

There is a public disposition, if not a reason, to believe that a conscious plan of great magnitude is in operation, of which this munificent Rockefeller gift is part, to control the educational institutions of the country in such manner as to perpetuate the economic superstitions that hold the working masses in thrall to the privileged classes which Mr. Rockefeller personifies. Mayor Johnson gave voice to this idea when he said: "We all know that the people are now realizing that special privileges are immensely valuable, and when the time comes for the government to pass legislation restricting these things, will not the cry be raised that the legislation will affect this great endowment? that you will be hurting a fund provided for the education of the youth of the country? It reminds one of conditions before the Civil War. Donations to colleges were made in the South, but were any donations made where the slavery question was permitted to be discussed? Times are different probably, but methods are still similar." The matter might be likened also to the theological endowments of the past upon which colleges have thrived. The dead hand of religious superstition held them in a vise-like grip, which has but recently relaxed its hold. So may such endowments as this of Mr. Rockefeller hold the colleges of the future in the grip of a dead hand of economic superstition and industrial oppression.

* * *

THE PROTECTION SUPERSTITION.

The whole protective system is founded upon a political and economic superstition—the utterly baseless assumption that Labor needs protection. Grant this assumption, and you are compelled to defend the protective system; or, if you attack it, the best ammunition you can get is blank cartridges. It is because most of the opponents of the protective tariff have granted this major premise—that Labor needs protection—that their onslaughts have been weak and ineffective. Never until those who attack protection are willing to pull it up by the roots will any substantial results be achieved.

Labor is the only thing in the world that cannot be protected by any agency outside of itself. This is because it is the active force in the production of wealth. Since society is divided into three classes, workers, beggars and thieves, it is clearly evident that the first cannot be protected by the other two. Now the question naturally arises, why is it that nearly every one entertains the no-

tion that it is absolutely necessary that Labor be protected or disaster, poverty and distress will follow. Does it not result from the fact that opportunities of all kinds are scarce? Is not this the reason that Labor is always dependent, always in the attitude of a supplicant or beggar asking for an opportunity to live? Labor has never been respected, and until very recently and in limited quarters it has not even respected itself. The fundamental reason is that Labor has always supported the beggars and thieves.

Those two classes are parasites in their nature, and parasites never respect the thing on which they feed. The slave owner never respected the slave. Even the man with a free pass in his pocket has a secret contempt in his heart for the other passengers in the car who have paid their own fares and his too. This is in the very nature of parasitism. Not until there is but one class, and that a working class, will work, useful service, be universally respected. Universal usefulness and universal respect are two parts of the same thing. One cannot exist without the other.

How is it, then, that such a vast body of idlers exists at the expense of the workers? Must it not be because of some radical denial of rights which results in a denial of equal opportunities? How can any society be safe, sane or normal, or even decently conservative, which harbors, cherishes and defends any institution that makes tribute takers of one class and tribute payers of another? Can there be a more flagrant denial of equal freedom than is involved in an institution which enables some men to charge others unthinkable sums for the mere privilege of using the bounties of nature? It is perfectly safe to predict, however, that just so long as society condones this moral iniquity, which not only disinherits the masses of mankind, rendering them dependent, and in the case of a great multitude helpless, born in rented houses, on rented land, in a rented country and upon a rented planet,—just so long will Labor harbor the notion that it needs protection, and just so long will the exploiters of Labor foster that notion.

This institution is utterly incompatible with a truly civilized state. It is inimical to good morals, and subversive of the first principles of democracy, the great ultimate in human government. It can be destroyed only by uprooting the idea upon which it rests, the idea that land is property, involving the private appropriation of ground rent. This last is the great, the fundamental, the wholly unnecessary element in land tenure as at present established. Private posses-

sion of land is necessary to a stable society; private ownership of ground rent is not.

The evil can be corrected by the same agency that has established and now maintains land tenure. This agency is civil government. But all the substantial benefits of civil government go to the owners of the soil in the form of ground rentals. Civil government is maintained by taxation. No other method has yet been devised, nor can be. To tax is to take. The idea of voluntary contributions for the support of government is chimerical. If something must be taken, why not take ground rent? And if it is taken, infinite results will flow from it for the uplift of mankind, so broad in its ultimate effects as to cover the whole earth, so wide-reaching in its results as to take in the last man. This spells democracy. This ends the protection superstition.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, Feb. 13, 1907.

Mayor Dunne's Veto.

In vetoing on the 11th the traction settlement ordinances adopted by the Chicago City Council last week (p. 1063), Mayor Dunne submitted a lengthy message in which he set forth these objections:

In my letter addressed to Alderman Werno, chairman of the committee on local transportation, dated April 27, 1906, I stated that in dealing with the traction question "the controlling consideration must be that nothing shall be done which will impair the right of the city to acquire the street railway systems as soon as it has established its financial ability to do so." This being the controlling consideration in framing these ordinances, the right of the city to acquire the street railway properties should be fully protected in the same. This, in my judgment, has not been done. While purporting upon their face to give the city the right to acquire the traction systems of the companies at any time upon six months' notice, the ordinances fail to provide practical methods for the acquisition of the systems. The properties can only be purchased by the payment of money. The city can only secure money by the issuance of Mueller certificates. At the present time the authority of the city to issue certificates is limited to \$75,000,000. After the payment of the usual brokerage fees these certificates will not net to exceed \$72,000,000 in cash. The price of the present properties—tangible and intangible—as fixed in the ordinances aggregates \$50,000,000. The cost of rehabilitation, it is admitted, will be from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 and may run up to an unlimited amount, making the total cost to the city at least \$90,000,000 to \$100,000,000. . . . I confidently predict from what has come to my knowledge during these negotiations that a consolidation will

take place in the early future and that when that consolidation does take place, it will be under the ordinance of the Chicago City Railway Company which provides that the city may not acquire the plant unless upon the payment of cash to the amount of the total cost of all the properties and the rehabilitation of the same. The city being in the position of having only \$72,000,000 worth of cash on hand, as at present authorized by the Mueller certificate ordinance, it will never be in a position to acquire these plants until the City Council shall see fit to pass supplemental ordinances authorizing Mueller certificates to the aggregate of at least \$100,000,000. It may be said that the City Council can pass such ordinances in the future, but from all our experience within the last two years we must know what almost insuperable obstacles will be offered to the passage of such supplemental ordinances. Although the citizens of Chicago declared for immediate municipal ownership of the traction systems of this city in the election of April, 1905, by a vote of 141,518 to 55,660, and although I was elected Mayor by a majority of nearly 25,000 on that sole issue, we all know how difficult it was, notwithstanding that tremendous popular vote, to obtain any ordinance authorizing the issuance of Mueller certificates, and that when the ordinance was finally passed, it was the result of a sudden and most remarkable change in Aldermanic sentiment as expressed in previous votes. Unless a provision is now incorporated in these ordinances, limiting the cost of rehabilitation at any time to the amount of Mueller certificates authorized to be issued, in my judgment it will be most difficult, if not impossible, judging of the future by the past, to obtain the passage of such ordinances, no matter what may be the popular sentiment upon the question. . . . It will be plainly and clearly to the interest of the traction companies in the street to prolong the life of their tenure in the public streets to oppose at all times the passage of such ordinances. . . .

Nor can we hope with any confidence, under the terms of these ordinances, that a fund will be acquired out of the 55 per cent. net receipts which becomes the property of the city. The traction companies have been very loud in their protestations that the city's portion of the net receipts will aggregate \$1,350,000 during the first year of the ordinances and that these profits will increase year by year. But when they were asked in committee to guarantee that such returns would come to the city by amending their ordinances so as to guarantee at least 8 per cent. of the gross receipts, they utterly refused to do so. We must, therefore, view with serious misgivings their assertions that the net receipts coming to the city will be any substantial part of the gross receipts. Before the committee on local transportation an effort was made by the city's representatives to obtain a guarantee of at least 8 per cent. of the gross receipts, but the companies refused this most reasonable proposition. Notwithstanding that refusal, you have passed these ordinances without any provision of any character for gross receipts. . . .

While under the terms of these ordinances the city would be compelled to pay from \$90,000,000 to \$100,000,000 in cash with less than \$72,000,000 available, and while there is no provision for a guarantee of a sinking fund, the city is further embarrassed by a provision in the same which permits these companies to charge 10 per cent. contractor's profit upon the cost of rehabilitation, and at the same time the ordinances permit them to make sub-contracts. Sub-contractors will not work without a contractor's profit, and presumably the sub-contractor will obtain his 10 per cent. profit, and yet after the payment of the sub-contractor with his profit the company is empowered under the ordinances to charge 10 per cent. additional, both on the cost of sub-contracts and the profit obtained therefrom. There is nothing in the ordinances to prevent the gentlemen in control of these properties from organizing construction companies and having these construction companies obtain a contract, with the approval of the board of supervising engineers, for the building of power houses, railway barns and other