

—personal, political, etc.—preferred for their duties as a whole to the candidates in opposition. But in each instance they were specifically instructed by their constituencies on one point. By overwhelming majorities they were instructed to cease negotiations with the traction companies and to proceed without delay to give the city a municipal traction system in place of the inefficient and corrupt and corrupting system of the companies. Instead of obeying those instructions these aldermen have refused to do anything or consider anything but negotiations with the inefficient and corrupt companies. After three months devoted to these negotiations they adopted the ordinances which these companies presented to them, and reported them to the Council for favorable action. In doing so they became in effect sponsors for those ordinances, and some of their number had the temerity to recommend the ordinances as not only the best the companies would agree to but as positively good. And yet, in the twinkling of an eye the same ring has had those ordinances referred back. What for? For the correction of some oversight prejudicial to public interests? Not at all. For the substitution of municipal ownership measures, as their constituencies have instructed? By no manner of means. They have had them referred back for the purpose of renewing negotiations with the traction companies. Such men are either too sophisticated or too innocent to be fit for any public service in which any important interests of the public are in conflict with any very valuable financial interests of aggressive and conscienceless corporations.

THE DEMOCRATIC MIND.

There cannot be a democracy without the democratic mind. That was the trouble with the attempts at democracy in the past; that is the trouble with the democracy we are trying to-day. There has been progress, but the trouble is that too few have yet been edu-

cated, even now, to the standard of the democratic mind.

"The real doctrine," says the cleverest of modern essayists, "is something which we do not, with all our modern humanitarianism, very clearly understand, much less very clearly practice. There is nothing, for instance," so he continues in his witty way, "particularly undemocratic about kicking your butler down stairs. It may be wrong, but it is not unfraternal. In a certain sense, the blow or kick may be considered as a confession of equality; you are meeting your brother body to body; you are almost according to him the privilege of the duel. There is nothing undemocratic, though there may be something unreasonable, in expecting a great deal from the butler, and being filled with a kind of frenzy of surprise when he falls short of the divine stature. The thing which is really undemocratic and unfraternal is to say, as so many modern humanitarians say, 'Of course one must make allowances for those on a lower plane.' All things considered, indeed, it may be said, without undue exaggeration, that the really undemocratic thing is the common practice of not kicking the butler downstairs."

In this comic and paradoxical way Mr. Chesterton goes home to the point. And that he knows what he is talking about is shown by what he further says in a more serious way. Alluding to his illustration of the butler, he says: "It is only because such a vast section of the modern world is out of sympathy with the serious democratic sentiment that this statement will seem to many to be lacking in seriousness. Democracy is not philanthropy; it is not even altruism or social reform. Democracy is not founded on pity for the common man; democracy is founded on reverence for the common man. It does not champion man because man is so miserable, but because man is so sublime."

If anything better than this has been said lately, I have not seen it. It is high time that just these words should be said to our modern humanitarians and to many of our modern reformers—"Democracy is not philanthropy." So long as philanthropy has in it one whit of the protective spirit of superi-

ority it is not only not democratic, it is not truly philanthropic.

It ought to be understood, once for all, that charity towards fellow man as inferior is no charity, it is pharisaism.

Modern praise goes to the man who gives liberally, though in condescension. The upper public does not discriminate. It does not see that the condescension damns the giving. It does not see that such giving is twice damned—it damns him that gives and him that takes. And why? Because such giving really separates, a fact which so many would-be good people fail to see. They do not see that the man with the democratic mind may give without harm, while the man without the democratic mind cannot give without harm.

This applies, of course, not only to giving but to doing. And here the confusion is even greater, and therefore demands the plainer speech. There are hundreds of would-be good people who are today devoting themselves, as they think, to the welfare of the masses by establishing social settlements and going down to live in slums. If any of these are working without the truly democratic mind of man to man, they are wasting their time in hopeless pharisaism.

A man may give his money to feed the poor, may give his time to wood-yards and social settlements, may write books on how the other half lives, may be called the best citizen of the metropolis, may be heralded as philanthropist, may head every newspaper list for any charity, and yet, if he have not the democratic mind, be as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal so far as democracy is concerned.

This is the lesson that all those need to learn who talk about the ingratitude of the poor. They do not understand it. Of course not; because they have not yet advanced in education toward the democratic mind as far as many of the poor have. The lower public does discriminate.

The same blindness affects many reformers in local politics. They do not understand why workingmen are not with them in movements that seem manifestly good. I came recently in contact

with a movement for increasing liquor licenses from a minimum of one hundred to a minimum of five hundred dollars. The leaders complained that the workingmen were opposed, although it was understood that the increased revenues were to go to the public schools. They could not see that the whole burden of their campaign had been such as almost inevitably to alienate the support of self-respecting workingmen. They talked about the workingman precisely in the spirit of the modern humanitarian dealing with Chesterton's butler. They talked all the time about saving the poor workingman from the temptation of the corner saloon.

This is the trouble with very many well-meaning reformers. They do not think or talk of the workingman as a man, but as an inferior to be looked after and protected. They have not the democratic mind, and they cannot see that many workingmen, certainly the leaders, are better educated than themselves.

The education of the democratic mind has spread, in spite of all reactions, during the past century. The American revolution and the French revolution were days of high enlightenment which could never be forgotten. Reactions might come, but the idea of the democratic mind was destined to abide. The nineteenth century preserved the spirit in the face of every difficulty. And men came to voice the spirit. Even Carlyle in his confusing voice could not away with it. It became the tragedy of his life. He tried to preach autocracy, and said more than most men of his day to destroy it. In his splendid inconsistency he dealt many hard blows to the superstitious reverence for aristocracy and oligarchy.

Carlyle was a friend to the Italian outcast, who, more than he, undermined the ancient superstitions of subserviency. The time will come when we shall all do reverence to this great Italian who was hunted out of the governments of Europe because he, more than any man of his day, had the democratic mind. What he said fifty years ago about the democratic mind can never be amended. The Chestertons of to-

day can only illustrate and expand what he said a half century ago. His only mistake was that he thought the day of fruition was near at hand, just as the men of the New Testament expected the "day of the Lord"; but his words are true in spite of all postponement, and they may profitably be set beside the words of the modern essayist which I quoted above.

"Yesterday," said Mazzini, "we revered the priest, the lord, the soldier, the master; to-day we reverence the man, his liberty, his dignity, his immortality, his labor, his progressive tendency, all that constitutes him a creature made in the image of God."

Can we not see in these solemn words of Mazzini, coupled with the light words of Chesterton, something of the meaning of the democratic mind? To acknowledge and profess this democratic mind is the supreme problem in America to-day. We are trying at present to save ourselves by one-sided prosperity and one-sided philanthropy. We need to open our eyes to the new light of the democratic mind, which still cherishes, in spite of the ridicule of reactionists, the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The gist of the whole matter is this: The democratic mind emphasizes humanity; the aristocratic mind emphasizes the distinctions in humanity. And our whole attitude toward life depends always upon where we put the emphasis.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS NARRATIVE

How to use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives: Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue so until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 11.

A new phase of the Chicago traction question.

Another unexpected twist in the Chicago traction situation (pp. 577, 598, 657) has thrown everything into confusion.

As already reported in these col-

umns (p. 577) the majority of the local transportation committee of the City Council had on the 4th of December, after several weeks of negotiation with the traction companies, reported three ordinances for a 20-year private corporation franchise, one ordinance for each of the present traction systems. In reporting these ordinances the majority of the committee recommended that "after consideration and favorable action by the committee of the whole, they lie on the table" until after the city election in April, and that meanwhile the Council take the necessary steps for securing a referendum vote. They described the ordinances as "the one practical solution of a problem of extraordinary complexity and difficulty, and as the most direct way to complete municipal control of local transportation," and averred a belief that "they reach the limit of concession by the companies, and that the choice lies between their acceptance, and prolonged litigation with the continuance of intolerable service."

Nearly four weeks went by without action by the Council in committee of the whole, and without any steps on the part of the Council looking to a referendum; and as the time limit for securing the necessary referendum petition of over 100,000 signatures would expire early in February, the coalition of municipal ownership organizations decided that the delay was suspicious and therefore took steps to secure a referendum (p. 657) on their own initiative. This petition was first publicly announced in the Chicago Examiner on the 2d. Immediately upon its announcement the majority of the local transportation committee got together and hurriedly prepared referendum questions (p. 658) which the minority characterize as unfairly formulated. These questions were presented to the Council at its meeting on the evening of the 2d, when their consideration was postponed. This was the situation when the new twist, alluded to above, threw everything into confusion.

The first significant thing was the publication on the morning of the 4th in the Record-Herald, one of Mr. Victor F. Lawson's papers,