

ble to outlaw a man for any conduct, upon the *more ipse dixit* of a government bureau; but to outlaw his family by errors that are almost inevitable under such bureaucratic government, is to make the indefensible intolerable.

+ +

The Republican Choice for the Vice-Presidency.

Yielding doubtless to the pressure of the political gang, whose choice for President was Speaker Cannon, the friends of Mr. Taft failed to find him a running mate who represents the aristocratic spirit as faithfully as himself. Mr. Sherman appears to be one of the Republican "Boys," who are in politics for the flesh pots. At any rate his name is found among those of the mileage raiders in Congress five years ago.

+

Let us explain. One of the many acts of usurpation of which President Roosevelt has been guilty was that of making a "constructive" recess of the infinitesimal time that elapsed between the end of the special session of the 58th Congress and the beginning of the regular session at noon on the first Monday of December, 1903. Taking advantage of this straining of the law by the President, the "Boys" in Congress determined to raid the treasury and get mileage for three sessions instead of two, although the special session had been continued up to the very moment set by the Constitution for the beginning of the regular session. It was therefore impossible for a member to have even drawn a breath between the two sessions, let alone go home and come back again to Washington. When originally attempted on January 30, 1904, this barefaced raid was successfully combated by Congressmen Underwood, DeArmond and Baker. They were successful because many who favored the steal were afraid to face their constituents by going on record for it with the Congressional elections only a few months off. With the elections over, however, the raid was renewed during the concluding days of the 58th Congress, March 1, 1905, and under the leadership of James S. Sherman, the Republican candidate for Vice-President.

+

Although opposed by the same three members who had fought it at the previous session, the attempt of Mr. Sherman to open the treasury to the "Boys" was this time successful so far as the action of the House alone could make it so. Not only did Mr. Sherman lead the raid, but he defended it in this brazen manner:

I want to say, in answer to my colleague from

the Borough of Brooklyn [Mr. Baker], that neither on this proposition or any other which I have ever offered or ever shall offer in this House am I afraid to stand upon my feet and say that I am in favor of it.

I have never had any doubt about our legal right to draw the money. I never had any doubt, and I have none now, about our moral right to draw the money.

Think of that! The "moral" right of a legislative body to draw mileage for a second session, when not one second could have elapsed between its convening and the termination of the previous session! If this is Mr. Sherman's idea of public honesty, his theory of public dishonesty would be interesting—if he has any. One can easily picture the riot of extravagance, and the facility with which jobs would glide through under a Sherman administration, should the country ever be afflicted with one. The "Boys" would have their innings at the treasury under a President Sherman, even if thereby the country was bankrupted; and there might happen to be a President Sherman if a Vice-President Sherman were elected.

+ +

Industrial Education.

We again warn our readers to be careful in making up their minds on the subject of industrial education in the public schools. There is no dispute about the importance of industrial education. Beyond all possibility of cavil it is one of the necessities of a democratic citizenship. The mind, the civic conscience, and the hand should be trained to function co-operatively. Without this co-operation the best citizenship is impossible. But while there is no room to question the importance of industrial education, there is ample room to question the kind that shall be adopted; and over this question a tremendous educational controversy is brewing—a controversy which is to determine whether we shall have a republic of industrial oligarchs commanding an army of industrial serfs, or a republic of intelligent and equal-opportunities citizens. As defined more definitely in these columns last Spring (p. 151) the issue "is whether the public school systems of this country shall educate intelligent and useful citizens by means in part of industrial training, or whether they shall by that means become an agency for flooding the labor market with uneducated youth skilled in narrow mechanical specialties."

+

The latest manifestation of the latter tendency is reported from New York. At a meeting of the school board of that city last week, one of the

members, Mr. Frederic Coudert, offered a report on trade schools in which the serfdom policy was quite distinctly suggested. This report recommended, as we find it stated in the New York Herald of the 25th—

That shop work be introduced into all schools in which there are boys in the seventh or eighth year.

That, as far as possible, the practical use of tools employed in the wood working and metal working trades be taught in the public schools, and the workshops be properly equipped.

That the additional time needed for the extension of work in the shop be fixed as between three and five o'clock in the afternoons or Saturday mornings, or, in the evenings.

That a separate vocational school for boys between fourteen and sixteen years be established, and that part of Public School No. 144, Manhattan, facing Orchard street, be so equipped and that fifteen rooms in Public School No. 75, Brooklyn, be set aside as a vocational school for girls.

+

It doesn't require much reading between the lines to see in those suggestions a purpose to subordinate general industrial education to the acquirement of special skill sufficient for routine factory jobs. Mr. Coudert may be innocent enough of that purpose personally, but somewhere among the influences behind him there is evidently a deliberate intention to utilize the public schools as labor-supply stations for industrial oligarchs. One could almost believe that these suggestions were written by the noted labor union "buster," James W. Van Cleave, who, only a few days earlier, in an attack upon trade unions in which he foretold their extinction, frankly said:

Right at our hand is an opportunity to raise more and better mechanics than the apprenticeship system ever furnished, namely by attaching a manual training department to every public school of the primary grade in the United States. In this department, let every boy from the age of 9 or 10 to 14 give an hour every day to the use of tools employed in the more important mechanical trades, under competent instructors, and make the attendance compulsory on each boy.

The evident object here is to qualify the great mass of school children, those of the poorer class, to become, not educated mechanics, but human cogs in an industrial mechanism, ready upon demand to be put into the place of the human cogs that drop out; and all for the financial advantage of the owners of the mechanism, without reference to the good of the human cogs or of society as a whole. The object was brought out even more clearly by Andrew S. Draper, the commissioner of education of the State of New York, in a paper read before the National Educational Association at Cleveland on the 29th, in which he

proposed three distinct classes of schools to follow the elementary schools: First, the present high school system; second, business schools looking to work in offices, stores, etc.; and, third, factory and trades schools looking to the training of workmen.

+

True industrial education is different from all that. It is an education in the manual arts that everyone should acquire as part of his general school work, for the education of his mind as well as his hand. It should be broad, laying a firm basis for any kind of employment, manual or professional, which the youth as he matures sufficiently to decide with intelligence may choose to adopt. An industrial education of the right kind, is no less important to the future lawyer, physician, preacher, journalist, or merchant, than to the journeyman mechanic or the engineer. We must have it if we are to have a good democratic citizenship. But the kind for which Mr. Van Cleave prays and which Mr. Coudert and Mr. Draper offer as if in answer to Mr. Van Cleave's prayer, is of a totally different species. It would emphasize mere manual skill in a restricted sphere of industry, in order to furnish ready-made machine-tenders incompetent ever to be anything else. To object to this, one need not be solicitous for trade unions. A labor force so recruited would soon organize against the oligarchs, and probably with more intelligence and mutual loyalty than is usual among shop-grown workmen. But the tendency of such a system toward class stratification makes it intolerable as an attachment of the public schools. Our public schools are for the training of citizens. They are not for the segregation of scholars from clerks and both from factory hands; and they must not be organized to serve as intelligence offices for industrial oligarchs in quest of industrial serfs.

+ +

The Death of Grover Cleveland.

It has become the custom when a public man dies, to cover his memory with flowers of rhetoric; and few are so profuse in fulsome tributes as those who in his lifetime were among his bitterest assailants. The latest object of this species of post mortem apologetics is Grover Cleveland, although a man of his stamina could hardly have contemplated the possibility of it without some sense of contempt. This is not to imply that kindly words should be withheld when death comes. Very far is it from implying that the fairer opinion into which one may be shocked by