

in favor of taxation that will encourage industry and thrift, and discourage waste and idleness; that will help the land-user and the laborer, and as far as possible do away with the mere land owner, land grabber and land speculator; that will tend to build up and improve the city, cheapen land and lower rents."

+

It is needless to say that Mr. DuBois was not elected. Too many people in Bayonne as elsewhere, are in favor of the taxes that discourage industry, or else are indifferent. In Chicago, for instance, the whole population are cheering the enforcement of a "wheel tax," which falls upon the use of vehicles. If such a tax were very high, it would cut down the use of vehicles to the minimum, thereby lessening opportunities for work, just as the old window and chimney taxes did. As everybody sees this, no one would consent to a prohibitive wheel tax. Yet a light wheel tax is the same in principle, and its tendency is toward the same result. Every dollar collected as a wheel tax, lessens the burden on vacant lot owners—thereby fostering high prices for building lots and thus obstructing the erection and use of buildings,—while at the same time it increases the burden on the use of vehicles, thereby discouraging in greater or less degree the construction and use of vehicles. This taxation discourages industry and checks employment; but it "looks good" to the exploiting interests.

+ +

The "Outlook" and the "Standard Oil."

A supposed discovery that Standard Oil interests are behind the "Outlook" magazine, was exploited through the press last week as a huge joke upon President Roosevelt, because he is understood to have signed an agreement with the "Outlook" to become one of its editors. Just why this should be regarded as a joke on Mr. Roosevelt it is difficult to see, upon any other hypothesis than the flippancy that characterizes modern newspaper reporting. If Mr. Stillman, of the Standard Oil bank and the Standard Oil crowd, is in truth and secretly a two-thirds owner of the "Outlook," there is no joke in it upon Mr. Roosevelt. The joke, if so grim a thing can be called a joke, is upon the "Outlook." For the "Outlook" is an organ of opinion. It has ranked and does rank as an honest organ of opinion, uninfluenced by improper considerations or control. Its tendency, therefore, to stand by the great Interests as against the "muck rakers" has been attributed to judicial motives. This popular judgment of the "Outlook" could not very well continue if its owner-

ship were found to be dominated by the Standard Oil "crowd"; for that body is under just suspicions of resorting to subtle methods of controlling the channels of public thought and opinion. But the story so far is only newspaper gossip. It may be one of the practical jokes that make up so large a part of newspaper reporting in these days. The "Outlook's" denial or explanation, therefore, will be accepted with general satisfaction.

+ +

Lynching and Lynching.

Because a Southern man of influence has been lynched by Southern peasants, a good deal of moral indignation has been expressed. So long as lynchings were confined to burning "niggers," there was little profound indignation, although an occasional indication of regret might be detected if you listened keenly or read close. But now that the lynching habit has pierced the mass of Negroes and reached up to white men—a perfectly natural development—the militia is called out and "law and order" is to be preserved at every cost.

+

All this is good as far as it goes. Law and order are imperative conditions of civilized life, and should be preserved at every cost. But we shall do well to consider that lawlessness and disorder of the physical kind are often generated by laws that produce disorder of a more subtle sort. The Tennessee case seems to be an instance in point. Here was a large natural lake in which the work-a-day folks of the region fished for food. This was orderly. But then came Captain Rankin in behalf of large landed interests, with schemes for putting a stop to that fishing, and the Tennessee legislature adopted his schemes. It was logical enough. For generations the work-a-day folks down there had been cut off from tilling the natural soil except as they paid soil monopolists for the privilege, and why not cut them off from fishing in natural waters? The logic was perfect to a fault. But it ran counter to habits. Although those work-a-day folks were habituated to interference with their use of the soil, fishing had always been free. So they rose in resistance. But whom could they resist? and how? Habit again answered the question. Captain Rankin was the offender in the concrete; therefore resist Capt. Rankin. Lynching was the approved method made familiar in reforming Negro morality; therefore lynch Captain Rankin. Accordingly when Rankin came down into the region to arrange for enforcing his land monopoly laws, those illogical work-a-day people kidnapped him from

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