

has boasted not a little, was achieved by barefaced election frauds.

There was about the convention of the National Educational association, held in Detroit last week, a flavor of plutocracy which is anything but encouraging. Not that these teachers are themselves rich or hope to be; not even that they are inclined towards the plutocratic ideal of government by and for the rich. But they evidently recognize the drift of things toward plutocracy; and, with only a few exceptions, dare not risk their livelihood by turning their faces against it.

One episode in the conference went to show that the disposition to make educational institutions subservient to plutocratic tendencies is reluctant. President Jesse, of the Missouri university, read a paper in which he declared that it was one of the functions of universities to help the people solve their social and economic problems, to understand taxation, to control corporations, etc. He was asked two questions by President George McA. Miller, of Ruskin college, a Missouri institution, situated at Trenton, which undertakes to enable students to support themselves while acquiring a high grade college education, and professes to treat social problems boldly in the public interest. President Miller asked "to what extent universities and colleges are trying to help the people to a solution of social problems," and whether, if they are neglecting this function, the Educational association can "take any steps looking toward concerted action for a proper observance of it." Replying to these questions President Jesse candidly admitted that he knew of no college or university that is doing any practical work on the line of the solution of social problems. But he shrank from proposing action by the association, because, as he said, it is always a long time after an ideal is presented to the people before they are willing to do any-

thing practical in the way of realizing it. So the matter rested about as President Miller described it, when, in asking his questions, he observed that the attitude of the colleges toward social problems reminded him of George Eliot's Mr. Riley, who "had a good knowledge of Latin in general, but no knowledge of any particular Latin."

Another episode had a similar bearing. William T. Harris, United States commissioner of education, had spoken in optimistic terms of the progress of education in the United States, mentioning, among other encouraging facts, the large increase in the number of schools and in the attendance. Mr. Harris struck a keynote, and, as usual, the docile educators began to sing to his tune. Several arose to say that these statements should send every teacher home satisfied. But there was one teacher present who knows the difference between official statistics and facts. This was Miss Margaret A. Haley, of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, which has been so efficient in exposing the tax-dodging corporations of Chicago. In what the press reports call a "rapid-fire" speech, she wanted to know how increase in the number of schools and attendance could be encouraging "when it could be shown that the amount of money available for schools was declining." Some one, she said, must suffer from this condition. Nor was she in any wise indefinite. She told of the tax dodging in Chicago; and what was even more to the point, she showed how the public domain in Chicago set aside for public school purposes would furnish an abundant revenue if it had not been sold or virtually given away. Miss Haley's line of attack bore heavily upon the plutocratic tendencies that more or less influence our educational institutions; and Mr. Harris, instead of meeting her points, evaded them with an attack upon the city from which she hailed. He called Chicago "the great storm center of the country—the place of tornado, whirlwind and fire," said it "has a morbid tenden-

cy that is always manifesting itself in trying to find something disturbing and threatening to things as they are"—a tendency amounting almost "to a hysterical mania," and declared that "we cannot be influenced by what is going on there." In reply to this somewhat jocular tirade Miss Haley challenged Mr. Harris to debate the sanity of Chicago at a future time and an appropriate place. "If it is morbid," said she, "to look into things and see whether at bottom conditions are sound, then Chicago will not be afraid to be called a morbid city. If it is hysterical to watch not only the evidence of progress, but also to inquire into the ultimate tendency of things, then we are hysterical." Mr. Harris did not accept Miss Haley's challenge. That, however, is of no moment. It makes no difference what opinions may be held regarding Chicago hysterics. The important thing that Miss Haley did was to bring Harris's puerile boasting about school statistics into unfavorable comparison with the plutocratic conditions that threaten the independence of our free school system.

A letter from Prof. Bemis to George C. Sikes, secretary of the Chicago Transportation commission, published in the Chicago papers of the 16th, indicates that the sincerity of Chicago politicians who profess to favor a street car service for the benefit of the people rather than of the corporations, is likely to be brought to a sharp test. Prof. Bemis writes:

My contact with Tom L. Johnson and his deceased brother Albert, and some of the other street railway men associated with them, convinces me that if you can establish the fact legally that the franchises expire in a year or two, and if you can get a city council the majority of whom are prepared to do business without boodle, you can get a proposition for all you want, and a straight three-cent fare besides, although I do not at present undertake to say just who would make the proposition.

The question of expiration of franchises has reference to what is known as the 99-year claim of the Chicago street car monopoly. That question

is now in the courts, brought there by the monopoly itself, and the city authorities ought to be able to push the case to a decision if they want to. The only other point is whether a majority of the board of aldermen can be dealt with without boodle. That goes directly and exclusively to the question of sincerity. There is a point besides, which Prof. Bemis does not mention. His suggestion is upon the basis of a three-cent fare. But Mayor Harrison is opposed to three cent fares, proposing that out of the extra two cents collected from every street car passenger the company shall pay a tax of half a cent (ten per cent. on gross receipts) to the city. The objections to this are obvious. To begin with, it would allow the street car monopoly to tax passengers two cents a ride more than the ride is worth, so as to give the city half a cent a ride. Next, it would maintain a system which would generate competition by tempting the monopoly to undervalue its receipts and to bribe officials in order to facilitate the process of undervaluation. Finally, it would unjustly tax street car passengers. Shop girls, clerks, mechanics, and the like, riding to and from their homes, would be taxed (at two cents a ride besides the fair price of three cents) some \$10 to \$12 a year. Yet Mayor Harrison prefers all this to a three cent fare system; and having that view of the matter he may stand as an obstacle to the plan which Prof. Bemis declares to be feasible upon the two very simple conditions he names.

Perhaps all American believers in the declaration of independence, as they become more familiar with the history of Mr. McKinley's criminal aggression in the Philippines, will be better disposed to sympathize with Gen. Otis's perplexities than to condemn him for his weakness. This is already the view of the Boston Transcript, one of the great papers of New England. Commenting upon the strained relations between Otis and MacArthur which are disclosed

by a recent publication of extracts from their official correspondence, the Transcript significantly concludes:

In his retirement, broken by such invidious publications from his correspondence as that appearing to-day, Gen. Otis might perhaps be pardoned for bitter reflections on what different courses the history-making of which he was so large a part might have taken, had he, on receiving the president's proclamation announcing the enforcement of our possession by conquest, instead of elaborately blue-penciling and emasculating it, in accordance with his ever-conscientious sense of his public as well as his military duty, pocketed it and resigned.

THE DEMOCRACY OF OHIO.

The real fight of the democracy of Ohio this year is on local issues. But both in their news reports and their editorial comments the plutocratic press of both political parties attempt to give it national significance of a sinister sort. They emphasize the fact that the state convention ignored Mr. Bryan and the Kansas City platform, making that appear to be its most important action. One of them, the Chicago Evening Post, a republican paper, frankly says in its issue of the 11th that every "enlightened republican will rejoice and congratulate the Ohio democracy upon its new departure, or, rather, upon its reversion to ante-Bryan doctrines;" and the others express essentially the same sentiment in varying but hardly less guarded phrase.

We have good reason for believing that no deliberate slight to Bryan or the Kansas City platform was intended by the majority of the delegates. Mayor Johnson's associates had gone into the convention with the declared purpose of forcing it to fight a state campaign on the question of local taxation. To that end they confined their energies to the trying struggle in which they found themselves pitted against McLean and the anti-Bryan leaders whom he had brought into the convention. These men represented the Ohio railroad interests as against Johnson's tax reform agitation as devotedly as they represented opposition to Bryan and the Kansas City platform. In that struggle the one demand and constant argument of the Johnson delegates were for a local campaign. This idea

of the Johnson men became the sentiment of a majority of the delegates and secured the adoption of Johnson's taxation planks, of his plan for a referendum on franchises, and of his proposal that hereafter and until federal senators are elected by the people democratic state conventions shall make senatorial nominations.

But the same argument that had been a factor in beating the reactionary leaders surrounding McLean, this democratic argument for a local campaign on local issues, enabled those leaders to influence the committee on resolutions and the convention to ignore Bryan and the national platform.

Since that omission is urged by the reactionary elements of the party as a conclusive indication that the really important outcome of the convention was not the complete defeat of the reactionaries on local democratic policies, but was their assumed triumph in overthrowing Bryan and Bryanism and reverting to old leaders and doctrines, the matter demands consideration. To appreciate the meaning of such a reversion, reference to the more recent history of the democratic party is necessary.

In the first period following the civil war the democratic party was distinguished chiefly by its efforts to get its managers and heelers into office.

It had no principles; or if it had, it kept them well out of sight. Even the good democratic doctrine of state sovereignty, as yet identified with the infamous proslavery cause, received from it only half intelligent and half hearted support. Its righteous and advancing free trade policy of the forties and fifties had been overshadowed by the slavery question, and in the excitement of the war in which that question culminated was forgotten. The democratic idol of this time was a rich New York lawyer who had acquired his wealth by railroad wrecking. He was a fit type of the party at that stage of its history.

This period ended with the first administration of President Cleveland. Mr. Cleveland had been elected not because he represented anything. He was a democrat by tradition, and represented nothing. His victory was merely negative. The corruption of