

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Connecticut
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
MISS GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XIV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1911.

No. 712

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL

The Growth of a Man.

Anonymous correspondents are suspicious characters and as a rule deserve no attention; but when one of the species asks a question of general interest, it hardly seems reasonable to ignore the question because the questioner's method of asking it may excite contempt. So we reply to a question from such a source. This question refers to Woodrow Wilson, of whom we recently said that with every speech he proves the genuineness of his democratic philosophy. Thereupon our anonymous correspondent quotes from a book by Governor Wilson bearing a publisher's imprint of 1893, and asks us how we reconcile our statement with that quotation. Our answer is that we find sufficient to reconcile the two in the difference between a Wesleyan College professor of text book jurisprudence and cloistered politics at the age of 37, and a ripened and militant American citizen of national dimensions at the age of 55.

♦ ♦

"Good Trusts" and "Bad Trusts."

When "good trusts" are distinguished from "bad trusts," there is a valid reason for it; but the reason usually given is wrong. Not only is it wrong, but it discloses a radical misapprehension of the whole subject. For it proceeds upon the mistaken theory that the distinguishing characteristic of trusts is *combination*. If that were their distinguishing characteristic, it would be quite

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

The Growth of a Man.....	1185
"Good Trusts" and "Bad Trusts".....	1185
Convention Lobbying in Ohio.....	1186
American Politics and Ecclesiasticism.....	1186
Pensions for Mothers.....	1187
"All In Your Eye".....	1187
Advertisements of Food.....	1187
Death of S. J. Chubb.....	1187
Harmon's Candidacy.....	1188

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Henry George, Jr.'s, Speaking Tour.....	1189
Politics in Los Angeles (Edmund Norton).....	1190
The Henry George Movement in Denmark (Signe Bjorner).....	1192

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

How to Pull the Supreme Court's Teeth (F. C. Leubuscher).....	1193
---	------

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Joseph Fels Fund Commission.....	1194
An American Singletax City.....	1194
Pensions for Mothers.....	1194
Criminal Proceedings Against the Meat Trust.....	1195
The Situation in China.....	1195
News Notes.....	1196
Press Opinions.....	1197

RELATED THINGS:

A. D. 1911 (Thorwald Slegfried).....	1198
The True Monument Idea (Jos. Fels).....	1198
The United Labor Party (Louis F. Post).....	1198
The Weapons of Liberty—Initiative, Referendum and Recall (Chas. E. Baker).....	1200

BOOKS:

Mind Philosophy.....	1201
A Voice Out of Plutocracy.....	1201
Books Received.....	1202
Pamphlets.....	1202
Periodicals.....	1203

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.