

The American Teacher

Democracy in Education; Education for Democracy

VOL. IV. No. 9.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1915

50 CENTS A YEAR



Preparedness

Prepare! Prepare! Prepare!

Prepare the girls, prepare the boys—to work
together for the Common Welfare!

Prepare the girls and boys to hate Ignorance
and Superstition!

Prepare them all to rout Poverty and chase
Disease away!

Prepare the boys, prepare the girls—to fight
Injustice everywhere!

Prepare the girls and boys to resist Aggression
and Exploitation at home!

Prepare them all to live in Human Fellowship!

Prepare! Prepare! Prepare!

THE LOGIC OF FREEST SPEECH

SAM SCHMALHAUSEN

De Witt Clinton High School, New York

THE PROBLEM of free speech does not arise until a fellow embarrasses you with his wisdom. Everyone of course believes in freedom of speech: that is, for those who megaphone his views. But for those who are obstinate, idiosyncratic, whimsical or original, freedom of speech must be restricted. Social welfare demands it! Veneration for our ancient liberties consecrates it. Self-respect glorifies it!

Do we all believe in freedom of speech? I doubt it. We believe in what we approve. What we disapprove, we naturally dislike to hear uttered. Uncongenial utterances irritate us. What we call freedom is merely an accustomed routine: a system of habitual yeas and nays. Every system is a vicious circle. What we oppose we loathe to hear, what we loathe to hear, all the more spitefully do we oppose. Any sensible definition of freedom must make way for exits from this vicious thralldom. I shall propose such a definition of freedom.

Why should speech be free?

First—Because every one at times wants it to be chained. Our instincts are on the side of slavery, the slavery of compacency, the complacency of habit.

Second—Speech in bondage makes life duller. Dumb mutes do not feel the manifold thrill of living. "Silence is golden" was *spoken* by a tactful, timid fool. Silence is usually evasion or treachery. Crooked politicians are silent and their silence, ironically enough, is worth its weight in gold.

Third—The powerful possess income, the meek possess only their tongues. Freedom of speech is the creation of the disinherited. "Money talks" is a cynical truth. Lacking money, the defeated must resort to tongues of fire. Freedom of speech is the only telling weapon in the hands of those who struggle for a finer standard of living.

Fourth—Freedom of speech cuts

athwart the barriers of caste by endowing the mass with insights and prerogatives similar to those possessed by the masters. Only free speech is competent to betray and dethrone the fool in power. Only free speech can build articulations and cohesions between those who suffer and those who would understand them.

Fifth—Freedom of speech is the visible and meritorious sign of emancipation—emancipation from the tyranny of dogma and of dogmatist. The freedom of speech is its right to be critical and revolutionary. There are two types of people who oppose unlimited freedom of speech: conservatives and radicals. Conservatives damn the future and glorify the past. Radicals glorify their surmise of the future and damn the dream of all other radicals.

You may count upon the fingers of one hand the advocates of Freest Speech. Yet only freest speech is roomy enough to allow standing space for all sorts and conditions of believers. Freest speech fulfills my definition of comprehensive honorable freedom.

There is an infallible test by which one may know whether he honestly champions freedom of speech or merely acquiesces in conventional formulations. If you can listen without intolerance or vindictiveness to exponents of ideas bitingly hostile to your own, you may boast (a little) of your love of freedom. If, in the presence of alien views, you fidget and swear under your breath and grow alternately hot and cold and spoil for a chance to retaliate and hate the expositor for a scoundrel and yearn to shut him up in a "cooler," you do not love free speech: you are simply enamored of your own familiar chains. You are the unwitting disciple of the pathetic poet who sang:

Four walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bars a cage.

Your cage pleases you: you can't

perceive your own plight. John Stuart Mill loved freedom. His intellectual poise was god-like. Who else could have written the conviction that a thinker must pursue the logic of his thots to the very end, no matter into what disconcerting bypaths it might lead him. There's an ideal of intellectual honesty! Immanuel Kant was another genuine lover of freedom. He modestly confesses his practise of seeking out every possible objection to his idea, ruminating upon it, assimilating it and then patiently reformulating his original notion to embrace valuable new elements. I call that intellectual honesty. Few of us possess the mental timbre, the courage or the time for so painstaking a research in freedom's utilities. Herbert Spencer did not love freedom. He adored system, intellectual chains and slavery, albeit a slavery fashioned by his own brilliant intellect. He could not endure to read a book which disagreed with his fixed views. His intolerance was as rooted as dogmatism usually is when it ramifies in the mind of a powerful thinker.

Conventional freedom of speech is a compromise, a pretense, a shadow of the reality. Take the case of Scott Nearing. Professor Nearing was expelled for teaching human economics. He had been appointed and was paid to teach capitalist economics. Nearing's temperament is frank and humanistic; his scholarship is ultra-modern and sociological. To ask Nearing to defend the villainies of capitalism and the lying economic dogmas of the professor apologists, is asking the impossible. Nearing was honest: the trustees were evasive. Nearing was fearless: the trustees were tactful. Clash was inevitable. His dismissal was justified on the ground of "wisdom": the wisdom of preserving intact our capitalist exploitations and of keeping unsullied the fair name of the University of Pennsylvania. Thus the trustees.

Nothing more encouraging to the propaganda of radicalism has occurred within a decade than this dismissal of Scott Nearing. The problem of the free-

dom of academic speech in particular, and of public speech in general, has been pushed to the center of social interest. Compromise is beside the point. We know that the apologists for the repression of free thinking are intellectually dishonest. Anyone who happens to read *The New York Times'* editorials knows how conservatives fear frank utterance of radical truth by the Nearings.

This famous Dread Scott decision handed down by the Supreme Court of Trustees of the U. of P. justifies the right of a master to control the freedom of speech of a professorial hireling. The New Slavery is more insidious than the old because it is entrenched in the public centers of learning and cunningly supported by propertied interests clever enough to cite scripture for their purpose, powerful enough to realize their own sweet vindictive way. The Dread Scott decision is a landmark in the history of a fettered freedom of speech. Why are teachers thruout this land of freedom so supine? Why do they rally so tardily to the defense of fundamental rights?

Every trustee of Ben Franklin's university, who has thus far achieved print, reaffirms his undying faith in Freedom of Speech. Freedom with a *proviso*. Freedom hedged about with *Ifs* and *Buts*. Freedom, in short, as personally twisted and limited by the prejudices of the interpreter. To the apologists for property and prejudice (whether conservative or radical), freedom of speech seems to mean the freedom to deprive an antagonist of his freedom of expression when that disagreeable fellow irritates you. Such a conception of freedom is tantamount to asserting that society consists of two classes: those who abuse their freedoms and those who do not. Inasmuch as every person during his stormy career has innumerable occasions to draw up indictments against his hostile and *outcaste* fellows, everyone is in the absurd position of synchronously accusing and being accused. Who, then, shall set the limits to freedom? Is any one among us held to be omnipo-

tent? Or prescient? Or immaculate? Or perfect in justice?

Obviously, any definition of freedom becomes a mockery and a hindrance so long as it obstinately includes taboos and limitations. Whether we like it or no, we are driven to the inference, that only the *freest* speech can be free. Speech unfettered, unchained, socially censured, but *never throttled* or vindictively punished, is the genuine freedom. The Board of Education of New York disgraced itself when it stooped to fining Henrietta Rodman. Whether the limitation on the freedom of utterance come from blockhead or philosopher, property owner or communist, it is equally vicious: a thoroly human and thoroly bad attempt to drag the world down to our own familiar level of quaint monotony.

Professor Overstreet has attempted to frame a pro-social limitation for his theory of freedom. Who is to define pro-sociality in every concrete case? Is it arithmetical count, or financial power, or social prestige, or clever word juggling, or sheer prejudice? Doesn't all our bafflement arise from the very fact that in a concrete antagonism of views or interests, both attitudes are pro-social from the claimant's angle? If your sympathies are with the corporation—whether Rockefeller Oil Trust or U. of P. Educational Trust—will not yours be the pro-social definition of freedom, your opponent being the violator? If, on the contrary, your sympathies, for whatever reason or lack of reason, coincide with the "larger public" interpretation of freedom, you will speak of your definition as the true pro-social one. Is it not better for definition's sake and for the realization in practise of the mind's slow striving after non-partisanship, to abandon cramping, self-seeking limitations on freedom? Is it not wiser and infinitely fairer to permit and encourage the Freest Speech as the one genuine honesty of mind?

Freest speech is the doctrine that expression with all its abuses is more in accord with human desire and human

progress than is repression with all its so-called virtues. If abuses and revilements and petty practises are necessary by-products of unfettered speech, let it be said in explanation, first, that by-products are themselves useful, and secondly, that mortality is the habitat of gross imperfections. We must pay the penalty of our inadequacies. And we must discourage scabbing. Why snuff out a candle because it burns fitfully? Fitfulness may be the true distinction of a candle. If man's free speech is fitful and feverish, would you snuff out the light within his brain?

Nobody objects to the freest utterance provided it does not affect his specific prejudices, aversions or beliefs. For example, Mrs. Margaret Sanger is not in the least outraged by the freest, frankest speech on birth control and sexual hygiene. Justice McInerney rebels furiously and foams at the mouth. He decidedly does not believe in *that* kind of free speech. However, the good Justice does not object to frank utterances on the glory of the judiciary, the honor and fidelity of our Justices or the shining perfection of his own discriminating wisdom. Honorable William Howard Taft does not oppose or wish to taboo the extremest statement of praise anent our constitution framers or his own marvelous administration of the Presidency or Roosevelt's abilities before 1912 A. D. Agnes Repplier (impotent iconoclast) believes in the broadest freedom of assertion for the verbally cultured few who, like herself, contribute so much to the charm and refinement of our decadent civilization. *Every one approves of the freest speech when it profits his income or his prestige so to approve.* The business of courageous radicals is to enthrone unfettered freedom of utterance as the one imperishable safeguard of *every one's* unique contribution to mortality's melting pot.

The logic of freest speech is the perception that expression with all its abuses is more productive of general human welfare than repression with all its so-called virtues.

THE CHICAGO TEACHERS AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

IN THE September number of THE AMERICAN TEACHER attention was directed to the fight that the Chicago Teachers' Federation is making in behalf of professional freedom. It will be recalled that the Board of Education issued an edict prohibiting teachers from joining any organization that is directly or indirectly affiliated with a labor union or one that has a non-teacher for its business agent. When it was pointed out that such interdict puts the ban on practically all teachers' organizations—city, state, and national—supplementary resolutions were passed which in effect seek the destruction of the Chicago Teachers' Federation. Now, it is true that this organization is directly affiliated with the Chicago Federation of Labor, and that in itself might be sufficient cause for the outbursts of a reactionary Board of Education. As a matter of fact, however, the Chicago Teachers' Federation is not the only educational association in Chicago that is affiliated with a labor union. There is at least one other in the same category. Why then should the wrath of the Board be directed toward the Federation only? To answer this question requires a little historical perspective.

In 1818 the United States gave a square mile of land in each congressional township of thirty-six square miles to the state of Illinois in order to develop its educational system. One of these square miles happened subsequently to form the most valuable part of the City of Chicago. About seventy years ago all of the land with the exception of one square block was sold. That remaining square block was leased to private interests on such terms that 6 per cent of the value of the plot would accrue to the Board of Education. To make the rate of interest and returns as equitable as possible it was further stipulated that the land be revaluated every five years. In this way, it was believed, all interests would be justly served. On these terms a number of prosperous and influential business houses established themselves

upon this valuable school property. Among these are Chicago's leading newspapers—*The Chicago Tribune*, and *The Chicago News*. Things went along peacefully on the basis of 6 per cent on the revaluations of every five years. As Chicago grew in population and importance the value of that particular school plot increased greatly. As the value of the land increased the interest return also increased. That interest return necessarily had to come from the business concern that leased the land. Altho they paid a comparatively small sum, they were not satisfied.

So at a secret meeting between the business interests and the proper authorities the agreement was altered so that the five-yearly revaluation clause was eliminated and the lease made on a flat rate of 6 per cent for ninety-nine years. In this way the educational fund was robbed of millions of dollars.

Not long ago the Board of Education found itself face to face with a big deficit. The cry of economy went up at once. Did they take steps to abrogate the secret contract and thus release millions of dollars for school use? Not at all. They proposed a simpler and easier method—the *safe* method. They proposed to reduce the salaries of the Chicago teachers by not less than about 7½ per cent.

And why not? Was not the city short of funds? Should not the strictest economy prevail? Were not the teachers overpaid and underworked anyway? Why shouldn't these soft-minded parasites teach the future defenders of the realm a concrete lesson in altruism by cheerfully allowing the politicians to abstract 7½ per cent of their salaries from their pockets? Surely the Board of Education and the city fathers did all in their power to find ways and means for raising money. It wasn't really their fault when they were compelled to rob the teachers. It was a business necessity, don't you see?

But the teachers of Chicago refused to take that view of the situation. In the way of the commonly accepted theory of teachers' organizations, they proceeded in what would appear to be a "selfish" plan. The public had been led to believe that teachers are interested only in questions of salary, and that they take but a half-hearted interest in matters educational or in the welfare of the children; whereas in regard to public matters, the popular belief is that teachers take no interest at all. And so it was quite "natural" for the teachers to accept the obvious necessity for reducing their salaries. Instead they set to work to find sources of revenue that might be applied to education. It did not take them long to uncover the secret agreement whereby the children were robbed of millions of dollars. Incidentally they started a campaign against tax-dodging corporations and forced them to disgorge about \$600,000. Nor was this all. They followed up every contract for sites, buildings, and supplies and showed where money could be saved. In short, they "showed up" the righteous Board of Education. Is it any wonder then that the enmity of the gods was invoked against them? Should not such disruptors of public morals be squelched? Yes, the teachers must now be made to pay for their sins.

All the teachers! No—only those who were actively engaged in uncovering graft and corruption. Only those who made things hot for some very respectable gentlemen in the second largest city of our land. And who are these teachers who had the temerity to do all this? Why, the members of the Chicago Teachers' Federation. And why did they, of all teachers' associations, take up the cudgels? The Chicago Teachers' Federation alone had the courage to make the fight, because it had the moral and financial backing of organized labor.

The Federation has kept up a continuous war to make tax dodging corporations and plutocrats pay taxes they had been dodging for years; and by winning this fight has forced these corporations to pay \$600,000 a year in taxes

since 1900. In addition, the Federation

Supported the locked out pressmen and the striking stereotypers and newsboys during the troubles in 1912, which started with the newspaper trust locking out the union pressmen, in addition to aiding the garment workers, coal miners, and all other workers in every struggle of labor;

Affiliated with the State Federation of Women's Clubs and helped in the fight for equal suffrage;

Has persistently fought the School Book Trust and supported Ella Flagg Young in her persistent fight to free the public schools from politicians and text-book companies;

Fought the scheme of Big Business, through the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and ex-Superintendent Cooley, to institute a dual system of education, which would put the children of the workers in one class and the children of the rich in another;

Fought to have the use of the public school building given to the people for social centers;

Fought against dark rooms and basement rooms and for better health and educational conditions for children;

Supported a move for lunches for school children and conducted a campaign for the protection of children against preventable contagious diseases;

Actively supported every move for public ownership of all public utilities.

Here we have a body of public workers taking a stand on every important social question that affected the children and the public—a stand remarkable for its courage, its social-mindedness, and its understanding of the injustice inherent in the social and economic system.

Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, has repeatedly acknowledged her appreciation of the work of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, and so have many of the citizens.

Nevertheless, the Chicago School

Board, as is well known, has seen fit to adopt a rule demanding the dissolution of the Federation and threatening its members with dismissal.

What is the reason for this rule? Is the claim that teachers are lacking in social interests merely a mask for a real desire that teachers should *not* take a share in public questions? Is the public good imperiled when one group of workers expresses its sympathy for other groups of workers striving to improve their conditions, and so directly improving the condition of the social group? Is fighting the School Book Trust a crime so heinous that society thru its School Board should demand in righteous indignation the destruction of the Federation responsible? Are the teachers who are fighting against the installation of a system that would perpetuate class lines forgetful of the true welfare of society?

Or is it possible that the School Board which adopted this rule is itself false to the public whose interests it is supposed to protect? A cursory examination of the economic affiliations of some of the eleven members who voted in favor of the rule might shed needed light on the reasons for their vote. The following information comes from Chicago:

1. Jacob M Loeb, who proposed the resolution, is a brother of Albert Loeb, vice-president of Sears, Roebuck and Company, one of the tax-dodging corporations.

2. William Rothman is a law partner of R O West, the chairman of the County Board of Review who voted to hand millions of dollars to corporations thru tax reductions. He was finally forced to assess corporations at ten per cent due to the efforts of Miss Margaret Haley and the Chicago Teachers' Federation.

3. J W Eckhardt is another law partner of R O West.

4. Joseph Holpuch is a large contractor who had the school repair plant abolished for the advantage of the contractors.

5. R C Otis is a millionaire leader in the Illinois Tax Association whose members are with few exceptions under attack by State's Attorney Hoyne for tax dodging. He is also the holder of the school land at Madison and State Streets, sub-leased at a profit to the Buck and Raynor Drug Company.

6. W Schlake is president of the Illinois Brick Company, which sells bricks to the contractors who build schools.

The inference is fair that the real enemy of the public is not the Chicago Teachers' Federation but the School Board which allows its economic interests to influence and direct its attitude toward the teachers and the schools.

The life of the Chicago Teachers' Federation is now in the balance. The future is uncertain but very hopeful. The teachers have the sympathy of the better element of the citizenry. They have the support of their courageous superintendent. They surely have the support of all thinking teachers all over the land.

The cry of economy and retrenchment may come up in your own town tomorrow. Will you be prepared?

BUSINESS AND THE PUBLIC

When the administration increases the burden of the teacher in any one of a dozen ways, it is simply applying the principles of "economy and efficiency" to the management of public affairs. When teachers attempt to apply the methods of modern business—the methods of bargain and coercion and strike—in their dealings with the administration, they are depriving the children of their rights, they are applying extortion to the public. How solicitous are the trustees and the taxpayers of the dear children and the dear public!

A PROMISING EXPERIMENT

THE STUDENT of education delights in the knowledge that New York City is far-sighted enough and broad-minded enough to devote one and one-quarter million dollars to educational experimentation. To Mr. Wirt of Gary, Indiana, are given several schools and one million dollars to try out his scheme. To Superintendent Ettinger is entrusted the experiment of pre-vocational education. To others are detailed other problems for investigation. At no time in the history of education was so much money, brains, and power concentrated in one locality for the purpose of experimentation. Some of the experiments have been in progress for over a year. Definite results are still far ahead of us. The trained thinker and observer knows that only time is essential in this important work.

But there are those among us who are extremely impatient. To them time is not an important element. In their zeal they forget the checking up process that is so necessary in all good work. Particularly is this true of the advocates of the Gary plan. There are good features in the plan. But there are also some doubtful ones. In the process of experimentation we may develop the good points and eliminate the bad ones. We may be led to do something entirely different, depending always upon the exigencies of the experiment. A certain amount of anxiety and overstatement on the part of the promoters of any scheme are pardonable. But when such excesses lead responsible officials to premature conclusions there is always an element of danger that is detrimental to the experiment itself.

In New York the financial authorities were led to believe that the adoption of the Gary plan would not only enrich the child's school life but that it would also save many dollars to the taxpayer. Naturally there has sprung up the demand

for the adoption of the Gary plan. The mere assertion that money would be saved, that the school program enriched, that opportunities for industrial training increased, is taken as the basis for the recommendation of the city-wide adoption of the plan.

We must counteract this recommendation, not because we are opposed to this plan and favor any other plan, but because

- (1) we want to see the experiment carried to a scientific conclusion;
- (2) we want the experiment properly evaluated;
- (3) we want to make a comparative study of the scientific results of all the experiments; and
- (4) we wish to show our resentment against the policy of controlling educational practise by the manipulation of the purse strings.

Shall it be said of New York that it spent money, time, and energy in initiating educational experiments merely for the sake of keeping abreast of the times? Or are these experiments to lead to some profitable conclusions? By all means let the experiments go on undisturbed. Let them try out all of the proposed schemes and evaluate them in accordance with modern scientific standards. There is probably enough good in the worst of them, and enough bad in the best of them, to warrant neither the acceptance nor the rejection of any of them, in toto. After all, New York might show an educational supremacy equal to its commercial supremacy, in bringing forth a new educational scheme that is worthy of imitation by the very best in the land.

Every new subscription means added strength to the movement for democracy.

The
American Teacher

Democracy in Education: Education for Democracy

Published monthly, except July and August, by
THE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPANY, INC.,
129 Lafayette Street, New York.

ANGELO PATRIPresident
LOUISE M. DITHRIDGE.....Treasurer

Edited by
HENRY R. LINVILLE
Editor-in-Chief
BENJAMIN C. GRUENBERG
Managing Editor

Julia H. Doyle Jay D. Lester
Benjamin Glassberg Gabriel R. Mason
Sam Schmalhausen
J. EDWARD MAYMAN
Business Manager

This Magazine will be sent to subscribers until
an order to discontinue, together with all ar-
rearages, is received. At the time of expiration,
a bill will be found in the copy.

Remittances should be made in postal money-
order, express order, draft, stamps or check
(New York exchange).

**SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, 50 CENTS FOR THE
YEAR—FOREIGN, 60 CENTS.**

Entered as second-class matter, February 21,
1912, at the Post Office, at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. IV. NOVEMBER, 1915 No. 9

This paper is striving to do its part
in the creation of a real profession of
teaching, the members of which shall
be self-respecting and respected, thru
stimulating clear thinking on the work
and the social position of teachers, and
thru intelligent criticism of systems of
educational administration. No greater
service than this could be rendered to
the children of the state.

**EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC
BUSINESS**

A PROMINENT authority on municipal
administration, speaking before a gather-
ing of teachers, offered an ingenious de-
fense against the charge that he had
been meddling in educational affairs.
He pointed out that members of boards
of education, altho successful (and there-
fore "efficient" no doubt) as lawyers,

contractors, merchants and real-estate
dealers, were not specifically trained for
wise judgment in educational matters,
and therefore sufficiently incompetent
for the purpose. It was only reasonable,
then, to allow other lay persons, who had
made special studies of finance and ac-
counting, to form opinions on educa-
tional affairs, and to use whatever power
and authority they had to advance these
opinions. In other words, one incompe-
tent opinion is probably worth about as
much as another incompetent opinion.

This reply will satisfy many. As for
the rest, they need only consider that the
authorities that control the purse-strings
of a community must at last control the
situation. Competent judgment really
has nothing to do with it. This discus-
sion is but a polite concession to the tra-
dition that officials, in a republic, are ac-
countable to the public.

A SUSPICION

THERE are those among us who have
taken to teaching because they were not
quite up to doing anything in particular.
This is no secret. Whatever standards
we may have had in the past were im-
posed upon us by convenience or indif-
ference of school trustees intent upon
saving money or guarding against heresies.

There are also among us who never
see what practical folks like to call the
"main chance." This is no secret, either.
Those who have an eye to the main
chance do not, as a rule, go into the
teaching business. This is very fortun-
ate for the trustees and commissioners.
It enables them to obtain the services of
men and women for the price of girls
and boys—just like the factories. It
is also fortunate for the public, for it
enables the children to obtain services
for which there is no price.

That those who are generally incom-
petent frequently enter the ranks of
teachers is a tragic fact that is commonly
used as a basis for certain kinds of
slender jests. That those who deliber-
ately seek the teacher's career are fre-

quently blind to their material interests has made possible the underpayment of the workers in this field. But the situation has come about thru the unconscious inter-play of economic and social forces, so that no particular persons or groups are altogether to blame for it. But we have a suspicion that certain of the more practical people have become aware of the latter peculiarity of the teaching portion of our population, and that they are deliberately trying to exploit it.

More and more frequent are the demands made upon the services of the teacher. You need them for your Sunday School, and for the summer camps; they are useful on excursions and they are useful in settlements; they can serve on committees and they make good secretaries for various organizations. Everyone knows that the teacher's day is short, and everybody is learning to count upon the teacher for all kinds of free services. It is in the nature of a teacher to give, as it is in the nature of the horse-leech's daughter to demand. But when we suspect that we are being exploited for the weak spot in our quality, we are likely to resent the eagerness with which our friends find for us the opportunities to do another good turn, and still another.

Aside from the question of imposing unfair burdens upon those who will carry without protest, is the danger of pauperizing the business man who should be taught that all worthy service deserves—and should get—worthy compensation. We owe it to the children to cultivate a balanced life with its due share of leisure, and so we must not allow ourselves to be overcrowded with work; there is too much already of the strenuous ferment that leaves no room to live. We owe it to our fellow workers to maintain the level of pay for work as high as possible; and every stroke of unpaid work that competes with the services of those dependent upon the pay for their livelihood helps to depress wages, and thus the level of human living. To let the teachers do this and that because they

don't mind doing a little extra, is in the long run poor economy. We suspect it has been overworked.

THE COURSE OF STUDY—I

IN THE SEPTEMBER number of THE AMERICAN TEACHER the leading editorial dealt in introductory fashion with the matter of possible reform in our traditional course of study. Our readers are referred to that number of the periodical to get the connection with the series which is now definitely begun. In this series one after another phase of current educational life will be taken up and considered with reference to the value of the emphasis laid upon them in educational practise today, and also with reference to what may be called the ideal emphasis in the course of study of the future, with suggestions as to approaching the ideals thru accomplishments.

There is a good field for observation and reflection in the panorama of adult minds that spreads out before anyone who is disposed to look for ultimate effects in education. One of the common characteristics of minds is a certain disposition to react to the stimulation of an individual mind rather than to the social mind. This does not mean that the social mind does not exist for most persons, for an individual often expresses society's convictions while believing his utterances are his own. But the narrow, selfish, or self-centered point of view is more direct, more sharp, and more likely to prove productive of immediate results.

The origin of the power of the individual over other minds began, we may suppose, with the father of the family. From him it was extended to the religious teacher, and then to the secular teacher, and finally to everyone else who claimed authority by virtue of knowledge, position, or self-assurance. In the school we have permitted the idea to become established and closely bound up with our systems of discipline, as well as with our method of presenting ideas. The children must behave because the stern voice of the teacher tells them they must, or because the principal frightens

them. Lessons are learned because the children are under the stimulus of what an individual tells them will happen if the lesson is not prepared. Perhaps it is not true that the subject matter of the lessons themselves contain stimuli that spring from individual sources; neither does the subject matter afford social stimuli. And that is a condition which calls for radical change.

Most persons derive their political convictions from their immediate ancestors, or from the most successful or the most popular local political leader. The agitation for woman suffrage has lately offered interesting evidence of the power of individual stimulation. In the campaign of 1912 Colonel Roosevelt, acting on the stimulus of a few leaders in his party, decided that it would be good policy to come out for equal suffrage. The immediate result was that the members of the Progressive Party suddenly came to believe in that movement. But since the lapse of strength temporarily characteristic of the Party, many men have ceased to be convinced that women ought to vote after all. In fact, these men were never convinced at all. The social significance of the suffrage ideal had never entered their minds. It has been quite a commonplace experience of the suffrage workers to discover men who would or would not vote for the suffrage amendment because their wives, mothers, or sisters, would or would not vote if they had the chance.

It seems to us fair to state that our present leaders in educational thought have given little attention to the meagerness of purely social stimuli in our political, economic, and social life, and to the resulting littleness and triviality of the common mind. Neither have they gone over the course of study with the view to discovering what there is in it which might be retained in a broader, richer, and more socially productive outline of the school work. This must be done, and also we must search the field of human endeavor for ideas which are of human significance to bring them within reach of the minds of the children for the social stim-

ulation there contained. This is a gigantic undertaking, but one that must be made.

Only one point will be suggested here for partial development. The work of the world goes on in seething enormity. The children neither of the rich, nor the middle class, nor the poor, are given the slightest suggestion in the schools of the social meaning of work, and little of its relation to their individual lives for that matter. Experiments are under way at present in which there is the possibility of bringing to the minds of children something of the working experience of the race. One of the most valuable features of the Gary system of school organization makes this arrangement possible, for all children, both boys and girls, are brought into contact in school with work which real workers do outside the school. All socially minded persons who want to see the schools taking a more effective part in significant racial education must see to it that all experiments pointing in the right direction are given abundant encouragement and a fair trial.

PENSIONS FOR TEACHERS

IN THE DISCUSSION among teachers regarding pensions there seems to be much confusion of thought as well as a variety of hazy ideas. For instance, the Federation of Teachers Associations of New York makes certain proposals for a pensioning scheme with the initial statement that "any pension scheme to be proposed is to be on the basis of a pension and not of an insurance." What may be the significance of such a statement doubtless is clear in the minds of those who make it, but it carries little meaning to others. A pension is an annuity that must be paid for by some one the same as an annuity from an insurance company must be paid for, usually by the recipient of the annuity. Now a pension of a given amount and an annuity of the same amount will cost the same—the name has no effect upon the cost. The crux of the question is, *Who is to pay the cost?*

There is also a desire on the part of

some that a person leaving the system before retirement shall receive no refund of the part of his salary retained by the city in part payment of his prospective pension. If there were to be no refunds, suppose a teacher should die just before his time of retirement, the city might unjustly retain \$4000 or more of his salary. Such a system of furnishing an annuity from lapses is not allowed by the insurance laws of many states. The law is always somewhat behind the best ethical shot of the time. Certainly the teachers ought not to go back to the days of the tontine insurance policies. The business men on the Pension Commission have a higher ethical standard than this and will see to it that we have some method of refunds.

Thru all the discussion there seems to be a desire to dodge the question of the cost as in the Central Pension Committee two years ago the suggestion of first getting at the cost of a pension was laughed down and the chairman said, "Let us first plan what we would like, then see how near we can get to it." While some are saying "Give us no pensions at all, I prefer to invest my own money."

* * *

Why should there be a pension granted by the public to its servants? There should be none unless the public gets adequate return for the outlay. Pensioning public employes has become an established custom and is justified on the grounds that it makes for more efficient service by the retirement of the superannuated. For this increased efficiency the public is willing to pay; but it is not willing to assume the whole burden of retirement. The annuitant is asked to furnish a part (usually one half) of the necessary reserve. And this will be the plan devised by the Pension Commission which promises a sound and just bill for 1916.

Such a plan based upon the figures of actuaries of experience and breadth of view will be scientific. The teachers must make their criticism of it scientific, impersonal and unselfish.

SIDETALKS WITH SUPERINTENDENTS-VIII

J S

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE of the City of New York is a far-seeing official. The evidence of it is that recently in "General Order No. 57" he has established four grades of departmental recognition "For Merit" equivalent in importance to those previously established "For Valor."

The point in establishing the new grades of recognition appears to be that the luck of being convenient to a runaway horse does not fall to the lot of every deserving officer, nor do enough helpless humans await rescue in burning buildings. In these spectacular deeds, as well as on humdrum patrol duty, there is always the occasion for the play of intelligence. But exceptional judgment and that degree of intelligence which can show the way to meeting old difficulties and to solving problems are rare enough and precious enough to be encouraged by some form of official recognition. If superior intelligence is not encouraged in municipal departments, the City has no right to expect the development of intelligence in such places. I found "General Order No. 57" mighty interesting reading. A portion of it follows:

New York, October 6, 1915.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOGNITION

RULES 201 TO 207, inclusive, are hereby amended to read as follows:

201. Departmental recognition shall consist of the following grades:

<i>For Valor</i>	<i>For Merit</i>
1 Department Medal of Honor	1 Department Medal of Merit
2 Honorable Mention	2 Exceptional Merit
3 Commendation	3 Commendable Merit
4 Excellent Police Duty	4 Meritorious Police Duty

202. The Department Medal of Honor may be awarded for an act involving knowledge of the risk assumed, performed intelligently in the line of police duty and at imminent personal hazard of life.

203. Honorable Mention, Commendation and Excellent Police Duty may be awarded, ranking in the order named, for acts involving personal risk of life in the intelligent performance of police duty.

204. The Department Medal of Merit may be awarded for an act showing exceptional judgment, intelligence, and ability in the performance of police duty; or for an original suggestion which demonstrates, on trial, its practical value in improving police efficiency.

205. Exceptional Merit, Commendable Merit, and Meritorious Police Duty, ranking in the order named, may be awarded for particularly meritorious conduct in the intelligent performance of police duty, for exceptional judgment and presence of mind in a grave emergency, and under conditions where the life or property of another was in danger, or for quick judgment and proper action in a trying situation tending to prevent loss of life or property or serious calamity; or for original suggestions tending to improve the efficiency of the Department.

Now, you may think that teachers would not care for similar recognition for excellence in the actions, the duties, and the possibilities appropriate to their calling, if it involved being stood up in a line before the reviewing stand on Department of Education Parade Day, and looking self-conscious while the Mayor pins on the medals. Perhaps not. To some it might be objectionable by reason of the possibility of the official condescension with which a fortunately placed official regards another who for the moment may seem to be eating from the official hand. Again, you may think that teachers would spend too much of their time borrowing or stealing ideas with the intention of turning them into bronze, silver, or gold, and incidentally into terms of promotion. Besides, the Green-eyed Monster would get a great many, of course. These and other objections could be made to this or any plan for discovering ability in the teaching profession.

However, in the matter of formulating a suitable and practical plan for discovering ability there may be teachers who, purely for social reasons, or because of

the satisfaction of having a hand in a big job, would feel adequately paid if they were asked to help. You, honorable sirs, know the value of minds that cannot help thinking on lines of social improvement, and cannot help expressing what they think.

We may assume that even if it is difficult to agree on a plan for discovering ability, still there is general agreement on the urgency of discovering ability by some method. A great many are tired of witnessing the recognition and promotion of persons whose attainments seem to be more adapted to success in the great American game of poker than they are to the needs of American education.

Many will agree, also, on the need of making some sort of beginning in recognizing the latent intellectual capacity in the teaching profession. Let us have our intelligent fellows stand up before the Mayor and receive their bronze certificates of intelligence of the First, Second, Third, or even of the Fourth Order. The possession of medals would lead logically to deserved promotion. It might be that the president of a board of education would seem to introduce the winners of medals to the Mayor in a condescending manner, but that would be far better than having to accept the president's second, third, or fourth best friends, or friends of these friends, as expert officers of education.

It is quite possible to imagine the teaching profession actually passing into and thru that stage of social development now exemplified in the efficient New York patrolman of proven intelligence. That the souls of teachers may take a long time in migrating to their proper habitation in efficient and socially-minded human beings argues nothing against the need of change. Of course it will be a long time before we have the right sort of teachers, but we shall have them when existing social ideals come to be held by the general run of men. Then also shall we have the right sort of superintendents, never fear!—or none at all of the embattled and unremovable kind.

In that time it will indeed seem childish to be giving one another medals, for the persons who might issue the medals would be one of ourselves whom we had placed in temporary authority to carry out the social plan to the formulation of which all had contributed ideas. Under the social plan with freedom everyone who thinks will say what he thinks. If the rest believe ideas are useful, the ideas will be tried out. If the experiments are successful, the children will receive the benefit. And the ideal-formulators will receive adequate recompense in honor and in economic support.

But we shall have to exchange our ideals of individual success for new and generous ideals of social success—and there's the rub!

Cast your bread upon the waters:
every subscription helps the good work
along.

BASIS FOR HIGHER LICENSE

THE AMERICAN TEACHER presents herewith the accompanying resolutions introduced by Examiner Jerome A. O'Connell, at a meeting of the Board of Examiners, of New York City, on April 17, 1913. To date no definite action has been taken. These resolutions will doubtless come up at a future meeting, and final action upon them may be taken. Here is a splendid opportunity for the readers of THE AMERICAN TEACHER to express themselves on this important matter and thus have a share in bringing professional opinion to bear upon the situation. We urge all teachers to read the resolutions carefully, and then commit their thoughts to paper and send them to our office. THE AMERICAN TEACHER will endeavor to bring these thoughts (signed or unsigned) before the larger body of teachers, and thus create a unified, professional opinion to which the Board of Examiners will undoubtedly give due consideration in their deliberations:

Whereas from time to time it has been found necessary to modify and to improve the methods of selecting applicants for li-

censes with a view (1) to reducing to a minimum waste of time, energy and study in the applicants' preparation for such positions, (2) to directing the applicants' energies along lines of constructive endeavor which shall be most productive of improvement in their daily work, and (3) to selecting those applicants most accomplished in all the factors going to make proficient teachers and supervisors,

Resolved, That the Board of Examiners approve the following scheme for the next examination for principal and for assistant to principal in elementary schools and for first assistant in high schools:

A. There shall be an *Investigation of the Applicants' Studies and Experience* in accordance with the scheme shown hereinafter under the caption "Studies and Experience Examination." After the ratings have been given there shall be chosen in the order of standing for further examination twice as many applicants as it may appear to the Board of Examiners shall be needed for an eligible list. The applicants so selected shall be given

B. *The Oral Examination* (see II for the scope of the Oral Examination).

For those who pass the oral examination there shall be further

C. *A Class Teaching Test* (see III for the scope of the "Class Test").

For those who pass the class teaching test there shall be further

D. *A Written Examination* (see IV for the scope of the "Written Examination").

E. The Final Rating shall be determined by averaging the percentages obtained in the oral examination, the class test and the written examination.

I. *Studies and Experience Examination*
Studies (above the requirements for eligibility):

- | | |
|---|----|
| (1) for the master's degree in course... | 20 |
| (2) for the doctor's degree in course... | 40 |
| (3) for each college course (not included in 1 or 2)..... | 1 |
| (but not more than 2 credits for any school term) | |
| (4) for publications of value each..... | 1 |
| (5) for New York City Licenses obtained by written and oral examination, each | 5 |
| (6) for cultural travel to a maximum of | 5 |

Expe
(7)

(8)

(9)

II.

III.

IV.

Experience

- (7) (a) for satisfactory supervisory experience as principal or assistant to principal or head of department of more than six classes each term 4
 (b) for satisfactory evening school and summer school supervision, for each term 1
 (c) for other supervision each term (to a maximum of 15)..... 1
 (8) for variety of experience
 (for each type or grade of teaching or supervising experience extending over at least one term)... 1
 (to a maximum of 15)
 (9) for character of experience
 (a) satisfactory, each term ½
 (to a maximum of 15)
 (b) unusual ability in teaching in special lines, each..... ½
 (to a maximum of 15)
 (c) unusual and available suggestions for improvements in the work in his own school, each..... ½
 (to a maximum of 15)
 (d) outside activities of 2 hours per week for each term..... ½
 (but not more than 2 points for any term)
 (to a maximum of 30)
 (e) for unusual evidences of personal fitness as shown by special reports.
 (to a maximum of 15)

II. Oral Examination

- (a) Reading, interpretation of a passage, etc. 20
 (b) Discussion of school problems. 20
 (c) Personality 20

III. Class Test Examination

- (d) In the case of principal and assistant to principal—in two subjects and before a Member of the Board of Examiners 20
 In the case of first assistant in high schools, in one subject before a Member of the Board of Examiners 20

IV. (e) A Written Examination..... 40

- For the principals' examination:
 English and a choice of three pedagogical papers.
 For the assistant to principals' examination:

English and a choice of two pedagogical papers.

For first assistant in high schools:

Science of education and a specialty.

THE DOLLAR'S BURDEN

Efficiency and economy may be demonstrated—thru the use of public money—in a variety of ways. One way is to abolish useless offices, with which every city government is abundantly provided. Another way is to restrict public activities. This has a double advantage. It not only lowers the tax-rate, but gives sundry enterprising gentlemen an opportunity to serve the public on a commercial basis. Thus does the administration gain the support of the business men as well as of the taxpayers. A third method is to cut down the wages of public employes. It is not difficult to discover cases of overpayment in public service. Almost any public official can get into the front page of the newspapers by pointing his finger at two or three such cases within his own knowledge. It is but a step to conclude that most of the employes are being overpaid. Cutting down wages thus makes the public money go farther—and thus bring more—and also brings repute as economizer to the official who brings the change about.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

of THE AMERICAN TEACHER, published monthly, except July and August, at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1915.

Editor-in-Chief, HENRY R. LINVILLE, 129 Lafayette St.; Managing Editor, BENJ. C. GRUENBERG, 129 Lafayette St.; Business Manager, J. EDWARD MAYMAN, 129 Lafayette St.; Publisher, THE AMERICAN TEACHER CO., INC., 129 Lafayette St., New York City.
 Owners, THE AMERICAN TEACHER CO., INC.; BENJ. C. GRUENBERG, 129 Lafayette St., New York City; MARK HOFFMAN, 129 Lafayette St., New York City; HENRY R. LINVILLE, 129 Lafayette St., New York City; GABRIEL R. MASON, 129 Lafayette, New York City; J. EDWARD MAYMAN, 129 Lafayette St., New York City.

Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities—None.

J. EDWARD MAYMAN,
 Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of September, 1915.

ISIDOR GASTER,
 Notary Public Kings Co.
 (My commission expires March 30, 1917)

OUR NEW DUTIES

The people of each and every nation need to sink their nationalism in a larger internationalism, and to learn and teach the true place of their country among the nations of the earth. The task would not be so difficult if once it were resolutely undertaken. The people of different nationalities do not by nature hate one another, and many illustrations of international friendliness manifest themselves at any opportunity. The masses of the people do not want war, but peace. International hatreds are kept up by the governing classes and those who profit by such hatreds, and the basis for national jingoism and future international strife is continually implanted in the minds of the rising generation in the schools of the different nations. In most nations to-day the schools are deliberately used by those in authority to instill into the minds of the young an exaggerated nationalism, which can be touched off into international hatred at such moment as the governing authorities may desire.

Perhaps the greatest task which lies ahead of the school, in all lands and countries, is that of bending its energies toward the creation of a new order of international friendship, justice, and good will. Upon the public educational systems of each state and nation lies the responsibility of enlarging the national conceptions and promoting good will among the nations of the earth. Entirely new values and standards for judging need to be created among the different peoples. In particular the school histories need to be rewritten, and the teaching in history and geography in the schools needs to be entirely redirected. The emphasis now placed on the deeds of the soldier should be shifted to those who have created the best of our civilization and rendered the most lasting benefits on mankind. The emphasis now placed

on wars should be shifted to the gains to civilization made in the intervals between wars, and war should be shown in its true light as a destroyer of what civilization creates. The biologic, economic, and human waste of war should be emphasized, and the fact that war is the breakdown of law and order and civilized society should be made clear to the young. Upon those who teach, but especially upon those who organize and administer education, rests the responsibility of creating a new national life in all countries—a national life which shall prize the fruits of civilization, which shall honor most those who advance the larger interests of mankind, and which believes in international justice and good will and looks to friendly arbitration rather than to brute force to settle the difficulties which may arise between nations. The shaping of a new international policy among nations, looking ultimately toward international peace and good will and the preservation of the slow gains of civilization, calls for educational statesmanship of a high order, and will require time for its accomplishment, but such represents the greatest constructive task now before those who direct the work of instruction in every nation.—From N. E. A. Declaration of Principles, 1915.

DISCIPLINE AND CULTURE

THE DEEPEST-LYING cause of coarseness, among ourselves as in other countries, is the fact that the culture of the young—in spite of all the fine things that are said about it—is not the end aimed at in our school curriculum, and that the behavior resulting from compulsory measures of school discipline does not imply any acquisition of self-discipline acting from within. Thus, when school days are over, coarseness returns.—ELLEN KEY, in *The Younger Generation*.