

A vigorous fight is to be made in the Seventh senatorial district of Illinois, by both democratic-Democrats and democratic-Republicans, to smash the Republican machine, which is controlled by John Humphrey. Humphrey's name is most familiar in connection with the infamous bills for turning over the streets of Chicago to street car monopolies for 50 years. He represents that side of the issues between plutocracy and a genuine democracy which are crystallizing in American politics. The district is nominally Republican by a large majority; but Humphrey is opposed by Western Starr, whose democracy is of the Lincoln brand, and whose election against so pestiferous a ring as Humphrey's is prophesied with confidence by men of both parties. Mr. Starr was a Republican when the Republican party was democratic. He became a Democrat when the party of Lincoln was seized by the Hannas and Humphreys and Morgans and their like and dragged away from its democratic moorings into the whirlpool of imperialism and plutocracy. Though nominated by the Democratic convention, he was put forward by Republicans as well as Democrats. He stands for equitable taxation in the profoundest sense; for municipal ownership of municipal monopolies; and for government by the people instead of the politicians, through direct legislation. We bespeak for him the support of democrats of all parties. In his district and between him and Humphrey, the issue of democracy or plutocracy, of people or politicians, of rights or privileges, is distinctly drawn, and each side is admirably represented by its candidate.

A good word at a right time has been spoken by the Albany Argus, in connection with the case of Rebecca J. Taylor. Some anonymous correspondent had rebuked it for approving her criticism of the public department in which she worked, and it replied:

We must get rid of the un-American and dangerous notion that heads of

departments are "our rulers," and that an extravagant, sycophantic, personal loyalty is due to these so-called "rulers." The employes of our government, whether they be heads of departments, or clerks, serve the Hosts, that is the people of the state. Their duty is to the people. They are all alike servants; there is not a "ruler" among them. If one of them knows that a department is being run, by its temporary, transient head, in an extravagant, scandalous or hurtful manner, then it is his duty—his highest and most sacred duty—to let his real employer, the people, know the facts as to the mismanagement of the public business.

One of the most dangerous tendencies in American life is that which inculcates peculiar respect for officeholders. An officeholder should be respected for fidelity to his trust, and whether he is faithful or not his official acts should be obeyed in the interest of good order; but he should not be respected merely because he holds office, and above all he should never be exalted in the public mind above criticism. When "respect for the office" leads to toleration of bad service it is time to throw it off. The fact that officials, from lowest to highest, are not rulers, but servants, should never be lost sight of.

Home rule in taxation is forging ahead as one of the reforms by means of which the people of every locality can regulate taxes to suit themselves. Several local conventions of the Democratic party have adopted it, especially in the West, among others that of Traill county, North Dakota, which puts the demand in this excellent form:

A demand for early submission to the people of an amendment to the state constitution providing for the granting to counties and cities of the right to raise their own taxes in their own way by assessing or exempting personal property and improvements as they see fit.

This is the reform known as the Bucklin amendment, which is to be voted upon by the people of Colorado next November. It is being vigorously fought by the land grant railroads and Eastern land speculators, for whom the Republican papers are acting as organs in the fight, the large Democratic papers doing

their share by saying nothing. But the labor organizations are supporting the measure loyally, and the indications are that it will be adopted. Those who are promoting the movement in Colorado are handicapped for lack of funds to familiarize the people with its nature and anti-monopoly tendency.

THE RAILROAD TRUST.

The so-called "community of interest" or "railroad trust," which controls directly about 90 per cent. of the vital American steam railroad lines, and partially controls or influences the policy of the remainder, is made up of a coterie of capitalists who control this enormous amount of railway through the medium of what is known in Wall street as "the group principle."

That is to say, the bulk of the controlled mileage is divided into several great systems of railway lines, each system or group of lines being dominated by a particular financier or set of financiers. Up to a recent date there were but five such groups, but developments of the last few months have increased the number to seven.

The original five groups, which are known as "the Morgan," "the Vanderbilt," "the Pennsylvania," "the Gould-Rockefeller" and the "Harriman-Kuhn, Loeb" groups control in all about 122,400 miles of railway. If, however, we add the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe system, which is partially identified with the Morgan interests, we make a total for the five groups of 130,260 miles. In addition to this there should now be embraced in this "community of interest" two more large groups of recent origin, one being the Rock Island or "Moore" group, embracing about 7,200 miles, and the other the "Pierce" or St. Louis & San Francisco group, consisting of 4,301 miles. Thus, included in the seven groups or systems, there is (counting the Atchison system as a part of the "Morgan" group) a total of 141,563 miles of railroad directly embraced in a "community of interest" or "trust."

The following table shows the dif-

ferent groups, their mileage on July 1, 1902, and also the amount of mileage controlled by the same interests on July 1, 1897:

	Mileage 1902.	Mileage 1897.
Vanderbilt group.....	19,804	16,909
Pennsylvania Railroad group.....	17,687	8,977
Morgan group.....	50,607	15,173
Gould-Rockefeller group.....	19,133	10,853
Harriman-Kuhn Loeb group.....	22,821	9,916
Moore group.....	7,200
Pierce group.....	4,301
Total.....	141,563	61,833

Increase in five years.....79,730 miles

There are now, according to authoritative estimates, about 200,000 miles of steam railroad lines in the United States. Of this, 141,563 miles, as shown above, are directly controlled by a "community of interest." The remainder, aggregating about 58,500 miles, is made up as follows:

	Mileage, 1902.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul system.....	6,596
Boston & Maine system.....	3,259
New York, New Haven & Hartford.....	2,087
Seaboard Air Line system.....	2,511
Atlantic coast line system.....	4,470
Pere Marquette system.....	1,521
Small railroads and systems.....	37,706
Total.....	58,500

Of the above so-called "independent" mileage, 5,296 miles are located in New England. This New England mileage is controlled exclusively by two large railroad corporations, the policy of which, while undoubtedly influenced by "community-of-interest" ideas, is yet somewhat distinct because of the fact that the traffic is chiefly local, and hence not affected so strongly by the same influences that affect the trunk lines.

The only other large railroad system not embraced in the "community-of-interest" coterie is the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul company, operating 6,596 miles. This system is controlled by a conservative class of men, who have thus far been successful in resisting the acquisition giants. Its policy, however, is necessarily to a large extent affected by the existence of the "community of interest," members of the latter having important minority influence in the St. Paul directorate.

This is also true of the three smaller systems, the Pere Marquette, the Atlantic Coast Line, and the Seaboard Air Line. It is undoubtedly only a question of a year or two when all of these properties, including the New York, New Haven & Hartford

(into which Pennsylvania railroad interests have already bought) will be in some way formally embraced in the general "railroad trust."

The remaining railway lines of the country, which can still be looked upon as "independent," embrace, as shown above, about 37,700 miles. This mileage is made up almost entirely of small roads, many of which are feeders for the large systems, and are therefore more or less dependent on the latter; or else they are disconnected and unprofitable cross-country lines, running from nothing to nowhere, or not operating at all. In short, this 37,700 miles represents chiefly the useless, worn out, or profitless steam railway mileage of the country. Whatever portion of it may become valuable to the large systems, will sooner or later be acquired by those systems.

We see, therefore, that the total vital railway mileage of this country amounts to about 162,300 miles. Of this the "trust" or "community-of-interest" groups, control directly 141,563 miles; partially control the balance of 20,737 miles, and it is evidently only a question of one or two years when they will directly control all of the latter. The statement, therefore, that a "railroad trust" or "community of interest" dominates, by direct control, nearly 90 per cent. of the vital railway mileage of the country is shown to be literally true. That it indirectly dominates and bids fair shortly to directly dominate the remaining 10 per cent. of vital mileage, and also to absorb or wipe out most of the 37,700 miles of small, disconnected, or unprofitable lines, is equally true.

The leading financiers who are at the head of and entirely dominate this "railroad trust" are J. Pierpont Morgan, W. K. and F. W. Vanderbilt, James Stillman, John D. and William Rockefeller, E. H. Harriman, George J. Gould, A. J. Cassatt, S. M. Prevost, Effingham B. Morris, George F. Baker, James J. Hill, Myron T. Herrick, Russell Sage, Jacob H. Schiff, John W. Gates, Edwin Hawley, H. Clay Pierce, James Speyer, John J. Mitchell, H. H. Rogers, August Belmont, Thomas F. Ryan, Marshall Field, William B. Leeds, Joseph Mil-

bank, Thomas P. Fowler, W. H. and J. H. Moore, A. R. Flower, et. al.

Not only do these financiers dominate their respective groups, but the most important of them, as for instance, Morgan, Harriman, Gould, Rockefeller, Hill and Rogers are interested in and more or less dominate all the groups, and thus knit together the entire railway system of the country into the "community" or "trust." The superior dominating influence of Mr. Morgan is felt in greater or less degree in all the groups.

These wealthy and influential financiers, who control this "railroad trust," these men who also dictate the policies of and control the steel trust, the oil trust, the copper trust, tobacco trust, the New York City Lighting and Street Railway trusts, the shipping trust, the new United States realty trust, and many other enterprises, great and small, are nearly all men of great financial ability.

It is a mistake to belittle the cleverness or capacity of such men as J. Pierpont Morgan, E. H. Harriman, A. J. Cassatt, or John D. Rockefeller. They are all men of exceptional energy and brains, who have been fortunate enough to have wonderful special opportunities fall into their paths, and who have been clever enough to take the fullest advantage of these opportunities. They are nearly all intensely practical men, with practical motives, and they are and have always been in business to make money and make it as easily and rapidly as possible. They are not "sentimentalists" as a rule, and quite as naturally (from their standpoint) believe they are morally entitled to whatever monopoly or exclusive privilege the law allows them to appropriate or develop.

They all tacitly if not openly recognize that the strength and success of these combinations and trusts lie in the presence of a monopoly element. This I know to be true, despite the silly assertions of men like "Prof." Gunton and other apologists for monopoly. Mr. Morgan recognizes the monopoly principle in consolidating and acquiring control of the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania; Mr. Schwab recognizes it

in pointing out the strength of the steel trust in the possession of its coal and ore deposits, on which he places a valuation of \$800,000,000; Mr. Cassatt recognizes it in the great increases which he has made in the Pennsylvania railroad terminal properties during the past few years; Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Rogers recognize it as their only and exclusive strength in the oil monopoly and in the copper trust; and finally, these men all recognize it in their increasing acquisition of and large investments in urban and inter-urban traction and lighting companies, and metropolitan and realty corporations. In confirmation of the latter, witness the United States Realty & Construction company, now being formed in New York city, to develop metropolitan real estate, with a capital of \$66,000,000 and with Charles M. Schwab, James Stillman, Charles Steele (of J. P. Morgan & Co.) and John J. Mitchell on its executive board.

Even a very casual examination of the subject will reveal the astonishing breadth and reach of this "railroad trust." And it is not only through the transportation industry that its influence is paramount. As indicated above, the men who are at the head of the railway industry are also the "powers that be" in all the other large consolidated industries; and particularly in those which require transportation facilities. Nor are the ramifications of the "railroad trust" confined to the United States. Earth-girdling offshoots of this trust are among the possibilities of the near future, and Mr. J. P. Morgan is already experimenting along that line.

It is not the purpose of this article to attempt to point out either the good or bad effect of the existence of the "railroad trust" upon the community at large. But I would ask the reader to reflect a moment on what the condition of modern society would be if all the railroads were suddenly eliminated from the face of the earth. By reflecting upon this impossibility one can at least partially realize the strength and security of the "trust" or "community" which owns or controls the entire industry of the American people.

JOHN MOODY.

NEWS

On the 31st state troops began to pour into Shenandoah, where the riot in connection with the anthracite strike (p. 262) occurred on the 30th. Gov. Stone had refused to order troops to the strike region until they should have been petitioned for by the local business men and property owners as necessary to protect life and property. But when, on the 30th, after the outbreak at Shenandoah, he received from the sheriff a telegram giving particulars of the riot, asserting that the town was without police protection, that the local authorities were terrorized by threats of the mob and therefore feared to sign a petition, adding that the "mine workers admit foreign element beyond their control," and advising the governor that the sheriff was powerless "for want of sufficient assistance," and asking for troops immediately, the governor ordered troops to the scene. They camped on a high hill overlooking the town—two full regiments, two companies of a third regiment, and a troop of cavalry, all under the immediate command of Gen. Gobin.

The troops found the town perfectly quiet. Strike leaders there asserted that the request for military assistance was based upon exaggerated statements of fact; that none were needed; and that the outbreak of the day before had been caused by the unwarranted firing with a revolver upon strikers by a deputy sheriff, a nephew of the sheriff, who was escorting strike-breakers to the mines. They accordingly telegraphed the governor requesting that the troops be withdrawn, at the same time asking him to send a personal representative to investigate the situation. But the governor replied on the 2d, saying that "upon full consideration, he was of the opinion that it would not be wise nor safe to withdraw the troops at present."

Attacks with stones were reported on the 3d as having been made upon sentries and guards by gangs of men from ambush. Shots in reply were fired by the sentries, but without effect. Gen. Gobin is quoted in the reports as having in consequence of these ambush attacks ordered his men to "shoot to kill and investigate afterwards."

Newspaper reports are growing more and more sensational, but they are apparently confirmed by Maj. W. S. Miller, of Wilkesbarre, inspector general of the Third brigade, who describes the situation at Shenandoah as follows:

A more God-forsaken country I have never seen. Eighty-five per cent. of the population are foreigners, and 8,000 or 10,000 are anarchists. The Lithuanians [natives of Lithuania, a section of Poland in east Prussia and west Russia south of the Baltic] fear neither man nor God. They have no regard for law or order or anything. They run everything their own way and the priests say that nobody has control of them. The English-speaking miners are all right and have done a good deal to help the troops there. Nothing short of shot and shell can keep the foreigners subdued. We are not down there to run the mines but to see that law and order are maintained, and that we shall do, come what may. If the foreigners attack us there will be bloodshed. Shenandoah is a veritable hell hole. Ninety thousand barrels of beer are sold there annually to the miners.

In a speech at a mass meeting of strikers near Scranton on the 1st President Mitchell, alluding to the violence in connection with the strike, said:

The one among you who violates the law is the worst enemy you have. No one is more pleased than the operators in New York to hear of disorder in the coal regions. I want our men to exercise their rights that inure to them under the laws, but I want that no man shall transgress the laws.

In similar spirit Mr. Mitchell replied on the 1st to a letter from the Citizens' alliance of Wilkesbarre demanding that he preserve order among the strikers. He wrote:

Permit me to say that I do not recognize your right to make demands upon me to specifically declare myself opposed to any specific classes of lawlessness. As a citizen of the United States and the chief executive of the miners' organization, I have declared on innumerable occasions and in language not susceptible of misconstruction, that I am opposed to lawlessness of every character; and I do not propose to alter my views to conform to the tenets of the Citizens' alliance, namely—wink at capital crimes while inveighing against minor offenses. I have never in my life sought to condone an unlawful act. I have thrown the full weight of my personality and influence on the side of law and order, and I can say without egotism that the miners' union and its officers have done more for the conservation of peace than all the citizens' alliances that