

present session opened and it broke out today. Judge Birdsall, like Mr. Hinshaw, is on the merchant marine committee, which reported the subsidy bill. Birdsall devoted himself to a reply to some caustic observations of Grosvenor, who had spoken for the bill. 'The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Grosvenor,' he said, 'impugns not only the motives but the intelligence of Congressman Hinshaw. He impugns likewise the intelligence of all that membership of the house which represents what is called the cornfield constituencies of the country. He went further—to threaten some of us with defeat because of our attitude toward this bill; to threaten our defeat because some of us upon this committee have seen fit to disagree with the gentleman from Ohio—yes, and with the president, if you please—upon this question. Is it possible that because these ship subsidy people have failed to corrupt him by the tender of a liberal donation to his campaign fund, which he indignantly spurned, that they now propose to follow him out to his district and defeat him for re-nomination or at the polls? I like patriotism that is void of greed and that is not measured by the liberality of graft from the public treasury.' Judge Birdsall's speech created the sensation of the day. The charge of attempted bribery had been carefully kept out of public view so much as possible till the time when the explosion would do the most good. Mr. Hinshaw would not discuss the details of the matter in which his name had been used, further than to admit that Birdsall knew what he was talking about and was warranted in saying what he said."

Messrs. Birdsall and Hinshaw are republicans. It will be well for every member who voted for the ship subsidy bill to prepare for his constituents a defense of his vote and an explanation, also, of the charges made by Mr. Birdsall.

#### ◇◇◇◇ "AMERICAN BEAUTY" SYSTEM IN EDUCATION

The Commoner has already reproduced from the New York Tribune, the New York Evening Telegram and other publications articles showing that the purpose of the general education board, having in charge the Rockefeller donation, is to gradually weed out those educational institutions which in the opinion of the managers of the Rockefeller fund ought to go out of business. The Manufacturers' Record published at Baltimore is seeking to arouse the people of the south to what it calls "the menace to America emphasized by the enormity of the latest \$32,000,000 accretion to that phase of the slowly-forming Educational Trust known as the General Education Board of New York."

The Record quotes from a number of newspapers some of which are partisans of the Rockefeller "educational movement" to prove its point. For instance, the Outlook of New York, to which the Record refers as "one of the unfailing supporters of the tendency popularly called the Ogden (Rockefeller) movement" is quoted as saying: "With this financial power in its control, the General Education Board is in position to do what no other body in this country can, at present, even attempt. It can determine largely what institutions shall grow, and, in some measure, what shall stand still or decay. It can look over the territory of the nation, note the places where there is a famine of learning, and start new educational plants of any species it chooses, or revive old ones. It can do in many ways what the government does for education in France or Germany. Its power will be enormous; it seems as if it might be able really to determine the character of American education. The funds it holds represent only a fraction of the amounts which it will really control; by giving a sum to an institution on condition that the institution raise an equal or a greater amount, it will be able to direct much larger amounts than it possesses."

Another earnest advocate of this movement is the Brooklyn Eagle, which says: "There are some 400 colleges placed in small country towns. That is the policy which the General Education Board will reverse. It will establish colleges in many considerable cities and centers of population which now have none, and it will enlarge the facilities of colleges in centers of population like Brooklyn, where the local institutions are entirely inadequate to the needs of population."

Now read what is said by two great newspapers whose editors have not failed to recognize the menace in the Rockefeller "educational movement."

The Springfield, Massachusetts Republican says:

"There are those who still hold the idea that but for these great individual fortunes and their benefactions society would be worse off than it is in educational and philanthropic work. Such a theory is wholly untenable—that the people generally cannot be trusted properly to appreciate the importance of education and other effort for the elevation of the race and the amelioration of the

general conditions of living or to contribute adequately to their support. It is only true that the people will be laggard in support of such efforts when a comparatively few towering fortunes exist, able and willing to be leaned upon for these needs. Then we may expect communities and institutions to develop a mendicant attitude and turn from self-help to help from beyond which flows down as if from some superior source that is to be held in worshipful consideration. How socially demoralizing this must be no one can fail to understand."

The New York Journal of Commerce says: "A system of giving which has its own rules and customs, which is governed by principles of selection laid down in the beginning, which ramifies throughout the country and embraces especially those smaller institutions that are hampered by narrow means, is an infinitely more powerful force in the shaping of opinion than any single capitalist who makes separate and often unconditional gifts to be controlled and invested by the institutions themselves could ever be. As a mechanism for controlling academic opinion, there has perhaps never been anything in the history of education that would compare with the board system of subsidizing learning. Gifts to education are like campaign contributions in that they are best made in relatively small amounts and from many sources. Under such circumstances they are likely to leave the recipients in position to choose their own course in matters of opinion and teaching. If they must be large, it requires greater force of character to maintain independence of thought and action. Such freedom has been lacking in too many quarters. The spectacle of a university president preaching the maintenance of some of the worst abuses of capitalism and another meekly bowing the knee to receive the money offered by those for whose acts he had but lately suggested social ostracism as a penalty is not edifying. Instances can be given in abundance where the mere prospect of an immediate gift has changed the whole current of a college administrator's thought and made him trim his sails on an entirely new tack to catch the favoring breezes of prosperity. The craze and competition for large numbers of students has greatly crippled those who would uphold the older traditions of independent economic thinking. Increasing numbers mean increasing expense in college administration and lead to growing dependence on wealth of doubtful origin. This, among other reasons, is ground for thinking that the enormous benefactions of the past few years, whether as pensions, endowments or annual gifts to colleges, may put our academic thinkers into a moral strait-jacket at the same time that they are freed from the cramping influences of limited means."

#### ◇◇◇◇ FINE SARCASM

Richard H. Edmonds, editor of the Manufacturers' Record, published at Baltimore, recently gave to Andrew Carnegie some data about the development of the south, at the same time asking Mr. Carnegie for an expression on the outlook for steel. Mr. Carnegie wrote to Mr. Edmonds this letter:

The Cottage, Dungeness,  
Fernandina, Fla., February 7, 1907.

Many thanks, my dear Mr. Edmonds, for papers sent me, of which I shall make use.

The south is to have her day sure. The sun has already risen upon her. Where to get labor is already being asked, but this will come.

Having retired from steel, I cannot trust myself (to) open the subject. I saw what was coming thirty years ago and acted accordingly, and might have been a rich man if I hadn't resolved not to spend an old age in the pursuit. With renewed thanks, truly yours, ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Commenting upon this communication the Manufacturers' Record indulges in this bit of fine sarcasm: "What a pity it is that Mr. Carnegie did not remain in the steel business, and thus become a rich man! How hard it must be for him in his present poverty to realize what great wealth he missed by not continuing as a world-leader in iron and steel!"

#### ◇◇◇◇ THE GOOD ROADS QUESTION

An expert statistician has figured that bad roads cost the people of the United States \$500,000,000 annually. If this is true it is high time the question receive proper attention. For many years men have been agitating the better building of roads, but even those who would be most benefited thereby have been prone to dub these agitators "cranks." But the agitation received a great impetus with the advent of the bicycle, and when the automobile came additional energy was generated. But the farmers, the ones most interested from a financial viewpoint, have been slow to join the crusade. It is estimated by men of experience in road building that a macadamized

roadway, eighteen feet wide, may be built for an average cost of \$3,000 per mile the country over. This presents a good opportunity for some comparative figures. The country loses \$500,000,000 a year because of bad roads. In round numbers \$200,000,000 has been appropriated for the army and navy. At \$3,000 a mile the money appropriated for the military arm of the government would build 70,000 miles of macadamized roads within the next two years. In ten years 750,000 miles of such roadway could be built, and in another four years the money saved would give as more for the army and navy than would have been appropriated in the fourteen years—and we would also have the macadamized roads. Statistics are mighty interesting things when one gets started on them.

#### ◇◇◇◇ WHAT ABOUT THE PHILIPPINES?

The New York Evening Post is printing a series of interesting articles relating to the cost of the Philippine islands. These articles are written by the Post's Washington correspondent. They show that it is the purpose of republican leaders to conceal from the American people the real truth concerning our "white elephant" in the Orient. Following is an extract from the Post's article: "The cost of the Philippines is a question that a great many people have been trying to solve since the treaty of Paris was signed and the archipelago came into our possession. 'What has been the total cost of the islands to the people of the United States?' 'What is the annual cost of the islands to the taxpayers of the United States?' These are two questions that the administration does not purpose to have answered definitely and authoritatively. Senator Clay of Georgia introduced in the senate the other day a resolution of inquiry calling upon the government to answer them. His resolution has been shelved, and he has been flatly told by administration champions in the senate chamber that it is not the purpose at this time to allow these questions to be put officially nor to answer them. When Senator Clay introduced his resolution, Senator Lodge at once objected, saying that the information was in the published reports, and was accessible to anybody who cared to hunt it up. This is not strictly true. What information there is accessible about the cost of the Philippines is so scattered and so incomplete that it is a task of almost impossible dimensions to ferret it all out and assemble it in an orderly, telling perspective. One finds an item here and an item there, and undoubtedly there are other items of expense that are not disclosed, no matter how patient and searching the investigation may be. The Bureau of Insular Affairs of the war department, which is charged with the duty of collecting intelligence and disseminating information about the Philippines, has never made any estimate of either the total or annual cost of the islands. Senator Lodge succeeded in having referred to his committee Senator Clay's resolution of inquiry. It is safe to prophesy that it will never see the light again. Senator Clay has been endeavoring to collect a sufficient amount of information about the cost of the Philippines to embody in a speech, urging that his resolution be acted upon by the senate. He has found the utmost difficulty in getting at the facts. His present estimate is that the islands are costing us between fifty-five and sixty million dollars a year. These figures are as good as those of anybody else until they are disproved."

In the same article the Post's correspondent says: "In his speech of acceptance, ex-Judge Parker stated that the expense to which the United States had been put in the acquisition and retention of the Philippine Islands amounted to \$650,000,000. Richard Olney, secretary of state in Mr. Cleveland's cabinet, declared that the expense was \$700,000,000. Edward Atkinson of Boston made an estimate placing the figures at \$1,200,000,000. Secretary Taft in a speech delivered at Newark, N. J., on October 25, 1904, analyzed and ridiculed these figures. He estimated that the total cost of the Philippines to the United States down to that date had been about \$204,000,000. In computing this amount the secretary of war allowed \$180,000,000 chargeable to the support of the army; \$1,000,000 for the extra expenses in the navy department; \$3,000,000 appropriated in 1903 to relieve suffering from threatened famine, and \$20,000,000 to cover the amount paid under the treaty of Paris. In analyzing Judge Parker's figures Mr. Taft said: 'The first item in the cost is the \$20,000,000 paid under the treaty, and this, I may add, is the only correct item in the statement.' It is the present contention of the Bureau of Insular Affairs that even this item is not properly chargeable to the cost of the Philippines. It is defined officially by that bureau as 'the compromise settlement in lieu of our refusal to recognize the bonded obligations of the Philippine Islands before our acquisition of them.'

In another article the Post's correspondent says: