

was opposed by advocates of the combined system of oral speech and manual signs. The idea of "combination" is plausible, but it does not bear examination. Deaf people who speak only by manual signs are pretty certain to have their thinking modified by those signs. The influence against abstract thought becomes exceedingly strong. And this influence is intensified by the fact that they are forced to associate mentally only with persons who understand the sign language. There is therefore a trend toward the creation of a deaf and dumb people with a deaf and dumb civilization, if the sign language alone be taught. When it is taught in connection with oral speech, it becomes an additional and useless study; and what is worse, the fact that the sign language is much more easily acquired by the deaf than oral speech, invites the deaf to fall into a habit of preferring the former and losing ground in practicing the latter. Thus the combination system tends to become nearly if not quite as objectionable as the sign system alone. The best system, for many obvious reasons, is the system which best makes the deaf like unto other people, and that is the system of oral speech exclusively.

#### THE BLOT IN THE SOUTHOEON OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

At this time, when universities and colleges are settling down to another year's course, it may be well to consider for a moment the question of their attitude and influence in regard to problems of social welfare and progress, as involved in the spread of democratic ideals.

We may take it for granted that in special subjects such institutions are doing their work with zest and energy. Whether it be in Latin syntax, or in biology, or in medieval history, professors are guiding their classes according to the most approved modern methods. Laboratories and libraries are well equipped, and students are brought to first-hand sources of investigation and knowledge. In the conduct of the specific work

done there is no apparent cause for criticism.

In what, then, is there any cause for criticism? Is there any reason for feeling that the influences of higher education are out of line with the higher aspirations for a better civilization than now prevails? Is there such a feeling? Do the men who have ideals for true democracy and juster conditions—the prophets of today—do such men feel that the influences of great institutions of learning are on the whole making for the advancement of the social betterment of which they dream and for which they work?

There is undoubtedly in the colleges a prevailing sentiment in favor of what is called good government. Probably nine-tenths of the college men believe, for example, in civil service reform, and abhor boodle and bribery. They want to see clean administrations, and are generally found in opposition to political rings and bossism. In local elections they are not likely to be bound by party regularity, and are ready to support independent movements.

But the question we have asked goes deeper. It concerns not so much the administration of things as they are—important as this is, so far as it goes—but rather the rejection of things as they are. It concerns not the good administration of slavery, but the abolition of slavery. It is not a question of management but of ideals. Can the influences of the institutions of higher education be felt to be on the side of the ideals of genuine democracy—those ideals which received their classic expression in the Declaration of Independence? We fear not, and it seems worth while to ask why.

Some will at once say that the cause lies in the question of endowments; that colleges, needing money, are naturally, and perhaps unconsciously, warped in favor of the monopolistic classes that stand for things as they are. Undoubtedly this feeling has its influence, but it is by no means the most potent. The cause lies rather in the nature of the internal influences which the colleges, in obedience to the spirit of the age, are instilling into the minds of young men. It is of utmost im-

portance that some of these influences should be recognized and considered.

If one has listened to or read the addresses made to young men in college, and will think a moment of the dominant note of these addresses, he will find that it has been an appeal to personal ambition. College men have it preached to them on all occasions that they are to make the most of themselves. This would not be harmful if they were not at the same time made to understand that it means simply personal ambition for getting ahead of their fellows in the race of life. They are taught that they must be the elect leaders.

This is in conformity with the accepted spirit of modern scientific philosophy, which makes the survival of the fittest its golden rule and applies the test of biology to the higher life of humanity. It is the spirit that says, succeed, succeed. It minimizes faith in ideals and ignores the disposition, if need be, to suffer for any positive truth. It is the spirit that would smile at the injunction of an old-time prophet, who advised young men to find out some unpopular cause and espouse it. We can hardly imagine such an injunction uttered before a college audience. There the spirit is quite the opposite—not devotion to a cause, but devotion to a career.

Another development of college influence is the institution of a class feeling, which amounts almost to a caste feeling. To this there are of course notable exceptions; but the majority of college graduates are encouraged to foster it in various ways, and even to take pride in it. This is due somewhat to the excessive preaching of college spirit, which one now hears so much about in all the institutions of higher learning. In consequence of this, it is not so much enthusiasm for learning that pervades college precincts as enthusiasm for alma mater. First things are not put first. It is the mere membership in an institution, not the attainment of learning, of clear thinking, of fine ideals, which is the predominating atmosphere. And this spirit is sure to foster the narrowness of

class and caste, which is the negation of democracy.

Back of all the causes is the lack of idealism in college teaching and training. This lack has been unfortunately emphasized by the prevailing ultra-scientific spirit, which is so immersed in the minutiae of things that it has lost grasp of the whole of things. All is analysis and dissection. The fear of hasty generalization, the fear of formulating uncertain truth, has gone so far that it has led to the extreme of rejecting all generalization and to the attitude of universal skepticism. This excessive half-science has shoved the humanities out of college, or else reduced them to its own methods. Science, not humanity, holds the boards. The result is a most natural one. While colleges have made immense gains in scientific knowledge, they have not advanced the nurture of the higher possibilities on the humanitarian side of character. This has led to a coldness in regard to the spread and progress of democracy. In short, the scientific spirit, in its present advancement, will study the minutiae of social conditions, but it will neither reach generalization as to these conditions, nor will it produce enthusiasm or emotion.

Let it be noted that the expression used above is "the scientific spirit in its present advancement." No one wishes to deny the great work of the scientific spirit both in its practical results and in its effort to correct loose vaporings. The point is that the scientific spirit as it is now interpreted has fostered a certain temper of mind. This temper of mind ignores the great truths and belittles the enthusiasms that make for the spread of justice and freedom.

So it is that the prevailing note of college teaching is diametrically opposed both to the enthusiasm and to the generalization of such a document as the Declaration of Independence. And hence it is that this great paper is almost universally discredited in college halls.

Such are some of the reasons, inherent in the inner influences of the present life of the higher in-

stitutions of learning, which hold them back from being in the advance line of the surely coming changes in economic and social conditions.

J. H. DILLARD.

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

COLORADO.

Denver, Nov. 28.—It is difficult to describe the stress of political conditions in Colorado, and impossible to predict their outcome. All this cloud of trouble may blow over in a few weeks; but it is just as probable that the difficulties may culminate in some violent upheaval.

Attention is concentrated at present upon the Supreme Court of the State, which has undertaken to control the situation by means of injunction proceedings. This is the longest stride yet, in the direction of government by injunction. The local circumstances should be understood, therefore, wherever the dangers to popular government which that judicial innovation threatens are appreciated. My information regarding these circumstances is derived almost wholly from representative Republicans who are defenders of the course taken by the Colorado court, and principally, so far as the theory of the court proceedings is concerned, from Mr. John M. Waldron, one of the most astute and prominent lawyers of the State, under whose advice and active professional direction, as leading counsel for Gov. Peabody, the present injunction proceedings were begun and are being carried on.

It must be understood at the outset that the ballot in Denver has for years been monstrously corrupted. The corruption began with the Republicans, and was imitated and progressively improved upon by the Democrats. As to the beginning of this corruption by the Republican machine there is no dispute. The Republicans themselves freely admit it. Neither is there any dispute about its imitation by the Democratic machine. This is as freely admitted by the Democrats. If there is any dispute at all it is only as to whether or not the Democratic imitation has been worse in character than the Republican original. I am disposed to believe that it has been; not because the Democrats are worse than the Republicans, but because they were later in the line of this infamous progression.

At any rate there appears to be no room for doubt that it has long been customary in Denver to stuff registry lists, to connive at wholesale repeating, to substitute false for true ballots in the count, and in numerous other ways familiar to political heelers to falsify the legitimate vote. This custom has been advancing toward the perfection of shameless infamy. The frauds have

not only been perpetrated by election officials, but they have been connived at by county officials to such an extent that criminal prosecutions for election offenses have been practically impossible.

Notwithstanding the shamelessness and shocking notoriety of these frauds, they do not appear to have outraged public sentiment—not as frauds. Some men of both parties have, indeed, freely and honestly denounced them because they were crimes, and regardless of whom they might help or hurt. But these objectors appear to have been in a hopeless minority. Theirs were only feeble cries in the wilderness. On the whole, those who have liked the electoral results of the frauds have been inclined to condone the means for the sake of the end, while those who have not liked those results have condemned the frauds all too evidently from partisan and not from civic motives. All through and on both sides the question has been, for the most part, only a question of whose ox was gored. The city itself seems to have been, in the civic sense, utterly debauched.

That was the situation when Mr. Waldron and his associates, just prior to the recent election, began in the Supreme Court of the State the equity suit which is the basis of the present proceedings.

This suit was begun in the name of the people of the State on the relation of the attorney general and against the election officers of Denver. It is in theory a suit by the people of the State for the protection of their reserved sovereignty. According to the theory of those who brought it, which I shall explain farther on, the people's sovereignty was assailed by the assaults upon the integrity of the voting franchise on which the sovereignty of all the American commonwealths rests.

Immediately upon bringing the suit an application was made for an injunction order against the election officials, and in support of that application it was charged, upon the basis of past experience, that force and fraud would probably be used at the approaching election to prevent a free, fair and open election in certain election precincts.

An argument on this application, summarily ordered, was had before the court; and at its conclusion, a few days prior to the election, the court granted an injunction order against the election officials, forbidding a great variety of things already criminal by statute, and with voluminous particularity commanding a faithful performance by those officials of all their statutory duties.

Among other things, in order to secure respectful regard for this equity process, simply in the execution of its equity