

document — Senate Document No. 2314. Since the first Congress met, aye, since the first Colonial Legislature was formed, there never has been so wanton, so flagrant an attack upon the principles of liberty, of liberty of thought, as this bill, and David B. Hill is its author. This is the bill popularly known as the anti-anarchist bill, the bill introduced into the Senate of the United States in its last closing days by David B. Hill.

"I am not an anarchist; it is also needless for me to say that. But I am far from sharing in the opinion that an anarchist is merely a man who wants to use dynamite. The anarchists have not a monopoly of physical force. That has been used over and over again by trades unions, by American patriots, and by people of all kinds. Anarchy in its true meaning is a belief; it is a political philosophy. It is an extension to its limit of the old democratic belief that the best government is the government that governs least.

"The anarchists would abolish government. In that I think they are mistaken. I think they go too far on one side, just as the socialists go too far on the other side. But every anarchist has a right to his opinion. Now, what is this bill? A bill to provide for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists, which provides that no alien anarchist shall hereafter be permitted to land in any part of the United States; that a board of inquiry is to examine every person who is suspected of being an anarchist. This is David B. Hill! Every alien seeking admission into the United States is to be examined if he is suspected of being an anarchist. Examined as to what? As to whether he ever blew up a house, or killed an emperor, or murdered a brutal and oppressive governor, whom human laws could not reach? No, nothing of that kind. He is to be examined by pertinent questions as to his antecedents, and as to his opinions as to government!

"Is there any difference between examining a man as to his opinions as to government, and if you do not like him sending him back again, and asking his opinion as to God, and after that sending him back? He is to be examined as to whether he belongs to any society or association of known anarchistic tendencies, and this board may examine the person of such alien for marks indicative of such membership. What does that mean? To examine him from the crown of his head

to the soles of his feet for marks indicative of such tendency! What marks? Would a man looked for by all the police of the monarchies of Europe mark himself so that he could be known by them? No; but in some of those countries political prisoners are marked. This precious bill took that way of finding out whether any man coming to this country in search of liberty had been under the ban of the despotic police of Europe.

"And more. This board may accept evidence of an emigrant's common reputation as an anarchist, and the judgments of foreign courts and police investigations may be taken as prima facie evidence, which may be deemed sufficient, unless controverted.

"And this bill goes on to provide that, in case they think there is evidence of his holding such opinions, he is to be sent back from this country, and from there the bill goes on to appropriate \$60,000 of money wrung from labor by the most atrocious taxation. For what? To send agents who are virtually to be police spies to Europe; there to go into connection with the police of European countries, and to find out and report here whom they suspect to be anarchists.

"Why, under that bill such a man as Prince Krapotkine, a man who enjoys the hospitality of England to-day, a man who as an investigator has rendered the greatest service; such a man as Prof. Reclus, who enjoys the freedom of free Switzerland, a man who stands to-day as the most eminent of living geographers—under that bill if such men came to this country they could be taken up, examined as to their opinions of government and then sent back to Europe. The man who introduced that bill was David B. Hill. A man posing as a democrat; posing to-day as a friend of labor; posing to-day as a defender of free speech. There never was such an atrocious bill introduced into the Congress of the United States.

"And in that Senate which has become an American house of millionaires, that Senate which was only anxious to serve the sugar trust, for good and sufficient reasons; in that Senate this bill passed without opposition, and it might have been to-day the law of the land, just as the atrocious Russian treaty that binds us to send back political offenders to Russia is the law of the land. It might have been the law of the land, but, thank God, there was one real democrat, a single tax democrat—John DeWitt Warner—who

stood up and protested, and killed that bill there and then. No man who ever introduced such a bill as that into the Senate of the United States, whatever else he may have done; no man who ever fathered such a bill as that can have my vote any time or for anything. John DeWitt Warner, a man who stood up and did this, the man who has been true to all his pledges, has been turned down by Tammany. You cannot vote for him this year. Tammany and Hill! They are simply parts of the same thing. I shall vote against Tammany and I shall vote against Hill."

MR. GARRISON ON MR. HANNA.
AN OPEN LETTER TO REV. EDWARD
EVERETT HALE.

Published in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of February 26.

Dear Sir: Your recent eulogy of Senator Hanna at the Washington funeral services, wherein you extolled him as "a whole-souled child of God who believed in success and who knew how to succeed by using the infinite powers," if a true estimate, compels one to readjust his ideas either of the Ohio politician or of religion.

On such occasions it is natural that expressions evoked by a keen sense of loss should lack the restraint and balance which marks later judgments of character and service. Grief is rarely joined to dispassionate speech. But you were not under the spell of close friendship. "I knew him very little," was your voluntary acknowledgment. Of him and his career, however, aside from his agreeable personality, you held a common and undisputed knowledge. That conceded, how is your picture of the deceased to be reconciled with the reality?

These ostentatious and exceptional honors were not rendered to the senator's memory because of individual probity, genial manners or family virtues. These traits are not in themselves reason for distinction. It is true that great stress is laid upon them in this instance, evidently to draw attention away from the indefensible acts of his political career,—the special acts, however, which this deliberate public display was calculated to condone. To this scheme your sincere friends have cause to regret that you lent your respected name and reputation.

Whatever Senator Hanna's personal merits or party value, it is undisputed that his political methods, now held up for admiration, would have been adjudged criminal had he applied them to private transactions. They are in-

cluded in this graphic indictment by a well-known writer:

The party was the country to Mr. Hanna, and, as the Sun says, his way of keeping his party in power was not a nice way. The game of politics was played to win. The offices of the country, with their salaries and "chances" were to be used to the party's advantage. He treated the South as a captured province. He filled the Federal offices in that section of the country with profligates and worse. He was the outspoken foe of all attempts to purify the public service. He was the friend and champion of the spoilsman. He was the arch-enemy of the merit system. He was for using for the party's gain all the machinery which had been laboriously constructed for the public weal.

If these grave charges have weight, and Senator Hanna's defenders prefer justification to denial, the question recurs concerning the fitness of your eulogy. How could "a whole-souled child of God who believed in success and who knew how to succeed by using infinite powers," engage in such godless work and so misuse those powers for finite corruption.

Unhappily posthumous praise of unworthy men by worthy eulogists is no rarity. It is rare that such eulogy is ever adopted by the historian of the times. It will not be in this instance. Rather he will record that in a degenerate day, through a degenerate party, the foes of democratic government essayed the subversion of the republic. As of old, they resorted to material temptations in order to weaken idealism, tempting greed by the display and glamor of wealth. In Senator Hanna they found concentrated the highest qualities for an effective instrument, all the more effective from possession of qualities that have human charm. His type pervades the history of all decadent republics.

"Many men know how to flatter, few know how to praise," says the Greek apothegm. May I suggest that, better for the fame of the dead senator and more worthy of your own, would have been a funeral discourse in the spirit of Aeschines's oration when he debated whether Athens should grant Demosthenes a crown:—

Most of all, fellow-citizens, if your sons ask whose example they shall imitate, what will you say? For you know well it is not music, nor the gymnasium, nor the schools that mold young men; it is much more the public proclamations, the public example. If you take one whose life has no high purpose, one who mocks at morals, and crown him in the theater, every boy who sees it is corrupted. When a bad man suffers his deserts, the people learn;—on the contrary, when a man votes against what is noble and just, and then comes home to teach his son, the boy will very properly say:

"Your lesson is impertinent and a bore." Beware, therefore, Athenians, remembering posterity will rejudge your judgment, and that the character of a city is determined by the character of the men it crowns.

WM. LLÖYD GARRISON.

Lexington, February 24, 1904.

GERMAN SOCIALISM.

An extract from "Rise and Progress of Socialism in Germany," by William Jennings Bryan, published in the Chicago Sunday American of February 14. This article is one of a series of foreign articles written by Mr. Bryan, now appearing in the Chicago American.

THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

In Germany Socialism as an economic theory is being urged by a strong and growing party. In the last general election the Socialists polled a little more than 3,000,000 votes out of a total of about 9,500,000. Measured by the popular vote it is now the strongest party in Germany.

The fact that with 31 per cent. of the vote it only has 81 members of the Reichstag out of a total of 397 is due, in part, to the fact that the Socialist vote is massed in the cities and in part to the fact that the population has increased more rapidly in the cities, and as there has been no recent redistricting the Socialist city districts are larger than the districts returning members of other parties.

GERMANY'S SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

George von Vollmar, a member of the Reichstag, in a recent issue of the National Review thus states the general purpose of the Social Democratic party in Germany:

It is well known that Social Democracy in all countries, as its name indicates, aims in the first place at social and economic reform. It starts from the point of view that economic development, the substitution of machinery for hand implements, and the supplanting of small industries by gigantic industrial combinations deprive the worker in an ever increasing degree of the essential means of production, thereby converting him into a possessionless proletarian, and that the means of production are becoming the exclusive possession of a comparatively small number of capitalists, who constantly monopolize all the advantages which the gigantic increase in the productive capacity of human effort has brought about.

Thus, according to the Social Democrats, capital is master of all the springs of life and lays a yoke on the working classes in particular and the whole population in general, which ever becomes more and more unbearable.

The masses, as their insight into the general trend of affairs develops, become daily more and more conscious of the contrast between the exploiter and the exploited, and in all countries with an industrial development society is divided into two hostile camps, which wage war

on each other with ever increasing bitterness.

To this class-war is due the origin and continuous development of Social Democracy, the chief task of which is to unite these factions in an harmonious whole which they will direct to its true goal.

Industrial combination on a large scale can be converted from a source of misery and oppression into a source of the greatest prosperity and of harmonious perfection when the means of production cease to be the exclusive appanage of capital and are transferred to the hands of society at large.

The social revolution here indicated implies the liberation not only of the proletariat but of mankind as a whole, which suffers from the decomposing influence of existing class antagonism whereby all social progress is crippled.

AIMS OF THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS.

One of the most influential of the German Socialists, in answer to a series of questions submitted by me, said in substance:

First—The general aim of Socialists in Germany is the same as the aim of other Socialists throughout the world—namely, the establishment of a collective commonwealth based on democratic equality.

Second—The Socialists of Germany have organized a liberal party of unrivaled strength; they have educated the working classes to a very high standard of political intelligence and to a strong sense of their independence and of their social mission, as the living and progressive force in every social respect; they have promoted the organization of trade unions and have by their incessant agitation compelled the other parties and the Government to take up social and labor legislation.

Third—German Socialists at present are contending for a legal eight-hour and for the creation of a labor department in the Government, with labor offices and labor chambers throughout the country. In addition to these special reforms Socialists are urging various constitutional and democratic reforms in the State and municipalities—in the latter housing reforms, direct employment of labor, etc.

Fourth—There may be some difference of opinion among Socialists in regard to the competitive system, but being scientific evolutionists they all agree that competition was at one time a great step in advance and acted for generations as a social lever of industrial progress, but they believe that it has many evil consequences and that it is now being outgrown by capitalistic concerns whose power to oppress has become a real danger to the community. They contend that there is not much competition left with these monopolies and that as, on the other hand, education and the sense of civic responsibility are visibly growing and will grow more rapidly when Socialism gets hold of the public mind Socialists think that the time is approaching when all monopolies must and can safely be taken over by the State or municipality as the case may be. This would not destroy all competition at once—in industries not centralized some competition might continue to exist. In this respect also all Socialists are evolutionists,