

his bed at the tavern, and after hanging him from the limb of a convenient tree, filled his body with bullets—just as if he had been a mere black “nigger.”

+

While we condemn all this, isn't there something about it to shock us into a realization that physical disorder is not the only kind in human society, and that the more subtle legalized disorders are not only as bad or worse, but that they may engender the others? What Captain Rankin and the Tennessee legislature had been doing was along the line of establishing in Tennessee a European status of landed class and peasant class. In connection with this crusade, he was assassinated by working folks destined by his laws to a more helpless peasantry than they were already in. Assassination is always to be deplored. Probably it is always to be condemned, though our newspapers and churches do not uniformly condemn it. But we shall make a grievous mistake if we insist upon regarding this Tennessee event as a wanton assassination, without considering that it may have been an episode in a subtle war of all legalized privilege for the few upon the natural rights of the many.

* *

Professor Starr and the Filipinos.

At a meeting of public school principals lately held in Chicago, Professor Frederick Starr, just back from a long visit to the Philippines, talked refreshingly under the inspiration of his old-fashioned American sense of the value of self-government. “We should get out of the islands,” he said. “I do not mean some time in the future when convenient, but I mean right now, just as soon as we can pack our baggage and leave. We are there without invitation; we are there voting their money for high salaries. When we say that we will give them their freedom when they are prepared for it, what does that mean? We say that it will take about a generation, or twenty years, to prepare them for freedom and self-government. I say it will take about twenty years, or a generation, to vote away all their resources. The men who are exploiting our own country for their own gain are anxious to exploit other lands.”

* *

Bryan and The Commoner.

The Commoner of the 13th, which announces resumption of its editorship by Mr. Bryan, proposes a thorough investigation of the causes of the election results. “How did it happen,” is the question asked, “that the result was so wholly at

variance with the hopes of one party, with the fears of the other, and with the general opinion among men accustomed to the study of political conditions and public sentiment?” This is the question The Commoner hopes to solve, not to gratify “idle curiosity, but in order that men who regard citizenship as a trust may be able to discharge their duty with intelligent concern for the future.” To this end it asks the co-operation of its readers—and we trust a response may come from all other quarters,—in ascertaining certain specific facts and opinions. The questions designed by The Commoner to draw out this information are as follows:

Did the Democratic party make losses in your county and precinct?

If so, to what influence were such losses due?

What course shall reformers adopt for the future?

Can the Democratic party hope ever to gain control of the Federal government?

* * *

NATURAL INSTRUMENTS OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

V. From Primitive Production to Civilized.

Recalling our conversations (p. 748) about the fundamental confusion of capitalistic thought, Doctor, doesn't it seem to you by this time that we ought to make the manifest distinction which capitalists and socialists alike are so prone to ignore? Don't you agree that if we wish to think clearly upon the subject of social service, we must distinguish the two sources of capitalistic power? Isn't it absolutely necessary to clarity of thought, that the power which springs out of capitalization of the artificial instruments of production produced by labor from and on the planet, be distinguished from the power which springs out of capitalization of the planet itself? Isn't it simple horse sense to distinguish the secondary from the primary class of productive instruments, the artificial from the natural, machinery from the land out of which machinery is continually produced and upon which it must be used if used at all? And is it any less important to make this distinction when these two different kinds of things are not capitalized and interchangeable than when they are? Aye, aye! I thought you would say so.

Well, we have already considered the matter, and have concluded that labor activities cannot be cut off from industrial access to artificial instruments directly, without express laws of exclusion. But if you have reflected on our last talk I think you will also agree that labor interests can be cut

off from them indirectly by being cut off from the great natural instrument. In other words, I think you will realize that machinery, no matter how gigantic, cannot be withheld from use by labor interests without direct and arbitrary prohibition, unless obstacles are placed in the way of the access of labor to land. Let us see if I cannot make this quite clear.

Before going any further, however, I must remind you that it really makes no essential difference to labor interests whether the natural instruments of production are monopolized by a personal class, such as landlords were under the system of feudal tenures of land, or by means of impersonal commercial interests, such as those of our present capitalistic system under which the natural and the artificial instruments of production are indiscriminately capitalized. In either case labor is plundered and exploited. Accidental or arbitrary differences there may be; but on the whole the commands of the landlord under feudalism were essentially the same as are the demands of the investor under capitalism.

Bear that in mind, Doctor, and then think for a moment of production in its most primitive forms. Don't be confused by the fact that the simple primitive forms have given way to complex capitalistic forms; but think upon them as a prelude to considering the capitalistic forms. Now, what are the most primitive forms of production?

A common example is a naked savage at the shore of the sea, digging clams with his fingers.

Analyze that example, and what do you find? I should say four things, wouldn't you? First, the naked savage digging clams: a man working for his living. Second, the seashore, in the sands of which the clams are naturally deposited: a part of the planet. Third, the clams in their natural state in the sand: also part of the planet. Fourth, the clams picked out of the sand and pulled from their shells by the crude art of the savage: artificial products of that man's work from that natural storehouse of the planet.

Those four things really resolve themselves into three, for the clams lying naturally in the sand of the shore, and the shore itself, are identical in economic character. They are natural instruments or sources of satisfying human wants—in this case, of satisfying hunger.

So we have in that example one of the most primitive methods of production: a man applying his work to the planet to procure food. Using Karl Marx's terms, we could translate that analysis into something like this: "Labor" applied to

"matter" to produce "use-values." But as I prefer the terms of the classical political economy, I should express the same idea by interpreting that example of primitive production as an instance in simplest form of the application of "labor" to "land" to produce "wealth." With either set of terms, the meaning is the same.

Pausing here for a moment, let us try to see how that process could be obstructed.

Given the hungry man and the natural clam deposit, would obstruction be possible except in one of two ways? Could anything obstruct that process except coercion of the man by direct application of force to his person, or through his acknowledgment of another's dominion over the clam bed? I think not. You could apply force directly to his person by enslaving the man's body, compelling him to dig clams for you, supporting him out of his own product, and then living yourself upon its surplus; or, recognizing his personal freedom, you could assume governmental sovereignty over him as citizen or subject, and take a portion of his clams as a tax without his consent. Either way would be a direct application of force. But if you would avoid the use of force, you might in some way induce him to acknowledge your ownership of the sea shore where the clams were in their natural state, and then forbid his digging clams there except upon such terms of rent or purchase as would give you a share in the clams he dug. No matter which method you adopted, however, you would be getting service from him without giving service to him.

Now, what I want you to observe, Doctor, is that those obvious principles are not confined to primitive forms of production. They extend all the way up from the simplicity of that sea-shore example, through the epochs of paternal slavery, serfdom, and feudalism, into the present era of capitalism.

In all production, no matter what the form, there are those three things, and only those three—the human worker, the natural instruments or sources, and the artificial products. And in all distribution or division there are but two ways of diverting any share of those products from the workers who produce them—by direct action upon the person of the worker, or by indirect action through monopoly of his natural instruments or sources.

Throughout production and distribution, there are those three elements: the human worker, the natural instruments or sources, and the product. Essentially different, these must be constantly distinguished. In other words, "labor," "land,"

and "wealth" differ in kind and must be so distinguished in reasoning about them. Yes; we might translate those terms into Marx's, and say, meaning the same thing, that "labor," "matter," and "use-values" differ in kind and must be scrupulously distinguished.

We may now advance a stage from that primitive clam digging, holding however to familiar illustrations. Borrowing one of these, let's suppose that the naked clam digger finds he can save his fingers and yet dig clams faster and eat them more comfortably, if he digs them with a stick and breaks them open with stones.

Then he must get a suitable stick. And what does this mean? Does it mean that he must depend upon some stick-owner for permission to dig clams with a stick instead of digging them with his fingers? Not at all. He goes to another part of his natural instrument or source of production—goes back, that is, a little way from the shore,—and applies his work to that part of the planet to get himself a stick. When he gets it, it is an artificial instrument for clam production, isn't it? And in getting it hasn't he applied his "labor" to "land" to produce "capital" with which to get food? And hasn't he done the same to get the stones? And isn't he then a capitalist in the sense of being an owner of capital? And thereafter, in digging and opening clams, doesn't he use artificial instruments as well as natural instruments in securing artificial products—"capital" as well as "land"—in securing "wealth"?

And what is the essential nature of his capital? Isn't it unfinished wealth? Aren't his stick and those stones unfinished sea food, since he makes them as part of the process of making his sea food—as part of the process of getting and making edible the clams he finds at the shore?

Can you possibly think, then, that anybody could coerce that savage by merely taking away from him that stick and those stones? Not in a million years, provided he retained access to the natural sources of such sticks and such stones. So long as he had access to the natural instruments of his clam production—the sea shore with its natural clam deposits, and the upland with its natural deposits of stones and its natural growth of sticks,—so long as he was free in that respect, the loss of those tools of his would not conquer him. It might put him to temporary inconvenience, of course; but it couldn't make him economically defenseless.

Yes, I rather think you are right about that famous water tank parable of Bellamy's, which our socialist friend is fond of quoting. I reckon

it does fit in here. Let me see if I have Bellamy's book handy. Ah, here it is—"Equality."

The parable occurs in chapter twenty-three. But it takes up the whole chapter and we won't stop to read it. You remember the point about it. According to the parable, there was a dry land in which men worked at nothing but getting water. Some of the crafty ones, capitalists, had gathered stores of water, from which they gave drink to the thirsty on condition that these become their servants, they and their children. So the capitalists organized the servants into working bands. Some dipped at the springs; others carried to the tank, where all the people came to drink; others sought out new springs. And the capitalists gave a penny for each bucket of water poured into the tank, and charged two for every bucket taken out. In time, however, so fruitful was the work of the servants, the tank overflowed; and then the capitalists said to the people, "Sit ye down and be patient, for ye shall bring us no more water till the tank be empty." This made hard times, business depression, for when the servants got no more pennies they could buy no more water. And the people suffered and murmured, and the capitalists lost money and swore—or words to that effect. After a while the suffering of the people was such that they threatened to take the tank by force. But after another while the water in the tank had fallen low, and then the people were employed to fill it again. When these experiences had been many times repeated, and there had been much bad language and some incidental mob violence, the whole trouble was settled by dismissing the capitalists as bosses of the water-workers and making a collective organization in which the workers governed themselves and each took pay according to his work, with no rake-off "profit" for anybody.

Now, Doctor, I regard that as really a splendid social parable, all the way through—except as to its method of reform.

Right there Bellamy "falls down." No, it is not to the self-organization, and the dismissal of the capitalists, and the abolition of rake-off "profit" that I object. I put all those things in the meritorious part of the parable. What I regard as its weakness is the impotency of the method proposed for accomplishing those results. That is a weakness which is due to Bellamy's failure to appreciate the essential difference between natural springs and artificial tanks.

I realize, of course, that Bellamy used the tank as a simile for the market, as a symbol for Marx's idea of commodities as "exchange values," as a form of industrial organization, and not as a ma-

chine made of wood. What he evidently intended to point at as the power that dominates labor, was not capital in the sense of an artificial machine. His allusion was to business organization.

But for this purpose the tank as a symbol was unfortunate. To our friend down the street, you know, it really does stand for artificial instruments of production, for machinery. So considered, the parable is, of course, valueless in its constructive features. The question that at once arises is this: No matter if the tank owners did stop the use of the artificial tank, why did the workers suffer for want of water if the natural springs were still free to them? They knew how to dip, and they knew how to carry. Did the capitalists own the pails and the tank? Even so, there must still have been natural wood in that country; why didn't some of the workers make pails and a tank for the rest?

To be sure, the parable assumes a country in which all artificial products consist of water carried to a tank. But if you lay your emphasis there, then the pails and the tank must have symbolized some kind of natural instruments of production, like the springs; and in that case the power of the capitalists resided in a monopoly of natural instruments, and not in a monopoly of artificial instruments or capital—in a monopoly of land and not in a monopoly of machinery.

As an illustration of the economic power of the monopoly of artificial instruments of production, Bellamy's parable is without value. As an illustration of the power of the economic monopoly of natural instruments, it would be excellent but for the defective symbolism which makes it appear to be an illustration of the power of monopoly of artificial instruments. While land-capitalism is deadly to labor interests, whether alone or as an element in capital-capitalism, the latter is quite innocuous without the former.

Returning for further exemplification of this to our clam digger, with sticks and stones for his capital, we can see that he is independent as long as he has access to the natural sources of supply of sticks and stones and clams. But what is true of the clam digger in those primitive circumstances, Doctor, is true of industry as a whole in the most advanced stages of the industrial arts and the most complex conditions of commercialism.

If all workers, with their vast diversity of knowledge and skill, are unobstructed, as workers, in access to all the appropriate natural instruments of production, they can laugh at the capitalist who threatens to coerce them by monopolizing

the existing artificial instruments. But if diversified labor be obstructed in its access to the natural instruments of production, then mere laborers are indeed helpless and capitalists all powerful.

The coercion of labor has always been accomplished in that way. Except as bodily slavery or some of its equivalents have played a part, the labor of the world has been coerced only by monopolization of the planet, which constitutes the one all-comprehensive natural instrument of production.

In the feudal regime, and in regimes of kindred character—that is to say, in eras in which landlordism was a distinct and visible institution,—the coercion of labor by obstructing its use of the planet was what the street boy would call "raw." Landlords, claiming divine right of ownership of the planet, "made no bones" about plundering workers. Owning the earth, they owned the landless who lived and worked upon it, and they didn't hesitate to say so. The condition was really one of human slavery. The master had become a landlord, the slave a tenant or serf.

But with the development of capitalism to the point of sweeping the planet itself into the category of market commodities, land-capitalism took the place of land-lordism. Consequently, a sort of rude, unbalanced, unfair personal reciprocity gave way to the impersonal wage-slave condition we now see. The social service market, through its phenomena of value measurements, has developed two great—interests, I was about to say, Doctor, as I have said heretofore, but "interests" has so many connotations that it may confuse my meaning; so I will fall back on a good old word, and say "weal." Two great weals, then, have been developed in the social service market by capitalism, in place of the two great personal classes of feudalism—weal in production, and weal in the natural instruments of production.

Weal in production includes all the diversified interests in labor and its fruits, whether these fruits, as some modern economists would call them, be "consumption goods" or "production goods"; or, as the old economists would have said, whether they be "capital" or "wealth"; or, as I should say, whether they be "artificial instruments of production" or "final products."

On the other hand, weal in the natural instruments of production includes all the diversified proprietary titles to the planet.

And just as the weal of the landlord class and the weal of vassal class under feudalism were essentially hostile, no matter how tender the personal relationships, so the weal in production and

the weal in natural instruments of production under capitalism are essentially hostile, no matter how cordial the personal relationships, or even how completely these hostile weals may be merged in the same proprietary titles or in the same individual owners. What either weal gains, the other must lose, regardless of its personal distribution.

Farmer Doe, for example, has a weal in the capitalization of his farm site, another in the capitalization of his farm improvements and machinery and stock, and a third in the condition of himself as a laborer. Doe's weal as a laborer is precisely that of old Joshua, his hired man, who hasn't a dollar in the world except his monthly wages. Doe's weal in his machinery and stock is of the same kind, for he has either made it or bought it with what he did make; it is in the nature of wages, or would be if he hadn't a cinch in other ways. But his weal in the capitalization of his farm site is precisely the same as old man Sampson's weal in those valuable building lots from which he gets ground rents—a "rake-off" weal.

In those circumstances the economic conflict is between weals or interests which ramify personal classes, instead of being, as under feudalism, a conflict between personal classes. To be sure, slavery gives us the only perfect exemplification of hostile class interests in the personal sense—master class, slave class, and the nondescript masterless class. Under feudalism, ramifying interests as distinguished from class interests creep in slightly, and under capitalism survivals of distinct class interests are observable; but characteristically, feudalism involves a conflict of personal classes, whereas capitalism involves a conflict of impersonal interests.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

EMMA GOLDMAN IN OMAHA.

Omaha, Neb., Nov. 16.—Emma Goldman came to Omaha to speak in a cosy little theater located in a commercial college building and leased to a liberal-minded man of the name of Alfred Tomson. Tomson's lease with the owners stipulates that they reserve the right to veto his contracts; but he had not "gone against the game" before, so he leased the place for a week. The Chief of Police, who, for years and until within the past two years, had been blind to the presence of numerous crooks, and who could not catch Pat Crowe, though he had been in the city scores of times and finally surrendered himself, went to the easily-frightened proprietors of the theater and gave them to understand that any hall rented to Emma Goldman was likely to cause the owner trouble. Miss Goldman was thereupon obliged to go to the Labor Temple, located in a

poor part of town and anything but inviting. But the joke on the proprietor of the Lyric Theater is, that the very persons whose good opinion he had hoped to secure, flocked down to the Labor Temple in their automobiles to hear this "queen of anarchy." Moreover, they seem to have been pleased.

At the first lecture, several detectives in citizens' clothes, were judiciously using note books for dangerous statements, yet they did not succeed in reaching the point of action, chiefly because several members of the police commission as well as Mayor Dahman, advised moderation. Really the only incandiarism preached was by the Chief and his lieutenants before Miss Goldman's arrival.

And now Omaha people are wondering what it is about this peaceable little woman that so frightens the police and the yellow sheets.

L. J. QUINBY.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FROM A CANDIDATE WHO LOST.

Hymer, Kans., November 6.—Was not the acceptance of feudalism phenomenal? We are a sort of "variety show." We fill the house; we obtain applause and arouse enthusiasm; but the owner of the theater—he gets the real fact, the cash.

How more thoroughly does one love a good, sound God-built horse one has been beaten on! To understand—that is to love, I think; and to have ridden the losing horse without spurs right down to a finish, is to know the splendor of the horse, his courage and his great power.

The horse which beat us was spurred and whipped. The course on which we ran our horse, the Pure Democracy, was impeded by ignorance and fear, which obstacles can only be overcome by false methods in riding—spurs and whips, threats and misstatements.

Say, but I love our horse, bless his old heart! You can burn all the whips and spurs, and he will run out his course.

I never knew what hatred meant until November 3. November 2 I saw the writing on the wall. November 3 I saw men lock up the brains I had touched, and vote the cowardice which is as old as the world. I knew, as in scornful silence I watched, the desire, as old as their cowardice, to kill these things which impede the Messiah's return. The earth seemed too small to contain us both!

Oh, I've got over it now, the poor devils! As I ride my beautiful defeated horse I know the reward for having thrown away spurs and whips, and learned to really co-operate. Lord, but I know my God-made horse will win some day. And the poor Hymer lads that cast eighteen votes for Taft and fear, will never have this supreme joy. I love my horse indeed, for only when mounted upon him can I really leave the dirt. God grant I stay on him longer, and do not get down to fight my fellows over their love of dirt.

Oh, I am quite normal, thanks. If folks will edit The Public, why, I guess they've got to put up with having confused volumes of its fruit chucked at