

EDUCATIONAL SERIES

Influence of the College Professor

Franklin, Ky., April 11.—By reason of recent events the public interest in the Carnegie foundation fund and the acceptance thereof by the great universities of the country, especially state universities, is made more manifest.

Not long ago Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, chief of the bureau of chemistry, made public his opinion that benzoate of soda as a preservative of foods was quite harmful and injurious both to digestion and health. This being the method commonly adopted by the large manufacturers, quite naturally, they sought to discredit Dr. Wiley's statement. As has grown the custom these later days, the assistance of the president was invoked to determine a plan whereby the controversy should be settled.

Note, however, that the real parties interested were the public on the one side, who desire and deserve pure and wholesome food; and the manufacturers on the other, desiring to market their product in an acceptable manner at the least possible cost by the use of this questionable preservative.

The manufacturers prevailed upon the president to appoint a "referee board" which was composed of the "professors of the great universities" of our country. Such institutions of learning as Johns Hopkins University, Yale, Medical School of Northwestern University, and the University of California furnished representatives on the committee. It was most natural that the president should choose such a board; and as questions of dispute will continue to arise, it will quite likely devolve on just such men in the future to settle questions of even greater magnitude. Therefore, the character, the environment, the sentiments and alliances of the college professor become at once questions of public moment.

Already there is a great and increasing sentiment that capital and labor disputes be settled by arbitration. As matters now stand all such disagreements are settled by capital on the one side attempting to starve labor into accepting its proposal; and by labor on the other, attempting to punish capital pecuniarily by ceasing to work, thereby forcing capital to accede to labor's demands. Such contests are a detriment to the general public, unfair to both labor and capital; but labor is less able to bear it.

In such a dispute how very natural it would be for some future president to refer the controversy to the professors of economics in our great institutions of learning.

While it might have been denied some few years ago, yet it is now pretty well understood even by those of moderate information that there is a complete system of net work permeating the entire system of the capitalistic class and any man who is the beneficiary of one governmental industrial parasite might well consider himself a beneficiary of any one or all of them.

For argument's sake, it might be admitted that such men as our college professors are so "high-minded, just and righteous" that a donation or gift from an industrial parasite like the steel trust would not influence them in their judgment. Grant that this be possible; have not the people the right to be satisfied? Should they be satisfied with anything less than unbiased judges who are not the beneficiaries of any of the parties interested in the dispute? An honest judgment of a just and unbiased judge demands at least the respect of the people; and while the judgment might be the same, if the judges were beneficiaries, that it would were they not; yet, that satisfaction which the people have the right to feel, and that respect which an honest judgment ought to receive, would be lacking, and a spirit of unrest would naturally follow. It is almost as important to remove the suspicion which would cause unjust criticism of an honest, intelligent judgment as to secure the honest, intelligent, unbiased judgment itself.

How much criticism of the president's board would the people make if they knew that the board which discredited Dr. Wiley's statement were beneficiaries of the bounties of the manufacturers of food containing benzoate of soda?

How much confidence would the people have in the decision of a board of professors wherein the interest of one governmental industrial para-

site was involved when those same professors were the beneficiaries of an institution of the same or like kind?

The question of receiving such donations by our college professors, who each day are moulding public sentiment and opinion is closely allied in principle to the reception of campaign funds by candidates and political parties. The mention of the one suggests the other. To receive a gift is a serious matter, if one is possessed with the ordinary impulses of human nature. It immediately creates an obligation and an honest recipient of a gift must feel himself indebted to the donor; thereby creating a natural impulse and desire to repay.

The people should know from whom "gifts" are received by their public officials. No man should be exempt from this rule, it matters not what his reputation for "justness and righteousness" may be. There is more than human authority that "gifts" have their evil effects. Although there is the very highest political authority that "gifts" do not effect such men as "I or Mr. Hughes or Mr. Taft." Now all would agree that a gift would effect a weak minded, corrupt man; but how about a "strong minded, wise and righteous man," are not they affected also, and to their detriment?

I pin my faith to that authority which has at least a little more claim for inspiration than the president's dictum.

Moses, the great law giver, said (another candidate for the Ananias Club) Exodus 23-8; "And thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous." And again in Deuteronomy 16-19: "Thou shalt not rest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise and pervert the words of the righteous." On the other hand in Proverbs 15-27, we read: "He that is greedy of gain troubleth his own house; (I suppose the revised version would read "congress") but he that hateth gifts shall live."

The effect on the recipient of a gift is plainly told in First Samuel, eighth chapter, third verse, wherein the character of the sons of Samuel is described: "And his sons walked not in his (father's) ways, but turned aside after lucre and took bribes, and perverted judgment."

A perverted judgment is the necessary sequence to the reception of a gift and from this the moral can be easily drawn.

Nothing should be permitted to be done in the name of patriotism, charity, or morality that would in effect tend to stifle the free expression of the unbiased opinion of our college professors. They should be free from all "entangling alliance."

LAURENCE B. FINN.

THE CARNEGIE PENSION FUND

The Lincoln (Neb.) Trade Review, edited by H. M. Bushnell, formerly postmaster at Lincoln and one of the best known of Nebraskans, prints this editorial:

"Andrew Carnegie has set aside \$15,000,000 worth of bonds of the steel trust, the income from which is to go into a pension fund for the professors in schools of higher education. He requires in the case of state universities that the legislatures give a receipt for the funds in the form of an acceptance. A bill providing for an acceptance of the fund on the part of the University of Nebraska was introduced in the legislature of this state. The action taken on this bill was to decide whether or not Mr. Carnegie would be taken into partnership in the support and influence of this state's greatest institution.

"As to whether this is tainted money or not is a question of individual opinion. If there are those who believe the millions of a few men were earned as honestly and under methods as free from criticism as the dollars of the many, it is of no great profit to dispute their opinions. Truthfully has it been written of monarchies that 'kings rise to eminence over men's graves.' Truthfully does the record show that the oil and steel kings of this nation have risen to their ownership of unnatural millions through the crushing competition, the destruction of individual lines of business, through special privileges, through labor held in grinding toll with

homeless homes filled with suffering and children forced into channels of ignorance. If those who are to be the direct beneficiaries of the pension fund, who reach with avidity for it, whose teachings are to make for freedom and opportunity and character—if these can accept these funds with no touch of conscience there are others, many, many others, not in this class, who do not want to see the University of Nebraska rise to eminence in this way. Every argument advanced in favor of this fund and its acceptance, thus far made, has carried with it a defense of the fund showing that while it is pronounced clean by the lips that the heart feels that it needs defense. It is asserted that the gift is not a pension. Literally this is true. It is a purchase with the intent to buy the good opinions of good men; to purchase a 'higher education' that will lead those who come after to forget the wrongs of the past; that will educate them to render unto Caesar more things and to God less things; to honor material success regardless of how achieved. Were these funds a pension in the true meaning of the word they would go to the pensioning of thousands of men who gave of their strength to make the millions at a wage that left them nothing for old age. If it were a pension it would go to the support of lower education, to the assistance of the humble teachers whose work reaches the ignorant and deserving and who are the genuine molders of character through contact with child life.

"The glory of the University of Nebraska is in its individual possession by the people of this state. That it is their own with all the keen satisfaction that comes with self-ownership. Every man in the state with a tax receipt has his full share in the ownership and support of the university in proportion to what he is worth. The spirit that has made the university all that it is rests in this fact. That spirit has sent the student body out from thousands of homes; that spirit has loyally supported the institution in the past, generously supports it in the present and, if uninterrupted, will more generously support it in the future far beyond the temporary gain of the so-called pension fund. Divided support of the university will inevitably lessen the support of the school instead of augmenting it. Divided support will lessen responsibility. Accepting the gratuity of today will lead to neglect of direct support in the hope of greater gratuity tomorrow. Soon we will be soliciting the dollars of the kings of corrupt finance to assist the state in the annual support of the university and be standing with outstretched palms waiting for millionaires to remember our great educational institutions in their wills. Has this splendid state come to this and is the spirit of its people rightly judged in thinking that they want these things? Abundantly is this state able to care for its own. Far in advance will its standard be planted if these insidiously sought associations are declined. Infinitely stronger will be those who instruct and those who are instructed if the University of Nebraska remains both in letter and spirit literally the school of the people of this state with no divided allegiance. To paraphrase the words of him who became the greatest in this nation and whose education was not achieved or influenced by pension funds, let the thoughtful and unselfish of this state highly resolve that this state university of the people, by the people and for the people shall not decline or perish in spirit and purpose."

NOTES OF A TARIFF DIARIST

Or, of course, you can take the point of view that you don't need stockings, and consider cheerfully the bare legs of the "hardy Scots."

"Sugar!" you may hear the homespun, stand-pat statesman snort, "Sugar! Why, molasses or good old sorghum in the coffee used to be good enough for our pioneers. We've been getting too much luxury of late, anyhow."

"Gloves!" says the cheerful idiot; "give me the good old days of home-knit mitts and chilblains."

"What's all this talk about high priced meats, any way?" asks the staffstician. "Statistics show that one pound of boiling meat contains three and seven-tenths as much nutriment as an equal measure of fried chicken." (This man never heard of what happened to old Foulon, who told the people they could eat grass.)

"Dear me," says the old timer; "now here are the women taking a hand in politics and talking about the cost of living. It used to be that woman's sphere was enough for women. Let them darn stockings like our grandmothers used to do."—Kansas City Times.