

Mohammed succeeded in reorganizing it with great profit to the national exchequer. Under Muzeffer-Eddin he became director general of customs. In this capacity he laid the foundation of the system upon which to this day Persia's international credit is based and which saved the country's finances during the late troubles from utter ruin." As a governor and as concessionaire of the Persian telegraph system he became the richest man in Persia. After the abrogation of the Constitution by the late Shah, he was sent to subdue the revolt which broke out at Tabriz (vol. xi, pp. 348, 369, 395, 471, 831; xii, pp. 63, 396, 419); but being at heart a Liberal, and seeing, moreover, the signs of a new day, he resigned and went back to his home, to later organize the army that captured Teheran. His assumption of the premiership gives at least a strong hand to a government struggling with the problem of constructing a democracy in an ancient Asiatic civilization that dates its absolutism back 2,500 years, to the days when the laws of "the Medes and Persians" were royal decrees which "altered not."

\* \*

#### **Constitutionalism in China Advances According to Schedule.**

The Chinese ten years' program for constitutionalism, laid down last year (vol. xi, p. 708; vol. xii, p. 825), is working out as planned. The steps for 1909 were announced as "election of provincial assemblymen; issuing of school books." Word has come that the Provincial Assemblies have actually met in the capitals of the respective departments. Their function seems to be more advisory than legislative. The Chinese, unaccustomed to the new forms, are said so far to have paid but little attention to this evidence of a new epoch.

\* \*

#### **British Politics.**

In the House of Commons on the 22d, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. George, presented the Budget (p. 1020) estimates as revised.

+

The present situation is described at length in the Chicago Tribune of the 24th by T. P. O'Connor, M. P., who has just arrived in this country on an Irish party mission, accompanied by Richard McGhee, a former Irish member who is also a land value taxationist. Mr. O'Connor's letter, written from New York, is the best first-hand report of the British situation that has yet been made in an American paper. At the time he left London the Commons had adjourned for a week, to give the Ministry a chance to rest. The danger he now fears is not that the Lords will reject the Budget, but that they will pass it and that the Ministry "will then be satisfied and will make the

attempt to live through another year or two of office." Continuing he says:

This is the reason of the tone which Mr. Redmond has taken up during his recent successful tour of speech-making in the English cities. He has declared his strong opinion that the Government will be ill advised if they don't have an early general election, whether the Budget be accepted or rejected. And even he went the length of saying that he and his party would do their best to force the Government to a dissolution. This is also the attitude of the radicals, including the radicals in the ministry. The powerful and aggressive speeches of Lloyd-George and Churchill have not been made without a purpose. They provoked wild outbursts of rage from all the friends of the House of Lords and people speak of these two politicians as Abraham Lincoln was spoken of in the bitterest days of the civil war. But it is just what they want. They are determined to force a general election if they can, being convinced that if the House of Lords question be not tackled now, it will not be tackled for years to come, and that until the House of Lords is brought to its senses there can be no hope for real progress in England.

\* \*

#### **Free Speech in Philadelphia.**

In the Goldman injunction case in Philadelphia (p. 1017), Judge Willson in his adverse opinion said that the case rested upon two contentions: that (1) under the Constitution of Pennsylvania "every citizen may freely speak, write and print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty;" and that (2) under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, no State can "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." As to the first contention he held that Miss Goldman can claim no infringement of a right, "because she is not a citizen, either of Pennsylvania or of the United States." As to the second he holds that "it does not appear that the State of Pennsylvania has attempted to discriminate against the plaintiff personally, or as one of a class of persons." Considering, then, the essence of the question, Judge Willson made this assertion of the arbitrary powers of peace officers over freedom of speech:

The question which the plaintiff would have us determine is whether or not public officers, entrusted with the preservation of the peace, acting (as we ought to presume the defendants would) in the honest exercise of their judgment, should be restrained from prohibiting the delivery of lectures which would be likely to excite public disturbances and to result in a breach of the public peace. If such public officers should attempt to interfere in such a case, their interference would be justified, not upon the ground that the person to be affected by their action was an alien or a citizen, but by the knowledge that dangerous and disturbing sentiments tending to disturb the peace would be uttered. We do not mean to say that an alien has the same or as full a right to at-

tack the institutions of our country and to advocate the abolition of the constituted and constitutional government of the land that a citizen might have, but, so far as the case which is before us is concerned, we should regard the right of a citizen as no higher than that of an alien.

+

Exercising the arbitrary power thus adjudicated, the police of Philadelphia on the 17th arbitrarily stopped the meeting called to protest against the Spanish execution of Professor Francisco Ferrer (p. 1017), and broke up another. Miss Goldman was not present nor to be present at either. The Ferrer meeting, which, as already reported (p. 1017), had been called for Industrial Hall, and was stopped by a body of police who stood at the entrance and drove away all who appeared, was followed, as also reported, by the meeting at 424 Pine street, a small hall above the ground. The police followed the people into the room. Joseph J. Cohen called the meeting to order, and without interruption made the following impressive speech, as reported by the Philadelphia Record of the 18th:

"The entire world is aghast to-day at a crime committed the other day in Spain. Francisco Ferrer, a friend to all humanity, was foully but officially murdered. Yet, black as that crime is and horror-stricken as the world must be, a worse crime is being committed in this city to-night. It is not so terrible a thing to kill one man's body as it is to stifle and to prevent their upward trend. We have been forbidden by the police to meet together to discuss anything. Our leaders are forbidden to give us the benefit of their words. We are not allowed to seek to better our minds. I came not so many years ago from Russia, where the tyranny of the police is as all the world knows it. Yet never have I found tyranny in Russia such as this in Philadelphia. I do not know what to say of the presence of the police in this room. They were not invited, and as I understand it, they have no right here. But we are not here to fight them or to give them trouble, and I ask you all to keep your seats and maintain good order no matter what happens."

Turning directly to Acting Police Lieutenant Hogan, where he stood surrounded by his men, Mr. Cohen said:

"You men should know, as the world knows, that by actions such as yours to-night our doctrines are only spread and strengthened. For years we have struggled for a hearing. Until the police opposed us we could not get it. To-night we are a comparatively small body. Continue your oppression and I tell you that in a few years all the police of all the world will not be able to stem the tide of anarchy. You may arrest us, you may imprison us, you may kill us to-night or at any other time, but the hardships we suffer at your hands will bring more converts to our cause than all your tyranny can drive away."

It was at the close of Mr. Cohen's speech that the police lieutenant, who had listened in apparent bewilderment, broke up the meeting for the stated

reason that the floor of the room was too weak to hold so large a crowd.

+

Of this police intervention the Philadelphia Record's report comments in these words:

Anarchistic sentiment in Philadelphia received a decided impetus last night from the drastic methods adopted by the police, under orders from Director Clay, to keep the leaders of the cult from speaking publicly in protest at the execution of Francisco Ferrer, the Spanish modernist.

+ +

#### The De Lara Case.

Across the continent from Philadelphia, the police of Los Angeles, California, subsequently supplemented by Federal immigration officials, have extended arbitrary power in a manner that may well excite Americans who look upon the Philadelphia affair with equanimity. According to the Los Angeles Times of the 11th, in a coarsely partisan report intended to justify the police, a speaker at a peaceable meeting at the Plaza on the 10th, was arrested in the middle of his speech. We find nowhere in the Times' report any other reason for the arrest than that he said, "Taft is only a stool pigeon for Diaz." According to the Times' report, "before he had time to notice how his remark had been received by his audience, he was snatched off his feet and headed toward the police station." Though called an "anarchist" by the report, this was evidently a loose epithet, for the man proves to have been Guitierrez de Lara, a prominent Socialist.

+

At the regular Socialist meeting on the night of his arrest, De Lara's wife, an American woman, stated that she could get no information at the jail or the police station as to the cause of her husband's arrest nor as to the possibility of giving bail for him. Thereupon some 30 or 40 Socialists went from the meeting to the police station in his behalf. From a correspondent for whose veracity we do not hesitate to vouch and who was present, we learn that "the conduct of the police was simply outrageous." The report in the Times, though loaded down with partisan verbiage, is to the effect that the Socialists' question as to the cause of the arrest was announced by the desk sergeant, who said: "Those men [De Lara and some of his auditors who were arrested later] are booked as suspects." When the Socialists said they wanted to offer bail, the sergeant replied, "You can't." And as they were urging their right, the police lieutenant appeared and gave an order to "clear the hall," whereupon, says the report, "half a dozen officers got busy on the inside end of the crowd, and the visitors were moved without much loss of time." The inference is that they were clubbed out.