

prisoner shall not be interrogated as to his alleged crime except in open court and of his own free will, rests upon sound principles, not only of humanity but of evidence. The "sweat box" breeds false testimony.

+ +

### The Conspiracy Against Municipal Operation in Cleveland.

Although Mayor Johnson has almost completed his triumph over the monopolistic enemies of municipal traction in Cleveland, the obstructive fight still goes on. In the city of Cleveland itself, there is no longer any real opposition. Public sentiment is clearly with the municipal movement, and its success is apparent. But monopolistic interests both in Cleveland and outside are combined to spread abroad an impression that the Cleveland enterprise is a failure. This is done by means of "fake" newspaper correspondence based upon trifling facts which are themselves made to order. One of these facts is the referendum on the franchise. There is no reason whatever to doubt that the franchise will be sustained at the special election now set for the 22d of October; but the fact that such a referendum is pending is published broadcast in distorted form, partly to discourage investment in the Cleveland enterprise and partly to discourage tendencies elsewhere to look approvingly upon the Cleveland method of municipalization. This species of obstructive campaign is further promoted by bankers who, though they have no scruple against advising their clients to invest in Wall street "cats and dogs," such as pulled many an honest penny out of many an honest hand a year ago, are even officious in advising them against investing in the Cleveland enterprise. Another of the trifling facts upon which these inspired newspaper reports are based, is a "taxpayers'" suit which the Interests have set on foot in Cleveland for "news" purposes and nothing else. Even if this suit were successful, and even if in addition the referendum went against the municipal franchise at the special election, the only effect would be to postpone the inevitable municipalization. New franchises would be immediately passed, and no financial supporter of this municipalizing process would lose a dollar, nor any street car passenger know the difference except as he read it in the newspapers. The street car system in Cleveland is already virtually municipalized and in successful and satisfactory operation. Its enemies as well as its friends know it, and if nothing but Cleveland traction interests were at stake there would be none of this captious opposition. But if other municipalities knew the

facts about Cleveland as well as they are locally known, every public service monopoly in the country would be in danger. Hence the obstruction. All we say in this paragraph is completely confirmed by the Cleveland Plain Dealer, from which we quote in our department of Press Opinions.

+ + +

## NATURAL INSTRUMENTS OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

### I. Capitalization.

At our last conversation (p. 460) I was saying, Doctor, that it is monopoly of the natural instruments of production to which the monopoly of artificial instruments is traceable. In reality, therefore, it is that monopoly, and not monopoly of the artificial ones, which coerces the working interests of the social service market and despoils them. Our socialist friend down the street contends that it is monopoly of both, and I am admitting that in a superficial way he is right. Both are in fact monopolized; and the ill effect of this double monopolization is most keenly felt by hired workingmen, especially at their point of contact with the artificial instruments. But my contention is that under conditions otherwise free, there could be no monopoly of artificial instruments without monopoly of the natural ones. By "otherwise free" I mean in the absence of slavery, patent monopoly laws, or other direct coercion of the person.

Isn't it clear to you?—it seems clear enough to me, at all events,—that with the natural instruments of production and delivery unmonopolized, and with men unenslaved personally, artificial instruments unpatented could not be monopolized. Wouldn't it be altogether impossible? On the other hand, isn't it equally clear that even though men were personally free, and there were no patents forbidding production, yet if the natural instruments of production were monopolized, monopoly of artificial instruments would inevitably result?

What's the use, then, of insisting that economic coercion of labor interests is due to monopoly of both kinds of instruments? And what's the use of proposing schemes for subjecting both to regulation, or governmentalization, or socialization, or communalization, or whatever else you choose to call it? Why not hit the efficient cause plumb in its solar plexus and knock it out? Why not establish equity with reference to artificial instruments indirectly, by establishing it directly with reference to natural instruments? Why not establish it with reference to the former as the consequence,