

1908. Mr. Bryan said the other day in London that there were others besides himself who had claims on the nomination through services rendered Democracy, and mentioned pleasantly Mr. Folk, Mr. Bailey and myself. While appreciating Mr. Bryan's compliment, I must decline to be considered a candidate. Let the list stand, if Mr. Bryan pleases, Bryan or Folk or Bailey. For my part I would substitute Stevenson for Bailey. Mr. Bryan's services to the Democracy are too well recognized to be rehearsed. He has led the party conspicuously in two Presidential campaigns and one senatorial campaign. In national campaigns he has made issues himself and expounded them with brilliancy unequalled, unapproached. Mr. Folk's services to the Democracy are notable and real. In fact, his services have been rendered to all citizens, irrespective of party, for his career as an honest and efficient public servant is an example to Republicans and Democrats alike. As for Mr. Bailey—well, Bailey's services have been rendered to that corporation end of Democracy that I do not consider democracy, and whose control of the machinery of the Democratic as well as of the Republican party has led me to seek my ideals of the democracy of Jefferson and the republicanism of Lincoln in the Independence League. Bailey's nomination for first place, even by the machine that nominated Parker, would be impossible, but Bailey's nomination for second place is conceivable. It would have the material advantage of insuring Texas to the Democracy and of eliciting a substantial campaign contribution from John D. Rockefeller. But its disadvantages are obvious. Folk and Bailey, for instance, would be an oil and water ticket that wouldn't mix—a ticket of good, pure water and Standard oil. Bryan and Bailey would be alliterative and tickling to the ear, but would sound too much like Barnum and Bailey to suit the discriminating taste of the convention. Bailey, I am afraid, must continue to waste his fragrance on the desert air of the Senate. But there is Stevenson of Illinois, than whom there is no finer figure among Democratic statesmen. He stands with Tilden and Thurman, a noble type of true American and old-fashioned Democrat, respected by all men, but neglected in the greed and graft of modern politics. Why not Bryan or Folk or Stevenson in 1908 on the Democratic side, and why not Roosevelt or La Follette on the Republican side? I repeat definitely and positively I am not a candidate. I made the first fight in 1904 for what I considered true democracy, for the democracy I had been taught and the democracy I had believed in, for the democracy that represented the will of the majority and the best interests of the majority. I made the fight against what I honestly believed to be, and still believe to be, the forces of corporation corruption. I offered to lead that fight only when no other would undertake the task. I consider that I did my duty in that contest, but I will never undertake another one in that way. A man's motives are much misunderstood and his purposes much misrepresented if he can be charged with having a personal object to attain. I am, moreover, well pleased, as I am well satisfied, to use the power of my publications to drive out of office the white slaves of the trusts and to promote the fortunes of the honest servants of the people, and I cannot do this as effectually if I am mixed up in purely party politics. In the political fair, wherever I see a trust-owned head I am going to hit it, no matter what party it is said to belong to. I have been hitting the corporation crown of Mr. Tom Taggart, best known as a gambling-house keeper, and after that as chairman of the national committee, and am glad that the Governor of Indiana has just ordered the Attorney General to proceed against Mr. Taggart for maintaining a gambling den and that the sheriff has raided his establishment. I have been hitting the head of Mr. Guffey of Pennsylvania, a gentleman who is a politician in business and a Standard Oil agent in politics. I am glad to see that the sincere Democrats of Pennsylvania have repudiated Mr. Guffey and have united with the Lincoln Republicans in an honest effort to represent the people. I think that I am doing a work that is of value to my fellow-citizens and I am content. I do not say that I will not run for any office, for I am willing to run, as I did last fall, to break up a political trust, a criminal combination between both parties, or to help defeat those wretched little political sneak thieves that are lifted into the open window of public office by the corporations to pass out to them the people's property. I am willing to join in any independent movement the object of which is to free parties from boss rule and corporation control,

and to give the people a free voice in the management of their own affairs. I am eager to see the line drawn, irrespective of party, between those who believe in special privileges and those who believe in popular rights, between the producing classes and the plundering corporations, and wherever that line is drawn I will gladly fight in the lead or in the ranks as required.

* *

The Independence League.

Mr. Hearst's mention of the Independence League calls for an explanation. Its organization began in New York soon after the mayoralty election of last Fall, at which Mr. Hearst was the independent candidate. It has since been extended very widely through the State of New York and on the 4th its organization for the State of Illinois was announced in Chicago and its statement of principles and intent published in full in the Hearst papers. According to its statement, this League is—

Its express purposes are to—

- Prevent the private confiscation of public property.
- Secure rule by the majority.
- Secure ballot reform.
- Secure continuous control over officials by their constituents.
- Prevent boss rule.
- Establish direct nominations.
- Aid the farmer by making good roads and preventing railroad discriminations.
- Foster labor unionism while protecting capital.
- Make United States senators elective by direct popular vote.
- Discover and prosecute frauds by great financial organizations.
- Unite for concentrated effort all citizens and organizations in sympathy with these purposes.
- Advocate a constitutional amendment adopting the initiative and referendum.
- Place ability and integrity above partisanship in the selection of candidates for office.

* *

The American Public School System.

Chicago is again the storm center of that phase of the public school question which relates especially to the two conflicting theories of educational management—the despotic or arbitrarily executive, and the democratic or professional—and which incidentally involves the subject of the relation of school finances to public taxation. This controversy, which in one form or another is either in agitation or under suppression throughout the country, has been most pronounced at Chicago because circumstances here have produced a militant organization of teachers.

*

When the teachers' meager salaries were cut in the late '90s, they organized to discover the cause. It was not long before they had traced it to the "tax-dodging" of the great public utilities corporations. A heated litigation resulted in which the teachers were fully vindicated by the Supreme Court of the State. In this contest they had been obstructed by both the city administration and the school board, a fact which they attributed to the influence of powerful financial interests. And as the litiga-

tion progressed they discovered also, as they believed, that certain onerous exactions of the school authorities from the teaching body, and a despotic business policy which deprived the teaching body of all consultative functions, had a financial rather than a pedagogical animus. The teachers' organization, therefore, set about making a persistent campaign for the protection of the school system from financial starvation by the great business interests of the city, and the substitution of the democratic or professional for the despotic or arbitrarily executive policy of instruction. Meeting opposition from every other organized quarter, they sought the assistance of organized labor by sending regular delegates from their body to the Chicago Federation of Labor, and such assistance they are believed to have received.

+

When Mayor Dunne came into office in 1905, he found seven expiring positions on the school board, and in filling these he named five appointees with especial reference to the controversy which by this time had been distinctly raised between what have been described as the pedagogical and the factory systems of public school management. These five were Jane Addams of Hull House, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, Dr. Cornelia De Bey, John C. Harding and Emil W. Ritter. But there were still 14 hold-over members—the law calling for the appointment of seven every year for three-year terms—and no constructive policy was possible. At the beginning of the present week, however, Mayor Dunne had seven more regular appointments to make, and one in addition to fill a vacancy. Of these eight, the Chicago Tribune reports that 10—within one of a majority—are “certain to support” the policy of the teachers' organization, that three more are likely to do so, that three are opposed, and that five are doubtful. The new appointees are the Rev. R. A. White (who succeeds himself), P. Shelly O’Ryan (who succeeds himself), and Raymond Robins, Louis F. Post, Wiley Wright Mills, Dr. John Guerin, John P. Sonstebly, and Philip Angsten.

+

The school board of Chicago is an unsalaried body, which has full management of the school system, including the school property and tax appropriations. The school property includes, in addition to that which is used by the schools, some of the most valuable business sites in Chicago. These are the remnant of a large grant from the Federal government many years ago, the great bulk of which has been frittered away by school boards in the past; and as to the remnant there is constant pressure from business interests to divert it from the schools by long term and improvident leases. With reference to the bearing of Mayor Dunne's appointments on this matter, an apparently well-advised reporter explained as follows in the Chicago Examiner of the 9th:

The Mayor has told some of his advisers that it is his intention to appoint strong, virile men to the vacancies, in order that there may be an aggressive majority in the board. What is particularly desired is a board that will do something toward securing just assessments of the great corporate and individual estates of Chicago, one that will stir the board of assessors to more equitable

action and bring about a radical change from the policy of the last generation or so. One of the Mayor's friends called attention to the fact that under the State law every section numbered 16 in Illinois was originally allotted as school land. Section 16 in township 39, range 13, is bounded by State, Twelfth, Halsted and Madison streets, and of that square mile the school lands are now only about a block of property. Under the lax policy the Board of Education has for decades past been permitting the school properties to slip away and leasing them for wholly inadequate rentals, so that instead of owning one of the richest tracts of land in the world, it is now pitifully poor. What Judge Dunne will try to secure by his appointments to-night, the friend continued, will be to name a board that will conserve the property that is left and get the best possible return for it, and which will also endeavor to bring about a system of taxation that will give the board the money to do the work it ought to do. As the Mayor's friend put it, the big moneyed interests, both individual and corporate, have been well content with the sort of board that has for a long time been in control, and the fear that an active, aggressive body may upset the old policy has stirred them to activity in the behalf of so-called conservative appointments.

+

The new Board organized on the 11th. On motion of Mrs. Blaine, seconded by Miss Addams, Emil W. Ritter was unanimously elected president. Dr. Kuflewski was elected vice-president.

+

+

Chicago Traction Question.

Indications of trouble in the settlement of traction matters in Chicago (p. 299) were apparent at the meeting on the 9th of the transportation committee of the City Council. As the traction situation now stands, either the old companies must make an adjustment on fair terms, in which case the traction controversy is at an end and Mayor Dunne's municipal ownership policy will be realized, or the old companies must be guilty of palpable bad faith, in which case the public will no longer tolerate any negotiations with them and Mayor Dunne's policy will be realized through other agencies. The indications now are that the companies may adopt the latter course.

+

At the meeting in question the counsel for the City Railway Company, Mr. John P. Wilson, made this explanation, as reported in the Record-Herald of the 10th:

We have completed the schedules of tangible property values, and have furnished them to your experts. We have no statement for submission on intangible values. These involve legal questions; on the tangible values no legal questions are involved. On the intangible values the companies have nothing that the city does not possess. Under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court there are open questions about our rights in certain streets, and I have advised the City Railway Company that no progress can be made by making up values according to streets. There are streets where it would be hopeless to expect an agreement. I do not see any way in which detailed franchise values can be submitted. It is not necessary for us to do this to enable the city and its experts to form values from the city's point of view. The City Railway Company has not concluded its ascertainment of intangible values, because there are mixed questions of law and fact in the matter. We will submit a single amount as the value of our intangible property by the time the values of tangible property have been fixed. I have talked over this plan with Mr. Gurley of the Chicago Union Traction Company and their position is practically the same as ours.

After discussion, which resulted in the refusal by