

The consolidation into one party of those of us whom Mr. Taft calls "socialists," for a battle royal with his remnant of the Republican party, is a welcome possibility. The sooner it comes the better. And when it does come let Mr. Taft be thanked for his Michigan speech as a factor in hurrying it on.

+ +

Public Service by the Wealthy.

In an educational address, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, one of the very wealthy citizens of Chicago, has made some sensible observations regarding the notion which has had considerable vogue, that the rich are trustees of their wealth for the common good. No doubt this fanciful notion is soothing to the overwealthy when they measure the comparative dimensions of needles' eyes and camels; but Mrs. Blaine thoughtfully questions it, saying, as she is reported in the newspapers:

If an individual has special powers of doing for the community by wealth giving does he not therefore instinctively feel relieved of other civic duties which he otherwise would necessarily feel he shared with all of the community? And by a certain wealth giving which satisfies his sense of duty, does he not unburden himself of those other civic duties? Again, if an individual justly feels that he is not able to give wealth in what seems to him an adequate proportion, does he not instinctively identify civic duty with that act, and, feeling that his hands are full with what are his own manifest responsibilities, leave it all to the other one who can? My question is whether the individuals who make up the state do not largely buy for themselves immunity from the essential civic responsibilities by the purchasing power of their own wealth giving or some other person's? Again, in amounts gained the enormous sums even that our multimillionaires can persuade themselves to part with are fragmentary compared with what the state might have by evenly, proportionately, and certainly collected sums from all of its citizens.

The suggestion that a proportionate tax be collected of all, regardless of whether they earn their incomes or somebody else earns their incomes for them, will not bear scrutiny; but the faultiness of this suggestion is offset by the good sense and civic spirit of Mrs. Blaine's criticism of the Lord and Lady Bountiful theory of public duty.

+ +

Mrs. Young's Triumph.

When the elementary teachers of the Chicago public schools joined spontaneously in celebrating Ella Flagg Young's successful administration as superintendent (vol. xii, pp. 745, 756, 901, 1144) with a reception at the Auditorium last week they paid her the best possible kind of tribute and one that she had abundantly earned. This distin-

guished educator and efficient administrator—the first woman in the United States to be entrusted with public functions of so high an order on so large a scale—has in one year rescued the teaching service in the Chicago public schools from the baffling demoralization with which for years prior to her appointment it had been pestered. Nor was the splendid reception her teachers gave her either perfunctory or a study in fawning, as such demonstrations are too apt to be. The spontaneity and enthusiasm of the tribute was unmistakably genuine. And there was a reason for it. Mrs. Young has established in the school system of Chicago the educational policy of leadership, in place of the business policy of drivership, which had preceded her appointment and was coincident with the long drawn out demoralization of the teaching force. This is the secret of her success. Never before have the teaching force of all grades—elementary and high school teachers, and the principals over both—been so completely co-operative in spirit and action as in ten months they have come to be under Mrs. Young's official leadership. In that respect it is doubtful if any other large school system in the country equals that of Chicago at this time. It is a striking demonstration of the superiority of the educational over the factory method of public school administration.

+ +

A National Health Department.

Mrs. Coonley Ward's paper on the proposed department of health in the Federal government (p. 495), which appeared in a recent issue of *The Public*, has evoked both approval and criticism, and from sources that are alike democratic. Those who criticize opposition to this project call attention to the fact that men of truly democratic interests and purposes are supporting the project and that the Senatorial leader in its behalf is Senator Owen. We may say that we have confidence in the democracy of this Senator, and also of others whose names are called to our attention as supporters of the measure. But as to one of the important facts we have as yet had no light—or rather, the light has all shone in one direction. We see no refutation of the charge that the movement for this national health department is supported exclusively—so far as medical support is concerned—by one school of physicians, and this a school which has a long record for professional bigotry. The essence of the opposition to the proposed national department of health is not altogether an objection to such a department. It is to the probability that under the circumstances the

department would be controlled by leaders of the "regular" school of doctors.

+

If this would be the result, the project is full of menace. What could be more menacing than a national health bureau dominated by one school of physicians and with the despotic powers which such bureaus are conceded by the Supreme Court to have. It is bad enough to realize that the immigration bureau may arbitrarily exclude from the country any citizen returning from a foreign trip, with no power in the courts to interfere (pp. 388-90), but what if like powers were conferred upon a narrowly orthodox school of physicians?

+

Whether there should be a national health board may be a debatable question. But in our view, there is no room for debate upon a question of virtually turning all the powers of the Federal government regarding the public health over to one school of medical practitioners. If this question is involved in the matter, the fact that men who would not be in sympathy with such a purpose favor this project makes no difference. It would not be the first time that democratic intentions had played innocently into the hands of autocratic purposes. Is that question reasonably involved or not? is the test. And if it is not, how does it happen that no organizations of physicians other than those of the old school are promoting the project?

+

On the question of having a national health department with any greater powers than such as are necessary for general sanitation as distinguished from personal treatment, it does not seem to us that those persons who are asking for it have the stronger side of the case. Imperial standards of medical orthodoxy controlled by a Federal bureau which, like other Federal bureaus, would be an absolute dictator over all matters within its jurisdiction, would be approximately as objectionable as imperial standards of religious orthodoxy under similar control.

+ +

"Barbarous Mexico."

Readers of the American Magazine who became deeply interested in John Kenneth Turner's articles on "Barbarous Mexico" (vol. xii, pp. 982, 1058, 1077, 1244), have been puzzled at their sudden and unaccountable stoppage. Mr. Turner's explanation is published in the June 4 issue of the Appeal to Reason, of Girard, Kansas. In sub-

stance it is, to use Mr. Turner's words, because the editors of the American Magazine found themselves face to face with "a power whose might they had misjudged and which threatened to crush them." A publication is promised by the Appeal to Reason of the "Barbarous Mexico" series which the American discontinued.

+ +

Perpetual Franchises.

Bryan's Commoner reports a recent Federal court decision at Omaha which gives promise of putting an end to perpetual public service franchises. The court declared in the franchise under consideration—a grant to the Omaha Electric Lighting Co.—that "even if the Mayor and Council had intended to grant a perpetual franchise to the company they were powerless to do so."

+ + +

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS.*

One of the historic law firms of the older New York was Coudert Brothers—"Coodair," as the name was pronounced nearly enough right in the courts and on the street,—and one of the implicitly trusted and highly respected attaches of this firm, as a youth in its prime and in middle life on his return to it after some years of official life in Washington, was Charles Frederick Adams, a man who figured among the earliest disciples of Henry George on the Atlantic Coast.

As a legal practitioner Mr. Adams was unique.

Asked once why he with his admirable abilities and equipment as a lawyer had been content to spend some of the best years of his early professional life upon a salary of only \$1,500 a year, he replied: "The salary I got was not \$1,500 a year; I got—no matter how much,—\$20,000 a year, if you please, and I gave back the difference for freedom to refuse any professional service I objected to."

It was true. If the morals of a case turned over to him for action were repugnant to his scruples of conscience, or the facts impressed him as suspicious, or the law for his side seemed to him to be what lawyers call "bad law," he returned the papers and asked to be excused.

Added to his extraordinary scruples, is a sincere and self-judging modesty which has influenced Mr. Adams to decline opportunities cordially offered him by those concerned, because he himself deemed doubtful his ability to do justice to them. An amusingly characteristic instance of his handling of such a situation occurred once in Wash-

*A portrait of Mr. Adams goes with this issue of The Public as a supplement.