

monopoly, not combination, that makes blacklisting effective. We would, therefore, destroy blacklisting by abolishing monopoly. It can be done in no other way.

With all possible respect for Mr. Strong's judgment, we deny that anything that would be innocent if accomplished by one person, becomes wrongful when done by a combination of several persons. The essence of wrong is the concurrence of an evil act with a corresponding evil purpose. Whether this be the individual purpose and act of one or the joint purpose and act of many, makes no difference in principle. A purpose and act which would not be wrongful in an individual cannot be wrongful in a combination of individuals. Mere numbers do not in the nature of things change what is innocent into what is criminal. In other words, we believe the law of conspiracy—ancient though it undoubtedly is—to be an unprincipled innovation. And while in exceptional cases, like those of the railroad "blacklisting," it may be invoked as a labor palliative, its main use will continue to be a club for the judicial pounding of workingmen.

As an organ of McKinleyism, the New York Times feels, of course, in duty bound to discredit the doctrine of the declaration of independence that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. But it has the sense to refrain from candid denunciations. The hour for that has not precisely arrived. It would be as yet highly impolitic openly to attack the mass of "prejudice" which holds the heads and hearts of the American people true to the declaration of independence. So the tactics of the Times are for the present those of the sapper and miner. The doctrine of the fathers is assailed with masked satire, which it is hoped may by an imperceptible process make the doctrine ridiculous. The Times accordingly sets itself the task of demonstrating in an underhand way

that government by consent of the governed is impracticable and absurd.

Divested of the smartness that characterizes its editorial writing, and put into blunt English, an argument which the Times in one of its recent issues makes against the declaration of independence is as follows: The McKinley policy of criminal aggression in the Philippines, the imperialism which proposes to rule distant peoples as crown colonies, is right; because the principle of "the consent of the governed" is not acted on in domestic affairs. For example: (1) The Indians are governed without regard for the letter and spirit of the declaration of independence. (2) The District of Columbia is administered without the advice and consent of its inhabitants. (3) The entire woman population is so governed. (4) The army and navy are administered without reference to the opinions of the soldiers and sailors. (5) The committee on rules in congress is a governing body which "derives its powers" from a party caucus and not from the consent of the governed. This, apparently, is the best that the ablest administration organ can do by way of apology for imperialism. We may safely leave its effort to the consideration of our readers, with the bare suggestion that proved deviations furnish no reason for abandoning an ideal. Because men stray from the path of rectitude, that is no reason for closing it. Because a pledged teetotaler has fallen from grace to the extent of drinking now a glass of beer and now a glass of wine, or even to the extent of getting "jolly drunk" at times, that is no good reason for his deliberately becoming a sot.

Apropos of the death of the duke of Argyll, an American magazine, Scribner's, recently discussed the uses of a leisure class. It began with the proposition that "a priori, a man who inherits money enough to be all his life, as the French say, 'at his ease,' is the man from whom we should expect the things that make the world

better, and for which there does not seem to be any immediate market in money." But that is just what ought not to be expected a priori. A leisure class is of necessity a parasitical class. It is supported arbitrarily by the labor of others. And by no rational inference can we expect from a parasitical class devotion to the world's betterment. As well expect grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. It is of the nature of parasites to be always too intent upon their own selfish enjoyment and the perpetuation of their parasitical privileges to know or care about anything else. In self-satisfaction and the effort at holding on, their energies are exhausted. And this is what the magazine in question discovers a posteriori with reference to the British leisure class. It finds that Argyll "was the only duke in Great Britain who within living memory has amounted to anything;" and that the marquis of Salisbury, when he was Lord Robert Cecil, was, upon the authority of Bagehot, "the only member of the British aristocracy who had shown the capacity of earning his own living." To these two, Scribner's adds Lord Rosebery, and, speaking of them as "three out of 500 members of the house of lords" who are worth their salt as workers, adds:

Perhaps an ordinarily well-informed observer might manage to pick out half a dozen more lords who might fairly be called distinguished for something else than being lords, barring the achievements. But that is a sorry showing for so many holders of what may be called perpetually endowed new men, who owe their titles to their fellowships.

From a consideration of these and similar facts Scribner's finally comes to the sensible conclusion that the necessity of earning one's own living is the necessary condition of all worthy achievements, and "that the desire to have been born a duke, which often assails lazy people as a delightful dream, is really a desire to have foregone a much better birthright." Yes, indeed. If it were not for the parasites who suck away the earnings of the workers, there could be no richer birthright than the so-called "curse of Adam."