

# The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and  
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1914.

No. 826

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE THACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.  
STOUGHTON COOLEY, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.  
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, }  
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
HENRY F. BING, Texas  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio  
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
LEWELLYN JONES, Illinois  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Calif.  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York  
HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York  
W. G. EGGLESTON, California  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon  
R. F. FETTERBREW, South Dakota  
LEWIS E. BEAUM, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, England  
ERNEST BRAY, Australia  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager

Elisworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents      Yearly Subscription, One Dollar  
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

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

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

Alaska Favored by the Senate—S. D.	97
Protecting the Trusts—S. D.	97
Rebating Continues—S. D.	98
Why Confine It to Radium?—S. C.	98
Bourbon Democrats—S. C.	99
Illinois Democracy Menaced by Sullivan—S. D.	99
Jobs and the Jobless—S. C.	99
Is There Any Difference?—S. D.	100
An Old Ogre in a New Guise—S. C.	101
University "Economics"—S. D.	101

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Michigan Tax Association and Singletax—A. M. Todd	101
---	-----

### INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

The Reason for Withdrawal—E. J. Shriver	101
The Issue in Mexico	105

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

Senate Passes Alaska Railway Bill	105
Prospective Trust Legislation	105
Investigation of Railroad Abuses	106
The Joseph Fels Fund Conference	106
New York Graft Investigation	107
The Labor War	108
Mexico and the United States	108
British Affairs	108
German Affairs	109
A Correction	109
News Notes	109
Press Opinions	111

### RELATED THINGS:

The Lost Trail—Arthur Ketchum	112
Some Friends of Ours, IV—Charles Howard Shinn	112
The Better Samaritan—Bolton Hall	112
Equality of Opportunities, Not of Incomes—Lincoln Steffens	113
Property in Land—A. C. Auchmuty	113

### BOOKS:

Memories of William T. Stead	114
Wages and Standards of Living	114
Periodicals	115

## EDITORIAL

### Alaska Favored by The Senate.

In refreshing contrast to the proposed puerile anti-trust legislation is the action of the United States Senate in passing the Alaska government railroad bill. That is true constructive legislation. Now let it be followed by legislation that will assure to the people whose money and labor builds the road all of the land values which the road will create. Otherwise an opportunity will be offered to landowners in Alaska to take from the wealth producers of the Territory all the financial benefits that will accrue from the government road. Land speculation will be encouraged and Alaska will become as the rest of the Union, a land of poverty as well as of progress.

S. D.



### Protecting the Trusts.

An extended lease of life is assured to the trusts. Whatever the anti-trust bills introduced in accordance with the President's message may accomplish, there is one thing they certainly will not do. They will not solve the trust problem. If they fairly represent the line along which the administration will work in endeavoring to abolish trusts, then nothing will be accomplished during Wilson's term to lessen the evil. The result will be the same, regardless of whether the laws will be strictly enforced or whether they become dead letters. No evil can be abolished without removing its cause.



Take the Steel Trust as an example. Its power rests principally on ownership or control of coal lands and ore beds. It owns among other natural resources, sixty thousand acres of coking coal deposits in the Connellsville region. Any other producer of steel must have this coal but must agree to the trust's terms in order to get it. Now what is there in any of the anti-trust bills to put an end to this predatory power? Nothing whatever. The

bill to abolish interlocking directorates would still leave these sixty thousand acres in the control of individuals intent on preventing any competitor of the trust from getting coking coal. So would the bill to make guilt personal, or the bill to strictly define offenses against the anti-trust law, or the bill for a trade commission. Even if the latter body were empowered to regulate prices and to enforce regulations, it would fail. The trust would still control the source of supply; could therefore control production and create an artificial scarcity in the commodity in which it deals, in spite of the commission's orders. It would be the same with all monopolistic combinations. As long as they are permitted to retain possession of their privileges no commission can be strong enough to control them.



In adopting the policy of trust regulation the Democratic Congress apparently puts the seal of approval on the policy advocated by Theodore Roosevelt and the national platform of the Progressive party. It repudiates President Wilson's condemnation of government by experts. It opens the way to the danger which the President showed must follow from such government—that those controlled by the government must necessarily get closer to the government. Mr. Roosevelt and his followers may criticize certain details in those Democratic bills, but they can not consistently condemn the principle on which they are based. It is more probable that they will claim to have won a victory, that the Democratic party has surrendered to them—and the claim will be absolutely correct.



Not only the followers of Roosevelt, but the followers of Taft, may—if they are logical—find comfort in this new Democratic policy. If solution of the trust problem actually requires arbitrary regulation, then a false position was taken by the Democratic party when it placed blame for the existence of trusts on the protective tariff. If trusts, which derive power from other than tariff privileges, can be abolished without abolition of their privileges, then tariff-fed trusts can also be abolished without any interference with the tariff. Fortunately, logic is a weapon with the use of which protectionists are none too familiar—else they would not be protectionists. For that reason Democratic congressmen may hope to escape much embarrassment to which the folly and inconsistency of their party leaders now renders them liable.

S. D.

### Rebating Continues.

The frequency with which charges of rebating are being brought against railroads together with occasional convictions of the offense indicates that the practice prevails probably as extensively as it ever did. For every time such an act as discovered it is not at all improbable that it has been done many times without discovery, or without legal proof being available. The practice is one of great value in maintaining trust power. It was folly to expect punitive legislation to abolish it. While public franchises remain private property, rebating in some form will continue, for the reason that it offers a possibility of profit, which no punitive legislation can destroy. This is one of the facts to which Congress in framing anti-trust laws has kept its eyes closed.

S. D.



### Why Confine It to Radium?

Much ado is made in Congress, in the press, and by the public in general, over the disposal of radium deposits in Colorado. It has been proposed by some unterrified radicals that instead of conveying title as has been our custom to an inverted pyramid with its apex at the center of the earth and its base in the depths of space, with absolute possession to all things between, the Government shall reserve its right to the radium ore that may be found therein, and so prevent the monopolization of a most useful agent of nature. This is most commendable from any point of view; indeed, one wonders how any man can be found to oppose it. But after all, is the need of retaining the people's right in these lands so different from that of securing their right to lands bearing more common minerals, or timber, or even fertility? Is a million dollars' worth of coal, or iron or salt worth any less than a million dollars' worth of radium?



Should the Government continue its time-honored policy of giving to a few the lands that belong of right to all, what difference does it really make whether the land contains value of one kind or value of another kind? Whoever gets the radium lands—supposing them to be given into private hands—will put the product on the market in the same way, and with the same motive, as actuates the owners of iron or coal, wheat or cabbage lands. The fact that radium is worth millions of dollars an ounce, while coal is worth but a few dollars a ton, does not alter the principle involved. Nor does the fact that radium may be a possible cure for cancer. Should it prove to be the long-