

The methods of all who have thus far come to the defense of the compromise ordinance are extremely unsatisfactory. Upon them rests the burden of showing that the ordinance would effect the results they claim for it. But instead of attempting this, they ignore and evade. It seems almost like a pre-arranged policy. They echo one another in asserting that the ordinance would secure good service, but shuffle away from the objection that it confers no powers to enforce good service, short of the drastic and therefore often impracticable one of forfeiture. They echo one another in asserting that the possibilities of litigation would be removed, but shuffle away from explanations that these possibilities would be augmented. Why don't they answer these objections frankly if their proposal is meritorious?

And why do they echo and re-echo the challenge to their critics either to stop criticising or to offer a counter-plan? Why do they do this while ignoring or sneering at every plan that does not contemplate compromise? Is it because they want compromise, or because compromise is necessary? If the latter, why don't they relieve the situation by explaining why? The issue now is compromise or no compromise; and this issue, as with every objection to their own plans, the promoters of compromise have so far refused to meet in any other spirit than that in which it is met by the traction interests. This cannot be in conservation of public interests. The people of Chicago have emphatically demanded municipal ownership without any intermediate compromise. Is that legally possible or isn't it? If it is, then the Mayor, the City Council, the corporation counsel, and the special counsel (all of whom are paid to find means for effectively realizing the people's will, not to hunt diligently for reasons for thwarting it), are under the most sacred kind of civic obligation to turn that possibility into a reality. If, however, it is in their best judg-

ment not legally possible—and this is the only honorable explanation of the policy they are pursuing—then they are under equally sacred civic obligations to take the people into their confidence and candidly explain why it is not possible. Their explanations thus far are of a kind which, if made by a lawyer to his client, could hardly have any other effect than to startle the client into a conviction that he had better get another lawyer—one who would be at least as considerate of his interests as of those of his adversary.

A very suggestive letter to the editor of the New York Evening Post appeared recently in the columns of that paper over the signature of Samuel H. Bishop. Its immediate reference was to the changes regarding civil service reform and class legislation that have come over Theodore Roosevelt since his accession to the Presidency; but its possible applications are many, from President down to city councilman. "When we study men as men," writes Mr. Bishop, "we know their opinions and where to find them; but when we study men as officials, we do not know their opinions and we do not know where to find them." With that apt phrasing of a thought that has floated at times in the minds of many of us, Mr. Bishop proceeds:

I remember that a great clergyman now dead once said to me: "I wonder if it would be possible for a bishop to be the same man in thought and policy that he was as a clergyman;" by which remark I supposed he meant that he was puzzled as I am puzzled to understand the change that comes over men who are put upon the apex of official positions. Let us grant that such men do become necessarily subject to the influence of motives which are not felt and cannot be understood by men not in those positions; that they are the subjects of wider laws and multiplex forces, which we who are not in those positions cannot understand; yet do we not need now some light to be thrown upon official exigencies and necessities, so that we can have at least some understanding of those exigencies and necessities, and can in some measure determine how far men ought to be changed in thought and policy

when they become executives either in church or state?

Having thus described the problem in terms which must appeal forcibly to all who have observed the phenomena of democracy, and pointed to Mr. Roosevelt as a type of the men who lose their ideals upon coming into high office; having, moreover, refused to accept the explanation that this deplorable transformation originates in bad motives, Mr. Bishop looks for "the deeper, the final effective cause." What he has to offer as the result of this inquiry is an impressive and as we believe a substantially true explanation of a very puzzling social riddle. He says:

I think it is the mental and moral perplexity involved in official positions, the sudden and overwhelming perception of a great new class of motives, exigencies and forces to which the official is now subject. The consciences of most men are so ill-trained that they cannot adapt and adjust themselves to this new multiplex system of motives and forces to which executive officials are subject. Indeed we are going through a time when the ordinary man—the business man, the director, the merchant, the clerk, men in every kind of occupation are unable to see what the strictly right thing is, or unable to adapt and adjust their consciences to the intricate and complex system of modern life; and so cannot act according to the stern dictates of the personal conscience.

Recurring to Mr. Roosevelt's case for a concrete illustration, Mr. Bishop continues:

I believe that the Republican policy, which is essentially a selfish and class policy, adds very greatly to the mental and moral perplexity of its executives and its politicians. Mr. Roosevelt is mentally and morally bound hand and foot by the selfish and class interests which really constitute Republican policy. He is not great enough (and I am one of those who think few men would be) to withstand the mighty force which presses upon him from the selfish interests involved in the continued subjugation of the Philippines, the class tariff and the other policies for which the Republican party stands.

Reflection upon Mr. Bishop's really profound observations might incline us all to be a little more charitable towards the motives of officials perplexed by conflicting social forces. Better yet, it might stimulate the officials them-

selves to cultivate more sensitive consciences. For the same selfish class-interests that confuse President Roosevelt's moral sense press all the way down from the White House even to town constable, confusing the moral sense of all who stand in their path. The question is in truth a social and not an individual one. But while this calls for charity toward the motives of officials, from those whose moral sense happens not to be exposed to the confusion, it does not call for toleration toward the officials themselves. The only way to rid society of social forces so confusing to the moral sense of officials, is to divest ourselves of confidence, pretended or otherwise, in all officials whose moral sense they have confused and whose fidelity to public trusts they have consequently baffled.

Among the syndicate articles now floating through the press, is a series purporting to be by "an ex-mayor of one of the largest American cities." Whoever the writer may be, he touches a chord very like that which is touched in Mr. Bishop's letter. Referring to what he justly characterizes as the "visionary character" known as the "ideal mayor"—and for mayor you may substitute any office you please, President, governor, legislator, etc.—this writer remarks:

To one who has filled a mayor's chair for at least one term, these efforts to fashion the improbable out of the hardly possible are calculated to establish an all-embracing feeling of intense and prolonged fatigue. Such a one knows from bitter experience that the ideal mayor cannot become a realization until the ideal city is an actuality. And you can never get the ideal city. I am repeating substantially what I said to a couple of well-meaning gentlemen who called on me near the end of my term to enter a mild protest against some official act of mine. One of them asked me to give him my views on the ideal city, and I replied: "A town whose business men do not have one standard of honesty for private business and another for public business." I felt safe in venturing that opinion, for I sincerely believe that if the representative business men of any large city would measure their civic

relations, duties and obligations with the same rule of conduct they use in private affairs, that city would become the ideal municipality.

Can it be that this ideal is impossible? If so, whose is the fault, if it is not the fault of the much-belauded business man himself? Would that the business and professional men of Chicago might at this time take to heart that just characterization of their immoral ethics—honesty in their private business, dishonesty in their public relations.

An instructive incident bearing on the race question was that at the convention of the American Bankers' Association at New York last week, one that might with great profit be compared with the antithetical instance at the dental convention in St. Louis (p. 371) a week before. At the bankers' convention, as at the dental convention, one Negro member attended. But here the parallel ends. The Negro at the bankers' convention was not insulted—neither at the sessions of the convention nor at the banquet. Nor was this due merely to Northern sentiment. The most gratifying thing about the incident was its disclosure of what is in some degree the fact, that race persecution at the South is not expressive of the better white sentiment of that section. To this fact the president of a Georgia bank was the witness. The Negro member of the bankers' association, John Mitchell, Jr., president of a Richmond savings bank, had insisted that there is no color line in business at the South. Replying to this, Col. Lowrey, president of the Lowrey National Bank, of Atlanta, Georgia, said:

There is no trouble between my race and his race in Georgia. Both the loafing white men and the loafing black men are despised in my State. I am glad Mr. Mitchell has spoken and gone on record that the Bankers' Association draws no color line and welcomes successful bankers, be they white or black, as members.

Col. Lowrey spoke rather loosely when he said that both "the loafing white men and the loafing

black men are despised" in his State. To have said that loafing white men (if poor) are despised, and loafing black men are burned, would have expressed the fact more closely. But his intent was evidently good and Southerners ought to applaud him. The time is ripe for Southerners with democratic blood in their veins to stand up for their section and their race by rebuking those childish assumptions of weak-minded Southerners that they have an inborn and ineradicable superiority because they have white skins. It is no honor to any country to boast of color. It is too suggestive of the possibility of there being nothing else available for boasting purposes. But the fact is that in the South there are many noble things to boast of.

At the bankers' convention in New York the head of the Standard Oil banking system, Mr. James Stillman, spoke with cordial approval of "the great economic value of cooperation," and deprecatingly of "the waste which follows "unintelligent competition." One must rub his eyes after reading that to be sure that the speaker was not making a "socialistic harangue." For Mr. Stillman has expressed the economic theory of socialism perfectly. The difference between the regular socialists and the Stillman type is that the former, while they advocate "cooperation" and the abolition of "unintelligent competition," just as Mr. Stillman does, would distribute the profits equally among the cooperators, whereas Mr. Stillman would distribute them in chunks more or less unequally among the men with a "cinch."

What queer folks some Christians be! Here is a Chicago reverend, whose calling is emphasized by his name, for it is Priest, and his religion by the name of his church, the "Church of the Redeemer," who so far forgot his calling last Sunday as to preach a vindictive sermon against highwaymen. His reliance was not upon the regenerating force of the