

bulwarks; but the man who deliberately puts another to death, whether as hangman, juror, legislator, or citizen, has the making in his heart of a deliberate murderer. Cultivate this state of mind in him by retaining capital penalties, and if he does not kill to satisfy his blood-lust, it is either because no provocation occurs or he lacks the courage of his brutishness. The 13 men on the Illinois judiciary committee who voted to abolish capital penalties are to be congratulated, and it is to be hoped that they will yet be able to rid their State of its criminal law. The experience of other States proves that these penalties serve no purpose whatever in restraining homicide—the only possible excuse, if there be any excuse, that human men can offer for laws that take human life.

+ +

Mallock on Labor.

Of W. H. Mallock, the English essayist, it has been said that he convinces by arguing platitudes elaborately and then jumping over a fallacy into his desired conclusion. For example: Says Mr. Mallock, "Twice two are four, and I will prove it." He does prove it, logically, and with delightful diction; the man's thought seems to be invincible. "Similarly," he continues, "twice four are eight, and I'll prove that." He proves that also, and one feels that his thought is indeed invincible. "Furthermore," he resumes, "twice eight are sixteen; I'll prove that, too." And so thoroughly does he prove it that confidence is completely established. Whereupon he concludes: "Whoever has followed me thus far will readily see that twice sixteen are forty-seven." Judging from the reports of Mr. Mallock's lectures in New York, he is arguing after that fashion. Having proved that all wealth is not produced by hired labor, he adds the assertion that the contention that "labor is the source of all wealth" is platitudinous "if labor be taken to include industrial effort of all kinds," and then concludes that in that case, "to say that all wealth ought to go to the laborers is like saying that all wealth ought to go to the human race." Mr. Mallock skips the important fact that all members of the human race do not join in industrial effort; but this skip is intended to be invisible. It is the jump from a demonstration that twice eight are sixteen, to the conclusion that therefore twice sixteen are forty-seven.

+ +

Rockefeller's Donation.

Thirty-two million dollars is the munificent gift of John D. Rockefeller to educational pur-

poses, and the press is blessing his benevolent name. But what does this gift consist of? The question is asked by Tom L. Johnson, and he answers it, and answers it right. It does not consist of food, nor clothing, nor houses, nor any actually existing wealth that may be consumed in satisfying human needs. It consists of paper documents, which the labor of the future must perennially redeem, yet never cancel—of paper titles to railroad rights of way, to special privileges in city streets, and to legal monopolies of mineral deposits and other gifts of God to mankind. These documents are mere powers to levy taxes, to take tribute, to say to the worker of the future, "For every three units of energy you expend in wealth production, you must give the produce of one to me." What Mr. Rockefeller has really contributed to educational uses, therefore, is the labor of other men, yet to be performed, and to an annual amount that would capitalize into \$32,000,000. Estimating this amount at 5 per cent. and the labor at an average per worker as high even as \$500 a year net, the gift from Mr. Rockefeller resolves itself into a gift in perpetuity of 3,200 industrious men.

+

But we are not quarreling with Mr. Rockefeller for having made the gift. His command over industrious men is, under existing economic conditions, at his own disposal. There is no direct way in which he could set those men free if he tried. The situation is not so simple as under the slavery regime, when the enslaved men could be identified by name or number. It is not 3,200 particular men that he gives or has to give. The particular men cannot be identified, and no particular man furnishes all the labor energy contributed. But particular men, it may be millions, will have to contribute each an indefinable part of this labor energy. Mr. Rockefeller, therefore, cannot manumit his slaves directly. What he can do, and all he can do, is to utilize their labor for purposes that will tend to change the economic conditions which shackle them with the invisible chains of a slavery that is none the less real for being intangible.

+

Has he done that by his educational gift? This is the question the answer to which determines whether he is to be applauded for his gift or not. He cannot be applauded if his purpose is to perpetuate the very laws that give him dominion over the industry and tribute from the production of his fellow men. Yet such is said and widely believed to be his purpose. More than that.

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 beggarmen 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-