

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1903.

Number 252.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

"No gun was ever fired in war," said Gen. MacArthur, in a speech at a Chicago banquet this week, "without contributing to the happiness of mankind." Could revolting devil worship go further?

A "protective committee" has been voluntarily founded in Chicago to adjust the traction question. It is composed of owners of the voluminous watered stock of the existing companies whose franchises are about to expire. One would have no difficulty therefore, in concluding what this "protective committee" will try most strenuously to "protect."

Senator Teller was nominated in the Colorado legislature for reelection by a woman member—Mrs. Alice M. Ruble. What a desecration of womanhood, wifehood, and motherhood! Think of this unsexed woman spending in political turmoil the time she ought to be giving to her abandoned home and her neglected children! Does she not offer a fine text for a sermon against the performance of civic duties by women? She would, indeed, if the Associated Press, when reporting her nominating speech, had not incautiously said of her:

She is a devoted mother, and her home is a model of coziness and comfort. She is idolized by her children.

In connection with the trust question much has been made in certain quarters of the difference between "good trusts" and "bad trusts," the principal purpose of which seems to have been to secure immunity for the "bad ones" in consideration of the great merits of the "good ones." One

of the jugglers has now gone a step farther. While advocating "publicity" with tremendous vigor, he makes a neat distinction between "public publicity" and "private publicity," the former being as yet, so he says, quite impracticable. Now bring out your shackles, Mr. Roosevelt; cunning is at large.

The restrictive legislation which is pending before Congress for the suppression of trusts is well calculated to make competition in business between the States well nigh impossible. All such legislation tends to intensify the evil it is nominally designed to cure. The trusts are a product of restricted competition; the true remedy for them, therefore, is freer competition. The perfect remedy would be free competition. It is not competition but strangled competition that has made a burning question of industrial problems.

Some statesmen from the South seem wholly unable to realize that the time has gone by when the civil and political rights of any man can be made to depend upon the color of his skin. They are as obtuse about human rights in relation to color as are many Northern men about those rights in relation to dollars. Consequently they fail to distinguish between the right of a Negro to meet them socially in their homes, and his right if otherwise eligible to go to an official reception at the White House. It is no one's right to intrude upon another in his home, no matter how arbitrary the standards of eligibility may be. But when official receptions at the White House are given, the fact that an officer of the government happens to be a Negro is no bar. The White House belongs as truly to Negroes as to white men, for all are American citi-

zens. In insisting upon this principle, President Roosevelt, no matter whether his motives are high or low, is making a true exemplification of the American ideal. Of course the statesmen to whom personal association with Negroes in any other relationship than that of master and servant is offensive, are at liberty to stay away from White House receptions which Negroes attend. So long as their resentment retains that form they are within their rights. Yet one may inquire curiously how such men, claiming to be Democrats, define their democracy.

Congressman Shafroth strikes a true note when, referring to the arbitration treaty over the Alaska boundary, he says: "Our title is so perfect that we can afford to submit to arbitration the question as to ownership." In those words is more wisdom than appears upon the surface, though on the surface also they are wise. It is not just claims, but unjust ones, that nations shrink from arbitrating. It is to be hoped that Mr. Shafroth's view, and not that of the jingoes who are saying that we have nothing to arbitrate and ought to hold fast and fight unless Canada lets go, will prevail in American sentiment. Mr. Roosevelt's administration has this arbitration treaty to its credit, and the credit should be cordially given. Every such treaty is one more spike driven home in Gen. MacArthur's "beneficent" war guns.

Between the Teachers' Federation of Chicago and the Civic Federation of the same city, a conflict is developing over a proposed legislative reorganization of the Chicago public school system. The bill providing for the change was drawn by the Civic Federation and is understood to be satisfactory alike to the present school board, the superintendent, and vari-

ous tax-dodging interests; while, on the other hand, it is manifestly unsatisfactory to those of the teachers who support the Teachers' Federation.

—

This bill would establish a school board of nine, to be appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council. They would hold office in groups of three for three years each, but be removable by the mayor upon proved charges. The superintendent would be appointed by the school board, and after a satisfactory probation of two years hold office for five years further; subject, however, to removal by the board upon charges. He could sit and speak in the board and its committees, but not vote; and he would have supervision of the whole school system, though under the potential check of a veto by the board. All subordinates would be appointed, promoted, salaried, and transferred or dismissed after a hearing, by him, his action being final unless disapproved by the board at or before its second meeting after his report, within which time subordinates transferred or removed might claim a hearing before the board. Absolute power over certifications of competency for teachers for three successive years would also be reposed in him; and he would be authorized, though not required, to consult assistant superintendents, principals and teachers relative to educational and other school affairs. Many other provisions are contained in the bill, but this recital is sufficient to indicate its general character and spirit.

—

In opposition to this bill, objections are raised by the Teachers' Federation: first, that the bill proposes to take the control of the public schools away from the people of Chicago and vest it in the State legislature, being thus defiant of the principle of home rule; second, that it confers on the superintendent power belonging naturally to the whole teaching force; third, that this is done for the purpose of suppressing

the influence of the foreign element in the citizenship of Chicago; and, fourth, that it is intended as a step in the direction of disfranchising that large number of heavily-taxed citizens who, because they are not rich and pay their taxes indirectly, are commonly spoken of as "non-tax payers."

—

We defer comment upon all these objections, with the exception of the second, which we shall only briefly consider. This objection rests upon a true principle, namely, that the teaching force in a public school system should be a consultative body. And it should be such, not at the mere whim of the superintendent, leaving him to pick and choose individuals for consultation and thus encouraging him to build up a machine by "playing favorites," but in a regular, orderly, open and dignified manner, to the end that the superintendent may be either directly controlled by the deliberate decisions of the teaching body as a whole, or subjected to full responsibility before the public for ignoring their advice. To deny the correctness of this principle of school government comes with ill grace from those who object to the trade union organization among the teachers on the ground that teachers belong to a "liberal profession." The members of a liberal profession who are nevertheless deemed fit only to obey orders abjectly without consultation, need not be especially vain about the liberal character of their profession.

—

Quite irrespective of the objections raised by the teachers, some general observations may be of value. Observance of a few simple principles of government, principles which only autocrats on the one hand or anarchists on the other can logically object to, would place the management of the public school system upon a sound basis; and these can be considered quite regardless of the conflict between the Chicago Teachers' Federation and the advocates of the Civic Federation school bill. In

the first place, the plain difference between legislative and executive functions should be distinguished at every point. The one prescribes policies; the other carries them out. As to the first, the legislative function, there should be consultation, which tends to secure combined wisdom, though at the expense of divided responsibility. As to the second, the executive, there should be no division of responsibility, but unimpeded one man power. Applying this principle to public schools, the general policy of the system—the character and scope of the studies, the standards of competency, etc.—would clearly fall within the legislative category, and ought to be determined by a deliberative body. Whether this were a school board, or the teaching force, or a committee of the city council, would make no difference so far as the principle now under consideration is concerned. But the legislative policy having been thus fixed, the power to administer should be vested in one person, and he should be absolute, yet responsible to the appointing power. In the next place, the legislative power should be subject to popular control, by some mode of initiative and referendum which could be invoked upon occasion; and though the executive need not be directly responsible to the public, he should be responsible to the mayor, in whom should be vested powers of removal as well as appointment, and thus himself be made responsible to the people for the faithful administration of the school system. A reasonable degree of deference to these two general principles—distinction of legislative and executive functions, and responsibility to the people—would secure an effective and economical (not cheap, but economical) school system.

—

But the Civic Federation's school bill utterly ignores both principles. It obscures the difference between legislative and executive functions, by empowering the superintendent to legislate as well as execute so long as the school board withholds

its veto, and by empowering the board to interfere with both legislation and execution whenever moved thereto. On the point of responsibility, also, the bill is open to grave objection. It divides responsibility with so much complexity of powers and checks upon powers that no one could be held to account for bad management. The mayor could not be so held; for when he once appoints the board members he loses effective control over them. The board could not be; for they are nine in number, each of whom can accuse his colleagues; and while they could check the superintendent, they could not command him. The superintendent could not be held to any degree of responsibility to the people, for while he might initiate, the board could check and worry him. And so it would go. The mayor could throw the responsibility upon the board; the board members upon each other and the superintendent; and the superintendent back again upon the board; while the teaching force would be a body of obedient nonentities more anxious to know what would please the superintendent or the board and secure permanency of tenure or promotion in place, than to promote the usefulness of the schools. Taken all in all, the Civic Federation school bill is about as vicious a piece of school legislation as could well be devised at this stage of municipal progress. With a good superintendent and a docile board, the system it would establish might work fairly well, until the teaching force had withered with dry rot. But if the board were to select a bad but politic man (and there is nothing in the bill to interfere with its selecting the worst political heeler in Chicago), the Chicago school system could be made a prey to "politics" of the basest sort.

The insincerity of the Republican leaders in Congress, regarding the trust question, was cleverly exposed recently by Congressman Sulzer, of New York. It was in connection with the new cabinet department of

commerce and labor. Labor organizations have long been trying to secure a labor secretary in the President's cabinet. This the Republicans are unwilling to concede. But as the matter is pressed and bids fair to divert the labor vote, they have cooked up a bill providing for a cabinet secretary of "commerce and labor." Obviously this secretary is to be a "business" man. The commercial interests would not tolerate a "labor" man for such a post. Consequently the "labor" interests will be looked after under the "commerce and labor" bill by "business" leaders. Over this happy adjustment of conflicting industrial interests, the Republicans are boasting about their practical demonstrations of love for the dear "laboring man." But in framing their "commerce and labor" bill they have conveniently omitted to provide for any check upon trusts, a subject over which the contemplated cabinet officer might reasonably be expected to have jurisdiction. Not a line gives any indication of a disposition to "shackle cunning," though the bill is a highly appropriate one for that purpose. Even the favorite administration idea of "publicity" is ignored. Therefore Mr. Sulzer moved as an amendment that there be in the proposed department a bureau of corporations to which every corporation doing an interstate business should be required to make reports of its condition. Though there was no objection from the Republican side of the House, either to the character or the form of the amendment, every Republican voted against it. Their reasons were not stated, but the inference is strong that while they do much talking about "publicity" and "shackling," they are under such peculiar obligations to the powerful trusts that they dare not take hostile action of any kind, not even of the kind they profess to advocate. Mr. Sulzer has now put the matter in such shape upon the record that no other inference is possible.

When the bill to establish a depart-

ment of labor and commerce was before the lower House, as noted above, a remarkable recommendation from labor sources was announced. Congressman Mann, of Illinois, who supported the bill, explained that he had "sent to the Chicago Federation of Labor, which" he believed to be "the largest organization of labor in the country affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, a copy of the bill as reported to the House and a copy of the report of the committee giving the reasons why the department of labor should be included in the department of commerce and labor, and had that morning received "a reply in the shape of a letter from the Chicago Federation of Labor, stating that they have received the bill and report, that they appreciate the favor of sending them to them, and hope that the efforts to pass the bill will prove successful." Mr. Mann added: "I know of no better instance that can be given of the actual feeling of labor than a letter of this sort from probably the greatest body of organized labor in the country." The remarkable thing about this recommendation is the fact that the labor leaders who gave it, were at about that time being voted out of office as officials of the Chicago Federation by an overwhelming majority, because their fidelity to their organization was distrusted. These men were Mayor Harrison's "labor" contingent. Some of them held office at the Chicago city hall, some were employed by the street car companies, some were on the pay rolls both at the city hall and at the street car offices, and altogether they were a nest of labor "fakers," counting themselves into office as labor leaders at every Federation election and serving the Harrison political machine and the street car monopoly between times.

A "labor leader" outfit has come to be regarded as part of the recognized equipment of political and monopoly rings; and the surface signs indicate that Tom L. Johnson has run up against an equipment of this kind with which Senator Hanna has