

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1904.

Number 308.

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.

"Why don't you endow a chair in economics at our university?" This identical question was asked a few years ago by a distinguished educator, a man of national fame in his vocation, of a millionaire who had disclosed to him a profound interest in economic subjects.

As the story is true and at the present time instructively significant, it may be worth the telling. To appreciate its value, however, one must understand that the millionaire actor in it was in principle that very rare bird in the millionaire life of America, a democrat of the Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln type.

"Why don't I endow a chair of economics at your university?" returned the millionaire. "Well, I suppose it might be because I haven't much respect for the kind of economics the universities are teaching." But this reply did not divert the "touch" of the educator. "Oh," said he, "that could be easily arranged to suit you!"

Here was a plain intimation to the millionaire that if he would endow a chair in economics he might have any kind of economics taught from it that he preferred. The question of right or wrong, of truth or falsity, of science or bunco, cut no figure. Only the endowment cut any figure. In this instance the endowment was withheld, because the subject of the "touch" had no more respect for that kind of college administration than he had for the regular brand of college economics. But

it is a common thing now-a-days for millionaires who are not democratic to respond with fabulous gifts to the "touches" of pushing educators; and one cannot but wonder whether these gifts may not be made upon some such tacit understanding as the educator of our story proposed. Do these educators assure these donors that in consideration of their gifts the teaching of the favored college will be arranged to suit them?

It is the suspicion that this may be so, which gives to the dismissal of Oscar Lovell Triggs from the faculty of the Rockefeller-Harper university at Chicago its public importance. So far as the public knows, Mr. Triggs may be incompetent. His popularity among the students and his long connection with the university tend to discredit that assumption: yet questions of competency must be determined by trustees—the public cannot decide them. So far as the public knows, the pronounced democratic spirit of the man may have had nothing to do with his dismissal. It may be that all of us would approve the action of the trustees were we apprised of the facts which the trustees withhold. And whether we would or no, we should all be inclined to say that the responsibility is upon the trustees, and so long as they are worthy of confidence we must accept their conclusions not only as necessarily final but as presumably just. But there's the rub!—that question of confidence. How can the public be confident that Mr. Triggs has been dropped for legitimate educational reasons? How can the public be confident that he has not been dropped in pursuance of some understanding that the teaching force and spirit of the Chicago university shall be "arranged to suit" Mr. Rockefeller?

It is because they reasonably excite suspicions like these that lavish gifts to colleges from the millionaire beneficiaries of rich and rare legal privileges are peculiarly dangerous to the educational interests of a democracy. Such gifts tend to undermine public confidence in the management of the educational institutions upon which they are bestowed. The Chicago university is an example. Notwithstanding the value of the work that this university has done and is doing; notwithstanding the attitude of bold and intelligent defiance to plutocracy which some of its professors maintain as citizens, and the democratic spirit of their teaching; yet there is a well-defined and entirely excusable feeling abroad that when one of these manly professors is dropped from the faculty, the reason is more likely traceable to some arrangement with Mr. Rockefeller than to sound and sincere educational considerations. And so would it be with the University of Nebraska should President Andrews succeed in his arrangements for "touching" Mr. Rockefeller in its behalf. This whole regime of plutocratic paternalism is bringing the administration of American educational tendencies into scandalous discredit.

There is no mistaking the signs of a revival of the movement to force Grover Cleveland's nomination (pp 549, 553) upon the Democratic party. Mr. Cleveland's friend and adviser "Dan," whose surname is Lamont, is reported to be firm in his demand for Cleveland and nobody but Cleveland. Tammany Hall, now under the control of the Rockefeller financial interests, has virtually declared for Cleveland. Strong Republican influences, financial in character, have long had the Cleveland trend; and now that Hanna is