, Bishop Pitaval has nothing to regret, nor in his case have American Catholics anything to regret for him.

\*See Public of October 6, page 1017, and Public of November 3, page 1115.