

The facts above set forth effectually refute the view that the uncertainty consequent on the prospect of tariff-reform was an influential cause of the great depression. The untenability of that view was evident a priori from the fact that no real change in the situation, so far as the matter of tariff is concerned, has taken place since the Presidential election. There might naturally be a little trepidation among those interested in tariff-fed industries, as the day of Congressional action drew near. But, as the Nation points out, the only uncertainty that remains, or has remained since the Democratic victory, is in regard to details. To those who complain of the effect of such uncertainty upon business operations, it is replied with strict logic that all such arguments constitute the strongest possible reasons for the prompt enactment of the new Tariff Law, to which the party in power is so distinctly pledged. The same argument is applicable, in a tariff-reform, or re-adjustment, or whatever it may be, that has been made, and is being made from time to time, by our own Government. Leading members of the Government are, it is true, giving emphatic assurances that the principle of protection shall not be impaired and that the interests of the manufacturers shall still be cared for. But these assurances, just in proportion as they are reassuring to the protected are calculated to increase the energy of the tariff-reformers and so to increase the uncertainty with regard to the future, the distance to have much effect on the present business situation. So long as large and influential sections of the people are in revolt against, not only the high tariff, but the policy of protection as well, there must be uncertainty in regard to the effect upon business operations on either side of the line is one of the strongest proofs that the main industries of our country are far less dependent upon the protective tariffs than many would have us suppose.

STATE EDUCATION.

"The American Journal of Politics" is a magazine for intelligent men and women who read and think on vital questions of the time. There is no question of political science more vitally important at the present time than that of the right and duty of a State with regard to the education of its children. Many of the men and women who think will, therefore, turn with interest to the leading article in the September number of this magazine, in which M. M. Trumbull discusses the existence and limits of the rights and obligations of the State in this regard. In due time the colleges will be opened free to all the people. Then "the higher learnings shall be the prerogative of brains and not of money." Not only so, but "trades, as means of livelihood, will be taught in the public schools, and we shall see free

all peoples, times and circumstances, will lay down the magazine with deep disappointment. Indeed, Gen. Trumbull's first care is to affirm, in effect, that no such principle exists. "The right of a state to educate its children, and the extent of that right may," he argues, "vary under different political conditions."

"The same principles of State Education do not apply to a theocratic, absolute monarchy like that of Russia, a State socialistic monarchy like that of Germany, a limited constitutional monarchy like that of England, and a representative republican democracy like that of the United States. In the Russian monarchy where the Czar is both Emperor and Pope, where all the people are practically of one religion, it seems that sectarian, religious education in the public schools is logical, in complete harmony with the theory of government, and entirely consistent with its duty to the people; while such a doctrine could not be admitted for a moment in the United States, where the people are of different religions, where Church and State have been divorced, and where the patronage of any religion, whatever, by money endowment from the State, is forbidden by the supreme law."

Proceeding to develop his theory along the line of these principles, if such they may be called, Gen. Trumbull reaches such conclusions as that in Germany, the right of the State to educate its children is founded on a sort of national patriotism, "the right of the State to protect itself from popular ignorance and bad subjects"; in England, if any principle can be found, the education is graciously conceded as a sort of charity; while in the United States "public school education rests on principles peculiarly its own." There the State has no right at all to educate its children except what grows out of the right of the children to be educated." In that favoured land "the right of the child to an education is absolute"; "the right of the State is limited to the simple duty of providing the means whereby to enforce the right of the child."

We have not space, nor would it be to our purpose, to follow the various steps in the argument by which Gen. Trumbull, having thus cleared the ground, goes on to the sweeping conclusion that there is no limit to the extent of the education which is thus the right of every child in the United States. "In a Government founded, theoretically at least, on social and political equality, every child is entitled to a public school education, incidentally for the advantage of the State, but absolutely as the right of the child, for the child's own sake, in order that every boy and every girl may have a fair and equal start with every other in the race for honourable position, and in the struggle for a respectable existence." "In due time the colleges will be opened free to all the people. Then "the higher learnings shall be the prerogative of brains and not of money." Not only so, but "trades, as means of livelihood, will be taught in the public schools, and we shall see free

colleges for public education in law, medicine, and all the intellectual occupations which are described as the learned professions." And as "the right to an education includes the right to the means by which it may be acquired," it follows that all the books and other appliances necessary to the acquiring of all this education must be provided free. It also logically follows, though the General does not say so, that as the students must have food and clothing during all the seemingly unlimited number of years which would be required for this universal march through college, and, we suppose, through the post-graduate and professional and specialist courses, so the State must see to it that no one is placed at a disadvantage in this respect. It must further follow, we infer, that this complete course must be made compulsory throughout, else the parsimony or poverty of some parent, or the shortsightedness or indolence of some child, may place the latter at a disadvantage in the race for respectability or distinction.

There is surely a crudity in the reasoning which finds its principles in the accidents of forms of government, instead of in the unchanging decrees of nature. Those are strange conceptions of "rights" which can make them harmonize with religious intolerance and persecution of Standists in Russia, universal militarism in Germany, and aristocratic exclusiveness in England, while giving every child who happens to be born in Republican America an absolute and indefeasible claim to the highest and freest education that it is possible for the State to give. Has the child, as an intellectual and moral being, no rights in its relation to the State, save such as are the outcome of the "theory of government" which prevails in the country in which he may happen to be born?

We are, however, concerned, just now, not so much with the logic of the article in question as with the subject with which it deals, else we might, we think, be able to show that much confusion of thought is caused in it and many similar articles, by the tacit assumption that the State proper is an entity distinct from the citizens who compose it. Were writers on such subjects clearly to recognize and keep in mind the fact, which surely needs no demonstration, that the State is but the citizens in their organized capacity, and that whatever may be its character in various countries as the result of a long series of historical causes, it can have no rights save those conferred upon it or conceded to it by the people who compose it, a vast amount of confusion of thought might, it seems to us, be avoided.

To apply this doctrine to the case in hand, it follows that to speak of the rights or the obligations of the State in any respect, is to talk nonsense. Rights belong to, obligations rest upon, sentient, intelligent, moral agents. States, like corporations, have no souls. Whatever ridicule a