

the reach of the "herd" is, in his estimation, "a paltry, commonplace mediocre strutting around, swelling and puffing as if he were expected to bring order out of chaos and set the whole world upon the road to perfection." Has any one ever seen human nature exhibited in a more hideous aspect than in this utterance? "Dog in the manger," through and through. Oh, ye shades of Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, were you not pestered with this same kind of barking ere yet your worth was recognized?

Conceited, indeed, when every sincere seeker after truth feels humbled in the realization of the truth of Prof. Aggasiz' grand words: "The older I grow, the more I know that I know nothing."

Bacteriologists tell us that micro-organisms manifest by their movements the same conditions which characterize the higher orders of life, and it seems that our friend and critic, who is never(?) "afflicted with a petulant spirit and disposed to berate people who do not believe as he does" (no, never!), has not yet evolved out of this primordial mental state. Seeing, furthermore, that no "brain" has ever yet been discovered in these animalcules, and the analogy is complete. Any wonder that he exhibits such a repugnance to what is so foreign to his nature?

Don't talk to him about any kind of university! He has no use for anything that is designed to cultivate what he is so deficient in. What support can a Free-thought university expect from a man who is still governed by the predilections contracted while he was a minister of the gospel? "The more universities abound, the less use he has for them," to paraphrase his words.

Our good friend and critic is evidently unable to see the difference between having appropriations by the state made for good or for evil purposes; whether the funds are to be used for the propagation of superstition or for the dissemination of the Liberal sciences. Admitting that your university would be under the control of individuals, what organization is not? Is the state itself not composed of individuals? And have the projectors of an institution not a prior right to its control? Can any one be more interested in its efficiency than they themselves?

But, objects our good friend and critic, the state legislature was asked to do for this university what you were not willing to have it do for Christian universities. What difference does it make to the majority whether the minority is willing or not? If the majority decides that funds shall be appropriated for the building up and support of universities, then tell me, in the name of common sense,

why the minority shall not come in for its share?

"It's the principle involved," I hear our good friend and critic observe. But who has laid down this principle but Christians themselves? Have we no right to follow in their own footsteps if they deviate not from "the path of righteousness?" In the present state of public sentiment it is considered right and proper that money should be appropriated for the maintenance of institutions of learning and for the advancement of science, and no distinction is made as to the belief of the individuals asking an appropriation for such purposes. Is it for any of us Liberals to draw the line against ourselves and say: We shall be excluded? Would this not appear as the height of folly to Christians themselves? When public sentiment orders the line drawn against us we must necessarily submit to it, but it is certainly not the province of a professed Freethought organ to aid in bringing about such a result.

So long, then, as public sentiment declares in favor of making appropriations for educational purposes, so long has each individual a right to "fall in line" with it. At the same time, he also has a perfect right to oppose appropriations if he considers them wrong. I can illustrate the principle involved no better than by referring to Proudhon's celebrated maxim that "Property is robbery." Thus, while he strenuously advocated this principle all his lifetime, did he therefore yield his rights to possess property? Did he ever attempt to put this principle into practice in his own individual case? We know he did not, since he claimed the same property rights the state gave to others. Why did he not surrender his property rights if he believed that to own anything was robbery? Simply because the people were not, and still are not, educated up to this principle. He may seem inconsistent, but there is also a maxim that "Necessity knows no law." (Whether right or not I will not, and need not, argue here.) Thus he was compelled by necessity, by the inexorable course of events, to submit to the voice of the people, though he endeavored to educate them up to higher conceptions of social life. Herr Most wears eight-dollar patent leather shoes, yet, let the people once understand the principle of equality, and insist that no man shall have any pre-eminence over another, and I dare say he will discard them instantly. Thus public sentiment forces us to assume that that is right which we firmly believe to be wrong. If wrong has the sanction of the majority, the minority is expected to submit to it, if not to endorse it.

Concluded on 6th page.

...The...

Liberal University



THE ONLY SCHOOL
OF THE KIND.



Free from Superstition
Strictly Non-Sectarian



Pupils are Given Every Opportunity to Learn
Without Being Hampered by Supersti-
tions and Dogmas.



Location Healthful,
Society Good.
Expenses Moderate



A Splendid Corps of Teachers and Good Faci-
lities for Teaching. For information,
address

J. E. HOSMER, Ph. D., B. S. D.,
PRESIDENT,

SILVERTON.

OREGON.