

# The Outlook

## A Family Paper

NEW SERIES OF THE CHRISTIAN UNION

Volume 50

For Week ending 29 September, 1894

Number 13



THE Louisiana sugar-planters held their convention last week, and voted to go over bodily to the Republican party, on the ground that protection is necessary to the sugar industry of Louisiana, and can be found only through that party. According to the New York "Sun" there were eight hundred persons present, all of them men of political influence; they represented two-thirds of the sugar industry of the State; and among them were a number of heretofore prominent and influential Democrats. This is the most hopeful sign we have seen in Southern politics since the war. It is perfectly certain that these planters will endeavor to secure the negro vote, and equally sure that their opponents will endeavor to secure a counteracting negro vote. This movement is the entering of a wedge which promises to break up the "solid South" and to give us party divisions not formed on race and color lines. We may repeat what we have said before, that those in the South who believe in tariffs or bounties for the purpose of protecting or promoting American industries belong in the Republican party, and honor requires that they should identify themselves with that party and work openly and aboveboard for its political principles.

The American Protective Association, popularly known as the A. P. A., appears to be pursuing a course analogous both in its methods and in its immediate results with that of the Know-Nothing movement. The A. P. A. is a secret society, and its political strength is disclosed only when an election takes place. Its object is to neutralize Roman Catholic influence in politics, and it is both affirmed and denied by those who ought to know that its secret pledges require its members in no case to vote for a Roman Catholic for public office. However this may be, it unquestionably makes the sectarian and the political line of division identical. In such a case assault provokes counter-assault. So we have in St. Louis a School Board the majority of whose members belong to the A. P. A., while the Police Board has recently retired a police captain because he is a member of the A. P. A., and promoted a Roman Catholic in his place. If we may trust the Springfield "Republican," the A. P. A. has elected Mr. Barrett to the Republican State Convention against the vigorous endeavors of Senator Lodge, and is working assiduously, though secretly, to determine the Republican nomination for Governor. If we may trust the "Sun," the Republican managers in Connecticut are dreading the voting power of the A. P. A. in the next State and town elections, and are endeavoring to make local alliances with them. In our judgment, this movement will not secure the following which was secured by the Know-Nothing movement, and will not exert an influence even as long-lived as the transient influence of Know-Nothingism. Where the Roman Catholic hierarchy are exerting a pernicious influence in politics, as in some localities they

may be doing, the remedy lies, not in an anti-Roman Catholic movement, but in an anti-sectarian movement, in which the co-operation of patriotic American Catholics could be secured. Meanwhile a certain section of the Roman Catholic Church, by endeavoring to band together the Germans in an effort to preserve the German language and exclude American influences from Roman Catholic schools and churches, is doing all that it can to promote the A. P. A. movement; and Monsignor Satolli, by apparently lending his approval to this un-American effort, is in danger of giving aid and comfort to the organized enemies of the Roman Catholic Church in America.

In our judgment, the Constitutional Convention of this State might have gone further than it has gone in providing home rule for the cities of the State. It is true that we are not yet wise enough to draw sharply the line between municipal and State authority, and it is also true that the Convention should be slow in limiting the powers of the legislatures even over the great cities, but it would seem that there are some matters so purely municipal that the Constitution might properly have left them under the exclusive control of the people of the municipality. However, the very conservative provision which the Convention has adopted will at least operate to prevent such gross outrages on the city as that which was perpetrated last year on Buffalo at the dictation of Mr. Sheehan. The clause adopted requires that all special legislation respecting any city or class of cities—the cities being divided into three classes, according to their population—must be transmitted to the Mayor of such city or cities, and if not approved within fifteen days must be again passed upon by both branches of the Legislature. Thus the Mayor, or in some cases the Mayor and legislative body of the city acting concurrently, is given a quasi-veto power over all special legislation affecting the municipality, except that the Legislature may overrule the veto by a mere majority vote. The effect of this amendment will be to give time for public agitation respecting all measures affecting any city; and, while public agitation is by no means a perfect protection, experience has demonstrated that is a great safeguard. The amendment is not all that radical believers in home rule might well desire, but it is at least good as far as it goes.

Much better work was done by the Convention with respect to gambling. The clause of the present Constitution forbidding the sale of lottery tickets was supplemented by the prohibition of "pool-selling, book-making, or any other kind of gambling." The adoption of a Constitution containing this clause will wipe out from the statute-book the Ives pool law that now disgraces it. Opponents of the amendment attempted to impugn the motives of Mr. Tekulsky (the President of the State Liquor-Dealers' Association), who had so earnestly championed it. Mr. Tekulsky won the respect of the Convention by good-

humoredly avoiding the personal issue and keeping before the Convention the one question whether gambling should be prohibited. President Choate moved to strike from the amendment the clause "or any other kind of gambling," on the ground that such a provision would put a stop to church-fair raffles, and games for small stakes in private houses and clubs. Mr. Veeder, of Brooklyn, promptly condemned this proposition, on the ground that petty gambling was not less corrupting when carried on even in churches, and the Convention adopted the amendment unchanged, with but four dissenting votes.

The committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, appointed to investigate the charges brought by Mr. Wells, late Superintendent of Education of that State, have made a report completely exonerating Professor Ely from all of the charges preferred against him. In their report they take up one after another of the specific accusations, such as that of aiding strikes and threatening to take away his printing from an establishment if the proprietor did not make it a union office, and declare them proved false. They do not merely say that these accusations are not proved true; they affirmatively state that they find them untrue. They next take up the charges against Dr. Ely's teachings, and are equally explicit in affirming these groundless. "We have been unable," says the report, "to find any teachings or practice of Dr. Ely justifying attacks upon life or property; but we do find that he has repeatedly and in the strongest language admonished against both." Finally, the Board, in accepting and adopting this report—and both the action of the committee and the action of the Board are apparently unanimous—expresses, as *The Outlook* did when Mr. Wells's attack was first published in the New York "Evening Post," its disapproval of the course of Mr. Wells "in publishing his attack upon Dr. Ely, of the University, in the New York papers, instead of submitting his charges or criticisms, if any, in proper form, to the President of the University or of this Board." We desire to emphasize this disapproval. By his course Mr. Wells has done Dr. Ely an irreparable injury. Many who read the original charges will never read the report of the investigating committee; and, unhappily, many who read both carelessly will have left on their mind at the end of a year, in spite of the explicit character of the report and the complete vindication of Dr. Ely, nothing but a vague impression that charges of being an incendiary character and teacher were preferred against him, and that "where there is smoke there must be fire." In fact, the personal charges against Dr. Ely appear to have been based wholly on street rumors, which the most cursory examination proved to be wholly baseless, and the charges of heresy in teaching to be based almost entirely on second-hand reports, which on examination of his printed utterances at once proved equally false.

The truth is that probably no teacher in the United States, either in press, pulpit, or professor's chair, has done more to counteract incendiary teaching than Professor Ely. He has studied the incendiary writers and acquainted himself with their doctrines and purposes. Several years before Anarchism became the dangerous force it is to-day in Chicago, he published in *The Outlook* a series of papers telling the country what the Anarchists were doing, and pointing out the inevitable danger of suffering their incendiary teachings to pass unnoticed; and this was, we believe, the first attempt to bring their hitherto unknown schemes before the public. He has

studied labor organizations and Socialistic teachings at first hand, has not condemned them without inquiry, has discriminated between the true and the false, the just and the unjust, and has counteracted the dangerous heresy by the only safe and permanent method—a discriminating recognition of what is true in the teaching. The difficulty with such critics as Mr. Wells is that they do not distinguish between grammar-school and university instruction. If boys of twelve or fourteen are to be taught anything about Socialism, they probably ought to be guarded against its more seductive and plausible errors. But the office of a university is to tell young men what Socialism is, as taught by its advocates, to present to them the strongest possible arguments for it, and to train them to examine it for themselves and form their own judgments as to its truth or falsehood. What the committee on Professor Ely's case say on this subject might well be repeated and applied to every branch of study, including theology, in every higher institution in the land: "We cannot for a moment believe that knowledge has reached its final goal, or that the present condition of society is perfect. We must, therefore, welcome from our teachers such discussions as shall suggest the means and prepare the way by which knowledge may be extended, present evils may be removed, and others prevented." Unconsciously Mr. Wells has rendered the cause of education a valuable service in giving to such a body as the Board of Regents of Wisconsin an occasion for so admirable a defense of the liberty of teachers and teaching.

Dr. Parkhurst, having returned from his summer vacation, brings back with him an immense amount of energy and enthusiasm for righteousness, and is at once, naturally, at the front in the campaign against municipal corruption and misrule. He may be said, indeed, to occupy the skirmish line. In a public speech last week he declared that he would rather vote for Mr. Gilroy for Mayor than for a man who would not give assurance that he will throw himself wholly into the concerted movement for the best interests of the municipality. In this we believe he is thoroughly right. What is wanted in all our great cities, pre-eminently just now in New York, is not merely a good man for Mayor, but an uprising and a combination of all good men for the purpose of a war of extermination against corruption in all its forms. Dr. Parkhurst is vigorous in his denunciation of Superintendent Byrnes's quasi-apology for the police, namely, that the social evil has always existed and will continue to exist, and would be worse if disreputable women are driven into the tenement-houses than if they are permitted by the police to maintain separate houses of vice. Dr. Parkhurst's reply to this is quite conclusive. It is the business of the police to execute laws, not to make them, and the present campaign is not one against houses of vice, but against a police department which receives pay from houses of vice for permitting their continuance when it is paid by the community to close them. One may perhaps question the wisdom of taking this time to make an attack upon a practice, now common in this city, of demanding a political assessment from the judges as a compensation for nomination, but Dr. Parkhurst has apparently weighed his words well in condemning this system, and the condemnation is entirely justified. "It is impossible for such a man to sit on the bench and distribute justice impartially; he mortgages himself to the interests of the party to which he contributes. I don't say that he intends to be dishonest, but sitting on a bench that one has purchased renders it impossible for him to hold the scales even in the interest of the party to which he is indebted."