

HUMANITY VS. THE INDIVIDUAL.

In another contribution it was stated that contrary to the general opinion that which was seemingly in the interests of the individual is not always in those of humanity. By interests of the individual is meant those things which go to support individual life which are not the result of personal endeavor. By humanity is meant that continuity of individuals, known as the race, state or nation, and not humanity of today in any given time. First as to

Public Beneficences.

Why should any one give anything to the public, to which he owes nothing, save for reasons elsewhere stated? The public is composed of individuals for whom it is impossible for any sane man to have a personal liking, except for very few. The number of friends in good seasons and bad seasons, which one makes in a lifetime, can easily be counted on one hand. The every-day acquaintanceship of good-fellowship are fair-weather birds. Even for them no man would or does do in life what men often do on their death for that indefinite object—humanity. If evil communications corrupt good manners, certainly wrong thinking is corruptive of sterling morality. Private beneficence is fast corrupting the public morals. If our best acquaintances, not to speak of our few friends, have no right to expect anything of us, why has the public a right to expect so much? That it does expect it, that it is being educated to expect it by press and pulpit, is to be seen by the demands it is making and the almost universal condemnation of the rich man who provides for his family and does not rob them for the benefit of this public highwayman who is seeking to rob his heirs by succession and inheritance taxes of every name and description. Again it is defiantly asserted that

The Individual Owes Nothing to the Public.

It is universally admitted and generally lived up to outside the admissions of the laws of inheritance, that no man has a right to anything he does not voice by his own abilities. Even the most rabid socialists—with some absolutely insane exceptions—insist upon this in relation to themselves. That is "natural law" and human law dare not attempt to nullify it except at the peril of the nullifiers. That being so, the public being simply a social organization of individuals, how can it be asserted that that which is true of every individual is not equally so of every accumulation of individuals? Why should the public claim rights which every individual denies to every other individual, personally, of the same community? In point of fact the public has become

An Omnivorous Dead-beat

and is fast becoming a highwayman, using the bludgeon of the law and the sand-bag of superstition to rob widows

and orphans, the care of whom, in their affliction, has been said to be the purest outcome of religion by accepted authority.

Public Beneficence a Public Menace.

As the practical object to which public beneficence has been largely applied is the maintenance of the unfit, and the unfit are those who cannot maintain themselves in the struggle for existence, it should be self-evident that such maintenance is contrary to nature and is surely resulting to the injury of the race. Rigidly understood there is no doubt that every public benefactor is either a menace to or an enemy of the race. If it is a generally accepted rule that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," why should the public, which does nothing, have so much for nothing? If the public were truly and manly honest it would put an end to all public beneficence by making it impossible by law.

Superstition Supported and Ignorance Upheld.

If, as must be admitted, the large majority of public beneficences are made on so-called religious grounds, to the untrammelled, non-traditional mind it is self-evident that no matter how much they may contribute to the maintenance of the unfit, deeds made on the basis of superstition must contribute to continuance of ignorance, the greatest menace to the prosperity of the race. The man who gives money to an ecclesiastical institution, or one under ecclesiastical management, is an enemy of his race. The reasons for the gift sanctify the benefactor, not its effects on the recipient.

All Altruism is a Racial Menace.

Let us illustrate this by a striking and to many a shocking example. As every consumptive is more or less a menace to the race, as the chief cause of consumption is hereditary transmission, as no cure, no matter how apparently perfect, can remove the constitutional weakness and render a person fit to be a father or mother, it must be evident that every method looking to the preservation of consumptives must be antagonistic to the welfare of the race. If living for humanity is everything, here is a hard nut to crack for its advocates. The same is true of all institutions for the care of imbeciles and criminals. Whatever the individual may benefit thereby it is evident that it is at the cost of and welfare of the race. Whatever individuals may benefit by free education, due to public beneficence, it is safe to say that, as members of the public, they have no right to such benefits unless "that which is worth having is worth paying for" is a fallacy, except when applied to individuals. The public should look out for itself in the same manner it requires of individuals. There is no doing for others except that which is done without even the pleasure of self-satisfaction. The major part, if

not all of this public beneficence and altruism, is the grossest selfishness. A person recently died leaving a fortune to public institutions and his wife and children in comparative poverty and yet the press and pulpit praised his "great charity" and said not a word of those almost thrown on the public thereby. Another did the same thing, receiving unlimited praise, and yet that person gave to the public an ancestral home that had come down in the family since 1630 and left nephews and nieces to struggle with poverty; some of them half-starving ministers of the gospel. Every dollar this person had was inherited. The public naturally praises its benefactors. The press speeds the nobility of character of persons who in life were nothing but despicable misers or false-hearted hypocrites. The public cares not an iota how the money was got. It is "good money" then. The donor is sainted whether the money represents the life-blood of the poor, the spoils of the gambling-hell, saloon. The donor at once arises to nobility and the church blesses the memory of the money-shark whose hands were buried elbow deep in the misfortunes of humanity. What the public sorely needs is a self-respecting, self-supporting manliness. What the millionaire sorely needs is educating out of superstition into manly courage and a self-respecting manhood instead of cowardly vanity and a due regard for family and friends instead of purse-proud vanity. What is needed, when millionaires have more than is requisite for their family and needy friends, is intelligent giving of a sufficiency for the purpose to personally selected young men and women, and annuities for life to worthy widows and orphans, left so by no fault of their own, and who cannot possibly maintain themselves. If the life insurance companies would work intelligently in this direction they would be as much benefit to humanity as they now are to individuals. "If I could save the world by pulling out of a hair I would not lift my finger unless the world paid for the hair." That is justice.

FRANK S. BILLINGS.

EDUCATION IN NEBRASKA.

The state of Nebraska is expending large sums of money for educational purposes.

How much has been expended each year, since 1875, upon the agricultural farm and the agricultural experiment station?

How many practical farmers are there in Nebraska who have been certificated by the agricultural college?

How many persons have graduated at the state university and where are they and what are they doing?

Will some university publication or the State Journal kindly answer these interrogatories? Statistics of educational development in Nebraska can be made very useful if properly classified.