meetings and parades, and an outrageous, as well as illegal, police policy of interference with free speech. He should have no ideas worth mentioning regarding the taxation system. He should, in short, be very careful to have no opinion before election of any kind except such as will meet with no serious oppositon.

While these views have not been openly expressed by Messrs. Harrison, Schweitzer, Olson or Thompson, their silence on these and similar matters makes it clear that they have not been misrepresented. It is deplorable indeed that in the second city of the country neither of the two largest parties should be able to produce a candidate for mayor possessed of sufficient knowledge and ability to present some plan to settle the city's most serious questions. S. D.

EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY IN ILLINOIS.

How impetuously the "industrial unrest" has launched itself into the educational world was evident to any onlooker at the First Annual Convention of the Vocational Education Association of the Middle West held in Chicago February 5 and 6. It would be hard to find a more alert roomful of citizens in America than those three or four hundred teachers, business men and labor leaders who on Saturday morning heard and fought each others' views on "Proposed Vocational Education Legislation in Illinois." Difficult also would it be to find a body of Americans deliberating on a more important question, if its true import be considered. "Shall our children continue to leave the common school, unprepared for any specialized life work and untrained in the rudiments of mental efficiency?" asked some partizans. "Shall our children during their few short years in the public schools be educated into life, or merely trained into a job?" asked others. The particular question before the house was whether vocational education —which all agree must in greater measure somehow be introduced into public education—shall come in as an integral part of the present system, administered by the same head, offered in the same schools (that is, under the "unit" system), or whether such vocational curricula shall be brought in under a separate administration in separate and special schools, that is, under the "dual" system. Impassioned arguments were presented by both the "unit" and the "dual" advocates. We shall not go into them now. One or two facts, however, stood out boldly to the observer in the back of the room. First, the speakers who advocated the dual system all represented in one way or another what are known as "the business interests"; the speakers who wanted the unit system represented the educational and labor world. Second, the "duals" talked of "efficiency," the "units" spoke of "life." Third, the business men discussed the job and its child; the teachers and workingmen discussed the child and his job. One speaker, not immediately in the controversy, summed it all up when she said: "The question is not, 'What will the children do for Industry?' but 'What will Industry do to the children?'"

A. L. G.

SUSAN LOOK AVERY.*

"To cease upon the midnight, with no pain."
—Keats.

The death of this woman was as natural as her life, which was typical of what all lives should be and prophetic of what all might be. She lived vitally through nearly a hundred years of advancing social thought; she died as the tired child sleeps, weary but not worn out.

When Susan Look entered public life as a school teacher, a girl in her teens, chattel slavery was the social problem which our country faced, and by which it was in another generation to be wrecked and torn. She found herself in Kentucky where slavery prevailed and where, therefore, partly from tradition, partly from associations, and partly from self interest—as it is with all social questions — public sentiment buttressed this wretched institution. But she was a democrat. Not by party label, not by mere profession or lip service, not for herself and hers alone, but a democrat in all that the word implies. To her heart and intellect the rights of man were vastly wider in scope than the privileges of race or family, of wealth or culture. So, in a slave community, she was an abolitionist.

Neither was her democracy circumscribed by the limitations of the first democratic struggle that had seized upon her young imagination. It was with her a vital principle by which for more than three-quarters of a century she tried every social problem that challenged public attention. Her democracy made her a woman suffragist in the earliest years of the agitation for woman suffrage. It made her a greenbacker when the industrial problem entered the political arena in that guise. It made her a champion of the free coinage of silver when this was the battle banner of democ-

*See page 159 of this paper.