

arrested for climbing into a belfry. There is no law against climbing into belfries, and to me the temptation of climbing into the belfry of a church, perhaps the oldest on the American continent, was irresistible. From the Indian point of view, we had invaded their town and the sanctity of their church, and we should be punished accordingly. One of them, in his argument for our prosecution before the Aztec judge, picking up something belonging to one of our party, said:

"There is no law against my touching this: I may not want to take it, but it is not mine, and consequently I have no right to touch it."

When one of our party said, judging the Indian by his knowledge of the demoralized mixed race, "Oh, they merely want to get some money out of us," and Mr. Barrett instructed him to pay the Indians, that we might get out, the old judge drew himself up with dignity and scorned the proposition.

The recent commercial and industrial

development of Mexico is surprising, but with it the Indian must go. Mexico no longer imports her cotton fabrics, but is now looking for a foreign market for her output. At Rio Blanco we saw manufacturers putting up fine calico prints with the French label on them, and they could not be distinguished from the finest French manufacture. At Monterey they are putting up a \$10,000,000 steel plant, and, with its solid mountain of iron at Durango, when completed it will turn out as much steel plate and rails in one day as the entire republic can consume in one month. The place has the largest smelting-works in the world, and breweries galore.

With this great industrial awakening, the people have mostly forgotten how to make a revolution, and when they do attempt it, as not infrequently happens, in some out-of-the-way region, President Diaz sends his soldiers, and the revolutionists and sometimes their entire community are promptly annihilated, and the outside world is none the wiser.

Municipal Ownership and Corrupt Politics

By Henry C. Adams

Professor of Political Economy in the University of Michigan

THE question of the municipal ownership of street railways is not an isolated question, but a part of a great system of industrial evolution that is now going on. Whether regarded from the nature of the service rendered or of the conditions under which they are operated, street railways must be classed as public industries; and, this being the case, the question whether they should be owned and operated by the municipality, or controlled through a commission appointed by the municipality, is the only one to be considered. My own opinion, arrived at with some reluctance after many years of hesitation, is that the policy of public ownership and public administration has more to be said in its favor, all things taken into consideration, than the programme of public control.

It is often said that municipal ownership of the street railways would result in the creation of a political machine and in

the corruption of city politics. This, without doubt, suggests a most serious criticism upon the plan. At the same time, I am inclined to think there is less likelihood of corruption should the street railways be owned by the city than under existing conditions. The franchise of the street railway in a large city is worth an immense amount of money, and increases in value at a rate more rapid than the increase in population. This being the case, there is every motive presented for the purchase of political influence, so long as the street railway remains in the hands of private corporations. If, however, the city itself owns the franchise and operates the railways upon it, the Aldermen have nothing of value to sell, and the present form of political corruption at least would be done away with.

There are two thoughts in addition that I would like to suggest. In the first place, are we entirely clear as to what we mean when we use the term "political cor-

ruption"? Many things which in private industry are regarded as all right are characterized as corrupt if done by an official of the State.

The truth is, the ideal of public morality entertained by the American people is infinitely purer and higher than the ideal of morality which controls in the business world. We should not forget that municipal ownership means absolute publicity, an established system of accounting, and the unquestioned right on the part of citizens to investigate the manner in which the municipality performs its public duties—a condition which does not and cannot exist so long as street railways continue to be private property.

The second thought which I wish to express relative to this phase of the question is that public responsibility is always followed by a development of the sense of respectability. Men of influence and brains are no longer in this generation influenced by the amount of money that can be made out of a situation. The political economy which assumes that the struggle for money is an adequate explanation of industrial conduct is sure to err in its conclusions, because it does not recognize all the motives involved. The sense of power and the ambition for influence are equally strong motives to industrial activity with the desire for money. This being the case, the talents and brains of the country will inevitably be drawn into the service of those organizations which grant the opportunity of an exercise of power and influence.

The conclusion from this premise is direct. If the municipalities wish to secure the services of men of talent and of respectability, they must assume functions that call talent into the field and also those that gratify the sense of respectability. History declares that the rise of efficient local government follows the assumption by the government of social responsibilities, and, as exemplified in the United States, that the decay of local government follows the restriction of local functions.

The superficial humorist may reply that this argument involves an amendment of the New Testament to the effect that he who is unfaithful in little things will surely be faithful in big things, which, of course, is not only a misquotation but a misappli-

cation of the true quotation. If the city desires the service of respectability and talent, it must grant to its servants responsibility and influence.

The dangers which attend the experiment in municipal ownership of street railways arise, as it appears to me, from two sources. In the first place, it is likely that the public will demand an immediate dividend from the new investment in an abnormal reduction in fares, and, in the second place, it is not unlikely that the Common Council of the city, in its desire to justify the purchase, will sacrifice the interests of the future to the present. These difficulties, however, may be easily avoided by two simple devices. In the first place, the municipal railway accounts should provide for a deterioration account, and charge up to operating expenses each year an ample sum to cover deterioration. Provided this is done, fares cannot be reduced too low—assuming, of course, that the railways are not to be operated for the public profit. In the second place, the bonds issued for this purpose should include a sinking-fund provision capable of wiping out the debt in a reasonable number of years.

It seems to me that the problem of municipal ownership of street railways and the government ownership of commercial railways are independent problems. The great difficulty in governmental ownership of commercial railways does not lie in the technical questions of construction and operation, but in the adjustment of a schedule of rates that shall be fair to all sections of the country. In the question of municipal railways this question does not find a place. There are no terminal facilities, since the freight carried, being passengers, is self-loading and self-unloading; there is no need of an extended classification of freight, since all freight for the most part is of the same sort. The question of rates is one that may be easily and simply settled. Moreover, the interests involved in the case of municipal railways are restricted to a small locality, and the result of this is that the policies of administration may be easily adjusted. For many other reasons also that might be mentioned, the decision in favor of municipal ownership for street railways does not involve a similar decision for commercial railways.

The Divinity School and the University¹

By Theodore T. Munger

NO department of professional study is undergoing so close scrutiny and sharp criticism as that of Theology.

The pressing questions to-day in theology are—*what* shall be taught; *how* shall it be taught, and *where* shall it be taught? I propose to say a few words on the last point; and my contention will be that it should be taught in a University rather than by itself.

I shall not attempt to define closely the relation which the Theological School should sustain to the University, but I would urge that it should always be made a department in a University; that its relation should be so close and vital as to feel its spirit, and to learn and adopt those careful and comprehensive habits of thought which are fostered by University life. What I plead for is no radical change in this Divinity School, or any change except such as shall bring it closer to the University, into a fuller participation in the studies of departments kindred to its own, and for such administration as shall fully co-ordinate it with other departments, to the end that its students shall regard their status as University men as prior to that of the Divinity School. To state it concretely, I would have a student think and feel and say (for it involves all three) that he is studying theology in the University rather than in the Divinity School.

A trifling distinction, it may be said. Let us see. What I have in mind is a complete breaking up and end of the closely segregated theological school of the past. It need not be a cataclysmal change, but an orderly development and natural falling into the place where it belongs.

Nor is it so revolutionary as it seems to be. The Theological Seminary is not yet venerable. It displaced other methods by wiser ones, but that does not give it the right to permanence. Indeed, it wears the appearance of a makeshift until there should be either a return to some previous

method or progress into a better one in the future. So short is the period of theological education in this country, and so difficult have been the conditions under which it has been carried forward, that we have no right to infer that the best method has been demonstrated.

It is an interesting and suggestive fact that the first Congregational ministers in New England were distinctly University men. Davenport, John Eliot, Richard Mather—though he did not wait long enough to take his degree—were University men, as were many, if not most, of the first pastors of the Colonial churches. They fixed standards of scholarship and left a spirit of learning which have not yet died out. Harvard and Yale are the children of these men. They were founded not only to secure a learned and godly ministry, but the University type of ministers. The humanities were included in their studies along with Hebrew and Theology; and their early graduates could talk Latin.

Owing perhaps to theological jealousies, or to the encroachment of secular studies upon the curriculum, candidates for the ministry began to study in private with some eminent divine—an ideal method, one might think, but a worse method could hardly have been devised. It was the reversal of the University method, and almost a return to the method of the nursery. Imagine a fairly bright youth spending two years in the study of Dr. Bellamy; what would be the result? Another Bellamy? No, but just as close an image of him as the pressure of two years could produce.

Then came the era of the Theological Seminary. It would be difficult to overestimate the good achieved by Andover; from the first presided over by men of marked and often great ability, the home of learning and of noted scholars—one of whom has just passed away from earth—a man of so fine and rare a type that one thinks of him first as a chivalrous soldier, and then as a saint of whitest purity, and last as a student who counted not his life dear to him if he

¹ Read at the ordination to the ministry of Professor F. K. Sanders, Dean of the Yale Divinity School, January 6, 1902.