

what justification or excuse there is for the action of the Attorney General? The case surely furnishes all the elements and circumstances of a newspaper story, whether the complaints are true or not. Newspaper silence, therefore, if it continues, cannot but excite suspicion, not only that the complaints are true, but also that the Mexican political and the American capitalistic influences that are said to have reached our government, have reached also into the sanctums of our newspapers.

+ +

### Fostering Courage.

In the light of the unfaltering courage and devotion of the crew of the ill-fated Republic, how flimsy seems the plea for warfare that it is necessary to foster courage. In this catastrophe the captain of the vessel and the wireless operator reap honors which they well deserve; but the rest of the crew, though unhonored individually, were also faithful and courageous up to the full measure of their several responsibilities. And even the modest courage of all these men was not unique. Such courage is so common that it arouses no general interest unless it happens to have a spectacular setting. How degrading then—how gratuitously degrading—this plea for war, that it is necessary to inculcate devotion to duty and to foster courage in performing it. With examples like that of the Republic's crew before them, no men whose courage would under any circumstances rise above the low level of spectacular bravery, need war to cultivate it. The courage that risks life to take life, is not fit for comparison with the courage that risks life to save life.

+ +

### The Rudovitz Case.

Secretary Root is to be commended for his decision in the Rudovitz case (p. 103), although the case was so clear that no other decision was possible without stultification of the American tradition that this country is an asylum for political refugees. But the fact that a refugee could have been held in one of our jails for months, upon a case as flimsy as this, under the shadow all that time of a fear of extradition to a country which is now governed by a barbarous and blood-thirsty oligarchy, emphasizes the necessity for further and more fundamental action. The extradition treaty with Russia should be abrogated. It enables the Russian oligarchy to reach over the sea and into our own country for political refugees of whom it would make examples at home. Russia does not seek for real criminals. As for

our own country, the treaty serves it in no way whatever. Our criminal fugitives do not escape to Russia; if they did it would be as well for us and worse for them to let them stay, than to bring them back for trial and punishment. Such a treaty with a barbarous power is unworthy of the people of this Republic. It should be abrogated without further unnecessary delay.

+ +

### San Francisco's Disgrace.

San Francisco, alone of all the principal cities, competes with Chicago for the dishonor of preventing public lectures by Emma Goldman. She lectures freely in New York, in Cleveland, in Cincinnati, in Portland, Oregon; and what she says is worth hearing; according to the local reports, whether we agree with her or not. But in San Francisco, as in Chicago, the police break up her meetings; and they arrest her and her agent without the slightest proof of lawlessness on her part either done or intended. One San Francisco paper protests with characteristic vigor against this violation of American law by the police. It is the Star, which never shrinks from its duty. Declaring that it holds no brief for Emma Goldman, and does not agree with her, yet it "does not hesitate to denounce as an outrage, the arrest and jailing of her on the trumped-up charge of 'inciting to riot.'" Proceeding to comment the Star says: "The fools—and they are fools—responsible for such outrages are doing more to incite to riot, and more to make anarchists, than all the Goldmans and Reitmans can ever do. . . . Free speech is for *all*, not for some only. The laws provide that all persons shall be responsible for what they say. They are fools who insist that freedom of speech shall be guaranteed only to those who agree with them." Of like tenor is this deserved excoriation by William Marion Reedy of the St. Louis Mirror, which also gives a wholesome warning: "Emma Goldman does not incite to riot, incendiarism or murder. She is not guilty of 'conduct calculated to provoke a breach of the peace.' It is the police who indulge in such conduct. And Dr. Ben Reitman is not a vagrant. He earns his living by his advance work as Miss Goldman's agent. The Anarchist woman has as much right to utter her views as any San Francisco pastor. Those views may be all wrong, but what guarantee have we that, with some turn of the wheel, the at present all right views of those who condemn the Goldman doctrine, will not be suppressed as all wrong? If Emma Goldman can be prevented from speaking, so can another. If an Anarchist may not talk in

public, then a Democratic speech may be prohibited in a Republican town, or *vice versa*, or a Catholic speaker may be silenced in a Protestant town, or *vice versa*. It is the authorities who suppress Emma Goldman, and not that interesting and truly able and wholly kindly little woman, who are the anarchists in the baser sense of the term. If free speech, free assemblage and free press are all to be checked in the United States, the end of even the semblance of liberty is near at hand."

+ +

### The Growth of Heney.

Some men grow under stress, and some shrivel. Francis J. Heney, the San Francisco prosecutor, is one of the kind that grow. When he entered upon his career it was as a sportsman upon a man hunt. But he has been of the hunted as well as hunter, and through all the excitement he seems to have caught glimpses of things beyond—things more noble than sport and more seriously significant than individual delinquencies. At any rate his unique and thoughtful comments in the San Francisco Star on the essentially democratic charter proposed for Berkeley, indicate a profounder sense of social order than so prosaic a subject as the charter of a small city could be expected to reveal. That Mr. Heney should have distinguished and approved the real excellencies of that document as clearly as he has done, is strong testimony to his growth in civic grace.

+ +

### Who Owns the Earth?

We wish that every man and woman not a natural born fool or a natural born crook, could read Henry M. Hyde's answer to the question, "Who Owns the Earth and How Did They Get It?" which appears in two articles in the January and February numbers of *The Technical World Magazine* of Chicago. Those articles would make good reading for fools and crooks as well—but what's the use? For sane and honest people, however, wherever you may find them, the articles are of the utmost value. They are also intensely interesting. For they tell in broad detail of the looting of the United States of its natural resources—its land until the most of that is gone, and now its water power. An empire as large as Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island is the private estate of one man. In the Valley of the Sacramento alone, 100 men hold estates larger than that in the aggregate by 4,000 square miles. Millions of acres are owned by foreign nobles, including the Duke of Portland and the Duke of Devonshire. The number of farms of 1,000 acres or more in the United States had

risen to 50,000 at the last census, and 35 out of every 100 working farmers were tenants. Even farm tenancy, with its quasi-independence, which has so largely succeeded home ownership, is giving way to a condition of dependent and cringing servitude to man-masters who own many men by owning so much of the earth.

+

Of the once great landed heritage of the people of this country, there remains out of the 1,800,000,000 acres only 755,000,000. Of this area 370,000,000 is in Alaska, leaving only 385,000,000 for farming. And from that, must be deducted unknown millions of acres, for land in mountain and desert unadapted to farming, for forest reservations, and for national parks. Of the land disposed of, the land grafters of one continental railroad alone were given by Congress an area equal to the combined area of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Delaware. Up to twelve years ago "Congress had given away the public domain to railroad and other corporations to the extent of 266,000,000 acres"—equal to the total area of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota. And now comes the water grab, of which Mr. Hyde also gives a graphic account, with a terrible but not overdrawn picture of what it means to the future of our country.

+

We are often asked for definite information of the large facts regarding land monopoly in the United States. No better response could be made than to refer all such enquirers to these clear and earnest as well as brilliant articles of Mr. Hyde's in the *Technical World* for January and February.

+ +

### Something To Think Over.

In an open letter to the President, published in the San Francisco Star recently, John F. Murray offers this among other ideas on public school systems: "When the children need a schoolhouse they get their parents to vote school bonds, which are sold to some rich person or corporation, usually to a bank which got its original capital from the government for nothing. Why can not the Federal government take these bonds as security and issue to the school district currency to the face value of the bonds, at the same rate of interest as is now charged the national banks for bank currency? There are school districts where, when they issue bonds for improvements, they tax them-