

lers invite them to bid for. The bitterness of our condemnation belongs elsewhere.

Yet the owner of these coal mines, who have clamped so many of them down so that no one can work them, appear in the light of benefactors when they let labor into them—upon a bidding that leaves only the barest of a bare living to labor. Not alone thick-headed workmen, but many a long-headed business man as well, may see his stupidity reflected as in a mirror by this little story which comes up from the coal regions of Fairmount, W. Va., where the Watson family has long monopolized a terranean plug extending like an inverted pyramid from the earth's center upwards without limit:

An agitator was laboring with a miner to join the strike. He used the usual arguments. The miner was half convinced. "Well," he said, finally, "mebbe I strike. But before I do I go see Mr. Watson." "What do you want to see Mr. Watson for?" asked the astonished agitator. "What did the Watsons ever do for you?" "What they do for me?" exclaimed the miner; "what they do for me? Why, old man Watson put all this coal in the hills here forty-odd years ago, and has kept us at work ever since digging it out."

One thing about the manifestations of violence in the region of the anthracite coal strike cannot have escaped general observation. It is the fact that the American and Americanized strikers are not the ones who have become violent, but that the violent strikers are Lithuanians. These are foreigners from a part of the world where governmental tyranny is so perfect that violent strikes are the only kind possible. They are not Americanized and do not appreciate the difference. When they see uniformed troops quartered in their midst they are unable to understand that these are simply citizens, temporarily massed in military organization for the preservation of the public peace. To their imaginations these citizen soldiers are the same as the imperial soldiery, the military machine composed of dehumanized

units with which they are familiar in their own subjugated homes. It is not remarkable, therefore, that they have stoned and mauled our citizen soldiers, any more than it is remarkable that they gave a violent turn to the strike. Nor would it be remarkable if, as their countrymen at home are even now doing, they broke out in open riotous revolt. But if they did, then where, as well for that as for what they have already done, should the moral responsibility rest? Plutocratic papers put it upon the officers of the miners' organization. But that is too obviously a special plea inspired by a special interest. No peaceable American strikers can be held morally responsible for the violence of unmanageable foreign mobs. The moral responsibility rests upon the managers of the coal companies. They have imported these violent classes for the purpose primarily of making a glut in the labor market to force down wages, and secondarily to have upon the ground an irresponsible mob which in times of strikes would create an excuse for calling out troops. Not only have they imported these men, but they have done so in violation of law. The presidents of the coal companies and the coal owning railroads, therefore, and not Mitchell and his associates, are the persons who are morally guilty of these crimes against the peace in Pennsylvania, and upon them the burden of moral responsibility should fall.

Once more Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is obstructed by the Cleveland street car ring in his unyielding efforts to secure three-cent street car fares for the people there. The story to this point has been told at length in these columns (pp. 274, 281), the last report being that the intermediate appellate court had dissolved the injunction of one of its judges forbidding the granting of a franchise by the existing city council. The street car ring has now procured a new injunction from a judge of the Supreme Court of the state, before whom a motion to dissolve it is to

be heard on the 15th. That this was done at the instigation of the street car ring, though in another name, is evident from the circumstances. When the suit was brought originally, its promoters disclaimed any connection with the ring, insisting that their only object was to prevent the laying of tracks in a certain street. Mayor Johnson thereupon vetoed the ordinance relating to that part of the route. There was then no reason for proceeding with the injunction. Yet it not only was proceeded with until it had been dissolved by the intermediate court, but it is now carried to the Supreme Court. Since the veto, the residents of the one street in question could have no motive in spending further money in a law suit merely to keep tracks out of their street. The object of the further prosecution of the suit, then, must be to keep three-cent fare tracks out of all the streets.

Mayor Johnson's equitable tax agitation in Cleveland has had a comical effect upon the public service corporations. Having the ear, and not unlikely able also to "pull the leg," of the supervising tax authorities, they thwarted the mayor's efforts to make them pay taxes upon the same basis of valuation as other property owners, and secured the privilege of virtually deciding for themselves how much or little taxes they should pay. But "rattled" by fear of what Johnson might yet do, the street car companies have voluntarily increased their returns of values for taxation this year (p. 275) by more than a million and a half over last year; and, following that example of those demoralized tax dodgers, the electric illuminating company has almost doubled its tax returns of last year. It raises its valuation from \$489,050 to \$718,197. This is still much below an equitable valuation, but the whole thing is significant. Down in Delaware they have a saying that "one hornet can break up a whole camp-meeting, if it is industrious;" and Mayor John-

son seems to have played in the role of industrious hornet at the camp meeting of monopoly tax dodgers in Cleveland with no little effect.

It is somewhat risky to comment upon the reports in Chicago newspapers of what is said by professors and lecturers at the University of Chicago. The newspaper itch to be sensational produces habitually such glaring misrepresentations in the local press that the professors have in despair given up all attempts at correcting them. Yet G. Stanley Hall, president of Clarke university, who lectured at the Chicago institution the other day, on "The Education of the Heart," is reported as saying something which he may very likely have said, and which, if he did say it, should be as a feather in his professorial cap. He is quoted as having strongly condemned what he described as the "namby-pamby ideal" about making no enemies, urging that "we ought to have constant antagonisms," though these antagonisms ought, of course, to be "of the right sort." President Hall clearly did not advise personal antagonisms primarily, but antagonisms to wrong ideals and policies and purposes and methods, with personal antagonisms as incidents if necessary. That is wholesome doctrine for young men and women, and it is the very backbone of any true education of the heart. Its neglect accounts for the great amount of mollusk morality which in these days makes public opinion so spineless in its attitude toward moral questions. Our generation seems to have lost all capacity for righteous wrath.

If the printed and published statement of two graduates of the University of Chicago—Angeline Loesch and Theresa Hirschl—is not overdrawn, which it does not appear to be, President Harper, successful though he has been as a college steward, might have been even more successful as a "practical" politician. Let the incredulous read this statement of Mesdames Loesch and Hir-

schl, which has the additional advantage of concisely but clearly explaining the development of the co-education controversy at the university:

The question of separate instruction for men and women during the first two years' work at the University of Chicago came up before the trustees some time ago. At that time a gift was offered to them for the purpose of building separate quadrangles for the men and women of the Junior colleges. It was noticed by them that in the terms of the offer "quadrangles" was meant to include not only separate dormitories, but separate classrooms and laboratories as well. As this made the matter a question of educational policy, the board of trustees referred for advice to the Senate. This is the highest ruling body of the faculty, composed of heads of departments only, and ordinarily all educational questions are brought to it before being submitted to the board of trustees. The Senate, after discussion, voted to ask for the opinion of the Junior college faculty, before giving its own decision. At its meeting held on June 14, the Junior college faculty, over which President Harper presided, considered two reports from its committee: the majority recommending "that in the development of Junior college instruction, provision be made as far as possible for separate sections for men and women;" and the minority recommending "that the system of coinstruction be continued as heretofore." The committee's majority report was disapproved by a vote of 19 to 14. After the adjournment of the meeting, President Harper spoke to two members of the faculty and their votes were then changed from negative to affirmative, making the vote 17 to 16 still against separation. President Harper himself then voted, and threw out the opposing votes of six other persons. This was done on the ground that they were disqualified because they were on one year appointments only, a rule of the University, so far as can be ascertained, never before enforced. The president then, several hours after adjournment, announced the final vote as 17 to 11 in favor of separation of the sexes. Two days later the Congregation, a body which is composed of delegates from the faculties and alumni, and which has certain advisory powers, voted 24 to 7, disapproving the action of the Junior college faculty as reported to them, i. e., 17 to 11 for separation. The Junior college faculty was obliged then to reconsider. Its vote this time was informally announced 25 to 18 in favor of segregation. Among

the members of the faculty themselves, it is not positively known whose votes were this time allowed and whose not. The Senate next met and after hours of discussion, decided to take its vote by mail in order to include its members who were away on vacation.

Apropos of the discussion of the question of religious teaching in the public schools, the following remark of Gladstone's, quoted by Mr. G. W. E. Russell in a recent article in the London Commonwealth, is worth repeating:

An undenominational system of religion, framed by or under the authority of the state, is a moral monster. The state has no charter from heaven such as may belong to the church or to the individual conscience. It would, as I think, be better for the state to limit itself to giving secular instruction, which, of course, is no complete education, than rashly to adventure upon such a system.

People are unreasonable in expecting the public schools to do all the work of character-building. Hence the disappointment in the results. One of the lessons which our self-conceit has to learn is that our public school system, great as it is, cannot be expected to do all the work of making good citizens. It is quite conceivable that any state in the Union might show a percentage of 100 in literacy and still have a fair supply of bribable legislators and purchasable voters.

Among the Democratic daily papers of the country that are truly democratic is the Cleveland Waechter und Anzeiger, which is just now celebrating its golden jubilee with a handsome birthday edition. This paper is one of the monuments to that group of exiled German democrats, of whom Carl Schurz is one of the survivors, and Louis Prang and Gov. Mueller two of the others, which came to this country in 1848. The late Dr. Schmitt, of Chicago, was another of the group. Through all the changes in party policy, most of these men kept their democracy green; and the Waechter und Anzeiger has never turned back upon