

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

made revelations regarding Presidential campaign funds which have excited universal interest and no little astonishment. Mr. Perkins occupies a dual position. He is an active salaried officer of the New York Life Insurance Company, and also an active member of the banking firm of J. Pierpont Morgan, with which the company has large banking and syndicate transactions. On the 15th, while under examination as a witness before the investigating committee, Mr. Perkins was asked the following questions and made the following answers:

"I have here a check," said Mr. Hughes, the counsel to the committee, producing a bit of paper, "which I desire to read. This is a check for \$43,702.50, made to the order of J. P. Morgan & Co., and signed by F. Shipman, assistant treasurer, and E. D. Randolph, treasurer of the New York Life. What was that payment for?"

Mr. Perkins replied: "That was money paid to Cornelius N. Bliss on account of the Republican national committee campaign fund of last year. We had agreed to pay him \$50,000, as much as that Mr. McCall said if he wished it, but that was all Mr. Bliss called for, and it was paid in that way as cash to him. The same thing happened in 1900 and 1896. We did it in the first and second McKinley campaigns and in the last one."

"On whose account was that money paid?"

"I cannot answer that, sir, but I presume we can find out the way it was charged. I am glad you brought this matter up."

"I intended that it should be brought up."

"Yes, sir. I should like to say that these payments were made after a great deal of deliberation and not in the manner that campaign contributions are usually made. We believed the integrity of our assets was being assailed. We believed it was a legitimate thing for us to do to protect the property of those hundreds of thousands of policy holders. We made contributions of \$50,000 each in the two McKinley campaigns, and when we saw the St. Louis platform we believed more than ever that our assets were endangered and we made a contribution to the Republican campaign of the same amount—\$50,000. Mr. McCall, who is a Democrat, believed as I did, and he voted the Republican ticket in each campaign."

"And you charged it in this Hanover office bank account by order of the president without any mention of what it was for?"

"I don't know. Lots of items are probably entered that way. I would

like to make one statement, however. The fact that these checks were drawn on J. P. Morgan & Co. had no significance. The money was ordered paid by President McCall and I paid it."

Senator Armstrong asked if any one in addition to President McCall and Mr. Perkins knew of the transaction.

"I don't recall whether or not any of the other officials knew about it other than Mr. McCall and myself."

"Do you know how the figure comes to be such an odd one?"

"No, except that we had agreed to pay over \$50,000. When the accounts were made up at the end of the year it was found Mr. Bliss had not drawn the entire amount."

"Has the New York Life ever made any other campaign contributions besides these three?"

"Not that I know of."

"Were you in a position to know?"

"I don't know that I was in a position to know absolutely."

"Is there no self-restraint allowed the officers in these campaign contributions?"

"None that I know of. I think we have a right to leave the matter to the judgment of the officers."

Mr. Hughes then asked: "Is it your view that contributions by insurance companies to political campaign funds are necessary?"

"I think it is a very bad practice, and I think you could do nothing better than to draw up a law that would put an end to it. If a man is running for public office he should be made to schedule his expenditures. He should be made to say what he spends his money for. Of course, in a country like ours, there might easily arise a situation in which we should contribute a sum of money, say 25 or 50 or 75 cents from each policy-holder. But a thing like that should be made known. The only way you can protect these life insurance companies is by the utmost publicity. I believe the three contributions made by the New York Life would have been indorsed by the policy-holders."

"I would like to have you produce the accounts of these contributions," said Mr. Hughes.

"I will do it," said Mr. Perkins.

"You don't think the president should have the authority to make large payments of this kind without consulting the other officials?"

"Yes, I think it should be left to the authority of the president; but I think blanks should be filled out for the expenditures and submitted to the executive committee for approval. You have got to give men authority."

"Why was not the finance committee informed of these contributions?"

"Why, if everything was submitted to the finance committee they would have to come down to the office and sit as clerks. I think it would be a good

idea for them to indorse memorandums of such expenditures."

In view of accusations made by Alton B. Parker, the Democratic candidate for President, during the Presidential campaign (vol. vii, p. 486), Judge Parker was asked by representatives of the press if he had any comment to make upon Mr. Perkins's disclosure. Judge Parker replied on the 16th, as reported, as follows:

Yes, I believe I ought to say, now that there is no political excitement to distract the public attention, that the president of the New York Life was not the only such contributor. The officers of other great life insurance companies, such as the Equitable and the Mutual, also contributed from the policy-holders' funds for campaign purposes last year. What has been proved in the case of the New York Life will undoubtedly be proved in the other cases. The facts exist, and honest and able counsel, backed by an honest committee, will undoubtedly bring them out for the public good. Were there an investigation of railroad, manufacturing, and other corporations it would be found that these life insurance officers were not the only corporation officers who put their hands into the treasury and took out moneys belonging to widows and orphans to help secure a partisan triumph. That their acts were unlawful and their purposes corrupt goes without saying. They intended to have the money used, as it was, in corrupting the electorate. Mr. Perkins makes the point that Mr. John A. McCall, the president of the New York Life, is a Democrat. Apparently, he would have the public assume that when Mr. McCall unlawfully and wrongfully contributed these funds—the company's share probably as a member of the underwriting syndicate—it was evidence of political virtue rather than misconduct. The truth about it is, and I say it without feeling, but emphatically, that men like McCall have no political convictions that stand in the way of their personal advantage. Such men desire the triumph of that party which will better serve their personal financial interests, and will—for contributions, past, present, and future—continue to protect those interests by lenient legislation and by pretense at execution of law which shall be tenderly blind to all their offenses. That party they espouse in the board room, and contribute to it of the moneys they hold in trust and, occasionally a little of their own. The underlying principles which divide the great mass of the people into parties have no effect upon such men. Their one inquiry is, Will the party organization in its hour of triumph remember our generosity and re-

spond to our demands? Of course, the organization does remember, for it expects a similar contribution next time. And the expectation is not in vain. Last year was not the first time. Such contributions had been made before in national, State and municipal elections. The officers responsible for these raids upon the treasuries of corporations have received their reward in unfettered management of life insurance corporations; in unembarrassed raids upon the public through trusts, condemned by both common and statute law; in refusal to punish criminally the officers of railroad and other corporations for violating the laws; and in statutory permission to manufacturing corporations to levy tribute on the people. There can be no hope of checking the unlawful aggressions of officers of great corporations so long as they may thus form a quasi-partnership with the organization of the dominant political party. For in the hour when the administrative official seeks to punish the offender he is reminded by the head of the organization of the magnitude of the contributions of the corporation. There is, however, something worse, if possible, than the escape of such offenders from justice. It is the gradual demoralization of voters and the dulling of the public conscience caused by the efforts to make these vast sums of money procure the ballots they were intended to procure, corruptly and otherwise. It is not my purpose to claim that the Democratic party, subjected to the temptation which has overcome the other party during the last few years, would have acted differently. Mere party advantage should not be sought from the disclosures made in this investigation. But the facts should be diligently sought, that the people may become so aroused that they will insist upon legislation making it a criminal offense for officers to contribute corporate funds for political purposes and depriving the apparently successful candidates of their offices. Efforts in that direction have been making in different States since November last, and particularly in this State. But the Republican organization would not consent to it, so the legislature defeated the bills. And the organization never will consent until an aroused public sentiment shall threaten legislators with political oblivion who fail to enact effective laws upon the subject.

Subsequently, on the 20th, John A. McCall himself, the president of the New York Life, was examined before the committee, and on this point he testified:

I had knowledge of the payment of \$48,000 to Mr. Bliss for the Republican national committee in 1904, and I approved of it, and I do now. I was a Democrat up to the nomination

of Bryan. When they adopted the free silver platform in 1896 I made up my mind that I would do all in my power to defeat that candidate and that platform, and I did it with my heart and soul. I had no idea in my mind about politics at all, but I had a duty and a trust regarding the New York Life policy holders, and I felt that if free silver in the country was approved, and that if Bryan was elected President, we might as well close up the shutters on the New York Life Insurance company's doors. Knowing that, and believing it, in 1896 I consented to a payment to defeat free silver—not to defeat the Democratic party, but to defeat this free silver heresy, and I thank God that I did it. In 1892 the platform of both parties were gold platforms, and they satisfied me, and not a dollar of New York Life insurance money that year went to either party. In 1890 there was the same contribution as in 1896. I do not like you to characterize it "Republican campaign fund." The gold platform is what I subscribed to. It was to defeat free silver, and it was for that reason that I contributed to the gold platform. Under no other circumstances since I have been president of the New York Life Insurance company have we ever paid one dollar to any party, local, State or national, except the three contributions that I have described. In 1904, before the St. Louis convention, I was approached by several of the Democratic leaders in regard to going as a delegate. I said that my inclination was that if Cleveland were nominated in 1904 I should support him, and, therefore, I would take it under consideration in relation to that fact. In 1904, when, by a vote of 35 to 15, they rejected the gold platform at St. Louis, it brought me back to old moorings, and I thought the Republican ticket should win, with its gold platform. That is the reason I made a contribution. There was a candidate who had twice voted for Bryan, and was a candidate on a platform which rejected by a vote of two to one a gold platform. There was a man running against him on a platform advocating gold. I stood with him in behalf of our policy-holders, and for that reason I gave that contribution.

Q. Did you take occasion to ascertain how many of your policy holders agreed with your position?

A. No. And I did not care.

Q. Did you consult with any members of your board?

A. Not a soul on earth except myself and the vice president of the company, Mr. Perkins.

Q. You did not bring it to their attention in any way? A. Not at all, not for a minute.

Will you just let me make a statement along those lines? My life was

made weary by the Democratic candidates chasing me for money in that campaign. Some of the very men who to-day are being interviewed in the papers and denouncing these men who contribute to campaigns—their shadows were crossing my path every step I took, looking for money. One—the candidate himself, Parker—the chairman of the Democratic State committee; if he would show up his books for that corporation money, as chairman of the Democratic committee, it would give you a fit. He never rejected a dollar in the world; he would take every dollar that was paid to him.

I do not justify the use of insurance money for campaign purposes; I justify the use of these funds for the protection of the policy holders' interest. I do not care about the Republican side or the Democratic side; it does not count at all with me; what is the best thing for the New York Life is what moves and controls me. That is a matter, which, whether it was left to my individual decision or not, I took it. I honestly and absolutely believe it was a highly eminent and proper use of the money under the circumstances. If you ask whether I think it is right to take insurance money and devote it to political campaigns, no; a thousand times, no. But this was not the question involved, to my way of thinking, of what I should do in the New York Life. When a great party abandons its principles and advances principles which would have ruined us in our business, the question was: What should I do in the New York Life? I am absolutely in favor of such power and responsibility in the executive.

Judge Parker instantly denied Mr. McCall's allegations as to him. Judge Parker said:

If Mr. McCall's answer is intended to convey the impression that in the campaign of 1904 I, either directly or indirectly, solicited from him or his corporation, or any other corporation, any money or valuable thing, his statement is absolutely false. On the contrary, I repeat now what I said before the election, that I expressly notified and directed the chairman of the executive committee of the national committee that no money should be received from corporations.

William F. Sheehan's attention being called to the testimony of Mr. McCall, he said:

I was chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic national committee. There was not a single man connected with the Democratic national campaign that solicited a dollar from Mr. McCall. If any such person made any such solicitation, Mr. McCall should name him.

Mr. McCall, referring to his testi-

mony, explained to newspaper correspondents as follows:

The meaning I intended to convey when I mentioned Judge Parker was this: Judge Parker, when a candidate for the Presidency last year, did not personally ask me for campaign funds, but friends of his did so repeatedly. Judge Parker, as chairman of the State Democratic committee several years ago, did, however, accept proffered contributions to the campaign fund.

Judge Parker's interpretation of the deeper significance of these campaign contributions was in some degree corroborated by the following special dispatch from Washington to the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper, in which the dispatch appeared on the 17th:

Significance attaches to the admission of Mr. Perkins that the large insurance companies paid large sums to the Republicans in the year that Theodore Roosevelt was running for President. The reason for this may be shown when the insurance lobby comes here with a bill placing all insurance business under Federal control. This bill has already been drawn and introduced in the Senate. By the same token President Roosevelt has become interested in it and has started an agitation in favor of the measure. The measure was drawn by James M. Beck, former assistant attorney general, now counsel for the Mutual Life Insurance Company; and one of its most earnest supporters is Senator Dryden, of New Jersey, president of the Prudential Life Insurance Company. John A. McCall, during the national campaign of 1904, came out in favor of Roosevelt's election, although he and Alton B. Parker had been great friends. Mr. McCall was one of those who journeyed to Oyster Bay and saw the President. Since then he had been entertained at the White House. George W. Perkins is a frequent visitor at the White House, and so are important men interested in the Equitable and Mutual Life.

President Roosevelt has made no statement and Cornelius N. Bliss refuses to make any. But on the 20th it was unauthoritatively reported in the dispatches from Oyster Bay that President Roosevelt had summoned George B. Cortelyou, the chairman of the Republican campaign committee; Secretary Root, who knows intimately the machinery of the big insurance companies; Senator Lodge, his personal representative in the Senate, and Joseph H. Choate, upon whose legal knowl-

edge he relies implicitly, to a secret conference to consider the advisability of paying back to the treasuries of life insurance companies all money contributed by them to the last campaign.

Bryan to Roosevelt on peace plans.

Apropos of the reports of President Roosevelt's services in connection with the Russian-Japanese treaty of peace (pp. 353, 357) William J. Bryan addressed him the following letter from Lincoln, Neb., on the 14th:

Circumstances have placed you in a position where, as Chief Executive of the nation, you were able to bring Russia and Japan together to effect an honorable peace. You performed your duty in a manner creditable to yourself and your country. You have been hailed as a peacemaker, and you realize how the peaceful victory thus achieved by you outshines your military exploits. Why not use your present opportunity to put on foot a movement for the establishment of permanent peace? Last winter you asked for authority to enter into agreements which would be in effect arbitration treaties, and the Senate (wisely, I believe,) refused to surrender the treaty-making power. But now, if you had been intrusted with the authority asked, you would have hesitated to submit the question involving the nation's honor, and it is not always possible to know in advance what questions may be involved. Why not ask Congress for authority to submit all international questions (when an agreement cannot be reached by the parties interested) to an impartial board for investigation and report. Investigation will, in nearly every case, reveal the cause of complaint and reconcile the parties. Questions which a nation might be unwilling to submit to arbitration in advance could be settled by investigation by an impartial international board. It was a glorious thing to end the war between Russia and Japan, but it would have been more glorious to have prevented the war and saved the frightful loss of life. The moral prestige which our nation now enjoys in all probability would enable it to lead a successful peace movement. The congratulations which you have received from the heads of European governments strengthen the chances of success. If leading nations of the world would enter into an agreement to join in the creation of such a board and pledge themselves to submit all disputes to the board, for investigation before declaring war, the danger of war would be reduced to a minimum. Few men have had it in their power to do so much for humanity. Will you improve the opportunity?

Peace conference of the Powers.

It was reported from St. Petersburg on the 18th that the Czar has issued invitations to the world Powers for a second peace conference (vol. vii, pp. 375, 475) at The Hague, and from Oyster Bay that President Roosevelt will leave to the Czar the honor of making this call; but nothing authoritative on the subject has yet been made public.

The printers' eight-hour day in Chicago.

According to the reports of the printers' union of Chicago, apparently confirmed by other circumstances, the printers' strike for an eight-hour day (p. 377) is virtually won. On the 15th agreements for an eight-hour day were reported by representatives of the union as having been signed by over 75 establishments. This number had risen to 168 on the 19th. Among these are several members of the Typothetae. The Employers' Association, of which F. W. Job is secretary, has been active in supporting the resisting establishments, but that these establishments are crippled in their work is evident and the reports of the Typographical union seem well founded. The latest general news on the subject is to the effect that these establishments are trying to utilize typewriter girls as operators of linotype machines.

Progress of the Chicago traction movement.

At the adjourned meeting of the local transportation committee of the City Council of Chicago on the 15th, held for the purpose of receiving proposals from the existing companies (p. 375), no progress was made. All the traction interests were represented, and Col. E. R. Bliss acted as their spokesman. Col. Bliss stated that he had a proposition to make, but refused to submit it, though he said:

Our proposition is along the same lines as the Mayor's contract plan, with four or five sections omitted. Write the name of the Chicago City Railway Company in it in place of the Mayor's five directors and we will accept it."

"Will you agree to give the city all the earnings but 5 per cent. and to exercise control," the Mayor asked.

"I won't answer that question, but we will accept it with sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 omitted."