

water colors and clay which they may freely use. Allow the teacher to take them out of doors at any hour she may wish, taking them to parks and museums for the pleasure and profit of going and seeing, rather than to prepare them to "pass" any particular examination. Let them gain fundamental conceptions of numbers by the use of the rule, handling things, counting, estimating, weighing, measuring, etc. Let them hear beautiful poems recited by the teacher, and allow them to recite them also, but do not force the committing.

One year spent in such occupations and activities will make every six-year-old child in any city stronger, sounder, more beautiful of body, more intelligent, alert, and responsive of mind, and sweeter of spirit, even though he has not learned to read or write or "do" arithmetic. He has learned to think and observe and reason as well as a six-year-old mind is able. The integrity of the nervous system has been preserved and the body improved in every way, and the spirit has been happy and has grown finer and more responsive. Is not this education?

Then why not continue the same general scheme for the second, third and fourth grades, enlarging the scope, and using books as soon as they are needed to explain, verify, or broaden the child's experiences?

The School of Organic Education at Fairhope, Ala., is making an effort to literally meet the demands of the child. No requirements are made in the first six years. No so-called "lessons," no grades, marks, or examinations, no home tasks given.

The children come to school to have a good time—to do things—to find out about things; and incidentally they learn many things. The day is full of activity—singing, playing, working, investigating, observing, story-telling, gardening, using numbers and materials, art work, and nature study. No books are used by children under the tenth year, except as the child himself desires to learn to read. No writing is required, no formal numbers nor spelling. At ten the children begin to use books, learning to read very quickly because the desire to read is strong and the nervous system has been strengthened instead of weakened during the previous years. From ten to thirteen all books—literature, geography, and history—are used *with* the teachers, for the simple purpose of enjoying what the book may contain—never as a task to be learned and recited. Learning the true value of books in this way, with the assistance of a sympathetic teacher, a real love of books is acquired.

Formal arithmetic is begun at ten, and with the growth of the fundamental conceptions attained in the previous years, very little difficulty is experienced.

At thirteen and fourteen regular formal work in the seventh and eighth grade studies is begun, but the children have learned to think and reason, have learned to use books, and are keen to get everything possible from the books, so that there are no real "school tasks" even in the grammar department.

At fourteen or fifteen the children begin high school work. Four years of serious, earnest, enthusiastic—for it will be more enthusiastic than ever if the previous years have been well spent—work in mathematics, science, history, language, and litera-

ture, with gardening, manual training, music and art continued, constitutes the high school course.

No "passing per cent" is required in the high school, but if the work is pursued seriously and earnestly, the youth gets from it all that is possible for him to absorb or digest at that time, and what can be the value of forced study or mental indigestion?

Institutions to be educational must meet the demands of the individual, rather than make requirements which he must meet. An institution has no right to ask, "What do you know?" "What have you done?" "Where are your credentials?" But must ask, "What do you need?" "How may we serve you?" The "standards" of an institution are measured by its service, not by its requirements.

Unless the individual emerges from the institution stronger of body, more intelligent of mind, sweeter and more helpful of spirit, the process has not been educational.

MARIETTE L. JOHNSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, December 19, 1911.

Russian Relations with the United States.

Under the leadership of Congressman William Sulzer of New York, the House of Representatives adopted on the 13th the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the government of the United States concludes its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate, between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg Dec. 18, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of one year after the date of notification to the government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the government of Russia.

The purpose of this resolution was to terminate a

policy of discrimination enforced by the Russian government against Jews with American passports who visit Russia.



Prior to the adoption of the foregoing resolution by the lower House of Congress, its presentation by Mr. Sulzer had precipitated a Cabinet meeting at the White House on the 5th, at which the Secretary of State, Mr. Knox, was directed to advise the Russian ambassador at Washington, George Bagmetoff, that the President would recommend abrogation of the treaty of 1832 unless Russia recognizes the right of American Jews to visit Russia pursuant to the first Article of the treaty, which is as follows:

There shall be between the territories of the high contracting parties a reciprocal liberty of commerce and navigation; the inhabitants of their respective states shall mutually have liberty to enter the ports, places and rivers of the territories of each party wherever foreign commerce is permitted. They shall be at liberty to sojourn and reside in all parts whatsoever of said territories in order to attend to their affairs, and they shall enjoy, to that effect, the same security and protection as natives of the country wherein they reside on condition of their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing, and particularly to the regulations in force concerning commerce.



It should be explained that the Russian government interprets the above Article by a clause of the treaty which makes the sojourn of visitors from either country in the other conditional upon "their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing," and therefore argues that all Russian restrictions applying to Jews living in Russia may be enforced against American Jews visiting Russia. By the American State Department under both political parties it has long been urged that the United States cannot acquiesce in religious tests; but to this point the Russian government responds that it does not exclude all Jews nor act toward any Jews with reference to religious tests. It refers the matter to questions of internal civil order which necessitate barriers to "certain categories of foreigners," thereby bringing the Russian policy within the principle of the American policy of excluding "anarchists." According to an editorial in the St. Petersburg newspaper "Rossia," of the 7th, described as a "semi-official" paper—

the prohibition of foreign Jews, irrespective of nationality, from entering Russia as well as Russian Jews who emigrated without permission, was established by law on March 23 and Aug. 11, 1824. The Russo-American treaty eight years later contains no provision with respect to a modification of the existing law in favor of American Jews. American Jews err in supposing that Russia has introduced new restrictions with regard to them. On the contrary, Russian legislation of 1835-'39 granted admission to certain selected categories. Regula-

tions adopted on March 27, 1891, empower the Russian consul to vise passports of heads of business firms and also their commercial travelers, representatives and clerks without limitation, with respect to admission to the pale and without preliminary sanction by the Minister of the Interior. The passports of other Jews are vised with the sanction of the Minister of the Interior. Thus all Jewish business men and all others engaged in an occupation not regarded as undesirable may enter and reside in Russia for six months. But the sovereign right not to admit undesirables cannot be disputed, and is exercised strictly by the United States itself. Only Jews emigrating through the agency of the Jewish Colonization Society are permanently excluded, in accordance with the rules of March 21, 1892. Of the eleven American Jews applying for a vise during 1910 only three were rejected. The laws for the readmission of foreign Jews cannot be changed as a result of demonstrations of groups of American Jews nor as a result of friendly representations on the part of the United States. The United States government, of course, does not possess the right of interference in the home affairs of Russia. The repeal of the treaty of 1832 has been suggested, but all the disadvantages of such a step would fall upon the United States. Russian customs statistics from 1905 to 1910 show that the Russian exports to America amounted to \$20,500,000 and imports to \$177,000,000. The figures in the Department of Commerce and Labor at Washington put the Russian exports at \$85,000,000 and the imports at \$113,000,000. Furthermore, the American imports into Russia are constantly growing. They amounted to \$20,500,000 in 1905 and \$36,500,000 in 1910. It is to be regretted if the traditional friendly relations between true born Americans and Russians are disturbed.



A mass meeting which demanded the abrogation of the treaty upon one year's notice was held at Carnegie Hall, New York, on the 6th, the speakers advocating abrogation being Senator O'Gorman, Governor Wilson, Speaker Clark, William McAdoo, William Randolph Hearst, Congressman Sulzer, Congressman Francis Burton Harrison and ex-Congressman Bennet. Andrew D. White, former ambassador from the United States to Russia, spoke against abrogation and in favor of inviting Russia to arbitrate at The Hague. He argued that peremptory demands would lead to indignant rejoinders regardless of justice.



Congressman Sulzer's concurrent resolution was agreed to unanimously on the 12th in the House Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he is chairman, and was accordingly reported favorably to the House by him on the 13th. Congressman Olmstead of Pennsylvania then moved to amend so as to make the resolution complain of Russia's interpretation of the treaty instead of charging her with violating it, but this motion was lost by 115 ayes to 184 noes. Thereupon the Sulzer resolution

was adopted without alteration by 300 to 1, the one dissenting vote having been recorded by Congressman Malley of New York. The resolution went at once to the Senate, where it was discussed on the 14th, but without action of any kind.



Meanwhile representations had been formally made on the 16th to the American State Department by the Russian ambassador, to the effect that approval of the Sulzer resolution in its original form as adopted by the House would be regarded by the Russian government as an insult to Russia and be followed by a severance by Russia of all friendly relations with the United States. The President thereupon decided to make a dead letter of the Sulzer resolution by giving formal notice at once to Russia of the desire of the United States to terminate the treaty under a clause of the treaty which provides that it shall continue in force until January 1, 1839, provided that—

if, one year before that day, one of the high contracting parties shall not have announced to the other, by an official notification of its intention to arrest the operation thereof, this treaty shall remain obligatory one year beyond that day, and so on until the expiration of the year which shall commence after the date of a similar notification.



Accordingly on the 18th, President Taft sent to the Senate a special message in which he explained that instructions had been given on the 15th to the American Ambassador at St. Petersburg, in accordance with which "there was given to the imperial Russian government under date of the seventeenth day of December, 1911, official notification on behalf of this government of intention to terminate the operation of the treaty of commerce and navigation of December 18, 1832, between the United States and Russia upon the expiration of the year commencing on the first of January, 1912." Upon the Senate's receiving this message, the Senate committee on foreign relations, of which Senator Lodge is chairman, reported a substitute for the Sulzer resolution. This substitute, after summarizing the terms of the treaty in respect of its duration, proceeds:

Whereas, on the 17th day of December, 1911, the President caused to be delivered to the imperial Russian government by the American ambassador at St. Petersburg an official notification on behalf of the government of the United States announcing intention to terminate the operation of this treaty upon the expiration of the year commencing on the first of January, 1912; and whereas, said treaty is no longer responsive in various respects to the political principles and commercial needs of the two countries; and whereas, the constructions placed thereon by the contracting parties differ upon matters of fundamental importance and interest to each; Therefore be it resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress

assembled, that the notice thus given by the President of the United States to the government of the Empire of Russia to terminate said treaty in accordance with the terms of the treaty is hereby adopted and ratified.

After debate, the foregoing substitute resolution was adopted by the Senate by a unanimous vote.



Election in Arizona.

The election that determines Arizona's Statehood and chooses State officials in case of a popular vote satisfactory to President Taft on the Recall, came off on the 12th. Officials voted for were the Governor, two United States Senators (subject to election by the legislature), one Representative in Congress, several judges, State Senators and members of the lower house of the legislature. Three tickets were in the field with the following candidates: Republican, Edward W. Wells; Democratic, George W. P. Hunt; Socialist, P. W. Galentine. A heavy vote was polled—about 26,000. There was much "scratching" and the exact returns are not yet available, but there was a Democratic landslide. The Recall was modified as President Taft required, by an overwhelming majority. Explaining the result the Chairman of the Democratic State Committee said on the 13th that—

the people of Arizona simply refused to indorse Taft's dictation. While they voted to eliminate the Recall from the Constitution, as they were obliged to do in order to gain Statehood, they showed at the same time that the Recall would be placed back in the Constitution as soon as it possibly could be done.

[See current volume, pages 866, 875, 930, 971.]



Judicial Dictation Defeated.

A successful revolt of a jury against dictation by the judge in a trial before them is reported from St. Louis. It exemplifies an editorial in The Public of December 1, 1911, at page 1211. The suit was over the will of Bridget McDermott. Her daughter, Mary Farrington, brought suit to annul the will in order to acquire certain real estate which under the will had gone to her mother's priest, the Rev. John White, a Catholic. Mrs. Farrington is described as having been a nurse in a lunatic asylum at a salary of \$25 a month, out of which she had saved \$3,000 and bought a home, taking title in her mother's name. Through her mother's will this property went to Father White, and she sued to set aside the will on the ground that her mother had been unduly influenced by him. There appears to have been no direct evidence of undue influence, but the jury were unanimously of opinion that undue influence had been shown by circumstantial evidence. Religious considerations do not appear to have entered into the controversy be-