

we beg to give is that, from present appearances, the abrogation of that rule may not improbably result in Hearst's election on the first ballot, or at any rate before his line breaks in favor of a worthier candidate.

The Cleveland "patriots" alone have made Hearst possible and are now augmenting his strength. Why do they not meet the Hearst movement with a democratic opposition instead of a Grover Cleveland opposition, if party harmony and not personal plunder is what they want? It is not for lack of men. There is Gen. Miles, of the District of Columbia. Is his reputation too exclusively military? Then there is John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. Is the party afraid to go into the contest with a Southern Democrat? Then let it come farther North, on the border line, and take up Joseph W. Folk, of Missouri. Must we have a New Yorker in order to get the large electoral vote of that State? Then why ignore Edward M. Shepard. Is Shepard's professional connection with corporations as a practicing lawyer an element of weakness? Then why not Lucius F. C. Garvin. This is not all the list of men who may or may not be first favorites with democratic Democrats, yet whose nomination would not arouse their hostility. These are men upon whom compromise might be made, if that is what the "conservatives" want; and any one of them would be stronger, except in and about the offices of Hill, Harriman, Morgan, et al—than Grover Cleveland himself would be. But compromise is not what the Grover Cleveland contingent wants. What they want is Cleveland and the rich perquisites for plutocrats that would go with another Cleveland administration.

When we remarked that the Democratic party might go farther and fare worse in its search for a Presidential candidate than to Gen. Miles (p. 673), we were criticised by peace-loving friends for recommending a military can-

didate. This kind of criticism strikes us as taking more thought of clothes than of men. From the fact that Gen. Miles has worn a uniform and been all his mature life a military officer, it does not follow that he would be a military candidate. There is more repugnant militarism in one breath of a Roosevelt than in a whole lifetime of a Miles. Mr. Gamaliel Bradford, of Boston, is not famous for love of militarism, yet he advocates Miles. He does so on the express ground that the only great issue before the country to-day is the principle of peace versus the principle of war, and that Miles is our most distinguished representative of the peace principle. For ourselves there are other possible candidates that we prefer to Gen. Miles, but we prefer him infinitely to the two who are just at present in the lead. Aside from our preferences, however, we see no good ground for objecting to any military man who, although he recognizes the possibility of war and its necessity in defense of liberty, believes and declares as Gen. Miles does, that nevertheless "the spirit of peace should be cultivated rather than the demon of carnage."

The Progressives were again overwhelmingly victorious at the County Council election held in London on March 5th. Their representatives number 83 in the new council, as against 84 in the old, while the Moderates and Independents now have a combined vote of 35 as against 34 before. As the only loss of strength which the Progressives suffered was in the defeat of George Bernard Shaw, the brilliant author and opportunist socialist, and as his defeat was evidently due to his championing of Balfour's state church educational bill, the Progressives are virtually in the same position as before the election. The chief significance of this election is its indication that the bitter "patriotism" engendered by the Boer war, which was in progress at the time of the previous election, in 1901, could have had little effect. Lon-

doners appear to have progressed much farther than Americans in divorcing municipal questions from national party policies.

The recent election insures, of course, a continuation of the municipal policies that have made the Progressives strong ever since the creation of the London County Council some twelve years ago. Not only has the city acquired and successfully operated most of the street-car lines, and set about acquiring the London Water Company, but it is grappling, as no city in this country pretends to be doing, with the question of "overcrowding." Millions of dollars are being expended in taking over large tracts of land in the suburbs and erecting small dwellings thereon in such number as practically to found colonies. The Progressive programme calls for a great extension of electric street-car lines on the conduit system, operated by the Council itself; the acquirement of the entire water system; the acquirement of further large municipal estates for municipal cottages; reduction of the number of saloons; refusal of licenses to new music-halls; direct employment of labor; enforcement of trades-union wages with a "moral minimum"; and a persistent pressure on Parliament for the taxation of land-values to meet the cost of these reforms. When this London program is compared with the municipal policy of either of the great parties in any of our large cities except Cleveland, and it is remembered that these things are not merely talked about but are being done, how senseless appears our boast that Americans are the most progressive people in the world.

One of the best suggestions recently made by public school authorities is that of Edwin G. Cooley, superintendent of the public schools of Chicago, for organizing the pupils as citizens of a republic similar to that of the United States and thereby training them in the functions and principles of

citizenship, not merely from books but by actual experience. As outlined in the local press Mr. Cooley's excellent plan of civic education—

contemplates the election of a national house of representatives from the grammar schools, considered as separate States, and the election of senators from the high schools. Each elementary school will send one representative to the national congress, and each high school will send several senators—one or two from each year's class—to the higher branch of the mock national government. The project first contemplates the organization of the national government, and if this miniature United States is found strong enough to hold together without insurrections or political disturbances, the State and city governments will be formed in much the same way. The president and all officers of the different branches of government will be elected by the Australian ballot system, and in every detail the machinery of the national government will be copied. Young women not only will be given the right to vote, but also will carry such titles as "senator," "congressman," and "alderman." The little government will be founded upon the principles of coeducation and equal suffrage. The meetings of the different legislative bodies will not interfere with the regular school work, and enfranchisement as well as participation in the affairs of the governments will be voluntary. The conventions, congress, councils and the State legislature will meet in school halls after school hours on Fridays, as often as is determined advisable. The plan will be brought to the attention of the high school teachers at their next meeting.

Prof. George Baker, of Harvard, puts his finger upon the educational disease when he deplures, as a result too common in college training, the graduation of young men with minds "like a desk with pigeon holes." This is not usually the fault of the student. It is the fault of a scholastic system which mistakes tutoring for education.

In one of the newspaper comments on Prof. Baker's observation, it is said that the "pigeon hole mind" is not peculiar to the college graduate, but is "common to all of us in an age of voluminous literature and of manifold interests and activities." In elaboration of that thought the comment continues:

We take a lot of magazines and newspapers, instead of one or two good maga-

zines and newspapers, and we are surfeited with books on a wide range of subjects. We therefore read none of them thoroughly, and we find we have assimilated nothing. We want to take everything in sight. We scatter. What is needed is more thoroughness and concentration.

That view will not commend itself upon reflection. While every man ought to be concentrated and thorough on some subject or part of a subject, he ought not to lock up his mind in one pigeon hole.

Diffusion of reading, observation and study is a good thing if assimilated; and assimilation depends not so much upon thoroughness, in the sense of completeness, as upon a disposition and ability to relate miscellaneous facts to unifying principles. Every new fact intelligently related, counts for progress in the educative process, no matter what afterwards becomes of the fact. But accumulations of miscellaneous facts upon miscellaneous strings of theory, untested by the original thought of the student, only lumber up the memory and make chattering parrots of beings who might be thoughtful men, no matter how many magazines or newspapers they read nor how wide or superficial the range of subjects they explore.

The greatest lack among college students is lack of that intellectual independence the possession of which tends to make a man, and the lack of which tends to make a parrot; and this lack is no more peculiar to students than to professors and business and professional men. It is a phase of the socialistic trend of the time, one of the phenomena of a state of society in which individuality is tabooed and solidarity is deified. The student who takes his principles from the professor, is like the professor who yields his own perceptions to the standard of his cult, or the preacher who yields his own message to the creed of his sect, or the citizen who yields his own political conscience to the demands of his party boss.

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

Several weeks ago we criticised a speech of Archbishop Quigley, of Chicago (p. 595), in which he had advocated a division of public school funds. For this we are criticised in turn.

The part of Archbishop Quigley's speech to which we excepted was reported in the press as follows:

The State must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority. The State should divide the public school system and maintain a separate system for the minority—separate in the sense of religious teaching. The two systems could be under one control, but in the Catholic division Catholic principles should be taught. This would give the minority an equal chance with the majority. This would be just and equitable, but not satisfactory to the Protestants. The cry all over is for non-sectarian education. The Catholic schools are recognized by the State, but they are not supported by the State because non-Catholics believe that it would be dangerous for the State to support them.

In our criticism of this pronouncement, we said:

We can conceive of nothing better calculated than this to revive in the United States the almost obsolete hatred once vigorously entertained by non-Catholics for Catholics. Moreover, the demand is utterly indefensible from any point of view but that of medieval European ecclesiasticism. The only defense of the public school system is that the State should provide opportunities for secular education, in order that all may have the ordinary educational benefits. Religious education is another matter. If the public school officials try to proselyte Catholic children through unfair teachers or unfair books, that is good ground of complaint. Any fair-minded non-Catholic will acknowledge it as such, and will volunteer his influence to correct the wrong—provided he is not thereby placed in a false position by demands of Catholic dignitaries for public money for church uses. But religious teaching is wholly a private matter. To make it a public matter with reference to one kind of religious teaching would make it so with reference to all kinds. Consequently if one division of the public school system were given over to Catholic teaching it could be logically insisted that the other should be divided up into sub-divisions of Presbyterians, Episcopallians, Methodists, Baptists,