

they were "labor sluggers" or else that they were revolutionaries.



By "labor slugger" we mean the type of man who takes part in labor quarrels as a plug-ugly, a fellow whose animal spirits find an outlet through bludgeons or pistols or dynamite, and who would as lief kill as eat. It was men of this type whom some of the leading Chicago newspapers employed when they were fighting among themselves two years ago, and who, after finishing their job of "shooting up" newsmen to the satisfaction of their newspaper employers, started a little reign of terror in the pay of one set of labor unionists against another. "Labor sluggers" of this type are employed at the present moment by some of the big newspapers of Chicago to help them in their fight with street newsdealers over the pressmen's strike which originated on the Hearst papers. But your "labor slugger" has no social philosophy. He simply loves to "slug." He takes pay, of course—for sluggers, too, must live—but, with the muscle of an ox and the heart of a gnat, he slugs from pure joy of slugging. The McNamaras do not belong in his class on its lower levels. It may be taken for granted, too, that they are not even among the higher-ups of the class—those who have motives for their criminal manifestations of pure animal joy, such motives as the winning of a strike.



It is evident that the McNamaras do have a social philosophy, and that their crime was committed in pursuance of it. Their philosophy contemplates a labor state composed of labor unions. Not that they were Socialist Party socialists; in political affiliation they appear to have been Democrats. Not that they sympathized with Socialist Party methods; they probably did not. But that they believed in the kind of labor state the Socialist Party proclaims. Their views as to the way to get it, however, were "syndicalistic" rather than "socialistic," the way of the Industrial Workers of the World rather than that of the Socialist Party. Yet they did not belong openly to any known "syndicalistic" organization, nor is there reason to believe that they belonged secretly. They appear to have been their own organization. They believed that a class war is on between the capitalist class and the labor class; they believed that this war must be fought out on the labor side by the "direct action" of labor organizations; they believed that "direct action" may on occasion mean violent action; they believed that the strike in Los Angeles was one of those occasions; they there-

fore resorted to violence, resulting in destruction of human life. Under the circumstances, they now regard themselves as prisoners of war captured in battle.



Irresponsible County Government.

One of the most important problems before the American people concerns our too-much neglected county governments. These are the arteries which supply the life-blood to greater organizations of evil. The bosses have learned how to use "county rings" and boards of supervisors; in fact, the worst sort of politicians get their training and their discipline in county affairs. The governing bodies of most counties are too large, devote too little time to their work, are underpaid, and are not responsible. There is, for instance, a county in California whose five supervisors have the spending of over a million dollars a year; they receive a hundred dollars a month apiece and mileage; they are narrow and third-rate men, selected from the five districts of the county, and, even when honest, they waste immense sums through carelessness and incompetence. Worse than this, the guiding star of their lives has come to be "political patronage" in all their appointments and expenditures. They thus build up a very powerful machine, intimately related to all other county machines regardless of party names.



How should wise reformers attack this most dangerous evil? First, by arousing the people to the situation. Secondly, by working for intelligent and safe-guarded county commission-government. Three county commissioners elected from the county at large, and giving their entire time to county affairs, could save very large sums, and introduce many important reforms. If subject to Initiative, Referendum and Recall, and kept in the white light of publicity, they might be trusted to appoint minor county officers, thus making a "short ballot" practicable.



The hopelessness of most American county governments can be more clearly understood by considering the almost total absence of civic pride. Many of our American counties are so large, so overflowing with resources, so full of energetic and capable people, that anyone would suppose they could be managed according to a systematic and progressive plan of development; that every road-side would be lined with useful and beautiful trees; that the county would own farms and for-

ests, where the unemployed could have work, and the old and ill could find comfort. One would also think that all the public institutions, all the civic architecture, all the villages and highways would amply and constantly illustrate high intellectual and spiritual ideals working steadily onward and upward. Is there a single county in America whose citizens so love and honor it that they passionately toil for its right government? Why can we not give ourselves the chance to feel towards the counties we live in as did the citizens of Athens and Florence towards those places in the days of their blossoming?



The Road to Industrial Democracy.

A correspondent from Oak Park, Illinois, makes a proposal which may be best considered by our readers if we print it in full:

Why not make Singletax advocates a political force this year by a united determination to aid the Socialist ticket? The Singletax proposal is revolutionary and menacing to the capitalist system. It never will be adopted effectively before the working class is consciously in political power. It is futile to attempt this radical change by means of a propaganda that tries to gain support from the trading class—it is like putting salt on a bird's tail in order to catch it. It is now apparent that one of the first and most revolutionary things that the Socialist Party may do when it gains political power, is to tackle the land question. It probably will use the Singletax as its first step. If this change brings industrial freedom, the Socialist Party and the working class will be satisfied. All sincere persons who desire to see the Singletax applied should vote the Socialist ticket. It is likely that two million Socialist votes would so terrify the plutocratic parties that their representatives in office would try various proposals of the Singletaxers in an effort to allay the unrest of the workers. The Socialist platform is the only one which advocates the Singletax ideals. A vote for the Republican, Democratic or Progressive party Presidential candidates is certainly a vote against the Singletax and against the social ideals held by Singletaxers. A vote for the Socialist Party candidates is certainly a vote for land reform and for the supremacy of the working class, which, of course, is desired by intelligent Singletaxers.

OTTO McFEELY.



That a good many Singletaxers will vote the Socialist ticket this year is by no means improbable, and for the reasons urged by Mr. McFeely. Equally probable is it, however, that a good many others will not do so, and for reasons varying with individuals. Some Singletaxers who will withhold their votes from the Socialist ticket have no interest in the Singletax except as a fiscal reform; some are individualists; some, like most

Socialists, ignorantly think of the Singletax as superficial, and, unlike many Socialists, don't want any social reform that isn't superficial; some are Singletaxers only unconsciously, not accounting themselves Singletaxers at all but favoring things that make for the Singletax; some will withhold their votes from the Socialist Party this year for the very reasons Mr. McFeely urges for their doing otherwise,—namely that they want the substance of the social state that Socialism wants. But they do not want the Socialist form of social state, and they wouldn't expect to secure any form of it by Socialist methods.



What is the social state that Socialism wants? A Labor state, isn't it? And by Labor state is meant, if we understand the aspirations of Socialism, a world-wide industrial democracy in place of the existing "capitalist-class" governments. That is precisely the kind of social state that Singletaxers of the Henry George type also want. But the Socialist form for such a social state differs from the Singletax form. Whereas the Socialist form would have to be one of minute rules and regulations, choke-full of specific "dos" and "don'ts," the Singletax form would uproot industrial privilege and keep it uprooted. The Socialist method, too, differs from the Singletax method. Whereas Socialism aims at establishing industrial democracy through a struggle between employers and employees, as hostile *personal classes*, the Singletax aims at establishing industrial democracy through a struggle between Privilege and Labor as hostile *economic interests*, regardless of class lines. A further difference in method, though logically resulting from the other, relates to partisanship. Socialists of the political group—for "direct actionists," though similarly intent on establishing the Labor state, take no stock in any kind of politics—are party-bound, and expectant of developing their party into the Labor state; but all partisan bonds lie loose on Singletaxers of the Henry George type. The latter do not expect much of any political party all at once. They vote with or to oppose parties, not as partisans, but as an effective way of stimulating, promoting and helping to guide public opinion in the direction of industrial democracy. Such Singletaxers are not very likely to vote the national Socialist ticket this year, although it can be granted that they might "go farther and fare worse."



The attitude of Singletaxers of the Henry George kind toward the Socialist objective and