

through every sentence. The man who could create that speech is no mere traditional democrat, but a democrat whose democracy is vital. And be Bryan elected or defeated, that quality in his speech will make it a classic in American politics. The other notable thing about it, notable chiefly because it is in such striking contrast with the timidity that distinguishes Mr. Bryan's adversary, is the clear-cut definiteness of its Philippine policy. He makes no "ifs" nor "ands." He leaves no loophole. But he promises to call congress together at once upon his inauguration, and to submit his policy, the approved democratic policy, for final settlement of the question. And without reserve he describes precisely the policy he will recommend. It is a policy to which no objection can be raised on the score of international responsibilities, and yet one which reaches out to a speedy and righteous conclusion. The opportunity to support for president a man of the intellectual and moral vigor, the patriotic stamina, the statesmanlike grasp, and the profound democratic purpose, which Mr. Bryan displayed in his Indianapolis speech, does not come to the American voter every four years.

No genuine democrat can rejoice over the result of the election last week in North Carolina. It was not a democratic victory. Most explicitly it was a victory the other way. Gen. O. O. Howard is quoted upon the subject as saying that "those who voted to disfranchise the negroes in North Carolina are all democrats." He added: "If that does not smack of imperialism, I should like to know what the word means." In saying that it smacks of imperialism he is right. This disfranchisement of the black working class of the south will eventually be followed, if imperialism goes on developing, by disfranchisement of the white working class everywhere. But Gen. Howard is mistaken when he says that "those who voted for the negro disfranchisement in North Carolina are all democrats." None of

them are democrats, except some of the dupes. The white men who voted that way intelligently are natural born imperialists of the Hanna-McKinley-Roosevelt pattern.

That this is so, is evident from the fact that North Carolina is regarded now as a doubtful state. The so-called democrats who voted for disfranchisement were kept in the democratic ranks because they feared that if they joined the republican party the white and black vote would so split up as to give the negro a hearing and put him in the saddle in state politics. But now that they think this danger past they are coming out in their true colors and openly advocating McKinleyism. This view of the matter is accepted at national republican headquarters, as appears by the following extract from headquarters news, published in the Chicago Tribune this week:

Senator Marion Butler's prediction that the result of the recent election in North Carolina will make that a doubtful state at the coming presidential election is thoroughly indorsed at the republican national headquarters. The belief is also shared at the democratic headquarters, but the men in authority there are not so willing to talk about it. The reason given for the confidence of the republican managers is this: In North Carolina, as in many other southern states, the majority of the substantial business men and the financial and social leaders are at heart republicans, and desire the election of a republican president. One thing and one thing only has kept them in the democratic ranks, and that is the fear of negro domination if the negroes are allowed to exercise their rights at the ballot box.

Two instances of lawless interference by officers of the law with the right of free speech are reported this week—one in Ohio and one in Chicago. The former relates to the Dowie missionaries, whose case we referred to last week, the men who were first mobbed at Mansfield, O., and then, instead of being protected by the local authorities, were driven by them out of the town. There is no pretense that they committed any crime. Nothing whatever is charged against them, except that in a perfect-

ly lawful and peaceable manner they preached religious doctrines which their persecutors do not accept. Yet, when, in the exercise of their unquestioned rights, they returned to Mansfield this week, the authorities used the power of their position to prevent their stopping there.

With reference to the other instance, that of the suppression of an "anarchist" meeting in Chicago, let us premise by saying that we have no sympathy with assassination, and that we are sticklers for law and order. We do not believe in violent revolution; we do believe in freedom for peaceable agitation. And because we believe in law and order and peaceable agitation, we conceive freedom of speech and of the press to be one of the most sacred charges the law imposes upon officers of the law. Let that right be invaded, and no rights are secure. Let the law for the protection of freedom of speech and of the press be arbitrarily set at naught, and "law and order" is a by-word. There can be neither law nor order, where speaking and printing, either or both, are dependent upon the irresponsible whims of policemen. And if it is thus dependent in any case, it may easily become so in all. If without legal warrant, based upon due legal proceedings, policemen may suppress free speech in an unpopular or even dangerous instance, they can suppress it whenever they please; and as it is the nature of power to breed power, they will not be slow in doing so. The danger point, therefore, is at the initial step. Not in any wise, then, as a special plea for the so-called "anarchists," but in the name and for the sake of law and order, we beg all who are not themselves "anarchists" at heart, to consider the ominous nature of the arbitrary and unwarranted act of the Chicago police last Sunday in suppressing the public meeting just referred to.

The call for the meeting in question was in these terms:

Liberty lovers, attention: Mass meeting Sunday afternoon, August 5, at two

o'clock, at the Twelfth street Turner hall, on Twelfth street near Halsted, to consider our view of the removal of the King of Italy.

There was nothing in that call to excite fears of a disorderly purpose or a dangerous act. There is no pretense to the contrary except that the words "our view" were emphasized, and that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist. The first point is childish. The second is an exposure of ignorance. Many men avow themselves anarchists who are personally as harmless as Quakers. Although some anarchists believe that the existing order will be overthrown by irresistible revolt, and some propose by criminal methods to help on the revolt, others are emphatically men of peace. The fact, then, that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist is wholly void of significance. But even if the meeting had been called by criminal anarchists, even if its purpose had unmistakably been to approve the assassination of the King of Italy, even if it had been to encourage that kind of folly and crime against other potentates, nevertheless it had not done so. It had violated no law. To go a step further: even if the meeting had been held, and had done all this, yet so long as it remained a peaceable meeting the police would have had no right to interfere. Their function in such matters is to preserve the peace, not to censor public speakers. It does not follow that meetings which advocate assassination may proceed with impunity. If speakers do advocate assassination, and there is any law against such incendiarism, they may be dealt with by the law. But if we are to have law and order, if that public dignity which comports with public safety is to be observed, if the people are to be assured that the law guaranteeing freedom of speech with responsibility for utterances made is to be upheld, speakers who transgress must be held to account by orderly legal proceedings, based upon actual utterances, in which judgment shall be pronounced by juries. Their meetings must not be disturbed by policemen acting upon their own irrespon-

sible volition and without, even the shadow of a pretense of legal warrant. Yet in the case under consideration the Chicago police, without legal complaint, without a warrant, without other authority than a self assumed censorship, suppressed the meeting mentioned and summarily arrested the leading participants in the call quoted above. They did so, moreover, before a word had been uttered or a purpose had been indicated by any speaker. In doing this they themselves became "anarchists," overriding guaranteed rights of free speech, defying the law, disturbing the peace and making a mockery of public order. Their unwarranted act was more subversive of law and order, more inimical to the public peace, and more dangerous to good government than anything that could possibly have been said at the suppressed meeting.

The single tax men of New York have done a sensible thing in organizing a "Bryan and Stevenson single tax campaign committee." Henry George, Jr., is the president, with Montague R. Levenson as secretary. The treasurer is Jerome O'Neill, one of the oldest and most active of Henry George's disciples. Not only is this a sensible proceeding, but it is an appropriate tribute at this time to the memory of Henry George. For Mr. George realized, no one better, that a vital issue was pending in this country, which even before he died had begun to take shape. On the eve of the presidential election of 1896 he wrote:

What is really in issue in the election that takes place to-morrow is the very life of the republic. It may not be a final conflict, but it must be a conflict that will make the side that wins stronger and the side that loses weaker for conflicts yet to come. And it is drawing near to the close of the century when, as I have long thought, the great struggle must in fact though not in form, be determined.

It was part of Henry George's greatness that he could distinguish essence from form. He knew that the elementary rights of men to the use

of the earth might very likely, most probably would, be determined in struggles in which that particular question would not be formally at stake. He saw it as an unnamed issue in the campaign of 1896; he foresaw it as the unnamed issue of 1900. And so it proves to be. The paramount issue of imperialism essentially involves all that Henry George contended for. With a popular awakening upon that issue there cannot fail to be a popular awakening upon the issue that is inseparably associated with George's name. A tide is rising which George's followers can, if they will, take at its flood. Or they may let the flood pass while they amuse themselves with imitation politics. The New York single tax men, with George's eldest son, his confidant and biographer, as president, have seized the opportunity. Describing themselves in their call as "dedicated to the principle of equal rights, by which all forms of privilege shall be abolished and every man shall be free to enjoy the full fruits of his labor," they declare their alliance "with the democratic party of the country in this presidential contest, with a deep and fervid conviction that such action is required by the sacred cause of human rights;" and solemnly pledging themselves for this struggle, they call upon their "single tax brethren throughout the nation" to join them "heart and soul in an earnest effort to carry to a triumphant issue the candidacy of Bryan and Stevenson."

Those who are not already informed will no doubt be interested to learn what vouchers there are for the authenticity of the appeal of the central Filipino committee "To the American People," which appeared in *The Public* of July 28—Page 252. The author of this appeal, Dr. Galicano Apacible, a Filipino scholar and patriot, is the president of the central Filipino committee at Hong-Kong. Some of our readers may remember Dr. Apacible's remarkable and thrilling letter which appeared in *The Public* June 10, 1899 (No. 62,