

EDUCATION BY THE STATE.

A recent number of the Nebraska Farmer contained an editorial in favor of the pan-paternalism of government. It takes THE CONSERVATIVE to task for having suggested that it is not a function of the state to provide education for any specialists—neither lawyers nor doctors, farmers nor merchants, nor blacksmiths, nor milliners, photographers nor shoemakers.

Every time a parent is relieved from a natural duty to his offspring, by the act of the state, which undertakes to do for the child just what the parent ought to do for it, a government like this is weakened. It is the duty of fathers and mothers to feed, clothe and educate their children. When they wilfully fail to perform that function of parenthood they demonstrate the incapacity of their breed.

Whenever the state makes it possible for persons to study law, medicine and other specific professions and pursuits at the cost of the state, instead of at the expense of themselves or parents, the state invites mediocrity and incapacity to attempt the impossible. Those who are born with brains and ambition, who seek eminence in any calling, will certainly achieve it. Those not so born will not reach the heights of human knowledge, even with a state treasury and a state university to aid them.

The Nebraska Farmer remarks: "To educate men to excel in an industry is the greatest service the state can render, aside from securing equal and exact justice between men and corporations."

But the state cannot by enactment provide excellent brains for those born without them. Those who excel do so not because the state decrees their excellence, but because birth, ancestry, breeding, Nature, God, make it possible.

Perhaps the most phenomenal linguist of this century was a native of the United States, Elihu Burrit, "the learned blacksmith," who acquired a knowledge of more than thirty languages. THE CONSERVATIVE heard him lecture and describe his method of getting an education during those hours when he could be spared from the forge and shop. It was not a state method—no governmental paternalism prepared him for blacksmithing or for oratory and he was an adept in both.

But his own indomitable will, his tremendous power of application and intermittent industry, backed by the brains and ambition with which he was born, made him one of the foremost scholars of his time. And his skill as a blacksmith was just as much to his credit as was his irresistible power as an

orator. THE CONSERVATIVE honors and respects successful industry in all the legitimate vocations of mankind. There has never been "any suggestion of contempt of the artisan" anywhere in these columns, at any time, though they do cherish and express supreme contempt for that pan-paternalism which is preached by the parasitic press of this country.

It is the spirit and ambition, the intent and ability with which a man enters into any calling that determines whether that calling be an honorable and legitimate calling or not. It is not the soot and grime of the forge, nor the smell of wax and leather, nor the dust of the mill and factory which make character for the workman. His intelligent, ambitious, independent and unconquerable industry woven into honesty and truth-telling makes him the peer of any citizen. The state schools cannot confer ability nor graft character upon an individuality that by inheritance and evolution has neither. The legislature cannot enact, either directly or indirectly, a good farmer, lawyer, doctor, blacksmith or miller. It is not the business of the state to prescribe professions for citizens, and at the expense of all the tax-payers prepare them to practice them. The twaddle about it being a function of the state "to educate men to excel in an industry" shows non-power of analysis. The Beatrice Institute for the Feeble Minded may as well attempt to educate its inmates for professorships in the university. Those men who excel do so without state nursing.

In natural philosophy Watt, Franklin, Fulton, Morse, Edison and Bell loom up and illumine the heights of modern advances in the material world. Did they develop from state institutions distributing gratuitous schooling?

Among the inventors of agricultural implements and machinery did the state educate McCormick, John Deere, Studebaker, or any other of the inventive men who have given thought, investigation and hard work to evolve the many labor-saving machines now used on the farms of the United States?

To bring the question right down to date in our own state of Nebraska, will the friends of a system for making lawyers and shoemakers, farmers and doctors by gratuitous instruction at our university, to be paid for by taxation of all the people, tell THE CONSERVATIVE where, in this state, fruits of this system, commensurate with its cost, can be found?

PROHIBITION. "The Army Canteen still continues as the president's murder mill by the sanction of Attorney-General Griggs and a cowardly cabinet. It is a shame.

The nation will pay dearly for such wickedness and greed."

The great central organ of prohibition, the New Republic, contained the foregoing in its last issue. That journal has no objection to "criminal aggression" with shot and shell. But a whiskey "murder mill" startles it out of all the proprieties that should govern pious people when writing of presidents of the United States.

THE CONSERVATIVE remembers when a recent candidate for that high office, at a state democratic convention in 1889, over which Hon. A. J. Poppleton presided, at Omaha, tried to formulate a temperance platform plank which would attract prohibitionists. Mr. Bryan was then very anxious to conciliate the anticanteen citizens.

BEVERIDGE In a recent speech at New York Senator Beveridge truthfully said:

"The occupation of demagogues today is to divide the American people and to set brothers laboring in one calling against brothers laboring in another. Of all of these the banks and bankers are the favorite objects of perpetual attack. The reason of this is that the banking interests of the nation are the natural objects of the people's suspicion, because the banks are the holders of the people's accumulated wealth, and each depositor, forgetting his individual deposit, looks at the vast aggregation of deposits and thinks of the massed and mighty bulk of wealth as the property of the banks themselves. And so the ear is credulous to the charge of the Jack Cades of politics, that the banks are unnaturally rich; that this enormous wealth is dishonest wealth, by mysterious and wizard hands won by grinding down the people, won by squeezing the juices out of prosperous times until only the husk of hard times is left for the masses. The cry of political Catilines today and always is, that the prosperity of the banker means the poverty of the producer, and on every incendiary stump and in every sheet of hatred in the land it is proclaimed that the bankers of America are the natural enemies of the laboring, the producing, and the business elements of the nation.

"All patriotic men should denounce that slander. For there is no business so utterly dependent on the welfare of their fellowmen as the business of the bankers of the United States. Banks have but two sources of profit—interest and exchange. When times are good, money is in demand, rates are high, exchange is brisk, and banks prosper precisely as the country prospers. When times are bad exchange diminishes, loans are called in, and all the sources of income dry up like the withering roots of growing corn in a summer's drought. When do banks earn largest dividends? Exactly when the farmer