

women and children. These happy people live on a small island called Tavolara, near Sardinia.

Their history is interesting. When Vittorio Amedeo II was made King of Sardinia, the little island was overlooked, much to the pleasure of the people, who were thus free from police, galling laws, military service and taxes. In 1836 King Carlo Alberto, in cruising about, saw the island, and no one being able to tell him anything about it, he landed. A young and attractive looking man at once came to meet him, speaking simply, but with courtesy. To various questions, he replied that he was the king of the island, which rather took Carlo Alberto aback, as he certainly did not expect to find a colleague there. He was, however, much amused, and on returning to the mainland confirmed by royal decree the king in his possession, and thus began the dynasty of the Bartolloni, with Paolo I.

When Paolo died, no aspirants to the throne appearing, the population remained for four years without any government at all, until a sudden resolution was taken, and they proclaimed the republic. The president remains in office for six years, the position being absolutely without compensation, as are all the other public offices, so that this free people live in peace and comparative prosperity, with neither taxes nor laws, which might rouse envy in the breasts of those who have these—benefits.

—New York Times.

\* \* \*

## MONOPOLY QUESTIONS IN CANADA.

From a Sermon on "The City and Its Problems," Delivered April 29, 1906, in Halifax, Can., by the Rev.

C. L. Ball, as Reported in the Halifax Evening Mail.

What gives right to private property? Labor. Private wealth is the result of labor applied to the land. Production gives right of property. Pro, duco, i. e., to draw forth from the land. If a man produces anything he owns it as against all the world, or if he acquires it from the producer, or if he can trace it through a line of exchanges back to the producer.

But who produced the land; whoever had a just right to give title of ownership to it? All titles to land rest back on force, fraud and pre-emption. No one has a title (except Baer the Pennsylvania coal baron) from the producer, because God created it. The land never belonging by right to any one, it belongs as a gift from God to all.

All the monopolies that seem oppressive are land monopolies. The Standard Oil Company is a land monopoly. It secured control of the markets by railroad rebates (land monopoly) and its pipe lines (land monopoly). The beef trust was built up by the same means. All these immense fortunes are made up of public wealth which a few individuals have been allowed to appropriate to their own uses.

These great fortunes are a menace to free institutions. A few men already control industrial America. They actually govern the country through congressman and senator, who are no more than the hired agents of these corporations. They own the courts, and their friends are officers in the army.

Not in Canada? Yes, in Canada. I am burning

oil rather than pay \$2.50 per thousand for gas, and I pay twice as much for my oil as I did in Springfield, Mass. It cost more to get there? No. The gas monopoly enables the Standard to charge more.

What interests do our members in parliaments represent if they do not represent transportation, coal, banking, landed interests? Have we forgotten the millions given to the Canadian Pacific? Have we forgotten the more millions given the Grand Trunk? These corporations have debauched our public morality. I happen to know of money used in the last Dominion election. Do you believe it was spent without regard for value to be received?

Public wealth in private hands is a menace. The public wealth must be kept for the public. The people must go into politics, especially the laboring people, as they are doing in England.

\* \* \*

## DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION.

### II. EFFICIENT TEACHING.

Portions of an Address Delivered Before the Western Section of the Northern Illinois Teachers' Association, at Dixon, Ill., October, 1905, by David Kinley, Professor of Economics, and Dean of College of Literature and Arts, University of Illinois.

If the time ever comes when the public shall lay more emphasis upon the importance of a complete and smooth administrative machinery in our schools than it lays upon the efficiency of the teaching; if public opinion ever comes to the point where it believes that the teachers as a body are incapable of giving sound advice on educational matters, it will mean the degradation of the teaching profession. It will mean that self-respecting men and women, the equals of any officers in any administrative position, will seek other fields for their life activities and will refuse to subject themselves to the whims and dictates of men who might have been good slave drivers in the days of slavery, but are hardly fit members of the educational system of an intelligent community, where men and women believe that individual initiative spontaneity, of sense of responsibility, knowledge, intelligence and sympathy, individuality—are more important factors in education than smooth administration or strong executive action. The question before us, then, is whether the tone and character of our educational systems in this country are to be determined by the great body of the teachers of the country, or are to be imposed upon the teachers by a relatively small number of men of autocratic temperament, who sneer at the teacher and insist that his proper place is a subordinate one of obedience to higher authority.

The demand for so called strong administration is based largely on the alleged necessity for uniformity of method and smoothness in the work of the administrative machinery. The desire for uniformity is a curse in every department of educational matters. The ideal school would be one which had no uniformity of method or administration, because each individual pupil would be treated according to his specific characteristics; the only place where method and system would be needed would be in

the keeping of accounts, in order that thereby the progress of the pupil might be noted. To crowd every teacher into the same mold is to destroy personality; to cast every complex character and undeveloped life into the same frame is to destroy individuality. A flower that has been pressed for herbarium purposes is after all only a mummy; however well it may serve as a specimen in a collection, it cannot be compared for beauty or for the discharge of the service of flowers to mankind, with a flower in its natural condition. Its fragrance is gone, color is lost, the lights and shadows of its surface have disappeared; it is dead. So with teachers who are crowded too closely in the press of administrative machinery.

The time for dogmatism and for coercive uniformity is past. Administrative school systems, like all institutions, are good only so far as they give opportunity to all the influences within them to contribute to the growth of the people whom they affect.

The substitution of a higher form of control for a lower, of voluntary obedience and intelligent acquiescence for external control, marks a step in social progress. It always involves higher moral training and therefore a more developed individuality and a better character to offer more alternatives and trust a man to make the right selection than to deprive him of all choice and compel him to walk in a prescribed way. What we need in educational administration is the replacement of coercive control and authority, with free action combined with a responsibility for the consequences of that action.

When a superintendent distrusts his teachers or a college president distrusts his faculty; when either says that the teachers are incapable of advising with reference to school policy; when he says that they are without sound judgment and that they need to have their ways of action pointed out to them and kept well within the limits of a system laid down for them by their superior officers, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that that superintendent or that president has not yet learned the superiority of the organic over the mechanical. He has not learned that the flower expanding to the sun, blooming and shedding its fragrance and beauty in response to internal forces, is more typical of moral character and of the ideal individual life than the steam engine, however smoothly it runs, which is driven by a force outside of itself and is absolutely under the control of the manager of that force. He has failed to grasp that great truth of evolution that responsiveness to influence is a higher form of action than action in response to coercion. He has failed to see that spontaneous action is better than compulsory movement. He has failed to see that leadership is a higher form of authority, and is productive of far better results for the world than is driving. He has failed to distinguish between a leader of men and a driver of slaves. He has failed to grasp the great moral and economic truth that the product of free labor is greater in quantity and far better in character than that of slave labor. He has failed to learn that in many cases influence is more powerful than authority.

A favorite illustration of some school officers, when speaking of their faculties and teachers, is that of the stage driver. They look upon and liken the corps of teachers to a group of unruly horses which need a

driver to control them and make them pull together. The figure is a vicious one. If we are to go to the animal kingdom for an example, rather should we go to the dogs pulling the sledge of the arctic traveler. The movement of the team is controlled by the leader, who is at the front of the line. He it is, who, setting the example, pointing the way, blazing the path, rouses his followers to enthusiasm and brings about that unison of action that results in the highest speed. The former figure is gratifying to the men who, by accident of office, have been led to feel themselves superior to their fellow workers, but who, by the very use of the figure in question, show that they have not grasped the first principle of sound administration.

Mere differentiation and coordination of function, mere complexity of organization, mere exercise of authority to compel uniformity of action, does not prove that the system under which it is done is a good system or that it is making for progress. There is an order and peace that may be attained in the streets of a city under martial law, but it is not to be compared for a moment in its effects on human character or in its results for the progress of civilization with the peace that comes from the acquiescence of the citizens of the town in the laws of the land. The peace and order and system that make for progress are those that command voluntary obedience and the willing cooperation of those who are subject to them. The best system of administration in school work, as in all other work, is that which does indeed work smoothly, but which attains its results from and through the acts of intelligent voluntary cooperation of all the individuals working in it, because all these individuals see its beneficent character and because it supplies them with multifarious opportunities whereby all their differing individualities can work out a congenial development.

\* \* \*

## THE BREAKING OF THE TIE.

For The Public.

I must confess that my feelings were badly hurt when I heard of the rupture of the friendly relations between my friend Tom Knolls and the railroad magnate, General Peak.

The grief was if anything more intense than it was at the time Lieutenant Hance's mule threw me over his head into the cactus patch. Goose grease and sweet oil will alleviate the stings of cactus needles, if patiently applied, but the inward stings that come from bad news are beyond the reach of any of the remedies mentioned in the doctors' books.

It may be surmised from the similarity of the names that Tom Knolls and General Peak were blood relations, but such was not the case.

The relation that existed and was so sadly ruptured was merely that which can be sometimes traced between the reception of railroad passes and other substantial favors, on the one hand, and friendly services in legislative and political circles on the other.

Tom did not ride on the railroad all the time. It was not from lack of passes, however, but from the fact that he had to stay at home part of the time in