

he could override them, while an aristocratic Astor was scrupulously law abiding; yet if acceptance of a pious gift from the former tended so to influence religious opinion as to promote their profitable but unjust law-breaking, and acceptance of such a gift from the latter tended to perpetuate the profitable but unjust institution that gives him an unearned income, both gifts would be gifts of "tainted money."

The monopoly that takes the increasing residue.

How true it is that land monopoly confiscates all that other monopolies are forced to leave is shown in the Kansas gas belt with startling clearness. Hundreds of cities, towns and villages in south-eastern Kansas now use only natural gas for fuel and lighting. They get it at a cost of 10 to 20 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, and in many places at less by a flat rate per month—10 cents a month for 30 candle power lamps and 50 to 75 cents for stoves. Is this a great blessing to the people? That depends upon whether they own the land they live on. But only about half the inhabitants do. The other half are renters and for them the landlord acts as receiver for the benefits of cheap gas. He adds the saving to their rent. Aside from the pecuniary advantage in cost of fuel and light, there is cleanliness, convenience and comfort in the use of gas, and this makes the gas towns very attractive as places of residence. But people who go there must pay a land monopolist the value of those privileges, either in purchase price or rents. "Do you expect to enjoy the benefits of cheap gas for nothing?" exclaim the land monopolists when their inflated prices are questioned.

The Chicago traction fight.

Mayor Dunne has acted wisely in responding favorably to requests to go directly to the people of Chicago with his plan (p. 369) for defeating traction graft and securing municipal ownership and operation of the traction service.

Obstructed by a majority of the City Council's committee on transportation, under the leadership of pronounced opponents of municipal ownership who have succeeded for the present in pigeon-holing his plan while they try to give a franchise to the Morgan grafters, the Mayor asks the people to come again to his support for the protection of their own interests. Naturally this policy is not agreeable to aldermen and newspapers that stand for the traction ring. But it is the right and the wise course to take, and already its favorable effects are noticeable.

Municipal ownership in Sheffield.

An example of the animus of the traction newspapers of Chicago was furnished a few days ago. Quoting from the Daily Consular report of the 16th to show that municipal ownership had failed in Sheffield, England, from neglect to charge annually for depreciation of plant, they were exceedingly lugubrious because it would now be necessary to increase fares. But they failed to make it as clear as the Daily Consular report did, that fares in Sheffield are 17 per cent. cheaper than the next cheapest in England; and that with as high a rate of fare as at Leeds—an average of less than 24 cents—there would be a great profit in the Sheffield system after ample allowance for depreciation. This is what the traction press of Chicago regards as failure of municipal ownership! It is a noteworthy fact that while they picked out this solitary item, they unanimously overlooked a more significant report, from Nottingham, in the very same issue of the Daily Consular report, and in a more conspicuous place. This report shows that, with an average fare of only 2 1-6 cents, the net profits for the year just closed at Nottingham exceeded \$100,000. It also shows, an important fact in connection with the traction question in Chicago, that only one fatal accident occurred in connection with traction operation in Nottingham during the year, and

that this was the first in three years, during which time 7,250,000 miles had been traversed by the municipally owned and operated cars, and 80,000,000 passengers carried. Other accidents have been few and trivial.

Municipal ownership in Glasgow.

The official report of traction operation in Glasgow (p. 382). Scotland, is interesting here, especially in view of the flippant criticism that the traction newspapers and other friends of traction interests made of Mr. du Pont's estimates (p. 345) of earnings for a municipal street car system in the streets of Chicago on which traction franchises have expired. Mr. du Pont estimated the gross earnings for the first year at \$12,000,000. The trackage on which he estimated is 264 miles, and the population to be served is 1,100,000. Turning now to the Glasgow report we find a trackage of only 147½ miles for a city the population of which is only 800,000. Yet the receipts for passengers carried last year (196,767,519) would have amounted at a 5-cent fare to \$9,788,375. Why should \$12,000,000 receipts be regarded as a rash estimate for the Chicago properties, if Glasgow would have received at the same fare nearly \$10,000,000 on her system, though with much shorter trackage and a smaller as well as less active population?

THE PRESIDENT'S WEAK SIDE.

It is not in a factious or partisan spirit that we may see wherein President Roosevelt, at this period of our national life, is seriously lacking. The personality of a public officer may at times be an important feature in a nation's history, and may thus become a legitimate subject of comment.

The President has gained the reputation of "doing things." He did things in the Cuban war. He was a brave officer and received his just reward of praise. He went down in the submarine boat. It was a daring act, which appealed to the sportsman spirit of the country, and was admired even by those who seemed to

plore his daring. He has deserved the thanks of the world by his efforts for peace between Russia and Japan. He has, indeed, throughout his public career, done many good things, for all of which he has received the praise that was due.

But there is one kind of thing the President has not done.

A new life of Andrew Jackson has recently appeared, which is dedicated "to the embodiment in our times of the Jacksonian spirit, Theodore Roosevelt." Andrew Jackson was impulsive and somewhat spectacular, but the likeness between these two Presidents is purely superficial. The author of the book missed the supreme quality of Jackson's genius and the immense importance of his greatest achievement, else he could not have displayed the ignorance of his comparison. No man in American history saw distant results more clearly than Andrew Jackson. He saw the beginnings of our tremendous material development. He knew what steam and machinery and railroads would do. He saw the dangerous influences of concentrated wealth. He struck at the danger where he found it beginning to show itself. He struck and struck and struck. The United States Bank had behind it all the influences of wealth, privilege and social prestige. But Jackson kept striking, in scorn of personal consequence, until he struck it down. Where was there in his policy of curing the concentration of monopolistic power, any thought of temporizing with the evil? Nor could the monopoly have been abolished in any other way than by Jackson's persistent, uncompromising steadfastness.

Corresponding to the bank power in Jackson's day, we have in our day the tariff power, the railroad power, and other powers, all powerfully combined to resist attack anywhere along the line. The danger, the abuse, the insolence of concentrated wealth have immensely increased. Can the evil be abolished by a policy of moderation and temporizing? By bold talk one-half year, and then protesting the next half that in dealing with such large interests it is necessary to go slowly? Never can privilege be dispossessed

in such wise. What if certain interests must temporarily suffer? What if the powers, as was done in Jackson's time, can increase the suffering to the point of panic—is the long gain not worth the pain? Why permit the powers of special privilege to go on counting upon the policy of postponement under the plea of moderation? The interests of true moderation demand progress through the abolition of abuses clearly seen. It is the policy of temporizing that tends to produce in the end immoderate action.

Here we see the President's unfortunate failure. Whether from lack of patience, or of persistency, or from disinclination to offend close associates and to incur the hostile criticism of dominant forces, the fact remains that he has not followed throughout any policy of reform that would tend to hamper, much less abolish, the economic abuses of concentrated wealth. A few papers have begun to call attention to this fact. Among these, one of the fairest and most judicious, the New York Journal of Commerce, in a recent editorial wrote as follows:

Recent utterances seem to show that President Roosevelt's attitude on railway matters has been substantially modified since the adjournment of Congress. Whereas, at the last session, he called loudly, if somewhat ambiguously, for positive legislation on this subject, and was well pleased with the bill passed by the House, he now asks vaguely for an act that will merely correct railway abuses. Coupling this with the semi-official announcement that tariff revision must wait until after the next Presidential election, an almost complete *reductio ad absurdum* is reached in the administration plan of reform. This situation would be ridiculous if it had not so many serious aspects. It conveys an extremely important general lesson as well as a direct menace for the immediate future. The threat is found in the fact that industrial interests, desirous of blocking legislation, have now fully learned the location of the President's weak point.

The industrial interests, the writer goes on to say, have found that all they need is to get a postponement. They trust in the President's fatal fault of not pursuing throughout—through all details and complications and oppositions—the contest that is needed.

What makes the situation worse is the President's protesta-

tion of reform. The people fondly believe that he will do something in this direction of social problems. And the very fact that he has acted strenuously on some occasions and in some directions adds to the credence. Up to the present time all real evidences point to the conclusion that nothing of vital importance in our economic conditions will be done during the present administration. President Roosevelt has supplied precisely what the allied special interests needed at this time: one who would hold out the hope and seeming, without the reality, of doing something in response to clamor that was raised against them.

What is the lesson? Is it not this? That no reforms, of the kind needed by the people, can be expected until the people are converted to elect a President who shall be in truth an embodiment of the Jacksonian spirit, one who, with the highest type of bravery, and a real belief in democracy, shall persist, without temporizing, in striking down the abuses that retard, and in clearing the way for the activities that promote, a fairer apportionment of the nation's inevitable wealth. This is our great problem, which we need to face all the time. In solving it lies our highest service, not only to ourselves but to the peoples of other countries. Not by army, navy, foreign expansion, Monroe doctrine, or otherwise, can this nation so promote the progress of the world and the good of mankind as by holding its face steadily to this problem of the concentration and abuse of wealth. Whatever diverts attention from it is a delusion and a snare. And no matter what President Roosevelt may do in other directions, in failing to face this problem, after apparently seeing it, future judgment will be against him.

J. H. DILLARD.

## NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 21.

### Political corruption revealed.

In the course of the insurance investigation by a legislative committee of the State of New York (p. 376), Mr. George W. Perkins has