

association of that city. This association, of which nothing has heretofore been published in our country, was organized in 1902 with 24 members. In 1903 the membership had increased to 407 and in 1905 to 550. Its work has consisted in circulating literature, providing copy for the newspapers and magazines, and promoting single tax lectures. What must be even more encouraging to single taxers than the existence of so large a society in Denmark where the agitation is spontaneous, is the fact, for which "Ret" vouches, that the monthly magazines and weekly newspapers of Denmark open their columns readily and gladly to single tax contributions. The daily papers, however, are more cautious. Although they do not reject, they hesitate. The George idea seems so simple and plausible that they apparently harbor discreet fears that in some mysterious way it may be dangerously "loaded."

Juries in Criminal Trials.

Secretary Taft's attack upon the institution of trial by jury, in his address to the graduating class of the Yale law school on the 26th, affords another indication of the plutocratic drift away from popular government and toward government by judges and bureaucrats. True to that judicial instinct which found its most faithful exemplification in the career of Jeffreys, Mr. Taft regards "miscarriages of justice" and acquittals as synonymous terms. Jury trial, therefore, ranks with him as a fetish; and he condemns its adoption in Porto Rico and approves its exclusion from the Philippines. But jury trial in criminal cases is the palladium of personal liberty—and this is no parrot-like encomium. It is the palladium of popular liberties because it reserves to the people themselves, regardless of bribed legislators or class judges, the ultimate power of peaceable resistance to official repression. It operates as a referendum on the execution of every criminal statute. Let jury trial in criminal cases be abol-

ished, or the absolute rights of the jury be curtailed by judges, and personal liberty would soon depend, as it did in the past in similar circumstances, upon the grace of rulers or the mercy of judges.

Hadley's Baccalaureate Address.

Much better advice to young men going out into the world, than that of Mr. Taft to the law graduates at Yale, was that of President Hadley to the academic graduates. Dr. Hadley graphically distinguished the pharisee, who prides himself on his devotion to rules and observances, from the man who tries to govern his conduct by principles—him who keeps the letter of the law and kills the spirit from him who adapts the letter to the spirit. Noting the external fact that the breaking of one rule is demoralizing to the whole system of rules with those who place their trust in keeping the letter of the law, Dr. Hadley enlarged upon the vastly more important consideration of the dangers to character of adopting rules of conduct in stead of principles of life for guides. "Even if no emergencies or crises arise," he said, "which stretch our rules to the breaking point, there is another and more insidious series of dangers which beset the man whose morality and religion are matters of rule alone. The keeping of definite rules produces self-satisfaction; and self-satisfaction is but one step short of moral stagnation." There was in that baccalaureate address more human and civic and religious vitality than there could be in the whole college course without it. To absorb that vitality is not to choose what seems a flowery path to the hopeful but unsophisticated. As Dr. Hadley wisely explained, those who line up with principles of life instead of rules of conduct "will have to fight those who are opposed," and "sometimes be beaten, which is bad enough;" they will be "misunderstood by those who should be on" their side, "which is worse;" they will make mistakes of their own "in judging where the right

really lies, which is worst of all." But "through defeats and misunderstandings and mistakes," said he, "you will all the time be growing into something larger than you were before," whereas "if you choose the part of the pharisee, you will probably get something of the success which you desire, but in the very process of getting it you will become constantly narrower and meaner." How infinitely superior and more optimistic is that kind of admonition to the college graduate than the adjurations to strive for an ignoble success which in recent years have been the staple of college addresses.

Municipal Government in Ohio.

Another of Lincoln Steffens's exposures of civic corruption appears in McClure's for July. It bears this significant title: "Ohio: A Tale of Two Cities." No one need be told that the two cities are Cleveland and Cincinnati; nor will anyone familiar with the facts be surprised at the assurance that Cincinnati under Boss Cox is the worst, while Cleveland under Mayor Johnson is the best-governed city in the United States. Friends and imitators of Senator Hanna are outraged in their minds at Mr. Steffens's candor in dealing with the career of that "man of brains not of mind;" but the facts Mr. Steffens presents are indisputable and the inferences unevadable. There is no denying this pen portrait: "You can't understand the American people and the United States without seeing Hanna, as he was—good and bad, a delight and a danger, a business man in politics, a business man who dominated a city, became United States Senator and the boss of a State, became national head of the dominant national party and was the choice of big business and bad machine politics for the President of the United States." Boss Cox seems to be a worthy successor to Mr. Hanna as State boss of Ohio Republicans. Hanna's civic philosophy, as Mr. Steffens describes it, was "a government of the people

by politicians hired to represent the privileged class;" and the chief difference between Hanna and Cox is that Hanna came down from the privileged class to hire politicians, whereas Cox goes up to the privileged class to be hired.

Naturally Mr. Steffens approaches his report of conditions in Cleveland under Mayor Johnson, "with fear and trembling;" for he went to Cleveland with a ready-made notion, spread by frenzied financiers, that Mayor Johnson was "a dangerous theorist with a dangerous ambition;" but after long and painstaking investigation he concluded "that Tom Johnson is the best mayor of the best-governed city in the United States." Why he approached the disclosure of this optimistic fact with fear and trembling is easily explained. He had already learned that the "cheerful idiots who think themselves optimists" because they want investigators of conditions to "find something good now and then," really do not want to see the good where it exists; they want to be told of it where it doesn't exist. Mr. Steffens's fears, however, are not his most pronounced characteristic; and as of Folk, La Follette, and Garvin, so of Johnson, he tells the truth even if it does disturb the frenzied financiers and their "optimistic" hangers-on. An intelligent statement of the details of Johnson's career—not as just to Johnson in its earlier stages as the facts demand, yet as just perhaps as could be expected of any disinterested narrator who approaches the subject judicially but under the shadows of a hostile prejudice,—is concluded by Mr. Steffens with this acute summary: "Tom Johnson is the 'business man for mayor' that business men have been prophesying so long must come along some day to give us a 'good business administration of a city government;' and, now that he has come, Business hates him because he has given Cleveland not only good government, but representative government; not only clean streets, but

clean tax lists; he has stopped not only blackmail, but bribery; he tackled not only low-down petty police and political graft, but high-toned, big, respectable, business graft, both legitimate and illegitimate. Tom Johnson is a reformed business man. His reform began at home; he reformed himself first, then he undertook political reform; and his political reform began with the reform of his own class. And that is Tom Johnson's sin."

The Merit System of Civil Service.

In explaining its decision in a case recently before it, the Chicago Civil Service Commission confirmed our views (vol. vii, p. 773) as to the importance of protecting the civil service from abuses at the removal as well as at the appointive end, if a merit system is to prevail. It construes the Illinois law as contemplating—the complete and absolute protection of the employe while in the service of the city against any kind of political influence calculated to make any employe in the service feel he is in any way responsible to any political party or any person or persons connected with any political party. Unless the employe in the classified service of the city can feel that he holds his position solely as the result of his own merit and by virtue of his continued good service while in office, the civil service law does not afford to that employe the protection which the law contemplates. A certain indisposition of the present Commission to act strictly in accordance with this principle is to be regretted. Its tendency to defer to the wishes of heads of departments in approving removals is not well calculated to make the employe "feel that he holds his position solely as the result of his own merit and by virtue of his continued good service," but quite the contrary. The inevitable effect of such a practice is to foster among public employes an impression that they must keep their political "fences" in repair or lose their jobs.

Attacks Upon the Teachers' Federation of Chicago.

Persons with short memories may suppose that the attack made last week (p. 177) upon the Teachers' Federation by certain mem-

bers of the Chicago school board and certain newspapers was made for pedagogical reasons, and merely because the federation of teachers is affiliated with the Federation of Labor. But whoever recalls the origin of the Teachers' Federation, and the history of its fight for six years or more against the tools of the corporations—from the traction companies down to the Standard Oil University—will readily understand that the motive, so far from being pedagogical was fiscal, and that the offense, so far from being the affiliation of the teachers with the Federation of Labor, was their hostile attitude toward the tax-dodging interests whose sordidness has for years been strangling our public school system. The identical bitterness and substantially the same arguments which characterize the present fight against the Teachers' Federation, ostensibly for affiliating with the Federation of Labor, characterized the tax-dodgers' fight against them when they were exposing tax-dodgers in the courts four years before they affiliated with the Federation of Labor. The present objection to this affiliation took the form at that time of an objection to their concerning themselves at all with questions of taxation.

The argument against their affiliating with the Federation of Labor is on its face as puerile as at bottom it is insincere. The pretense is that such an affiliation is a participation of public employes who serve all classes, in a class struggle with one class against another. This is not true. The ideal of labor federation is to draw no line between different classes of laborers. Its ideal is to distinguish between laborers and parasites, and surely it is not a teachers' function to regard parasites as in a class to be respected. All laborers are not in the Federation of Labor, and all parasites may not be out of it, but its ideal is to draw the line between workers on the one hand and drones and grafters