

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-