

may make mistakes, but they will not commit crimes.

+ +

Equality.

Is it unconscious class loyalty, or conscious individual perversity, that makes some moralists of intelligence and honest repute play fast and loose with the plain principles of human equality? Of course that question is for such moralists themselves to answer—and to themselves. It is none of our business. We only wonder. And if sometimes we wonder ungently, let it be remembered that legalized robbery of workingmen, and the physical and moral lives of hosts of little children, are involved in the issue. Who can help wondering, and possibly with some un-Christian feeling, when Dr. Parkhurst, for instance, joins the band of confusionists? He says that "men are not created equal," and "no amount of trying to be equal, and no amount of leveling legislation will make them so." Not at his saying this thing is there reason for critical wonder, for it is true; but at his saying this true thing with false implications in behalf of great industrial parasites. Dr. Parkhurst distinctly implies, in a signed editorial in the Hearst papers, that the inequalities of financial condition in our day are because "some people have a talent for making money," which "is a gift, as much so as painting or sculpture or oratory," and "a thing that cannot be put into a man if he hasn't it nor legislated out of him if he possesses it." This is a false and misleading suggestion to account for colossal fortunes.

+

The "doctrinaire" indictment to which Dr. Parkhurst enters those special pleas has no reference to personal qualifications. Some men may indeed, as he says, be born "to be six feet tall" while "others are born to be five feet ten." But what of it? The brain of some men may be "of finer quality than that of others." But what of that? A few may be "constitutionally gifted," and the great mass be "plain and ordinary." But where is the relevancy? Some may "have a talent for making money." But the real issue is whether legislation shall be maintained which enables them legally to exercise that talent at the expense of the "plain and ordinary." No amount of "leveling legislation may make men equal in money-making." But has not un-leveling legislation made, and does it not continue to make, gross inequalities in money-getting? and is not this the gravamen of the indictment which Dr. Parkhurst moves to quash? When men born to be tall

tower high up into the sky, instead of rising six feet from the ground, it behooves moralists to lift the immaculate drapery and see if these magical six-foot men may not be standing on the heads of five-foot-tens, and eights, and fives, and four-and-a-halves. Likewise when some men without working have larger incomes every hour, many of them enormously larger, than competent and industrious workers get in a week for hard and useful work. Instead of slurring over the social regulations which make this possible, men of moral light and leading would approve themselves better to the "plain ordinaries" if they asked themselves a penetrating question and squarely answered it. They should learn whether the incomes which Dr. Parkhurst relates to a talent for money making that cannot be legislated out, may not in fact be largely due to a talent for taking advantage of un-leveling social regulations that ought to be legislated out. How legislated out? Is that the interrogative retort we hear? It is a futile question until the other is answered. The how must follow the wish, and not precede it. Are our social regulations un-leveling? If they are, do we wish to abolish their un-leveling factors and influences? Let these questions be answered affirmatively, not with perfunctory acquiescence but from the heart, and the effective *how* may not be difficult.

+ +

The Roots of Public Corruption.

Whether Patrick Calhoun is guilty of having bribed San Francisco officials we do not know. The judgment of a jury, 10 to 2 in his favor, raises a doubt at the very least. And we are not sorry, for we find no satisfaction in the mere punishment of individuals. If Mr. Calhoun is guilty, he is no worse than other Big Business men of his time. He may have been more careless or cynical in his methods, but he is hardly more culpable than the best. And that the men of his class felt it so, is evident from the swiftness with which they protested against his prosecution. They were vigorous enough in urging the relentless prosecution of the bribees. They had no mercy for Ruef, the political go-between; nor for Mayor Schmitz, the easy dupe; nor for the bribed aldermen. But when it came to the prosecution of traction magnates, Big Business jumped into the arena with a virtuous protest. And yet, where there are bribees there must be bribers. Why is it that the very classes who beg workingmen to refrain from class agitation, are so quick to stand between the law and