



## AGAINST UNIFORMITY

Leading Eds  
Condensed Indiana Journal

### HOME RULE IS DEMANDED

Teachers' Journal Has Comprehensive Article On Subject of Books For Public Schools

Journals devoted to education are getting into the fight against the state laws compelling uniformity of books used in the public schools. The Teachers' Journal, published at Marion, Ind., and edited by A. Jones, in its last issue devotes considerable space to an arraignment of the system. Following an editorial, a number of letters from leading educators all agreeing against the uniformity laws are printed. Among these writers are President Enot of Harvard, President Ainsell of University of Michigan, Dr. G. Staley Hall of Clark University, Dr. Nicholas M. Butler of Columbia, Dr. A. S. Draper and Dr. Sartorius of New York. Among the state superintendents of schools who are represented with letters are Prof. Olson of Minnesota, Bryan of Washington, Phillips of Alabama and Wright of Michigan.

In part the editorial follows:

The unprogressive position in some

of the states in Indiana today is the tenth-day fallopian. It is well for the teachers and those who are

really progressive for the success of the schools. The question would be

quickly settled. That Indiana has a

different system of education is un-

competent to judge doubts. That she

hangs on to a plan for selecting text

books that is not tolerated in a single

eastern state and that has been dis-

carded in every progressive western

and southern state that has tried it

for any considerable length of time

is the wonder of leading educators

everywhere.

The predominant ideas in education

today are the development of the

individuality of the pupil and the

adjustment of the schools to the need

of the community. Uniform text

books, however good, are a serious

obstacle in the way of pushing these

ideas into practice.

Opens Way For Graft.

The principle of state uniformity

is undemocratic. It takes away from

the citizens of a community the right

and privilege of choosing what they

through their representatives want.

It opens a way for graft, enormous

graft.

State uniformity in text books is

not new in the United States. The

state of Vermont was one of the ear-

liest to provide by law that the books

should be uniform throughout the

state. This law continued in force

until the people of the state were

scandalized by the adoption of a

series of arithmetics prepared by the

chief educational officer of the state

and copyrighted for his benefit

and sold at a high price.

The prevailing laws in all the

states of the union before the civil

war left the choice of books in the

hands of the same officers who con-

trolled the schools with respect to

the employment of teachers, the

studies to be pursued, the building of

school houses and their subsequent

care. Immediately after the civil

war, governments were organized in

the southern states which became

known popularly, and are now known

historically, as "carpet bag govern-

ments". The carpet baggers were

the inventors of the present kind of

laws for state uniformity in school

books.

Scheme for Plunder.

The funds of certain states were

appropriated and when everything in

sight was seized upon, some law-

makers in the struggle for plunder

arranged the notion that the schools

of the state should be provided with

uniform school books. It was not

proposed that the state should buy

them. That would be a clear waste

of money that might otherwise be

obtained for the personal benefit of

the hungry office holders. The pri-

ilege of selling books to the people

of the state was to be restricted to

one firm which should have a mon-

opoly of the trade of the state for a

period of years.

One of the first northern states to

create a legalized monopoly in school

books was Minnesota. A law was

passed in February, 1877, fixing the

prices of each book and naming the

favorite contractor. He was not a

publisher and did not own a single

book.

At the end of 15 years the books

were cast out and the people of the

state enjoyed in the freedom to get

books for their children without the

aid of political state officials, such books

as were needed in the schools.

System Broke Down.

A law was passed in 1876 in the

State of California providing for uni-

form books throughout that state.

Three adoptions were made under

this law, but a new constitution was

then enacted and under this, through

the influence of "sand lot" oratory,

the state itself undertook the manu-

facture of schoolbooks which were to

be sold at "cost of manufacture" to

the people and used uniformly in all

the schools. The books were written

by the citizens of the state and, not

withstanding the promise of cheap-

ness, were sold at rates fully as high

as the prices of standard books. The state took all the extra cost, making

farmer and the poor bear the burden

of the law in this, as in the other

two cases of uniformity.

Michigan passed a law in 1881, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1883.

Indiana passed a law in 1881, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1883.

Illinois passed a law in 1881, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1883.

Indiana passed a state uniformity

law in 1887, but the people resisted

it, so that the law was repealed in

1891.

Indiana passed a law in 1891, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1893.

Indiana passed a law in 1893, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1895.

Indiana passed a law in 1895, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1897.

Indiana passed a law in 1897, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1899.

Indiana passed a law in 1899, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1901.

Indiana passed a law in 1901, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1903.

Indiana passed a law in 1903, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1905.

Indiana passed a law in 1905, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1907.

Indiana passed a law in 1907, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1909.

Indiana passed a law in 1909, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1911.

Indiana passed a law in 1911, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1913.

Indiana passed a law in 1913, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1915.

Indiana passed a law in 1915, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1917.

Indiana passed a law in 1917, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1919.

Indiana passed a law in 1919, but

the people resisted it, so that the

law was repealed in 1921.

Indiana passed a law in 1921, but

the people resisted it, so that