

trouble in the middle west, like that which the Puerto Rican act had aroused. When the commission was appointed, its members were promised that their authority would be supplied by the Spooner bill, which was withdrawn while they were on their way to Manila. The censor permitted us to know from the Manila dispatches how the chairman of the commission anxiously asked on arriving at Manila: "Has the Spooner bill passed?" We have learned many things in the past two years of what a president may do in defiance of the law and his official oath, but I do not think he can legislate either directly or vicariously. He no doubt may try to do so, and his deputies may go through all the motions. If necessary to accomplish his ends, he would probably also assume to have, and would try to exercise, judicial powers, but the validity of his judgments would be as doubtful as is, in my opinion, the legality of his legislation through the commission. As commander in chief of the army he is the ruler of the Philippines, and can delegate his military power to Gen. MacArthur or anyone else. And if this commission has any authority, it seems to me it is only as a part of the president's military authority.

The president announced when he appointed the commission that beginning with September 1 they should have authority to establish a civil government in the Philippines. We had understood that Gen. MacArthur was the commanding officer in the Philippines. The authority given to the commission may mean that so much of the government of the archipelago is taken from the hands of the commanding officer; or it possibly means that the commissioners are his staff or advisers on civil matters, and very good advisers on such matters they no doubt are; but when they advise him or his superior officers, this cannot accurately be called legislation, nor, I submit, is any civil law enacted when their advice is taken and promulgated.

The measures which the commissioners adopt or suggest for enforcement by the military power, which is the only American power in that unhappy land, are, when approved by the commanding officer and shorn of the McKinley verbiage, merely military edicts or decrees. I suppose these orders should appear in that officer's official record and report as "General Order No. —." On the other hand, if the commanding offi-

cer has nothing to do with the matters which are delegated by his chief to the commissioners, then, notwithstanding the McKinleyesque use of misleading terms importing civil authority, the alleged laws enacted by the commission are, I submit, none the less merely military edicts or decrees.

If I am wrong about all this I should be glad to be informed. My error, if one, arises from some old-time notions as to the nature of our system of government, and I am not unprepared to hear that these primitive ideas of mine are obsolete.

CHARLES B. WILBY.
Cincinnati, Dec. 22, 1900.

THE SCHOOLS DO NOT TEACH OF SOCIAL RELATIONS.

An extract from a paper on "The Duty of the Schools to Society," read by Prof. Charles Lischer, of New Athens, Ill., before the meeting of the St. Clair County Teachers' Institute at Belleville, Ill., Dec. 8.

It is important that teachers should inquire whether the schools are in any degree responsible for the [present] unfortunate [social] conditions. I am compelled to acknowledge that I think they are, though other agencies are also responsible. The responsibility of the schools is not a blame-worthy responsibility, for the forces of no other agency have been guided with purer motives. Hence, there is no room for condemnation. The relation of the schools to society, however, is so intimate, and their influences are so potent in their formative effects, that it would be folly to claim that they are entirely free from responsibility in this grave matter. Even if the schools have not contributed directly or purposely to it, they have not studied how to prevent it. They have cultivated, unintentionally, of course, those characteristics which have produced it, and have failed to cultivate, except incidentally, those better characteristics which must correct it. Throughout the whole course of the development of our public schools, their relation to the child as an individual with personal ends in life to be attained has been an all-determining factor, while their relation to the child as a member of society has never been sufficiently emphasized. The effort, therefore, on the part of the schools has uniformly been to enable the child, when grown to manhood, to successfully guard his personal interests and secure his personal ends. There is no general or continued effort to so train and develop him that he will contribute to

the welfare of society. Why has the child been taught to read, to write, to cipher? Primarily, because a knowledge of these has seemed to be absolutely essential in securing his so-called rights among his fellows. His ethical side is now demanding cultivation more loudly than ever. So far as education is purely intellectual, it only trains him for a fiercer part in the great struggle for personal ends, and tends to diminish the severity of that struggle in such degree only as purely intellectual culture indirectly contributes to the ethical, through attention to subjects related to the ethical.

Back of all social discontent, and back of all forms in which it appears, we find the primary cause of social disorders in the presence of erroneous ideas among men, particularly the presence of erroneous notions concerning the relations which exist among men. There are certain fundamental ideas upon which the social edifice is built. In each of these a thousand others germinate, and the thousand are wrong if the one is wrong. Thus, in treating of the natural rights and duties of the individual, we should impress the ethical relations between individuals which arise from the fact of birth. All are in the world through no fault or merit of their own, hence no blame or credit attaches to the fact of being here in any case. No man brought anything with him which every other man did not bring; hence, all are by nature endowed with equal rights and equal opportunities. This opens up an immense field of thought in the direction of modifying the existing conditions of unequal rights and unequal opportunities, which all students of social questions recognize with serious misgivings. . . .

Nothing is more important for our children and youth to understand than the nature and character of human relations; but these are ignored as if there were no such relations, lest the existing abnormal ones be disturbed. Here, in my judgment, is the most serious defect of our schools, and not in the lack of proper correlation of studies.

To correct it we must form more comprehensive standards of patriotism, call it patriotism, religion, sympathy, the enthusiasm for humanity or the love of God—give it what name you will; there is yet a force in human nature which may overcome the powers of darkness; a chemical force, if you please, which melts, and fuses

and overwhelms; to which nothing seems impossible.

For a hundred years Bunker Hill has been presented to the schools as a type of patriotism in the concrete. We were taught that a patriot is a man who loves his country and is ready to die for it—Lincoln and Grant in the north, and, with precisely the same sentiment, Lee and Jackson in the south. Since the civil war new names have been added to the list. All our patriotic literature has the same ring: America is a sweet land of liberty, land where our fathers died; Columbia's heroes fought and bled in freedom's cause; in the rocket's red glare, and with bombs bursting in air, the star-spangled banner waves o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave. As a stimulus to this emotion, we have put the flag over our schoolhouses, and have taught children to salute it. Not content with chanting the praises of the country's heroes, men and women everywhere are glorying in descent from them. The Sons and Daughters of the Revolution form an exclusive and select society.

What does it mean, and what is to be the outcome of it all, is the question for us to consider. This sentiment has the weakness of the old theology which aimed to teach men how to die. Shall the patriotism of the twentieth century explode itself in after-dinner speeches on battle, anniversaries, in building monuments to patriots of the past? Shall it pride itself chiefly in a patriotic ancestry, or shall its energy be transmuted into useful work? We surely see that a great and independent nation like ours will not have to fight over the old battles or to meet again the old foes. Our work, therefore, in the education of the young for citizenship, will be threefold. We shall need, first, to get beneath the manifestations of patriotic emotions in the past to the essential, underlying principle; from the deeds to the spirit. Next, we shall need to show what are the peculiar perils of our country today; to discover the real enemies. And third, we must teach how these enemies are to be met and conquered; in other words, how the old spirit must manifest itself under the new conditions.

We know too well, and it will be our business to teach, that our foes are of our own household; dangers not to be met by cruisers and torpedo boats, nor by coast fortifications, nor by a standing army. And we may show that in comparison with these enemies, the bombardment of a city by a foreign fleet would be a light affliction. Are

we teachers willing to sink partisan prejudice and to unite in an alliance, offensive and defensive, arming ourselves with twentieth century weapons, for twentieth century conflict?

Then may we sing with Frances Brown:

The days of the nation bear no trace
Of all the sunshine so far foretold;
The cannon speaks in the teacher's place—
The age is weary with work and gold;
And high hopes wither, and memories wane;
On hearths and altars the fires are dead;
But that brave faith hath not lived in vain—
And this is all that our watcher said.

THE BEST METHOD OF TAXATION AND ASSESSMENT IN MUNICIPALITIES.

An abridgement of a paper read by Lawson Purdy, secretary of the New York Tax Reform association, before the convention of the League of American Municipalities in session at Charleston, S. C., December 14.

Although the subject under discussion is city taxation, it is impossible to consider the city apart from its relation to state government. It would not be difficult to devise a system of city taxation if the city stood alone, but unfortunately our cities are bound by constitutional limitations and systems of taxation which require uniformity throughout the state in which the cities are situated. It would be useless, therefore, to suggest reforms in city taxation without pointing out the obstacles that must be removed before the reforms can be adopted.

The most serious obstacle to reform is to be found in the constitutions of the states, which, as a rule, require the uniform and equal taxation of all property save such as is specifically exempted by the constitution itself. Such a provision exists in the constitutions of 25 states, and strange as it may seem those constitutions which most offend against the true standard of constitution building are those which have been most recently adopted. The constitutions of eight states only are at all satisfactory in respect to the provisions regarding taxation, and with one exception these states are among the original 13. Those who framed these constitutions did not deem it necessary to bind their legislatures and subsequent generations to an inflexible system, but permitted their sons to increase in wisdom as in wealth and change their methods of taxation as conditions changed and learning grew. These eight states deserve to be placed on record to furnish an example for the rest of the union. They are as follows: Ala-

bama, Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont.

I think it is too obvious to require argument that the legislatures of our states should be as free to adopt new methods of taxation as that manufacturers should be free to adopt new machinery. Constitutions in which are embodied a mass of statute law are as bad an example of the exercise of despotic power as the edict of an emperor or the ukase of the czar. Emerson, or some other great man, has said that "There is no law to prevent a man from growing wise," but the constitutions of 37 states decree that the voters of those states shall remain in primitive ignorance. To achieve improvement we must have power to change, and the first step which must be made in these 37 states is to remove the constitutional restrictions upon the power of the legislature to adopt improved methods of taxation.

The second obstacle which must be removed before we can amend municipal taxation is the method at present in vogue in the great majority of the states for raising state revenue. Assessment and taxation are uniform throughout these states, and a tax is levied for state purposes on all property throughout the state on the assessment made in each tax district by local officials.

Not only is this system bad in itself, but it binds every tax district in the state to a uniform system which is almost as serious a bar to progress as restrictions imposed by a constitution.

All the states raise money by specific taxes; many have inheritance taxes, many have taxes on corporations. Some have special taxes, for the use of the state, imposed upon railroads, among these being the state of Connecticut, which has a model system of railroad taxation. Some of these taxes are extremely bad, and some few are good, but we can well afford to leave them all undisturbed for the present and devote our attention to the consideration of a really good system of raising so much revenue for state purposes as the state may need, over and above what it now derives from these fixed taxes. Such a system has been devised, and was for the first time proposed in the state of New York a year ago. The plan is simple, flexible, and has a tendency to fix responsibility and check extravagance. It is really the application to political divisions of