

the owner's equity. Consequently a tax also on the mortgage is double taxation. But this is not so of taxes on corporation stocks and bonds. The stock of a corporation represents only the corporation's equity in its property. The rest is represented by the bonds. A tax on the stock, therefore, is a tax only on the equity. For illustration: Suppose a piece of real estate worth \$100,000 and mortgaged for \$50,000. To tax the owner on the value of the property and the mortgagee on the value of the mortgage would be to lay the tax on \$150,000, which is \$50,000 more than the property is worth. That is what is called double taxation. But suppose now that the owners of this real estate incorporate and issue stock for its value—\$100,000. Suppose that then they bond the company for \$50,000. What will the stock and the bonds be worth? Evidently the bonds will be at par and the stock at 50 per cent., or \$100,000 all together. If now we tax the stock alone at its market value, we only tax the property at half its worth, for the value of the stock is but \$50,000. To tax the whole property we must tax the bonds at market value—\$50,000 bonds at par, \$50,000,—and the stock at its market value—\$100,000 stock at 50 per cent., \$50,000; making \$100,000 in all as the basis of the tax. That would not be double taxation.

HOW TO STAMP OUT ANARCHY.

The hysterical hunt for a remedy for "red anarchy," which the assassination of McKinley has stirred up, is much less likely to stamp it out, or even to keep it in control, than to make it more subtle, more extensive and more dangerous than ever.

Nothing is being run down in this hunt but persons—persons who believe in murdering rulers, and others whose honest opinions regarding government may, when freely expressed, be by some possibility construed into an instigation of that kind of murder. The question of the initial cause of "red anarchy" is disregarded.

Yet, may it not be possible that the

statesmen and newspapers and the virtuous people generally who are raising a hue and cry against "red anarchy," are themselves responsible for the conditions which breed it? If they are, it is incumbent upon them not merely to cry out against anarchists, but also to remove the cause of anarchy in so far as they are responsible.

The red anarchist is not inspired by sordid motives. This is generally conceded. He is a revolutionist, hoping by murdering rulers to attack government in its vital spot, and so to set men free.

That he must be punished when he commits an overt act, goes without the saying; except with persons whose evils take other forms. They alone need to cry out vociferously against the "red anarchist." It is thus that they—

Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to.

But inasmuch as "red anarchists" are inspired by a revolutionary spirit, any genuine crusade for their extermination must take into consideration this revolutionary motive. Not alone must it recognize the motive. It must ascertain also whether the motive has justification or excuse; and if it has, remove them.

No intelligent investigation of this matter can be made without an understanding of the mental attitude of anarchists. Screaming headlines in newspapers and reactionary demands from political clubs contribute nothing. What is needed is judicial poise and democratic sympathies; and the inquiry must begin with the question: Why are anarchists anarchists?

Anarchism of all schools rests upon the theory that if men were absolutely free they would be just and fair. It assumes that government, by introducing an element of arbitrary force, not for an occasion merely but as a permanent institution, creates disorder.

This theory is not so sentimental as to persons accustomed to government it is apt to seem when they first hear of it. There are many indications in practical experience that it possesses at least a germ of truth.

With reference to laws for debt, for example, some instances have demonstrated that they are less effective than honor. Gamblers' debts, which the law does not enforce, are, for one thing, notoriously more secure than commercial debts, which the law does enforce. The following item, now going the rounds of the press, illustrates the anarchistic idea in another phase, by reference to the history of Colorado:

"Talk about anarchists," remarked an old fifty-niner. "It makes my head ache to see these ducks going around here branding everybody an anarchist that doesn't line up with the Republican party and a lot of two-for-a-nickel statesmen who think it is the duty of everybody to vote them into office where they can live without work. Great goodness! in 1859 Colorado enjoyed a genuine era of anarchy. We had no laws, not a darn law that anybody knew of. If anything went wrong a few people were called in and the matter was arbitrated without taxing a whole lot of people for court fees, lawyers and things of that sort. If a man was too bad, we just simply took him out and strung him up and that ended his career. Of course, this was in days before the newspaper men, politicians, lawyers, doctors and priests had very much to do in the way of regulating society, but I want to tell you, sir, those days were absolutely lawless. We had no laws, consequently we were anarchists; but for all of that a person in those days was safer with \$100,000 in gold on his person than he is to-day in Denver with a dollar's worth of chicken feed in his pocket."

We have no means of knowing whether this Colorado story is fact or not, but it serves to illustrate the anarchist point of view. Like a poem, it may be true without being a fact.

Though some anarchists believe that peace, order and justice would reign the instant the repressive arm of government was removed, others are not so confident. They realize that there would be an era of mob law. But they prefer mob law to government because of its temporaryness. Permanent government, they argue, tends to draw power to itself and to become mechanically tyrannical; whereas mob law, springing out of each occasion, is quite as likely to be as just as government law, while no more distorted by popular clamor,

and is certain to spend its force in the occasion that evokes it.

Still other anarchists entertain conceptions of private organizations, which would go into the business, competitively, of protecting their respective members from aggression. But, whatever the school of anarchism, all anarchists, those of the physical force cult as well as every variety of those of the peaceable kind, profess to believe, and doubtless do believe, as we have already said, that government, instead of establishing justice and maintaining order, fosters injustice and causes disorder.

Our own view of this subject needs no elaboration. Readers who have followed us intelligently know that we believe there is a field for no-government, into which government cannot enter without causing disorder; and that there is a field for government, out of which government cannot stay without permitting disorder.

But our view of the matter is not the issue. The question now before us is whether government as it exists and is administered—our own American government, if you please—tends to inspire confidence in the principle of government.

If it does not, if it is so unjust and disorderly as to excuse a belief that government is in itself an aggressive, despotic and wrongful thing, then we have a condition that warrants the opinions of peaceable anarchists, and accounts for the crimes of the anarchists who appeal to physical force.

So long as we allow those conditions to continue, we are not stamping out anarchy. Though we stifle press and speech, though we punish men for opinions' sake, though we abandon every popular right our fathers suffered and fought for, yet we cannot stamp out anarchy while we foster the causes of anarchy in bad government. All that is worth preserving in our republic we may stamp out, but not anarchy while those conditions last.

It is to be feared that the people of this country, if they are honest with themselves, must plead guilty to the charge of fostering anarchy through bad government. Without considering the more fundamental

evils of our government, out of which classes and clashing class interests have grown—a subject to which it is our purpose to give attention in this connection in a future issue—there is enough in the surface evils to put the American people upon their defense in any fair controversy with anarchism.

Take Tammany Hall for an illustration. Here is an organization, which by sheer force of the automatic characteristics of government, has seized upon a city and even holds a national political party by the throat.

But Tammany Hall is only a type. Similar organizations control the affairs of most of our cities. Where the cities are Democratic they use the Democratic party label, as in New York. Where the cities are Republican these predatory organizations wear the Republican label.

Nor are they confined to municipalities. If New York city has its Croker, the nation has its Hanna. If New York city has its water steals and Philadelphia its street car conspiracies, the nation has its ship-subsidy bill.

And these are but concrete examples of a rottenness in government which is appalling to whoever will stop howling about "red anarchy" long enough to think. Here is anarchy, harnessed in the trappings of government.

And how do we meet it? Once in awhile we rise up and "put good men in office." But what do the "good men" do? If they don't turn out to be bad men, but give "good government" for a time, it is not good government for all; it is good government for a "superior" class. This may be no fault of theirs, but it is a fact. When Mr. Low, for instance, was elected mayor of Brooklyn 20 years ago or thereabouts, he was the "good man in office" candidate and he did not go back upon his principles. He gave the city of Brooklyn "good government," with the net effect—nothing more—of raising the price of Brooklyn real estate.

Not only have we instances of rotten government, and instances of "good government" for the peculiar benefit of a "superior" class, but our officials deliberately violate their of-

ficial obligations in response to newspaper clamor. An instance was the arbitrary suppression of a public meeting last week by Mayor Harrison of Chicago. That is only one among many of the commonest things in connection with the practical administration of government. This lawless departure of officials—not for corrupt purposes alone, but also for "patriotic" or other like reasons—from their obligations under the law, is, upon the surface, at any rate, a most striking vindication of the anarchist doctrine that the best government is that which doesn't govern at all.

When corrupt or despotic officials arouse the animosity of a large proportion of a community and mobs rise up—something that seldom happens, because public officials make it a rule to keep on the right side of the mob—we all readily understand the motives of the mob, and they are pretty apt to be excused by people who do not account themselves anarchists.

In fact, mobs are not to be excused any more than the individual who, without a large enough mob behind him to act effectively, acts alone as a mob would act. Both he and mobs, however great their incentive, are and ought to be held to strict responsibility at the bar of the criminal courts.

But as the motive of the mob, which is a collection of "red anarchists" no matter how much they think they abhor anarchy, is understandable, so should that of the "red anarchist" individual be. The only real difference between them is a difference in courage. And this motive must be understood and taken into account. When we deal with mobs or any other kind of anarchy, we deal with human nature; and human nature in revolt always means that somewhere, somehow, human nature has been outraged.

If "red anarchy" is to be stamped out, we must listen to its complaint as patiently as we would to that of a respectable mob. The causes that foster it must be ascertained and stamped out before we can stamp out anarchy. And these causes are not speeches and writings. The

spirit of revolution is never awakened in even one breast by speeches or writings unless there are wrongs to speak and write about. The things that make anarchists are abuses of government.

We cannot go on making anarchists by misusing government for personal, class and mob purposes, and expect to rid ourselves, by the strong arm, of violent assaults in some form upon such government. That is an impossibility.

The world is pointedly reminded of this by the Manchester Guardian which calls attention to the fact that one —

thing which is often said about the murderous sort of anarchists, but not often carried to its logical consequences, is that they are vermin. That is to say, a state plagued with them is verminous. When tramps are verminous they are forced to take a bath, but when a great power is found to be verminous it seems to be thought that the only thing that need be done is to kill the creature which bit last, execrate the rest, and then go on very much as before. What we have to see more clearly than we do is that political vermin, like others, are bred by political dirt, and that the only way to be quite rid of them is not merely to kill them when caught, but to live cleanly. In other words, the infested countries, and in particular Italy, whence come nine anarchist murderers out of ten, should set their houses in such order as not to furnish great breeding grounds of squalor, misery and ignorance. The new Italian ministry, to do it justice, is making a brave effort, but it is not too soon. Of course there will always be plenty of persons with one of the attributes of the homicidal anarchist—the belief that all present systems of government would be better out of the way. That belief is held by many persons who would not for the world be so much as un-civil to a policeman. But the two other attributes—a belief that murder is justifiable and a feeling that his own life is worth nothing to him—are things that can only be produced in men by the most violent processes of mental and moral wrenching and corrosion; and to keep down the production of such monstrosities we must not merely deplore and destroy them when made, but wage war more methodically on the social evils that render them possible.

What we sow that also shall we reap, not tenfold nor a hundredfold,

but ten thousandfold. With our corrupt municipal governments, of which New York and Philadelphia are samples; with our corrupt national government, with its ship-subsidies and its trust-fostering tariffs; with corrupt municipal governments, of which niplaters like Quay in Pennsylvania, Croker in New York and Hanna in the United States—with these and other incentives to anarchy, of which we shall have occasion to write hereafter, anarchy cannot be suppressed. It flourishes upon that kind of food. If we really mean to stamp it out we must not stop with enforcing laws against crimes that are commonly called anarchistic. We must in some way get at and suppress the kind of anarchy that so manipulates government as to make it an enemy where it should be a friend, a plunderer where it should be a protector, a disorderly oppressor where it should be an orderly conservator.

NEWS

The death of the Ameer of Afghanistan, Abdur Rahman, may prove to be an important political event. Abdur Rahman died on the 3d, at the age of 71 years. He has been succeeded by Habibullah, his eldest legitimate son, whose mother, the late Ameer's third wife, was once a slave of the Ameer's first wife, a fact which it is supposed will detract from his popularity and strength as a ruler. The event is of political moment because it is freighted with possibilities of a rupture between Great Britain and Russia.

Afghanistan lies to the northwest of British India, and is the buffer state between that country and Russian Turkestan. Prior to 1880, the territory was undefined and was occupied by conflicting tribes, the sovereignty of an ameer being recognized outside of the Cabul region only spasmodically. But the late Ameer succeeded in acquiring dominion over the other chiefs, and in July, 1880, the British recognized him as sovereign. The frontier was outlined in 1893 between Afghanistan and Great Britain. In the agreement several of the southern provinces were conceded by the Ameer to be within the sphere of British influence, Great Britain paying an annuity of \$800,-

000. She has subsequently claimed Afghanistan as a dependency of India. Russia, however, has never recognized the delimitation of the frontier as final nor acquiesced in the British claims to Afghanistan as an Indian dependency. Subsidized by the British, the late Ameer maintained a friendly attitude toward that power. At the same time his attitude toward Russia was not hostile. His power over his people, together with the geographical position of his country, made him a factor in preserving the peace between Russia and Great Britain. But it has long been feared that upon his death Afghanistan would relapse into a state of tribal warfare, which would afford Russia her coveted opportunity to press on toward the Indian frontier. The Ameer having now died, and his successor, who is friendly to Great Britain, being regarded as probably incapable of preserving internal peace in Afghanistan, if indeed he can retain his position against the pretensions (supported by Russia) of the late Ameer's fourth son, Mohammed Umar, the British government is manifestly disturbed.

It has a serious situation upon its hands in South Africa without the embarrassments of a war on the Indian frontier, for the Boers have by their recent hard fighting revived all the doubts of two years ago regarding British success. Winston Churchill, the South African war correspondent, who is now a ministerial member of the British parliament, indicated this in a speech at Oldham on the 4th, in the course of which he declared that the military situation is now "not less momentous than when the Boer armies threw themselves into Natal at the beginning of the war." and that the British empire "confronts difficulties and dangers more embarrassing than those which hung over it in the black week of December, 1899." It seems that the British loss at Moedwill was considerably more severe than reported last week. Instead of being 33 killed, 88 wounded and 40 missing, as then reported, it was 55 killed and 115 wounded. The later report makes no mention of men missing. The deaths for August in the British reconcentration are reported by the British as 2,345 (of which 1,878 were children) out of a total of 137,619 prisoners. Engagements with Boers on the 6th are reported, but only vaguely. The desperate condition in Cape Colony