

able that there will be many censors who will think the most effective answer is the "cut out." Whatever may be thought of the Socialist as a constructive critic, as a destructive critic he is a past master. He can kick a hole through a rotten tub as easily as the next one—even if he is a little slow about mending it. When, therefore, he puts his incisive indictments of social and industrial conditions on the screen they will hurt; and the sharpest smart will come from the consciousness that they are true. The best way to provide against the abuse of a little brief authority at a future time is to lay a restraining hand upon the censors of today. Bureaucratic judgments as to what is proper to send through the mails, or what is permissible in public speech, have no place in a free country; and the sooner the mistaken zeal of the censorially inclined is frowned upon, the briefer will be the train of evils that follows in its wake.

S. C.



Again, Trust-Busting.

What good will it do for Congress to create a commission with power to inquire into all commercial relations that are harmless, and leave it helpless in the presence of the only thing potent for evil—special privilege? Will the Interstate Trade Commission at the very best do more than "regulate" the stifling prisoners in the Black Hole of Calcutta? Discipline them it may, and reduce them to an orderly procession, so that each may get his breath of air as he passes the window. But what sort of solution is this of the economic problem? Is there a man in this day so fatuous as to think Labor and Capital can be kept at peace in the Black Hole of Privilege? The irrepressible conflict in the industrial world is not due to the fact that some business men are so much shrewder than others, or so much more unprincipled; it is due to the fact that they are fortified by legal privilege; and so long as that legal privilege remains, all regulations and restrictions will be in vain. So obvious a fact appeals little to the statesman who is bent upon relieving the victim without disturbing the beneficiary. He will come ultimately to the true remedy, but he must first try all the wrong ones.

S. C.



Colorado's Agitators.

"The law has given us power, we are going to maintain it, no government dare take it from us, and whoever will not submit must leave our domain." This is in substance, though not in words, the statement of their position filed by Colorado's

mine owners with the congressional committee. It is quite natural that they should take such a position. It is the attitude always assumed by a privileged class, confiding in its might, and blind to any possibility of overthrow. It is well that it is so. The abolition of Privilege would be a far more difficult task were its holders less inclined to flaunt their power, and more inclined to be moderate in its use. These mine owners have done much to open the eyes of many hitherto blind to the wrong of the monopoly of nature's bounties. They have done much to show the need of government action to remedy this wrong. "The real agitator is the conservative," as Dan Beard, artist and author, truly said. Colorado's mine owners are splendid agitators.

S. D.



On Dangerous Ground.

"If the State will not furnish to owners of property the protection to which they are entitled it is left to them to defend themselves and their property by whatever means they can find." This is part of a public statement made in behalf of the Rockefeller and other Colorado mining interests. Is the position assumed justifiable? Is the action outlined right? If so, then these mine owners invoke a radical principle on which others may as rightfully act. There are natural rights which neither State nor Nation at present protects, rights which are violated by grants to favored individuals of such privileges as those on which these complaining interests base their power. That is why this nation is a land of poverty as well as of progress. That is why we must contend with all the vice, crime and misery resulting from poverty or the fear of it. May those suffering from the neglect by government to guard their rights take the correction of these evils into their own hands? If not, how can the mine owners' threat be justified? If so, what may be done with the mine owners' privilege?

S. D.



The Landlord's Power.

A legal excuse for suppressing free speech in Tarrytown, New York, has been found. F. R. Pierson, president of the Village Trustees, explains it this way: "We haven't a single foot of unoccupied land in town that the community owns. The title to our streets is not in the Trustees of the Village, but is held by the abutting property owners. The rights we have in the streets are merely easements covering the right of traffic to pass over them. New York owns its streets, the property owners own ours. We have no squares, parks, or