

against the sentiment for transferring the control of corporations from the State to the Federal government. Referring to the statement in the Outlook that "proper control is no longer possible by the single State which creates corporate existence," he says: "I beg leave to question sharply the accuracy of this statement, and I submit that it has no foundation in fact. On the contrary, the State which creates corporate existence has the power of complete control over its creature." The letter is a refreshing counterblast to the tendency to fly to Washington for relief, and is worth reading throughout.

Immunity to criminals.

The beef trust associates are either criminals or they are not. If they are not criminals no question of immunity can be of importance either to them or to the people. If they are criminals, any law that grants them general immunity for their crimes must be a bad law, and any promise of such immunity ought to be invalid. Yet the beef trust associates are seeking immunity from charges of crime upon allegations of official promises of immunity by Mr. Garfield, who investigated them. Isn't it a little as if a gang of counterfeiters had permitted a government inquisitor to investigate the operations of the gang for statistics upon a promise that the facts should not be given to the Department of Justice and that the entire gang should nevertheless be at liberty to pursue their criminal vocation? Whatever the courts may decide on this immunity question, the general public will have no difficulty in drawing a common-sense conclusion. If the beef people are not criminals, they need no immunity; if they need immunity, it must be because they are criminals.

Having eyes, yet seeing not.

Anyone who has ridden on an Irish jaunting car knows that if one sits on the wrong side of the car, it is possible to ride around the Lakes of Killarney any num-

ber of times without seeing the Lakes. A writer in the New York Outlook for January 6 did something very like this. In an attempt to answer the question, What is the true criterion of the value of men's services in economic exchange? he makes a circular tour around the crucial point and winds up with the declaration that "the root of injustice is an immoral estimate of money as merely a means for commanding service." There you have it. Change the whole moral nature of man and everything will come right! The writer didn't see the industrial obstructions lying in plain sight on the other side of his economic jaunting car.

Landlords and the weather.

When single tax advocates explain that improvements, whether public or private, tend to increase site values, the business man thinks them mystics and their theory incomprehensible. But it is all plain enough to the business man when business profit and not social justice is the subject of consideration. For instance, the Commercial Bulletin, of Cleveland, an investment paper pure and simple, explains that "it is improvements that make values," meaning site values; "and the faster time that can be made in the building trade brings enhanced values that much sooner." This mention of greater rapidity in the enhancement of site values was an allusion to the continued good weather which had made building operations "fairly hum." So the real estate investor sees precisely what the single taxer sees—that improvements enhance site values, and that good weather, to the extent that it promotes improving, tends to quicken the enhancement of site values. The misunderstanding between them is doubtless due to the point of view. Whereas the single taxer thinks of this enhancement of site values as a common benefit which should go to the common good, the real estate investor thinks of them as the private property of the site owner for his appropria-

tion regardless of the common good.

Gaining the world and losing your soul.

David R. Forgan, of the First National Bank of Chicago, spoke as an expert when at a Presbyterian banquet on the 29th, he told his auditors that if they knew some millionaires as well as he did they would agree with him that these persons "had lost the last vestige of the souls they may be presumed to have possessed before the mania for money-getting obsessed them." The truth is that no business man can give himself over to money-getting without losing his soul—and not in any mystical sense either.

In business life there are two great arts—the art of making money and the art of spending money. The art of making money resolves itself into serving others; the art of spending money resolves itself into being served by others. For when a man takes money, what is that money but a certificate of the agreed value of the service he has rendered others? When he spends money, what is that money but a certificate of the agreed value of the service he has received from others? If our industrial environment were normal and therefore just, all getting and all spending of money would represent the two sides of normal civilized life—the rendering of service to others and the receiving of service from others.

Our abnormal industrial environment largely interferes with that evenly balanced life. Too often, sometimes unlawfully and sometimes lawfully, the getting of money certifies to no service rendered, but only to unjust power applied; it may be the lawless power of the highwayman or the legalized power of the monopolist, but with either the moral principle is the same. Too often, also, the spending of money certifies to no service received, but only to a vanity indulged; it may be the reckless gratification of hurtful

appetites or the calculated self-satisfaction of spectacular charity. While such an environment continues, no equilibrium of getting money and spending money can produce the normal equilibrium of service for service; but even in this abnormal environment, some approximation to that equilibrium can be made. The man who does his best to adjust his getting of money to honest service, and his spending of money to honest getting of equivalent service, will approximate well-balanced manhood; whereas the man who clings to the conditions that enable him to get much money for little service and give little money for much service, is pretty likely to shrivel his soul. Service for service is the natural law of orderly human life, and whoever violates it invites inward damnation.

Philip Henrici.

There are few men anywhere who know Chicago at all but will recall Philip Henrici, the originator and proprietor of Henrici's restaurants. Mr. Henrici, whose death was reported on the 25th, was worthy of remembrance for more than his success merely as a business man. He was also a man. And that means that he harbored genuinely democratic convictions and cultivated the courage of his convictions. A German by birth, an American by adoption, a baker by trade, a business man by occupation, a successful one by good management and good fortune, and a fundamental democrat by temper and conviction, Mr. Henrici knew no artificial distinctions of station, wealth or race. As long ago as thirty years, when Negroes in Chicago were denied restaurant accommodations even more brutally than now, Mr. Henrici would not turn away Negroes who entered his doors. They were served with the same promptness and consideration as any other customers; and if, as sometimes happened, his waiters refused to serve them, Henrici did it himself. Prejudice did not chill nor clamor

intimidate him. While the so-called "anarchists" were in jail, Mr. Henrici, without charge or pay and without the omission of a day from their first arrest to their removal, some to the gallows and the others to State prison, sent them the best meals his restaurant afforded. He was not an anarchist. He was simply a human man, at a time when and in a place where most men in his circumstances were howling brutes with a thirst for human blood. Philip Henrici held human life sacred, he believed in human liberty, he stood for equality of rights. War, slavery, and privilege he therefore abhorred. Better to leave behind the fragrance of such a character than the odor of tainted millions.

The sacred soldier.

Nothing shows better the weakness of militarism than its sensitiveness to criticism. The following was recently published in a number of periodicals under the head of news from Germany:

Herr Kunert, a Social Democratic member of the German Reichstag, was sentenced at Halle yesterday to three months' imprisonment for insulting members of the German expedition sent to China in 1900 by saying in a campaign speech: "Our soldiers in that desolated land plundered and abused women." A number of former soldiers of the expedition were examined and gave corroborative testimony in great detail.

It makes no difference whether the criticism be true. Those who are engaged in the noble profession of fighting must not be criticised.

The life insurance problem.

Now that the insurance investigation is over, whatever may be the legislative outcome the fact is established that the life companies, largely owing to the growth of monopoly in business and the consequent wholesale destruction of small, independent enterprises, have become the chief custodians of the people's savings. That the men who chanced to be at the head of these institutions were not, in all cases, equal to the moral strain of handling so much

money was only to be expected. A few of the Jonahs have been sacrificed to propitiate the mob, but the danger still exists in a great measure. Policy holders have been encouraged to rely upon State protection of their interests at the same time that the State divested them of the power to protect themselves by bringing actions against the companies if aggrieved. How much the State protection was worth is now well known to the world. Insurance is a difficult business to regulate satisfactorily. In its nature it is a "mutual" business, because it is the distribution among the many of the losses that fall upon the few; nevertheless a workable scheme of self-government among the policy-holders of insurance companies has yet to be devised.

The womanly touch in literature.

Dickens wrote a letter to George Eliot soon after her first publication, and it is interesting to see how surely he detected that the author was a woman. He began his letter, "Dear Sir," but at once expressed his doubt. The letter has been published in the London Daily News. It runs, in part, as follows:

In addressing these few words of thankfulness to the creator of the Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton, and the sad love story of Mr. Gilfil, I am (I presume) bound to adopt the name that it pleases that excellent writer to assume. I can suggest no better one; but I should have been strongly disposed, if I had been left to my own devices, to address the said writer as a woman. I have observed what seemed to me such womanly touches in those moving fictions, that the assurance on the title page is insufficient to satisfy me even now.

A SORRY CONTRAST.

In Great Britain, without a whisper of corruption, a great constituency has just made election, not of a picturesque and magnetic personality—Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is quite as unlikely an object of hero worship as former Judge Parker,—but of the leading representative of principle applied to commerce, to education, and to social reform.

In France, Mr. Fallieres, the son