

tion on wool, on the ground that wool raising ought not to be discriminated against in the one-at-a-time process of ending tariff plunder, the sufficient answer is that when you begin to abolish robbery, the first robber you catch is the one to "go for," regardless of all his outcries for a fair deal as between him and his pals.

* *

Taft in Training.

It is evident that Mr. Taft is in full training for the Presidential race of 1912, and that his trainer is a competent person. This may be inferred from the serious newspaper "jollies" that flow steadily out of Washington. But is the trainer a man totally without the sense of humor, or one who has it in high degree? That is something nobody can tell just yet. The newspaper "jollies" point sometimes one way, sometimes the other, and sometimes both. But anyhow he is singularly competent.

* *

Another College Coercion Case.

When college professors are accused of dodging live civic questions, they usually insist that they are under no coercion. Often, no doubt, they think so, and are prudent rather than timid; and sometimes coercion, which seems clear enough to the looker-on and must be felt by its victims, cannot be proved. But here is a case which, without assuming to pass judgment upon it, we submit to the college fraternity of the United States for consideration.

*

The facts we cite are from a statement by R. B. Brinsmade, late professor in the engineering department of the West Virginia University. They were stated by him at the request of the Morgantown Post-Chronicle, as the editor explains, and were published in that paper in its issue of June 15th. Professor Brinsmade was appointed to his chair in the University nearly two years ago. In the middle of the summer vacation of last year the president of the university notified him that the Board of Regents had decided to drop him at the end of the twelve months for which he had been engaged. No reason was given. Upon Professor Brinsmade's request for a reason, however, the president of the Board wrote him as follows, under date of August 9, 1910:

We have no charges to prefer against your conduct or ability, but we have been hoping to find a man who had the magnetism and personal qualities, together with the ambition, to build up the engineering department as it has not been before in our University. We have consulted your students and

visitors, together with some of the faculty and others who were in a position to get an impression of your work, and the consensus of opinion is to the effect that your work is seriously discounted by your active interest in certain economic questions which you discuss to the exclusion of the legitimate work of your classes.

That sounds like a good reason. But the best reasons are bad if not true, and this one seems to have had that defect. The truth about the matter turns out to be that Professor Brinsmade's "interest in certain economic questions," if they "discounted his professorial work" at all, did so not because he discussed them to the exclusion of the legitimate work of his classes, for he did not, but because the Governor of the State disliked the kind of economics he talked about with his fellow citizens when his day's work was over.

*

That Professor Brinsmade was removed in order to "discourage the free discussion of political and economic questions by members of the university faculty," is the openly declared opinion of the Morgantown Post-Chronicle, and here are its reasons: When Professor Brinsmade appeared before the Regents near the end of his engagement last September, he showed the falsity of the charge that he had allowed his economic views to interfere with the work of his department in the University; and then he asked the Board point blank if they believed in the policy of academic freedom for the University. They did. He then inquired if they had any objection to his conducting a class in economics in his leisure time among such as might be interested in Morgantown. They certainly had no objection. He thereupon explained that his chief object in leaving private engineering practice for a State university position was in order that he might work for the best interests of the State as a whole; and after a short withdrawal he was told, on his reappearance, that the Board had been incorrectly informed as to his activities, and had decided to renew his appointment. Professor Brinsmade thereupon continued his university work, and in his own leisure time he organized the "Social Ethics Club" among Morgantown citizens, for the study and discussion of economic and political problems from a non-partisan standpoint. The Club had informal meetings and a monthly banquet after the plan of the "Public Question Club" of St. Louis; and it brought to Morgantown Henry George, Jr., Democratic Congressman from New York City, who lectured to an appreciative audience on the Single tax. Henry George's lecture was on January 6th

On the 28th of the same month the Board of Regents dismissed Professor Brinsmade, long before the expiration of his term.

+

Of that summary dismissal immediately after George's lecture, Professor Brinsmade tells the Morgantown Post-Chronicle that in his opinion "if there is no connection between these two events there is none between a match and a conflagration." He adds that he lays the responsibility not upon the Regents, who were evidently "acting on orders from higher authority," but "upon Governor Glasscock and his accomplices." The Post-Chronicle leaves no doubt of its own editorial opinion. "No one," it says, "who knows anything about present conditions at the University and in Charleston has any doubt that Professor Brinsmade's enthusiasm in promoting the Single-tax propaganda cost him his place;" and as to the Board's "assertion that the Professor had not been successful in 'building up his department,'" it characterizes this as "a ridiculous subterfuge," he "not having had time to show whether he could even make a good beginning at the work of building up the department." Very properly the Post-Chronicle closes its editorial with this comment:

The personal injustice that has been wrought in the case of Professor Brinsmade and in other cases is a small matter in comparison with the injury that has been done to the University itself and the loss of its efficiency in the educational economy of the State. No institution can be a fit place for the education of young Americans in which there is even a suspicion that the men of the teaching force are talking through political muzzles, that they are of an emasculated type of citizenship, incapable of taking a virile part in the practical affairs of government, afraid to speak the truth as they believe it in their hearts. The Brinsmade case should help speed the day when we may hope for the ultimate emancipation of thought and speech in West Virginia University.

+ +

Labor Sluggers.

Good people outside of Chicago, and many such inside, should be advised, as the fact is, that the "labor sluggers" of whom they read so much are not labor-union sluggers. Gangs whose brutal services are at the command of any paymaster, they are frequently hired by employers of labor. Members of this identical gang are reasonably believed to have been employed by detective agencies with anti-union work to do. They were hired by certain Chicago newspapers only recently, to "promote circulation." They did it by slugging news dealers. They were hired to create labor disturbances at Muscatine, Iowa, during the pearl button

strike, in order to make an excuse for calling out the militia to awe the strikers. The men "higher up" in the Chicago slugging are not labor leaders. They are business men and politicians.

+ +

Roosevelt's "If."

Roosevelt's editorial duel with Harrison Gray Otis is one in which the instincts of every intellectually honest reader must be with Roosevelt. Otis is the owner of the Los Angeles Times, whose building was destroyed last fall by an explosion of some kind. Disinterested reports indicated that the character of the explosion was that of one caused by gas. Otis decided, however, as soon as he heard of it, and while miles away, that it had been caused by dynamite used criminally for the purpose by labor unionist agitators—his particular aversion. In the course of several months, certain labor union men were indicted upon charges of having committed that crime. They are now in jail at Los Angeles awaiting trial. The question of whether the explosion was of gas or dynamite is still undecided in their case, and upon its decision their lives may depend. Under these circumstances Mr. Roosevelt published an editorial in The Outlook in which he said: "If the explosion was not an accident, it was an outrage of dastardly iniquity," etc. The italics are ours. We use them for the purpose of emphasizing the word for which Roosevelt is attacked by Otis. Observe, now, what Otis says of Roosevelt's "if." He denounces it editorially as "a distinct aid to the villains who dynamited the Times building"! This conception of a fair trial of men accused of capital crime marks the utter unworthiness of Otis as a citizen. He has been held up by other men to the contempt of fair men, but never so decisively as by himself in that quotation.

+

As one of the two great issues in the charge of crime against those indicted labor union men is whether or not the explosion was by dynamite, and as this issue is yet to be decided by a jury of Los Angeles upon the testimony of witnesses sworn and subject to cross examination, the objection Otis makes to regarding the question as an open one, places him in the lynching class. He does not know, apparently, what law and order means. "If the explosion was not an accident," says Roosevelt, those who did it should be punished. Isn't that true? and isn't the "if" reservation necessary to make it true? But it is "a distinct aid" to the accused, says Otis. Why? Because it lends