

# DON'T BLAME THE OIL MAN!

## A Talk About John D. Rockefeller— and Some Other Subjects.

---

Most people know that John D. Rockefeller founded the Standard Oil Company and the University of Chicago.

But only a few people are aware that the Standard Oil magnate has withdrawn his representatives from the University Board of Trustees and severed his personal connection with the big school.

What does Mr. Rockefeller mean by this?

The story has been told by Louis Wallis in Harper's Weekly under the title "Mr. Rockefeller's Dilemma." Write for a copy to the McClure Publications, Fourth Ave., and 20th St., New York City.

When Mr. Rockefeller founded the Standard Oil Company, he knew exactly what he was doing.

But he was not so well informed on education as he was on business. His views on theology and sociology are quite conventional and orthodox. The University of Chicago has turned out to be more and more radical in its influence. Mr. Rockefeller has gracefully and silently withdrawn.

Don't blame the Oil Man.

The best refutation of the cheap jingoism which has been trying to drag the United States into criminal aggression against Mexico has been given by Professor William E. Dodd, of the Department of History in the University. See the Public for March 27.

A radical, democratic book, entitled "Between Eras," has been recently issued by the head of the Department of Sociology, Professor Albion Woodbury Small, who predicts that before long our present social system, if let alone, will result in having every cubic inch of land, sea, and sky bonded to a clique of financiers who will dictate the terms upon which the rest of us shall be permitted to stay on the earth. See note in the Public last week signed by Louis Wallis. Professor Small's book is now selling in the second edition. Your dealer can get you a copy from the Inter-Collegiate Press, Kemper Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.

The fight against the "System" in Chicago has been helped along by the aldermanic candidacy of Professor Allan Hoben, of the Department of Theology.

The radicalism of the Department of Theology dates back to the late President Harper, under whose leadership the University was committed to the "Higher Criticism."

A great struggle for social justice was the real force which transformed the religion of the Hebrews from paganism into the religion of the Bible, according to Professor J. M. P. Smith, who succeeds President Harper in charge of several Theological courses. This is the real meaning of Higher Criticism; and this is why it is opposed by wealthy conservatives.

A new and interesting form of the Higher Criticism appears in a book recently published by the University under the title "Sociological

"Study of the Bible." The author of this work is Louis Wallis, whose article, "Mr. Rockefeller's Dilemma," is mentioned above. The book is having an extensive sale. Your dealer can get you a copy from the University of Chicago Press, 58th St. and Ellis Ave., Chicago.

Mr. Rockefeller's motive in severing his personal connection with the University of Chicago seems to be tolerably clear. Much larger amounts of money than he ever gave to the school on the Midway are now being poured into more safe, sane, conventional, orthodox philanthropies by the great Oil King.

This is the whole social problem of today in a nut-shell.

The records of United States courts, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the national and state legislatures prove that the Oil Trust got its power through usurpation of the Taxing Power by prostitution of the highway function. Nevertheless, don't blame the Oil Man. The fault is not Mr. Rockefeller's. We are all responsible for a social system by which one man, or a small class of men, can get a strangle-hold on society.

Before long, the democratic meaning of the collegiate fight over Biblical Higher Criticism will become clear to the American people. The advocates of special privilege want the "practical" man to think that he is not interested in Higher Criticism. The most effective way to fight standpatism in economics is to fight standpatism in religion, because the two things are really one and the same. Radical Higher Criticism eventually gets on the nerves of standpatters. Nothing is effective until it gets on somebody's nerves.

For illustration, President Harper frequently spoke of the national deity of the Hebrews as "Yahweh." People said, "Why does President Harper use that peculiar term?" The reason was simple. The more familiar word "Jehovah" cannot be found anywhere in the Bible nor anywhere in ancient Hebrew literature. The name Jehovah is found only in certain modern translations of the Bible, but it was not in the early manuscripts.

Standpatism keeps the people from realizing that the name Yahweh was a battle-cry in the ancient Hebrew warfare against Dollar Diplomacy and Big Business. The god of the dollar was named "Baal," a word which has the sense of "slave-holder" and "monopolist." These facts are brought into view by Higher Criticism.

The Hebrew nation was formed out of two races, a free race of anti-monopolists from the desert of Arabia, and a slave-holding, Baal-worshipping race which held the commercial centers of Canaan. There was no "conquest of Canaan," in the popular sense of the phrase.

After the Hebrew nation was formed, the Big Business men wanted to apply the name Baal to Yahweh, the deity of the desert. This was fiercely denounced by the prophet Jeremiah. Therefore Jeremiah was put into a foul cistern. The religious ideas which we have inherited from the Hebrews were brought into shape through a mighty social struggle. But standpatism does not want the people to know the facts.

Religious life today is on the point of reverting to the warfare between Democracy and Privilege. Democracy, however, cannot be consolidated for the final battle against Privilege without an appeal to religious feeling analogous to that which carried our fathers through the struggle against the Slave Dynasty in the South and the struggle against the Stuart Dynasty in England.

A mysterious force restrains most of our theological seminaries from emphasizing the Higher Criticism in a way which the people can understand. The nature of that force is suggested by a recent news dispatch stating that a Texas millionaire has announced his determination to confine his gifts to colleges that are "right" in their teachings.

Wealth is concentrating in the hands of men who feel competent to say what our colleges and theological seminaries and churches shall think and teach and preach. But the system of privilege will break down from its own weight.

Plans are now under consideration for the establishment of a new journal, to be called RELIGIOUS LIFE, which is to deal with religion and the social problem from the democratic point of view.

Not enough money has yet been pledged to start the undertaking. If you feel disposed to aid the enterprise in the event that a responsible committee is formed to receive subscriptions and give a public accounting, write for a sample proof of the proposed journal, which will be sent to you free. You incur no obligation by writing.

ANDREW P. CANNING,  
828 Unity Bldg., Chicago.

N. B.—The University of Chicago has no connection, direct or indirect, official or unofficial, with this advertisement.