

The AMERICAN TEACHER

The Organ of
the American
Federation
of Teachers

OCTOBER, 1920



British Labor Wins



The Ethics of Academic
Freedom



Around the Circuit



Stirring Up the Teachers

Bur of Education
Washington
D C

Democracy in Education

Education for Democracy

Labor and Co-operation

THERE are said to be between 3,000 and 4,000 cooperative consumers' stores in the United States at the present time. They are almost exclusively owned by trade unionists and by farmers. Consumers' cooperation has probably never reached so high a level at any previous time in this country. Cooperative banking has advanced by bounds. Large numbers of small credit unions seem to be firmly entrenched while ambitious plans for state and national banks have been carefully laid.

Producers' cooperation has been advanced. Among trade unionists a number of interesting experiments are being made, while among farmers large and wealthy associations seem to be thoroly established. In numbers of organizations, in volume of business and most of all in centralized and critically self-conscious effort cooperation is on a higher plane than it has ever before reached in the United States. The successful stores are moreover chiefly those which are the property of trade unionists. Dr J P Warbasse, president of the Cooperative League of America, states that a recent examination of most of the consumers' undertakings listed by the league showed them to be overwhelmingly laborite in their membership.

Members of the American Federation of Labor are backing the present revival of cooperation. One of the dominant A F of L unions, the United Mine Workers of America, is responsible for some of the largest groups of stores in the United States. Outside organizations such as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the railroad brotherhoods have shown as much zeal as the mine workers. Radical and conservative alike are giving impetus to the development. Cooperation furthermore has for the first time brought organized labor and associated farmers together in an undertaking which rests on something more solid than emotion or opinion. Often enough in this country farmers and artisans have deemed their interests to be clashing and have acted in that belief.

Now both groups have discovered a practical interest which may bind them as firmly as the desire for protection bound the manufacturers of the first half of the nineteenth century.—William L Cheney in *The Survey* of October 9, 1920.

Experiments with cooperative enterprises among teachers have not yet developed apparently. Teachers are requested to send information of any experiments that may be under way to the AMERICAN TEACHER.

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS	146
BRITISH LABOR WINS	148
THE ETHICS OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM	151
AROUND THE CIRCUIT	157
THE ISSUE OF SALARIES FOR MEN	161
NEUTRALITY	163
FROM THE LOCALS OF THE A F OF T	165
STIRRING UP THE TEACHERS	168

The American Teacher

Entered as second-class matter, Feb. 21, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Published at 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, monthly, except July and August. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized September 27, 1919.

Volume IX, No. 7.

OCTOBER, 1920

One Dollar a Year

OTHER AFFILIATIONS

The AMERICAN TEACHER desires the cooperation of our members in ascertaining the names of cities in which some form of agreement seems to have been made between the educational systems and chambers of commerce. It is important that an investigation on a national scale be undertaken in this connection. In the event of significant data being obtained, a report will be published in these columns.

FOR THE NEW WAR, THE BATTERY OF SCIENTIFIC INTELLIGENCE

More things will happen in the "backwash" of the war than the probable change of the political complexion of the national government. The setting up of fake standards of patriotism, and the advertising of 100 percenters in various one-sided notions of Americanism will give way to calm and merciless studies of actual practices in our colleges and schools during the war period, before and since that dread epoch. Some of these studies, like the admirable one presented in this issue on "The Ethics of Academic Freedom," are not directed against any particular class of offenders in our academic life. Yet they tend to discredit all classes of offenders against the spirit of freedom, and to hasten the day of intelligent citizenship.

HIS MAJESTY, THE LAW

President Stillman's report of the struggles of the two locals at Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania, is well worth our attention. What has happened there is what might have been expected. In fact, like the credit-seeking newspaper that "forecasts" events, and then exclaims, "I told you so!", THE AMERICAN TEACHER desires to call attention to the forecast it made in the September issue. "Unless we set a watch upon their

[the officials'] actions they will be copying Finnegans's opinions, and setting them up as the law." Sure enough, Superintendent Noonan has given out the suggestion that the Finegan decision is the law in Pennsylvania. He has done even better than that. He has taken it upon himself to interpret the law to cover his own act when he calmly walks into a teachers' meeting, picks up the charter granted to the local by the American Federation of Teachers, and walks out with it, stating that any of his teachers who affiliated with organized labor would not have their license renewed that year. Has ever barbaric potentate been more true to form?

MORE GOOD MATERIAL FOR DEBATES

Columbia University, New York, is arranging a debate with the University of Texas on the now popular subject, "Shall teachers join unions and affiliate with the American Federation of Labor?" The Columbia students have had their "try-out," which yielded the interesting result that those who spoke on the side of unionization showed far better preparation than did those who chose the other side. It is not known yet which college will speak for the unions.

In the meantime, things are happening in the world at large, especially in England, that will have an important bearing on the question of whether teachers are affiliating with a special group in the state as against the public itself. Mr Stone's interesting statement published in this issue showing that the coal miners made their fight in behalf of the public as well as in their own interest, will be good material for this debate. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers in this country have also indicated a definite purpose to act in behalf of the public. The social idealism of organized labor has no counterpart in the activities of any organizations with which the National Security League, for example, would have us affiliate.

LEADERSHIP IN LABOR

The organized teachers in America have been affiliated with labor long enough to justify a thorough examination of our contributions to the social movement which labor represents. As a special group of educated workers, we should be peculiarly fitted for assisting in undertaking and in carrying out certain endeavors. Two kinds of helpful contributions would be cooperation in the efforts of labor to educate itself, and cooperation in the newer effort of labor to strengthen its leadership. The first is well under way; the latter calls for immediate attention.

We should understand at the beginning that leadership in labor is not to be improved by any process of meddling. There should be no uneasiness on this point in our case, however, if we are fundamentally and sincerely a part of the labor movement. Since we are a part of the labor movement socially and by deliberate choice, our effort will serve so far as it is intelligent.

Labor needs leadership that understands the philosophy of the movement. There should be a bureau in every labor center which could devote itself to the preparation of promising young men and women for the work of teaching and leading thru practical means the rank and file of the members. The young people should be trained thru the intensive study of trade unionism, economics, history, English and public speaking. The persons who can prepare themselves for teaching the coming leaders are the organized teachers. In fact, no others can do this work so well. Naturally, this means that as the plan develops many teachers will find that their vocation will be altered in such a way that they will teach in the labor schools altogether.

Along with the development of scientific understanding within the leadership of labor will come, under the incidental social stimulation of criticism, a definite sense of responsibility for clean and honest leadership. Now and then labor is shamed by public scandals of crookedness in its leadership. The gross defiance of the rights of the public and the brutal treatment of the workers themselves by dishonest leaders do untold harm. The current exposure of the leadership in the Building Trades

Council of New York hurts tremendously. Things of this sort become known from time to time, the old leaders are overthrown, and new leaders with senses made more keen to "watch their step," take their places.

We whose business it is to understand the drift and movement in history should place ourselves in positions to demonstrate to labor the futility of changing one leader for another, and letting it go at that. We must teach labor to give up the old idea of leadership which involves the dependence on men who are able, and are that alone. Even if we say that leaders should be honest, that they should be intelligent, that they should scorn to displace all possible competitors in the leadership, these qualities would not be enough. Leaders must be socially minded, and above all they must give their greatest effort toward the development in their people of the conception of leadership as the instrument thru which their own social desires are furthered and accomplished.

FROM THE BUSINESS MANAGER

Many notices have come to us from postmasters notifying us of removal of subscribers or readers of the "American Teacher." In many cases the NEW ADDRESS HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN. Such readers are of course dropped from our list. It is therefore essential that persons changing their addresses should notify the office at 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City, of such change.

Secretaries of Locals are asked to cooperate whenever possible.

The American Teacher

Democracy in Education Education for Democracy

Published monthly, except July and August, by

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

at 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

HENRY R. LINVILLE, Editor

Associate Editors

AUGUSTINE AURIANNE

SAMUEL G. MCLEAN

HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

ALICE L. WOOD

MAX ROSENHAUS, Business Manager

At the time of expiration, a bill will be found in the copy. Subscribers are requested to give prompt notice of changes in address.

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

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR FOR THE YEAR
FOREIGN, \$1.10

British Labor Wins

WILMER E. STONE

De Witt Clinton High School, New York

The issues in the great strike of British coal miners have been complicated by the emphasis on details, as reported in the press, yet the underlying struggle is massive and simple. The question primarily is whether labor shall force government to intervene in the management of the industry on behalf of the commonwealth, or whether government shall step aside and allow the workers and owners to fight a selfish battle, each in their own interest, with the public as victims. To the honor of the miners, supported by organized labor thruout the United Kingdom, they have taken up the gage in behalf of the British public and the ideal of service.

Last July the miners framed demands including a two-shilling raise per man per day, and the reduction of the price of domestic coal by 14 shillings, 2 pence, per ton. After negotiation between the miners' executive, the owners, and the government, threats of a strike and balloting upon it, the miners' leaders allowed themselves to be outmanœuvred. They withdrew the demand for the reduction in the price of coal, and, when the strike was finally called, the issue was a simple question of wages. Then the government overplayed its hand, being confident, no doubt, that the miners' leaders had lost their courage. Instead of granting the two shillings per day increase, the government, thru Sir Robert Horne, insisted upon making the increase depend upon increased output, with the proviso that decreased output would result in a cut in wages.

Robert Smillie, the miners' leader, had made a long fight for a basic minimum wage thruout the coal industry, and insisted that the increase was justified by increased cost of living, while falling production was due to the failure of the owners to work the best seams of coal and to failure to install modern methods and machinery. He claimed that the owners were deliberately making a poor showing in order to secure greater prices, then to succeed in having the government relinquish all control of the industry, when the owners could abandon the poor coal veins, work the rich ones, and, at the new high prices, make

immense profits for themselves. (Most of the profit now, under government control, go to reduce the war debt.) So the fight really was one, on the part of the miners, for continued government control, with an established basic minimum wage as a leading feature, in addition to protection of the public.

However, so great was the clamor in the press that the miners were merely selfish in demanding a two-shilling increase, yet refusing to guarantee output, that Smillie advised the miners to accept the government's terms, since they would get their increase and control would be retained, even if the basic minimum wage were lost in case of further falling off in production. The men were not to be so easily defeated. They voted to reject the government proposal; the strike began. It at once became evident that, despite the wavering of some labor leaders, like Thomas, of the railroad workers, the rank and file thruout the key industries, and especially the other members of the Triple Alliance (the Transport Workers and National Union of Railway Men) would line up behind the miners for a finish fight against owners and government (almost synonymous terms).

The government took fright, and, notwithstanding the gesture of passing a bill enabling it to use the military power in the emergency, began to negotiate once more. Smillie and the other leaders of the miners, strengthened by the evident determination of the men, now increased their demands. At present, the terms of the new tentative agreement between government and owners on one side and miners' executive on the other, are not available in full detail. They are outlined, however, as follows: The miners are to get their two-shilling increase, to date from October first; a commission is to be established to sit permanently to regulate wages in relation to output, providing that wages are not to fall below the minimum now existing, thus preserving both government control and the minimum wage; finally, *profits* as well as wages are to vary in proportion to output, thus strengthening the principle of con-

trol and recognizing the responsibility of the owners to the public and to the principle of service. It is to be hoped that the miners will vote to accept these terms, for they make a great gash in the divine right of private property to do as it pleases, and they constitute a long step towards the miners' ultimate goal—nationalization and democratic management of the mines. Attempt to disguise the fact as it may, the government is defeated. It bows to *force majeure*; and the credit for the victory belongs to the rank and file of British labor.

MOTHER AND THE TEACHER

FLORENCE ROOD

St Paul Federation of Women Teachers

Time was, if we may be allowed (temporarily only) to lay aside our professional language and speak in that of the day, when mother appears to have been the whole works. We suggest to those who doubt this statement that they read a certain quotation: Proverbs xxxi, vs. 10-31.

Having had the bearing and rearing of the family thrust on her by nature, she seems to have taken over all the activities of the industrial, social, and educational fields of the time. Is it any wonder there was nothing left for father but to "be known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land"?

Now that the fireless cooker, the vacuum cleaner, the electric washer and ironer and the ready-to-wear garment have so largely emancipated mother, we class-room teachers find ourselves, somewhat unwillingly, inheriting a garment that looks like mother's mantle in the field of education. If we should chronicle our activities in the language of the quotation, they would read pretty much this way.

Who can find a conscientious teacher? for her price is above rubies.

She has the confidence of her supervising officers, and they trust in her.

"She doeth them good."

She seeketh educational lectures and meetings and listeneth eagerly with her ears.

She is like the merchant ships, she bringeth her ideas from afar.

She riseth while it is yet night and goeth many

miles to her labors. Yea, verily, the bottom step of the street car is hers. She singeth praises that it is her garment, and not herself that is separated in the struggles of the workers like unto mad beasts.

She perceiveth that her labor is endless; her candle goeth not out at night.

She layeth her hand to her pen and the red ink, and her hand to her "demon papers." She maketh averages and reports. She supplieth her superior officer with material on which he writeth a thesis and on which he getteth a degree, and a promotion.

"He is known in the gates when he sitteth among the elders of the land."

She looketh well to the ways of her school room; and eateth not the bread of idleness.

She washeth many feet of blackboards and writeth assignments thereon.

She prepareth a lesson in each of the subjects man knoweth. She greeteth her children with joy.

She readeth an "Official Bulletin."

She examineth her children for the ills that flesh is heir to; she reporteth them to the nurse.

She readeth an "Official Bulletin."

She teacheth a lesson for a supervisor.

She disciplineth a child, "she openeth her mouth with wisdom and in her tongue is the law of kindness.

She readeth an "Official Bulletin" and prepareth an unexpected and "immediate" report on how many erasers she hath, or some other piece of information vital to the educational system.

"Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain," but a teacher who asketh not for greater compensation lest she be unprofessional, "she shall be praised."

"Give her the fruit of her hands; let her own works praise her in the gates."

THE FIFTH CONVENTION.—The call for the fifth convention of the American Federation of Teachers to be held the last week in December, has been issued under date of November 3rd. This convention will be held in St. Paul beginning at ten o'clock Tuesday forenoon, December 28th. Credential blanks are being sent to all locals who should elect delegates at the earliest opportunity. Duplicate blanks should be returned to Secretary Stecker after election of delegates. Further information regarding the convention will then be furnished to the delegates. Local arrangements are in the hands of the St. Paul Locals 28 and 43.

The Ethics of Academic Freedom*

WILLIAM L. WERNER

Lebanon, Pa.

Instructor in English, Pennsylvania State College

INTRODUCTION

This is a selective summary, chiefly of numerous magazine articles and reports, that have discussed various phases of academic freedom in America. The Preliminary Discussion considers the ramifications of the problem and gives conclusions when they seem undebatable. The Discussion takes up the debatable issues which concern the present situation, such issues that are of value in the pragmatic consideration of the problem. It concludes with an attempt to summarize the reasonable limits of freedom. The Practical Suggestions are concrete proposals which would tend to bring about such general rules of conflict or ethics, as the conclusions of Part Two might suggest as desirable.

In all this discussion it is assumed that private citizens may enjoy the very widest extent of freedom in thought, speech, and press. Limitations on such rights of private citizens would naturally limit the rights of teachers.

Where important material has been borrowed from other articles, the numeral employed will indicate the number of the reference in the bibliography. In this way, the reader can compare the statements of the original with the selective summary, noticing the reservations and interpretations of the present writer. All statements without such numerals are the writer's contribution to the discussion.

I. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

I. There are at most six parties involved in the contract of teaching: the founders and donors, the State, the trustees or supervisors, the teachers, the students, and the constituency. In some cases, some of these are lacking, in others they overlap; but this does not interfere with the present discussion of the rights of each.¹

(a) The *founders* and *donors* have no rights except the initial determination of how their gifts shall be used.¹¹ The founders can state the gen-

eral purpose of the institution and select the first trustees. The donors can choose the place of their gifts. But as soon as they try to control the school, after their gifts are made, they cease to be donors and are mere bargainers. This applies to State legislatures as well as to private individuals.¹⁰ "There can be no room for debate as to the impropriety of permitting powerful individuals outside the university, in or out of public office, to dictate to university presidents respecting the utterance of university professors."¹

(b) The *State* can exempt schools from taxation and can regulate schools by refusing to give them the right to grant degrees. There exists a general attitude that states should exempt schools from taxes and also that they should refuse charters "where the field is full and to individual promulgators of prejudice."¹¹ I do not see any ground for these opinions. Private schools should be willing to be taxed as much as any other public utility. State money ought not to go to institutions which the state does not control. At the same time, it would be dangerous to allow the state to refuse charters to schools on any grounds. Such restrictions might become a basis of intolerable political and religious repression (cf. attempt of New York Legislature to destroy the Rand School). Classification of schools by limiting their rights to degree-giving, etc., would not be objectionable (cf. III, 4).

(c) The rights of *trustees* in colleges and of *supervisors* in schools are greatest at present, and so, most important. Opinions vary widely, from the attitude of some trustees of the University of Pennsylvania⁹ (and elsewhere) who believe in their complete control, to the opinions of others that they shall merely ratify faculty suggestions. H. W. Nutt¹² in a book on supervision says, "one of the prime objects (of supervision) is to develop independence on the part of the teacher." Perhaps the one undebatable point is that some selection and some censorship is always made by the trustees before their choice and in their choice of teachers.¹⁰ This is an undeniable privilege, as

* Thesis presented in Education at Summer Session of Columbia University, July, 1920.

no one so far has suggested that a faculty select its own members (except where teachers are also trustees, as in the School for Social Research, I believe; and in minor appointments to instructorships and assistantships). The power of trustees over professors, after their selection, will be considered later in this thesis.

(d) The *teachers* have some just claims for independence, which will be discussed under III. I shall merely point out here some of the abuses of the privileges which their position entails; abuses which are opposed to complete academic freedom. Such essential qualities of characteristics are:

1. A scholarly attitude and sincere research.
2. An expression of one's views with dignity, courtesy, and temperance.
3. The duty of training pupils to think rather than copy one's own ideas.
4. Competency, to teach or direct research.¹
5. A fair, judicial mind, setting forth divergent opinions.¹⁰
6. The duty of teaching one's subject to the best of one's ability, not dealing in class with matters wholly unrelated to that subject.^{18, 4}
7. The duty of not calling true ideas untested by others.
8. The duty of not claiming authority outside one's subjects.
9. The duty of not linking the name of one's school with the expression of one's private opinions outside.
10. Correct personal conduct; high morality.
11. No hostility to the state aiming at its dismemberment or destruction.
12. Duty toward school, as first consideration in all one's acts.¹⁸

I do not think there is any debate about the first ten requirements. But I should say that loyalty to the truth is more important than to the state or the institution (opposed to 11 and 12). The characteristics 1, 2, and 5, should be sufficient guarantee of a correct attitude toward state and school (except in the case of private schools, discussed later). The loyalty to truth in a teacher seems to me to admit of no conflicting loyalties. Should these various loyalties become totally in-

compatible, resignation is better than a sacrifice of truth.

(e) *Students* in the present state of student government have no recognized authority. Their regulations of academic freedom are confined to individual boycotts of certain classes or teachers. A student in higher institutions may avoid a certain course, or drop it before it ends or walk out of a class room, to express disapproval. The immature pupil of the lower schools has little, if any, voice in the matter. The most valid objections of pupils to entirely free speech are: (1) neglect of a catalogued course for extraneous material that interests the teacher; (2) neglect of the desired course in response to demands of backward students or discussions of students especially interested in particular phases of a problem; and (3) introduction into the course of entirely extraneous material that is offensive to the student or his parents.¹¹ These seem to be three reasonable limitations to entirely free speech (cf. previous paragraph, duties 2, 6, and 8. Perhaps the best way for the student to enforce these limitations is to follow the example of Lincoln Steffens and others, who gave their professor at a European university one minute off his subject, and then shuffled their feet on the floor until he returned to pertinent matter. (Further discussion under III, 5.)

(f) The *constituency* of a school includes, among others, the alumni and the group of citizens from which its students and its money are drawn.¹¹ There is no question as to the ultimate power of this group, as no school can exist without students or funds. But at present its lack of organization and its distance from the school usually make it powerless. In private schools, it has no rights except such as can be enforced through a withdrawal of support (as with donors). In public schools, it must act thru its representatives (legislature, school directors, etc.). The right of an alumnus to protect his own prestige by insisting that the standards of the school be maintained must be worked out thru alumni representation on the governing board. The proper location of the power of all this group, in fact, should lie in the board of trustees, bringing it under the previous discussion of (c).

Having examined these six parties, we see that the present situation is a conflict between trustees and teachers. The other four groups have no rights, or have no means of enforcing them at present. (The matter of enforcing recognized rights is taken up in Part III.)

2. *Three phases of freedom.* There are six parties involved; there are three phases of the problem. They are freedom: (a) for inquiry and research; (b) of teaching in the class room; and (c) in extra-mural utterance and action.

(a) *Freedom for inquiry and research* is a generally admitted right, provided that it does not interfere with teaching activities. I have found only one dismissal from research work, that of Professor Hale¹⁴ from Dartmouth College about 1835, and that seems to have arisen from sectarian religious differences, not connected with the work. I can find no justification for Prof. John Dewey's¹⁰ statement that the danger to freedom to work is greater than to freedom of speech. Lack of appropriations, of course, hampers research work, but usually this is from lack of funds rather than from misappropriation. (Even this danger is paralleled by an omission of course or low pay of teachers in subjects objectionable to the authorities^{9,1}, cf. Scott Nearing case.) The general attitude today, I believe, is for unhampered research (partly because the danger of research to existing conditions and beliefs is not realized), and I shall not consider this aspect further.

(b) Freedom of speech in the class room seems to be the most susceptible to limitations. Here the teacher is speaking in his official capacity with a definitely assigned field to cover, and not as a private individual. The teacher's first duty lies in teaching his subject as ably and completely as possible. The characteristics essential to a teacher and the reasonable limitations of students (both cited above, *l, d, and e*) should be legitimate restrictions on his freedom of speech in the class room. The desirability of as much freedom as possible is discussed in the next subdivision (3), and the practical working out of the compromise between freedom and abuse of privileges is discussed in Part III. Only one other point needs consideration here: one teacher does not control

a student, as so much discussion seems to take for granted. There are three powerful antidotes to any abuse of freedom on the part of one teacher: (1) the actual experience of the student; (2) the opinions of friends, prominent persons and other teachers; and (3) the lack of substantiation by authoritative text-books on the subject. Altho the last two of these reasons may not apply to the average student, the first certainly does, and, considered from a pragmatic viewpoint, its value is very great. So even the fullest freedom on the part of the teacher is decidedly limited in these three ways; his good ideas will naturally survive and the bad ones will tend to fail.

(c) Freedom in extra-mural utterance and action can hardly be denied. Only three conditions should be imposed: the necessity of a morally clean life; the expression of private views with dignity, courtesy and temperance; and the necessity of not linking personal opinions with the name of his school.⁷ None of these three restrictions limits the content of the teachers' opinions, and so free speech and action is practically guaranteed.

3. *The desirability of as much freedom as possible* seems obvious. "No man can be a successful teacher unless he enjoys the respect of his students and their confidence in his intellectual integrity."¹ One of the essential conditions of teachings is "the unhindered opportunity for action and reaction of the personalities of teacher and pupil."² "To investigate truth; critically to verify fact; to reach conclusions by means of the best methods at command, untrammelled by fear or favor, to communicate this truth to the student; to interpret to him its bearing on the questions he will have to face in life—this is precisely the aim and object of the university."¹⁰ President Harper said that complete freedom of speech is "regarded as fundamental" in the University of Chicago.⁷ He continues: "If an officer on permanent appointment abuses his privilege as a professor, the university must suffer and it is proper that it should suffer. Abuse is not so great an evil as restriction of liberty." "Every act of the supervisor should be for the purpose of making teachers independent and efficient."¹¹ "It is neither possible nor desirable to deprive a col-

lege professor of the political rights vouchsafed to every citizen."¹ Thomas Huxley said: "Universities should be places in which thought is free from all fetters, and in which all sources of knowledge and all aids to learning should be accessible to all comers, without distinction of creed or country, riches or poverty."² These quotations, from varied sources, on freedom both in class room and without, indicate the general trend of thought: that the ideal in teaching is freedom.

4. The pragmatic value of this discussion must be based on a consideration of the *actual cases of limitation of academic freedom*. There are many alleged excuses for dismissing teachers, ranging from nervousness and lack of taste to lack of patriotism in a Latin teacher.¹⁰ R M Wenley sums up the fields in which academic freedom was contested in past times as follows: (a) astronomy; (b) geology; (c) biology; (d) philosophy and now (e) economics. Surveying the contemporary dismissals, I find that they come under six headings: (a) politics; (b) economics; (c) religion; (d) incompetence; (e) immorality; (f) disloyalty to the institution or the state.¹ Both incompetence and immorality do not enter into this discussion; disloyalty has already been discussed (I, d) with respect to loyalty to truth. Politics and religion seem to be perennial subjects of dissent. Economics has succeeded biology as the present bone of contention.¹⁷ The one important fact that the above lists show is that the problems of academic freedom are always in debatable fields, where opinion rather than facts are available. The absurdity of Alton Parker's¹⁰ plan of "requesting members of university faculties to confine themselves to teaching things that have stood some tests of time and concerning which the best cultivated opinion of the age is favorable" is manifest. *Since freedom is chiefly a problem of opinions, there can be no good criteria of judgment; and so the safest plan seems to be complete freedom.* Or if judgments are necessary, care should be taken to secure competent judges (cf. III, 1).

II. DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT PROBLEM

1. The discussion will be simplified by separating the problems of private schools and of state

institutions. It seems fundamental that a school, privately established and supported, should restrict all activities that interfere with its primary purpose. A school established to propagate a particular brand of religion or economic opinion has the right to do so without interference on the part of its teachers. This is a generally accepted opinion. Of course, a teacher entering such a school, should be informed clearly of any limitations to his discussion (cf. case of Professor Mecklin³ at Lafayette College, for evils of uncertainty of this point). For further discussion of this point see Part III, 4.

2. The problem of state institutions (public schools and universities) is different. The only possible limit to free speech would be in regard to opinions contrary to the interests or existence of the state, or of its ruling class. Even this limitation must go, if we admit that the government exists for the people and not the people for the government. The loyalty to truth is the greatest loyalty in this type of institution. Such freedom in state schools would attract the better teachers and students and at the same time, by competition, check the private schools from a too narrow outlook. Opinions taught soberly in classrooms do not easily overthrow states. The pupils are often minors and they form a very small minority of the population; there is little danger in this direction (cf. also I, 2, b, for natural conflict of unorthodox teaching with others' opinions and experiences). I should say that the state should put no limits on free discussion, and by example and competition should encourage the same attitude in private schools.

3. Another natural division to simplify discussion is the difference between mature and immature students. All the preceding discussion applies chiefly to mature students. *For immature students special limitations are necessary.* "It is expected that the instructor will present scientific truth with discretion, that he will introduce the student to new conceptions gradually, with some consideration for the student's preconceptions and traditions, and with due regard to character building. The teacher ought also to be especially on guard against taking unfair advantage of the student's immaturity by indoctrinating him with

the teacher's own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness of judgment to be entitled to form any definite opinion of his own."¹ This does not mean that a hard and fast line can be drawn between mature and immature students and between universities and schools of acknowledged facts. The public school pupil who is taught to memorize and not to reason, will not be able to bridge the gap between the two processes later. Initiative and free discussion should be encouraged thruout the system. The attitude of Mr. Mufson⁶ (recorded in the account of his trial and dismissal from De Witt Clinton High School, New York City) seems to me to be the best compromise. First, he would bar entirely such subjects as are irrelevant and beyond the pupils' comprehension (*e. g.*, anarchism). Then, he would permit discussions of relevant topics by the pupils, with criticism by fellow students, while the teacher remains neutral (or perhaps asks probing questions). If a decision is desired in a discussion, the majority of the class can usually come to an agreement that is not far from correct. (I have followed this plan in high school teaching of history, English literature and general science, and have found it interesting and satisfactory.) To deny all discussion would repress the child's natural energy and would encourage parrots rather than thinkers. To have the teacher impose his own views would be autocratic and unfair. Even if the majority decides on a wrong solution of a problem, it will encourage thoughtfulness. Such a decision is just as subject to change later, as any of our ideas in adult life. It is important in secondary schools that an inquiring attitude be stimulated, in preparation for independent action in maturity.

Conclusion to this discussion: *there are five justifiable limitations to absolute academic freedom.* They are: (1) *limits if any, imposed on every citizen of the state in morality, loyalty, etc.* (mentioned in introduction, paragraph 2); (2) *limits imposed by a teacher on himself* (I, d); (3) *limits imposed by students* (I, e); (4) *limits imposed by trustees or founders of private in-*

stitutions (II, 1); and (5) *limits imposed upon teachers of immature students* (preceding paragraph).

III. PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

There remain the practical suggestions for exercising this freedom to these limits in the ablest manner; that is, the problems of technique.

1. The most important practical remedy is an *increased power for the faculty*, especially in *judging cases of academic freedom*. No one can judge better than a professor the limits another teacher should impose upon himself. Nor are there better judges among donors or trustees than among teachers, on the merits of those debatable questions (*e. g.*, economics) which are usually the bone of contention.¹ A man should be tried by his peers. The teaching profession should be willing to purge itself. One of the conditions of academic freedom is "the fixing upon the teaching profession of the full responsibility for attaining this freedom of opportunity."² Trial by a jury of the faculty, before any dismissal, would insure better justice for the present, and would establish an ethical code for future cases.

2. Another benefit would be secured by *partial faculty control of the curriculum*, choice of instructors, etc. This would make a curriculum more flexible, more responsive to changing needs and theories. At the same time the ease of repeating old courses would keep the curriculum from being too faddish. The value of this reform would lie in the improbability of slighting certain fields of teaching or research (*e. g.*, present lack of sociology and biology in some sectarian colleges). The teachers more than the trustees would realize the value of a well-rounded culture. This is a debatable point, but I think that the average faculty is more broad-minded and open on such matters than the average board of trustees.

3. The profession should be rendered more attractive, not entirely by salary raises, but by insuring the dignity, independence and reasonable security of tenure. Committees on ethics and judicial decisions of faculties would in time build up a series of precedents and a code of profes-

sional conduct (cf. present variety of opinion: President Harper, of Chicago, recommends permanent, irrevocable appointment of professors, while President Reed, of Dickinson, thinks a one-year tenure is sufficient for all positions, including presidency).

4. The distinction between public (free discussion) institutions and private (sectarian, etc.) schools should be accurately defined and made public.¹ The differences between narrow sectarianism, broad-minded Christianity and entire freedom should be made clear.² This would enable professors and students to enter institutions with a full realization of its extent of freedom. The State could make these distinctions clear and public in educational reports and by regulating its degree-conferring powers.

5. Students should be stimulated to independent thinking and (in some cases) to research.¹ Intercollegiate rivalry should extend to studies as well as athletics. Institutions should emphasize their strong courses and strong teachers. Promising students should be searched for and encouraged as promising athletes are today. Migration of post-graduate students should be encouraged by a system of easily transferable credits (the present conditions are vague and confusing). Students must be encouraged to demand their rights (cf. I, 1) from incompetent teachers.¹

The execution of these five suggestions would do much to rationalize and systematize present chaotic opinions on matters of academic freedom. The basis of present actions and decision ought to rest on complete freedom, except for the five limitations cited in the conclusion to the main discussion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1.—Bulletin of American Association of University Professors. All reports of committee on academic freedom and tenure, including investigations at University of Pennsylvania, University of Utah, University of Washington, Allegheny College, Wooster College, University of Montana, etc.
- 2.—Nat'l Ed. Ass'n Speeches. "Administrative Responsibility and Current Doctrines of Academic Freedom and Tenure"—E. C. Elliott.
- 3.—Report of joint committee of inquiry of Am. Philosophical Ass'n and Am. Psych. Ass'n on condition at Lafayette College, 1914.
- 4.—"Academic Freedom," speech of Dr. George C. Butte, U. of Texas, 1917.
- 5.—Report of Board of Education, N. Y. C., on Mary S. McDowell, 1918.
- 6.—Reports on trial of De Witt Clinton H. S. teachers, New York City.
- 7.—N. Y. Evening Post, Mar. 25, 1901, p. 7—Views of leading college presidents on the dismissal of professors.
- 8.—Report of Committee of Economists on E. A. Ross-Stanford U. case.
- 9.—The Nearing Case—Lightner Witmer.
- 10.—"Academic Freedom"—John Dewey in Educational Review. Also discussion on this article in later issues, by Frank Thilly, Alton Parker, etc.
- 11.—"Academic Freedom in America"—Wm. DeW. Hyde.
- 12.—"Supervision of Instruction"—H. W. Nutt. one chapter.
- 13.—"The Human Factor in Education"—J. P. Munroe, one chapter.
- 14.—"Professor Hale and Dartmouth College." Anonymous pamphlet, ca. 1835.
- 15.—"The American College"; Abraham Flexner. Several pertinent pages.
- 16.—"Freedom of the Teacher"—C. B. Gilbert. Nat'l Ed. Ass'n Reports.
- 17.—"Educational Charters"—A. F. Leach.
- 18.—Columbia U.—Report (joint) of com. on ed. and special com. on the state of teaching, etc., 1918.

BUFFALO TEACHERS TO GIVE DAY'S PAY TO SEVEN OUSTED MEMBERS

Buffalo, October 14.—Both financial and moral support was assured today for the officers of the Teachers' Educational League who were suspended by action of the Buffalo school board Monday. The support was voted at a meeting last night of more than 1,000 teachers, all women, members of the Teachers' League.

Resolutions were passed condemning the action of the school board in dismissing Miss Mary A. O'Connor, former principal of School No. 25, and in suspending six other teachers, officers of the league. One day's pay was pledged by each member for the purpose of backing a legal fight against the action of the school board. Plans were made for a public mass meeting to be held Sunday, at which the teachers will state their side of the controversy to the public.

Another resolution was passed accepting Miss Margaret M. Considine's resignation as treasurer of the league, after a resolution of expulsion had been quashed. Miss Considine, one of the suspended teachers, was reinstated by the school board after she showed she was not a member of the Officers' League.

The school board dismissed Miss O'Connor and suspended the six teachers because of alleged adverse criticisms of the school board contained in a pamphlet published by the Teachers' League.—From the New York "Call" of October 17, 1920.

Around the Circuit

CHARLES B STILLMAN

President, The American Federation of Teachers

Our locals are resuming their activities for the improvement of the schools, which were necessarily interrupted in most cases by the summer vacation. Reports of constructive plans are coming into headquarters with increasing frequency. As these plans develop, the various locals should have interesting and valuable contributions to the columns of *THE AMERICAN TEACHER*.

The problem of reaching the new teachers has been solved effectively by the St Paul Federation of Women Teachers. The St Paul local's gave a reception to the new teachers, which was attended by over eight hundred persons, including the officials of the schools and of the city, and the great majority of all the teachers, old and new. It proved an excellent method of cordially welcoming new colleagues, and developing an *esprit de corps*. Locals in other communities are planning similar gatherings.

TRADES AND LABOR CONGRESS OF CANADA

At Windsor last month I spent a few days at the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada. I found the officers and delegates intensely interested in our movement and actively sympathetic. After there was an opportunity to present our cause to the convention many of the delegates came to me urging that we inaugurate campaigns in their communities and promised their assistance. Powerful interests are opposing the affiliation of Canadian teachers with our movement, because affiliation would strengthen the principle of international organization. Canadian locals would, of course, retain autonomy under the American Federation of Teachers, even more completely, if that is possible, than do our locals in the United States. But the development of mutual understanding and good feeling would go forward apace. And the Junkers of both countries would be glad to see the American Federation of Labor movement smashed because the movement is the surest guarantee of continued friendly relations between the two countries.

MORE OF PENNSYLVANIA

You are familiar with the splendid spirit shown

by our Lancaster local when confronted with the lockout as the generous answer of the Lancaster school board to our voluntary renunciation of the weapon of the strike. More of that story later—it is far from being a closed incident.

Mahanoy City, of the same state, has been passing thru interesting experiences. Our Coal Township and Shenandoah locals, in the same vicinity, have not been disturbed by their local authorities, as a result of Dr Finegan's ruling in the Lancaster case. But the Superintendent of Mahanoy Township in a series of three misleading and abusive newspaper articles did his best to kill our Mahanoy City local, and unfortunately he received support from the school superintendent of that city. His distortion of Dr Finegan's decision is so common, and the sorry conception of official relationships revealed is so typical of a large proportion of communities and school systems, that I quote at considerable length from my answer to Superintendent Noonan in the Mahanoy City *Record-American* of October 13.

DR FINEGAN'S RULING NOT MANDATORY

While visiting some of the eastern locals of the American Federation of Teachers, I find that in Mahanoy City an attempt has been made, chiefly by Superintendent Noonan of the township schools, gravely to mislead the public as to the school law of Pennsylvania, the purposes and methods of the American Federation of Teachers, and the relationship between union teachers and the American Federation of Labor.

I have seldom seen a more flagrant abuse of the time-honored device of garbled quotation than is shown in Supt Noonan's discussion of Dr Finegan's decision. In the first place it seems necessary to remind some local school officials that the constitution of this State places the law-making power in the hands, not of appointed officials, but of duly elected representatives of the people, comprising the State legislature. Dr Finegan, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is an appointee of the Governor, and a member of the executive, not the legislative branch of government. The school code has been enacted, and can be amended, only by the legislature. It is the function of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to see that the provisions of the school code are carried out. In performing that function, questions concerning the interpretation of the school law may arise, and Section 1014 provides:

"He may, when requested, give decisions and interpretations of the school law, which shall be valid

and binding in like effect as law until reversed by proper judicial authority."

Under that section Dr Finegan rendered his Lancaster decision. And now let me quote vital passages in that decision which Superintendent Noonan was very careful to omit.

"There is, therefore, presented to me for determination, first, a question of law, which is, Did the Board of School Directors violate the legal rights of any of the teachers in failing or refusing to contract with them for the ensuing year?" Since there is no tenure law in Pennsylvania, he answers that question in the negative. He then continues:

"There is also presented to me for determination a further question of broad educational policy, which is, Is it proper and professional for teachers to affiliate as an organized body with another organization representing a portion of the citizens of the community in which such teachers are employed?" And at the close of the same paragraph: "It is the duty of the State Superintendent to determine such question for the purpose not only of adjusting this controversy, but also of expressing the judgment of the State Superintendent on what is a sound and educational policy to be pursued by teachers and school boards if a similar issue should be raised in the future." He then answers the second question also in the negative.

I have italicized certain passages for convenient reference. Section 1014 provides that the State Superintendent's "decisions and interpretations" of school laws "are legally binding until reversed by the courts." Therefore Dr Finegan, in the very language of his ruling, carefully distinguishes between matters of law, and matters of his opinion and judgment on policies outside the law. In the former his ruling is law; but in the latter, since the school code in no way discriminates against teachers because of organizations which they may choose to join, he avoids any pretense that his judgment on that matter is law. In fact, earlier in his ruling he specifically stated, and this also Superintendent Noonan deliberately refused to quote:

"There is no legal obligation on the part of the Board of School Directors to contract for the ensuing year with any of the teachers employed during the past school year, and the fact that such teachers are or are not members of an organization of any kind has no bearing upon the lawful action which a board may take in such matter."

Concerning Dr Finegan's Lancaster decision the Educational Editor of the New York *Evening Post*, formerly the Editor of *School Life*, the official organ of the U S Bureau of Education, after personal investigation on the ground, had this to say in the issue of August 14. He comments on the lack of tenure, in which Pennsylvania is not exceptional—"The School Board here can let any teacher go if the members do not like the color of her hair or her eyes, or the way she dresses, or anything else about her. It shows the professional position in which American teachers are to-day" and then continues: "Legally the State Superintendent was on firm ground. But he did not stop here. He drew up a statement on the propriety of teacher affiliation that will return to plague him some day. Nobody who knows Dr Finegan will believe that he wrote it himself, for it isn't even an effective attack on labor affiliation. It repeats most of the erroneous assumptions about labor organizations that are current among those that have not taken the trouble to investigate."

Dr Finegan's whole discussion of the union movement among teachers shows a grievous misconception of its constitution, methods, and relationships, and a complete lack of appreciation of its purposes, and of the spirit of social idealism which permeates it. He seized the opportunity offered by Lancaster to use the influence of his official position against an organization in which he did not happen to believe. He went far enough in all conscience, as he would probably be the first to admit, but in ordinary fairness to Dr Finegan it must be said that he revealed no such inordinate lust for power as is attributed to him in Superintendent Noonan's articles.

Those articles also stress, with an obvious intention to mislead and intimidate the power of the State Superintendent to revoke teachers' certificates, and to withhold State funds from school districts. Those powers can, of course, be exercised only under the provisions of the code; not arbitrarily on the basis of the personal opinion or whim of a State Superintendent, but only when the school law, enacted by the elected representatives of the people, has been violated. In the case of the district in Erie county given as an illustration by Mr. Noonan, it is my information that State funds were withheld because the district did not conform to the state law in regard to vaccination. Certainly teachers' organizations were not an element in the case. Fortunately this whole phase is cleared up by Dr Finegan himself in the passage already quoted:

"The fact that such teachers are or are not members of an organization of any kind has no bearing upon the lawful action which a board may take in such matter."

Since that ruling is an interpretation of existing law, it is binding until modified by the courts or new legislation. Dr Finegan is capable of speaking for himself, and after he has spoken so explicitly, it is rather unreasonable to expect us to believe that he has now selected as his spokesman and official interpreter, the superintendent of schools of Mahanoy Township.

Superintendent Oday, of the Mahanoy City schools, altho happily apparently without the vindictiveness of Superintendent Noonan, has also been guilty of garbling the Lancaster decision. At a meeting of the city teachers called for the purpose without warning, he carefully selected passages from the decision, asserted vehemently that they were law, and demanded a vote by the teachers on whether it would not be for the best interests of the schools for them to withdraw from the American Federation of Teachers. A considerable proportion of them refused to vote on the ground that the procedure was unfair. Some of the teachers, lacking an opportunity to consult their attorney, or even each other, and impressed by the superintendent's position as their official superior, and by his dogmatic insistence that his interpretation was the only possible interpretation, and that they would be lawbreakers if they did not accept his viewpoint and withdraw from the local, voted with him, so that he secured a majority of those voting, but only a minority of the teachers present. He then thought to clinch the matter by rushing a statement of the majority vote to the press, and soon the report was circulated thruout the State that the Mahanoy City teachers' local had withdrawn. But of course characters are not surrendered in quite that cavalier fashion. The citizens of Mahanoy City must not undervalue the metal of their teachers, because

despite those tactics, the Mahanoy City local has maintained its charter and is in good standing.

LOYALTY BY CONTRACT

Another interesting development in the local situation relates to the contracts between the school board and the teachers. This is the first time in years that a written contract has been used, but the teachers were entirely willing to sign a fair contract. The final clause in the draft submitted to them read as follows:

"She will loyally co-operate with the District Superintendent and the State Department of Public Instruction in their endeavor to increase the efficiency of the public schools and raise the professional standard of the teacher."

Primary purposes of our movement are, in the language of the Constitution of the A F of T, to "raise the standard of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service; and to promote such a democratization of the schools as will enable them better to equip their pupils to take their place in the industrial, social, and political life of the community." We are ready and anxious to co-operate with school authorities and all others who will assist in the advancement of those purposes. The city teachers therefore were amazed to find that Superintendent Oday could see a conflict between that clause and membership in the A F of T. However, their contract was with the school board, not with the superintendent, and they were informed that the board intended no joker in that final clause and that signing the contract would affect in no way their membership in the union. Only upon that understanding did they sign. In that the board has simply taken the position I have already twice quoted from Dr Finegan. I am sorry that I have not had the opportunity of talking to all the board members, but I have seen the majority and find that they still told that position.

But aside from this, to place any other meaning upon the language of that clause leads to very unpleasant and dangerous conclusions. When Superintendent Oday asked the teachers to come to him to sign their contracts, forgetting that the contracts were with the board and not with him, he attempted to impress upon the teachers his interpretation. And coupled with the now familiar distortion of the Lancaster decision into a mandatory law, that remarkable interpretation was to the effect that since Dr Finegan believed membership in the A F of T unprofessional, and the contract pledged the teachers to co-operate loyally with the District Superintendent and the Department of Public Instruction, therefore the teachers were bound by their contract to sever their membership regardless of their own judgment! He admits freely that he even went so far as to ask in many cases, and I understand in some instances to secure the promise of a teacher that she would withdraw, before he permitted her to sign the contract.

That interpretation assumes that loyal co-operation for certain specified and worthy ends is equivalent to servile surrender of independent conscience and judgment. It degrades the final clause of the contract into a mere petty pledge of personal loyalty to officialdom. Such contracts would offer a State bureaucracy or local school administration a very effective means to build up a powerful machine among the teachers by the simple process of making positions contingent upon pledges of personal loyalty. I cannot believe that Superintendent Oday

realized even the immediate implications of his interpretation. The American ideal is loyalty to principles, rather than to men. I think Mr. Oday would agree that the only personal loyalty any superintendent, or any one else, can legitimately claim, must be earned by ability, breadth of view and tolerance and public-spirited service. Any personal loyalty that must be exacted by contract requirement is demeaning to both teacher and superintendent.

But let me return to Superintendent Noonan's article and take up some additional statements of his so far as time and space permit. I notice that he adopts the old subterfuge of labor haters everywhere, and insists that he is not opposed or organized labor in general, in the mines, for instance, since he is living in a community consisting predominantly of union miners. No, he is opposed to organized labor only when it enters his field, when classroom teachers affiliate with it, and what he considers the rightful prerogatives of superintendents are thus endangered. It is a pitiful attempt to carry water on both shoulders, to keep up his political fences, and still indulge his bitter prejudice against our movement. He writes, "The township teachers already see it properly." It was his method of compelling many of his teachers to see it thru his eyes that aroused the wrath of the General Mine Committee. It seems that some proportion of township teachers hold a type of license that requires the endorsement of the Superintendent for its renewal at the end of the year. Last spring township teachers applied to the A F of T for a charter, but it was reported that before they could perfect an organization, they were stamped by the Superintendent's threats that he would refuse to recommend the renewal of the license of any member of the A F of T. So they came to "see it properly." There is no question that the Superintendent is the authoritative spokesman for his teachers. He confesses it naively and repeatedly. While writing of the generous treatment of his teachers by the board, he calmly says, "I shall ask the teachers at an early meeting to signify their feelings in this matter by the passage of whatever resolution they may see fit to adopt." We of course must expect a voluntary and spontaneous expression of gratitude to follow.

Again, he states that the A F of T is an "organization not educational from a professional viewpoint," and elsewhere implies that we are an organization "outside" the profession. The A F of T is the national organization of classroom teachers, affiliated with the A F of L. It is composed exclusively of teachers, and is democratically controlled by annual conventions of delegates elected by the various locals. In conducts its affairs without dictation, or the suggestion of control of any force outside its membership of classroom teachers. It has adopted a non-strike policy, and cannot under any circumstances be called out on sympathetic strike. (In spite of those facts, the weapon of the lockout has been used against it by one or two reactionary boards of education.) In the determination and carrying out of its policies, it is absolutely independent—and here is the rub—independent even of the superintendents. While the N E A and the various State Teachers' Associations have proverbially been dominated by the Superintendents. After sixty years of teachers' associations controlled by superintendents, we submit to any unbiased observer that the resulting condition of the schools and the teaching profession does not justify an exclusive continuance of that type of leadership. There is a

logical place for at least one organization of classroom teachers. But naturally we must expect bitter hostility from the old guard type of superintendents of high or low degree.

But that by no means includes all superintendents. I have had the good fortune to teach under some superintendents who were broad gauge and liberal-minded, and able successfully to resist the tradition of autocratic authority which colored so much of the environment of their position. And I believe that the democratic type of superintendent is increasing in number.

CHARGE MOVEMENT TO CRUSH TEACHER UNIONS IN STATE

Representatives at Convention of Teacher Organizations Open Drive for Right to Unionize

Charging that thruout the state "a far-reaching and concerted movement is at work in an endeavor to crush the teachers organizations," delegates representing the organized teachers yesterday brought before the State Federation in the form of resolutions and proposed legislation their program for the protection and betterment of the profession.

The principal action sought is the enactment of state legislation granting tenure of position along conditional lines, and statutory form of trials for dismissed instructors. A resolution pledging labor to the support of Amendment No. 16 on the November ballot, which increases the state apportionment for teacher's salaries, was also introduced.

The measures advanced by the union representatives mark the opening of a struggle, backed by the organized labor of the state as well as the American Federation of Labor, for the right of the teachers to form union organizations as a means of bettering their living conditions, hours of work and pay.

In the order of their presentation the resolutions, signed by E J Dupuy, Robert L Ennis, J J McTierman, and Miss Josephine Colby, third vice-president of the National Teachers' Federation, follow:

"Whereas, the state labor organizations are realizing more and more the obstacles placed in the path of the teachers in the public schools, as well as the open discrimination made against teachers forming unions and affiliating with the Federation of Labor; and

"Whereas, the proper citizenship can be developed in the public schools only when the teachers are allowed their freedom of thought, of speech and of action; and

"Whereas, the improvement of our schools does not rest solely upon an increase in salaries but in the removal of the altogether too arbitrary rule of those placed in authority over the rank and file of the teaching force; and

"Whereas, it is a known fact that thruout the commonwealth of California a far-reaching and concerted movement is at work in an endeavor to crush the teachers organizations affiliated with the Labor Councils and the State Federation of Labor, namely, manifested in the activity of the Commercial Federation of California, now the Better America, and that thruout this agency and others of the same character teachers are coerced into refraining from joining any organization excepting the ones designated by Boards of Education or Boards of School Trustees; and

"Whereas, in several localities California teachers have been demoted, compelled to resign, or dropped from their department of education for having joined teachers federations in order to make place for others who may be more willing to obey and never question; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the California State Federation of Labor in twenty-first annual convention assembled that we urge during the coming year an active campaign of organizing teachers into federations or unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and pledge the support of our state and local organizations to all such unions of public school teachers and that organized labor strive to secure representation on local school boards to the end that the teachers who are entrusted with the education of our children may impart to their charges the proper ideals and standards which should obtain in a free democracy, and not be intimidated into presenting views and theories which only represent the ideas of a class or of such un-American organizations as the Commercial Federation, and prepare in the proper manner our rising generation for the struggles it will have to encounter."

"Whereas, The more than 15,000 teachers of California are without the protection which is enjoyed by other members of the State Civil Service, and

"Whereas, Their tenure of position consists of an individual yearly contract, not based on the fundamental labor principle of collective bargaining and is subject to the whim and caprice of school authorities, and

"Whereas, This insecurity of tenure is a potent cause of the present unrest among teachers and the accompanying teacher-shortage; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the California State Federation of Labor directly and thru its affiliated locals, use every effort to secure the enactment of state legislation granting tenure of position for teachers along the following lines:

"1. After the lapse of a probationary period of not less than two years, tenure, shall be permanent, subject to following provisions.

"2. All dismissals, both during and after probation, to be for causes definitely embodied in the educational law, such as gross insubordination, inefficiency, conduct unbecoming a teacher, etc.

"3. After the period of probation, a teacher dismissed for any cause (including inefficiency) shall have the right of a trial to be conducted by a board of seven chosen as follows: Three by the school board, three by the teachers, the six to elect a seventh, who is not to be either a member of the school board or of the teaching force. At all hearings the teacher shall have the privilege of being represented by counsel. Appeal from the decision of the trial board may be made to the civil courts, whose decision shall be final."

"Whereas, The present sources of income for the support of schools and the remuneration of teachers are grossly inadequate, and

"Whereas, The present support of district support of schools results in unequal opportunities for the children of the State; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the California State Federation of Labor pledge its support to the enactment of the proposed initiative measure amending Article 9, Section 6 of the State Constitution, appearing as proposition 16 on the ballot."

—From Fresno Newspapers.

The Issue of Salaries for Men

F G STECKER

Secretary-Treasurer, The American Federation of Teachers

[A letter to the Secretary of the Boston Federation of Men Teachers, Local 100, A F of T. Published by request of The American Teacher.]

Your letter of Sept 22nd reporting the action of your local in regard to affiliation was promptly received and copies have been sent to the members of the Executive Council in order that all may be informed. The reasons for the action have been carefully noted. The generous action of the members in voting to pay all obligations to date including per capita to the American Federation of Teachers for the month of September, is fully appreciated. I can think of no details aside from the charter and seal, to the return of which you have already referred. We are very glad to have your statement of experience as secretary and especially your expression of good will toward the American Federation of Teachers and your interest in its future welfare.

The Boston situation as regards the position of men in the schools and their feeling toward the principle of equal pay for equal service regardless of sex has been known to us for some time. It is an unfortunate situation and one which we feel to be a sort of hangover from the period in education out of which it is hoped we shall soon pass. The schools have been too largely feminized due to the wage conditions and the lack of proper consideration for the schools and for the teaching vocation. The solution of this serious problem must be given careful attention if the American school is to be placed on the basis which is indispensable in our national life. There is no phase in our social, political and industrial life more critical than that of our school system and its relation to national standards.

In its policy of equal pay for equal service, the American Federation of Teachers does not feel that its actions are based upon mere sentiment. As a matter of abstract justice the proposition stands without opposing argument. It is a well known fact that the training necessary for the teaching profession is as expensive for women as for men. Neither is there discrimination in the economic conditions. The only reason ever advanced for higher pay for men is one based upon

the so-called law of supply and demand which at first appearance does seem to justify a salary discrimination. But a careful analysis removes these appearances if the proper standards are observed. Even though there may be five or more women to one man who qualify for a given position, it does not necessarily follow that there is equality among all the qualifying candidates, or that all the candidates should be accepted as desirable rather than to raise the minimum requirements, which would not only induce more men to present themselves as candidates but would also attract more and better qualified women. When the conditions are such as to attract an undue proportion of the two sexes it is my opinion that it is a serious reflection on the minimum requirements. It is this standard of minimum requirements that the American Federation of Teachers, with the support of the American Federation of Labor, seeks to elevate. If the requirements are merely academic, a considerable number of women can qualify who do not possess the personality and general knowledge which should be demanded of the teacher. It is not so much a matter of competing against the men in the schools but rather a matter of inability to compete in the commercial field which allows them to accept the economic conditions of the teacher. This is merely another way of saying that the minimum requirements are too low, and too narrow.

To put the case concretely let me refer to Chicago experience covering many years. In previous administrations members of the Board of Education were fond of meeting at dinners with high school men whom they toasted as the finest group of men teachers in the world, a group of which the Board members were justly proud and which in their opinion was worthy of much higher salaries. As nothing was ever done and as these occasions carried an atmosphere of increasing insincerity the men tired of all this and saw its falseness. Out of these dinner groups with their inactivity and indirection and unorganization

sprang the Chicago Federation of Men Teachers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Out of this came organization, leadership, activity and increasing achievement. The idea of higher salary for men has never found a voice there, partly because the movement was forward-looking and sympathetic with the modern trend of social development and partly because it was felt that there must be a future to the welfare of the schools as well as of the individual teachers. Today there is no sentiment in Chicago on which to base a demand for discriminating salary schedules.

If the public is unwilling to pay the salaries and maintain the type of schools that will attract high-grade men and women into the service, then the public must be content with such teachers as will present themselves under the conditions established. Should it turn out that only women accept the positions, then the situation as a whole cannot be permanently relieved by any temporary expedient, such as a discriminating salary. The problem is one of general education of the public to see the need of better schools and to demand that teachers have, in addition to the academic requirements, a knowledge of the world, of human nature, and of the significance of training for citizenship. When these requirements are established it will be found that men and women of the same degree of qualification and personality can be found in about equal numbers and the problem will be eliminated. To ask that men receive higher salaries is to accept standards as they are without protest. This causes a great weakening in the process of education of the public to the new standards to fit the new conditions of American life. Nor can this work be carried on by the women teachers alone since their ranks will be increased by those whose admission is made possible by the existing requirements. It is not unlikely that the process of bringing our schools to the desired standard of excellence will be more rapid if no measures of expediency are adopted. If salary schedules will not call in men, then the absence of men from the school system will be a striking lesson to the public and will serve to arouse some long needed thinking on this subject. To keep a small percentage of men by artificial in-

ducement is to give the public an opiate from which it may take years to recover. After all, it is a matter of the welfare of the schools and not the temporary relief of teachers which can justify the existence of a teachers' organization. In general, of course, there can be no welfare of the schools which is destructive of the welfare of the teachers. But should there be an apparent breach, the American Federation of Teachers in my opinion will place itself on the side of the welfare of the schools for in that direction lies the ultimate welfare of the teachers.

In this effort to explain the underlying principles which prompt the American Federation of Teachers to maintain policies with which your group is not in accord, there is no desire to criticize your members for failure to accept our ideas. The honesty of your group commands our deepest respect. We can only regret that unfortunate conditions are responsible for the failure of continued cooperation. The American Federation of Teachers is based upon the recognition that the American school system is sadly defective in many respects and upon the hope that organized teachers thru an appeal to democratic and civic organizations can take part in alleviating these conditions. When the American school is what it should be it will recognize the merit of mind and character of the teacher, and offer the proper compensation in salary and promotion. The real merit system can be established, in my opinion, only thru the efforts of organized teachers. It cannot come from the top. Merit systems, as they have existed thus far, mean simply the power of one or more to judge of the ability and effort of the various teachers. Little can be said in favor of such a system and much that is pernicious is everywhere obvious. It is the bureaucracy to which this leads that is sapping the life of our educational system from kindergarten to university. In Chicago and other places both the teachers and the administration have come to accept seniority, unjust as it is, as better than any system of rating power. We sympathize with you in your desire for a real merit system. We feel, however, that the American Federation of Teachers can do more to bring this about in time than can unaffiliated groups or individual teachers.

I recognize that this letter may not sound to you as I wish it to sound and that it may not convey the friendly spirit which it is intended to convey. I trust that the termination of formal affiliation will not mean that I do not hear from you further in regard to your problems, your activities and your achievements. Whenever I can be of assistance be sure to call upon me.

With a deep feeling of appreciation for the fine spirit of your letter and with regret for the action which you feel impelled to take, I am

Fraternally yours,

NEUTRALITY

ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ

Teachers' Union, Local 5, A F of T, New York

Everywhere the unconscious and conscious educational servants of the Employing Class are exhorting the teachers to refrain from affiliating or forming entangling alliances with organizations primarily economic in their objects and representing a special interest or class, such as the American Federation of Labor. "Neutrality between capital and labor," is their cry. "Our chief function," say these holier than thou educators, "is to serve the cause of justice and orderly social progress." Admirable shibboleths indeed, but how are they applied in our economic life?

In Buffalo, N Y, the schools have joined with the Chamber of Commerce and their subsidized organs to inculcate civic idealism, while in Syracuse, N Y, the "neutral" activity of the Chamber of Commerce is augmented by the activity of such a neutral body as the Rotary Club. Just what kind of idealism is being taught is well known to those who are familiar with the "neutrality" for which these organizations stand.

In Seattle, the Associated Industries, a subsidiary labor-hating agency of the Chamber of Commerce, quietly went out of existence after being beaten in its ruthless anti-union war in which every weapon that is usually brought into play by class-conscious capital was used to the Nth power. Nevertheless, the leaders of that defunct organization, under the respectable garb of members of the Chamber of Commerce, are advocating the teaching of economics in grade schools so that *identity of interest between employer and employee may be duly emphasized.*

In Cleveland, Ohio, one of America's foremost industrial centers, the schools are cooperating with the Chamber of Commerce and the Cleveland Advertising Club, in an effort to awaken "civic consciousness" in all the community groups. In California, where the anti-union campaign against teachers has been openly advertised by the Chamber of Commerce, the "neutral" educational leaders have been persuaded to send entire classes to the Chamber of Commerce lectures where they are probably taught to be National Security League Americans; that is, that present institutions, being the product of the past, are civilization's greatest handiwork and must not be tampered with lest the great social structure, built up by the genius of capitalism, is undermined and possibly destroyed. Their spirit of "neutrality" is both admirable and commendable.

In a word, the chambers of commerce of our country, representing the class interests of the dominant economic group, are the most active supporters of community civics and Americanization drives and the policy of "teacher-neutrality." They are actuated, without doubt, by a desire to socialize or Americanize the foreigners who are continually referred to as "Reds, radicals, wops, hunkies, sheenies or some other equally euphonious terms connoting brotherly love and rational affection. In this movement they are actively assisted by educational administrators and teachers who are animated by the spirit of "teacher-neutrality." This neutral spirit is admirably displayed in every great strike. Only recently one of the leading universities of New York showed its admirable "neutral" spirit by furnishing strike-breakers who, by their conduct, displayed a laudable desire to serve the community. "Neutrality" is in great demand by chambers of commerce which cannot be called class institutions because their members are on boards of education and boards of trustees, are leaders of such civic organizations as the American Defense Society, the National Security League, and, last but not least, prominent contributors to charity and the like.

What, then, is the attitude of the locals affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers? Is it "neutral"? The locals of the American Federa-

tion of Teachers are not and have *no desire* to be neutral in the Chamber of Commerce sense. Our teachers are proud of their affiliation with labor because of the service such affiliation enables them to render society. They are neutral in the sense that their judgments are based on first-hand information, but unneutral in that they refuse to accept the "neutral" data so freely furnished by a brass-checked-press, or the "neutral" interpretations of the chambers of commerce. The neutrality of the union teachers ceases when conclusions are reached, and then they openly become partisan on behalf of communal welfare and social progress. Union teachers cannot be neutral when social progress hangs in the balance, or is jeopardized, or in danger of being retarded.

Those who participate in the struggles of life cannot be neutral. They must, from the economic viewpoint, be for capital and against labor, or for labor and against capital, on such fundamental economic issues as the 8-hour day, social welfare legislation and decent living conditions. Union teachers are frankly pro-labor in such cases, just as the non-union teachers are "neutral," that is, *pro capital*. When we realize that teachers have every incentive to be "neutral" it must be the sense of overwhelming danger to progress that induces them to risk *all* to become unneutral. Can teachers be neutral on the question of violent revolution versus evolution as a method of regular change? Can they be neutral on the question of child labor? No doubt the industrial barons of the South, and some of those in the North, believe they ought to be neutral, but the union teachers have no respect for neutrality of that type.

If our critics, whether honest or subsidized by economic necessity, mean that union teachers cannot be neutral when labor is fighting for a subsistence wage, or for welfare legislation, or for sanitary factory conditions, then we have no objection to the charge. But if, by that expression, they mean to imply that we are so partial to labor and so blind to the rights of mankind that we cannot be impartial in our judgments even when the interests of labor or particular group conflict with the interests of social progress, then the charge or insinuation is not only without

foundation, but a dishonest attack on a group that has consistently and quite successfully fought for progress. Every great struggle involves a taking of sides. Neutrality is only possible to those in the educational cloister. Our shibboleth is not "neutrality" but *progress* or its hand-maiden *social service*. We leave to our opponents their conception of "neutrality" as the social function of the teacher, while we are frankly *partisan* in the cause of *humanity*.

STILL STANDING FIRM

If any local becomes low-spirited, thinking there is nothing it can do for its members and for education, let it contemplate the Lancaster local frequently referred to in these pages. Thrown out of their positions by the school board, and outlawed as Lancaster teachers by the decision of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the members have gone to work in various trades, and a few at teaching in country districts. But they maintain the Lancaster local and pay their dues regularly. They are teachers yet in the eyes of the American Federation of Teachers. Can we honor these fellow-workers as much as they have honored themselves? They know they are right, and they are standing firm.

AN INTELLIGENT CRITIC

(Extract from a letter from a professor of education in a Western University)

Upon finding your name in the directory of the American Federation of Teachers, I am addressing you this letter, with the request that you furnish me as soon as possible whatever information you can as to the number of members of your local, the number of qualified persons who have not joined it, the attitude of supervising officers toward your organization, its definite policies and accomplishments, and any general results that you think have followed its formation.

Up to the present time I must confess to a feeling of distrust and opposition with reference to this movement, but it has acquired such momentum that mere denunciation does not get us anywhere. We must begin to study it. I hope to make a thorough investigation of the whole situation, and shall be pleased to regard your reply, in whole or in part, in absolute confidence, if that assists in securing a fuller statement.

From the Locals of the American Federation of Teachers

EASTERN CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Second Session

November 26, 27, 1920

To be held at the Civic Club, New York
14 West 12th St.

Friday, Nov 26, 10.30 A M, Business Meeting

Report of the Secretary

Reports of Committees: Finance, Teachers'

Welfare, Literature, School Organization

Appointment of Conference Committees

Informal Luncheon at Civic Club, 12.30

Friday, November 26, 2.00 P M

1. Programs for Legislation

Salaries

Tenure

Trial Board

Taxation for Education

Etc, etc.

II. World Labor Situation

Friday, November 26, 8 P M, Evening Meeting

The Professional Unions

Speakers: Mr George Soule, Author, Investigator of Labor Problems; Mr John A Fitch, New York School of Social Work, Investigator of Labor Problems

Saturday, November 27, 10.30 A M

Our Fight for Unionism to Protect Locals under Attack

Experience in Pennsylvania

Suggestions for Publicity Methods. Plans for Winning Public Respect, and for Developing Union Morale

Education of Union Leadership

Labor Education

Informal Luncheon at Civic Club, 12.30

Saturday, November 27, 2 P M

Election of Officers

Organization of Permanent Committees

Reports of Conference Committees

Resolutions

Entertainment planned for Saturday Evening

President Charles B Stillman will be present at the meetings of Saturday at least, and will take part in the discussions.

RUTH G HARDY, Secretary.

FROM LOCAL 84, FRESNO, CALIF.

At the request of the President I am writing you these notes bearing on the situation of the Fresno Elementary Teachers' Local 84.

The union opened the fall activities with a called meeting, for the purpose of hearing Miss Colby's report of the legal fight being made by the three Fresno teachers discharged last June. This meeting was well attended, which was a point of encouragement considering the open opposition shown by the City School Board. The board has adopted and published resolutions condemning union organizations of teachers.

At the first regular meeting new officers were elected and also new members taken in, another encouraging support from unafraid teachers.

During the state labor convention, held early in October, resolutions were passed by that body which are based on sound ideas for the welfare and progress of our schools.

On October 16th the Fresno County Union held its first meeting of the year, and appointed a committee to consider ways and means of preserving and strengthening the county unit, in order that it may do effective work before the state legislature during the winter session.

EMMA SCHRAY,
Corresponding Secretary.

CIVIL SERVICE AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL OF PORTLAND, OREGON

When the High School Teachers' Union, Local 111, of the American Federation of Teachers organized and affiliated with the Central Labor Council of Portland in the Fall of 1919, they were immediately invited to join a civil service council which was an organized section of the central body. This council, made up of representatives from the Federal Employees' Union, the fire fighters, the mail carriers' and postal clerks' unions, and a union of city hall employees, changed their name and constitution to receive the three delegates from the High School Teachers'

Union. The name of the organization now is The Civil Service and Public Employees' Council of Portland and Vicinity.

Besides, the value of meeting in a small group to discuss matters of common interest to these six unions, this section of the Central Labor Council by virtue of its organization is entitled to a member on the legislative committee of the central body, a member on the Executive Council of this body, and a representative on the Board of Control of the Oregon Labor Press.

In looking forward to the plans for this year the Civil Service and Public Employees' Council hopes to materially increase its value to the unions represented in it by bringing together all the members of these six unions in one or more large social gatherings. When we come to know one another in fraternal unity of purpose we can then hope to make big strides in the realization of "Democracy in Education and Education for Democracy" in its largest and most far-reaching sense.

NEED OF APPEAL COURT

The action of the Postmaster General in attempting to dismiss eleven officers of Local No. 1, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, emphasizes the urgent need of a Civil Service Court of Appeals to which employes may appeal in cases involving demotion or dismissal. We have long urged this reform. The present system is obviously defective. The Department acts as complainant, judge, jury and high chief executioner. Such a system is made to order for bureaucrats of the Burleson-Koons-Praeger type who publicly declare that the "truth is mighty," and then refuse to grant employes an opportunity to prove the untruth of charges pending against them.

If the Burleson-Koons-Praeger dynasty are such believers in the might of truth they would not constantly oppose the efforts of the postal workers to establish a tribunal whose sole purpose would be to arrive at the truth in accordance with the recognized standards of judicial inquiry.

The transmission of mails is a government monopoly. Therefore the loss of a job by dismissal operates as a national blacklist to the worker. He should be protected against unjust dismissal by proper safeguards. We do not question the right of the Department to rid the service of the unfit, or to impose necessary disciplinary measures. And the Department should not object to submitting this question of fitness to a detached tribunal where the possibility of inflicting an injustice would be greatly minimized.

We do not desire a Court of Appeals as a refuge for the incompetents. We want it as a safeguard for the rights and liberties of wage-earners who are now at the mercy of supervisory officials, and Department bureaucrats from whose arbitrary judgment there is no appeal. Inasmuch as prac-

tically all of the postal organizations are committed to this reform of its enactment—the need of which has been emphasized by the Chicago cases—can be confidently looked for at the next session of the Congress.—*From the "Union Postal Clerk" for September, 1920.*

LAUD WORKERS AGAINST UNION OF TEACHERS

Riverside, October 6.—Resolutions commending the school authorities of Oakland and Fresno for the "splendid service they rendered in combatting efforts of certain groups to unionize the teachers of the two cities," were adopted at the *State Convention of County and City Superintendents of California here today*. The resolutions were offered by Mrs. Susan M. Dorsey, city superintendent of Los Angeles.

—*From the San Francisco Chronicle.*

This is the Official Organ of the **American Federation of Teachers**

ORGANIZED APRIL 15, 1916

Affiliated with the American Federation of Labor

Executive Council of the American Federation
of Teachers

President, CHARLES B STILLMAN, Chicago
1620 Lake Avenue, Wilmette, Ill

First Vice-President and Editor, American Teacher,
HENRY R LINVILLE, New York City,
36 Terrace Avenue, Jamaica

Second Vice-President and Field Secretary,
L V LAMPSON, Washington, D C,
1336 Otis Place, N W

Third Vice-President, JOSEPHINE COLBY, Fresno, Cal,
124 North Van Ness Boulevard

Fourth Vice-President, HERMAN DEFREM,
New York City, 2875 Broadway

Fifth Vice-President, ISABEL WILLIAMS,
St Paul, Minn, 554 Holly Avenue

Sixth Vice-President, JENNIE A WILCOX, Chicago, Ill,
212 North Grove Avenue, Oak Park, Ill

Seventh Vice-President, ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ,
New York City, Grand Avenue, East Elmhurst

Eighth Vice-President, C E PHILLIPS, Atlanta, Ga,
94 Brookline Street

Ninth Vice-President, CLARA K STUTZ,
Washington, D C, 1628 Swann Street

Secretary-Treasurer, F G STECKER, Chicago, Ill,
1618 Lake Avenue, Wilmette, Ill

WHO OWNS THE PRESS AND WHY?

When you read your daily paper, are you reading facts or propaganda. And whose propaganda?

Who furnishes the raw material for your thoughts about life? Is it honest material?

No man can ask more important questions than these; and here for the first time the questions are answered in a book.

THE BRASS CHECK

A STUDY OF AMERICAN JOURNALISM By UPTON SINCLAIR

Ninth edition just sent to press—a total of 144,000 copies.

"The Brass Check" is a book of facts; a book packed solid with facts. Says the introduction:

"Here are names, places, dates—such a mass of material as you cannot doubt, you cannot evade. Here are your sacred names, the very highest of your gods. When you have read this story, you will know the thing called American Journalism; you will know the body and soul of it."

Says Robert Herrick: "I wish to thank you and congratulate you."

Says Charles Zueblin: "The Brass Check" ought to raise the roof!" (It has done so.)

Says John Haynes Holmes: "The book is tremendous. I have never read a more strongly consistent argument or one so formidably buttressed by facts. You have proved your case

to the hilt. I again take satisfaction in saluting you not only as a great novelist, but as the ablest pamphleteer in America today. I am already passing around the word in my church and taking orders for the book."

Says the "Nation" (New York): "A most important book . . . a fascinating and thorough treatise upon the American Press."

Says the "Nation" (London): "This astonishing production . . . a highly curious record . . . a telling array of evidence . . . a plain factual record."

Says the "Neues Journal" (Vienna): "A book-trade 'scoop' without equal . . . a breath-taking, clutching, frightful book."

448 pages. Single copy, paper, 60 cents postpaid; three copies, \$1.50; ten copies, \$4.50. Single copy, cloth, \$1.20 postpaid; three copies, \$3.00; ten copies, \$9.00.

Address: UPTON SINCLAIR, Pasadena, California.

DON'T BLAME THE MINER

Coal miners are hard at work all over the country, with the exception of Alabama and the Mingo county field of West Virginia. In those two fields they are on strike for a living wage and respectable working conditions. Everywhere else the industry is humming and coal is being produced in great quantities. Yet there is a howl for more coal. From all sides there comes the cry of a coal shortage as a menace to the people for the coming winter. What is the reason for this cry?

We wish again to assure the people of this country that if there is a coal shortage this winter the responsibility cannot be laid at the doors of the coal miners. They are producing the coal to keep the people warm and to keep industry in operation. If this coal fails to reach the people or the industries in sufficient quantities to answer their needs it is no fault of the miners. The responsibility must be placed elsewhere.

Up to October 2 the miners had produced fifty-one and one-third million tons more bituminous coal this year than in the same period last year. This is an enormous increase in production and yet it fails to stop the fear of a coal shortage. Evidently there is something wrong with the system of distribution and the coal produced is not properly placed. Again, that is not the fault of the coal miner, for he has nothing to do with the coal after it comes from the mine.

We believe the American people are finding out the true situation, and that hereafter instead of immediately charging the coal miners with everything that goes wrong in the coal industry they will seek the truth so that they may know just who

is to blame. The people have found that the coal miners are not the scoundrels, rough-necks, low-brows and dangerous citizens that some persons have tried to prove them to be. We wish to assure the public that the coal miner has just as deep an interest in the public good as any other man; that he is just as loyal and patriotic a citizen; that he is just as honest and fair as any man, and that he will do just as much for the public welfare as any man in America. So, when the cry of coal famine is raised, do not blame the miner.

—From the *United Mine Workers Journal*
of October, 15, 1920.

ANOTHER GOUGE

Anthracite coal companies who recently were directed by the Anthracite Coal Commission to pay their employees an increase of 17 per cent. in wages, promptly passed the increase on to the public—which was wholly unfair to the public—and now they are penalizing the mine workers by increasing the price of house coal \$1.25 a ton, with an extra charge for haulage.

This means, of course, that these companies are going to gouge the public and the miners out of millions of dollars.

Attorney General Palmer has ordered an investigation of the bituminous coal industry, but Palmer investigations of profiteering have been so farcical in the past that this one also sounds like a joke. Surely, there is a remedy somewhere for the imposition that is being practiced by the anthracite coal companies.

—From the *United Mine Workers Journal*
of October, 15, 1920.

STIRRING UP THE TEACHERS—AN INDICTMENT

"The teachers of Syracuse are satisfied. Only the Bolsheviks are making trouble!"

Thus, the State senators and the assemblymen of that city reported to the Legislature of New York in 1919. But the teachers were not satisfied anywhere in the State, and they kept on until the Legislature in 1920 granted increases to the extent of about thirty millions of dollars for the fifty-three thousand teachers of the State of New York.

Do the people begrudge decent salary increases for teachers? They do not. Then why do they hurl the name "Bolshevik" at those who start the movement? Because anyone who first voices the need of a body of human beings is a menace to *things as they are*. He must be warned. He must be insulted or ostracized. If he does not stop, his living must be cut off.

If the result of agitation is approved, then why do men object to the method, if it is open and above board? Because those who secure economic betterment must receive it in the proper spirit of humility. It is unprofessional to demand. It is undignified. It is too much like a labor union.

Commissioner Finegan, of Pennsylvania, in the Lancaster decision reproved the Lancaster teachers because they had taken the initiative. "The Lancaster teachers knew that the Governor had several times announced in public addresses that he was in favor of increasing their compensation." The commissioner also said the Lancaster teachers were assuming a threatening attitude when they affiliated with labor. The real trouble was that they were preparing to "demand." That is the thing that is improper for teachers. Of course it is; they are not used to it.

It is not altogether because teachers are joining hands with labor that objection is made. They receive the same treatment if they join with their fellows only, and *demand*. It is the *demanding* that gets under the skin of those who have assumed the obligation to "represent the public," the Finegans, the Garys, etc.

How do we know this? Because teachers who are not affiliated with labor are being dismissed every year for "stirring up the teachers."

In a small city in Western New York three teachers were dismissed last Spring for that reason. They had aided in the formation of a non-union teachers' organization, the purpose of which was to urge salary increases. They had done nothing else which might be a cause for complaint. And yet they were dismissed.

We have not the privilege of mentioning the city, or the names of the teachers, because the leader of the group has had the good fortune to secure another position. She fears reprisals and the loss of her present position if a fight is made in her behalf, since she has lost several opportunities to secure a new position on account of the superintendent of the town reporting when asked about her that she had "stirred the teachers up." This much THE AMERICAN TEACHER must divulge for the sake of teachers who have their fight still to make.

Teachers of America! You cannot win your professional rights without a contest with those who for various reasons will oppose you. Alone with your little group your leaders are lost, and their misfortunes frighten others. In the ranks of the workers they will have what they need — POWER and COURAGE.

