

seeking, most of them brutal—believe that the schools are about to be rescued from the clutches of a tax-dodging plutocracy.

In Chicago, as in many other places, the school question is at bottom an issue between taxation and pedagogy. On the one side are the financial interests which insist upon favoring tax dodgers at the expense of teachers and consequently to the detriment of pupils, and call it business management; on the other are the educationists who stand for sound methods of pedagogy. A parallel issue is that which arises between the factory method and the school method of education. The factory method regards the relation of teacher and pupil as analogous to that of the mechanic and his product, and consequently makes low-salaried teachers mere cogs in a vast mechanism which high-salaried superintendents control from a distance with metaphorical bell pushes. The intensely human relation of pupil and teacher is sacrificed to the mere mechanical relation of workman and product. The latter issue adapts itself to the former; for the factory method, being of the business type, fits harmoniously into the grooves of the tax-dodging interests. It is essentially business, business, business, as opposed to humanity and what humanity implies. It is, moreover, essentially autocracy as opposed to democracy.

From the pedagogical point of view the school question is editorially stated with great clearness and fairness by the Elementary School Teacher for March, 1905. The article is too long for reproduction here, but we reproduce in another column so much of it as is explanatory of the present situation. It will be observed that this excellent school periodical, in no way connected with the Teachers' Federation, explains the nature of the present controversy in Chicago in a manner that fully accounts for the otherwise unaccountable assaults which the

plutocracy of this city, through their press and through certain members of the Board of Education, are making upon the Teachers' Federation and its efficient leaders.

One of the hopeful signs of the times is the revolt of so many clergymen and religious periodicals against the plutocratic influences that have so long strangled them. It takes time to awaken people to the subtle evils that beset them, and much patience is necessary; but as sure as there is a just God in the Heavens is all this devilry in swallow-tailed coats destined to come to grief. History is full of parallels. The times call not for despair nor pessimism, but for righteous purpose, a little courage, and reasonable patience.

ASSESSMENTS.

It goes without saying that in steady and persistent disregard of law and justice the processes and results of assessments take the lead. Other departments of government may vary in righteousness. The iniquity of assessments is constant. In every community the inequality is outrageous. Everyone knows it who thinks of it. Occasionally some one blabs out the fact. And yet the same old shameless condition continues.

You may hear a community pleading its poverty—not enough money for schools, or for roads, or for any public function; whereas any approach to a fair assessment would yield abundance of revenue for every purpose. It is absurd, when you come to think of it, that any community should talk of being too poor to support its legitimate community functions. What such a community is poor in, is not sources of revenue, but the essentials of citizenship and public spirit.

But apart from the question of revenue obtained and its uses, the worst feature of assessments is the heinous injustice of the inequality. Whether this be due to the hit-and-miss incapacity of the assessors, or to their partiality, or to pulls, or to bribes direct or in-

direct, the fact of inequality exists.

It exists in a remarkable regularity in one respect, which makes the inequality all the more execrable. What is this feature, occurring regularly everywhere, that constitutes the overtopping iniquity of assessments? The history of taxation in all countries shows it, and every man who has looked into the matter to-day knows it. But it is worth while to say it again, and it ought, to our shame, to be said over and over. It is this: that small holdings are assessed, and therefore taxed, relatively higher than large holdings.

There may be exceptions, but this is the general truth. As a rule the larger the value the smaller is the relative assessment. The small holder has not the pull or the influence which the large holder, whether individual or corporation, possesses, and accordingly he suffers injustice.

What is the remedy? First, a practical remedial measure consists in adopting a more definite method. For example, we should compel a separate assessment of the land from improvements—by actual acreage in the country, and by actual front-footage in the towns. This would at least avoid the loose manner, prevalent in most places, of assessing in the mass.

But secondly, the remedy lies in creating and concentrating a public sentiment, through publicity and education, which will compel assessors to do their duty. In this way the press of the country can perform a great economic service.

J. H. DILLARD.

WHY DID THEY LAUGH?

A thousand members of the Chicago Young Men's Christian Association recently listened to an address by William J. Bryan. They laughed incredulously when he told them that he would rather talk about religion than politics. Again they expressed their incredulity in laughter, when he said that he could talk better when he was receiving no compensation. They were still unconvinced when he insisted that he was sincere. And those young men were not hoodlums. They were members of the young Men's Christian As-

sociation—the equals in morality and intelligence of any other body of young men in the country.

What irresistible influence was it that impelled them to laugh in the face of the orator when he said that he could talk with greater satisfaction when he was to receive no compensation, because it was impossible to lose sight of self when one was talking for money?

Subsequently the writer attended, as an invited guest, a meeting of a young men's club, and listened with interest and profit to the reading of two thoughtful and well written essays upon the "Causes of the American Revolution." This meeting was in a city a hundred miles and more from Chicago, the scene of Mr. Bryan's address. After the papers had been read and discussed, and during a lull in the proceedings, one young man remarked, smilingly: "The papers say that Mr. William Jennings Bryan, in an address before the Young Men's Christian Association, at Chicago, said he'd rather talk on religion than to talk on free silver." And this was greeted with a burst of laughter!

But neither were these young men hoodlums. They were the equals, in every good respect, of any other group of young men that could be culled out from the youth of any city in Illinois—or of any other State.

An infinitely tactful lady, who knew (what the first speaker did not know) that an admirer of Mr. Bryan was present, relieved the situation by saying: "I heard Mr. Bryan once, and he impressed me as being a profoundly religious man. The splendid truths he uttered, and his convincing eloquence, reminded me of the great preachers of a generation ago. I should not wonder if he spoke truly when he declared his preference for religious themes."

After a moment of impressive silence, the admirer of Mr. Bryan added: "All really great men are profoundly religious. Theodore Roosevelt frequently preaches from the pulpit, Gladstone loved to expound the doctrines of Christianity. All truly great and sincere men are irresistibly drawn toward the Christ." The lady of infinite tact bowed acquiescence,

and the palpable silence gave unanimous approval.

Now, why did the young men laugh derisively at the thought of Mr. Bryan's declared preference for religious themes, and for neighborly service? The answer is, of course, that they believed him to be insincere.

But another and far more important question arises here, and that question is: Why did they believe him to be insincere?

There are but two answers: Either their minds had been poisoned against Mr. Bryan in particular, by misinformation regarding him, or else their minds had been poisoned against men in general by their knowledge of them!

In either case the thoughtful man will realize that the situation is most deplorable. The fact that young men of the Republican party have been so shamefully deceived in regard to the character of one of the greatest of contemporary Americans constitutes a heavy indictment against those who are guilty of the deception.

Of course not all those who picture Mr. Bryan as an unprincipled demagogue are conscious falsifiers. Persons who themselves possess no moral principles are not likely to recognize moral principles in another. With such, right and wrong are determined by their personal likes and dislikes. And such men are as naturally and inevitably repelled by the lofty ideals of a Bryan, as is the savage by the arts of peace.

Such men it is who poison the minds of unsophisticated youth against every good man whose efforts at social reform meet with a sufficient measure of success to attract their attention. It was such as they who, unable either to understand or confute the doctrines of the Nazarene, sought to turn the force of popular superstition against him by suggesting Beelzebub as the source of his power.

In Mr. Bryan's Chicago speech he gave utterance to the profoundest social philosophy, and to the purest religious sentiments. Not only there and then, but everywhere and at all times he has done the same. Although Mr. Bryan's public life has been a consistent

concrete expression of all this, yet the young men doubted his sincerity! Why?

Is sincerity in public men so rare that its existence in the noblest is doubted? Or is selfishness so nearly universal as to preclude belief in the sincerity of one who declares his satisfaction with opportunities for gratuitous service?

Had the young men's faith in their fellow men been destroyed by the moral poison-mongers of the partisan press, and by the multitudinous revelations of dishonor in both the political and commercial life of the nation? Or (God forbid that it should be so) has the spirit of the times despoiled our young men of the power to appreciate the matchless value of gratuitous service when circumstances demand it?

To what purpose do our college men read history if they fail to become impressed with the universal testimony to the incomparable value of such sacrifice? To what purpose the training of the university if it does not arm the graduate against the false witness of the partisan?

It is fashionable in some quarters to deplore the blind trust of the trade unionist in his leaders; but do not our educated men follow as blindly their partisan leaders?

Either the members of the Chicago Young Men's Christian Association have blindly accepted the false characterization of Bryan by his political opponents, or else they reject his moral philosophy. If their derisive laughter was a spontaneous rebuke to insincerity, then they are manifestly ignorant of the character of a man who has lived in the public view for ten years past—they have permitted their party leaders to deceive them. If their laughter was aimed at the philosophy expressed by Mr. Bryan—that service is the law of progress, and that political platforms should be based on the golden rule—it indicates a moral decadence that is truly startling!

Nineteen hundred years ago Jesus said: "Whosoever would be greatest among you, let him serve all the rest"—and the people could not understand his doctrine.

To-day Mr. Bryan says: "I am happiest when serving my fellow

men without pay"—and they laugh in his face!

We think we know why the people of two millenniums ago rejected this philosophy; but do we know why the people of to-day reject it also?

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CLEVELAND.

Cleveland, June 4.—Mayor Johnson's low-fare and municipal-ownership "outing" yesterday has proved to be a more effective factor in promoting the municipal-ownership movement than its organizers had hoped for. Their hopes had been raised to a pretty high pitch by the expectation of a joint meeting of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, and Mayor Dunne, of Chicago, as representatives of the two cities in which that movement has taken most advanced shape. This expectation was chilled by the inability of Mayor Dunne to leave Chicago in time to keep his appointment. But Mayor Dunne's guest, Mr. Dalrymple, the manager of the municipal traction system of Glasgow, who attended at Mayor Dunne's request, made two casual remarks in his speech which, owing to their fatuous exploitation by the local traction interests, have furnished the low-fare and municipal-ownership advocates with some of their best material.

Quite in a casual way, Mr. Dalrymple remarked that less than five-cent fare would be quite impossible with universal transfers. This incidental remark was taken up, after the usual manner of American newspapers, and made much of, as if it had been the central point of Mr. Dalrymple's speech. All the changes were rung upon it, by means of labored editorials, interviews with beneficiaries of traction privileges, etc., to make it appear that this visiting expert was opposed to Mayor Johnson on the subject of low fares.

Also in a casual way Mr. Dalrymple said that municipal ownership in order to succeed must be divorced from politics; and this remark was exploited as the judgment of a municipal ownership expert against municipal ownership where city government is influenced by politics.

In order to emphasize the importance of these remarks, great stress was laid upon Mr. Dalrymple's transcendent qualities as an expert in the management of the municipally owned traction lines of Glasgow. Consequently, the fact is more widely advertised in Cleveland to-day than anything else could have advertised it, that Glasgow has a municipally owned traction system, and that it has long been in successful operation—in every way su-

perior to the privately owned systems of the same country.

On the face of it Mr. Dalrymple's two statements noted above seem to the unthinking to be adverse to the low-fare and municipal-ownership movement.

Had this been otherwise, they would not have been exploited, and the occasion would have been allowed to pass as an ordinary political picnic. But that neither of them is in reality at all embarrassing a moment's thought will show.

That spoils politics must be kept out of municipal business is universally insisted upon by municipal ownership advocates. One of the prime arguments for municipal ownership and operation of traction service is that it is necessary to drive politics out of that service. The greatest political corruption of our cities to-day is directly traceable to the hand which municipal service corporations take in city politics. Mr. Dalrymple's statement on this point is therefore a welcome admonition to us, to get rid of political corruption in municipal government by getting rid of public service corporations.

On the subject of low fares, it is not remarkable that so good a traction expert as Mr. Dalrymple should make the mistake of supposing that universal transfers would necessitate five-cent fares, for he has no expert knowledge regarding transfers, transfers not being in use with him. He is opposed to transfers, as is every intelligent traction expert; for they operate to give some patrons more than their money's worth and others less. But he neither knows nor pretends to know, from experience, that universal transfers would necessitate five-cent fares. On this point he is flatly contradicted by the action of the president of the Cleveland system, who offers universal transfers with a four-cent fare. If transfers are impossible on a five-cent basis how can the present company give them on a four-cent basis?

But whatever may be the worth of Mr. Dalrymple's testimony on a point regarding which he is not an expert and does not speak from experience, there is no doubt of its value on the points regarding which he does speak from experience. And the value of this testimony is enhanced by the good character and ability as an expert which the Cleveland traction interests have given him in order to throw a glamour about his incidental remarks which they interpret in their own favor.

The real substance of Mr. Dalrymple's speech here was a strong endorsement of municipal ownership and operation with low fares. On these points he spoke from experience.

He said that the average cost per passenger in Glasgow is less than one-cent, and that the average fare per passenger is less than two cents. It is true that wages are lower in Glasgow, as are some other expenses. But all told these expenses are not 40 per cent. less, and to offset that lesser cost the expense of furnishing a seat to every passenger must be considered. There are no "strap hangers" in Glasgow. Nevertheless, the average cost per passenger is less than one-cent and the average fare is less than two cents.

So Mr. Dalrymple stated, and he is borne out by the official reports. By vouching for him as an expert, the traction interests save the other side all necessity for proving his competency as a witness, and the substance of his speech will live and agitate for low fares and municipal ownership long after his incidental remark about transfers—a remark not drawn from his experience but exploited by the traction interests, although their own management disproves it—has been forgotten.

Local politics are getting ready to boil. The gubernatorial campaign is on. Gov. Herrick has been renominated by the Republicans and the Democratic convention is to meet in a few days. Herrick has made himself very unpopular, even in his own party. Cox, of Cincinnati, has succeeded Hanna as State boss. Leading Democrats in different parts of the State are confident of defeating Herrick. This may be hoping for too much.

But the effect in Cleveland is marked. Johnson will doubtless be the Democratic candidate for reelection as Mayor, and there is no observable indication of any possibility of his being defeated at the polls. Republicans, plutocratic Democrats, the agents of corporations, all concede his reelection, and the democratic Democrats are confident. When the Republicans abolished Spring elections they expected to sweep Johnson under by mixing the vote on State officers with that on local officers. But now they fear that the effect will be reversed. Instead of being swept under by a Republican avalanche for State officers, Johnson is likely to sweep the Republicans under by a Johnson avalanche for city officers.

L. F. P.

NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, June 8:

Dissolution of the Swedish-Norwegian Union.

Norway has declared her union with Sweden dissolved, and re-