

hand through the history of your country, think of it! "Arrest So-and-So and hold him subject to the orders of Such-and-Such a Department of the Federal government." Upon that kind of telegram from officials at Washington appointed by the President, to officials in a distant State also appointed by the President, the latter arrest an individual in that State without warrant, incarcerate him without a judicial hearing, and hold him captive, "incommunicado," subject to further orders from the department which has sent the telegram!

+

It is said that the man in this case is a foreigner. Even so, if this be a crime shall he not nevertheless be arrested by judicial warrant, and his alienage be investigated judicially, as in any other charge of crime? If the accusation of alienage is enough to warrant so high handed a bureaucratic invasion of personal liberty, what stands in the way of similar arrests regardless of citizenship upon similar charges? And if a foreigner may be tried by bureaucrats without judge or jury, upon a charge of alienage, and be thereof convicted and deported, what is to prevent similar trials and deportations of citizens? To permit such proceedings against foreigners because they are foreigners, is to authorize it against citizens.

+

It is analogous to authorizing arbitrary arrests and punishments for crime, on the plea that only criminals are affected. How do we know that a man is a criminal except through judicial trial by due process of law? How shall we know that a victim of this revival in the United States of the old "lettres de cachet" of France is a foreigner except through the same due process of law? Arbitrary arrest of any person for any cause in time of peace, spells arbitrary arrest for any other person. This is one of the lessons of history.

+

When this particular case is scrutinized, it reveals an astounding situation. From what country did De Lara come originally? Mexico. Why? Because his life was in danger on account of his political opposition to the present dynasty. How happens it that he is seized by our government and threatened with deportation, at this time? Only two reasons can possibly be inferred from the facts so far known: one is that he is reported to have called President Taft a tool of President Diaz; the other, that Mexico wants him because he acted as Turner's guide through Mexico for the facts upon which Turner is now exposing in the American Magazine the iniquities of the Diaz regime.

If the latter inference is true, the former would seem to be in course of proof; if the latter is not true, the former is not worth consideration.

+

The thing that is worth consideration is the fact that apparently a secret requisition of Diaz for a member of the opposition party in Mexican politics is being honored by the United States: and that this is being done by bureaucratic proceedings in imitation of despotic processes in autocratic countries. Such proceedings are hostile to the American traditions and ideals of personal liberty, and menacing to American citizenship.

+ +

Free Speech.

To speak freely any sentiments acceptable to the authorities is a right that has never been questioned, never obstructed, in all the history of the world. The right of free speech, which has been and is now questioned and obstructed, is the right to speak freely sentiments that are not, as well as those that are, acceptable to the authorities. When that unlimited right is obstructed, free speech is obstructed.

+

And let it not be forgotten that the right to listen, as well as the right to speak, is involved in the right of free speech. Our constitutions are not for the protection alone of those who would utter sentiments which the authorities disapprove of; they are for the protection also of such as would listen to those utterances. The court that narrows the right of free speech to speakers, disregarding hearers, is better fitted to interpret statutory grants than constitutional safeguards.

+

Let it not be forgotten either that the right to speak and to listen to "incendiary" utterances is also involved. No one has ever denied, no despot has ever obstructed, the utterance of sentiments that were not "incendiary." No constitutional safeguards are necessary for un-"incendiary" utterances. For "incendiary utterances" is merely a handy synonym for sentiments objectionable to the authorities. Speeches for freedom of worship were everywhere "incendiary" in the more or less distant past; speeches for democratic representation in the Duma are "incendiary" in Russia today, as are speeches for non-eclesiastical public schools in Spain; and speeches for the freedom of slaves were "incendiary" in our own country, even in non-slave States, only half a century ago.

Free speech has but one meaning, and that a broad one. Its meaning is that thought should be unfettered. This is what the idea stands for in Anglo-Saxon history and in the American polity. Whoever obstructs it, officially or unofficially, commits a crime of the first magnitude against American institutions. It will be well to bear in mind these suggestions when considering the Goldman case at Philadelphia.

+ +

It Is to Laugh.

The substitute which McClure's Magazine for November offers for Tammany Hall in the city government of New York has less of a civic than of a comic opera flavor. Advocating the "commission plan" of government, but without the referendum, initiative and recall features—unless it be in its bare allusion to the plan as "the Galveston or Des Moines plan," the latter of which does but the former does not embody those protective devices—McClure's gives its idea of the kind of commission New York ought to have. "It could and naturally would," says this magazine, "expect to secure the direction of a board of men of the caliber of the following ticket: Mayor, Theodore Roosevelt; Commissioner of Finance, J. Pierpont Morgan; Commissioner of Police, Gen. Leonard Wood; Commissioner of Public Works, William G. McAdoo, the builder of the Hudson tunnels; Commissioner of Law, Senator Elihu Root." Most men of that caliber would out-Tammany Tammany in letting their friends loot the public; although it must be admitted that they would be more careful to get the authority of law for the looting.

+ +

Business and Boodle.

One of the results of having a "Bodeite," Willis J. Spaulding, at the head of the water works in Springfield, Illinois, is the discovery of a "business man's" combine with corrupt politicians for the purpose of cheating the city in the interest of coal men. The bids are so arranged, as Mr. Spaulding has discovered, that a grade of coal which none but the conspiring company can supply is the only kind to bid upon. This grade, however, is not adapted to the uses of the water works; and after contracts are made another and cheaper grade, which any of the companies might supply, is substituted. If this species of business boodle were only a Springfield discovery, it might hardly be worth mention outside of Springfield; but everywhere else, in slightly varied form perhaps, the same kind of swindle is common—

only there are seldom any Willis J. Spauldings or other "Bodeites" to expose it. And as in Springfield, so everywhere else—from Podunk to San Francisco, Chicago or New York,—when you find corrupt contracts made through corrupted politicians, you have only to look a little farther to find a very respectable group of immaculate business men getting most of the "swag."

+ +

The "Best" Money System the "Worst."

After boasting so long about the "best money system the world ever saw," aren't the leaders of the Republican party a little bit shame-faced at such an admission as this, which one of their organs, the Chicago Tribune, made for them editorially in its issue of October 15? "The Tribune itself is determined to keep its mind open for a year and to consider deliberately all the plans that may be brought forward for the improvement of the most defective currency system known to civilization."

+ +

John Z. White in the "Twin Cities."

A week of speaking by John Z. White in Minneapolis and St. Paul, brings reports from local newspapers and enthusiastic auditors which make that a red letter week in the work of a man who is doing service for good government second to none in its essential value and effectiveness. Mr. White's lectures in St. Paul are reported from local sources to have been "a revelation to students of affairs and an inspiration to all." Among other audiences which he addressed were the Y. M. C. A., the Elks, the Commercial Club, the Knights of Columbus, the School of Agriculture, and three high schools. He was also in conference with the Charter Commission and the State Tax Commission.

+

Before the Commercial Club and the Elks, both composed of business men, Mr. White was welcomed with especial heartiness for a discussion of rational city government. He advocated the "commission plan," of which he is reported in the local press to have said:

In the commission plan is combined the efficiency of the monarchy and the safety of the republic. The monarchy is an efficient government, because there is concentrated in the monarch all the power and authority of the government. When the czar wants a thing done, he orders it done; immediately it is accomplished. But monarchy is deficient because it does not give the people any means of defending their rights. On the other hand, the republic, with its diffused authority and responsibility, gives the