

SAFETY LIES IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Remarks made by the Rev. L. M. Powers, of the Church of the Messiah (Universalist), at a meeting held in Buffalo, January 25, to protest against the deportation of John Turner, and section 38 of the Immigration laws as amended March 3, 1903. Other speakers were Frank C. Ferguson, W. S. Rann, C. B. Matthews, Wilson Larey and John Shillady, in the capacity of chairman.

Secretary Cortelyou has interpreted the anti-alien and seditious law to mean the exclusion of John Turner.

John Turner is known in Buffalo. He spent some weeks here not many years ago. It is the testimony of all who met him that he is an intelligent gentleman, opposed to every kind of violence. Whether the law was intended to exclude a man of this kind is now before the courts.

Now, if the law was designed to exclude any people save those who advocate crime and violence, it is a bad law. If this law be held to exclude John Turner, it would exclude Tolstoi, the foremost citizen of the world, and Elisee Reclus, one of the foremost scientists of France. It would exclude George Fox and the founder of the Christian religion, were they living, for John Turner is no more an anarchist than these men, or, to speak more accurately, he is the same kind of an anarchist as these men. It may seem to some irreverent to speak the name of Jesus of Nazareth in this connection, but if the words of Jesus are correctly reported, he did not believe in government by force. Quakers and Shakers, Menonites and non-resistant Christians of many kinds, have all believed that they could not be consistent followers of Jesus while participating in a government founded by and supported by force. Without a religious, or at least a Christian basis, John Turner believes precisely as these do; and if Turner is an anarchist, then Quakers are anarchists, and any law that would exclude Quakers is a stupid law.

It is a strange fact, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the gentlest people are the ones that apparently are hated most. Our Puritan forefathers used Quakers worse than we now use assassins, for they burned them. And what was their offense? Why, they would not go to law and they would not fight. They relied on intelligence and love to rule the world, instead of force.

Now this is anarchy, and John Turner, believing this, is an anarchist. In the popular thought an anarchist is one who believes in assassination. This misunderstanding is perhaps natural, since the man who killed President McKin-

ley claimed to be an anarchist. But the man who killed Garfield claimed, I believe, to be a Baptist. He certainly claimed to be a Christian. Yet no one assumes for this reason that Baptists or Christians are dangerous people. Of all men the anarchist is the one whose belief pledges him to the most peaceful methods.

I am not an anarchist, because I believe force is still needed in this world; but I believe we need much less than we have, and that more and more intelligence and love are to take the place of force. I believe we can all safely say with Thoreau: "I heartily accept 'the motto, 'that government is best which governs least,' and I should like to see it lived up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out it finally amounts to this, which also I believe: That government is best which governs not at all; and when we are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government they will have."

I believe that any man who advocates violence or murder should be locked up as a lunatic. But any law that makes it a crime to invite Tolstoi to visit this country, is a very stupid law. Milton said: "The whole truth has nothing to fear from the whole error." The world's experience shows that Milton was right.

Life and property are always safest where thought and speech are freest. England, where anarchists of every type of thought are given freest utterance in Hyde Park every Sunday, is almost the only country where a ruler has not been assassinated in recent years. There is no line we can draw marking a limit beyond which speech may not safely be free. The moment we say of any idea, "It is dangerous," the way is open to all tyranny. If the people cannot be trusted to decide what ideas are wise or foolish, democracy is a failure. The best way to cure a fool of his folly is to let him make a fool of himself, provided, of course, his folly harm no one else. If it be folly to believe that we can get along without a government of force—and all governments mean force—it is a folly that harms no one, since we have had Quakers and Shakers, and Passive Resistant Christians among us for a long time, and the world is the better for them all.

Turner has no wish to come to America, if America does not want him. He is willing, however, to spend six months in prison, treated as though he were the worst kind of a criminal, if by so doing he may help to preserve free speech in this country that has used him so badly. If this does not stir us to speech and action, and cause our

hearts to go out to him, then is there little hope for us left.

THE HOPE OF NEW ENGLAND DEMOCRACY.

Address of the Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island, etc., at the banquet of the New Haven Democratic Club, January 11, 1904. (See Public of January 16, page 647.) As reported in The Commoner of February 5.

Formerly New England was half Democratic; whilst Vermont, Massachusetts and Rhode Island were in the Whig column, Maine, New Hampshire and Connecticut inclined to Jeffersonian Democracy. At that time the population was more rural and more native—conditions which one would naturally expect to have favored Whig supremacy.

Notwithstanding the increase of urban and manufacturing and foreign-born population, all of which changes should count for Democratic gains, New England to-day is solidly Republican. How can such an apparent anomaly be explained? Wholly, I believe, by the increased power of money in elections, accompanied as it has been, by the drift of nearly all men of wealth into the Republican party.

The influence of money in determining the result of an election is almost unbounded. In the first place the daily newspapers of our large cities are great business enterprises, are owned by wealthy men and corporations, and find their largest profits in the advertising patronage of rich men and corporations engaged in other lines of business. Very naturally nearly all of these papers in New England are Republican in their politics, or, if nominally independent or Democratic, they are but half-heartedly so, having a bias, unconscious, very likely, towards the views of their customers and associates of the wealthy class.

The press is an influence at work all the year round to mould public sentiment; and most persons who depend upon one daily paper for their knowledge of public events, inevitably are influenced by the views it inculcates.

But money is another far more direct, and no less potent, influence upon the result of an election. I refer to its power of purchasing a strong party organization. "The cohesive power of public plunder" is spoken of, but it is trifling as compared with the cohesion which is effected by an abundant supply of funds placed at the absolute disposal of a shrewd party manager. The many ways of using campaign funds I need not specify at length. Clubs are sustained, workers are hired to qualify voters and then get them to the polls, lavish ad-

vertising and spectacular public meetings are paid for, teams for getting out the vote and a multitude of other "legitimate expenses" are provided. No doubt in a large majority of New England towns the result of an election is determined beforehand by the knowledge that the Republican local organization is well supplied with funds, and that the Democrats are destitute.

If any doubt exists in the minds of the managers of the dominant party as to the result of an election in any legislative district, then without hesitation illegitimate methods are called into use, to-wit: Direct bribery, and what is more effective in populous localities, the corruption of election officials and of active members of the Democratic organization.

Is it strange under these circumstances that the rich Republican party has permanent control of every New England State? Only sporadically, at long intervals, by a fluke, as it were—a fluke, by the way, which has not happened in any New England State for many years—can an opposition party ever get control of the State's government.

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding its perpetual minority, the people of New England at heart are democratic. Every state, every city, nearly if not quite every town, and certainly every party, contains a majority of voters who believe in democratic principles.

A very large majority of the Republicans of New England are in sentiment democrats. They are opposed to the policy carried out by their State governments, and regard the most important acts of legislation to be wrong. They rejoice in every veto of a party measure and wish they were more numerous.

The truth is that the monied men who supply the campaign funds, and they are very few when compared with the whole number of Republicans, also dictate the policy of the party. They see to it that legislation is in their own interest and not in that of the rank and file of their party.

It would seem strange that, even with the unlimited use of money, a party organization hostile to the people in almost its every act, can retain permanently the support of a plurality of the voters. And yet it does so succeed, aided no doubt by race prejudice, party spirit and a machinery of elections which invites and makes effective corrupt practices.

Whilst it is true that the Democratic party need not expect permanent control of any New England

State under present conditions, yet as believers in government by the people, we need not despair. John Stuart Mill held that man's will is free only to the extent that he can change his environment. However that may be, I am convinced that the one way in which New England democracy can acquire liberty is through an alteration of its constitutional environment. Although we cannot under present conditions carry elections, we can change our State constitutions.

In order to do so, however, in such a way as effectually to change the environment, we must agree upon a single amendment sufficiently fundamental to destroy the dominance of money in elections and to substitute therefor the real will of the majority.

An amendment which will accomplish this result and which because being "in the air," is easy of attainment, is what we call in Rhode Island the constitutional initiative. By that term we mean a constitutional provision which will enable a reasonable minority of the legal voters, say five per cent. of the total qualified electors of the State, to propose amendments to the State constitution. At present, as you are fully aware, all propositions of amendment must come through the State legislatures, which is another way of saying, must meet the approval of the monopolists who furnish the campaign funds of the dominant party. But public sentiment even now is a mighty power, and can force any legislature to do some one thing upon which it has determined. The trouble has been that public opinion has almost invariably concentrated about some minor and unimportant reform, which, when accomplished, left things very much as they were before.

At present, however, there seems to be a widespread wish, which ought to be stimulated, in favor of direct legislation by the people, or, as it is called in Switzerland, the initiative and referendum. For constitutional amendments we already have the referendum; it only remains, therefore, for us to amend our State constitutions so as to grant the popular initiative.

The power of money in elections is not peculiar to New England. With scarcely an exception the monied party is in control of every State. What has long been true of many of the States is more and more becoming true of all, and now is fast becoming true of the nation as a whole. It is a serious question, and one pregnant with grave forebodings, whether under existing conditions the democracy of the nation will ever again have a real rep-

resentative in the presidential chair. In my opinion it is very doubtful.

The wealth of the country, almost as a unit, is tributary to the national Republican organization. Through the party it secures the legislation which gives its holders excessive pecuniary returns. For tariff, franchise and other monopolies obtained through Republican legislation, State and national, the beneficiaries in return contribute lavishly to campaign expenses, thus constituting a vicious circle by means of which the people are exploited and equal rights denied. The speediest and surest remedy seems to be for the people to gain direct and complete control of their State and national constitutions.

UNCLE SAM COGITATING.

Ef Johnny Bull owned Panama
Would I be thar with ships and sich,
Preparin' fur to dig my ditch
An' eggin' on my friends tu war?

Ef William, Emperor by God's grace,
Owned a square foot in that 'ere clime
Would my marines be markin' time
Round there or in some other place?

Ef in that picturesque morass
John Crapeau in profoundest peace
Was croaken uv the Marsellaise
Would I go pokin' raound the grass?

Wall, I dunno, I reckon not,
But these 'ere chaps are small, ye see,
An' they just know how big I be,
An' what a critter I'm when hot.

Traditions? Huh! an' treaties—bosh!
In this free land it's might that's right!
An' I'm jest dyin' fur a fight,
Fur I'm almighty naouw, b'gosh,
—New Haven Register.

It is not apparent that the administration has yet instructed "Manifest Destiny" as to the part we shall take in the Russian-Japan difficulty. G. T. E.

The administration goes into ecstasies because its act of recognizing the Republic of Panama was regarded so favorably by the European governments that they followed suit. But it is not altogether doubtful that its rapturous exaltation would cease did those governments continue their imitation to a finish by declaring that they would defend the new republic against all aggressors. G. T. E.

While some of us are engaged with such trivial matters as whether Gov. Garvin has insulted and made a laughing stock of his State, in which the purchasable vote is said to exceed 5,000, by trying to put a stop to bribery here; in trying to induce wise action in respect to land, and money, and the unemployed, etc., some cultured Boston people are discussing such vital themes as, Which is the most picturesque, re-