

monopoly under all circumstances. But the bill itself is an indictment of conditions which enable a few to monopolize the country's space. A system is indefensible which makes the coming of willing workers, not otherwise objectionable, a real or apparent menace to workers already here. When it forces the enactment of barbarous anti-immigration laws it has one more wrong to account for. Whether the law be adopted or not, why not get rid of the great evil that made its adoption seem necessary?

S. D.



### A Public Product for Private Use.

Under the heading "Alaska Railroad Will Create Seattle Boom," a real estate advertisement appears in the Seattle Times of January 25. The advertisement goes on to argue that the expenditure of \$50,000,000, and unlocking of the "Treasures of Alaska" will result in doubling of land values in the north end of Seattle in a short time. The American people will do the sowing and a few Seattle landlords the reaping. The final result of such booming will be to check progress. Land owners who honestly believe values will double in a short time will feel tempted to insist on double prices now. Those intending to use land will be forced to pay exorbitantly. Investment of capital and employment of labor will thus be discouraged. Finally the boom will collapse, and then when prices of land sink low enough, some inducement to buy for improvement will be offered once more, and the slow recovery will begin.



If such will be the effect of the railroad in far off Seattle, it will surely have similar results in Alaska itself, unless the amendment should be adopted, proposed by Congressman Warren Worth Bailey of Pennsylvania, to take for public use the land values created by the railroad. Friends of the government railway project should insist that this be done.

S. D.



### Opening of Conserved Lands.

Said Congressman Albert Johnson of Washington in the House on January 30, as a slur on the conservation policy: "Think of it, more than 90 per cent of all of Arizona, 87 per cent of Nevada, more than 80 per cent of Idaho, 80 per cent of Utah, almost 70 per cent of Wyoming, 65 per cent of Montana, 62 per cent of New Mexico, half of Oregon, half of California, half of Colorado, and 40 per cent of my own State, Washington, all con-

served, together with their resources, for posterity." But what good would it do to open these lands without adequate provision against monopoly? Mr. Johnson should carefully read and consider the facts presented by his colleague, Representative J. W. Bryan, of Washington, in a speech delivered on June 17. Mr. Bryan tells therein about the opening to settlers in 1901 of 750,000 acres in the Olympic national forests. Then Mr. Bryan says further: "Ten years later only about 600 acres of the entire elimination had been cultivated at all, and title to 523,720 acres had passed into the hands of large owners with three companies holding 178,000 acres." What was gained by opening the land under such conditions? Would there not be a similar result if all the land mentioned by Mr. Johnson should be thrown open the same way? These lands had better remain conserved until conditions shall be made so as to ensure opening to labor instead of monopoly. What is needed is a measure like the proposed amendment of Congressman Bailey of Pennsylvania to the Alaska railroad bill. That provides for appropriation, for public use, instead of by private monopolists, of publicly created values. The same principle applied to the conserved public lands will make it possible to open them without danger of monopoly. Is Congressman Johnson ready to approve?

S. D.



### Direct Election of Senators.

For the sake of the fundamental principle involved it is to be hoped that the direct vote for Senators will be held under kindlier auspices in other States than it is likely to be in Illinois. With the Republican vote divided, the success of the Democrats is almost a certainty. Hence, the real choice of Senator will occur at the Democratic primaries; and the leading candidate before those primaries is the man who personifies all the evils of the old system, and few of the virtues of the new. But through his leadership as a political boss, he will have in reality more power in this election than he had under the old system. It is an old political trick for bosses to trade votes, and this year offers exceptional opportunities. For it matters little who receives the Republican nomination, and Republican bosses will be willing to throw votes to the Democratic boss's candidate in exchange for votes for other offices. An unflinching recourse of the clever boss at all times, it becomes doubly ominous when the boss himself is a candidate. With Roger C. Sullivan of Illinois an aspirant for a seat in the United States Senate, the democracy of this State is placed on trial. From

the success or failure of this man are we to know that Democracy is still wedded to its Bourbon idols, or has seen a new light. Political bosses can do much—particularly when they are as clever and resourceful as this one—but they can do nothing when the people assert themselves in opposition. It is the indifference of the people that makes the opportunity of the boss. The direct vote will allow the people to do what they will. But the direct vote is useless without the will of the people behind it. It is not automatic, nor is it foolproof; it is merely an instrument that reflects the will of those using it. Should Illinois Democrats, with a choice of men like John Z. White and Roger C. Sullivan before them, choose the latter, it will demonstrate that the State is worthy of no better representation than it will have; and real democrats will know that Democracy is a cloak for Bourbonism.

S. C.

### A Protectionist Free Trader.

It was in 1909 that Mr. L. N. Littauer, glove manufacturer and former Congressman, exerted influence which brought a heavy increase in the tariff on gloves. It was in 1914 that this same L. N. Littauer was detected in an attempt to smuggle. He would have the government rob others. He would not himself be robbed.

Ordinarily a detected smuggler need feel no more humiliation than if he had been detected in trying to escape the attentions of an illegal highwayman. But Littauer's case is different. The exposure shows what he honestly thinks of the tariff. It shows that in his heart he believes free trade to be right. It strengthens the suspicion that others prominent in fastening protective robbery on the people feel the same way. Unintentionally he has cast discredit on the policy of protection. His punishment is thus in the nature of atonement—not for his offense against the law—but for the real wrong he committed; the part played by him in securing imposition of tariff duties. If the fine he paid could be used to reimburse the victims of the high tariff on gloves the atonement would be more satisfactory.

S. D.

### Bleeding Mexico.

Of all the adjectives applied to Mexico, from "barbarous" to "manana," none seems more apt than the one applied to Kansas during its struggle against the introduction of chattel slavery. Bleeding Mexico it was at the dawn of history; and

bleeding Mexico it is today. To the natural savagery of the earlier tribes that occupied the country the Aztecs added a system of human sacrifice that seems to have left its bloody trail down to the present time. The war god Mexitl, or Huitzilopochtli, who stood at the head of this heathen pantheon, could be propitiated only by liberal sacrifices of human lives. Wars were waged for the purpose of securing prisoners to offer up on their altars to this monster-deity; and it is estimated that a single year saw as many as 20,000 men, women, and children laid upon the sacrificial stone, and their quivering hearts held up to the gaze of the people. A large part of the Mexican people are descendants of the Aztecs; is it so very strange that Mexican prisoners of war today should be sacrificed to the god of war?

Nor is this propensity for shedding blood, terrible as it is, the worst feature of Mexican history. From its earliest days the country has been subject to an economic condition that has produced a handful of rich, and a nation of poor, great wealth in a few hands, and nation-wide poverty. This was the condition in the time of the Aztecs; it is the condition today, a land of peons and great estates. The conquering Spaniards added nothing in the nature of democracy, and little in the way of mercy; for it may well be doubted if to live the life of a hopeless peon is preferable to immolation on the sacrificial stone. This condition is unnatural; and the struggle to right it is inevitable. But the Mexican problem is complicated by the composition of its population. The Spaniards, owing to their superior power in warfare, have been able to hold in subjection the great mass of natives; and the slow-grown Mexican class of mixed blood has lent itself to the same manipulation, so that wealth of the mass of the people has gone into the coffers of the small fighting class. The people in general lack the sense of solidarity necessary to enable them to make head against their oppressors. But the oppression is felt; and leaders will continue to take the field in behalf of the oppressed whenever there is the least weakness shown by the governing class.

Of the long succession of conquerors and usurpers who have held the government at Mexico City since the republic was established ninety years ago, none has been able to do more than maintain military possession. Civil government in the sense understood by Americans, Mexico has never had. Democracy and human rights have had no