

editors of magazines and newspapers will cease to assert that unimpeachable statistics, not only English but American, prove conclusively that wages have been rising ever since the early part of the nineteenth century. Their omission to mention Prof. Rogers in this connection, the one writer whose investigations go below the surface of the subject, indicates that these gentlemen don't feel quite so sure about what they say as they would have their readers believe.

---

## THE OBJECT OF EDUCATION.

*(For the Review.)*

By JENNIE A. ROGERS.

Prof. Elliott and some of our eminent educators are very much concerned about the result of popular education.

In the days of our forefathers when the man who could read and write was a wonder, and the woman who could read and write was a phenomenon, it was thought all the crime, poverty and unhappiness of the world was the result of ignorance, and if people were educated, these monsters would vanish from the world as had the mammoth and mastodon of past ages. It was believed that if men and women were interested and understood something of the beauty and wonders of the world around them and of the life which animated their own being, that the prayer of ages would be answered and the Kingdom of Heaven be at hand. So they started to educate and build private schools; for it was thought only those who had position and property needed education. This class soon found an enemy in the great illiterate mass, and decided this, interests could be best served by educating that mass. Then free schools were built by the thousands, and teachers supplied by the tens of thousands. Still there were some who did not appreciate or take advantage of these opportunities, and as they seemed to be the most troublesome members of society, education was made compulsory and books and materials furnished free. Now they propose to furnish free food, clothes and medical attendance, because they find a class unfit mentally and physically to take the education they provide.

What is the result of this system of education we thought was steadily advancing with the needs of the time? Have we less crime, poverty and unhappiness? True we have more men and women who can read and write, more general knowledge; but there is little doubt that crime and poverty are more appalling today than ever in the world's history. They are more subtle, and that makes them more cruel. The pangs of poverty are not half so sharp when shared by the whole community as when contrasted with the splendor and comforts of wealth. The warrior of old who met his enemy face to face in a fair fight did not inflict half so much mental and physical

suffering as does some financier of today who slowly but surely drives his enemy to suicide because of ruined name and lost friends and fortune. In the former case man had a chance to defend himself; in the latter, he often does not know he is in danger until ruin is upon him. We meet very few people today with smiling faces and happy, contented souls. Anxiety is in the atmosphere. No one is sure of a livelihood. They who have fortunes are in danger of their being swept away, and schemes are constantly put forth to betray or disgrace an honored name. This is true all along the line from our high financial and official officers to the shop girl or boy competing with his or her chum for a job.

Why has education intensified the very evils it sought to eradicate? Is it not evident that there is something radically wrong with the system? Is it not possible we are making a great mistake by concentrating our energy upon teaching our children to make a living instead of teaching them to live? Do you see the difference? Almost the entire conscious and unconscious thought underlying education is to equip the child with those qualities and ambitions that will enable it not only to hold its own in the world and secure those things necessary for the preservation of its life and the development of its faculties, but to enable it to secure some advantage to appropriate for its own benefit the energy of others without giving an equivalent in return. Just consider the school course and see if that is not the object.

We teach the arts and crafts which enable a man to build a house, but in our lessons in mathematics and physics, we do not teach the great eternal law that requires we should do our work honestly and give value for value received. We teach the child geometry and how to use the square and mitre in making a joint. But we do not teach him that he is in honor bound to make these joints fit so the wind and snow will not blow through doors and windows when the thermometer is at zero.

We teach the apprentice to economize in the use of the adhesive qualities of plaster so it will soon fall about our heads and he will be paid twice for doing one service. The plumber is taught to use as much time and as little and poor material as will make his work passable, without any regard for the damage that may be done to life and property as a result of his poor work. We teach weights and measures and the quality of materials to the manufacturer of the future, who is to convert the raw material of the world into some useful product, but we do not teach him to give measure for measure. Our frayed and faded garments testify he was not taught to give the quantity of wool or the quality of dye represented by the article. Where there is a free exchange of energy, both parties are benefited. Otherwise, they would not exchange. Each party receives an equivalent for what he gives and something more desirable. If this simple truth were taught, thousands of customs officials would be hunting some more useful employment. We teach our boys and girls physiology, psychology and many other kinds of "ology," but we shroud in mystery their most important relations and leave them to grope in darkness through the most sacred realm of life. And then we marvel there are so many misfits in the divorce courts.

Our law students should be taught there is a code of justice, of equity between individuals that can no more be violated without producing social discord than the musician can violate the laws of harmony without producing discord of sound. But instead we teach him his success will come in proportion to his ability to evade and violate the laws of justice and equity.

Nature most beautifully and wonderfully supplies that which is necessary for the growth and evolution of all things. The natural tree sheds its fruit and leaves which fertilize earth and air for the reproduction of its kind.

You cannot long continue to take choice fruit from a tree unless you supply to earth and air the qualities necessary to produce the fruit. You cannot long continue to take water from a stream unless you return an equal amount of moisture to the atmosphere that can again come down in rain to supply the source of the stream.

Neither ought we to take one pulsation of energy from any individual without giving an equivalent in return. Is it not possible there is a social law as exacting in justice as the material law? Is it not possible there is a law of social equilibrium that governs social atoms just as there is a law of equilibrium to govern material atoms which holds the planets in their places?

When natural equilibrium is disturbed unnatural phenomena is the result. Is not crime and poverty unnatural phenomena in a Christian civilization? Prof. Hughes of Toronto says, "Anarchy does not spring from freedom, it comes from coercion. It is the poisonous fungus that grows on the tree of blighted liberty. It grows rank and noisome from sap that should have been spent in spreading branches and rich foliage. Fungi comes not on the tree of full growth, but whose blight has brought decay and death."

The Golden Rule was given us as the balance by which to weigh human relations. But we do not even in Sunday School impress upon our children the importance of weighing their acts by this rule. Did it ever occur to you that almost without exception our great popular games are diametrically opposed to the principles of the Golden Rule? Games have always been considered very valuable in mental and physical development. Yet the principle upon which they are founded is that of taking every possible advantage of your competitor's weakness, of placing every possible obstacle in the way of his success, and the one who can do that most effectively receives the applause of the crowd. Our socialistic friends often point with pride to the public school system, but they do not realize that it is the hot bed where unfair competition and self-interest is nurtured. Scholarships and honors await the child who leaves his companion behind. It is a punishable offense to help along a weak and struggling classmate. Is it any wonder we have Rockefellers, Harrimans, Belmonts and Depews? We have been preparing them for generations. The early products of this system of education were honored and held up for imitation as examples of self-made men. Froebel says that education should lead man to clearness concerning himself and humanity, to peace with nature and to unity with God. That man by seeing himself expressed in what he does through and by means of the out-

ward material world becomes a conscious intelligent being. He says our work is a sort of mirror in which we see ourselves reflected and so come to know ourselves. How can we expect man to become a conscious intelligent being when we deprive him of the right to express himself freely through and by the means of the outward material world. When we drive him away from God's table or charge him for his right to satisfy his needs. If we taught our children to live instead of teaching them to make a living, it would involve teaching them the sacredness of life. It would involve teaching them that all other children had the same equal right to live, and that their own freedom to act and privilege to enjoy depended very largely upon helping to secure like conditions for those with whom they must associate.

We are commanded to love our neighbors as ourselves, and occasionally on one day in the week we are told, love is the greatest thing in the world. Earnest Crosby said, "Our soul is a loving machine," and in our heart of hearts, we believe him. But we do not in our public or Sunday schools impress upon the minds of the young that love is the foundation stone of civilization.

Today children leave school without the slightest knowledge of their rights as individuals or their relation to the community. Even then, instinctive conscience has been warped. Little wonder there is so much confusion in the public mind about the private ownership of public utilities, and the public ownership of private interests.

We are anxiously awaiting some Single Taxer to give us a science, formulating principles and rules to govern the human relations, so they will be as comprehensive and self-evident as are those we have for the study of other sciences. And so simple in form, that it can be presented to children in the early years of school life. So simple that adults can understand it without taking a college course. I say we are waiting for a Single Taxer to give us this science because a Single Taxer knows it was when land became private property that man lost his freedom.

When he lost his freedom to express his faculties in securing from natural sources that which was necessary for his life and development, he began to cultivate the shrewd and the cunning; to kill love and cultivate hate; to deaden the finer qualities of his nature so they would not rebel at his committing crimes against his brother.

When man was denied his natural right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, it became necessary for him to turn his attention to winning back these rights; to securing life, liberty and happiness instead of developing and cultivating them. That is how it came about that we teach our children to make a living instead of teaching them to live. The Single Taxer has traced the stream of social life to its source. He knows how and why it has become polluted. He knows how it can be purified, and best of all, he knows it *will* be purified.

---

If a man steals a chicken we fine him once; if he builds a house we fine him every year.