

a "threat" to defeat them for office. A ten-year-old child might understand that unless those who make the "threat" are sufficiently numerous, it must be ineffective; and even a subsidized trade paper ought to know that if they are sufficiently numerous to make their "threat" good at the polls, they are exercising the right for the exercise of which the polls exist. The function of legislatures is to enact the laws that the people want; a function of the voter is to keep out of office legislators who are opposed to enacting the laws he wants. One might think the Iron Age was satirizing its own constituency, for of all brain-hardened creatures on this footstool, the worst is the average "business" man who has had his arrogant dignity ruffled and his arrogant temper ruptured by the arrogance of a union committee. But the Iron Age can hardly be suspected of satire. It is too serenely and smugly serious for that. What it says is really a fair expression of the spirit which prevails among the class upon which it depends for advertising.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF GAMBLING.

Although gambling assumes many forms and is rather difficult to define exactly, its chief varieties and characteristics are fairly well in our minds. Whatever else gambling may include, it always involves the getting of something of value without earning it. This increases the property of one person and decreases the property of another, as a result of what we call chance or of future developments which are not thoroughly known to all parties when the gambling transaction begins.

What is it that leads people to gamble?

While there may be some persons who do it simply for sport or from other motives besides the winning of the prizes, I am convinced that the hope of winning something of value is the chief inducement to the great majority of persons who engage in gambling. To eradicate gambling, therefore, we must destroy or neutralize this

principal motive—the desire to get value without creating it by labor or giving something in a fair exchange.

We cannot suppress it effectually by laws repressing this or that form of gambling, although these may be very desirable and may be of great assistance. The gambling spirit to a great extent defies the laws and invents new forms when old ones are denied to it. We must strike at the root and destroy or neutralize the principal motive, the desire and willingness to get value without a fair exchange.

To illustrate: This same desire, in the form of stealing, has been largely destroyed or neutralized. It has been destroyed in the truly honest man, who has no desire to appropriate his neighbor's property and would scorn to do it even in the absence of restrictions. This desire has been neutralized in most other men not strictly honest, by attaching to the conduct known as stealing, as a consequence thereof, a term in jail or prison or the contempt or disapprobation of society. To put it bluntly, the motive to gamble, like the motive to steal,—and it is the same motive,—must be either destroyed by making men strictly honest and honorable, or it must be neutralized by attaching to the conduct known as gambling, as a consequence thereof, the reprobation and contempt of society and possibly penalties known to the law.

Nothing is truer than the saying that primarily there are but three ways of getting property, namely, earning, begging and stealing; we are all of us, morally speaking, either laboring men, beggar men or thieves. In which class does the gambler belong? He certainly does not labor or beg. It is because society has not yet awakened to the fact that gambling is thieving and is dishonorable that it is still in many quarters fashionable and even considered respectable.

You may reply that it is the nature of men to get what will satisfy their wants with the least effort possible. Generally speaking that may be true. But many men have ceased to be willing to get value with little effort.

when the method is generally recognized as dishonorable or is dishonorable in essence. Ordinary begging and the vulgar forms of stealing have ceased to be respectable or popular; and, with right education and right thinking, the more polite form of thieving, known as gambling, may also be put under the ban.

Your ordinary boy or girl, with the education now commonly received, would scorn to beg or pick pockets. Our education must produce in the boys and girls an equal scorn to take another person's property on a bet or a wager and actually convert it to his or her own use. The taking of money or property as a result of gambling, is essentially a mean, low and vulgar thing to do. There is no element of dignity or manliness in it. Boys and girls should be taught this truth both practically and theoretically, just as they are given all other moral and ethical teachings. In the case of a youth who has a fair sense of the propriety and fitness of things, the money obtained by him upon his first wager should burn his fingers and make him so uncomfortable that he cannot rest until he has restored it to its rightful owner. He should find it beneath his dignity to take another's property and actually use it to satisfy his own needs and desires, just as much as he would if a stranger should approach him and offer to make him the object of charity.

Do not teach your child that it is wrong to gamble because it is a losing game. It may be inexpedient for that reason. But teach him that it is a disgrace for him to take and appropriate the value produced through no effort of his own. When individuals and society can be led to look upon gambling in its true light, as an undignified, mean and vulgar practice, the chief motive for gambling will be destroyed or neutralized.

We have now considered the nature of gambling and the general characteristics of the remedy. Are there any features in our economic and industrial system which hinder the application of this remedy and are therefore to be considered as causes of the prevalence of gambling? In my judgment there are such economic causes which contribute more than

all others to the respectability which gambling enjoys.

The surest cure is to drive out evil with good. Teach your boy the correct ethics of wealth and he will have little desire to make money by gambling. Teach him that not a dollar rightfully belongs to him which has not been acquired by honest labor or some form of social service.

The dignity of labor needs teaching in a practical as well as in a theoretical way. For that purpose we need the great assistance of manual training in the public schools from top to bottom. When boys and girls are convinced by their education and vital experience that they must be either workers, beggars or thieves, and that gambling can be properly classified only as thieving, we shall be on the way toward the eradication of gambling.

The chief obstacle which stands in the way of this result, is the fact that, while society pretends to believe in the dignity of labor, it does not believe in it really or practically. Of course in the term labor I include intellectual as well as manual labor. Theoretically labor is dignified, but practically it is dignified only for certain classes upon whose labor other classes find it convenient to live.

The economic causes which tend to lessen the respect for honest labor, tend also inevitably to increase the respect for gambling. With reference to society's attitude toward labor, let me quote from a recent issue of *The Public* (vol. vi, p. 673).

The report of the trustees of the Tuskegee normal and industrial institute, of which Booker T. Washington is the head and personification, declares that the chief need of the Negroes of the South is "for teachers or leaders who will not only teach in the ordinary manner, but who will emphasize the dignity of labor," etc. But nothing is said of the need of emphasizing the fundamental rights of laborers, namely their right to natural opportunities and their right to the full value of their productions. Dignity of labor and exploitation of laborers are incompatible things. So long as our institutions allow laborers to be exploited, just so long shall we have to plead for a recognition of the dignity of labor, and plead in vain. The very classes that are most insistent verbally upon the dignity of labor, are least insistent practically upon getting their share of this dignity. Give them the products of labor and they care not who

has its dignity. So long as this is so, the Negroes of the South cannot be truly impressed with the dignity of labor. While they observe that it is not the man who labors, but the one who lives in luxury upon the labor of others, who is respected and honored—and the greater his unearned income the greater the respect and honor—how can they really believe that there is dignity in labor? With their native courtesy they may reply: "Das so. I reckon das so," but in their hearts they must feel like exclaiming: "G'way, chile, g'way." Most of the talk about "the dignity of labor" is mere mockery. It is like that other phrase, now so common in plutocratic circles, about "liberty to work." In truth, labor is dignified in the nature of things; but it is not dignified in the estimation of society. That society does dignify it, is the untruth to which our plutocracy tries to give currency as truth. They want a contented mental class upon whose labor they may luxuriously live, and this is one of the little confidence games they play upon the unsophisticated.

Let us consider the nature and operation of some of the causes which have robbed labor of its dignity in public estimation:

The earth, with all its resources and opportunities, is the gift of God or of Nature to mankind, from which, by labor, man may satisfy his wants either by producing what he needs or by exchanging his product for the product of some other man's labor. Labor, then, is the only basis or justification for individual ownership of property. If this be true, there can be nothing more dignified than labor. But our economic system has refused to recognize this truth, and, in direct violation of it, has given to individuals property in the source of wealth, in the earth itself, and has thus enabled them to wax rich without labor, but merely by granting to their fellows the privilege of laboring upon the earth. How can labor practically preserve its dignity under these circumstances? A man by luck or chance acquires land where a populous city is destined soon to be built. He and his descendants for many generations become independently rich and need never bother themselves about the dignity of labor except to preach it to those who are laboring upon their lands so that they will labor on contentedly. The holders of land, as such, perform absolutely no service to society or their fellow individuals,

and their income, being unearned, is a standing contradiction of the dignity and worth of labor.

To take another instance, suppose that in the early history of a city or State, a company acquires from a careless, improvident or perhaps venal city council or State legislature, a franchise of long or unlimited duration to carry passengers or freight on a route destined to become the teeming thoroughfare used by millions of people. The holders of this franchise need not use or operate it by their own labor. They have only to hold on to their title deeds and let others do the labor of transportation, paying well for the privilege. The owners of the franchise and their descendants will be dignified without labor, and will need to toil only in the way of caring for and investing the unearned income which accrues from the labor of others.

Or, suppose that certain men succeed, by chance or skill, in getting possession of the petroleum fields from which the people must get the material for lighting their homes and factories; or have succeeded in acquiring the coal fields from which the people must draw their means of heat, light and power; or have secured the copper ranges, from which must be derived the metal which will conduct the electrical current in this age of electricity. These fortunate individuals, as the world esteems them, need not worry about the dignity of labor. The inhabitants of the country, being engaged in acquiring that dignity during so much of the time that they have little chance for thinking or reflection, will gladly pay these owners of the earth a round sum for the privilege of getting these materials which are necessities of human existence under present conditions.

These individuals, whose wealth has come from the labor of others, or of society in general, are, by common consent, the princes of the earth, more honorable than any one who labors with hand or brain, more honorable even than the really great ones of the earth, the great inventors, the great scientists, and the great teachers of their times.

Dignity of labor forsooth!

Can you expect the average boy, under these conditions, to

think that it is wrong to get something for nothing? Can you expect him to believe in industry as the best means of success? Could you expect him to refrain, upon principle, from any gambling practices or enterprises from which he might hope to get something for nothing?

It will only be when we exterminate from society the parasite who lives upon it merely by allowing others the privilege of laboring, and when we make labor the real basis for the ownership of property, that we will make labor truly and actually dignified in the minds of the people, will make the getting of wealth without labor dishonorable, and will destroy or neutralize the motive which is the root of the gambling spirit. We must remove the economic causes which have counteracted and contradicted all the teachings of home, church and school about the dignity of labor, which have led the youth of the country to conclude that wealth and success are the things to be aimed at, without much regard to the means employed, and that honest labor, either manual or intellectual, is the least likely means of acquiring wealth.

JESSE F. ORTON.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

COLORADO.

Pueblo, Colo., Aug. 6.—While the newspapers of the East have generally been quite fair in their comments upon the troubles in Colorado, they have accepted and given currency to statements, emanating from the mine owners, which do the State grave injustice.

It has been stated repeatedly that the calling out of the militia was necessary because of a reign of terror in the mining camps to which troops were sent. The Western Federation of Miners is charged with planning and encouraging murder, train-wrecking and all forms of violence, and it is represented that in several counties its orders were so well obeyed that life and property were no longer safe. To these charges the Governor has given official approval in his proclamations declaring three counties in a state of "insurrection," as well as in his several interviews and published defenses. To be sure, insurrection is something more than the lawless and criminal conduct charged against the communities in question—being equivalent to rebellion—but alleged lawlessness and not revolution is the condition asserted as an excuse for the Governor's course.

In justice to the State, it should be known that in truth no such lawlessness existed in any of the counties which were placed under military control. The "insurrection" was in every case a fiction deemed necessary as a basis for the order for troops.

But two definite charges of violence in the Cripple Creek district have been made; one of an attack upon Justice Hawkins, of Altman, which is alleged to have been to punish him for a decision unfavorable to a union miner. The other case is that of one Stewart, who is alleged to have been beaten by union miners. Stewart's wife admits that she administered the beating in a family broil, and Stewart confessed as much to a police magistrate, who is authority for this statement.

After the arrival of the troops, an explosion in the Vindicator mine resulted in the death of the superintendent and a shift boss. This was at once charged to the unions. But no evidence was produced, and the coroner's jury reported that it was unable to determine the cause or to fix the blame. As the mine was under military guard, positive evidence of outside interference is necessary to show that the explosion was more than an accident.

It is declared, too, that the unions attempted to wreck a train loaded with soldiers and non-union men. But on the trial of the alleged wreckers, it clearly appeared that the loosening of the rail was the work of detectives of the Mine Owners' Association, who employed a worthless character to testify to facts incriminating the president of one of the unions. Not only was the accused acquitted, but the cases against his alleged accomplices were all dismissed, while the principal witness for the prosecution, this tool of the detectives, was held for perjury committed at the trial.

In Telluride, from the calling of the strike—and for some time previous—to the arrival of troops, the camp enjoyed a period of quiet never before known.

But more than a year before the troops were placed in control, Manager Collins, of one of the principal mines, was killed by a shot fired through a window of his residence. This act was credited to the unions, though there was at that time no labor trouble in that district. Some of Collins's friends attribute his death to parties who feared that he was about to expose their dealings in stolen ore; and others think it was an act of revenge on the part of a discharged employe. That the unions were in any way connected with the assassination is pure assumption.

Much is made also of the fact that in the Fall of 1901 a non-union miner disappeared and in the Spring of 1902 a second one disappeared, and it is charged that they were murdered by the miners. Whether the men were killed, and if

killed, by whom the deed was done, are matters upon which there is no evidence. Whatever the facts may be, as the latest of these disappearances occurred in March, 1902, it can hardly be regarded as evidence of an insurrection in December, 1903.

In the coal-mining district of which Trinidad is the center, there was no pretense of disturbances, except the killing of three Italians by deputy sheriffs, and sundry assaults upon members of the executive committee of the United Mine Workers. This is on the authority of the postmaster at Trinidad. Yet, when the troops were sent there in March last, they began a series of deportations of union officers, the only purpose of which was the breaking up of the unions.

In fact, the evidence is overwhelming that this was the sole purpose of calling out the troops in every instance. That purpose has been repeatedly expressed not only by the members of the Mine Owners' Association, but by Sherman Bell and the other officers of the National Guard.

It is a suggestive fact that the mine owners with all the powers of military government in their hands for nine months, have not convicted a single member of the miners' union of an offense against either life or property. And this is not due to any miscarriage of justice. On the trial of the few cases prosecuted to trial, in which it had been proclaimed that the evidence of guilt was abundant and damning, the prosecution utterly broke down, in some cases producing no evidence at all.

The decision of the Supreme Court by which Governor Peabody seeks to justify his course, is only to the effect that in the suppression of an insurrection the Executive may arrest and detain insurgents for a time without being answerable to the courts. While this decision has been severely criticised, and the fact that it cites no precedents has been noted, it does not afford any support to the deportation of citizens, nor to their arrest and detention without at least a charge of wrong-doing.

The Governor and his friends have asserted, and made much of the assertion, that the strike was the arbitrary act of the executive committee of the Western Federation of Miners. A like charge has been made as to the strike of the United Mine Workers. In neither case is there any foundation for such a statement.

In Cripple Creek, by a vote of the unions the question was referred to the district committee. That committee recommended the executive committee to order the strike.

In Telluride, the strike originated in a demand by the mill men for an eight-hour day, and was ordered by a vote of the men.

In the Coal fields, the miners insisted