tants would have to "move on" to a new Negro State in the interest of "advancing civilization."

Congressman Baker, who refused the Baltimore & Ohio railway-pass bribe, has put a riddle to the Democratic party in Congress. He has asked them in caucus to refuse these petty bribes. That a majority of the Democratic side of the House indicate a disposition to travel on railroad bribes and pocket as a perquisite the liberal traveling expenses which the government allows them, is not reassuring as to the sincerity of the party in power when it criticises the President for accepting railroad favors. Some officials look upon passes as too trifling to be regarded as bribes. But consider the enormous number of passes the railroads give out. Is it supposable that these free rides are given with no expectation of return—that they are mere courtesies? If they are, then why not give them to ex-Congressmen, ex-legislators, and ex-judges? Why confine the courtesy to men who control legislative or judicial favors? No lawyer trying a case against a railroad would accept a juror who had that railroad's pass in his pocket. Are legislators and judges who have passes any more to be trusted than jurors? It is to be hoped that Mr. Baker will drive his party on to refusing passes. Republican officials cannot be expected to refuse them. What are Republican officials there for? But Democrats, as members of a party in opposition to corporate aggression, if for no better reason, are bound to decline these and all other corporate favors. It may encourage Congressman Baker to know that the Democratic judges of Chicago are now refusing railroad passes, although the custom of giving them has long been common and more or less reputable.

It was a wise warning that Samuel Gompers gave the Federation of Labor at Boston, when he told the delegates to beware of anti-trust legislation, because much of it is aimed at the labor movement. All anti-trust legislation, however sincere, is heavily charged with elements of such danger. The only safe method of attacking the trusts is to undermine their monopoly privileges by repealing the laws that make them. That kind of anti-trust legislation cannot be used against the labor movement. All other kinds can be.

Complaints of the fruit trust are coming in on the score of its increasing the price of bananas. "By this increase in price," says a fruit merchant who is quoted by the daily papers, "the trust has practically stifled the demand for bananas among the poorer classes of people." The same merchant explains the power of the fruit trust in this respect by saying that it "owns all the banana land, all the ships—in fact everything but the water between America and the tropics." If it did own the water it might sell its ships and have even greater power than now. There are people, it is true, who think that monopoly of the land is less important than monopoly of machines, and to them it may appear that monopoly of the ocean would be less important than monopoly of the ships. But they would be in error. Monopoly of the ocean would really be the more important, whether we were in the canoe age or the age of ocean greyhounds.

A promising movement is under way in Cuba to tax unused lands enough to force them into the market. Similar steps are being taken with reference to the building sites of Cuban cities. Crude as the method is, the principle involved and the purpose sought are those of the single tax policy. By still another crude method, but sound as far as it goes, the city authorities of Paris are reported to be encouraging the erection of cottages for the poorer classes by exempting them from taxation. Crude as all these innovations are, they afford good object lessons of both the efficacy of the single tax principle and the advances it is making in actual legislation.

Carroll D. Wright regards the single tax question as "too vast for discussion." He is prepared to say, however, that "when the single tax advocate can demonstrate to us"—not merely demonstrate, mind you, but demonstrate "to us"—"that one-half or even one-tenth of the benefits they claim for their system are possible, we will all become single taxers." The condition is practically impossible. Carroll D. Wright couldn't be convinced of one-tenth of anything that might jar him loose from his job.

Republicans must feel like blushing for their pride in Hanna's Ohio victory, when they read such comment upon it as the following from the Boston Herald, a paper of their own party:

> Hanna and Foraker, Nash and Cox, stand for all manner of political corruption, and all manner of abuse of power. So far as political morality is concerned, they are as unworthy and shameful as any Democrats in the land. Johnson, with his adopted Bryanism and his own peculiar Populism, was defeated; but the defeat was not a victory of right and justice, only the victory of a machine organized to promote criminal politics.

That criticism is almost as withering a comment upon Republican morality in Ohio as are the increasing signs of commercial disaster a reflection upon the good sense of the majority of Ohio voters. They voted for Hanna because he promised to preserve good times; yet in less than two weeks after the election he has allowed stocks to fall, grain to decline, banks to fail, wages to be cut, strikes to be provoked, and workingmen to be turned out of employment with empty dinner pails. Hanna's word may be as good as his bond, but if it is his bond must be somewhat indifferent as a commercial asset.

How nearly the United States have retrograded to the period in their history which is distinguished by the enforcement of the

Digitized by Google

"alien and sedition laws," and how completely the autocratic principles of the defunct Federal party of Hamilton's day have triumphed in ours, is indicated by the decision of Judge Lacombe in the Turner deportation case. Turner is an English anarchist who arrived in New York a few weeks ago and was arrested while making a lawful speech at a peaceable public meeting (p. 474) in New York. The arrest was made upon a "lettre de cachet," issued by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, under the "anti-anarchist" act of Congress. Turner has been closely confined ever since, being denied to visitors and allowed to consult his counsel only in the presence of a guard. A secret non-judicial tribunal, a mere administrative board of inquiry, has decided that Turner comes within the "anti-anarchist" law and has accordingly ordered his deportation. To test the law, habeas corpus proceedings were instituted before Judge Lacombe, of the Federal court, and that functionary has sustained the law and by dismissing the writ left Turner to be disposed of by the subordinates of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

—

To appreciate the far-reaching importance of this decision, a word or two of explanation may be necessary. Turner is an anarchist; but that does not mean that he advocates violence. Tolstoy is an anarchist; yet he is an absolute non-resistant. Turner is to be deported under the "anti-anarchist" law; yet that does not mean that he believes in assassination. This law provides that—

> no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all organized government . . . shall be permitted to enter the United States, etc.

Other clauses of this law apply to the assassination of rulers, but they are not involved in the Turner case. His counsel stated to the court that if it could be proved that Turner is a person who believes in and advocates the overthrow of government by force, they would abandon his case. There was no such charge against Turner. The only charge, in substance, was that he disbelieves in and is opposed to all organized government—the same charge that could be made against Tolstoy. And Judge Lacombe decides that the law against this attitude of mind is constitutional and that Turner may consequently be deported!

—

Confronted with the constitutional provision guaranteeing freedom of speech and press, Judge Lacombe made this truly remarkable constitutional distinction:

> As to abridgment of the freedom of speech, that clause deals with the speech of persons in the United States and has no bearing upon the question what persons shall be allowed to enter therein.

The idea that the American constitution, which carefully provides for absolute freedom of opinion and expression within the United States, where it could do harm to this country if harmful, empowers Congress to legislate against it when exercised abroad, where it could do no harm to this country, is a novelty in constitutional interpretation. Its absurdity could be enhanced by nothing else than the fact that the astute judge who has discovered it labels himself "Democrat."

—

Under Lacombe's decision, Tolstoy, greatest of Russians and foremost among non-resistants, could not visit this country. Neither could Kropotkin, the famous literary man to whom England affords an asylum against Russian persecution; nor Reclus, the geographer of worldwide fame. Nor is that all. Under the principle of the decision, it would be constitutionally possible to exclude any foreigner who has an opinion on any subject. For "no person who disbelieves in or is opposed to all organized government," read "no person who disbelieves in or is opposed to all competition," and you exclude the socialist; "to all Protestantism," and you exclude the Roman Catholic; "to the Bible," and you exclude the agnostic; "to wars of conquest," and you exclude the anti-imperialist; "to the Pope of Rome" and you exclude Protestants; and so on with variations according to the popular prejudices or fears of the moment. Would these suggested exclusions be absurd? None could be more so than the one that Judge Lacombe sustains as reasonable. Any man may propose an amendment to the American constitution, but if he proposed an amendment repealing the instrument, on the ground that government is bad or useless, he would be an "anarchist" under the "anti-anarchist law;" and if he were a foreigner and made the proposition abroad, he could be deported if he afterwards got into this country and came before Judge Lacombe! If the whole thing did not cast an advancing shadow over the guarantees to free speech and free press within as well as without the United States, it might be humorous enough for a comic opera.

The Socialists of San Francisco have deservedly won a well fought battle for the right to use the public streets for public meetings. They had secured an injunction against the chief of police for interrupting their street meetings, and this injunction has been sustained by a local judge who decides that—

> Unless the socialistic meetings in question are conducted in some manner violative of law, unless they offend against decency, or ferment violence, or disturb the public peace, or otherwise offend against some statutory or local law, it would seem that the assemblages in question are not unlawful.

Since Whitney has pushed McClellan into the presidential limelight, editors are wondering whether McClellan is eligible. For the president must be "a natural born" citizen, and McClellan was born in Europe. Curiously enough lawyers are said to disagree on this question of eligibility. They must be queer lawyers.

Digitized by Google