

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

of a clerk, the grandson of a blacksmith, a countryman of genuinely simple life, has just been chosen to be the chief servant of the nation by the simplest machinery, working without clamor or expense.

On the other hand, the United States seems to be at this moment subject to the imperious will of an aristocrat who transparently condescends here and there to the arts of a demagogue, while surrounding himself with all the etiquette of a court; and acquiescence in his sovereign assumption, overruling the coordinate departments of government and the Constitution itself, is claimed to be a test of good citizenship.

Meanwhile, it has been quite forgotten that Mr. Roosevelt's position was reached with the use of great sums of money contributed by corporations and trusts, and that his apparent endorsement was obtained, not by a very general support so much as by divisions among his opponents.

We must try to believe that the United States, which for more than a century faithfully adhered on the whole to the ideals of democracy, contains within herself the elements of regeneration and purification. But how low is her standing to-day relatively to Great Britain and France in the actual conditions of her political life!

ERVING WINSLOW.

ALDERMANIC AMBIGUITY.

Certain members of the Chicago City Council, some of them very respectable and none of them of the so-called "gray wolf" group, are now revealed as having pursued in connection with the Chicago traction question (pp. 705, 707, 710), a course of considerable ambiguity. It is so ambiguous as to call for more satisfactory explanations than that they differed in opinion from the consistent municipal ownership members. We refer to the eight aldermen who constitute the majority of the committee on local transportation. Their names are: Milton J. Foreman, F. I. Bennett, Thos. Carey, Wm. D. Maypole, Walter J. Raymer, Robert R. McCormick, Thomas M. Hunter and Linn H. Young.

When Mayor Dunne had been elected on the municipal ownership issue, it was generally understood and unofficially declared in the Council that he would have the support of the Council regardless of party lines and in good faith, in perfecting and establishing his traction policy. Accordingly the local transportation committee was reorganized pursuant to a tacit agreement that it would assist and not obstruct Mayor Dunne. To that end the committee was promptly and with every appearance of good faith put under the chairmanship of Charles Werno, an alderman whose fidelity to the municipal ownership movement had been and has continued to be unimpeachable.

But this wisely generous civic spirit did not continue, and a curious transformation occurred within the local transportation committee. The external aspects of the change have now been publicly narrated by Alderman William E. Dever, one of the committee, who told the story in a speech at the City Club on the afternoon of the 27th, and again on the evening of the same day at a banquet given to the minority of the local transportation committee at the Iroquois Club.

No accusation nor imputation was preferred or hinted at by Alderman Dever in either speech. He merely disclosed the facts in their chronological order. But the barest statement of those facts constitutes an indictment of the eight aldermen in question, which no public spirited man can afford and no self-respecting man will permit to pass without explanation.

According to Alderman Dever's statements, the lines were first drawn by the eight aldermen named above, at the time when Mayor Dunne's "contract plan" for securing municipal ownership came up in the committee for consideration.

Prior to that time, said Alderman Dever, the committee did little. It was understood that Mayor Dunne would formulate his plans, and that upon their submission the committee would cordially cooperate with him in perfecting and promoting them. But immediately upon the taking up of the Dunne "contract plan," the

committee divided, 8 to 5, and remained so divided to the end. The five who continued in the original purpose, cooperating with Mayor Dunne, were Charles Werno (the chairman), Michael Zimmer, William E. Dever, Nicholas R. Finn and John J. Bradley. The eight who reversed this original purpose were those whose ambiguous conduct is here in question—Foreman, Bennett, Carey, Maypole, Raymer, R. R. McCormick, Hunter and Young.

Why did those eight aldermen reverse the original purpose of the committee by obstructing instead of cooperating with Dunne? That is one thing for them to explain if they can explain it. Another inquiry in the same connection is, why in pursuing the new purpose they threw themselves so completely, and as the circumstances imply, so questionably, into the arms of the traction interests?

But let us proceed with Alderman Dever's story.

When Mayor Dunne's "contract plan" for municipal ownership came up in the committee for consideration, only three sections were read. As the reading of the third section closed, and without any attempt at consideration, the eight members of the committee named above as the majority—Foreman, Bennett, Carey, Maypole, Raymer, R. R. McCormick, Hunter and Young—suddenly forced the committee to decide that this would be a good time to invite the traction companies to come before them and submit proposals for an extension of their franchises.

That was the very policy which had theretofore been regarded as having been defeated at the polls by a referendum vote and Dunne's election. Yet the committee precipitately adopted it by the vote of 8 to 5—Foreman, Bennett, Carey, Maypole, Raymer, R. R. McCormick, Hunter and Young voting in the affirmative.

By that vote the majority decided to side track the Mayor's plan without examination, discussion or consideration, and in favor of such proposals as the existing companies might make.

Why?

Alderman Dever has suggested