

The **AMERICAN
TEACHER**

The Organ of
the American
Federation
of Teachers

NOVEMBER, 1920

LIBRARY
JAN 1 1921

Safety First and Good
Business



Democracy in Education



Democracy in Industry



To A New Delegate

Bur of Education
Washington
D C

Democracy in Education

Education for Democracy

The Labor Movement

WHAT shall we say of the relation of the Church to the Labor Movement, which is one of the outstanding factors in the industrial world? cannot claim a good record with regard to labor questions. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution only a minority of the members of our Church have insisted on the social application of the Gospel.

Now that the conscience of the Christian community has been stirred, we must be content to bear the accusation that we are only trying to make ourselves popular with labor, because labor is now a dominant power. The accusation is not true. We are honestly trying to see and to speak the truth, and those who make that effort will not, in the long run, be popular with any party. The question is not

whether labor is friendly to the Church, or whether we can attract labor men to the Church, but whether the ideals of labor are sound and its claims just. No doubt there are strata in the labor movement, as in "the world" generally, which are secularist and materialistic. Certainly, also, there are labor men (though not so many in the English-speaking peoples as on the continent of Europe) who are advocates of violent revo-

lution. But we ought, in all fairness, to judge the labor movement at its best, and to consider what is to be the relation of its idealism to the idealism of the Church. The purpose of the labor movement, at its best, is curefulness of life, the opportunity of a complete development of their manhood and womanhood for those who labor; it seeks to furnish a better world for people to live in. While this is also the Church's aim, our su-

preme task must be to provide better people to live in the world. The labor movement can help the Church by bringing us into touch with actualities, and increasing our discontent with mere pious aspirations; and assuredly the Church can help the labor movement by pointing the way to that spiritual power which alone can bring the law of righteousness and love into permanent action. "He who

can spiritualize democracy," said Mazzini, "will save the world."—*From Report of a Committee at the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, Lambeth Palace, July 5 to August 7, 1920.*

The inherent social stimulation within the labor movement is destined to spread thruout all the creeds. In that movement they will realize their own ideals of service to mankind.

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS	171
DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION A . . .	173
DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRY	175
DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION B . . .	178
THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS	182
THE CLOSED SHOP AND THE OPEN SHOP	186
A PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL RE- FORM	188
BOOK REVIEWS	189
TO A NEW DELEGATE TO OUR NA- TIONAL CONVENTION	192

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. 8

NOVEMBER, 1920

One Dollar a Year

GETTING NEARER

It is obvious that where our analysis of school conditions becomes thoro we shall be getting close to our own lairs. Professor Hart, himself a teacher of many years' standing in college work, cuts close to the quick in his address on "Democracy in Education" printed in this issue. Many of us, indeed, have taken advantage of our positions to browbeat and insult those who cannot or dare not talk back. Habits developed under these circumstances are easily developed and retained for use when the teacher later has made his promotion and become a superior. But there are many petty tyrants left to abuse the children.

THE LONG TRAIL

Mr George Soule, whose article on Democracy in Industry appears in this issue, has made an uncommonly intelligent analysis of the conditions and reasons leading to workers' control in industry. Anyone who has acquaintance with industry knows that especially since the war the complaint among employers has been that the workers have been "slowing up." This has been going on in spite of the general improvement in wages. The usual interpretation suggested by the employers has been that the men had been spoiled by prosperity, and think of nothing but getting still higher wages without working. The true interpretation may be quite different.

Mr. Soule calls attention to this very common "drag" on industry. As he says, progressive engineers and employers have learned that active interest in production on the part of the workers is aroused whenever an increased measure of control is granted to them. In other words, industry gains in the co-operation and interest of the workers when responsibility is granted them. The quoted statements of Hart, Schaffner and Marx is proof enough that the sharing by workers in the control of conditions pays the employers.

The task of organized teachers, therefore, is to carry this lesson to their fellow teachers. It is necessary to stimulate teachers to want what other workers have learned to want, and many have learned how to obtain. Let us not be discouraged in traversing this long trail. It is a long way, but it appears to be the only way.

THE OPEN SHOP IS UNDERSTOOD

It is evident that some of our fellow unionists thruout the country are becoming nervous as the lines are drawn closely for the struggle on the issue of the "open shop." This is unfortunate but natural. At the same time there is little to be nervous about. It is as clear as day that the "open shop" means a shop closed against the unions. It is also clear that the interests that now close the shops against the organized workers are the most gigantic aggregations of selfishness existing in our American life to-day.

The Steel Corporations are out to destroy the unions. Is there any doubt about this? And if they accomplished their object is there any teacher in the American Federation of Teachers who believes the era of justice and freedom will be brought nearer? Does it seem by yielding to the Steel Corporations the right to determine the conditions under which men and women shall work for the shareholders, that we have approached the ideal standards of life for humanity? As honest persons we cannot say the Steel Corporations have any social purpose except that of taking advantage of their position to retain economic power, no matter what happens to the workers.

If our timid members will look about them they will see evidences of a form of distrust that is menacing to the selfish interests. The enlightened socially-minded ranks of the country that up to the present have escaped the attacks of the name-callers are doing some keen observing and some plain speaking. The Catholic clergy

have spoken strongly, and will be a powerful aid to the unions. No group outside of labor has taken a more definite stand against the "open shop" than has this one. The clergy are beginning to say the "open shop" campaign is an *anti-union* campaign.

In this issue we quote from the Report of the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican church on the social purpose of the union movement. One thing is certain, the churches are coming to realize the nature of the vast social undertaking lead by the union movement, the task of making this a better world. It is safe to predict that the churches will approach one another closely in the near future on this extraordinary platform which labor has initiated.

SAFETY FIRST AND GOOD BUSINESS

"Good Business insists that sufficient insurance be carried to meet contingent cases. We have always dodged the issue of an adequate or sufficient insurance for the protection of our Government. As a consequence, few of us will live to see the receipt bills for the World War."

This statement might be mistaken for one which the chairman of military affairs had announced to the country. But it is the statement of a superintendent of schools speaking to the teachers of Oakland, California. Since Mr Fred M Hunter, the superintendent, is President of the National Education Association, it is proper to say he is speaking to the teachers of the nation.

The vehicle of the quoted statement is the "Superintendents' Bulletin" of the date of October 29, 1920. The bulletin contains twelve pages. Six of these pages are given to sentiments about the need of national preparedness and to news about the personnel of the officers that conduct the training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the schools of Oakland. In this portion of the "Bulletin" are many sections designed to convince teachers and pupils of the need of having a reserve corps to lead our boys in another war. We may conclude that President Hunter believes in the policy of preparing to the hilt for the next war. We may also infer that he is not interested in a somewhat prevalent desire on the part of the workers in all countries to eliminate war altogether.

In another section of the "Bulletin" President

Hunter discusses "Politics." He says, "All principals in the Oakland schools are responsible for calling to the attention of the teachers the necessity for carefully refraining from any participation in political campaigns, national, state and local." After making an exception in regard to a proposed amendment to the state constitution which Mr Hunter thinks is good, he goes on to say, "*This caution in no sense restricts any teacher in exercising his functions as an American citizen*" (italics ours).

Then Superintendent Hunter prints in capitals "A LITTLE MESSAGE."

"VOTE 'YES' ON AMENDMENT 16. THIS AMENDMENT WILL ESTABLISH EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR EVERY CHILD; WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND WILL RE-OPEN THE HUNDREDS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS NOW CLOSED BY POVERTY."

The principals are instructed to see that the little message or one like it is copied and taken home by each child on November 1, 1920.

The President of the National Education Association has had a great deal to say elsewhere about training the children for democracy. Are we to understand that militarism and no political activity for teachers (with judicial exceptions, officially approved) are the natural springs for activity in democracy?

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

Democracy in Education—A*

JOSEPH K HART

Editorial Staff, The Survey, New York

All that may be said about democracy in industry may probably be said with equal truth about democracy in education. The school system may be likened to a factory system: each has its hierarchy of management; its buildings and equipments; its working forces; its raw materials; and its finished products. In each, the workers who perform the actual productive processes feel themselves deprived of certain elements essential to the completest success of their work: they do not select for themselves the particular tasks they are best fitted to perform; they do not have a voice in determining the conditions of service: wages, tenure, promotion, essential morale. They are subordinates, under authority. They are told to go and they must go; to stand and they must stand. In short, in so far as the school system is an organized system for the production of certain social goods all that needs to be said concerning democracy in industry applies with equal force to the schools.

But that is not all. Democracy in industry calls for the assumption of certain moral attitudes on the part of the worker. He must accept responsibility; he must know and understand; he must think, as well as feel. That is to say, democracy in industry is calling for a more responsible, a better educated, a more rounded type of individual workingman. Surely the school has some responsibility here!

And, now we see that subordination in education has two possible references, whereas subordination in industry has but one. In industry, the worker is subordinated to the management, and he asks for democratic relief. But no one spends much time thinking about or lamenting the fact that the iron is subordinate to the worker, nor would a crusade to deliver the iron from the cruel hand of the tyrant machinist get many followers,—even in this day when 'followers' are ready for any cause.

On the other hand, in the school system, subordination can take two turns; indeed, it always

does, and democracy in education involves each of these subordinations,—the one quite as much as the other. That is to say, the teacher is subordinate to the educational management, just as the worker is subordinate to the industrial management; and democracy in education calls for release of the teacher from the demoralizing aspects of this subordination. But, in a sense in which the iron he works upon is not morally subordinate to the mechanic, the pupil is subordinate to the teacher. And, not infrequently, the most vociferous leader of the cause of democracy in education is the most complete tyrant in the actual classroom. For not alone does the teacher need to be freed from the 'tyrant' who sits in the office of the board of education, or in the superintendent's sanctum, or in the principal's chair. He needs quite as much, and ever so much more fundamentally, to be freed from the tyrant who rules in his own stern manner, who handles the children with short and worried ways, and who frequently deals with these raw materials of the democratic industrial order of the future with such high-handed insolence.

Illustrations of this undemocracy of the classroom are too numerous and too personal for me to introduce them here. Democracy in education is not primarily needed for the sake of the teacher. Democracy in education will not mean primarily the "freeing" of the teacher. Democracy in education cannot be fully stated in terms of the teacher.

But the teacher is dealing with, is working in, the next generation: the society of tomorrow is being molded and formed in the school rooms of today,—not completely, not finally, not irrevocably,—but in part, at any rate. A free society of the future cannot be made by unfree workmen. Teachers must be free, in order that their work for tomorrow may be free. Democracy in education must be achieved in order that we may work out the intelligent and democratic social order of the future.

And the assurance of that social order is not in the books, nor in the schools, nor in the fu-

*Address delivered before the Teachers Union, New York, November 20, 1920.

tilities and stupidities of our conventional knowledges and folkways. All these things, so highly prized by the statesmen who periodically wreck the world, are assurances of social disorder, rather than of order. No, the hope of the future is in the freed lives of our children. Freedom is the only real restraint in the world. Oppression, repression, suppression: these promise nothing but disorder,—world without end.

Democracy in education goes far beyond the needs of the teacher, tho it always includes the teacher. It is the conception of a system of education in which free teachers shall bring hungry, hopeful, stumbling children into contact with free experiences, including free knowledge, in order that naturally, thoughtfully, patiently, a free social order may grow up in these children to take the place of the servile social orders of today. Democracy for the teachers is but one item in this program—tho when conceived in the largest light it is the most important, the crucial item. But democracy in education implies and involves so much more than freedom of the teachers. It implies and involves the ultimate freedom of society as a whole,—the assurance of that democratic freedom and intelligence which can underwrite all the longed-for developments of democracy in industry, in religion, in morality and even in politics.

THE ENEMY WITHIN

The Lockwood Housing Commission which was charged with the duty of discovering the true causes of the prevailing shortage of homes in New York, has discovered, incidentally, traces of a horrible cancer which has eaten into a considerable part of the body of our movement in this city.

We say purposely "a considerable part" of our labor movement and have not in mind Brindell's unions and his Building Trades Council alone. To begin with, it is a shame and a heartache that this sore had to be discovered by a Lockwood Commission, and that the entire labor movement, represented by the American Federation of Labor, had kept silent about this shameful corruption. The excuse, that it had not known these facts, is too frail, indeed. Had the American labor movement stood at the height of its obligations, it could not have helped knowing these facts. The shame is even greater when it is admitted that the corruption in the building trades was never a secret in the labor movement of New York.

There were enough men in the Building Trades who have loudly protested against this corruption. The Lockwood Commission discovered but little for these men. Articles about the deplorable situa-

tion in these unions have been published from time to time in various newspapers. And yet, the A F of L, with its entire force and influence, did not do the least thing to make an end to this horrible scandal. Could anyone, under the circumstances, be blamed for asserting that if the A F of L and the entire labor movement of New York has kept silence in this situation, it is an eloquent sign that the state of affairs in many other unions is not much better? Would not such conclusions be fully justified? And it is because of this that we say that the shame of the Unions in the Building Trades of New York is not the shame of Brindell's unions alone, but of our entire labor movement.

Any person with a degree of intelligence, could have understood that such strikes were not being called for nothing. It was known, in fact that all these strikes were a means for extortion of money from building contractors by Brindell and his gang, tho, not everybody suspected that such huge sums were involved in it. The labor movement, nevertheless, kept silent, and Brindell was not only not boycotted, but he played a big role in labor circles. This man never lost an opportunity to condemn the radical unions as "Bolshevist" organizations under the cloak of patriotism, the customary refuge of every scoundrel.

Years ago, we had in this city another such fellow in these same building trades. His name was Sam Parks. His misdoings, too, were not discovered by the union themselves, and he was not punished by the labor movement. It was a capitalist court which sentenced him to a term of years in prison, for bribery, where he died. It was thought that the fate of Sam Parks would serve a horrible example for those of his kind, and it was hoped that these unions would never permit a repetition of such a scandal. It appears, however, that Sam Parks is a saint in comparison with those involved in the recent revelation, and that the unions in the buildings trades have sunk even deeper under the domination of Brindell. There is only a Brindell on one side and thousands upon thousands of obedient slaves on the other side, men who have lost every sense of honor for the few additional cents in wages which he had gained for them. This latter factor, the practical disappearance of the unions, is the most deplorable factor in the entire story. It makes one despondent, indeed, to see so many thousands of workers ready to sell the best and the noblest within them—their independence, their right to self-determination—for a mess of pottage.

It must be kept in mind, however, that no matter how we may hate and despise Brindell, if the great mass of workers in the building trades unions had stood on a higher plane of intelligence, Brindell could not have operated among them as he did. It is the stark ignorance of the workers and their complete indifference to all that is beyond their petty interests, that has made possible the domination of a Brindell.

The only thing that can and must be done is for the few clear-headed and intelligent men in these unions to continue their ceaseless agitation and educational work among their fellow workers, no matter how ungrateful their work may be to-day,—for, light is bound to break through the dark walls of corruption even in their ranks.—From "Justice," the official organ of The International Ladies Garment Workers Union, of November 5, 1920.

Democracy in Industry*

GEORGE SOULE

Labor Bureau, New York

In recent years we have been hearing many phrases such as industrial democracy, workers' control, and so on. What do these phrases really mean? What do they stand for in people's minds, and what do they signify in actual experience?

It is easy enough to draw the parallel between democracy in political government and democracy in industry. In politics we have long been accustomed to the idea that just government must be based on the consent of the governed, and that everyone affected by laws and other conditions of society has a right to an equal voice in the framing of those laws and conditions. Yet a great industrial establishment, or an industry itself, is just as much subject to a government as the state, and its laws and conditions may affect the daily lives of those who work in it much more than the laws of the state. Why should not the workers in an industry, who are vitally dependent on it, have a right to a voice in its government, just as they have a right to a voice in political affairs? It was in this sense of *rights* that industrial democracy was first talked about.

There is also a parallel between the development of industrial democracy and that of political democracy. The beginning of the growth of one is almost as old as the beginning of the growth of the other. Political democracy was achieved by a series of steps, one class after another rising and demanding its rights from those in power, the rights themselves being elaborated as time went on. In England it was first the great barons and noble land owners who were admitted to their share of power, then the business and trading classes, then the workmen, and last of all the women. Sometimes, as in France, there was an attempt to achieve democracy by a sudden revolution, which was followed by reactions. But in either case the growth of democracy was a gradual spreading of power, sometimes begun by a violent overturn, sometimes punctuated by outbursts of violence. Industrial democracy has fol-

lowed much the same course. Not long after the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the large establishment and the control of capital had begun to fasten themselves upon industry, a movement arose in England for the abolishment of industrial autocracy and the sudden overturn of the system. Robert Owen and the Chartist movement were the first proponents of the "One Big Union," but the times were not ripe, and their efforts had little permanent result. Then began the organization of the workers into trade unions, which little by little encroached upon the control of the employer in such matters as hours and wages, and won a partial freedom for favored groups of highly skilled workers. It was not until much later that the great mass of unskilled labor began to participate in the limited industrial democracy which had been achieved, and apparently the "brain workers," like the women in political affairs, are to be the last group to receive the industrial franchise.

The whole trade-union movement, which has a history of over a hundred years in both England and the United States, is one long struggle for an increasing measure of industrial democracy. It has changed its form, its policies and its aspirations many times according to the conditions in which it found itself, but all its victories have been expressed in terms of greater control by the worker, over the conditions surrounding his working life. Wages and hours are the first battle-grounds of the campaign, which has since gone on to such questions as security of tenure, distribution of work, management of the productive process itself, and even penetration of the commercial and financial fields.

During the war a new movement arose in England for workers' control. It was known as the shop-stewards' movement, because it was carried on by the representatives of the workmen in the individual shops. The hands of the higher union officials were tied by war legislation forbidding strikes, and they could not efficiently negotiate about matters in the various shops anyway, on ac-

* Address delivered before The Teachers Union, New York, November 20, 1920.

count of the craft divisions among the unions. But the shop representatives of the various unions got together and formed unofficial shop committees, which negotiated as units with the several employers, particularly in the munitions and ship-building plants. These committees not only concerned themselves with questions of hours and wages, but with complicated questions of management, like the development of new processes and systems, and the admittance to the industry of unskilled or semi-skilled persons used to operate automatic machinery which crowded out old-fashioned manual skill. Many times they made valuable suggestions about the efficiency of industry, on account of their intimate acquaintance with the work.

Progressive engineers and employers welcomed the tendency toward increasing control on the part of the workmen, because it led to increased efficiency. They had long recognized that the greatest obstacle in the way of the introduction of new methods and technique, as well as the greatest drag on the operation of the existing methods, was the lack of interest on the part of the workman who was regarded as a machine and consequently contributed nothing but a grudging manual labor to the productive process. If they could arouse the active interest of the worker in production, they could afford to grant him in return an increased measure of control which would prevent the new technique being used to his detriment. They recognized that you cannot get interest without granting responsibility.

This marked a new phase in the development of industrial democracy. It was the entrance of the concept of function. The workman should have democracy not only because it is his right, but because with it he can perform his function better. He can produce more if he is an intelligent participator. We are now beginning to realize that the development of political democracy itself was not merely a progressive assertion of rights on the part of oppressed groups. The old autocratic systems fell not merely because people protested against them, but because they became inefficient; they ceased to function properly and hence could not satisfy the people living under them. The development of democracy has really

been in a larger aspect the development of the technique of administration. It is the same with industrial democracy. We must tap the sources of wisdom and power lying dormant in the rank and file of industry, because without their aid production will fail and civilization will be in danger. It is not merely necessary to grant rights; it is also necessary to organize industrial administration properly, and to do so the worker must win an opportunity to function.

In America, long before the war, the development of the shop committee had begun, and shop committees were exercising control in some plants. On the railroads, in the shop and repair departments, the "system federation" paralleled the shop committee in the British metal trades. During the war the lines of development here and the lesson of British experience converged so that the establishment of shop committees in munitions plants, ship-yards, and arsenals was consciously encouraged by the various labor administrations of the government, and was carried out with the cooperation of the national unions themselves.

Perhaps the first functioning shop committee here was in the clothing industry, where a strike in 1910 resulted in the recognition of the shop committee in the plant of Hart, Schaffner and Marx in Chicago, this being the beginning of the power of the trade-union group which has since developed into the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. This committee has now operated for ten years without interruption, and has built up a body of industrial laws which virtually form a constitution. It protects, for instance, the rights of the worker against arbitrary discharge. No worker can be discharged by his foreman; the foreman may merely suspend, and can make a complaint to the labor manager of the plant. This manager can dismiss, but the discharge is subject to review by a board composed of equal numbers of representatives of employer and union. If this board finds the discharge to be unjust, the worker is reinstated with back pay. I think that is more protection than the teachers have.

Hart, Schaffner and Marx, testifying before the U. S. Industrial Relations Commission in 1914, made this remarkable statement: "Not the least of the advantages we have derived from our

system is the reaction of the ideas and ideals, first applied in the labor department, upon the other departments and particularly upon the executive staff of the manufacturing department. Inefficient methods as to prevailing conditions on the part of higher executives; these could not long survive when every complaint brought by a workman was thoroly investigated and the root cause of the trouble brought to light. The unexpected and indirect results of our labor policy in increasing the efficiency, reforming the conduct, and raising the intelligence of the executives coming in contact with the system, have been as profitable and satisfactory as the direct result, i. e., the creation of harmony and good will on the part of the people toward the Company."

In the United States Arsenal at Rock Island, Illinois, a shop committee functioned very effectively thru the war, and after the war actually took part in the larger management of the plant. The men desired to avoid the unemployment which would result from a slackening of the war demand for munitions, and so they urged that the arsenal develop a market for peace-time products. Their request was granted, and they helped to transform the arsenal and to develop the market. The conventionally-minded army officers in charge, however, soon became afraid that so successful an example would lead farther than they intended, and the Rock Island experiment was abolished, not because it was a failure, but because it worked too well.

A word of caution is necessary about shop committees and forms of "industrial democracy" installed by employers where the demand does not arise from the workers, and the employer does not cooperate with an independent union which can if necessary protect its members. A number of the largest steel companies installed such paper schemes during or after the war, and it was in these very companies that the steel strike was most effective. The men were unable to gain any real security from committees controlled by the company.

Industrial democracy does not stop within the walls of the shop. It is reaching out toward the drastic reorganization of large industries. The coal miners in England have asked for a form of

national ownership in which a preponderant share of the management shall be in the hands of those who actually work in the industry, and the American railway men have pointed out how the railroads could be operated to the better advantage of the public under some such scheme as the Plumb Plan. Thought and research along these lines is growing by leaps and bounds, because we are coming to see that we cannot systematize and make efficient our whole machinery of production and distribution until democratic management supplants the autocratic management of the private owner and banker. With all our enormous advances in science and technique, we have not yet installed an administration of industry which can produce enough to enable everyone to live decently, or which, in fact, can avoid catastrophes that threaten to be disastrous to civilization. In order to save the world, the power and wisdom of the workers must be functionally connected with the administration of industry, and this can be done only by the proper organization of workers' control.

GUNS AND BASEBALL BATS URGED BY FRESNO EDUCATOR

Riverside, Cal., Nov. 6.—A demand for law and order and gatling guns and, baseball bats to use against teachers who join trade unions were features of a harangue by Jerome O. Cross, before a meeting of city superintendents of California public schools.

Cross is head of the Fresno public school system and toady to the two-by-four autocrats and cheap wage employers who are opposing trade unionism among teachers in Fresno, Oakland and other cities in the state.

Cross attempted to take the sting out of his anarchistic utterances by approving "some things" that organized labor has done.

"This is a problem that we cannot settle through conferences or counsel," he shrieked. "It looks to me that a baseball bat or a gatling gun is needed."

Then the "educator" urged law and order, demanded respect for authority and scored the "insinuating influences that are at work endeavoring to undermine constituted authority."

After the meeting destroyed the teachers' unions, it took up the question of conducting school bonds campaigns. One superintendent, who joined with the rest in their high regard for public opinion, doubted the wisdom of holding public meetings to discuss bond issues. He said public meetings proposing side to get in their damaging work."—From the A F of L Weekly Newsletter.

Democracy in Education—B

This report was made at the meeting of the North Dakota State Teachers' Association at Grand Forks, North Dakota, before the Section of Higher and Professional Education. The committee, which was continued for working out further details, wishes a full and frank discussion of its report and will welcome any suggestions which may be made. Address—DR ERNEST SHAW REYNOLDS, *Agricultural College, N. D.*

In the discussion of this subject it must be recognized at the outset that the remarks made are in no way intended as a reflection upon any particular person, nor upon administrators as a class, nor do they reflect upon the administration of any institution. When autocracy is mentioned it does not necessarily imply either an inefficient, an unsympathetic or an unfriendly administrator, but purely and simply a system in which one man or a small group has the large measure of control in determining the policies and the practices of an institution. An opposite system of control is the democratic which presupposes ultimate control of the institution by a balanced co-operation of all who are directly involved in the work of education but does not imply any special formula for organization.

An autocratic system is such whether its leaders are benign or baneful in their methods of administration. And here in America we are committed to a policy of democracy of government. Why then should we tolerate the opposite method in the educational system which is the very fountain head of our governmental life where our future leaders are trained and our best intellects are associated? We should not be deceived by the paternalistic arguments of advocates of the autocratic system that it is more efficient and provides better for those controlled.

It might be held that, comparing Germany with the United States prior to 1914, the government of Germany was more efficient and provided for the people's comfort better than our own, yet the final result was not such as to justify the conclusion that that Nation was fundamentally better than ours. Immediate results are not to be the final test of a system. Democracy can be made ultimately more efficient than autocracy and will be so when we consciously set to work to determine the best methods. That has been the effort of this committee in relation to education. To attain a fundamental, permanent change in a system which is well established, it is necessary that all concerned shall be somewhat pre-

pared for the change and that it occur in an evolutionary manner. This does not mean that the processes must be imperceptibly slow, but that no complete and sudden revolution can be expected to bring permanent and noticeably advanced progress. Changes may be rapid and the net result a great modification of former conditions yet the process be orderly. It will be the effort of this report to indicate something of the steps by which a change from an autocratic form of administration to an efficient democratic one may be effected, and some of the prominent safeguards which are necessary to prevent reversion to the former type.

Democracy in education implies among other things the following:

1. That those engaged in daily classroom work shall have a large part in the determination of the policies and practices of the institution.
2. That all such shall have the freedom in the classroom to teach their subjects as they believe they should be taught, under such supervision as shall be determined in a democratic fashion after a fair and full discussion among teachers.
3. That all shall be free from any special censure for acts and utterances outside the classroom aside from that to which any other citizen is subject.
4. That no financial control or fear of loss of position shall hold the teachers in subjection.
5. That for each institution there should be democratic representation of the faculty on the board, when it is considering matters relating to the institution.

The most important safeguard is that each educational unit shall have a constitution which shall clearly state the degree of protection and of responsibility of the teachers, and the method of organization of the group.

This implies that each group should be organized upon a democratic basis with its elected

officers and committees. If the administrative officers are elected by the group, they may be given certain ex-officio powers subject to veto by the group and then other powers may be delegated from time to time. If the administrative officers are merely appointed by superior authorities the democratically elected committee of the group should have coordinate powers of recommendation to the superior authorities. Only under exceptional conditions should there be two sets of recommendations since cooperation between the administrators and the committees would be the usual policy. Democracy does not imply individual freedom from restraint, but rather a mutual or co-operative restraint on the one hand and on the other an insurance of justice to the individual and protection of the rights of all collectively.

Three groups are concerned in the democratic administration of an educational institution—the public, the faculty and the board, whether given the designation of Trustees, Regents or some other. The public, of course, includes the clientele of the institution, but also in a more general way the whole people. The students also must be considered as a part of this group. The faculty should include those directly concerned in the teaching and executive positions; and the board consists of those chosen to represent the public.

Whether we conceive of the faculty members as employees of the public or as experts to direct the educational activities of the public, we must recognize that they are co-partners with the board in determining the practical methods of placing education in its proper place in society. This principle gives us the foundation upon which to base democracy. The public, thru appropriate legislation and the appointment of the board should voice the general will concerning education. The details should be left to those best acquainted with them. All matters pertaining to any given institution, then, should be determined by joint consent of the board and the faculty.

To protect the individual, as well as the corporate, rights of the Faculty the principle of democratic control should be adopted and guaranteed. We must not wait until overt acts compel

us to form a policy, but rather with calm unimpassioned judgment provide the principles upon which proper adjustments can be made. We have seen numerous instances where Boards, Presidents, Deans or other officials have arrogated to themselves autocratic powers and whether wisely or unwisely, whether with justice or injustice, have determined not only the educational policies of the public, but also the personal activities of the faculty members. As we have seen then, to insure the preservation of the truly democratic spirit in an institution the basis principle must be cooperation between the public, represented by the Board, and the Faculty.

The principles suggested by this committee are not new and untried in the educational field but are in most cases well established in institutions of higher education in America and Europe. To list all of the institutions where these principles are more or less in operation would be to call a roll of our best and most progressive colleges and universities. Oberlin, Dartmouth and Smith, Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Cornell and the Universities of Minnesota, California and Wisconsin are prominent in the list, tho many others could be named. Nevertheless, the movement toward democracy has been spasmodic and without broad consideration of the inter-relationships of the various steps. It has simply grown, like Topsey, so that there is a strange mixture of democratic and autocratic methods. The former have too often been the result of the necessities of the moment without much regard for the principles involved, or their relationship to the major portion of educational policy. This committee has attempted to synthesize in a calm and unimpassioned manner, the best of these methods into a constructive, unified and consistent statement of principles which shall be at once democratic in spirit and efficient in execution. The details as applied to any specific institution must be left to the cooperative action of the Board and the members of the institution.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND CONCLUSIONS

To summarize and put into concrete form the recommendations of the committee, each institution should have a written constitution, based upon the following principles:

1. The legislative body of the institution to include all who are on permanent appointment or who have been in the institution a given number of years in the grade of assistant professor or above.

2. Selection of the President, Deans and other officials, who have similar powers, by concurrent action of the Faculty and Board.

The nominations might be made by either Faculty or Board or both. These two bodies would meet separately and a majority vote (or any stated percentage) in each would voice the decision of the body. Nominations for positions of Deans and other officers might also be made by the President or a Faculty Committee or both.

3. The President as one member of the Faculty chosen to act as an Executive to carry out the plans for the institution as determined cooperatively by the Faculty and Board. The President to have power of veto, over which any measure may be passed by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty.

The Faculty may (and will normally) delegate many functions to the presidential office, and also to other administrative offices, in order to gain efficiency.

4. Selection of faculty members by the Board, nominated by the Faculty or its representatives in cooperation with the President.

To the heads of departments should be left the right of nomination for those within the department. To the Dean and an elected committee should be left the nomination for heads of departments, or in the larger departments, at least, the heads of departments should be nominated by all the members.

5. Recall, under proper limitations, applicable to all administrative officials and representatives.

In the case of those officials for which concurrence of the Board is necessary in appointing, the concurrence of the Board in the recall would be necessary. In all cases, the electors would have the power of recall. Definite provisions concerning the size of vote necessary to recall should be made.

6. Demotions, dismissals, etc., only thru co-

operation of an elected faculty committee and the President, and a trial before peers.

Such a committee and the procedure should be definitely arranged at regular times so that when the emergency should arise, special action would not be necessary upon the part of the Faculty as a whole. Permanent appointment on the Faculty should only be after a considerable period of temporary tenure such as two years as instructors and three years as Assistant Professor.

7. Frequent reports from all administrative officers to the faculty summarizing their activities.

8. Complete cooperation between the Faculty and Administrative officers, and between Faculty and Board thru democratically elected committees or directly.

All major matters should be arrived at by concurrent action with the President and Administrative officers.

9. A democratically administered method of rating the Faculty with reasonable requirements for progress.

Regular rules worked out thru complete cooperation between Board, Officers, and Faculty; and these (not the caprice of administrative officers, heads of departments or others) made the basis of action. One item to be taken into consideration should be the recommendation of the head of the department, or the dean of the school, but more than this is necessary.

10. Salaries and increases dependent upon this democratically administered rating system.

A salary scale with provision for regular increases should be provided.

11. Sabbatical periods provided for and to be democratically adjusted.

Regular rates for such should be provided and at least some of the years of temporary appointment should be counted as well as those of permanent appointment.

12. Determination of Educational policies by the faculty. Where additional expense is involved, the concurrence of the Board is necessary.

In a State system of schools, the inter-relationships of components of the system should

be determined by conference between democratically elected representatives of the faculties of the institutions concerned. Final confirmation by the Board would be necessary where finances or matters of general jurisdiction are involved. In case of final disagreement the Board would decide.

13. The secret ballot in all election of committees and where personalities are concerned, or differences of opinion between the faculty and administrative officers are concerned.

In addition, a secret ballot should be used whenever desired by any member of the group of electors.

14. All legislation relative to the institution, whether by act of legislature, board, faculty, or administrative officers, to be open to the inspection of all.

15. Election of all official committees, either directly by the faculty or thru an elected committee.

16. Freedom in classroom teaching to be guaranteed. In the case of instructors, the method of teaching, subject to supervision as may be determined by the faculty.

Regular rules governing this matter should be made by the faculty to prevent snap judgment or infringement upon the proper rights of the instructor. No one should be elevated to the higher grades, who needs this supervision.

17. Freedom of extra-mural activities for all members of the faculty subject only to such control as is afforded by society.

18. Representation of alumni and elected representatives of the faculty on the governing Board.

19. If possible, the participation of students in the inauguration and enforcement of rules for student discipline.

"A SQUARE DEAL FOR TEACHERS"

Mr Chairman and Gentlemen: St Peter was receiving a group of new arrivals at the gate of heaven, in answer to his question as to what each of the group did for a living while on earth, the first man in line said: "On earth I was the representative of justice between man and man; I also defended the oppressed and the unfortunate; I was a lawyer." The second said, "I brought the new-born babe into the world; I cured the sick; when that was impossible I lightened the pains of the dying; I was a doctor." The third said, "I

tried to have men lead good lives; in prosperity I advised them to practice self-restraint; in adversity I bade them hope; I was a clergyman." The fourth said, "I defended my country against her enemies within and without; on the field of battle I faced death bravely; I was a warrior." The fifth said, "I made my country's laws; I championed and voted for the greatest good to the greatest number; I was a Congressman." [Applause.] The sixth member of the group was slow to answer; she had a worn and tired look and a subdued manner, but she was encouraged to speak for she was a woman, and then she said, "I was the teacher who introduced these five distinguished gentlemen to knowledge. I guided their childish footsteps up the height of learning in their early days, but when fame and wealth came to them they not only forgot me, but also denied me a living wage. That accounts for my weariness, which you will please excuse, for I had grown so tired thru the incessant demands of teaching, I had become so worn out trying to make both ends meet on my poor salary, and had been so depressed from the long struggle against discouragement over not being appreciated on earth that death was a relief when it came and I am glad that at last I am here."—*From a speech by Hon John W Rainey, of Illinois, on "A Square Deal for Teachers," in the House of Representatives., Washington, March 27, 1920.*

WOMAN'S PART IN CAMPAIGN CIVICS

Salt Lake City's N E A election began, not with voters' analysis, but with insiders' wires. Several states wanted Waldo of Kalamazoo for president, several wanted Owen of Chicago. But upon arrival man after man was corralled by a small group and told it was "all fixed for Hunter of Oakland." This was not the year for a Pacific coast president, for it had last year's president. This was essentially the year for a teacher-training leader, a year for emphasis upon teacher recruiting. Five men did the thinking first for forty men, then for a thousand women voters.

Promises were broken, alignments shattered, next year's election dangled just as undemocratically as at any bossed party convention. And women pulled the chestnuts out of the fire.

President Owen was sidetracked altho he has for years done the hard work for the reorganization of the N E A which finally won at Salt Lake City. President Waldo's friends bowed to the cabal. Supt Hunter was rewarded for distinguished services—political, not educational—rendered before and at Pittsburgh N E A, 1918, when the opportunity to put public education at the helm was sacrificed, —at colossal cost to education.

Next year's election has already been agreed upon by the same little group which did the N E A's thinking and pulling in 1918, 1919 and 1920. A woman principal from N Y City is to be president if voters continue abdicating, not for any service to N E A or education, but for services to the cabal that has nearly wrecked the summer N E A.

After schools teach campaign civics educational politics will strike a higher plane. Any profession that does not organize and manage itself democratically cannot and will not train others for democracy. Campaign civics will rejuvenate educators themselves as voters, and perhaps at least stop us from paying employees to organize against the membership and to keep cabal fires lighted. —*From the "Public Service" Bulletin of Sept 21, 1920.*

The American Federation of Teachers*

CHARLES B STILLMAN

President, The American Federation of Teachers

Despite its youth the union movement among teachers has passed the experimental stage, and has justified itself by its record and achievements. An indirect but convincing indication is the concentrated opposition which has been developed in some reactionary quarters, and the heavy artillery which has been brought to bear among the old-line educators who fear any innovation originating with the teachers themselves, rather than with administrative officials. Opposition is wholesome, and we welcome it whenever it is based upon fact, and is an honest clash of opinion. But much of the present rather hysterical opposition is based upon misconception and distortion of underlying fact. That this misconception and distortion is not always deliberate, but is frequently sincere misunderstanding, does not alter its viciousness. One of the most unfortunate aspects is the revelation of how easily those who are supposed to be imbued with the ideals and methods of scholarship ignore verification of data in a controversy which challenges their traditional attitudes of mind and strikes close home.

The American Federation of Teachers is the national professional organization of classroom teachers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Our labor affiliation is sometimes misunderstood by those who have a distorted conception of the labor movement, who are ignorant of organized labor's splendid record in the development of our public schools, and who do not realize how completely the A F of L is built upon the principle of autonomy of its constituent organizations. The American Federation of Teachers conducts its affairs democratically thru annual delegate conventions, absolutely without dictation or interference of any kind.

The question of the strike is frequently raised in this connection. While unaffiliated teachers, helpless and desperate in their isolation, have used the strike, no local of the A F of T has used that method. Our recent convention by formal reso-

lution reindorsed our non-strike policy. Nor is the sympathetic strike possible. Some of our prominent opponents are so little familiar with the labor movement that they speak of this as a special concession and guarantee to teachers. It is, of course, merely part of the fundamental autonomy upon which the A F of L is built. There are several strong unions which do not strike.

But our independence, far from stopping with mere immunity from the strike, includes absolute freedom of thought, judgment and action. The only obligation assumed by a teacher in affiliation with our movement consists in endorsement of the principles of our Constitution. And those principles are briefly summarized in our motto, "Democracy in Education: Education for Democracy."

Some opponents, because of their failure to grasp the far-reaching implication of autonomy, are fond of stressing such phrases as "entangling alliances," and "proselyting and propaganda in the schools." Entangling alliance is an effective catch phrase that may easily mislead large portions of the public and of the teachers who are ignorant of the fundamentals of the labor movement. But it cannot be used by one who scrupulously verifies his facts.

One sincere critic has put it—"an alliance (with labor) will tend to destroy the impartiality and independence so essential to the teaching profession." There can be no question of the essential value of such impartiality and independence, but one's first reaction is that nothing can be destroyed until it has been created. The teachers have long been the usually unwilling and frequently unconscious agents of propaganda imposed upon them from above. For example, the school authorities in one of our large cities ordered the teachers to impress on their pupils the wisdom of universal military training in time of peace. It is not inconceivable that that doctrine may ultimately become a part of accepted American tradition, but it is very far from being that now. One of the reasons for the affiliation of

*Reprinted from *The Educational Review* for September, 1920.

teachers is the securing of the degree of strength and influence which alone can enable them to develop and maintain impartiality and independence in their teaching. One of our chief principles, and a principle with which organized labor heartily sympathizes, is tenure of position based on efficiency. That is the pre-requisite for independence and impartiality.

As to proselyting and propaganda, it is unfortunate that we have forgotten the hard fight required to establish the right of the teacher to be a member of the political or religious organization of his choice. It ought not to be necessary to wage a similar fight for the freedom of the teacher as an American citizen to join any professional and economic organization of his choice. Methodist teachers do not try to make Methodists of their pupils, nor union teachers unionists. It is significant that that charge has never been raised against any of our locals. When economic subjects are treated in the classroom, all that organized labor asks, and all that anyone has a right to ask, is that facts be fairly presented. If a teacher's thinking should be affected by affiliation, it would be due simply to additional data secured by the opening up of new and more direct channels of information. This is a very potent factor in the bitter and intolerant opposition to us in many quarters. Reactionary interests are not willing to have the teacher placed in a position to have first-hand knowledge of the labor side of controversies to balance with the knowledge of the employer's side in which teachers are habitually steeped. They are afraid to trust the trained judgment of teachers with all the facts before them. And again it should be emphasized that nothing in our affiliation would prevent the free exercise of the teacher's judgment whether friendly or hostile to the labor side of the controversy. There is no pressure of any kind. The teachers have known enough of masters. They entered the labor movement in search, not of another master, but of freedom, and they have found it.

Some may ask what return organized labor does expect from the teachers. The teachers do not strike; not a penny of the one cent per member per month, which is all they turn in to the treasury

of the A F of L, goes for the support of strikes. Teachers and labor alike are determined to free the schools of special propaganda; what does labor expect in return for its admittedly powerful support? For one thing, labor believes, rightly or wrongly, that the trained intelligence of the teachers should be able to make a contribution to the solving of vexed social and economic, as well as educational problems. The teachers have the heavy responsibility of showing that the vaunted value of their education is not overrated when faced with the living problems of this reconstruction period. For the first time they have the opportunity, not merely to teach history, more or less ancient and indirectly to influence future history, but actively to assist in the making of current history.

But the chief return that organized labor expects is a square educational deal for the children of all the people. They are making no class request, they ask nothing for their own children that they do not demand with equal force for all children. In fact, they have deeply and effectively resented all efforts of the manufacturers' associations to create separate, dual systems of schools, which would inevitably result in the training of the children of artisans to become mere adjuncts of machines. They know that children are not afforded a square deal and equal educational opportunities now. Two of the causes they can put their fingers on even as laymen—underpaid teachers, and overcrowded classes. But they are not trained to diagnose the ills of a school system. And they want the teacher to affiliate, primarily, so that thru delegates of the teachers, local central bodies and state and national labor conventions can be informed of conditions at first hand by classroom teachers on the educational firing line, and so that the teachers with their specialized training and knowledge, and organized labor with its influence in the community and the nation, working shoulder to shoulder, may develop a more efficient system of public schools from the kindergarten thru the university.

The objection of alleged class affiliation is sometimes raised. If by class is meant group, the term may apply. The great public is a resounding phrase, but is after all an intangible abstrac-

tion. Our chief method is an appeal to public opinion, but such an appeal to be successful cannot simply be turned loose into the general atmosphere, but must be made to definite, articulate group organizations. That kind of effective group affiliation we have.

But our opponents know very well that the term class affiliation carries with it to the great majority of people the extreme socialist interpretation, and in that sense the A F of L is not a class organization. It is founded on the belief that there is room in our society for both employers and employees, and that differences should be adjusted by conferences of representatives through mutual education and negotiation. The I W W with its class-war philosophy is the antithesis of the A F of L, as the extreme bitterness between them helps to show. And certainly, as I have said above, the worst enemy of organized labor cannot claim that the A F of L has ever made class demands in educational matters.

The ironic and tragic fact is that many of our opponents in their efforts to turn teachers and the public against us, have done a great deal to introduce the European conception of caste, to betray their own intolerant class consciousness and introduce its poison where it did not exist before. The A F of L is an integrating, not a disruptive force in our society. In affiliation with it we find that 1200 of the leading scientists of the country in the employment of various government bureaus, physicians in the health departments of some of our large cities, technical engineers, musicians, actors, librarians, and teachers in public schools, normals and universities. Surely an affiliation which draws together such diversified groups tends to break down the un-American tendency toward petty caste lines of division between profession and artisan workers.

Another fact often overlooked is that there is nothing exclusive in our affiliation. Our movement stimulates our locals to utilize every avenue of intimate contact with the communities they serve. Often where our locals are composed of women they affiliate with the Federated Women's Clubs of their state. Wherever opportunity offers they are found working with all other available civic agencies. We go out of our way to co-

operate with all forces for improvement of the schools.

Nor do we believe in the so-called "closed shop" for teachers. We desire as members only those teachers who share our idealism and feel that they belong with us. We work harmoniously with other teachers and teachers' associations. We secure our members by the presentation of our movement, and simply insist that each teacher must have the unchallenged right as an American citizen to determine what organizations he may choose to join, without intimidation by his colleagues or by school authorities. There is room in America for honest difference of opinion, but there should be no room for the coercion of individual judgment and conscience.

Some fail to understand that we are fundamentally an organization of classroom teachers. We now have a few locals of principals, but such officials as superintendents of schools and presidents of universities are not eligible. Some administrative officials, after giving at considerable length their arguments against our existence, then proceed to berate us for excluding them. To any one familiar with the type of administrative organization which is universal in our public schools and universities, the reason must be clear. This type of organization is autocratic, all authority originating at the top, and extending down thru the upper reaches of the hierarchy, the classroom teachers thru whom any school functions, having a negligible voice. The fact that an increasing number of liberal-minded administrators survive this deadly system furnishes no defense for its presence in twentieth century America. The only real exception would be supplied by a university with a genuinely democratic constitution, or by the very few public school systems in which the initiative and experience of the teachers is given adequate voice in the conduct of the schools.

From its inception the American Federation of Teachers has stood primarily for democratization of the schools, and its first plank demanded teachers' councils. We are very glad that the advocacy of teachers' councils has reached the stage of respectability and been taken up by other teachers' associations. But watchfulness is nec-

essary to prevent even teachers' councils from degenerating into tools of autocratic administrations. Usually the method of organization of associations of teachers makes possible their domination by supervisory and administrative officialdom, thru the subtle means of intimidation the "system" places in their hands. We have excluded such officials from membership simply because experience has shown during the last half century that any organization admitting them has rapidly become an organization primarily of, by, and for such officials. But our quarrel is with the system rather than with individuals, and many school officials of broad vision are working with classroom teachers to change the system. Meanwhile we are very glad to co-operate cordially with democratically-minded supervisors and administrators. And since they have freely and properly formed their own associations, it is rather narrow and illogical for them to begrudge the same elementary privilege to classroom teachers.

Space does not permit even mention of all the outrageous misrepresentations to which some responsible educators have given currency. For example, one attributes to us the claim that teachers are "laborers merely." We would not give that characterization to any human being, and least of all to teachers. We do state the obvious fact that teachers are employees, and as employees have the privilege and right, if they so desire, to associate themselves with the other public and private employees comprising the great democratic force of organized labor. That this is simply a historical evolution is shown by the following quotation from Professor Ely's "The Labor Movement in America": "At every period of our history public school questions have been labor questions or labor measures. And when I say this I do not exclude our universities. What then has the labor movement brought us? I reply first of all: It has been one of the chief causes which have brought us a public school system. Where shall we find guardians against assaults on our public schools? Where shall we find those who will not only protect what we have, but help us forward in new achievements in education, particularly by means of public schools? To both

questions I reply, in our labor organizations. All over the world labor organizations are supporting and bearing forward every popular educational movement."

Another absurd charge is that we believe in a flat compensation for all, when in every campaign we have demanded salary schedules giving proper weight to experience and professional training. But we do not believe in discrimination on account of sex or official favoritism. Similarly with regard to the charge of lowering qualifications, no group has been resisting more vigorously the present dangerous tendency to lower professional standards now inadequate.

The effectiveness of our organization has been amply demonstrated. Opportunity does not remain here for the recital of detailed achievements, but with the assistance of organized labor in various sections of the country we have been able to secure material increases in teachers' salaries, administrative reforms, such as reduction in size of classes, and the more democratic participation of classroom teachers in the conduct of the schools; the election of progressive boards of education; the enactment of such legislation as provisions for continuation schools, for free textbooks, and for increases in school revenues. In the increasingly important field of federal educational legislation, as a result of our co-operation with the N E A, the moribund and objectionable Smith Bill has been transformed into the strengthened Smith-Towner Bill Revised, with the backing of the four and a half million of organized labor.

What has proved an important factor is the extension of the professional influence of the teachers thru the seating of their delegates in city central labor bodies and state and national conventions where they have an effective voice in the formulation of the educational and legislative programs of powerful local and state federations of labor and of the A F of L, and are in a strategic position to secure labor's support for progressive educational measures. The value of the resulting contributions of state and national labor bodies to educational policy and achievement is unquestioned.

But of even greater importance, from the stand-

point of the professional equipment of the teacher, our affiliation enables teachers to come into first hand contact with the economic, civic, and social conditions for which they are supposed to be preparing their pupils. And it is high time that teachers recognized the tragic farce of holding aloof from, and remaining ignorant of the realities of community life, when the schools succeed or fail as they prepare or fail to prepare pupils for effective participation in that life. This spirit of social idealism, which has been the driving force in our movement from the beginning, is

admirably expressed in the following quotation from Miss Mabel Colter, President of the St. Paul Federation of Women Teachers: "We have more self-respect and more respect from the citizens of St. Paul. We have gained a sense of the solidarity of the teaching force. We have 'come alive' to the industrial, economic and social problems of the day. We touch real issues as never before. We are a part of the reconstructing forces of to-day and we hope we have awakened to a sense of our responsibility to society. These gains have come to us as a part of organized labor.

The Closed Shop and the Open Shop

ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ

Local 5, New York

When the Industrial Revolution became a reality the system of paternalism was displaced by the *laissez-faire* policy because the economists contended that it would lead to industrial efficiency and general prosperity. Instead, there resulted poverty, long hours, low wages, unsanitary factory conditions, over-employment of women and children; in a word, a general race deterioration. To prevent the killing of the geese that were laying the golden eggs, the more enlightened employers and statesmen determined to use the government forces to curb the more rapacious and unscrupulous employers. As government regulation availed the workers little, the toilers developed their own organizations or Unions. By means of collective bargaining they gradually improved their conditions and, in some cases, even gained a share in the management of industry.

Not only has collective bargaining proven efficient from the point of view of the worker, but its retention is absolutely necessary if society is to be saved a bitter and destructive class war. The issue looming on our industrial horizon is, "Shall the financial and industrial autocrats destroy collective bargaining under the guise of an *Open Shop* campaign?" This coming struggle presents various aspects. First, the more reactionary and courageous industrial leaders, like Gary, are absolutely opposed to the recognition

of unions in any form, altho they profess to be willing to meet their employees as individuals or even in groups. Secondly, a seemingly more enlightened group which believes in recognizing shop organizations, but not the representatives of the unions who are not employed by them because they are "outsiders." These employers, however loudly they may protest their belief in collective bargaining, are dishonest, because they refuse to recognize the essence of collective bargaining which is "equality of bargaining power." While capital is united, class conscious, and employs the ablest brains available, it refuses the workers the right to select their representatives to champion their cause, thus demonstrating that what they seek is not *true* collective bargaining, which is capable of forcing an issue, but *lame* collective bargaining that is easily crushed. Hence their advocacy of the American Plan or the Rockefeller Type of "good" union.

The third and most dangerous group of employers is composed of those who are willing to recognize the representatives of the unions but insist upon their right to employ non-union as well as union men; that is, they want the *Open Shop*. In this fight they are supported by the other two groups who realize that an open shop means a scab shop, since unionism can be easily undermined by hiring union men last and laying them off first. In other words, the open shop

campaign means the destruction of labor's most effective weapon,—trade-unionism, and is the prelude to wage slavery or the most terrible industrial war this country has ever known. It is unfortunate that the seeming fairness of these employers coupled not only with the inconvenience suffered by the general public in such a struggle, but also with the insidious propaganda spread by a subsidized press, may induce the so-called public to take the wrong side of a struggle on which the fate of our institutions depends.

While this struggle is but an incident in the further wealth accumulation of the employers, it means life or death to the organized workers, who are determined to fight for their organizations which were won by two centuries of travail and struggle. The meaning of this struggle was so well stated by Peter Finley Dunne. Dooley, in speaking of the open shop says to Hinnessey, "Tis like this, Hinnessey: Suppose wan av these free-born citizens is workin' in an open shop f'r th' princely wages av wan large iron dollar a day of tin hour. Along comes anither son av a gun, an' he sez t' th' boss,—'Oi think Oi could handle th' job nicely f'r 90 cints.' 'Sure,' sez th' boss, an' th' wan dollar man gets out into th' crool woruld t' exercise hiz inalienable rights as a free-born American citizen an' scab on some other poor devil. An' who gits th' benefit? Thru, it saves th' boss money, but he don't care no more f'r money thin he does f'r his right eye."

"It's all principle wid him. He hates t' see men robbed av their indipendence, regardless av anything else." "But," said Mr. Hinnessey, "these open shop min ye menshun say they are f'r unions iv properly conducted." "Shure," said Mr. Dooley, "iv properly conducted An' there we are. An' how would they have thim conducted? No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly any wages an' damn few mimbers."

The war on the closed shop means the replacement of real unions by unions "properly conducted" on the Rockefeller Plan which do not protect the workers because they are absolutely under the control of the employers and because

they are too local in their nature to be effective. If workers in one factory go in strike they cannot win because other factories will finish the work and meanwhile, they are starving. Since their own fellow workers are scabbing on them they will soon be forced to surrender. Do the employers fight that way? No, they have powerful Chambers of Commerce, Employers Associations. All that the workers ask is the right to organize as effectively as their employers. What then is the meaning of this struggle?

The open shop means an increase in industrial unrest, incessant industrial war, lower morale and wage slavery. The closed shop means the most efficient economic instrument yet developed by experience for the protection of the workers as well as the other parties engaged in production and the so-called public. The right of the free born to work where he pleases is the hypocritical cry of the owners of wealth who even deny their own fellow capitalists that freedom of economic action they so madly seek for the individual and helpless worker. A splendid illustration of their dualistic industrial philosophy is the refusal of the financial autocrats to lend money to a Ship Building Company that had secured \$46,000,000 worth of contracts, because they proposed to conduct their factories under strictly union conditions. The issue is clear. The citizens of America must decide whether labor or capital is to triumph and it is our task to enlighten the "public" in this great crisis.

GOOD CONDUCT

Play develops habits of good conduct. All games must be played according to rules. To obey the rules, especially under stress of conflict and excitement, develops self-control, courage, honesty, quick judgment, co-operation and will power. The nervous system has developed many centers of reflex action; without thinking we respond to certain stimuli or assume a defensive attitude toward threatening danger. Boys and girls, in playing competitive games, are continually called upon to render decisions involving honesty, fairness, co-operation, and will power. These decisions must be rendered quickly and accurately.

Character reflex actions are developed thru the instinctive desire to play.—*From Joy and Health thru Play, Bulletin, Bureau of Education.*

A PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Submitted by a Committee of the Associated Teachers of the University of North Dakota

Believing that a system of universal democratic education is necessary to ensure the permanence of democracy and other democratic institutions; and believing that our present public school system is in need of some modifications and improvements, we submit the following program of educational reform:

1. The creation of a Federal Department of Education and a liberal appropriation by the Federal Government for the promotion and support of education.
2. The liberal, ungrudging re-organization and increase of school revenues and raising of revenue for education in North Dakota from the mining of the lignite coal of this state; or from other separate sources of revenue.
3. The participation of teachers in educational management thru representatives chosen by themselves for boards of education and administration.
4. A minimum salary, after one year's experience, of \$2,000 for all teachers, and a minimum educational qualification of a high school education and professional training in pedagogy and psychology for all teachers.
5. Higher educational qualifications for teachers of rural schools and a requirement that all teachers do some professional improvement work once in every three years.
6. An expansion and diversification of both elementary and secondary education so as to afford equality of opportunity to all students for preparation for the callings of their choice. We approve of the Smith-Hughes law. When industrial and vocational training is given, it should be under the direction and supervision of an advisory committee composed of equal numbers of members of the union and employers belonging to the trades taught.
7. The employment as teachers of married care of children as valid grounds for leaves of women and the recognition of pregnancy and absence.
8. Academic freedom as to religious, political and economic views and no dismissals for any cause until after a hearing before a committee, on which there shall be at least some representatives of the teachers.
9. Free text books in the public schools.
10. An observance in spirit as well as in letter of the law providing for free tuition in all of the public schools of the State, including the institutions of higher learning.
11. Continuous medical and dental inspection of pupils in public schools.
12. A wider use of the school plants for social, educational and civic purposes of both children and adults including the teachers.
13. A plan of Americanization which shall require (a) the giving of all instruction during the school year in English as the basic language in both public and private schools, (b) the teaching of foreign languages only as subjects in the curriculum, (c) the use of histories which stress economic and social facts more than political and military facts, (d) the study of current events and problems of citizenship and (e) instruction to adult non-English speaking people.
14. Modern physical education under competent instructors.
15. The allotment of not more than twenty-five students to any one class or teacher.
16. The encouragement of scientific research.
17. The supply of hot school lunches where feasible.
18. Better enforcement of compulsory education laws, requiring full-time attendance of pupils under sixteen and the establishment of continuation schools for pupils who leave school at sixteen years of age.
19. The recognition of the unquestioned right of teachers to belong to the American Federation of Teachers and to affiliate with organized labor.
20. We recommend the work which the A F of T has already done for the teaching profession and for the cause of education.

BOOK REVIEWS

DEPARTMENT CONDUCTED BY ALICE WOOD,
Associate Editor

"What's on the Worker's Mind?" By Whitting Williams. Charles Scribner's Sons.

"A New obinson Crusoe." By Gilson Gardner. Harcourt, Brace & Howe.

"Main Street." By Sinclair Lewis. Harcourt, Brace & Howe.

"Jailed for Freedom." By Doris Stevens. Boni & Liveright.

"Darkwater." By W E B DuBois. Harcourt, Brace & Howe.

To find, not the six best sellers, but six worth buying, out of many hundreds each month is not always easy. But I have found five worth reading and worth recommending to other teachers, not as teachers, but as human beings, members of present day society.

A New Robinson Crusoe, by Gilson Gardner, purports to be a discarded manuscript of Selkirk and Defoe written in collaboration, in which the stress is laid on the economic problem of an individual in Selkirk's situation. "To him his island world became an economic microcosm wherein he found, reduced to simplest terms, all the elements of the problems which make up the economics of the most elaborate civilization. Every new experience on his island contributed something to his analysis and conclusions, and it is these analyses and conclusions, instead of religious homiletics, which make up the background of this earlier work." The familiar story thus serves as a medium for setting relations of man to man, and seemingly unescapable. It is only where we multiply the numbers and complicate the nomenclature that we can succeed in convincing ourselves that to multiply both sides of the equation by a million changes that relation.

Some years ago Walter Wycoff wrote a book on *The Workers*, an interesting chronicle of experiences of a college professor as a worker with his hands. But I think the interest of all of us in today's book is a little less academic. We admit, however grudgingly or even resentfully,

that what is on the worker's mind concerns us very vitally. It was the recognition of the importance of understanding the worker that led Whiting Williams, Personnel Director of the Hydraulic Pressed Steel Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, to work and live as an unskilled laborer for seven months, and to publish the results of his experiment in "What's on the Worker's Mind." He did not try, as he says, to learn what feelings his new environment gave him, but aimed to use the job and its surroundings to carry him close enough to his fellow-workers to learn *their* thoughts and their feelings. His jobs took him to steel plant, rolling-mill, coal mine, ship-yard, oil refinery, and iron-mine, and not the least value of the book, I think, for those who live outside of industrial communities, is the knowledge gained of actual conditions in factory and mine. The greater emphasis, however, is laid on the human element. The effect of the fatigue of the twelve-hour day on mind and on morals, the relation between boss and men, the result of non-participation of the laborer in entire processes, the detachment or resentment due to absentee-ownership and management, the terror of non-employment, the gulf between the skilled and the unskilled laborer, are all brought out most impressively. Whether one agrees or not with what conclusions or interpretations Mr Williams arrives at, his account of his experiences makes, I think, an extremely valuable book. I recommend it for absorbing interest. It ought to make one think.

Main Street, by Sinclair Lewis, is a novel of the small town. I recommend it to every school-teacher in every small town "in this broad land of ours." It is keenly observant, but the multitudinous detail is not photographic, but the innumerable fine lines of an etching that make it a work of art. It is provocative. From much of it I wish to dissent, but the essential truth of it defeats me. If it is true, that the small town is narrow, bigoted, dull and hideously ugly, (and can we say it is *not* true even if it is not the whole truth?) *what* are we teachers doing? Must the mass in a democracy always be blind to beauty and devoid of a thirst for truth? If the next problem beyond the present one of gain-

ing leisure for man is the use of the leisure, what beginning have we made? Of course the problem is not only that of the small town, it is the whole problem of life. But that is the fascination of the book. It is *bound* to make one think.

Jailed For Freedom, by Doris Stevens, is the story of the seven years' campaign for political freedom waged by The National Woman's Party, culminating in the passing of the Susan B Anthony Amendment and its ratification by the required number of state. Miss Stevens has done a fine piece of work in her selection from a vast mass of detail, her emphasis upon the logical, clearly thought-out plan of battle with its sequence of reactions, her discriminating characterizations and temperate tone, and the narrative's sustained interest. To me it was a thrilling and inspiring book.

Dr W E B DuBois, author of *Dark Water*, is also the author of the "Souls of Black Folk." Both of these books are poignant revelations of a phase of our so-called civilization destined to call more and more imperatively for our attention. Beyond the burning impression of terrible injustice, and the inexpressible suffering of a race, however, is the shining truth that Dr Du Bois is a poet—that none can rob him of the joy of the knowledge that what others may only own he actually possesses. The eternal solace of the world is Beauty, and the poet and the artist find that healing. One finishes the book with congratulations to a conqueror.

100%—THE STORY OF A PATRIOT

By UPTON SINCLAIR, Pasadena, California

To uninformed citizens who happen to rely for their "news" on such journals as the "New York Times" and who still believe in the Americanism of the "Fathers," Upton Sinclair's book will bring a blush of shame because they will be enlightened as to the methods by which the Debureau for the incitement of crime or into an agency of Big Business to rid the country of partment of Justice has been transformed into a dangerous "Reds"—a euphemism for champions of a new democratic order. In this 300-page book,

replete with dramatic incident, Sinclair shows how America, using "agents provocateurs," of the Peter Gudge type or police officials like Guffey who is a mere tool of the Tractions Interests, incites radicals or members of the chambers of commerce to commit acts of violence, slips dangerous phrases into "red" documents for the sole purpose of enabling the Department of Justice to rid the country of all those who oppose a system that battens upon economic injustice, or who are so un-American as to believe in the Americanism of Jefferson and Lincoln.

Now and then the overflowing anger of the reader is relieved by such incidents as Guffey's cursing of Peter Gudge for arresting the brother of a United States Senator for quoting the Declaration of Independence! Poor, simple and untutored Peter cannot understand why a man should be permitted to break the law just because he happens to be a brother of a senator or why seditious things may be said just because they happen to be in the Declaration of Independence or in the Bible. One cannot help smiling when Peter Gudge receives a letter from the head of the "Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution," hurries with it to Guffey and asks what kind of a "red" plot is being hatched by these female parlor Bolsheviks who have the hardihood to openly flaunt the word "revolution" on their letter heads at a time when America is fighting to save itself from the reds.

Upton Sinclair, as usual, has done America a service. His book will no doubt help to bring about a conversion from 100% Americanism to the Americanism on which most of us have been nurtured and then America, and not secret agents of the Department of Injustice, will once more be the trustee of liberty and civilization.

A LEFKOWITZ

The co-operative movement has been, and is, effecting a silent and sure revolution, not only in Ireland, but thruout the world, which is not brought about by blood and iron, but by brains and perseverance. In this revolution the captains of the companies are the managers of the co-operative societies, and they are captains in a democratic army in which the voice of the youngest officer can be heard in the highest councils.—L P Byrne and D Coffey in *Better Business*.

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

of The American Teacher, published monthly except July and August, at New York, N. Y. for October 1, 1920.

State of New York, County of Queens, ss.:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Henry R Linville, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of the American Teacher and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, The American Federation of Teachers, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Editor, Henry R Linville, 36 Terrace Ave., Jamaica, N. Y.

Managing Editor, None.

Business Manager, Max Rosenhaus, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of the total amount of stock.)

The American Federation of Teachers—President, Chas B Stillman, 1620 Lake Avenue, Wilmette, Ill.; Secretary-Treasurer, F G Stecker, 1618 Lake Avenue, Wilmette, Ill.; approximate number of members, 12,000.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during

the six months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily publications only.)

HENRY R LINVILLE,
Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of October, 1920.

(Seal) ALVIN M DUNHAM.
(My commission expires March 30, 1921.)

INSTRUCTION IN POLITICS FOR WOMEN

Goucher College has received the sum of \$25,000 for the establishment of the Elizabeth King Ellicott fellowship for the political education of women. By this fund Goucher College becomes the first women's college in the country to provide definitely for the education of women voters.—From *School Life* for November 1, 1920.

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 DEPREM,
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

Chapman

To a New Delegate to Our National Convention

What is it that your local has a right to expect when you bring back your report from the National Convention? Is it a mere catalog of the business transacted at each session? The official report gives that in more exact detail than you can hope to do. Do you go merely to shape the policies of The American Federation of Teachers? And do you return merely to render an account of your participation therein? In short, are conventions important solely for the business transacted? Are you to render a sort of phonographic service, and when you return, judiciously cut, and with costumes and scenery omitted?

No delegate who understands our movement,—and understanding is not of the mind solely, but of the heart as well,—can attend a national convention of The American Federation of Teachers without being strengthened and confirmed in purpose, inspired and encouraged to greater activity. Without being Pharisaical, he thanks God that this is not as other conventions are. It is the DIFFERENCE that is your justification for existence.

Is it not then this thing which is unique, this spirit which is the source of our loyalty, this type of discussion and interplay of personality which are the inevitable expression of an essential agreement,—is it not this that your local wants to hear about? If you yourself are not immune to the contagion of ideas, you will have gained more than facts at our convention. In addition to facts, this is what your local wants you to bring back. It is not the performance merely. It is the quality of the performance. See that you take home to your local the thing that makes the American Federation live in spite of difficulties, and grow, inevitably, in spite of opposition.

JOSEPHINE COLBY,
Field Secretary.



Hargrave

