

assist her with capital and organization. She can draw heavily upon England and France, but their moral position will be strongest if they demand no exclusive profits.

Russia and the industrial states afford merely one instance of the divergence of economic interest within the Entente. England, Russia, and Japan have divergent interests to reconcile in the trade of China; England, France and Italy in the trade of North Africa. These divergences would become sharply defined if any serious attempt were made to establish commercial union.

The world is not yet ready for extensive economic leagues of the nations. All the lessons of this war point to the desirability of a high degree of national self-sufficiency. It is not safe for one nation to become essentially dependent upon another, no matter how solid the basis of friendship between them may appear to be. Whatever the immediate effect of the war in creating a feeling of economic solidarity, we may be quite certain that the final effect will be a recrudescence of protectionism and economic separatism. From this tendency Germany, as an industrial export nation, may indeed suffer, but only incidentally and along with Great Britain and the United States, equally interested in industrial exportation.

Training for Public Service

ACCORDING to the American tradition, good government has meant righteous government rather than efficient government. Improvement in municipal affairs has had to be floated on a great wave of moral indignation. Reform has moved in cycles, each cleansing administration being drowned in the reactionary flood which the unpopularity of its own virtue has created. It took us a long time to discover that the only salvation from this futile and perpetual recurrence lay in a new professional attitude towards administration and the public service. We had to replace the moral by an intellectual emphasis. We had to see the public service as a profession to be trained for as rigidly and with the same disinterested spirit as the private professions were trained for.

Civil service reform was far less a victory for such training than is generally supposed. It did tend to destroy the old superstition that the public service was a mere feeding-trough for a horde of perfectly equal, perfectly deserving, though perfectly incompetent office-seekers. But it did not really provide for competence. It merely said, public offices shall be filled by trained officers. How or where they got their training was no concern to civil service commissions. Partly through a thoughtlessness that now seems almost perverse,

partly through a genuine effort to avoid favoritism in a world where the hungry wolves still prowled for spoils, the civil service tradition actually worked against specific training for the public service. The candidate was allowed to know the general subject in which he would be examined, and the credit he would receive for experience. But as to the specific character of the work or the peculiar problems and emphases of the public service, the civil service commission was deaf and dumb. The candidate could not even learn officially of his chances for appointment or promotion, or of any political or traditional rules which might influence his appointment or promotion. Nor would the civil service authorities either coöperate with or recognize schools which tried to provide specific training.

The result of this policy has been an over-emphasis on perfunctory intellectual tests, and the picking-up of "training" in unregulated cramming-schools which have sprung up to meet the demand. In default of real laboratory experience, of apprenticeship in the public service, the attitude of the prospective public servant has scarcely been changed by civil-service reform. He or she is still primarily an office-holder. The methods of entering the public service have changed, but the spirit has not. The technique of getting your job is more bothersome, but your approach continues the same. The energy that used to go into pull or personal persistence now goes into the assimilation of textbooks. Your work is still primarily a means of livelihood rather than a profession. The school system still exists in most large cities for the purpose of giving positions to local girls, and the city departments for the purpose of providing a living for the bright young men of the ward. The advance in morale or imaginative efficiency is negligible.

The new movement for training in public service is therefore not mere extension of civil service reform. In its shifting of values from the livelihood to the disinterested professional technique it is really revolutionary. It is an effort to build up in the municipal, state and federal service a stable corps of officers of scientific spirit who will have served their apprenticeships and secured the professional imagination of their craft. It is an effort to give the civil service body and backing so that it will really mean something. It seeks to identify good government with efficient government and make it possible for the would-be public servant to secure the specific training that will make him efficient.

In its plan of coöperation between the colleges and city departments, the Bureau of Municipal Research in New York has developed an effective technique for such training. The departments become laboratories for practical work. The college provides the theoretical background, shaping its

courses in political science, municipal administration and sanitation, to lead directly into practical service. The student then goes to work at specific problems in the city departments under the direction of the Bureau's officers who are conducting the investigation. The college gives credit for this laboratory work, and the student gets an apprenticeship training under expert officials at the same time that he is working for his college degree. The plan is analogous to the industrial coöperative courses between college or high school and shop in which the student divides his time between shop and school. It is another weapon in that fight to break down the walls between the school and communal life.

A Bureau of Municipal Research which has such a training school and can mediate between the college and the public service doubles its value to the community. And it doubles the value of the college. Already the colleges are beginning to shape their courses towards this public service training. The City College in New York has recently made a survey of the situation. Before the survey, it already had courses in municipal chemistry in direct coöperation with the central testing laboratory of the Board of Estimate; courses in food inspection and analysis in connection with the food and drug inspection laboratory of the Department of Health, and in the municipal sanitary inspection in coöperation with the Department. Since the survey, the college is in a position to adapt its courses more closely to the needs of the city administration, and provide training for those who wish to enter the lower grades, as well as those who want more specialized instruction for the higher positions, technical, professional and administrative. The municipal college, such as already exists in New York, Cincinnati, Toledo, Akron, will find itself doing nothing more important than this training of public servants for the city. The large universities, Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Cornell, New York, Johns Hopkins, and the smaller colleges like Reed, Whitman and Oregon, which have joined in the movement, will find their teaching of the political sciences immensely fertilized by this contact with direct practical work in administration. Through the municipal and state university, the government can thus take an effective part in the recruiting of its own personnel. The civil service commissions will not be allowed to continue aloof from this work. Demands will be made upon them for full publicity with regard to the services and appointments, promotions, technical requirements, and so on. They will come to supervise the training of public servants as well as to examine them. The community will come to be the laboratory of institutional life where its citizens learn to be public ser-

vants by working out genuine problems in intimate contact with the administrative machinery.

There will be little gain, however, in this training for the public service unless there goes on, along with this tightening of administrative skill, a clearer understanding of democratic policy. We need not only the efficient tool, but also the constructive purpose to direct its application. The new interest in administration is drawing the needful sharp line between policy and execution—the public will to decide what the community wants, and the trained administrative and responsive machine to carry out that will. The danger of a bureaucracy develops just when the administrative technique is perfected faster than the clear-sighted control. Without this guiding democratic control, the officers will set their own policies. This is always the bureaucratic danger. On the other hand, unless the administrative machine is organized and expert, the community is as powerless to act on its own decisions as a paralyzed man is to make his limbs obey his mind.

Along with training in public service must go a training in public opinion. Perhaps one is always a function of the other. Certainly in this country administrative carelessness has gone along with our cloudiness of social vision. Politics has been concerned less with public policy than with personal aggrandizement. Parties have been coalitions of feudal chieftains, each with his band of retainers, rather than associations for the carrying through of projects. Issues are habitually confused with personalities. Any new training for public service which subordinates personalities to the effective work may be expected to bring with it a new emphasis on issues rather than men. To develop the instrument would mean to develop the will and the vision to use it. This is the hope of the movement for training in public service.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL

WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

Why We Distrust Our Government

THE problem which now lays first claim on American statesmanship is the maintenance of our national ideals in a world of conflicting nations. American national ideals insist on government for the benefit of the governed as interpreted by a numerical majority of citizen voters. The maintenance of these ideals requires that the government shall be efficient—not only that the government shall be controlled by the expressed wishes of a majority, but that the nation possessing these ideals shall be able to command and use its wealth of human forces and material resources for the welfare of the people and, in case of need, to resist any attack from without. To command its human forces the government must have the confidence of the people. To use its human forces and material resources effectively the government must be capable and honest; it must be organized and managed in such manner as to make efficient action practicable.

None of these results has been attained. Our government is not trusted; our government has not developed expertness in organization and management. There is an awakening among the people due to a national consciousness of unpreparedness. Before armaments and war materials may be effectively used, it is necessary to develop a spiritual and social background that will cause citizens to enlist in a national cause—enlist with enthusiasm and with full confidence that their enthusiasm will be directed and used with such ability that our engines of war may speak defiance to any organized force that may seek to violate our territorial rights. Is this not a fit time for us to inquire why our government is distrusted—why we have not developed expertness in the conduct of public affairs?

Some of the concrete facts which stare us in the face are these:

Although we have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars each year on war equipment, we are now so ill equipped for defense that we are put to it to find the means of protecting our Mexican border against invasion by straggling bands of organized outlaws, although we are using practically all of our available military force for this purpose.

Our army posts have been scattered about in congressional districts—not because of their value for defense or the training of men, but to help congressmen get votes.

Our navy yards have been located at strategic points for vote getting, in many instances being so ill adapted for the purposes of their establishment that naval officers themselves have urged their abandonment.

Of the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated from the public treasury for the development of river and harbor improvements and other transportation facilities, not less than one-half has been worse than wasted—many of these expenditures being authorized purely for purposes of vote-getting through putting money in circulation in the localities of members of the appropriating body.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated for public buildings, not because of economies to be effected or conveniences to be added for the public good, but simply as a part of a process of partisan and personal bargaining.

Public-health services have been developed in five different administrative departments of the national government in less than a dozen different uncoordinated jurisdictions, not because this is the best way to protect the health of the people, but because it best serves the ends of those who must give an account of themselves to local constituencies.

Institutions and other means for the care and education of the defective, dependent and delinquent are put under six different federal departments, not pursuant to any well considered welfare plan, but for personal, partisan and accidental reasons.

Provisions are made for the regulation of commerce and banking in a hit-or-miss fashion and are uncoordinated with provisions for the promotion of trading, manufacture, mining and agriculture.

This weakness and wastefulness in our governmental agencies, national, state and municipal, constitute a condition that cries out for remedy—that causes the people not alone to lose confidence in those who have been chosen to conduct their common business but to doubt our republican institutions. We realize that our common business is conducted, not in a coöperative spirit, but by agencies which distrust one another. Congress distrusts the President; the President distrusts Congress; state legislators distrust governors and governors distrust legislators; local councils distrust local executives, and vice versa; and the people distrust everybody and everything political or governmental.

Our first consciousness of nationality was the outgrowth of a well earned distrust of executive power that ripened into a successful revolution against an existing irresponsible foreign autocrat. We emerged from a distressing war of eight years with national independence—and with a people united in distrust of all executive power. In setting up a new government the one controlling thought was to “secure . . . to ourselves and our posterity . . . the blessings of liberty.” All other things were made subordinate to this one dom-